ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General – ICANN Public Forum
Thursday, October 22, 2020 - 10:30 to 12:00 CEST

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Good morning, evening, or even night for all of you in the world participating to this Public Forum for the GNSO AGM meeting -- for the ICANN AGM meeting number 69.

I'm very aware that this is a time for some of you that may be in the middle of your night. Thank you for joining nevertheless; in particular, in the Americas. In Europe it's a bright morning. In Africa as well. And in the rest of the world, it's a decent time.

So these times of global -- the time zones does form one of the biggest hampers of the virtual meetings we have, as we discovered over the last weeks. And I have deep respect for all of you to continue to participate in this and contribute, because the discussions have been very lively and very good.

This meeting is really for you, as always, to answer -- ask your questions to the Board. The Board will be very happy to answer all those. And all questions are welcome.

If we can't answer on the spot because of the subject or because more research is needed, we'll take our time and come back to you afterwards.

So next to the time zone issue, of course we miss the social interaction. And I can speak on behalf of all of the Board to say that that has been a very useful and important aspect of our meetings in the past. And over the last year, we've tried to do our best in reaching out and being in contact with you in whatever ways possible, but it's not entirely the same.

Not having to travel to Hamburg is a shame in many ways. For those of you who saw Hamburg movie earlier this week and participated in the quiz, it's really a town worth visiting at some point that works for you. So the only positive side of not having to travel is that you don't have to leave your family behind and that you can join in any session you want by just a click of your mouse.

So we really look forward to your questions and to engage with you. And before we do so, I would firsthand over to Herb Waye to share with you the Expected Standards of Behavior.

ICANN is a multistakeholder system that should be welcoming for all, and we're all part of that.

So, Herb, please.

HERB WAYE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. My name is Herb Waye, and I'm the ICANN ombudsman.

On behalf of myself and Barb Curwin, the adjunct Ombud's, welcome to the ICANN69 virtual forum.

I would like to remind everyone to adhere to the ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior, not just during this Public Forum but throughout all of your interactions with the community, ICANN org staff, and members of the Board of Directors.

Respect and civility can turn conflict into progress. By focusing on the problem instead of the individual, people get things done. Abusive words, disruptive actions and inappropriate images have no place in our multistakeholder, multi-cultural environment where race and diversity, equity, inclusiveness, dignity and respect guides our moral compass.

As I mentioned in my recent blog post, the Expected Standards of Behavior extend to all visual, written, and verbal communications. All participants are entitled to expect that everyone will speak and act with professional courtesy, consider cultural differences, and behave with mutual respect at all times.

Thank you. Stay safe and be kind.

Brad?

BRAD WHITE: Thanks, Herb.

Today's Public Forum is going to last about 90 minutes. We have three 25-minute question-and-answer blocks. All three Q&A blocks are open to any subject of community interest.

I should mention that we've tried to keep this virtual Public Forum as close as possible to the in-person sessions that so many of you are familiar with and that we've done so many times in the past.

Now, allow me to talk just a bit about how to voice a question. All attendee mics are muted, so if you want to ask a question, click on the "raise your hand" icon at the bottom of your screen and you'll automatically go into the speaker's queue. When we see that it's your turn, you will be sent a note requesting that you unmute your mic. This lets you know that it's your turn to speak next. Once you've been introduced, please make certain to unmute your microphone, and then ask your question. It would also be helpful if you, for the sake of the record, if you would state your full name, who you're representing, if anyone, and where you're joining us from.

EN

The time rules are pretty much the same as they have always been at Public Forums. There will be a two-minute timer on your screen, which is how long you have to ask your question or make your comment. We use the time limit to facilitate as many questions and comments as possible.

The Board facilitator will then either answer your question or toss to the Board member who is best equipped to answer your question. I should note at this point that once a question is asked, the Board may need a few seconds to determine who is best prepared to answer your question. So if there's a little lag there, that may be why.

If you're unable to voice your comment, please write it in the Q&A pod. My colleague James Cole will then read it for the sake of those who only have an audio connection.

Please do not ask your question in the chat pod. We are not track being questions from the track pod, so it won't be read if you write it there. Use the Q&A pod instead.

We do have simultaneous interpretation available if you wish to take advantage of it. We invite you to download the Congress Rental Network app and follow the directions posted in the chat.

As detailed in the online description of this session, we offer translation in Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish, and

English which are the six U.N. languages. So with that, I'll turn it over to our first Board facilitator, Nigel Roberts.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Before asking the first question, I want to add my personal welcome to virtual Hamburg.

Ladies and gentlemen, greetings, and warm welcome to the ICANN Public Forum virtually in Hamburg. I'm very sad that I cannot greet you in the real Hamburg, because for 40 years, I had a second home in northern Germany, another Hanseatic city not far from here, and I was really happy to go back to my second homeland. But it was not to be, and so I'm welcoming you all from my home office on one of the Channel Islands, Alderney.

Regrettably, German is not one of the languages for which ICANN provides interpretation. I would be happy to help but because I am not an interpreter myself, I would like to ask you to please ask your questions in English or in another language on our list.

BRAD WHITE: Nigel, it looks like the first person in the queue is Emily Barabas. Emily, if you would please identify yourself for the record. Make

sure that you're unmuted. Tell us who you're representing, if anyone, and just tell us where you're joining us from.

Emily, can you hear us?

Apparently we're having technical issues trying to reach Emily, so let's go to the second person in the queue. And I hope I don't mangle this name too much. Amrita Choudhury I believe is the correct pronunciation. Amrita, you can my pronunciation if you can be so kind.

AMRITA CHOUDHARY: Hello, everyone. My name is Amrita Choudhary. I am from India and I represent an organization called CCAOI. We work on digital policies and represent the interest of end users. CCAOI is also an (indiscernible) affiliated to APRALO ICANN At-Large.

I want to raise the challenges end-users face when a registrar goes insolvent and would like ICANN to consider if any changes are required in ICANN's role in such circumstances.

Net for India, a registrar based in India, went into solvency recently. And the case is currently being examined by the Insolvency Board of India. Net for India registrants are not only based in India but overseas also, and the shutdown of its services had affected more than .35 million people. Therefore,

this is an issue confined not to the .IN registry of India but also impacts registrants from the world.

While the National Internet Exchange of India, the ccTLD, has released a press note that all domains due to expire will be renewed, we are concerned about the impact on registrants who own domains on TLDs such as .COM or .ORG. And most of the registrants are actually unaware of the situation, what they need to do, whom to contact, or what the process is.

In the interest of end users particularly, registrants, is ICANN considering taking some proactive action along with other gTLD and ccTLD operators to help mitigate this crisis and create some goodwill in the market and also how this learning could be used in future? Thank you so much.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you. And welcome, Amrita. Thank you for the question. I think this is probably a question best answered by the Org.

Göran, do you have something to suggest here?

GÖRAN MARBY: I would invite either Theresa Swinehart or Jamie Hedlund to answer that question.

JAMES COLE: Just give us one moment. We're going to have them promoted.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Hi. This is Jamie Hedlund. Can you hear me?

JAMES COLE: Sure can. Go for it, Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

                          Thank you, Amrita, for the question. I am head of ICANN's contractual compliance function, and we are very well aware of the issues surrounding Net for India.

                          We've received a number of complaints, and we worked with our vice president in India as well as other parts of ICANN to resolve them. When they initially filed for insolvency, we attempted to suspend them and prevent them from being able to register new names. But unfortunately due to the insolvency, we were not able to do that. We've been working closely with the registrar to resolve the many complaints that we have received.

                          The registrar is -- the resolution professional is responsive and is slowly resolving many of the complaints and allowing for

example, one registrant who was responsible for the education of 150,000 students to transfer their name to another registrar.

We continue to work with the court and with the -- rather, with the resolution professional in order to make sure that everyone is aware of the issue. We've provided additional support through our global support function and through contractual compliance.

And we have also put out information on how registrants can make sure that they are adequately protected.

We will continue to post more information on our compliance page and urge anyone to contact us if they have an issue. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you, Jamie.

Unless anybody's got anything else to add, I will toss it to Brad to introduce the next question.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you, Nigel.

Looks like the next person in the queue is Vincent Gouillart. Vincent, correct my mangled pronunciation and make sure you are unmuted. And please go ahead with your question.

Vincent, it looks like -- it looks like you're still muted on our end. There you go.

VINCENT GOUILLART: I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

BRAD WHITE: We can, indeed.

VINCENT GOUILLART: Great. Thank you, Brad. This is Vincent Gouillart from the French ministry of foreign affairs in Paris. I will speak in French.

Dear members of the Board and dear Göran, in particular, you know that there is a procedure for policy development. A PDP is going on for intellectual property rights in all of the gTLDs.

In August, VeriSign, the operator for the .NET and .COM, offered in the framework of that PDP that this system that is named Uniform Rapid Suspension in English, URS, be extended to all gTLDs. VeriSign added that if the working group refused, it would deal directly with ICANN Org on that issue. That

declaration is worrisome for France because VeriSign is trying to circumvent the PDP if it doesn't get what it wants.

As you know, the PDPs are the basis of our multistakeholder model. The problem by circumventing this is that the model is being made fragile.

The French government recognizes that VeriSign has its right to renegotiate its contract with ICANN. But it seems that the multistakeholder model be involved.

So the question is the following: If VeriSign does not get the extension of the URS by the PDP, if it asks ICANN Org a revision of its contracts in order to introduce the URS in the .NET and the .ORG, will ICANN respond yes? Or will ICANN say that the PDP didn't satisfy the demand and, therefore, the community needs to be -- the community's point of view needs to be taken into account? Thank you very much.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Vincent. And welcome. Thank you. Thank you for the question. And, again, I think this is a question for Org and possibly for compliance.

GÖRAN MARBY: Hello. I have to admit, I have to look into this a little bit more deeply because I am not really sure that I am informed about this process -- or the things from VeriSign.

In general, we go through -- I mean, when it comes to new G programs, we go through a PDP process that is quite -- where we are -- you know, where the community sets the policies that end up in contracts. And there is no real way to bypass that. When it comes to the VeriSign contracts, we normally go through another process and we went through another process with that already this year, even if it seems like a longer time ago, with the amendments of that.

So I'm not really sure about this particular thing. But, tell me one thing, it's very hard for anyone to bypass the ICANN multistakeholder model which ends up in the contracts there. And it's not up to individual partners to be able to do that in such a way is described. And, therefore, I think I would have someone reaching out to you to see if I can understand a little bit more the context of that question.

Sorry about that. Sorry I couldn't give you a straightforward answer.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay, Göran. Thank you very much for the answer.

I think next up we have a written question. I see a couple of questions coming in. Brad.

BRAD WHITE: I will toss to my colleague James Cole who will read that written question.

JAMES COLE: Thanks, Brad. The first written question comes from Marcus Faure. I appreciate that ICANN is providing a remote participation platform that is probably the best thing we can have as long as physical meetings are not possible.

In addition, the automatic transcription provided by Otter is helpful for anyone who is not a native speaker. I assume moving from the scribes we had in past meetings to Otter significantly improves the meeting budget which I also appreciate.

However, it seems that Otter is quite confused when it comes to ICANN lingo. Acronyms are usually rather messy. The word ICANN itself is often transcribed as the two words "I" and "can." During the universal acceptance session on Monday, Otter interpreted the FICCI initiative as "freaky." And during the RSSAC work session, a reference to RFC8806 was transcribed as "radio sex."

I'm not exactly sure what that is, but it sounds like it might violate the Expected Standards of Behavior.

Would it be possible for ICANN staff to get in touch with Otter and ask them to look at some of the ICANN acronyms?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Thanks for the question. It's a problem not just with ICANN and real-time interpreting. I think maybe somebody from the meetings teams might be able to assist.

GÖRAN MARBY: Actually, we will give this to Sally who is the head of language services.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Thanks very much. And thanks, Marcus, for the question.

What Nigel said, it's challenging in this live circumstance to get the right transcription. And certainly it's difficult. As you can see some of the examples that you shared, it does happen. But I can assure you we do work closely with the scribes and the organizations we use and provide glossaries.

Also, important to know that later, you'll find the corrected transcriptions posted and available. So it doesn't solve the

immediate problem of what you see during the meeting, but it is a good resource after the fact to go back and look.

Thank you for the question. And, yes, we do go back and follow up and do some QA afterwards and work with them on glossaries. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Sally.

Brad, I notice we have a lot of written questions piling up but I'm sure there are a lot of people who want to speak as well. So who is the next question?

BRAD WHITE: Looks like the next questioner, Nigel, is Jonathan Matkowsky. Jonathan, make sure you're unmuted and please proceed.

JONATHAN MATKOWSKY: Hello, my name is Jonathan Matkowsky from RiskIQ Incident Investigation and Intelligence, the i3 team, within the Forum of Incident Response and Security Teams, FIRST. I'm one of the co-chairs of the DNS Abuse Special Interest Group of FIRST. Can you hear me?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, we can hear you.

JONATHAN MATKOWSKY: My question is just to confirm there is situational awareness into this work. Within this group we are working on defining a common language and a first did he have nation of DNS abuse in an operational context to protect its constituencies and to inform international policy. The SIG has gathered many well-known experts and they are currently developing a classification scheme. The mission of the SIG recognizes that the DNS is a critical part of the Internet. Malicious threat actors dues the DNS protocol and DNS infrastructures and domain names and the technical resources associated with harmful cyber activity and operations. Computer Emergency Response teams worldwide are confronted with reported DNS abuse continuously. We rely heavily on DNS analysis and infrastructures to protect our constituencies.

Understanding the customary international norms applicable to detecting, mitigating and preventing DNS abuse is critical for the open Internet stability, security, and resiliency. While the term DNS has different meetings, the SIG is addressing it as both the technical infrastructure used for the resolution of the names and that used for the provision of registration services. In developing its classification scheme for DNS abuse, given the experts pool

from an incident response perspective, this work will be grounded in matured classification schemes, specifically ENISAs (phonetic). The SIG differentiates between abuse of the DNS and abuse of IDN DNS as registration with abusive intent, giving false identity information, and is abuse of the DNS. Giving false DNS answers or changing replies is in most cases abuse of the DNS, but the intended redirect is abuse by the DNS. A nameserver compromise would be an abuse of the DNS, but then displaying fraudulent content would also be abuse by the DNS. Phishing is abuse by the DNS, and if the domain name registration itself is abusive, then it is also abuse of the DNS.

I realize my time has expired. Just to conclude. For each incident classification, we will see how the SIG views the nature of the access to the DNS such as through one or more required resources, intrusions or denials. Examples that the SIG provides to differentiate between abuse of the DNS and by the DNS will facilitate detection, mitigation and prevention of DNS abuse.

Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you for the thoughtful comments. I think Merike has got something to say on the subject.

Merike, please.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah, thank you. This is Merike Kaeo, SSAC liaison to the Board.

Jonathan, thank you very much for bringing this work on DNS abuse done by the FIRST community to the ICANN community's awareness.

DNS abuse is an extremely important topic, and there are many stakeholders that deal with mitigation and knowing that the incident response community is also working on this issue is a very welcome piece of information.

So thank you very much for that.

JONATHAN MATKOWSKY: Thank you so much.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thanks, Merike.

Brad, who have we got next?

BRAD WHITE: Nigel, as you said earlier it looks like we're getting several written questions. So I'm going to toss to James Cole who will do two or three of these, raise two or three of the written questions.

Mason, I can see you in the queue. Don't go away. We'll get back to you. Let's just deal with some of these written questions first.

James?

JAMES COLE: Thanks, Brad. The first one is from David Taylor, a lawyer at Hogan Lovells: There is considerable friction between the data keepers and the data requestors in the current ICANN ecosystem. We all agree that we need a system that complies with the law but allows for data to be provided by data holders for legitimate interests on a lawful basis to the data requestors in a timely and efficient manner. We've heard this week that contracted parties receive many requests that do not provide the necessary information for them to take action.

When we as a law firm follow the data disclosure format provided by the contracted parties to the letter, showing the legal rights, legitimate interest, confirming good faith, and that the data will be processed legally, why is it that most registrars, consistently well over 50%, refuse to disclose the data and rarely propose any solution to obtain it? Do you think that this situation is acceptable? Can ICANN please define reasonable access on current WHOIS policies?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you for the question, David.

                        Becky.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: You're muted.

NIGEL ROBERTS: We're not hearing you.

BECKY BURR: Sorry. Can you hear me now? This is Becky Burr.

NIGEL ROBERTS: We can.

BECKY BURR: Thank you very much for the question. The Board is of course very interested in making sure that the policies on reasonable access are being followed by Compliance. I know that Compliance has been monitoring this situation. And perhaps Jamie could provide some data on -- on what we understand coming from complaints?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Hi, this is Jamie. Regarding data from complaints about denials to third-party access, we've had --

BECKY BURR: Yeah.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thank you. We've had relatively few complaints. Since we -- since February of this year, we've had about a dozen complaints that registrars inappropriately denied access. We're processing -- some of those are consolidated. We're processing about five of them. I know this is in contrast to some of the numbers that others have thrown around with their own experience in trying to reach registrars. And I don't have any insight into those much larger numbers of unresponsive registrars. We obviously can't -- we can't process complaints that we don't receive, but would encourage folks who are encountering registrars who are not responding at all to submit those complaints as a failure to respond is a clear violation of the obligation.

Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you, Jamie.

So it is critical -- I mean, it's very hard to -- We certainly have heard what you are saying, David, about no responsiveness, but we don't have data that enables us to confirm that that is going on.

We also note that the Board will be considering the recommendations from the GNSO on the expedited PDP on access to registration data. And one of the considerations, I think, that will be important is the extent to which a -- a uniform intake system can reduce issues associated with whether all required data is being provided, formatting. And hopefully reduce friction in the system with respect to responding to requests for data.

Nigel Roberts thank you, Becky.

James, I think we have some more written questions?

JAMES COLE: We do. The next is from Russ Pangborn, a lawyer with the seed IP law group: Thank you for the opportunity to pose questions to the Board. My question is ICANN postponed PPSAI pending the outcome of EPDP Phase 2, noting it was dependent on outputs of Phase 2. Now that Phase 2 has concluded largely without impacts to PPSAI, when will ICANN restart implementation of the privacy/proxy accreditation policy?

NIGEL ROBERTS:	Okay. Who wants this one?

BECKY BURR:	I believe that that -- This is Becky Burr, and I believe that the PPSAI issues are, in fact, on the table in the Implementation Review Team work on this matter.
	I -- if somebody on the ICANN, at org, can give us status on that, that would be helpful.

GÖRAN MARBY:	Theresa?

THERESA SWINEHART:	Yes. Thank you.
	Can everybody hear me okay?

NIGEL ROBERTS:	Yeah, sure.

THERESA SWINEHART:	There we go. Now I'm off mute. Excellent. Thank you. Apologies.

So we're currently reviewing the impact of the EPDP recommendations on the existing policies and procedures, including the PPSAI recommendation with regards to next steps, and the Phase 1 EPDP team is recognizing that these recommendations could impact other existing policies and procedures in Phase 1 rec 27 anticipated policy updates to other areas.

So this is the process that we're using to share the analysis and support the discussions on the next steps, especially regarding the proxy and privacy EPDP. And the report will be shared with the Phase 1 IRT and then provided to the GNSO Council following this meeting.

So I hope that's helpful with the response.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thank you, Theresa.

Brad, who is the next questioner?

BRAD WHITE: Next question -- questioner is Mason Cole, but before we take Mason's question, he is the only one in the queue to voice a question, so I'd like to encourage anyone who has a question to

please hit the "raise your hand" icon at the bottom of your screen so you can get into the queue.

Also, I'd like to remind people to please speak slowly for the sake of our interpreters and scribes when you're speaking. No one is more guilty of breaching that than me.

Mason, I'm going to throw it over to you. Please make sure you're unmuted and go for it.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Brad. Can you hear me?

BRAD WHITE: Indeed, we can.

MASON COLE: Thank you. Good morning. This is Mason Cole speaking to you from Portland, Oregon in the United States. Thank you for the opportunity to pose a question to the Board.

We learned recently that ICANN believes that public interest commitments may no longer enforceable. We further heard this week that many believe that DNS abuse issues are out of scope or the contracts don't provide for compliance capability.

Based on this, could you articulate what ICANN can do when it comes to DNS abuse or whether ICANN will seek to strengthen its contracts as a way to mitigate abuse?

Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Mason. Lots of questions about DNS abuse today.

Merike, I know you're going to be up next to facilitate. Do you want to say something on this?

MERIKE KAEO: I would expect -- I think this question was more about compliance and how DNS compliance --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I agree.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. Can I jump in a second?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Gladly.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. And this is Avri speaking from Providence, Rhode Island in the U.S.

Yeah, I think that there is an overstatement in saying that PICs cannot be enforced. I think that the issue -- first of all, the PICs that are currently in existence are definitely within the compliance and enforcement and all of those. The question that has sort of started this was a question that the Board has asked to sub pro, is given the contract as it current -- not the contract -- the bylaws and the mission as currently stated, we're just asking the Sub Pro Working Group to give us some feedback and such on how they see the new PICs, and especially the new registry voluntary commitments that -- how they would be treated in relation to the mission and such, if they were specifically content based or anything else that falls within the barrier that says, you know, ICANN will not go outside its mission, how do they see those being treated. So that when we come to doing the public interest, viewing it and determinations at the end of the PDP, we have a full set of info to work with.

So no statement in those questions that they cannot be just questions as to how they can be in the future.

Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thank you, Avri.

Just before I pass the baton to Merike, I'm going to go to Göran for a comment on this question.

GÖRAN MARBY: Just adding to what Avri said. And I think that to some extent, there seems to be misunderstandings about the intent of the comment from the Board because what the Board really wanted just to point out is this is something we have to take into account, that we always have to take into account what's inside or outside the ICANN's mission. So I think it's a fair thing to do.

But one thing I want to comment on more specifically is the importance of when PICs are introduced and used, they are something that Compliance can actually do something with. They have to be clear. They have to be sort of enforceable when we actually do PICs. And I think that's a learning process from the first round, is that whatever PICs there are, they have to be in the mission, but they also have to be clear enough for Compliance to do something with.

Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Göran.

And so, Merike, you're up next to facilitate the session. And thanks.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you very much, Nigel. And a few words in German from me as well.

(in German).

In Hamburg, but I hope that in the future that we can have meetings in Hamburg. And let's continue with the plenary and your questions and our answers.

And I welcome the next speaker and question.

BRAD WHITE: Thank you. The next question is from Stephen Deerhake. I believe that's how it's pronounced. Against, you can clear up my pronunciation, Stephen. Please make sure you're unmuted and proceed.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Can you hear me?

BRAD WHITE:	Yes, we can.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:	It's Stephen Deerhake, but I won't hold it against you.

My name is Stephen Deerhake, I represent the American Samoa ccTLD. I have been a long-time participant in ICANN, and I am currently one of the three ccNSO councilors for North America.

I also serve on the Empowered Community Administration on behalf of the ccNSO. And as some of you may know on the Board, I have developed what some might call a mildly unhealthy addiction to the minutiae of the ICANN bylaws.

As we know, ICANN is incorporated in California. It's a nonprofit public benefit corporation under California law, enjoying Federal 501(c) status as a nonprofit under the U.S. Federal Tax Code.

The SO/ACs are creatures of the bylaws, and as I recall from the transition discussions, they are also subject to California law as unincorporated associations. Yet as SO/AC councilors, of which I am one, we rarely get legal advice from ICANN org on our formal obligations as officers of these unincorporated associations.

Would you not consider it useful for, say, ICANN Legal to provide briefings to the SO/AC councils and councilors on our

obligations as leadership of these unincorporated associations existing under ICANN corp, perhaps annually? Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you very much for your question.

Which one of my Board colleagues would like to take this answer? I believe actually this is for JJ, for John Jeffrey.

JOHN JEFFREY: Yes. Thank you, Merike. Stephen, very good question, as always. I think there's a few facts in it that are incorrect, though, so I'd rather go back and analyze your question and respond to it fully since this deals with a fundamental legal issue that involves ICANN.

So thank you for your question. We'll take that question off and we'll respond to it offline.

MERIKE KAEO: Great. Thank you for the reply, John.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, J.J.

MERIKE KAEO: And I do see that we have a question, I believe, from the queue. Brad?

BRAD WHITE: We do. But before we go to that, my colleague James Cole is informing me that we have some written questions. So let me throw to you, James, to take the next written question.

JAMES COLE: Thanks, Brad. The next one is from Finn Petersen: The GAC has advised the Board to conduct an independent analysis of costs and benefits of the 2012 round of new gTLDs before the next gTLD round. The Board accepted this advice. What is the status of this cost-benefits analysis?

MERIKE KAEO: Avri, would you like to be the first from the Board to answer?

AVRI DORIA: Sure. Yes. I believe that process is just starting. So it has been accepted. There will be conversations. Perhaps somebody has more information on exactly where it is, but it's a process that is starting. And -- you know, yeah. Thanks.

MERIKE KAEO:	Okay. Would any other Board colleague like to chime in? Okay. I don't see anybody else at this point, so can we get on to the next question?
BRAD WHITE:	Sure. The next question is from Jeffrey Neuman. Jeff, please make sure you are unmuted and go ahead.
JEFF NEUMAN:	Thanks, Brad. And you pronounced it right, so that's good.

Just joking.

Thank you. And good morning, afternoon, evening, everyone. I have two comments and one of them is a question. The first one is I want to thank the Board. I'm one of the co-chairs of subsequent procedures, and I do want to thank the Board for staying very much involved in the PDP process in terms of filing comments and making sure that we can all see -- get some insights into what the Board is thinking. So I think that that's been a great development.

And I know there's lots of questions being asked during this meeting about what the Board has said in their comments.

I would -- although I know and understand why the questions are being asked, I think we need to, first, thank the Board for making those comments and participating in the process and try not to discourage the Board by asking so many questions so that they don't provide comments in the future.

The second thing is a comment on the operational design phase, which is something I just wanted to voice my complete support for. It seems like a lot of constituencies and stakeholder groups may be misinterpreting the purpose of the operational design phase as somehow trying to infringe on policy, processes. And I don't see that at all. I think the operational design phase makes a lot of sense.

I think for asking questions like how many employees is it going to take to carry out this program, especially for subsequent procedures, you know, what kind of budget is needed, how much money is up front, when will we start getting funds in, all that kind of stuff makes a lot of sense.

So the question is: What are the next steps on finalizing the operational design phase document and enshrining it into ICANN's processes going forward? Thanks.

MERIKE KAEO:	Thank you very much for your, first of all, positive comments for the Board. It's not often that we get them, so thank you.
	And then as to your question, I will pass it on first to Avri to answer.
AVRI DORIA:	Yes. Thank you, Jeff. This is Avri speaking. Thank you, Jeff, for your comment regarding the Board questions. And, trust me, I don't believe we will be afraid to send in questions, though we will pay lots of attention to our wording as we always do but we learn each time.
	Also very grateful for your comment on the ODP, and I would like to pass that on to Göran to discuss any of the next steps as it is an Org proposal.
	Thanks.
GÖRAN MARBY:	Thank you. And thank you, Jeff. Yes, we have received many questions about the ODP. But most -- not about the policy-making process itself, more of the notion of the last bite of the apple, that this will create another avenue for -- members of the community might not be happy about the outcome of, for instance, a PDP, to give them an opportunity to come in, to have

more opinions and change the outcome of the PDP. That's not the intention. And we're going to figure out a way of strengthening that part in the proposal of the ODP.

So that has been very good comments, and I thank you for that.

We all know that before the Board goes into making a decision, there's a lot of mechanics happening. We get advice from different parts of the community. And there's also -- it's always going to be outreach from different parts of the ICANN community or outside from ICANN to give input to the ICANN Board.

But this one, as you actually described it, Jeff, is really about making sure we are transparent in context, decision-making processes, before it goes to the Board.

So I -- so the next step of this is that we're going to rewrite the paper. We're going to use probably the expedited PDP phase 2, the first one, to reach out to GNSO Council.

The next step forward is actually that the Board instructs ICANN Org to start the operational design phase. It's in the hands of the Board to start up the particular process.

But I want to thank everybody in the community over the last couple of days who has done so much outreach about it. We

always learn, and we take in the comments as something positive. Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that, Göran.

I also wanted to make a comment that at every public forum, questions that are not answered in the session are published and answered within 48 hours on the website, just in case some answers are not clearly answered at the time of this session. So just wanted to make everybody aware of that.

Okay. Brad, I think we have a written question?

BRAD WHITE: That's correct. Alex, we see you in the queue. We're going to take two written questions, and then we will come back to you. So don't go away.

James.

JAMES COLE: Thanks, Brad. The first is from Yoshi Murakami of the Com Laude Group, Tokyo. In round one of new gTLDs, 70 plus applicants came from Japan. There is interest in round 2. Now that subs pro is reaching its conclusion, can I ask the Board to consider

asking staff to publish a timetable for implementation featuring preferred dates for publishing the rules and for opening application? Even knowing it would be "no later than" would be helpful.

MERIKE KAEO: Okay. Which one of my Board colleagues would like to take this? Well, I do think that the Board will consider asking that question. I think that --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Merike, it's Chris. If it's all right, I will just say a couple of things about this.

MERIKE KAEO: Absolutely.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Merike.

So I think putting together a timeline is always an integral part of what it is that needs to be done to move on to the next stage and the next steps. And it's not the Board's job to put that timeline together, obviously. It's Org's job to put that timeline together.

But I think everyone should rest assured that the Board is fully on top of everything that happens in respect to sub pro and all of the necessary steps that are going to follow. And as soon as there is any clarity about the likely timeline, we will ensure that everybody knows what it is. Thanks very much.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that answer, Chris.

And I do believe we again have another written question.

JAMES COLE: Yes, this one is from Syed Iftikhar, who says: Yes, Finn Petersen's question is important especially for the low-economic country as well. I also need to know the status of this cost-benefit analysis.

THERESA SWINEHART: Hi.

MERIKE KAEO: Just wondered, what is the -- anybody would like to answer as to the current status right now?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Not sure -- this is Chris. I'm not sure there is anything to add to the previous answer, to be honest. I think we pretty much covered it all.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah, I think so too. And as noted previously, if there is anything to add, please do look at the actual website where any added context will be answered to any of the questions that need any further clarification.

AVRI DORIA: Merike, this is Avri. If I can add something.

MERIKE KAEO: Absolutely.

AVRI DORIA: Part of it is we are still at the point where sub pro is very far along. It's finishing up its inclusion of comments and such from the review. But it has not completed. And so really making those projections and even asking the Org to make those projections until the PDP is actually completed would be very much a guessing game.

So -- but I think that once things are completed, once we've gotten into the process of approval and moving forward will be the time when those estimates will be able to come out.

And I think that, you know, there will be very strong attention paid to that.

I understand the eagerness to know. I have it myself. But really we've got to let the sub pro PDP working group finish its work and the GNSO finish its appraisal before we can make that kind of estimation. Thanks.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that added elaboration, Avri. Very much appreciated.

JAMES COLE: I believe Theresa also wants to add something to this.

MERIKE KAEO: Okay.

THERESA SWINEHART: Hi. Thank you. I don't know if I can be heard. Do I sound okay?

JAMES COLE:	You can. Thanks, Theresa.
THERESA SWINEHART:	Excellent, excellent. Thank you.
	Thank you very much for the question. As we'd also responded to the earlier question on the topic reference from Finn Petersen, we'll come back with some additional information on this and the communications around that. Thank you very much.
MERIKE KAEO:	Thank you for that added context, Theresa.
	Brad, I believe there's a question?
BRAD WHITE:	Yes, Merike. The next question is from Alex Deacon. Alex, thank you for being so patient so we can get some of those written questions out of the way. And please proceed.
ALEX DEACON:	Thank you. Hello. My name is Alex Deacon. And recently ICANN Org has proposed the concept of an operational design phase, which was mentioned just a few minutes ago.

While the concept is new, and I, I think like many of us, are wrapping our heads around the details of the proposal. I believe that for large and complex policies, such as the phase 2 policy that will take many, many years to implement design, build, and integrate and eventually deploy, it will come with a high price tag. The ability for the community to discuss and debate and define pragmatic operational design options using a framework such as the ODP seems important. So personally I support this concept.

As some may know, I have been researching design options that would allow ICANN to leverage existing infrastructure and capabilities now and evolve them over time for the recommendations as outlined in phase 2.

So I'm curious -- Göran mentioned this a few minutes ago. I'm curious if ICANN will commit to drafting an ODP with input from the community for the EPDP phase 2 policy prior to the Board discussion and decision? And if so, I personally believe it would be an important task to work on. And I would be interested in being involved in the process of defining the ultimate design. Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO:	Thank you very much for your comment and your question. Definitely ODP is quite important to get right.
	And so, Maarten, would you like to take this one?
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	Yeah. Just to add to what has been said earlier about ODP as well, it's important for all of us that we really understand what it means, how to implement, and how the design could work to respond to the needs expressed in the policy.
	So in that way, we are really following it. And where it happens, in which phase of the process, is not the key point. It needs to happen in a very transparent way. It needs to happen very fundamentally. And, therefore, I believe that you can trust that the community, Org, and Board will follow all of this very close together. So involvement of the right -- at the right level will sure be invited.
	Really look forward to formalizing this process that in some way always took place because we cannot implement it without design. Now we make it explicit. So thanks, Göran, again, for the proposal. And thanks all for the positive receipt of it. We look forward to make it work with you.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you, Maarten.

GÖRAN MARBY: May I add one more thing about this. As I said before, I would like to thank the GNSO Council for their idea to -- before the Board makes a discussion, to have a conversation with the Board about costs, which is really -- when we got that -- when we realized that recommendation was coming, it was such good proof of the need -- the need of actually doing this work. To be able to prepare the Board for having that conversation with GNSO, we actually have to do a lot of design work, like figuring out what kind of system, make sure that the system is legal, make sure we actually know the cost so the Board can have that.

There's another aspect to this one as well, and I see the continued discussion about this in the chat as well, is that this is not about the policy. Our job is to make sure when the GNSO Council has made their decision about recommendations for policy, what the Board is doing, what the Org is doing, is to make that happen. We are not there to stop it. We are actually there to make it happen. And this is a part of it.

The last thing I want to say is it also shows the expert PDP phase 2 or sub pro are very complex things that we need to do. And it's going to take time. Why are we describing this? It's also for the

community and everybody else we are not going to make decisions easily. Anybody who was involved in the first round as well very well knows. Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that added context, Göran.

So, Brad, I believe that you have another question to read.

BRAD WHITE: Yes, Merike. The next person in the queue is Fabricio Vayra. And then after Fabricio, we've got some written questions. And we'll take a written question after this.

Fabricio, please proceed.

FABRICIO VAYRA: Thanks, Brad. Fabricio Vayra from Perkins Coie. Thank you for the opportunity to ask a question. This week's sessions revealed what seems to be a general agreement that phishing is on the rise, but I don't believe we've heard anything about a path or a plan or commitment to addressing it.

I was wondering if somebody can speak to what ICANN's plan is going forward on this or just generally on DNS abuse issues and

if those plans entail amending the contracts or putting out any advisories on the contracts so compliance can perform its role.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that. It is, indeed, something that we all need to be aware of to make sure that any kind of abuse that utilizes DNS names get the attention it needs from all areas of the community. And we've definitely seen a very large interest that continues to make sure that everybody's doing their part in mitigating at whatever realm of authority that anybody has.

So the community is definitely moving towards looking at what should be done and what could be done and what ICANN's role is.

And we do see that everybody is -- especially from the registry and registrar communities, are doing their part already agreed to in the contracts.

But would anybody else like to add to this, from -- either Göran or from the org itself?

GÖRAN MARBY: I think your answer was -- when it comes to the abuse discussions, ICANN org and the Board is there to facilitate the discussions within the community. We continue -- and that's

where the decision -- this is the multistakeholder model that's the bottom-up process. The community decides on the actions and -- about this.

And I think the discussions and the initiatives that comes out of the community has been very positive, and I'm looking forward to see the outcome of that.

We continue to work with our contracts. We are having the audit coming up very soon, which is next point for us. Apart from that, we continue to develop systems to support the factual-based discussions within the community.

Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you for that.

Okay. I want to go to James for the next question.

JAMES COLE: Thank you. This one comes from -- apologies on the pronunciation Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Even in the current round commitments made are commitments and suitable legal documents can be drafted by the Legal

MERIKE KAEO: I'm trying to figure out, was there actually a question there? I believe it was a comment, and the comment is noted, and thank you very much.

Next, let's go to Brad again to get the next question.

BRAD WHITE: Thanks, Merike.

The next question is from Alan Greenberg. Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. My question is a follow-up to Amrita Choudhury's comment that led off the session.

I asked in the question-and-answer pod for Jamie had said this information posted on the website and he gave me three URLs that are there for anyone to see. Two of them are general information ones, one an FAQ on how to issue a complaint and the other is a record that ICANN issued a suspension notice 19 months ago, and the cure period ended over three -- almost three months ago at this point.

At-Large has received a fair number of comments about the problems in India, and from what is, by the way, India's largest registrar, or was India's largest registrar. And the situation needs, I think, something a little bit more tailored. There are people who are trying to find remedies. ICANN, as Jamie said, is helping people, but I think it needs to be documented a little bit clearer. For those of us who were around during the RegisterFly problems, it's really important that if ICANN knows about a problem that it takes positive action and makes sure that the registrants, who are actually the ones involved and of course all of their users, know what to do.

So it's not necessarily a question at this point. Jamie or someone can choose to answer it, but we really need more positive action. And when someone does a -- a Google search for "net for India" on the ICANN website and basically doesn't find anything, the only thing they can believe is that ICANN isn't doing anything.

Thank you.

MERIKE KAEO: Thank you very much for the comment, Alan. And I believe we'll take that offline with the org, but definitely something useful to bring forth, right? And so we'll get that handled offline.

Well, this concludes this part of the session, so thank you all for the contributions so far. And I will now pass to the continuation and pass the virtual baton to my Board colleague Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay, Merike. Thank you very much. And thanks to everybody for the questions so far.

Brad, where are we up to and what's next, please?

BRAD WHITE: Chris, we've got several written questions, so I will toss to James to read the next question.

JAMES COLE: Thanks, Brad. This one comes from Saso Nozic Serini: My question is about the organization of ICANN as a nonprofit. Is there any perspective to organize ICANN as ISOC in the way of having national chapters or is it enough to have national Internet registers as liaisons between ICANN and nations?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, Saso, that's an extraordinarily deep question about the very foundations and structure of ICANN, and we could take many hours discussing how that might work.

I don't know if anybody would like to comment. Raise a hand if you do. And speak.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Chris. This is Leon.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Go ahead, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Chris.

So we definitely are not organized in the same way that ISOC is, but I would definitely encourage you to approach the At-Large community. The At-Large community is formed by what we know as At-Large structures, ALSs, which engage at a local level pretty much in the same way that ISOC chapters engage with local communities. In fact, many ISOC chapters are ALSs within the At-Large community. So maybe you can approach, again, At-Large via your local ISOC chapter or maybe form an ALS yourself and begin engaging with ICANN and of course doing this outreach at a local level.

I hope that helps and answers your question and your comment.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Leon. That sounded pretty helpful to me.

Brad, what's next?

BRAD WHITE: Chris, the next person in the queue is Ajay Data. And Ajay is the last person in the queue, in fact. Ajay.

AJAY DATA: Hello. Ajay Data here. I wanted to put in a request here, actually, because now we are having virtual ICANNs and still we have many parallel sessions going on.

So could it be -- and (indiscernible) miss it because of many regions. So could we have a extra (indiscernible) there or could we plan it more better so that there are no overlapping sessions? Maybe we increase the day in the ICANN plan also but we accommodate more linear so people can have more accommodation to attend the events in that fashion.

And second is related to the IDNs and UA. I have been requesting on every forum that ICANN could be the example for accepting an IDN as a website for creating an example for the world. So could we have some action on that ground so that we have IDN domains accepted for the world to access ICANN website? Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Ajay, thank you very much.

Just on the meeting side of things, that feedback is welcome and useful. As I'm sure you know, there are those who think that this meeting has gone on for too long and that extra time is exactly what we don't want, and there are those who believe that we need extra time, and so on. So you won't be surprised to hear that there's a lot of feedback heading in lots of different directions. And the meetings team and org will need to take some time working with the community and community leaders to figure out what is the best way forward with virtual meetings.

I don't know if anybody else wants to take that point on virtual meetings and whether there is someone who would like to address the IDN question that Ajay asked.

Not hearing anybody. Ajay, we'll take the IDN question under advisement. Thank you for that. And as I said, your meeting feedback is welcome and appreciated.

I'm going to ask James, I believe we're going to go to written questions now. So skipping past Brad, James, over to you.

JAMES COLE:	Thanks, Chris. This one comes from Maxim Alzoba: Is it possible to ask lawyers whom they represent when speaking at this forum?
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	I guess it's possible. Whether it's desirable or not, I don't know. Does anybody want to comment?
MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:	Well, for sure we don't ask people, anyone who -- we ask who they represent, who they are, but we don't ask them whether they're a lawyer or not. So I think it's the same for all at the moment. I hope that helps.
BECKY BURR:	If I could just jump in.
CHRIS DISSPAIN:	I think also -- yes, go ahead, Becky.
BECKY BURR:	I think this is a -- it's a basic transparency issue. We all fill out statements of interest, and that is a long ICANN tradition that is in support of transparency.

So to the extent that people have interests, those should be -- those should be disclosed. And I think that it's certainly worth considering asking people who are -- in their questions to be clear about who they're representing.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Becky.

Nigel, did you want to say something?

NIGEL ROBERTS: I did. Becky just said it all.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. She does that.

Excellent. Thank you.

Brad, back do you.

BRAD WHITE: Thanks, Chris.

I'm going to go to my colleague James for another written question. James?

JAMES COLE: Thanks, Brad. This one comes from Alicia Hughes of ZeroTech from New Zealand: A question for the ICANN Board. Why is it you that allow the ICANN org structure to contain two senior people with security titles, Mr. Crain and Mr. Manderson, but with the global prevalence of both corporate/organizational and DNS security compromises, the Board has not yet made moves to create a CISO role in ICANN to directly advise the Board and the CEO and also bastion the cybersecurity efforts in ICANN? The lack of such a critical position in this day and age appears to be a failure of good corporate governance. Please comment how you are going to address this deficiency.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, Alicia, thank you for the question. The structure of the organization in general terms is a matter for the CEO. So, Göran, I don't know if you'd like to say anything about that.

GÖRAN MARBY: Actually, I could easily take it back to the Board because the Board has something called the Board Risk Committee which the ICANN org reports in to, and the Board Risk Committee goes through not only the I.T. risks or the cybersecurity risks (indiscernible) but any risk that could face the organization or ICANN as an institution.

We have developed -- Over the last three or four years, we have developed a lot of procedures when it comes to the overall risk but the I.T. risks is one of them.

The risk -- the security people that you referenced, which we are really happy to have, often works with outreach -- for instance, with capacity buildings and working with different parts of the ecosystem and outside -- to train them into things about DNS security.

If you look at the five-year strategic plan and also the operational plan you will see there is a lot of mentions and impacted actioning when it comes to the sort of overall DNS security issues. For instance, one of the things I can mention, too, is Merike from the Board is the -- is the chair of a Technical Study Group that actually works together with both community and outside to look into for specific threats against the DNS where we have seen several attacks over the last couple of years to come together to have better information between.

So sometimes it's not only about the -- not only about the titles but the work we actually do. But here I would say that the Board Risk Committee is well aware about the risks that the -- risk that -- the risk that faces the organization.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Göran.

Merike, did you want to comment given that Göran mentioned you?

MERIKE KAEO: Sure. I don't mind doing so at all.

Yeah, as Göran mentioned, I mean, there is a Risk Committee. And really as I'm looking at the overall industry for the last 20 years, it's not so much the titles that matter but absolutely that the functions are there. And so ICANN had, at a point, a chief security officer -- right? -- and then with different reorgs over the last decades roles or who reports to who has been modified.

But even in the industry, there is actually now a move that a chief risk officer is really the one that, underneath that, any CISO would fall under.

So overall, organizational structures are not all cookie cutter. They're not all the same. And really the emphases are that the security functions are covered. And the Board does very closely look at that and make sure the org has that covered.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Merike.

Brad, back to you.

BRAD WHITE: Thanks, Chris. Sebastien Bachollet is next. And I might add that we are going to close the queue. We've got several -- we've got Sebastien and one other person in the voice queue, and we've got several written. So given those numbers, we're going to shut down the queue in both the voice questions and the written questions.

So with that, Sebastien, the floor is yours.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello. This is Sebastien. I will speak French. Thank you very much.

Thank you all. First of all, my name is Sebastien Bachollet and not Beaujolais, even though I don't live too far from that beautiful wine region.

First of all, I wanted to thank ICANN and most especially the linguistic services for promoting German and adding it to this public meeting. I would have liked for the answer to my question about adding German to this European meeting be positive. It would have been wonderful if we had had German

added to different sessions and not just to this one. But it's very good that we got to hear some German.

So a comment. Somebody mentioned the ISOC chapters, and I would like to thank the vice-chair of the Board, Leon Sanchez, for his answer on that. But I wanted to add something.

Perhaps something could be added to the debate if there are recommendations from the ATRT3 and if those recommendations are implemented quickly.

If I understood well, when Göran explained, but maybe I was wrong and it's why I ask if a PDP was just for new gTLD.

And my last point it's, Chris, as you are chairing this session, I would like to thank you for all you have done in ICANN. And I am sure that you will stay around.

Thank you very much, everybody. Bye-bye.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sebastien thank you very much.

Göran, I think -- respond to his point about a PDP being only for new gTLDs.

GÖRAN MARBY: I don't think I've said that, and if I said that, I was literally wrong because we do --

[Laughter]

No, the community does PDPs for everything. But maybe the question was about the operational design phase.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, it probably was. Yes. My apologies.

GÖRAN MARBY: So formally we asked -- This was an internal document that we did. We did outreach to SO/AC leaders. We did outreach to community members. We talked to the sub pro group about opening up the transparency between the recommendations coming from the GNSO Council and the Board makes the decisions.

Anyway, so the Board is the one who is going to instruct ICANN org to go into the operational design phase, and it could be actually for anything that is complex or where we believe that the community needs more transparency.

The alternative not to do it the way we propose it is actually that we don't speak to the community about decisions made with the

interactions until the Board makes its decisions or leave it over to implementation, which is often -- which happens after the Board makes its decisions and, therefore, by definition, could be less transparent.

So if I said something like that, Sebastien, I was completely wrong. The idea about the operational design phase is to take complex issues, make sure that we are transparent in the front of the community, make sure that we get it right, and make sure that the Board get it right in answer to their questions before they make their decisions. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Authentication, Göran. That's hopefully very clear.

James, back to you for written question.

JAMES COLE: Thanks, Chris. The first is a comment from Stephen Deerhake who says: Chris, thank you for your contributions to this community for the past 20-plus years.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, James, for reading that out. And Stephen, thank you very much. You said it a couple of times already, and I appreciate it.

Moving on.

JAMES COLE: The next one is from Susan Payne of Valideus and ComLaude: We have heard this week at previous meetings that there are a relatively small number of contracted parties in which a high level of abuse is concentrated. So we know that there are members of the contracted parties and there are individuals who represent these registries and registrars who appear to be tolerated despite it being widely known that their business models encourage, or certainly do not discourage, domain name abuse. This undermines ICANN's credibility and discourages efforts to improve standards across the Board when there are no sanctions for egregious poor behavior.

How can we tackle these first? How can we bring them into compliance or de-accredit them and get them out of ICANN? We need to call out systematic abuse where we see it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:	Thank you, James. Thank you, Susan, for that preamble and the couple of questions.
	Becky, do you want to start?
BECKY BURR:	Thanks, Susan. I think that we are beginning to see more concrete information about the kinds of security abuse, phishing, malware, botnets, and that coming out through in particular the work that the community and the contracted parties and Org have been doing on DAAR. And I think that contracted parties are beginning to have the ability to use the information from DAAR to identify issues when they arise and respond to them.
	There are -- the question about sort of a small number of contracted parties with a high level of abuse is actually more complicated than it sounds because when you look at absolute numbers of incidence of phishing or sites or the like, there are larger numbers in some but those contracted parties may actually -- the percentage of registrations involved in abuse may be quite small as a percentage of their total registration. So you have to tackle the problem from both ends, not just, you know, some smaller organizations with a high percentage of abuse but also the work that larger organizations with a very small

percentage of abuse but a larger number because of the -- of their space, the space that they occupy.

And I think that that work is ongoing. It's ongoing with -- in the community in general with all of the focus on DNS abuse. It's also ongoing in the contracted parties house with their particular focus on some of the frameworks and the work on DAAR.

So I think that your point is -- is a good one and I know that compliance is focused on those areas where we see abuse.

That said, I think that, you know, this issue of abuse is a -- is a -- is an issue that as a community needs to tackle. And my understanding is that the GNSO is -- and the GNSO Council is looking at the issue of abuse based on the recommendation from the sub pro, that that needs to be called out as a separate line and not just limited to new gTLDs.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Becky.

I'm going to throw it back to Brad in a second.

Just before I do, Maxim, I just wanted to refer back to your -- Marc, sorry, just wanted to refer back to your question. Marc's

question is the one that's coming up, isn't it? Yes. We'll deal with that in, a second. My apologies.

Brad, go ahead.

BRAD WHITE: Chris, we have two questions left. One from the floor and a written one. We'll take the one from the floor first.

Gangesh Varma. Gangesh, please feel free to proceed.

GANGESH VARMA: Hi, this is Gangesh Varma from India. Can you hear me?

BRAD WHITE: We can, indeed.

GANGESH VARMA: Thank you. I'm representing India Council of Research on international economic relations. We are a nonprofit think tank based in New Delhi, India.

We once attended another ICANN meeting with extensive and very enriching discussions on DNS abuse. And I would like to thank Org and the community members for sharing their perspectives and learnings.

However, we may be having a little silo rhetoric entrenching positions, not really a multistakeholder dialogue.

It appears that we're obsessively focused on trying to establish abuse numbers are going down and while this approach sort of amplifies the discrepancies in numbers because they tell different stories depending on where we look and how we may be present them.

My question is whether ICANN can consider -- this is two parts. One: Is it possible and desirable to shift the focus to capture numbers or data from the DNS abuse victim side in terms of the number of people affected by the incidents? There may be fewer number of incidents, but maybe more people be are being affected. Is it possible or desirable to capture this kind of data?

And, second, has the conversation matured enough for ICANN to produce a consultation paper capturing the divergent perspective of the community and proposing an action plan? Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Gangesh, thank you for an excellent question.

Does anybody want to tackle that? Or would you prefer that we take it away as a suggestion and consider it and revert?

BECKY BURR: I'll just say I think the question of the number of -- the impact, the scale of the impact is an important aspect of this and something that I would think that the community would be focused on.

I will defer to Göran on this one, but I don't think that the dialogue in the community has proceeded to the place where Org could produce a reference paper. We're still -- we're still talking about some pretty fundamental issues.

But let me defer to Göran on that one in particular.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Göran.

GÖRAN MARBY: So I'm hearing sort of a couple of different stories about a lot of talk and nothing happening. But I have to say that I think things has happened, not as policy but, for instance, the initiative that the contracted parties took to fight abuse, the knowledge that we are sharing about abuse, which is also very important.

But in the end, my answer is always the same. I mean, it is not up to ICANN Org or the Board. Actually, we are prohibited, and for good reasons, to make policies. This really belongs -- the next step really belongs in the ICANN community what to do

next. And that's where it should be in a multistakeholder bottom-up process.

And in this case, I would probably refer you directly to GNSO who has this on their table. And I very much look forward to their insights on this. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Göran.

James, we have a couple of written questions left. So over to you.

JAMES COLE: This one comes from Marc. My question to Göran Marby is: Will two officials of the same organization holding a position in ICANN or any working group be treated as a conflict of interest as per ICANN's charter?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Let me just try and respond to that.

Marc, with respect, I think your question is unclear. But if you do have a question regarding a conflict of interest that you believe is not being addressed, then I would request you to send that information to ICANN so they can try and check it out.

I would encourage you to do that if you have an actual -- an actual concern about a conflict of interest. Thank you very much.

Does anybody else want to say anything? No? Okay.

James, back to you for the final question.

JAMES COLE: Thanks. This one comes again from Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

My name is Sivasubramanian. I am from Nameshop from India since 2012 pursuing the new gTLD application for .Internet. The timeline of its applications, its background, nuances, and the commitments that are accompanied are in perspective from the documents transparent from ICANN correspondence. Nameshop wrote to ICANN in June 2020 and during this meeting and in its request to delegate .Internet further expanded on its public interest commitments in view of the pandemic with an offer to operate .Internet as a clean new space for good, for benevolent collaboration to heal the pandemic and renew with a request for active involvement from the ICANN community.

This is a written request from Nameshop to the Board and the executive to pay expeditious attention to the communication. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Sivasubramanian. It is a written request and will be treated as such.

Maarten, I think we're done. And I want to throw back to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I appreciate that.

Thank you for that. Thank you for your excellent moderation. You've done it before over the last nine years. So glad you could benefit for this -- last time for this. And, also, appreciate the remarks from the audience in that perspective.

Very clear that many of the questions were about DNS abuse, about compliance issues, and about policies that are to be made to further our response as an ecosystem to abuse and look forward to see that further develop.

Also, very clear that both for EPDP and subsequent procedures, there's a lot of interest in the -- also the implementation aspects of that and the ODP, I've heard a lot of good questions about

that. So I'm looking forward to further developing that over time as well.

For the Board, mission is most important. The bottom-up multistakeholder model is key. And accountability and transparency is a method for all of our activities.

With that, just to end with the remark that if you didn't get a chance to ask your question, please email it to publicforum@icann.org. And we will respond to you via email.

And with that, looking forward to welcome you at the ICANN public meeting later on today. And thank you all for participating. Maybe see some of you in one of the fikas. Thank you very much, everybody. Thank you for organizing this, translators, support staff, technical staff, for all you do to make this possible and all of you from the ICANN community to participate and show your interest. Thank you. See you later.

This meeting is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]