
ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting - ICANN Public Forum
Thursday, October 28, 2021 - 14:30 to 16:00 PDT

[Recording in progress]

ANDREA GLANDON: Welcome to the ICANN72 Public Forum. We will now turn it over to Maarten Botterman, ICANN Board Chair.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Welcome, everybody, to this Public Forum. We look forward to really invite you and hear from you all the questions, concerns, or remarks you may have.

For us, this Public Forum is the opportunity to hear from you in a way that we otherwise wouldn't, and in particular in this time is the opportunity to make sure we hear things that we wouldn't hear outside of meetings. So listening to you, and let's make this the best hour possible.

I'll hand it over to Herb Waye to say a few words about Expected Standards of Behavior.

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.

HERB WAYE:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. My name is Herb Waye, and I am the ICANN Ombuds. My colleague, Barb Curwin, Adjunct Ombuds, and I welcome you to the ICANN72 Virtual Public Forum. We can be reached anytime, of course, at ombudsman@icann.org.

Our role is to ensure the ICANN community is treated fairly and that everyone can enjoy a professional and respectful environment.

Virtual participation has long been a necessary and useful way for the ICANN community to take part in the multistakeholder process. While virtual participation can be a good proxy for in-person meetings, some interactions do not translate as easily online.

We are all entitled to expect professionalism and courtesy when engaging with ICANN in all formats. The Office of the Ombudsman would like to remind you that ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior govern all aspects of interaction between participants in ICANN activities, including verbal, visual, and written communication.

I invite you all to read a recent blog posting I published regarding respectful participation in a virtual environment.

The link is posted in the conversation discussion tab on the ICANN72 home page.

And with that I wish you all a professional and respectful Public Forum.

Thank you. Stay safe, and be kind. Sally.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Thanks very much, Herb.

Welcome, everyone. My name is Sally Newell Cohen, and I'm the Senior Vice President of Global Communications and Language Services at ICANN Org.

I'm going to briefly explain the format of the session and how you can participate.

Today's Public Forum will be divided into three 25-minute blocks. All three blocks are open to any subject of community interest. Each block will be facilitated by a board shepherd, starting with Merike Kaeo, followed by

Lito Ibarra, and then rounded out by Ron da Silva.

During each block you can join the virtual queue in one of two ways. If you want to ask a question or make a comment verbally,

please click on the "Raise Hand" Icon at the bottom of your screen, and you'll automatically go into the speakers' queue. Once you're introduced by the board shepherd, please be sure that you have unmuted your microphone. And before you begin your comments or question, please be sure to state your name, where you're from, and your affiliation, who you're affiliated with, if it's applicable. And remember please to speak slowly so that the scribes and the interpreters can correctly capture your words.

If you're unable to voice your question or comment or choose not to, please write it in the Zoom Q&A pod. My colleague Rachel McFadyen will read it out loud when she's called on.

Please don't ask your questions, if you want them to be read, in the chat pod. We're not tracking the questions there, and your questions won't be read if they're written there so please be sure, if you want to have a question or comment written aloud, put it in the Q&A pod.

And again, when submitting your question or comment in the Q&A pod, it would be helpful if you would include your name, where you're from, and who you're representing or affiliated with, again.

And we do have time limit rules as we always do in Public Forums, and it will be the same as all Public Forums in the session: Two

minutes. And you will see a two-minute timer on your screen if you are making your comment or question verbally.

We use this time limit just to ensure that we can accommodate for as many questions and comments as possible.

The board shepherd will either respond to your question or comment or turn to the board member who is best equipped to answer your question or comment. I should note at this point that once a question or comment is posed, the Board may need a few seconds to determine who is best prepared to respond. So if you could just allow us that time.

Please also note that if you have a follow-up question, we ask that you re-enter the queue. This ensures that everyone does still have the opportunity to pose a question or comments. The two-minute rule will also apply to follow-ups.

This session is being interpreted in real-time in the standard United Nations languages which again are Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish.

The spoken language in Zoom may vary throughout the session depending on who is speaking, so for the best experience we recommend that you select the language you speak or listen to by

clicking on the "Interpretation" ICANN -- icon, sorry, located on the Zoom toolbar. So the bottom, to the right.

More details are available on the session page if you have additional questions, and a link is available in the chat as well.

With that, I'm going to open our first block, and our first board facilitator is Merike Kaeo. So Merike, over to you.

MERIKE KAEO:

Thank you very much, Sally.

So hello, everyone. My name is Merike Kaeo, and I would first like to welcome everyone to virtual Seattle. My Zoom background, as some of you may have recognized, is actually the city of Seattle but without the rain that's been falling the entire week.

Seattle may be known to some of you from the movie "Sleepless in Seattle," and I'm sure that for some of you attending in the middle of the night right now you identify with being sleepless in virtual Seattle. So thank you everybody who is joining us for this virtual plenary, and let's get started.

First speaker, please.

RACHEL McFADYEN: Merike, I believe that Steve DelBianco has his hand raised.

MERIKE KAE0: Okay. Steve, please ask the question.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Hey, thank you. So I'm Steve DelBianco with the business constituency, and my question has to do with the DNS abuse.

So in addressing DNS abuse, it's become clear that there's not a single comprehensive definition that we can come up with because, well, DNS abuse takes different forms of use of domain names to deceive and defraud Internet users. In other words, it's an arms race with clever criminals. And as the SSAC has said a few times, any definition has to be flexible enough to accommodate changes abuse vectors that occur over time.

I definitely want to acknowledge that voluntary endeavors by contract parties are laudable and very promising but they cannot replace an industry-wide requirement to mitigate DNS abuse, because after all, our role is to set a minimum standard for all registrars and not just rely on good registrars to do the right thing, as grateful as we are that many of them do.

So hand in hand with that role, ICANN Compliance has got to enforce those contracts. And if the contracts are, even if -- even

as compliance and some registrars have said insufficient for ICANN to steward DNS in the public interest, ICANN has got to be prepared to renegotiate the registrar contracts, registry contracts to better do its job.

So I'd close by asking the Board would you support and encourage contractual revisions for ICANN to remain a viable steward of the DNS in the face of an evolving battle over DNS abuse?

Thank you.

MERIKE KAEQ:

Thank you very much, Steve, for your question. And I think as you may have noted, there's been quite a few discussions on DNS abuse, not just this week but of course in all of the previous ICANN meetings and forums.

I believe that, you know, it definitely has to be a community effort so the community -- it is up to the community to really decide what the policies will be overall.

But I will also ask and invite some of my board colleagues to add to this, if anybody has an additional reply.

Becky, please.

BECKY BURR: Thanks.

Steve, thank you for the question. That's a discussion that we've had a couple of times this week. And I think that we have heard from ICANN Compliance that it believes it has the tools it needs to enforce the current obligations with respect to DNS abuse. But if the community decided on or adopted new policies and additional tools were required, then it would very much be part of the process to look at getting those tools into the contracts.

But as I said, we've asked this question several times directly to ICANN Compliance, and we have heard unequivocally that they believe they have the tools they need to enforce the current provisions of the contract.

STEVE DeIBIANCO: Becky, thank you for that. And this is Steve. Just following up briefly to suggest that I hope that you would invite those of us in the community who become aware of complaints of DNS abuse that have not been addressed, and then when Compliance tells us that the scope of their reach -- [Barking] -- is in the way -- There goes my dogs again.

If the scope of their powers is limiting the ability to enforce, then we will bring that evidence both to you and to Org and to

Compliance, because you don't want to just entirely ask Compliance since they may not agree with what the community feels about the proper scope of DNS abuse.

Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Steve, let me just say I agree completely, and my dog is barking in response to your dog.

MERIKE KAE0: Thank you for that.

STEVE DeIBIANCO: Thank you.

MERIKE KAE0: And I do see that Goran's hand is up.

GORAN MARBY: As Becky said, it might been said that we have had this particular discussion a couple of times.

And one of the things I would like to point to is the official reporting from Compliance when it comes to how many

complaints we get, which is a good indicator of the amount we get.

But I want to be more positive. There are things that's happened. And for instance, a while back ago, the (indiscernible) compliance through ICANN, we did actually propose a contractual change in the registries agreement to give access to more data to make it possible to get access to the data into the DAAR system. And I'm happy to say, and I posted that in the link, that we will now do that contractual change. We will make the DAAR system even better than it. And I would like to thank the contracted parties for that positive contribution. And I think that's part of what you're looking for. Concrete works that we do together to make -- to ensure that the community also knows about the work we do.

So thank you very much.

MERIKE KAE0:

Thank you, Goran. And I've also been reminded to just state the follow-up should be re-entered in the queue. So thank you.

Next up is Griffin Barnett.

GRIFFIN BARNETT: Thanks, everyone. This is Griffin Barnett, participating from Washington, D.C. I'm a member of the IPC, but speaking in an individual capacity.

Earlier this week, the GNSO Council approved the EPDP Phase 2A final report despite no votes from the IPC, the BC, and the NomCom appointed representative for the Non-Contracted Parties House. The recommendations in this report were designated as having consensus despite opposition on many of the recommendations from many in the community. There were minority statements filed by IPC, BC, GAC, ALAC, SSAC, and others.

Substantively, the report provides for no mandatory requirements and does not serve the public interest in its findings on two fundamental substantive issues in the Phase 2A charter by not requiring differentiation in natural versus legal person data processing consistent with GDPR and not requiring publication of a pseudonymized rather than anonymized or web form registrant email which is sorely needed to re-enable cross-domain correlation which is instrumental to DNS abuse law enforcement and cybersecurity efforts.

I appreciate that there are risks with these approaches to contracted parties under GDPR, but no commercial enterprise

operates free of risk and ICANN as a whole must take greater consideration of the broader public interest in ensuring a WHOIS system that adequately enables the legitimate purposes associated with maintaining the security and health of the DNS ecosystem.

I encourage the Board to and trust that it will properly discharge its obligation to promote the global public interest and further its security and stability mission by not simply rubber stamping what a very broad swath of the community so clearly rejects.

Thank you.

MERIKE KAE0:

Thank you. I very much appreciate your comment and question. So thank you very much for that. And of course the Board is taking very serious conversation of all of these points. So thank you.

RACHEL McFADYEN:

Hi. Next we have a question from the Q&A pod from Robert Nkambwe, an ICANN72 Fellow.

Welcome. How does ICANN reconcile the issue of serving a global community and yet gets into silent mode when some governments shut down the entire Internet. Does the Internet

remain secure, stable, and resilient in those communities where it is inaccessible?

MERIKE KAO: Thank you very much for this question. So I open it up to some of my Board colleagues. Who would like to respond? So Maarten, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sure. Yes. Well, unfortunately ICANN's role is really to provide this open end-to-end addressing system to the world and we're not to tell governments what to do. Even when we personally would feel that we might have an opinion about it, we're not a political organization. Our focus is truly on the technical facilitation of the Internet.

MERIKE KAO: Thank you for that, Maarten. Okay. Next up is Ashley Roberts.

ASHLEY ROBERTS: Hi. Can you hear me okay?

MERIKE KAO: Yes.

ASHLEY ROBERTS: Great. So I'm Ashley Roberts, and I work for Com Laude. So I'm aware that no decision has been made yet on the format for ICANN73, but I'm interested on how the Board is going to make its decision on whether there's any kind of face-to-face element for that meeting. So I've got two questions related to that. Firstly, are there any specific metrics that you're going to use to help inform your decision-making process, both for ICANN73 and for any other future meetings. And the second question, is it possible to share those metrics and how they're being assessed on an ongoing basis. Thank you.

MERIKE KAO: Thank you very much for your question. Maarten, please.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for the question. Indeed an important one because as you know, we thrive in also the face-to-face meetings, which hasn't been possible for quite some time. We do take a risk mitigation based approach and we do take into account, in particular for understanding the risk landscape, indicators that are globally accessible like, for instance, the CDC indicators for -- from the U.S. where there's four indicators, ranking from COVID-19 very high, level 4, to a low.

On level 4 and level 3, we find that it will be irresponsible to have an ICANN meeting. On level 2 and 1, we feel that we may be able to facilitate it, depending on local circumstances and with adequate measures.

Another factor we look at is, for instance, international SOS, and we are aware that also local circumstances are, of course, important.

But for sure, when we get together we will be still in the situation where we need to take into account that COVID is still around and measures like vaccination requirements, masks, and physical distancing will be a prerequisite as well as probably on-site temperature checks and COVID testing. And facilities will need to have the right ventilation qualities as well as staff that is also well prepared.

And then next to what's happening local, we're also aware that we need to look into international travel viability. What is the danger of traveling internationally, and is it possible to travel internationally in terms of cross border travel, open for essential travel, et cetera.

So while the Board is eager to resume public meetings for the clear benefits of collaboration, communication, and camaraderie, it's not willing to do so at the expense of the

community or staff. And we will continue to evaluate the risks, the variability of travel, and the condition under which it's reasonable to resume, all these factors that I mentioned before. I hope this helps.

MERIKE KAO: Thank you very much for your reply, Maarten. And next up we have a question from Mason Cole.

MASON COLE: Hi. Thank you. This is Mason Cole, chair of the business constituency. My question is as follows: ICANN assured three meetings ago that restart of the implementation of the PPSI policy was imminent. A year later, however, it is not restarted and it apparently is not on the horizon. We learned earlier today that it is being held up due to the SSAD ODP despite assurances the development of the ODP process would not impinge on implementation of community work. What is the rationale for further delay and when specifically will ICANN follow through on this assurance? Thank you.

MERIKE KAO: Thank you very much, Mason. And for some of you that may not know what PPSAI is, it's the privacy/proxy services accreditation implementation. And so which one of my Board colleague would like to answer? Anyone? So, I mean, we have had many

discussions that there have been many recommendations that have been pending for a while, and we just had a recent discussion today and several others also regarding, you know, prioritization and working through everything that -- all the recommendations that the community has been making over the last two years. So I do very much appreciate this question, and I will invite Becky to give some further context.

BECKY BURR:

So we are obviously aware that this recommendation, the PPSAI recommendation and implementation, was a point of active discussion in the EPDP process including controller, joint controller, independent controller issues and access to non-public personal contact details. The GNSO Council has sent a communication to Org noting that they don't identify any bar from policy perspective to continuing implementation. The July 2021, so a couple months ago letter said, in conclusion, based on the analysis and the impacts identified in the Wave report, there are no required updates or any bar to continuing implementation.

So, you know, so we have a relatively recent communication from the Council saying no current bars. This is obviously a critical piece of the consideration that we have right now underway with respect to resource prioritization, and one of the things that we want to do is to look at focusing on finishing EPDP phase 1, which

is a critical center of resources for Org and the community. And this work is -- is part of moving privacy/proxy forward.

So along with that and in addition to the discussions that we are having on the SSAD as part of the operational design phase, I think there will be forward momentum, but it makes sense to coordinate all of this with all of the other relevant pieces of work that are going on in the community and with respect to this which this has some dependencies.

MERIKE KAO: Thank you very much for that reply, Becky. Okay. Next up we have a question from Owen Smigelski.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Hi. Thank you. My name is Owen Smigelski. I am with registrar Namecheap. I am vice chair for policy of registrar stakeholder group, however, I'm speaking in my personal capacity.

I've been involved with ICANN since about 2007, and one common thing I've heard joked about a couple of times is that Jon Postel was either a pure genius or mad genius in creating a multistakeholder model. Pure genius in that he came up with a way to create policy across a broad cross section of interests coming together to find common ground acceptable to all.

Others say he was an evil genius because there's no way to get such a diverse group of interests to agree to anything.

I'm eternally an optimist so I choose to believe the former. I have noted, however, with great disappointment that over the past several years individuals and groups are attempting to subvert the multistakeholder model because they did not achieve 100% of their goals with the policy process and reject the results and claim that the multistakeholder model is broken. That is not true. The very essence of the multistakeholder model is compromising consensus. Did the registrar stakeholder group support each phase of the EPDP? Yes. Did we love absolutely every recommendation? Of course not, but we supported these policy efforts because we believe in ICANN and the multistakeholder model.

It saddens me to see individuals and groups attempting to subvert the ICANN process, policy process, by going to the Board to get them to overcome policy recommendations, lobbying governments for action, GNSO councilors who vote against reports, not for process issues but rather unhappiness with the results, or blog posts complaining about how the multistakeholder model is broken. All of these are disingenuous, go against multistakeholder model, and are hurtful to the many people who create these policies through thousands of hours of work. At worst, this is potentially threatening to the legitimacy of

ICANN. ICANN and the multistakeholder model are not perfect, but it's the best solution that we have to reach policies that help the global Internet.

There are other policy initiatives ongoing right now that myself and other registrars and participants are working on right now, with lots of opportunities to make great policies. Let's stop focusing on claimed failures and realize that together we can work together to make the multistakeholder model stronger and achieve good results.

Thank you.

MERIKE KAO: Owen, thank you very much for your comments and definitely noted. I am very like-minded. I'm an eternal optimist. So thank you for that. All right. I think up next we have Martin Sutton. Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: Sorry. It was -- can you hear me, Merike?

MERIKE KAO: Yes. Thank you.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Sorry about that. Martin Sutton from the Brand Registry Group. We've heard quite a lot this ICANN meeting about work that's in the pipeline, and one particular area of focus is the subsequent procedures which is now passed to the Board for review and decision. And you -- you've recently kicked off the operational design phase, which is now spread over a ten-month period. So probably further than the expectations of the working group participants that created the outputs over a number of years.

So one of the things that would be of interest and was raised during the Brand Registry Group session on Monday was to make sure that we -- we keep to time lines that are now put forward by the Board to complete this operational design phase, including the additional three-month ramp-up stage that's been added to the front of this. And I think it would be helpful, also, if the Board could provide sort of a breakdown of its expectations and any targets or deliverables that you're expecting to track over that period of time so that we can make sure that it does remain on track and items are being delivered as expected during that process rather than find that they -- it over-- or delays further than the ten months.

I'd also ask if there's a possibility for the Board to consider what it thinks are complex issues that need to be addressed from the outputs of subsequent procedures and perhaps consider how we

could achieve some of those or address some of those whilst the ODP is in progress so that perhaps referring back to the community any items where it will need further input to overcome any complex issues that have not been answered within the very significant outputs of subsequent procedures working group. Thank you.

MERIKE KAO: Yeah, thank you very much, Martin. And some very important considerations for sure. So I will invite my Board colleagues to see, you know, who would like to answer this particular question.

AVRI DORIA: This is Avri. I'm happy to take a crack at it. It's a very difficult question. I think, first of all, yes, there is every intention within the Board, I believe, to keep to the schedule that we've got now, if at all possible. And as such, you know, the best we can do is basically keep tracking the various milestones, the various times as they go along. As the schedule gets better set after the ramp-up, we'll have more and more items that we can track and such. Tracking it definitely the end state of it and the end date of it.

In terms of the complex questions, I think you find many of those expressed in the plan for the ODP. But those questions -- excuse me -- that are being explored by the Org side of the organization are largely an expression of questions and complexities that we

and the Board saw specifically in the SubPro caucus. There are other of the policy issues that the SubPro caucus will be going through, you know. Some of the obvious ones are, you know, the closed generics, open issue. And the auctions issue, and many others. There's a list of them.

So as we're going through those, certainly we will reach out to the community when we get to points of we hit an ambiguity, we hit something that we don't understand.

One of the things that we want to try and avoid is reopening up new policy areas, new policy discussions, new sub -- you know, subpolicy discussions that would tend to confuse things even more. But if that needs to happen, I assume we would do so.

And I've reached the end of my time.

MERIKE KAE0:

Thank you very much for that, Avri. And I want to thank all of the folks that have asked questions or made comments so far. And I will now hand it over to my Board colleague Lito who will lead the next session.

Thank you.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Merike.

I hope you can hear me well. I will say a few words in Spanish, if you allow me, before taking back the line.

I would like to address this community particularly to my colleagues in the Latin American community but in general to the whole community.

We had three intense -- very intense weeks around ICANN72. And during this event, we had several meetings. We heard comments, questions from many stakeholders. And the Board has been very attentive and will continue to be attentive to all these questions and comments.

We are taking down notes, and we will be discussing these comments in the corresponding groups of the Board. So I would like to thank you all and invite you to keep on participating by providing your question.

Now, I switch back to English.

So we will go to the questions and answers in the poll. Please, Rachel.

RACHEL McFADYEN: Thank you.

Before I read the question, I just want to remind all the participants, especially if you are reading a statement, to speak as slowly and clearly as possible so all of our community can understand it and so that our interpreters and translators can keep up.

So now I'm going to go to the question and answer pod. We have a question from Nigel Hickson, a GAC representative from the U.K.

In relation to a return to a hybrid format in San Juan, will the Board also take into consideration the precedence being set by the ITU in New York and Geneva and the U.N. IGF in Katowice, Poland?

LITO IBARRA: Okay. Thank you for the question.

I see Maarten's hand.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, no. Sure. Thank you, Nigel, for the question.

Obviously we are not alone in this and we are looking what's happening in the world around us. But we still will -- and we need to take our own responsibility.

Maybe, Leon, you want to add a little bit to that?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Yes, Maarten, thank you very much.

So as you will be aware soon, there is a Board operational priority for next year in regard to trying to transition into hybrid meetings and to in-person meetings at some level.

As part of the Board's work along with org, we are coordinating closely to gather as much input and information as possible to ensure that whatever transition we do in our meetings setup is, first and utmost, safe for everyone. And we -- as Maarten said previously, we have as a paramount principle to keep the members of our community, staff, and the Board free of risk or at least with lesser risk possible.

So, yes, we are looking into examples of how other institutions are handling hybrid meetings, how they are putting in place different measures and technologies to allow inclusive participation from those that are not onsite and, of course, mitigating the different risks that entail holding a meeting with an in-person component.

So, yes, Nigel, we will be looking at this very closely and, of course, willing to learn from others' experience in this -- in this topic. Thank you very much for your question.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Leon.

Just to reassure it is a topic that is, I would say, almost on the top of the agenda of the Board.

So, Rachel, shall we go to another Q&A poll question, please?

RACHEL McFADYEN: Sure. Thank you.

ICANN's strategic plan for fiscal year 2021 to 2025 sets out to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance. It acknowledges that there is a risk that limited resources could impact the ability for stakeholders to participate, which could compromise the credibility and the integrity of the multistakeholder model. ICANN has been making significant efforts to reach out to underserved regions in various ways, but there is still significant room for improvement from the perspective of small island developing states.

There is a need to consider the establishment of a cross-community working group focused on small island developing states as an underserved region. SIDS is not considered a region within the ICANN community, but it is a community established within global processes such as the United Nations.

The objective would be to allow for the effective pooling of resources to support small island developing states' interaction with the wider community.

That question was from Rodney Taylor of the Caribbean Telecommunications Union.

Lito, I think you might be on mute.

GORAN MARBY: Can I answer it?

RACHEL McFADYEN: I'm going to make an executive decision and say yes.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. Thank you very much for the suggestion, Rodney.

I will ask Sally Costerton who handles this to reach out to you and have a discussion with you. So thank you.

RACHEL McFADYEN: All right. Our next question is from the Q&A pod from Wisdom Donkor.

What is the state of the ICANN Open Data Initiative? When is it going to be operationalized? If the initiative is still in the plan, what is ICANN doing to make sure the community capacity is built and empowered?

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Goran, would you like me to take that one?

GORAN MARBY: That was so quick of you. Thank you.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Yes, this is Sally Cohen for the record.

Currently, we have several different data sets available on open data. It's very much an ongoing initiative.

Today we have the domain name marketplace indicators available on open data, some of the ITHI health indicators, although we have more data sets to add here. There are the per-registrar transaction reports that are available and registry function action reports.

We're also going to be putting Registry Agreements up, but we are working through some of the bugs there.

What we will be doing is coming back and providing a more robust roadmap to share with the community because we have been focused on kind of working through some of these bugs. But it's still very much an ongoing initiative.

So thank you.

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Sally. I apologize. My Zoom was crashing, so I got frozen. I hope it won't happen again.

So, Rachel, can we go to the next question, please?

RACHEL McFADYEN:

Yes. This one is from Nicolo Passaro, an ICANN72 fellow from Italy.

The complexity and interdisciplinary nature of the great dilemmas present in the network makes it difficult to act according to a programmed plan that could unify these dilemmas and allow the users to contribute with appropriate projects.

I'm trying to make an agenda about this complexity. Would the creation of a true Internet sustainable development goals agenda be an idea in line with ICANN's values, both technical and policy development, to unify topics just like data cybersecurity, intellectual property, good information, artificial intelligence, and so on?

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Nicolo, for the question.

While I wait for someone -- if somebody wants to answer, I will venture and say that ICANN is very interested in all matters that relate to Internet but within the limits or the boundaries of its mission and vision.

So we will -- I think I'm right to say that we will accompany and we will be watching all of these developments from our perspective.

Anyone else would like to add anything?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

I think you said it perfectly, Lito.

Of course, the subject may come up in the community and able to be discussed. But it's not right -- it's not where our focus will be

in terms of measures. According to our bylaws, we're limited to the mission.

So I think it's very good questions. And probably a forum like IGF would be even better to dive deeper into this. And in that, I would gladly participate.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you. Thank you, Maarten. And thank you, Nicolo, for the question.

Next we will go to James Bladel. James, please.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, good day. This is James. Hopefully you can hear me.

LITO IBARRA: Yes, we can.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay, great, fantastic. I'm James Bladel with GoDaddy but speaking -- these are my personal comments.

I wanted to first applaud and echo the sentiments made by my colleague Owen Smigelski earlier regarding the health and the strength and the viability of the multistakeholder model. I think

we all come here to reinforce this and the health of this ecosystem. And everything he said I think is something that we should be watching.

There's one other threat, however, I want to mention, which is ICANN -- the pace of work that is occurring currently within ICANN org and the community is, I believe, also a strain on the model and the credibility of the org and the community.

You know, if a baby were born during the last application round for new gTLDs, then she would be well into high school before she would have any hope of registering a domain name in the next round of gTLDs. And that pace of work is not contextually appropriate for something like the Internet. And I think it calls into question our ability as a community to effectively manage the DNS and keep it relevant to today's Internet.

And I just want to close by noting there's a lot of excitement around alternative technologies that the same technologies have been brought to bear against governments. And Central Banks are being targeted now at ICANN as a way to bypass some of these bottlenecks. And I think we need to be aware that this is occurring, and we need to be sounding the alarm that the pace of work needs to continue to increase and ICANN needs to deliver on its -- on its abilities to keep the DNS relevant for the demands of the current users or we're going to lose the whole thing. And I'm

concerned about that. And I think all of us should be concerned about that.

Again, thanks. And +1 to Owen.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, James.

Becky, would you like to add?

BECKY BURR: Yeah, I just want to start by acknowledging what James has said, which is something that the Board has heard loud and clear across the community this week. It is something that the Board is, in fact, quite engaged in and org is quite engaged in.

We don't have -- we wish things were moving more quickly than they are right now, but we do believe that we have put in place the mechanisms to move things along in an efficient, expeditious manner. And we will be counting on the community to work with us in those -- in those ways.

So rather than rehashing what we've said to every single part of the community because this has been a question for everyone single part of the community, let me just assure you that both the Board and org are concerned about the pace and (indiscernible)

to create the mechanisms and tools that we need to move forward on critical issues.

We are keenly aware of the risk that by taking too long people will figure out ways to run around ICANN, and that is a problem that we need to pay attention to.

So thank you for raising those issues again. And please be assured, as I think we have tried to assure folks in our conversations this week, that this is very much at the top of our list.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Becky.

Avri, would you care to add a few words?

AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thank you.

Very much support what Becky said.

The other thing that I wanted to add -- and I think it's something that we're still learning that gets pointed out by people and it is something that both, you know, the Board and org are working on, is that as the scale of what we're doing increases, as the

outreach of what we're doing increases, as the number of participants who have relatively fixed positions increases, we have to learn how to deal with it better. And I do think that both the Board and the org and the community at-large through the various multistakeholder improvement programs are working on this.

So I just wanted to say that it isn't just that it's hard to do, it is getting harder to do because we are having to learn to scale up to an additional scope of opinion and scope of work. So appreciate any effort that comes through.

And, yes, deadlines are really good things as forcing functions and very much agree. But when we miss them, it's something that we need to look at, understand why, and then move on with the next deadline. Thanks.

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Avri, Becky, and James for the question.

Rachel, can we really the question from Yoshi Murakami in the Q&A, please.

RACHEL McFADYEN: Yes. The next question -- before I read that, I would just like to remind everyone, if you are planning to speak, to turn off notifications on your computer. Thank you.

So this question from Yoshi Murakami from Com Laude Japan: We have heard ICANN's CEO and members of the Board refer repeatedly to the importance of the next round of new gTLDs to bringing users online in their native languages and scripts.

I am Japanese and I know of a number of companies who are expressing an interest in applying for a new gTLD. Those companies find it very difficult to understand why there is no clear timeline to the next round, clear commitment on whether there will be a next round, and not even a clear timeline on when we might expect such a commitment.

The lack of any certainty makes it difficult for potential Japanese applicants to garner internal support, plan, and budget. These difficulties will be even greater, I believe, in some of the less well-resourced countries that the org talks about wanting to bring online.

I understand that org will complete the ODP before the Board will make any decision. But can we please have a clear commitment to a date on which that will happen?

LITO IBARRA: Thank you for the question. This relates to the whole SubPro process and IDN -- the use of IDN characters.

I don't see...

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Happy to take that.

LITO IBARRA: Okay. Go ahead, Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, yes. We are now at the ODP phase, and with you we agree it's important to provide as much certainty as we can as soon as we can do it.

So very much with you on that. And right now we just don't know yet, so we need to make sure that once we give an indication, it's an indication that's a reasonable one, reasonable certainty. We're not there yet.

LITO IBARRA: Okay. Akinori, would you like to say anything?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes, thank you very much.

In addition to what Maarten mentioned, I appreciate, Murakami-san, that you mentioned the, you know, the inclusion of the local languages by the IDN. And then my understanding is that the second -- second round of the new gTLD will be the more -- with more focus on such IDN inclusion. Then I really expect the much more application by the IDN, then that -- which -- which will solve the inclusion of the diverse along the circumstances of the -- in the scope.

Thank you very much for pointing it out. Thanks. (Non-English word or phrase).

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Maarten, and thank you, Akinori.

We go next to Mark Datysgeld. Please, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. This is Mark Datysgeld speaking, GNSO Council with the BC. This is a comment that's more for myself, though.

So over the past few years, we, of course, have had a difficult time coordinating. It's great that our community managed to hold strong for all this time. But moving forward, as we head into the hybrid meetings and potentially get back to face to face, we will hopefully see an influx of new people. We'll hopefully see people who haven't been active coming back to the ICANN work.

So something I would like to request is that ICANN Org help us by creating some sort of roadmap, some sort of thing that we can point towards as where we are as a community. To give you an example, within the GNSO Council, Berry Cobb always produces an Action/Decision Radar that kind of keeps us informed of everything that's going on at any given time. And it's incredibly helpful for us to see the many moving pieces that are going on within ICANN at any given time.

To me, this should be more of a community resource, especially as we ramp up. And we have been -- really only the most people interested and the chairs and the people who are really involved in ICANN have been very present these past two years. A lot of people have been following from the sidelines or have quit all together.

So it would be really good if this could become more of a ICANN-wide policy that we are actually able. I know that ITI has been making some very interesting progress in that sense, but it would

be great to have something to point towards for everybody coming back. This is where we are, this is what we have to do, and get a sense of that.

Thank you very much.

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Mark. I have seen during these two weeks something along the lines that you are proposing, and we are conscious that we need to improve what we can in the -- in this area. So we all get updated and get a sense on where we are in each one of our tasks.

Anyone would like to add anything?

GORAN MARBY:

Thank you very much. You know, I -- The level of transparency that ICANN has, including org, I admittedly create a little bit of a problem because it's a lot of data. I think I marketed the CEO report, we have the policy report, we have individual implementation reports, we have a lot of different reports. At the same time, as you mentioned, the ITI project where we're trying to rebuild this airplane while it's in air with the 200,000 documents that we have to index.

But I take your comments for what it is, because I agree with you. Transparency should not lead to confusion.

There is also -- and we should make sure that we get better at it. So it's been interesting for me and my staff and the board to think about this because it's, as you mentioned, there are so many things going on, but we need to better ourselves.

So thank you for your comments.

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Goran, and thank you, Mark, for the question.

Next can we go to Rachel and Michael Bauland's question, please in the Q&A?

RACHEL McFADYEN:

Sure, this is from Michael Badland, a member of the RrSG, speaking in his own capacity. I understand that networking is very difficult during these remote ICANN meetings. What I don't understand is that it's made even more difficult due to many sessions being in a Zoom Webinar style where it's not possible to see who else is participating and it is impossible to send a private message to other participants.

Compared to a face-to-face meeting, this would mean keeping most of the people separate in their own cage with no way to see who's sitting left or right to them, a hopefully unthinkable situation.

I would kindly ask to not use the webinar style or at least keep it to an absolute minimum.

LITO IBARRA:

Thank you, Michael. I can assure you we have also been discussing about this, but I will let I think Goran to take it.

GORAN MARBY:

We hear you loud and clear. And this is something we definitely can discuss. Just to give you a little bit of background, it's been important for the org and also for the Board. For instance when the Board has a conversation with a part of the community which is done in a public session, but it's really between the Board and that constituency. And so we -- that's one of the reason for that format.

But I hear you, and we will of -- I mean, we are here to support the community, so the community feels they can interact with each other.

So let us come back on that question. Also speak to the planning committee coming into the next ICANN meeting.

I actually would rather figure out a way to meet face to face, to be honest.

LITO IBARRA: Thank you, Goran. I think you covered the sentiment, the common sentiment.

Okay. It's time for me to pass it on to Ron, Ron da Silva. He will be conducting the last part of the Public Forum. Thank you.

Ron.

RON DA SILVA: Thank you, Lito. Fabulous job. I felt like I should come back to the comment that Merike kicked it off with regarding where she is and where this meeting was supposed to be, because...

COMPUTER: "You've got mail."

RON DA SILVA: I used to work there, and it was kind of fun. Like, the movie coming out was a huge publicity thing for everybody that was working back in the day at AOL. And just to kind of connect the

dots here. Merike, you're my "Sleepless in Seattle." And I'm over here where AOL's headquarters were and a lot of infrastructure used to exist that supported all that stuff. So it's kind of fun.

But that said, I've got to also just commend Maarten for being brave. See, he's elected to pick the outgoing board members to host the Public Forum today, and nobody is really taking advantage that of, because, see, today you can ask all kinds of crazy questions, and you can't take us -- and we're not going to get pulled into the back room afterwards and get pummeled by our colleagues because we said something wrong.

So I'm just kind of instigating a little bit to encourage you to speak up. With Merike, Lito, and Nigel and I leaving, it's definitely been a pleasure serving the community in our capacity on the board, and it's a delight to be able to host one more Public Forum.

So with that, I'm going to move on to Chad Folkening.

CHAD FOLKENING: Yeah, can you guys hear me?

RON DA SILVA: Loud and clear.

CHAD FOLKENING: Thank you very much. Thank you, everybody, for your time and attention.

My name is Chad Folkening. I'm from the beautiful Boca Raton, Florida here, down here in coastal Miami, the crypto capital of the world.

I'm here -- I started in the domain space in 1996 before ICANN existed, and we wanted legitimacy as an asset class. And when Ira Magaziner put up a proposal, I was one of the very few that actually went to the White House to discuss kind of how do we kind of wrap this new technology out around there. So I appreciate everybody's time and attention. 20-some years later, here we are.

I'm here on the capacity of just a member of the Handshake community, which is a decentralized open source and transparent technology PDP naming system here. And why I got involved with that was the amount of people involved into it and to see the new technology evolve, you know, where we're at now.

So one of our main goals today was to address ICANN is hopefully aware that there's about a \$7 million no-obligation resources sitting there for them to take. This was created when the thing was created in February 2020, and now that value is approximately 6 to \$7 million, available for ICANN just to claim

and use however they want: feed the hungry kids, put it back into the community, whatever they want to do it. That's one of our main goal, is they're sitting there, (indiscernible) take that in there. There's now -- with Handshake, there's two million domains registered on that, and why we support that is the creativity. With the current situation, you either have to have a quarter million dollars to create a gTLD. That limits the creativity. And with this system you can actually have anybody create their own identity and creativity in that system.

So we just really wanted to put this on record that there is a nice, sizable pot, free, no obligation, to come claim. And we want to work with the ICANN community to use the -- put those good resources.

So my -- Appreciate your time. Thank you very much.

RON DA SILVA:

Chad, thank you for bringing to everyone's attention and putting that offer out there.

Anybody from the Board want to respond, or from org?

If not --

GORAN MARBY: I maybe want to point out that the names he represent doesn't resolve in what we call the Internet. Thank you very much.

RON DA SILVA: Okay. Question from the pod, I think. Rachel.

RACHEL MCFADYEN: Yes. This is a comment. My name is Sivasubramaniam. I am from Nameshop located in India, which has the application for .INTERNET, an application that has now been waiting for delegation for over eight years now. I have written to ICANN seeking attention and requesting that the Board and CEO act upon and delegate .INTERNET speedily. This TLD will serve the global public interest as described in Nameshop's many published letters and papers.

I wish to request, in particular, the attention of ALAC and GAC leadership on this matter as the Nameshop public interest commitments align with the principles and mission of each of these organizations. I hope these important advisory committees take formal note of the communication we have sent to them to describe our commitments in how .INTERNET is operated.

Nameshop will make these commitments contractually binding. In addition, we commit to an ongoing conversation and

involvement with the DNS community to receive its advice and evolve .INTERNET's mission and its potential for good. Especially in the short term, Nameshop looks forward to working with the merits and the combined strength of the DNS community in this last phase of pandemic management, soon to move on to a phase of renewal.

Thank you.

RON DA SILVA:

Well, thank you very much for that. I think regarding current status of names and requesting communiques with the organization it's probably best to hand it over to Goran.

GORAN MARBY:

I had a feeling that I might have answered this question before. And we have discussed this with you many times, and we have talked about why this application, according to the rules of ICANN, is unable to proceed. And I'm looking forward to talk to you again, but also with my team.

Thank you very much.

RON DA SILVA:

Do we have another question, Rachel, in the queue?

RACHEL McFADYEN: We do. Thank you. This one is from Amir: What would be the relation of ICANN with the U.N. initiatives like SG Roadmap for Digital Cooperation and common agenda? What will be the future of cooperation or competition between ICANN and U.N. and ITU regarding digital policy issues?

RON DA SILVA: This is a great question. I know we've spoken many times about the intersection between ICANN, its remit, and other organizations like the ITU. And in fact, if you remember, a couple of years ago there was an intentional effort by the organization to join one of the sectors in the ITU as a technical participant, and that intersection I think is -- you know, continues to be important because there are certain things that are important to our community and certain things that are important to the ITU. And there's not always overlap, but sometimes there is and it's good to be there to ensure the things that are important to us are well explained, articulated, defended, if needed, and continue on in their separate spaces.

But this is something that primarily is taken on by the organization.

Goran, do you want to talk a little bit about our engagement?

GORAN MARBY: You gave a perfect answer. And yes, we are members of the ITU-D. ITU-D is the place in the ITU when they talk about what it stands for: development, capacity building, et cetera, et cetera. And that's the place where ICANN engages with the ITU.

We also, of course, have other relationship with ITU, and also a lot of member states who speaks for us in the ITU, which I think is (indiscernible) very important now.

On the question when it comes to the U.N. initiatives like the SG Roadmap for Digital Cooperation and common agenda, we will always support any initiatives where it comes to having more people connected to one common Internet, where all the names are resolved, sorry. And this is something that I think we -- We are not in the capacity-building business for connectivity. We are not in the business of content. But many times we engage, because it helps the legislatures and governments to understand what is needed to (indiscernible).

So it's a very good question. Thank you.

RON DA SILVA: Thank you, Goran.

Do we have another question in the Q&A pod? Rachel?

RACHEL McFADYEN: We do. This one is from Andrey Shcherbovich, an ICANN72 Fellow. I would like to share concerns about the hybrid meetings. I think we should move forward as soon as possible towards restoring face-to-face meetings. Is it possible to create a paper outlining exact numbers of COVID threat preventing to organize it? I.e., all vaccinated in face to face.

RON DA SILVA: Yeah, a great topic. I know everybody shares that sentiment of when can we all be back to normal, right? And unfortunately this is the new normal. We are dealing in COVID issues across the globe, and even here in our community at ICANN.

Agree, we'd love to be face to face, but we're taking certain precautions. And I think it would probably be best to let Maarten speak about how the Board's going to move forward with that and how we're working with the organization on that strategy.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Not wanting to repeat what I told earlier about how we go about with risks, I think it's very important to recognize that the virtual meetings didn't only bring us the ability to progress our work when we couldn't meet, but it also provided opportunity for people to participate that would never have been able to meet, COVID or not. And we've learned to interact in different ways.

So for sure we'll keep that -- we'll try to keep the best of that, integrate it, wherever we are, in the years down the road.

And with that, the hybrid meeting is also something that basically we've done already for a long time. Only virtual was a baseline. What I think we'll see moving forward is that we'll try to facilitate better than before the integration and useful participation of both those in the room and those online.

RON DA SILVA:

Thank you, Maarten.

Why don't we go -- I think we still have some more in the Q&A, but I'm going -- I see Martin Sutton has come back to the queue. Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Hi, Martin Sutton here, Brand Registry Group. I was following on from the earlier question that I put to the Board and following some of the chat that I saw posted.

I was just wanting to hone in on the cost of the Operational Design Phase for SubPro. There's a significant set of 9 million that was quoted to conduct the assessment phase. I think if you add on the costs of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group activity over the multiyear time frame, it probably does come into

multiple millions already when you consider the volunteer work, staff work, and all the activities that were undertaken during that period of time. So that's a significant investment in financial terms, and one that's looming ahead as well with the ODP.

Looking at Avri's response, it just prompted me to think that, you know, you could go through this whole process and then the Board decides not to proceed with Subsequent Procedures. And I just wondered the Board's thought on what would be the reasons where they would not decide to go ahead with it, and whether there is a question or set of questions that needs to be teased out first of all before spending another multi-million pound budget. So that that would save, one, a load of work if you decide that you're not going to do it, and it means, you know, so on a fiduciary basis, that is important to the Board.

So I'm just worried that we're going down a process here which could lead us to, you know, many people that were involved disappearing so the institutional knowledge disappears that we built up over the last ten years, plus the financial side of this thing. But if it all goes to waste, that's not good. That is definitely not good. So is there any decisions that can be brought forward or part decisions that can be brought forward to add that certainty and predictability and on the basis then that this is a valuable spend to incur.

RON DA SILVA:

Thank you for that, Martin. I was kind of surprised by the pivot in your question, namely is there a scenario where we're not going to do something with this, and that's actually kind of an interesting question because I don't think we've had any discussions about not doing it, right? It's always been about how to do it.

So that said, I'll now punt it over to our CEO. Goran, do you want to respond to it?

GORAN MARBY:

I can start, and I think Avri or Becky or actually most of the Board could add on to it. Just to say something, last year we talked about it, we talked about four years, and I wasn't here so I can't really vouch for it, to do it. And the ODP was done after the Board decision. And many of you complained that it was -- and I agree with that -- it was not transparently and there was no cost control on it. And that's -- the ODP doesn't add to the time. I actually do believe it would save time and it will save money to do it. But we still have to do preparation.

The second thing is it's a little bit of a technicality in a sense of what I can't assign people to the work -- working on the next round without financing it from a budget, and that is because this round has been to be outside our operations budget. So if I move

Theresa over to this one, it actually gives, you know -- that cost will be assigned into the cost of the -- of the project. And, of course, a little bit of cost in the operations side. So that's one of the reasons why you actually see costs in it. We have to finance it that way, according to the recommendations.

I also want to say yes, there is a -- I'm eternally grateful for the ICANN community to spend so much time and so much hours on this one, so, of course, that's at a cost. We should also note that when we look at the total cost for this program, we are talking about a range of about 350, 400 million dollars in total. So I think an investment in that to make sure that we have control when we go to the Board of the potential cost and time line is a well, well investment. Thank you.

RON DA SILVA: Thank you, Goran. Any other comments? Avri, sure.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And I should have raised my hand. Yeah, this is Avri speaking. So first of all, to answer the question, no, there is no intent that if X, we will not approve. I think as Jeff says it very well in his comment. It would be going against an established policy. It would be going against a recommendation from the GNSO. There is no initial intention to do that. However, at the time the Board votes on it, the Board, by a supermajority, needs to decide

that going forward is in the global public interest and that all the I's have been dotted and the T's have been crossed. And therefore, it is perhaps presumptuous, certainly preliminary, to say at this state that yes, we will go forward when all of the analysis and the final decision hasn't been made.

But other than the ability to answer the question, is this in the global public interest, I -- you know, there is no reason sitting on a table somewhere just waiting to be proven for why this can't be done. This is something where there is a policy. The Board can vote to change a policy. However, that intentionality has not existed. But until a decision is made, it's not made. Thanks.

RON DA SILVA: Thank you, Avri. Let's go to the Q&A.

RACHEL McFADYEN: Hi. This is your last call for questions. So if anybody has a question, please either raise your hand or put it in the Q&A pod, please. But in the interim, we have a question for -- that looks like they took Ron up on his offer, and this is a question from Robert Carolina to any Board member who is retiring at the end of this meeting, what has been the most surprising, unexpected thing you've experienced during your tenure on the ICANN Board. And please speak slowly.

RON DA SILVA:

What a great question. Thank you, Robert. I'll go first. Give Merike, Lito, and Nigel an opportunity to come up with something. You know, I come to the Board from the numbering community. I've been building infrastructure throughout my career. So coming into the names space was fascinating in a lot of different areas. But one in particular that I always and probably will always continue to enjoy is all these bizarre stories that are centered around how the two-letter TLDs came into existence. All the country code operators, their history, their experience with how -- you know, the origins of the two-letter TLDs. I don't know. I don't know where to begin with that, because like every one of them seems to have a really interesting origin and how they're connected to the -- the origins of our industry and how that was tied in to addressing needs and name needs and networking needs and kind of gluing all that together and a lot of times in research environments. I would encourage everybody that, you know, if you have an opportunity, you happen to find somebody from one of the country code operators, corner them, buy them a beer, and ask them, tell me about how your country code started. It is always fun. So that's it. Who wants to go first, or second?

LITO IBARRA:

I can go.

RON DA SILVA: All right, Lito.

LITO IBARRA: Okay, thank you. Well, following what you said, since I am a ccTLD manager myself and I have been -- I was part of the LACNIC Board for nine years, too, I was very familiar with both numbers and names. But what -- what surprised me the most, I would say, is something very, very personal. When I joined the Board in 2015, I -- '15 in Dublin, Dublin, I wasn't expecting anything from anybody when the time to join the Board, the specific time during this -- the AGM and somebody said that, I hadn't realized, that I was, and I -- and it was true, the first Fellow, ICANN Fellow to join the Board. So for me that was a very pleasant surprise. I said it was very personal, but ever since I have been very proud of being that first Fellow on the Board. Thank you.

RON DA SILVA: Thank you, Lito. Merike.

MERIKE KAO: Yeah, thank you. And what a great question. So one of the things that I found really interesting and surprising was just really how very closely connected we are in all of the different Internet related communities. I have been in what I call the Internet circus for about 20, 25 years. And very much in the security

communities, in the numbers communities, did a lot of work for RIRs, was on the ARIN Board just before being elected to be the SSAC liaison on the Board, and I have been fortunate enough that when I joined the Board, I knew most of the Board members. And pretty well. I mean, Ron himself was a reviewer of my security book that was published in 2003. And a lot of the Board members I knew well for at least a decade, just from all of the different multistakeholder communities that are there. And so, you know, I found that a little bit surprising, not really, but I think, you know, it's great to see how well we're actually working together as a community during COVID times. I mean, and I mean that really truly. So thank you for the question. A good one.

RON DA SILVA: Thanks, Merike. Nigel, you're up?

NIGEL ROBERTS: You saved me to last, didn't you? I was involved in the discussions that led to ICANN's creation. I was in the ccTLD community when, at least in my perspective, the ICANN Board, mildly put, was the politburo of a very, very top-down organization back in 2002, 2003.

Now, that's a long time in the past. But every -- you know, you kind of harbor lingering suspicion, you know? So the main thing I learned that was surprising, although perhaps in hindsight it

shouldn't have been, was to learn how genuinely every single Board member that I've worked with in the last three years believes in the multistakeholder model, at a very fundamental level.

And this enables me, even though ICANN is not perfect and there's work still to be done, to be very, very proud of this unique thing that we've built working together over the last 25 years. It's been a privilege.

RON DA SILVA: Thank you, Nigel. What an interesting question. Let's move on. I see Werner Staub, your hand is up. Calling on you next.

WERNER STAUB: Sorry, I've --

RON DA SILVA: I think you almost had it.

WERNER STAUB: Yeah. Is it okay now?

RON DA SILVA: Very good, yeah.

WERNER STAUB:

Yeah. I would like to, you know, add this in a note of optimism at the same time as we have many reasons for alarm as, you know, the difficulties that we face. And specifically in the context of the domain abuse where I see that we make great efforts, and at the same time much of the domain abuse goes even unnoticed. I see that because personally I see more domain abuse privately than professionally, although I've been Internet active over two decades. And the reason is that new technology is being used by criminals as well, in particular, personal targeting and selective responses. So by the time a security probe or investigation looks at a domain, that system is already able to tell that there's a security probe and answers with some innocent content. They also have lots of domains available, so using them sparingly just, you know, for a couple of targeted messages each, so they're actually going to go quite unnoticed.

So this leads to a situation where we can no longer say that taking down bad domain names is sufficient. We have to also do something else. We have to enable the majority of the Internet content providers. Those are the honest ones. We have to enable those to show and demonstrate, not only to people but also to machines, that they are safe and thus enable intermediaries such as social networks, instant messaging applications and so on, to show that this URL can actually safely be clicked on. Maybe another case, at least it shouldn't be just an invitation to click and

thumbnails (indiscernible) shown (indiscernible) users. But, you know, there should be some circumspection. And in that way, we could actually help other intermediaries help their own customers, and at the same time actually provide a service to the typical customers of the registries and registrars who want to show that they have a good reputation. I think this can be a business. This can be something that is a technology that ICANN helps deliver and that the ICANN community makes happen.

RON DA SILVA:

Yeah, I agree. Thank you, Werner, for the topic and the suggestion. We will certainly take that away.

This brings us to the end of block 3 for the public forum. So I will relinquish the microphone back over to Maarten. All yours.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Thank you so much, Ron. Thank you, Merike, thank you, Lito, for doing your very best to the very last moment by moderating this panel. And yes, also thank you for Nigel for all you've done. And thank you to the -- all the community for the good questions asked and the togetherness that is very clear from many of your interactions. Yes, there's things that we need to work on. There's even things we need to continue to improve. And at the same time, there's also things that are embraced as being a positive thing.

I really appreciated the sentiment expressed by Owen and others, that it's really recognition of the importance of doing it all together. And I very much hear, and the Board has heard very much also, your continued interest in meetings, your appreciation that it needs to be safe but also looking forward to get the best out of it.

Obviously the new round of TLDs has come by for a couple of times and will continue to do so. It is on top of our agenda, even if it doesn't move as fast as you would like, or some others of the community, maybe it moves faster than you would like. But we are on top of it, and it's a policy that we are looking in on how to implement.

And, of course, last but not least, I really and truly and deeply loved Robert Carolina for asking his question to the Board members. It gave a good opportunity to express some of the camaraderie and what you can see if you are here to serve the full community in what's been happening.

So thank you all very much for this constructive public forum. As you will know, if you've been at ICANN meetings before for a longer period, in about half an hour we'll start with the Board meeting, the public Board meeting, to which you're all dearly invited. And in the meanwhile, wishing you very well and looking forward to see you in person. So thank you all. Thank Org for

helping to make this happen. Thank you, Rachel, for being the voice of the people here. Really appreciate it. And we'll see you hopefully in half an hour and otherwise, maybe at the future opportunity. Thank you. Meeting is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]