
ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO - CSG Membership Session
Tuesday, March 23, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 EST

BRENDA BREWER: Hello, and welcome to the Commercial Stakeholder Group membership session at ICANN70. My name is Brenda Brewer, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the Chair of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcription is not official or authoritative. To review the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Wolf Ulrich-Knoben. Thank you.

WOLF ULRICH-KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Brenda, and thank you to all of you participating in the call, especially the CEO of ICANN, Goran Marby. Thank you all.

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.

We have an agenda displayed here on the screen, and I do hope that we go through all of these topics during our session here.

But formally let me ask, since this is a membership meeting of this year's Commercial Stakeholder Group, whether there are any statements of interest to be disclosed here.

This is not the case. Thank you very much.

So let's dive directly into our agenda and Topic 1. Goran, we would like to use the time to discuss with your views on the questions of Internet governance and technical Internet governance in relation to policy. Your annual goal--#3, I read, and #2, is it?; exactly—for this fiscal year, '21, is to implement a common strategy for IG (Internet Governance) and technical Internet governance. So we would be curious as to what you could tell us about the achievements so far, if there are them. In particular, we are interested to hear whether the distinction, which you have several times explained between Internet governance and technical Internet governance, still makes sense as anticipated when you started this discussion and what may be the impact on ICANN's work on policy development in the future, if you look at what is happening on the side of technical Internet governance. Those questions we would like to discuss with you.

Maybe in addition, also Mason could chime in and add from his point of view some views. Mason?

MASON COLE: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. No, I'd like you to lead off on this and I'm glad to chip in afterwards. I'm interested in hearing from Goran on the same angle that you just proposed. So let's start with that, if we may.

WOLF ULRICH-KNOBEN: Okay. Great. Goran, [inaudible].

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. The questions were ... Let us talk about it and [inaudible] have follow-up questions. So, just a reminder, the ICANN ecosystem and the ecosystem we've been working in for more than 20 years has been very well defined, where a lot of the decisions have been made within this ecosystem, from technicals with the IETF, within the RIRs, and within ICANN. We're part of the same ecosystem. And then we have an [inaudible] called the Internet Governance Forums, where we're supposed to have contacts with the governments. There's always been challenges within this ecosystem and a lot of discussion. But it is mostly based on the multi-stakeholder process within all of those. I hope you can agree with [it] It's been extremely successful. Internet [inaudible] and ICANN with [inaudible] this is housing a very important to make that happened.

What has happened over the couple of years ... It is not unnatural that, when the Internet becomes something that society relies upon, the first that happens, which I came to you four years and said we're going to see more of, is legislature proposals coming out that could have an effect on ICANN's ability to make policies. We haven't seen anything

from the US. We don't hear anything from the US, but in Europe, parts of Asia, and Latin America, we see those. So they are GDPR-related ones. They are the NIS2 and the Digital Services Act from Europe, which you're well aware of. Those are examples of these.

But there was something else happening as well, which is different from the legislature, and that is [inaudible] standardizations. If you take proposals in the 5G [inaudible] forum, where, depending on how you see it, they use terms like—what do you call it?—non-best-effort Internet, which is something else than the Internet, where there are mobile providers who would like your constituencies to pay for them to be on the mobile [inaudible] of the users or quality and assurance but also for discussion but over the top where some operators would like to have their fair share of over-the-top services ... In that, it's an alternative to the Internet we have. So that's one technical for a that happens.

Another one is, of course, the famous New IP, which is fantastic name. It's very hard to discuss the technical terms of New IP because it's still ... “[Vague]” is a good word. And it doesn't happen inside our foras. It didn't start at IETF. It started [inaudible].

So there are technical proposals that might have an impact on people's ability to connect with what we call the Internet or companies' abilities to connect with what we call the Internet and even the [probability] of the Internet. That forms the underlying assumptions that we had ... To be able to be transparent but also our own understanding is to make a difference between what we usually call Internet governance because

it's more technical. It still might be an effect on how the Internet is done from a legislation [inaudible]. And of course, it's not easy because some of those things come together. If you look at the NIS2 proposal, there are things that might have an effect on the root servers, which could have an effect on people's ability to actually connect or the amount of root servers and people's ability to connect to the root servers, which we don't think seems to be a good idea. So it's both [techs control the] the legislators.

We have seen proposals where it's also a blend. There is a paper we wrote after the European data protection authorities wrote a paper about how IP addresses, if you deem them to be private information, and how that would actually affect the ability for anyone to have an IP address and therefore the ability to have Internet ... So there's of course a grayscale in between there. But it is a new landscape, and many of those things happen outside the usual places we go to.

So the way we do this is that we produce much more technical papers. We're lucky to have OCTO who helps us with this. You've seen that they've written a lot of new papers about this. We are engaging with standardization [forums], as we are engaged with governments. We are engaged with companies and talk to them and tell them about the risk.

In the technical area, we are a little bit more straightforward than we are in the political ones. I will explain why: because there we actually go to the heart of the technical problem, whereas in the governance part, we don't take a side about the legislation. We just try to tell them the

potential impact on the ICANN model on the ability for people to connect to the Internet in the first place.

As a sidenote of that, as you know also, we have started to produce what we call country papers [by] our government engagement teams, [with] previously much more information for you to read as well.

As a follow-up, one we proposed—I think it’s been two years since we did that—is actually to form a group within the community. We were thinking about this cross-community working group of Internet governance, and I can’t remember the name or the acronym right now, which I think was formally [inaudible] by At-Large, to [inaudible] that and actually make that as an intersection point between ICANN Org and the community, where we can go and more deeply discuss those things and also, for instance, go through where we made ... As you know we did some comments to the NIS2 legislation this week. We lack that intersection point.

So that was a long answer about this, but I hope you got a grasp of it. I think it is important. When you talk about the Internet today, it’s all negativity and it’s all bad. Sometimes when we engage ... The Internet as it works technically is a fairly fixed box, and if you start rocking that, it might be so that people might be able to connect, not using the device they want to be able to connect to it or not having the freedom to be able to move between devices. When you realize that can have an affect on your own ability to do banking business or download a movie, I think that that the movie companies around the world have been very grateful for Internet during this year. So that could be a real effect, and

that’s what we’re really trying to talk about from the technical perspective.

I hope that answers your question, Wolf.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thanks very much, Goran. Just looking around for whether there is somebody who would like to chime in here, this specific person is Mason, maybe?

MASON COLE: Do you hear me, Wolf?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah.

MASON COLE: So thanks for that answer, Goran. I think, from the BC’s perspective, when this first arose as an issue, we were wondering about the division between technical governance and policy itself because, if ICANN was going to focus itself on technical governance alone, then the question was—I don’t mean this to sound as stark as it is—if we’re not here doing policy, what are we doing here? I think we were just looking for some clarity on ICANN’s part about what exactly is the difference between technical Internet governance and the policy work that we’re doing now and, if it is that, is that line reasonably bright or is it fuzzy in a way that technical and policy overlap each other? What are we missing

here? I think your answer started down that path, but maybe a bit of elaboration might help on that, if you don't mind.

GORAN MARBY:

Another way of looking at this is that ICANN is actually a tree with two very distinct branches. One of them, where you a part of is, the policymaking process for some of the TLDs. We also do run IANA. We also run our own root server. We run things like DNSSEC. We are technically an integrated part of the technical identifiers that make up the Internet. We have a close relationship with the IETF from a technical standpoint, and there we have other stakeholders and other interested parties and other processes to achieve what we need to do. So some of the things we're talking about here in relation to DNSSEC and other things is of course something that is of great interest for the Internet's role, but you have to see it from that technical perspective.

As I said, there is a gray area, and that gray area, for instance [inaudible] can have an effect on the technical arm as well as on the policymaking process. So it's never ... But we realized that we have to engage more. One of the engagements we tried to do is actually go into those foras and say, "Hey, guys. Things like New IP should be discussed within the IETF," something we do share together with IETF. And we do share that with others in the ecosystem. Or, "No, this question belongs to the RIRs. They are the ones who make decisions about this," because we also think that ICANN has a role of preserving the ecosystem and multi-stakeholder model within it.

So the other way of dealing with it is trying to be as transparent, as open, about what we're doing. To some extent, we've always done part of this, because we have a technical mandate, but we've not always been as open about it, not because we want to [close] it but because there's been a lack of interest from big parts of the community as well.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Goran. Mason is okay with that? Yeah. Thanks.

MASON COLE: I'm good. I yield back to you, Wolf, please.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thanks very much. Good. Any further questions in this regard to Goran?

GORAN MARBY: Maybe you can help me set up this intersection point between ICANN Org and the community and help it to push on that because I think it's needed. I want to have this dialogue with the broader parts of the community. Now I have it 21 times instead of maybe one.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. But what about this cross-community working group you mentioned, Goran? Is that a forum which could discuss that with you?

GORAN MARBY: The problem is the charter. As Mary Wong wrote in the chat, it's an engagement group. The [inaudible] have set up rules on how to do things and how to engage. Today, it's not in that charter. Actually, this is, I would say, thank for At-Large for still having it. It's under At-Large. I think that you would be interested and everybody else would be interested. It's not part of the GNSO, for instance. I think, if I remember it correctly, GNSO was a part of it but then left. Is that the ... Maybe my [memory with all the history ...]

WOLF ULRICH-KNOBEN: Yes, I remember that as well. There was an Internet governance group chaired by the ALAC chair as well. I remember that. And there was a long discussion with the GNSO either to keep [the seat] or get leave it. I'm not sure whether somebody is still an observer there or so, but maybe they're not active. But that was not technical Internet governance. It was just Internet-governance-related.

GORAN MARBY: That's why I say it probably needs a re-chartering. So my offer to the community is that you form a group, whatever you want to do with GNSO and the SSAC and everybody else who also has questions about this. We would love to have that intersection. We would love to have that discussion so we can have a place where we can give updates and we can have discussions and also learn because, especially when it comes to governments' interactions, we often learn from them, from parts of the community.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. It's a good idea. So we'll talk about that in our groups as well. Thank you for that.

Any final questions in this respect? Otherwise, we move over to the next item with Goran.

Okay, let's do that. So you may have discussed also several times. I remember we did it in our one-to-one call as well, talking about the meeting plans ICANN has for the future, knowing COVID times. So the question is—we brought it up here because it's better that we have it here with the entire CSG comment [inaudible] discussed because there is no plenary talking about that ... So we would be really appreciative of that, if you could share some views on that: how ICANN is doing right now and what are the plans with regards to potentially open up the meetings again, all related to COVID times.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. This is something we talk about almost on a daily basis, but just to remind you—I said it an earlier meeting as well—after ICANN69—a little bit before as well, but especially after ICANN69—I thin we all agreed that we have to do better. It became a very long, very intense meeting. I can't remember with 100 sessions or something. And people were just tired.

So we [inaudible] the survey. We asked the community for ideas. It was very good. I think there were a couple hundred answers, and very

thoughtful. Of course, they were not always agreeing but there were some trends.

So we took some of those ... The SO and AC leaders took them into account and, to some extent, to this meeting, but we are continuing the discussion with the SO and AC leaders about what I would now call an evolution of the ICANN meeting strategy. First of all, there is no one who thinks we shouldn't go back to meetings. It's just that it's problematic, and it's going to be problematic for a long time, just the logistics of it.

But some of the interesting things that came out of the meeting were that the community, to a large extent, thought that the ICANN meeting should be about coming together, which means that then we have to figure out ways for how people come together in their groups outside the actual ICANN meetings, which is interesting. There was also discussions about regions—to support regions. We don't look at this from a financial standpoint because, if you actually took all the proposals, from a staff perspective, we would have one long ICANN meeting, just traveling the world with different participants. We already do 40 meetings per year or something, and this will be an extension of that. But I think it's interesting. So many communities that thought, when you actually go into an ICANN meeting, it should be about meeting each other.

Also, one of the other things is that we shouldn't go back to [the ways things] were. We have learned so much when it comes to remote participation, or instance. And the technology has worked. If I compare the Zoom environment from this year from last year, there's a lot of

technology advancement, both in my team but also with Zoom and other things that we're doing. Things that were not possible a year ago we now do.

So the next step of this—I can't remember the day; I think it's the middle of April somewhere—the SOs and ACs will have a final say about the proposal for a strategy—an evolution of the meeting strategy, I would call it. We're not changing some of the underlying concepts. And [inaudible], but I have to look at it. But it's really the SOs and AC leaders.

There's one thing that's come up in this debate which I think is interesting: who is actually responsible? Who is accountable? That is, I think, something that the SO and AC leadership is also thinking about because ICANN Org's staff is not responsible because we provide the venue, but it's up to the community to decide which sessions, what sessions, how many sessions, etc., etc. Then I think one of the problems in the last meeting was that in the virtual world there's really no boundaries. You can add a day. You can do things. You can do them differently because it's [inaudible]. It's not like when Nick says, "No, I don't have more rooms. We ran out of coffee machines." We tried to do this better this time. For instance, we are much more cautious about adding things on prep week because, in ICANN69, the prep week became part of the ICANN week, which was not good for anyone. When I figured out that there was no time this meeting to do my general meeting executive session, because it couldn't be fitted into the week, the community leaders involved in this said, "We don't have time for that, so we're not going to do it." Then we realized we can do that outside an ICANN meeting. So we will do that outside.

One final thing. An ICANN meeting is about people coming together. One of the things we have to balance in this COVID period is that it might be so that part of the world it will be able to travel within because it will be clean and people would have vaccines. But we have to think very carefully if it happens that the rest of the world cannot come. The ICANN meeting has to be diverse. It has to be a geographical presence. It has to be people around the world. It has to be people debating. Otherwise, it's not a multi-stakeholder model. I think that's going to be one of the biggest challenges coming back. When do we find the rebalance and say, "Now we have enough participation from so many regions around the world coming together to have a discussion?" because otherwise it could be only two countries that can actually travel to the ICANN meeting. Or five. Can we then have an ICANN meeting? We're not there yet.

My offices are still closed. They're going to remain closed until at least the end of June. And we closed down, as you know, [The Hague] meeting. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thanks very much for these open words, Goran. So do I understand correctly that you make clear distinction between virtual meetings and open face-to-face meetings? That means that, from your point of view, there should be no mix-up between those two. That means not having a community which is coming together face-to-face, and the other part is taking part virtually in that meeting, other than to have it clear: meetings—just face-to-face meetings—or virtual meetings. So that is

what makes it difference here because there are discussions going on, saying, “Okay. Why not start with face-to-face meetings with people who are safe [inaudible] with regard to the location, with regards to their personality as well?” The other [thing is] they can participate. They’re not excluded because they could participate virtually. So is that a discussion going on during your development of your plans?

GORAN MARBY:

Here again it’s not me making the plans. It’s based on the community survey, and the SOs and ACs are looking into it. I hope I don’t make that distinction.

But there is a practical thing to take into account, and that’s time zones, because the people who are able to travel to a place will be in the same time zone because we have time zones throughout the world and that could effectively prohibit people from the other side of earth to actually participate because it’s going to be in the middle of the night. So sometimes people call it hybrid. I call it “We want to have an ICANN meeting with remote participation.” We have to be better at remote participation. As I said, there’s a balance point where we can start having a face-to-face meeting, where we can have enough people meeting but also making sure that there’s remote participation. That’s going to take an effort from all of us, I think: when we have meetings, not to exclude the people who are on Zoom calls or conference calls or anything so they feel a part of it. But the time zones, as you know, Wolf, is one of the ... When you have global meetings, a time zone issue is ...

At one point in time during this year, I suppose all of us have been affected by the time zones.

I'm lucky this week, especially since the US went into summertime next week. So I don't have to start every meeting at 6:00 or 5:00. That was not planned, by the way.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes. Thank you very much for that. I see Brenda raised her hand. Brenda, please?

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I have a comment in that chat from Mark Datysgeld. He comments, "So far, the greater amount of actual Zoom sessions instead of webinars has been very helpful. It's a huge gain for community interaction." Thank you.

GORAN MARBY: One thing we learned a lot, Mark, is about translation. Even if I think that the artificial intelligence is helping us do the captioning, sometimes it goes a little bit astray, to my amusement. How we do translations and how we interact with the community about translations and language services is something that we improved a lot, and that's definitely something we [inaudible].

The only problem is it's hard for us to fix the time zones. But, again, Wolf, this is something that we have placed in the hands of the SO and

AC leaders to come up with a solution. ICANN Org should not come up with solutions to this.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Any further questions to that?

No, I don't see a hand. So we have some more time with Goran, and we could raise any other questions, any other topics, we might have. It is a chance, having the CEO of ICANN here and available, to grill him, to ask any question, to whatever.

I see a hand. Mark, please go ahead.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much. This is Mark Datysgeld with the BC and a GNSO Council. Thank you for being with us here today, Goran. So I think something that we had been discussing very actively is the amount of discussion about DNS abuse that has been carried out over the course of the past year-plus. I think we were picking up steam back when we were still all in the same room doing this face-to-face, but then the online era came and the plot kind of got lost, [as well] as diversity of sessions that are helpful on their own but, at the same time, too disjointed.

Certainly, this should be a community-led effort. It is important that the community should lead this, but at the same time, I do feel that we would then benefit from having more support from Org or having more coordination from Org—that aspect of actually help us interface at

different levels with each other and moving this forward not SO/ACs but as the ICANN community.

So I would appreciate hearing from you what are your thoughts on how we move forward on this subject in a way that is inclusive of all topics, of all different stakeholders, and how could, potentially, the Org be helpful in helping us coordinate this, in helping us advance this. Thank you very much.

GORAN MARBY:

Thank you, my friend. It's a very good question, but the unfortunate answer is it's not my job. It is up to the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. It's not even up to the Board. The Board cannot make policies. Our job is to facilitate the discussion within the community and provide facts to the community, which we do. Over the last three years, we have built systems like the health indicators, the DAAR system, which is, I would say, one of the few neutral sources of information about DNS abuse that exists because we actually went out and asked two independent academic resources to check how we do things.

The latest thing we provided was the DNS sticker, which I hope helped the ICANN community discuss it. I know there are other ones who think they have other ways of looking at this, but it's important for me and the multi-stakeholder model and I also know it's important for the Board. That's where the discussion has to happen. And we can go see that we go into an ICANN meeting and there are a lot of DNS abuse

discussions. And we also ask ourselves, “Why don’t they talk together?” But this has to be according to the ICANN multi-stakeholder model, where the GNSO is responsible for making policy. That’s the bylaws. I would be a very bad CEO if I start breaking that.

But thank you for the question. It’s not a bad question. I’m sorry for the answer.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Mark, do you know where to refer with your question right now?

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah. Thank you, Goran. I do get where you’re coming from. It’s just that there’s a small disconnect between the planning that goes on in terms of the meetings and how the sessions come together and how we are able to interact because of the online era. So we have much less capacity to do ad hoc things, and that, at the end of the day, could be facilitated in the sense of trying to create the spaces, as in helping us open the spaces where we can actually bring the stakeholders together. It is something that I have been very persistent about—that we encourage this during the online era. How do we create the spaces? But thank you anyway.

GORAN MARBY: I personally do agree with many things you said, and I think you point to one of the things I mentioned earlier—that the SO and AC leadership also recognized that someone has to be accountable for the meetings

itself. And the community has said they want to have more cross-community discussion when we go into an ICANN meeting.

So my understanding is that we are going to move towards that, but we are an elephant. They are many people involved and many opinions. But I think that the community seems to be moving in that direction. That's what I learned. But we will now more in the middle of April on how meetings will go on. But I agree. There's been a lot of DNS abuse discussions but also a lot of strange information about DNS abuse.

I see Mason's hand is up. I think I need to go off to this because I am apparently going into the GAC as well—probably answering the same question, by the way.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you. But before I hand over to Mason, there is a question in the chat also in relation to that. It's from Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. The question is, "Org experimented with the idea of meeting [hubs] with the NomCom last year. Would this be considered a success?"

GORAN MARBY: In the NomCom, we ended up ... NomCom has, of course, a very special status because they do actually elect leaders within the ICANN community and the ICANN Board. There was actually a member after [summer] last year ... There was some restrictions for people to travel. So what we did is we basically paid for hotel bills for people to be able to meet. We didn't do any more arrangement on that. We also did it under the [inaudible]. We didn't have any ICANN staff there. It was

really the people who wanted to do it. It was completely voluntary. So I wouldn't say that we experimented with anything with [hubs].

But we have our ICANN meeting. We have our ICANN offices around the world. What the community is saying is that maybe a more regional perspective on some of the discussions would be interesting. Again, I want to reference the work that the SO and AC leaders do.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you. Mason, please go ahead.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. So, Goran, I just wanted to follow-up on Mark's question. As you suspect, it has to do with DNS abuse. So there's, as you correctly point out, plenty of discussion inside the community and outside the community about DNS abuse. In fact, I think the European Commission has commissioned a study on DNS abuse that's supposed to come out later in the year. So it's getting lots of attention inside and outside the community.

I hear what you said—that it's a community-led effort—and that's admirable and that's what I think many in the community are trying to do to pick up the mantle and move it forward on DNS abuse. As an organization, though, how do you see ICANN's role in helping out with DNS abuse? Is there, for example, an enhanced role for ICANN Compliance? I think the BC has been calling for a more proactive role for ICANN Compliance to take up in DNS abuse. What's your response to that, and how can we view ICANN's role in DNS abuse?

GORAN MARBY

ICANN Compliance we actually test if the implementation of policy has worked. You know that there has also been direct contractual discussions between the ICANN Org and the contracted parties about some of the provisions, but the underlying concept is that the contracted parties has an empty hole in their contracts and they admit to filling that empty hole if something has gone through the multi-stakeholder model. It's very hard for ICANN Org to go and start negotiating if there's nothing that forces the contracted parties to come to the table.

So the best way to do that is through policy. If you think that the ICANN Compliance should have more things, more tools, that has to come out of policy. And you know this. The ICANN Board cannot create policy either, according to the bylaws. You are a member of the GNSO. The ICANN community has set up in the bylaws on how to do this, and it has come through the GNSO.

MASON COLE:

Can I follow up on that Wolf, please?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Yes, please.

GORAN MARBY:

But then I really need to leave. They are shooting at me that I need to go into the Board-GAC call. But I'll give you one more shot.

MASON COLE: All right. Last question, Goran. Thank you for being accommodating. ICANN is the accrediting body for the contracted parties. I guess I'm missing the gap here in between, where ICANN Compliance should take a role and where the community should take a role. They're existing contracts that ICANN doesn't enforce as proactively as it probably should, and I think that's a concern to most of the community: is there a better way to go about—

GORAN MARBY: A very short answer is that I disagree with you on the notion that Compliance is not doing what they can. I have sent Jamie here so many times, and we discussed it, and still I hear this thing that Compliance is not following the rules. Yes, you might have different implementation than we have, and that's fine, but let's be honest with each other because I heard this so many times. I don't want to sound too ... It's not a fruitful discussion to say that Compliance is not doing its job because it does and we're very transparent about how we interpret the rules and what we do. And still, we have this notion. "Yeah, Compliance should do something differently."

I agree. Some of the contracts' positions are [inaudible], which makes them very much harder. The enforcement part of it ... We had a contracted party who didn't pay his bills. It took us still two years to get rid of him. But, no Fabricio, I don't agree with you. And the contracted parties did not say that yesterday.

So we can have that discussion, but I think it's ... You invite me to these meetings and I always come here and I try to answer your questions. But some of them I think we have to have a further discussion about I don't think it helps anyone to further discussion that is based on those things because it's not positive and it's not helpful.

[Enough,] Fabricio. I [checked with them], and they do disagree with you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. That's fair.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for that.

GORAN MARBY: [inaudible]. And thank you, Mason. It is okay—my answer?

MASON COLE: Yeah. Thanks, Goran. Good luck with the GAC.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Goran. Well, there's still some time. Are there any other questions, for example, related to any other of Goran's [inaudible], like ODP and so on?

Steve DelBianco, please go ahead.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Hey, Wolf-Ulrich. I thought that, if the agenda will accommodate it in this open CSG meeting, why don't we have a discussion reacting to that last statement by Goran and what Fab and others observed with regard to enforcement? Could you allocate five to ten minutes to that discussion?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes. I will do that after universal acceptance.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Brian?

BRIAN KING: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. I was ready to jump on that conversation now, but we can do it after universal acceptance. That's fine.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, great. So are we done with the questions for Goran? I think he left already, didn't he?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, he has.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Oh. I'm sorry I didn't say thank you to him. So it was great to have him hear for such a long time. But we'll do it later on.

Then let's move over to the next one. Our friend Ajay Data has a very long day behind him. Well, I'm happy to see you here, Ajay. Give us a presentation about universal acceptance. Instead, you are saying on [simple] questions. Thank you very much. The floor is yours.

AJAY DATA: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. It's almost midnight in India, but I could not lose this opportunity to talk to all of you, which is very important—the stakeholder group—about universal acceptance. This is very close to all of us because this is what changing the world for language people who are breaking the barrier for languages.

So I'm going to present my screen here and [in a smart] presentation. Could you please enable my screen for screenshare, please?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, Ajay. Please stand by one moment.

between that dot, on the right side, we have the top-level domain name. on the left side, we have the second-level domain name. So .com and .net were getting created like that. There were many top-level domain names [inaudible]. The world was getting used with domain names in the last many decades.

At some part of time, ICANN started introducing the top-level domain name with more than three characters. Currently, there are 1,300 top-levels that are active which are having more than three characters or less than three-character domain names in the market in the [root] [inaudible] servers.

You can go for very large top-level domain names, and these are valid top-level domain names where the domains are getting registered on them. Just remember that you could have a top-level domain name which more than three characters.

Obviously, at some part of time, somebody else thought, “Why can’t we have the domain names other than English characters?” That is where a new Internet started taking shape and where the domain names other than three-characters also started getting built. That is where the actual problem started.

In 2015, the Universal Acceptance Steering Group got formed to ensure that more than three-character top-level domain name and domain names which have non-English characters are accepted equally in the world. That is where the group found the problem, and all the companies got together to solve this problem worldwide. This group

was formed in 2015 with a main objective to raise awareness about UA issues.

I'm going to talk about the issues also a little bit [inaudible] stakeholders. Developers made their systems ready by providing the documentation, common standards, technologies, and tools, and created businesses and had governments to ask their developers to supply UA-ready solutions.

The UA working group works through many working groups. So we have these many working groups—technology working groups, The EAI Working Group, the Measurement Working Group, the Communication Working Group, Local Initiative Working Group, and UA ambassadors. These are the working groups.

I have shared this screen with you. If you think you are interested in UA work, you can join any working group. We are open to accept applications, and everybody is invited to join the working group and contribute there. This is basis through which UA functions globally.

And this is where the problem is. [A] little bit of focus on this screen will tell you the entire UA issue. So I just referred to the top-level domain names. These are the examples here. So new short top-level domain names are. Other than the dots, with the original seven top-level domains, now you can have [.asci] as a new top-level domain name, which is only three characters. [.sva] in India is already a valid domain name. Now you can see .engineering is a very valid top domain name. And this is a valid top-level domain name. You can now register a domain name--.engineering instead of .com or .photography or

.accountant. Like that, there are domain names possible. And you can see the IDN example. And domain names which do not have any Latin characters. That is where the problems are that UA is trying to solve. These are the categories.

Once you have the top-level domain names, you naturally tend to have the e-mail addresses on those domain names. So you could see an ASCII on longer top-level domain names. An example is given on Istanbul, if you can see that. And `ascii.idn`. You can see society is having non-Latin characters. You can see the accented characters in that domain name. `Unicode.ascii`. You can see the mailbox not having English characters. And `[full]unicode.idn`, as an example you can see.

These are the examples you can see, and one line is missing here because of screen resolution. So there is a right-to-left script as an example, especially for Arabic, if you write a script from right to left. Normally, we always write left to right for all the scripts. Arabic script is written from right to left. So this is also an issue.

And these are the five pillars. So if you see the five boxes on the screen, which names say accept, validate, process, store, and display, these are the pillars of universal acceptance.

Allow me to explain it with an example. So let us say there's an ISPCP website or CSG website, and I want to register. And we all register for ICANN70 to come to this event. Let us say I have an e-mail address just like `ascii@idn`, an example that you just see on the screen. Could I register that to ICANN? So there is a test here now. Could I type in this e-mail address on the ICANN website to register? If it allows to type it in,

I passed the first test—that is, [it is accepted]. Could it validate it as a valid e-mail address? If it does that, I pass the second test. If it doesn't, it is a UA-ready website. Could it process it to register me in the system? So that's the third step. Could it store it well in the database or anywhere it wants to store? That's the fourth step. Then the fifth: if it shows me a registration page or an e-mail, could it display it well—what I typed? So, if any website or an application passed this five-step test, that website or an application is UA-ready.

So here is a test for all of you who are listening to this presentation. I'm going to share this presentation with the secretariat here. You can just copy that example and try to see whether on your website or application you can accept this e-mail address. If not, then your application is not UA-ready. That is exactly how the UASG group tries to help you solve that bug in your applications or in your websites. That's the [inaudible] solve it. And what is the market status?

So let's go to the next slide and you will know. Only 9.7% of e-mail servers worldwide—that's [inaudible] report—support receiving an e-mail and sending an e-mail with that kind of e-mail address which I just showed you. That's the challenge with UASG has in front of it. Only 9.7% supports them. So we have to go to the whole world and ensure that all e-mail servers enable their system to accept those valid e-mail addresses which are really valid e-mail addresses. They are not invalid e-mail addresses. But some servers will reject them. And “some servers” are a very large number, as you can see in the report.

11% of the top thousand websites globally support e-mail addressed in Arabic and Chinese. So it's a very small number, as you can see. Again, the majority of the world does not support it. But a good sign is that 98.3% of websites out of the top thousand globally accept an e-mail addresses with a short top-level domain name. Short top-level domain names (normally we consider ccTLDs or three-character domain names. So if you are .com— .india has .in, [inaudible] has [.it], and the US has .us—they are accepted well. But still you can see there are almost more than [1%] domain names or the servers [which] do not accept them as still valid.

This is the example which we need to consider, that this is the scope of UA to solve the problem worldwide. We cannot do it alone. We need everybody's support.

So what are we doing to ensure that this is remediated? All the domain names and all e-mail addresses are accepted equally. So we go around the world. So we are ambassadors as a group. So we have ambassadors right now in Berlin, China, Egypt, India, Nigeria, and South Africa. These are the ambassadors. Ambassadors are the people who advocate and create awareness about UA, about universal acceptance issues. So they will be part of the region and they will go back and go to the [inaudible], go to corporate, go to the industry and tell, give workshops, and speak in the events. We support them financially so that they are covered for their local experiences and they can spread awareness. That's the role of the ambassadors. They are normally influencers in their local region.

We also have local initiatives. This I started two years ago with my friends, colleagues, together because we decided that this is not possible to solve sitting at one place by four or five people in the leadership. We require leadership at a regional level, on their feet on the ground. So a local initiative was formed.

So currently we have a very good result of local initiatives. China is very active. The commonwealth of independent states and eastern Europe, which covers Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Latvia, the Russian Federation, Serbia, and the Ukraine –these are countries which are clumped together and taking their initiative further. India is running a very big initiative. Thailand is doing a very big initiative. And we have many proposals in the pipeline which are formed in the local initiatives. This is a strength: to support these people, local initiatives and measures and take the UA step further so that they can talk to the local community, talk to the local authorities, and ensure that all their applications or Internet is able to accept all domain names, all e-mail addresses, equally.

[inaudible] program [lasted through] 2020, in spite of the pandemic. We could work very actively and appoint these new ambassadors in Turnkey, Berlin, South Africa, India, Nigeria—two in India, in fact. And we have all ambassadors in India, Egypt [inaudible]. So these people are working together for the ambassador program.

If you are interested and you are interested to work in your region and you think you would like to become members of the UA, there's an ambassador program on the UASG.tech website. Please look at it, and

if you're keen, please apply for it. That would be very, very good for the community if you can influence and take the steps further.

There has been work which has been done by UA. We spent a lot of money which obviously you should all know: UASG is supported by ICANN financially and by the Secretariat. Sarmad Hussain is the current [ambassador] for the UA and his team is supporting us. We have done many projects and publications where we have created a compliance of programming and reported the numbers which we just showed, which was also part of [inaudible], which are done considering naming [inaudible] mailboxes. These are all documents. If you're interested, these are just a few of them I have written here which we did in 2021. You would see tens of documents more to look at the [inaudible] knowledge. It's wonderful knowledge, if you are interested for your organization or for yourself or for your government to be UA-ready.

What is UA? For your own purpose, if you're a lecturer or a CEO or a CTO or a developer, where you will find the [inaudible] just for you. This is the power which UA is trying to bring in on your table. You need not to work too much to research on your own.

These are some of the ongoing projects, which you can see. We are doing the open-source code for UA readiness. So we are working on them. There we can open the code and you can test your things. You test your tools and see whether you are UA-ready or not. We are also creating an inventory of EIA tools, applications, and services so that, if you're trying to procure a [inaudible] e-mail server, you know which

when is EAI-ready, which we have tested and we have published many reports around that. These are [inaudible]

We are also creating a WordPress as a pilot, making it UA-ready, what it takes to make it UA-ready. Right now, we are testing the readiness of the CMS and what will be required, then we will go into remediation— CMS as a pilot project. So we have discussed that. WordPress is a largely used CMS platform. If we make it UA-ready, millions of websites will become automatically UA-ready. That's our expectation. And that is how we function, just to give you an idea.

And there are some new projections I have mentioned and also mentioned here: readiness for [inaudible], readiness for social media [inaudible]. These are very important ones. So if you have the capability and technical ability to work on some of the projects, please subscribe to the UA discuss list. The link is available on the website, but also let me tell you: UASG.tech/subscribe. You will subscribe to the mailing list. We keep releasing the call for proposals, and if you have the capability, you can build for them and get the contract financially viable projects, and you can work as a volunteer or a professional to deliver these kinds of solutions to the world at large. Obviously, we are looking for all the solutions to make applications UA-ready.

We do events. We have done many events: UA webinar for African administration of universities on the 21st of January. I'm not going to speak of all of them, but you can see them on the list. These kinds of things keep happening continuously. UASG is doing something every week, somewhere in the world. Every week, something is happening.

So it's a very active thing which is happening, whether it's India or China. That's the region where we have local initiatives and measures so that we have more hands and someone is working and creating its impact [inaudible] to UA because we are committed that we are going to solve as much problems as required to remediate the UA issues and the website and have better percentage in the system.

Let me also tell you, if you are interested more in remediating of [inaudible] of UA, we are having a workshop just after one day. That is tomorrow, the 25th of March, at 2:00 UTC. Do not forget to attend this. This is a very important one.

We keep doing the local initiatives. They are some slides which are related to China and [inaudible] local initiative, where they're attending courses organized for UA education. There is a [CISE]. They can see that these countries got together where technical [inaudible] support is being organized and outreach is being done and public engagements are being done. The Russia UA Working Group is also part of this initiative since 2020.

So you can see there's a lot which is happening around the world, around the globe here. They're taking our workshops [inaudible] and [inaudible] a script. All the [inaudible] were done. Test beds were created. There is a lot of which is happening. [inaudible] are being formed. So what [inaudible] says that globally these communities have come together now. We are trying to get together and depend on and support the local initiative much more better so that they are more

empowered to solve the problem in their own region. This is all [CIAE] which is being done.

In India, let me share with you that there's a local initiative run by FICCI. FICCI is an Indian chamber of commerce—a large number. There are 60-plus [inaudible]. Many sessions have been done. One session was 350 on [inaudible]. We have been doing it ... Because India is a very large country, you can imagine, with 600 million Internet users there. So there is a large that is still left. Around 700 million is still left to come online. This is the initiative which is going to break the barriers. People can consume the Internet in their own language by accepting and ensuring that all the websites are UA-ready.

[FICCI Lila] is the organization which has signed up with the Universal Acceptance Steering Group as an MOU where the local initiative is empowered and we support them by bringing speakers, by bringing knowledge, by bringing the sessions tot them. They take it to the local community and create [people]. These are some pictures which have been done, and these are some brochures and things which have been done. I think there are a lot of activities planned in 2021 which are being executed, even without not being done physically. We have ensured that everybody was virtual could use the power [inaudible] and spread knowledge as much as possible. That's being done here. In Thailand, local activities are being done.

I think I have just tried to give you a brief summary to ensure that you can also become part of UA and take this initiative in this region. Take this initiative for the commercial benefit in your businesses and ensure

that the new customers who are coming with a new domain name and e-mail addresses are not rejected and are accepted as the e-mail addresses and domains in English.

That’s all from my side. I’m happy to answer questions. I also request you to please follow us on Twitter, LinkedIn, and Facebook to remain connected with UA. Thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, very much, Ajay. That was really comprehensive and indeed also very well to understand. Thank you so much. I see there are some comments, some questions in the chat. There are other questions as well coming up. Brenda, please go ahead.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. We have a comment in the chat from Dean Marks. He comment says, “This presentation is so informative and clear, particularly for a non-technical person like myself. Ajay, thank you so much for this excellent presentation and all the insights you were sharing. This is greatly appreciated.”

I’d also like to move on to a question from Tony Holmes. Tony’s question is, “What are the key goal/targets for the UA team for the next year and the year after? Thank you.”

AJAY DATA: Thank you for that appreciation. Thank you, Tony, for this question. So before I move to Tony’s answer, I’m going to make this presentation

available for all of you. So this kind of presentation is very well available and can be shared on the mailing list, no problem. Please feel free to reach out to us, even if you have any query. We'd be very, very happy to answer them and [inaudible] for the discussion. We are there to help.

Tony, we have a large process to create a strategy plan every year, and there's a strategic action plan, what UASG calls a [test] It's a document which goes every year with the help of the community. So what we will do in each section, in EAI communication and measurement, for all the working group: what is the scope we have decided? All the working groups get together and they decide their own. That get accumulated together and creates a strategic action plan. Then that strategic action plan goes to the community. We are 600 people in the community who looks at that plan and suggests what is required more, what is required less, what it does not require. We hear everybody and include those ideas, include those suggestions, into the strategic plan. Then this goes to the Board and that gets approval. Then we execute it in UASG.

So I would encourage all you to do is to visit the UASG.tech website. On the first page itself, you will find the first link of a strategic action plan. A very comprehensive strategic action plan is being done with lots of time [inaudible] been done. This will give you the whole picture of what UASG is going to do this year.

I hope this answers your question.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Ajay. I also would like to repeat a question from the chat as well, put in my Raymond Mamattah. There was some answers given in the chat, but maybe from the top of the UASG it would be good to hear. The question is, “Does one require a strong technical background to be a UA ambassador?”

AJAY DATA: Yes and no. A little bit about knowledge about scripts, about e-mail servers, about e-mail validation, and HTML would be essential, I would say. But you don’t have to be a system admin per se, or you do not to be a full-fledged developer or programmer to understand UA. If you are passionate about bringing more people online and ensure that you are able to help people guide them through the process—they’re going to do it—we are going to support you. The key here is the passion about bringing more people online, breaking the language barrier, and learning new things. These are not very technical things.

So, if you have a little bit of an idea about the e-mail servers work, how the websites work, and how the [inaudible] happens, you are good for it. You need to not be a great expert to become a UA ambassador.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for that. And Steve DelBianco is asking, “Are you recognizing any increased DNS abuse potential in IDNs? Homographs, for example?”

AJAY DATA: Yes, of course. We do not deal with that issue. However, this is an issue which gets dealt with by the general panel. They have done a bit of work there. I was also a co-chair for the [inaudible] Generation Panel, where we have taken care of these kinds of issues, including the similarity and the homographic text and what is possible. These scripts have been taken care of. The rules have been created by the generation panel.

The UASG does not take care of that much as such. The UASG worries about whether, if somebody has an IDN, it's accepted in the browser and opens the right website and, if there's an e-mail, it's accepted well everywhere. That's what we worry about.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Next question from the chat. I think Brenda may come in. Yeah?

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. We have a question from the chat from Waudo Siganga. "Greetings, Ajay. Are there any studies done to show the extent of the problem as far as the new longform over three chars]? gTLDs are concerned."

AJAY DATA: Yeah. I shared those presentation numbers with you related to the e-mail addresses, per se, where the domain names having e-mail addresses where more than three characters are more are not accepted well and a large percentage of domain names reject them. This is the report which I shared with you just in my presentation. More specifics

are being now for each specific region, and we are moving in that direction. The Measurement Working Group and the EAI Working group are going to work together to identify more specific reports in the future. But currently this is a problem area, and I just shared the numbers in my presentation. Please look at that number. The detailed reports are also available in the UASG.tech website if you are interested. Very specific, region-wise, details. They are there.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks for that. Before closing the question line here, I would like to put myself at the end after Brian King. Brian, please go ahead.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. To the question about homoglyphs, I would just shamelessly plug a session that I co-hosted with Brian Lonergan from Donuts yesterday during the Tech Day Session 3, where we talked about smart IDN policy that is supportive of universal acceptance and supportive of the adoption of IDNs and which has a few different policy choices that registries can make to address the threat of a homoglyph lookalike attack. So there's some good information there, and I'm happy to chat offline if anybody has questions about that and I'm just generally supportive and appreciative of Ajay and the universal acceptance work. Thank you.

AJAY DATA: Thank you, Brian. Thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Brian. Ajay, my question is related to the ambassadors program and the map you have shown with the ambassadors. This meeting was supposed to be Cancun in the Latin American region. If you look to the map, there is nobody in the Latin American region who's a UA ambassador. If that is because of the only-[US] Latin scripts? Or what is the major reason for that?

AJAY DATA: No, it is not intentionally designed that way. If we find one, we will definitely appoint one. It's a matter of picking the right person who is interested in that region. Of course, the problem [inaudible] is more about the language that's there. The language issue is there, which is going to be more focused areas. My friend reminded me that [Mark B] used to be the ambassador there, but I think he left the [registry] because he was interested in participating in the projects which we are trying to do or some other reason because we have a very strict conflict of interest policy. If you are an ambassador or are in a leadership position, you cannot participate in the projects which we offer. So some people do not participate in the leadership positions because they're interested in the projects which we offer. So that's a choice, obviously, which is fair.

So if somebody is interested, Wolf, if you would recommend somebody, if you know somebody, if somebody is interested in becoming a UA ambassador, we are more than happy to receive the application.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, great. Thank you for answering all these questions and thank you for your great presentation, Ajay. We wish you good night. Thank you.

AJAY DATA: Thank you very much. Thank you. My pleasure. Thank you for the opportunity. Thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: So for the very last 17 minutes, we are moving ahead to the policy discussion slot we have here. I would suggest that we directly dive into what we didn't finish before—the questions and the comments which were made around DNS abuse and Goran's comments around that—and then the other things here about GNSO framework for continuous improvement and maybe other items as well.

So who would like to start with that? Is it Steve DelBianco? Or who would like to take this part with regards to Goran's comment before?

STEVE DELBIANCO: I had mentioned this earlier, because as so often is the case, we finish a conversation with Goran and he will become defensive as opposed to being responsive. So I would suggest this an open meeting. So it's not as if we get into strategy, but let's perfect the rhetoric that we use to challenge his perception about Org's enforcement activities and do so by drawing upon what other ACs and SOs are saying. That makes it

much more difficult for Goran to disregard what we are coming up with if we show that it's more broadly supported by others.

With that, I'd like to see if Brian King, Fabricio, and others would like to weigh in. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks for that. Fabricio first.

FABRICIO: Thank you, Wolf. Can you hear me okay?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, we can.

FABRICIO: Wonderful. Thank you for the opportunity here to come back on this to speak. Thank you for putting it on the agenda. Yeah, I agree with you because, too often, it's we commercial stakeholders who are bringing this subject up alone.

I thought yesterday was a really good circle back on what we saw during the abuse session in Montreal, where Elliot Noss and others [then] in Montreal took the mic and, in a nutshell, had said, "We don't think we need to change the contracts because the contracts officially give ICANN the ability to enforce against abuse and that it should do it and it's not doing." Yesterday, we saw both Elliot Noss and Ashley Heineman come in and basically say the same thing over again. One

step further, they actually said in the chat, between me, Brian King, and others, that they would like to get together and put together examples and go to ICANN—in essence, work together on this issue—because they believe that ICANN wasn't enough.

My concern, to your point, Steve, is that, every time for the past four meetings we've brought up DNS abuse—I challenge everyone to find anything in the transcript that shows otherwise—Goran takes this approach. He gets very aggressive, extremely defensive, and says that we're being non-productive and that we're mis-categorizing things. I think anybody who [inaudible] were being asked from all sides and that they seem to challenge what ICANN is saying around compliance.

But we just heard Goran's response, right? "You're wrong and I'm not going to have this conversation because you're being non-productive." I think that we need to both address the DNS abuse problem together but I think we also need to address the fact that we have a CEO who, any time you even so much as raise or suggest that Org isn't doing its duty as an accrediting body to force compliance on its very own contracts, basically calls you a non-productive liar. I don't think that's very productive from a leadership position.

So I think we have two challenges here, and I'd love to hear from others on how to address it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Fabricio, for that. Brian?

BRIAN KING:

Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I think what's become clear to me—I share some of the frustrations and concerns that Fab just mentioned—is that we're not going to be able to change Goran's mind about what that contract provision means or convince him that Org can or should enforce it. So I don't have all of the answers or any of the answers right now, but it seems clear that we in the CSG are not going to be able to do that unilaterally. I think that we might benefit from some conversations around how we can do that with our friends, how we can do that with perhaps the GAC or some of the contracted parties that Fab mentioned, and whatever other approaches might be necessary because it seems like we're running into a wall trying to get Goran to see things our way. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thanks very much, Brian. My understanding is the same. So we have to try to find friends. Well, we have friends, but we have to put together [inaudible] in order to make that more clear. I think, from the other side, that's my experience. Also, I wasn't directly involved in these things. [Really], we don't have another chance.

Lori, please go ahead.

LORI SCHULMAN:

Hi. I do want to remind the CSG and the IPC that INTA wrote a strong letter about five years ago with very specific examples from large corporate members, and Fab was Chairman of their Internet Committee at the time. Fab, if you remember, we met with Maguay, and

then I met with Allen Grogan privately. We didn't even post the letter to the correspondence list initially because we were hoping, if we could do it quietly, we might get a little progress and then publicize the process. The bottom line is that was an epic fail, I'll have to say. So I think that getting allies and doing it publicly is probably the only way to go.

And I would say not even a few examples. We would need dozens of examples. And I would encourage particularly those in their constituencies who are attorneys who represent corporate clients. The trouble that INTA runs into is I get complaints privately, but then when I ask the corporations to speak up publicly, they're extremely reluctant to do so.

So unless we can convince our clients it's in their interest to disclose specific incidences, I don't know how we're going to achieve this.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Good point, Lori. Mark?

MARK DATYSGELD: Quick question. Does the CSG have a vision on how the GNSO Council should approach this? Do you guys have a direction you would like to see us try to go towards? Not saying it would be achievable, but as far as ideas go.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Very clear question. Who was first? Paul. Yes, Paul, please go ahead.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks, Wolf. I don't mean to be a contrarian, but in continuing to push on Goran at the very end of the call, I don't want us to overlook the fact that he did say that this needed to have more conversation. No one stopped and said, "Great. That's a good idea. Let's keep the conversation going. When can we talk?" Right? So I know we're all frustrated, but I do worry about the dynamic where, every time we speak to him, he, as Steve mentioned, ends up being defensive and the conversation is cut off.

So whoever follows up with him to thank him for being on the call with us I think also should thank him for his offer to keep the conversation going and see if we can do that and then, as someone noted, come to him with things that others besides us have said so that he can react to that.

But anyway, I just don't want us to miss the fact that he did invite us in to additional conversation, which I think we should take him up on. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Paul. Fabricio again.

FABRICIO VAYRA: Thanks, Paul. A few follow-on comments. First, I do remember the work that we did on behalf of INTA with Lori. For background for folks there, it was a huge dossier that we put together from multiple big brands who

partake in and participate within ICANN. Very detailed examples, very long conversations with ICANN Compliance that, as Lori accurately represents, went nowhere.

I'd also share that, after that, another group of ICANN participants across many industries got together, ultimately called the Independent Compliance Working Party, or ICWP, met with the Compliance team over several ICANN meetings to discuss compliance. That correspondence is public, and that also went nowhere.

I can share that, after the ICWP had its meetings, we then were invited to contracted party meetings with Jamie Hedlund and the Compliance team, where abuse came up, and ICANN's ability to actually combat abuse on its contracts was brought up, discussed, and very much mirrored what we say in yesterday's discussion with folks like myself and contacted parties noting to Jamie that they already had the powers to act against abuse. Those conversations went nowhere.

So I think my issue is that this thanking of Goran for continuing the conversation may as well be a letter that says, "Thank you. Can I have another?"—that other being absolutely non-productive conversations where we're being told that we're being hysterical, not straightforward, not productive, or flat-out being told that we're lying about the facts. The facts are that ICANN is an accrediting party. It accredits the contracted parties. Those agreements are actually ICANN's agreements, and it actually has all the powers under its bylaws and its 501c3 status to effectuate change so that it can effectively do its job as an accrediting body overseeing the DNS. For Goran to continue to tell

us that we need to have conversations, to ignore the problem, where you have multiple SOs and ACs agreeing on the issue, is not appropriate.

So we need to find a way forward that gets the ball moving. I do think that doing this collaboratively is a key. I think that doing so openly is a key. Otherwise, what we're getting is a game of divide-and-conquer, where each side is being told something different. That's not appropriate. This has been many years now that we're talking about the exact same thing.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thank you very much, Fabricio. So it seems to that many people, many groups, are frustrated with what's happening there. But on the other side, they or we are not in the position [inaudible] to bundle our forces in an appropriate way in order to say it in one block or together when it comes to those questions. So, otherwise, is it a game? gaming forward and backwards?

So here are ideas and questions about how to deal with that on council and how to prepare councilors on that. There were suggestions made: why not directly contact the Board regarding these issues? So that's what we are doing as CSG from time to time. We have, for example, meetings with our respective Board members. We could ask for that specifically, for example. We could do so.

So there is a bundle, a bunch, of ideas, but who is going to put that really in a kind of strategy? It's just a question mark from my side.

I have two further—or Fabricio, maybe that’s an old hand ? Margie is here, raising her hand. Margie, please?

MARGIE MILAM:

Hi. I just wanted to answer some questions in the chat. The way the RAA was adopted in 2013 was outside of a GNSO policy process. I think it would be instructive to at least understand how it worked. The 3.18—the abuse point of contact language—came as a result of the working group that was put together by, I think, Steve Metalitz, through the IPC to solicit areas where the RAA could be improved. Then that list of negotiating topics were sent to ICANN, and ICANN was at the negotiating table with the contracted parties with its list of asks, and that was one of them. Once that process was done, there was a public comment period, and then the new RAA was required in the next round of new gTLDs. That’s how ICANN got the 2013 RAA adopted.

That certainly is something that could be explored again. It took a while to get it done, but perhaps it’s time now to think about it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thanks very much, Margie. So the most concrete [thing] I got from the last chats is something that somebody—Dean?—wrote. [“]I’m happy to volunteer to work with Fab and Elliot.[“]So I’m not familiar with that, but if that would be helpful to bring that stone in rolling mode, again ... Kristen is also standing by for that. So that may be helpful if that is the way at first. I understand that all your context to GAC and the Contracted Parties House should be used in addition to move that

forward and coming back to a next CSG meeting or whenever it appropriate to come back with that.

I think there's no objection to do that. I leave it in your hands, Dean, to be active on that. I'm sure you are. Thank you for that.

Let me just use the very last minute, I think—it's just at the top of the hour—just for one question regarding the policy discussion advance—the GNSO framework for continuous improvement. You'll remember that that is the discussion point for the council and that a draft framework was shared by staff. It asks for our input. So we are still to go to put some input here and forward it to staff.

We as the ISP constituency have three concerns with that. One is the workload. That means, how should it be possible in the future to participate in all these groups tasked with this? Then the question is also for us [inaudible] critical with regard to prioritization of those taskforces to ... As you remember, we have a lot discussed around GNSO and a holistic review, and that's one thing we would like to see in a more prioritized way here. And the third thing is we are seeing is also the so-called voting scheme in case it comes to votes for voting on the taskforces. So these are three issues we have.

I wonder whether the other constituencies—the BC and IPC—had comments to that and would be curious to hear about that.

But first there as Philippe Fouquart and then Tony Holmes. Philippe, please go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Hope you can hear me. Just on that point, timewise, you will note that tomorrow it's only a five-minute discussion item. The odds are that we're not going to discuss that in great detail. And the odds are that we're going to have an extraordinary council meeting between tomorrow and the following council meeting.

So just to say that, if you want to have more substantial discussions to provide your inputs to the councilors, it's not within the next 24 hours but probably within the next fortnight. So take your time. Your inputs such as those that you provided, Wolf-Ulrich, will be extremely welcome, but there's no real rush, appreciating it's only 15 days. But there we are. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Very glad to hear. Very helpful. Thank you, Philippe. Tony?

TONY HOLMES: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. [inaudible] to use remarks from Philippe. I think [inaudible]—

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Tony, you are speaking ... It's like you're sitting in a hallway, in a deep hall.

TONY HOLMES: Okay. I'll try and change. Is that better, Wolf-Ulrich?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes.

TONY HOLMES: Okay. Just to say I appreciate the remarks from Philippe. That's very helpful. We should pay attention to this. And just to draw attention to the fact that, within this proposal, they recognize that we are three distinct constituencies. Certainly, when this group comes to discuss these issues, we will basically be able to represent each of our constituencies, which is a real step forward. But as soon as it goes to the situation where there's no consensus, we get put together once again. So we only get one voice.

So it seems as though they give us a voice all the time there's agreement. As soon as there isn't agreement, then we go back to having one voice. I would suggest that's one of the things that we should look towards making some representation of at the GNSO level. If they are going to give us a voice, then let's have it all the way through. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Tony. So let's come to an end. Any last questions open?

Doesn't seem to be case. So we are four minutes over. Thank you very much for participating. It was a lively discussion. Thank you so much. Have a good time during ICANN70 . The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]