

ICANN70 | Community Forum

Plenary Topic Proposals

Topics

1. Registry Voluntary Commitments: Getting it Right
2. Applicant Support: What Does Success Look Like?
3. Governmental Regulatory Developments and Community Discussion
4. Technical Internet Governance or technical aspects of Internet Governance

Detailed Proposals

1. Registry Voluntary Commitments: Getting it Right

Group/Affiliation * ALAC

Contact Name * Jonathan, Zuck

Brief Description (max 250 words) *

Registry Voluntary Commitments (RVCs, formally Voluntary PICs), exist as the primary means by which registries make commitments to the community, regarding a particular gTLD. Initially, these commitments were made as part of applications for new strings, often to address a GAC objection. More recently, they were raised in the context of the proposed acquisition of PIR. In both cases, there's a question about their value and enforceability by ICANN. Recently, the ICANN Board has suggested that Contract Compliance cannot enforce contract provisions that fall outside ICANN's remit.

Clearly, registries need a way to make enforceable commitments to the community. Are RVC's fit for purpose, with greater clarity over enforceability and perhaps standing to bring a DRP, or do we need another mechanism? In this session, we'll discuss the pros and cons of RVCs as well as possible improvements and alternatives.

Rationale/Desired Outcomes *

RVCs are regularly derided by the ICANN community. Were they poorly drafted, poorly enforced or is there something more endemic at work? This is an issue that needs to be resolved prior to any new round.

Session Format * 90min session
45min discussion by panelists
45min discussion by community

Session
Leaders/Facilitators * ALAC Moderator
2012 Registry Rep
Contract Compliance
ICANN Board
NCSG Rep

Community Interest * These commitments are of interest across the community.

2. Applicant Support: What Does Success Look Like?

Group/Affiliation * ALAC

Contact Name * Jonathan, Zuck

Brief Description (max 250 words) *

The 2012 Applicant Support Program, including the community mentoring initiative, is largely regarded as a failure. Theories abound to explain this failure and the Subsequent Procedures Working Group has made some proposals for improvement, leaving the details to the Implementation team.

A question that remains, that should be considered as a matter of policy, NOT implementation, is the identification of goals around the program. These goals need to be result oriented, not measures of effort. Goals could include number of applicants for support, number of awarded and delegated strings and geographic distribution of applicants.

In this session, we'll discuss community objectives for applicant support, including some possible concrete goals and measures of success for the next round of gTLDs.

Rationale/Desired Outcomes *

The next CCTRT will need to evaluate the success of applicant support initiatives during the next round. Short of the absolute failure of the 2012 effort, without concrete objectives, such an evaluation will be impossible. If we, as a community, are serious about greater diversity among registries, setting concrete objectives is essential.

Session Format * 90min
45min discussion by panelists
45min discussion by community

Session
Leaders/Facilitators * At-large Moderator
Christa Taylor, SubPro rapporteur for Applicant Support
2012 JAS Rep
AFRALO Rep
2012 Applicant Support Selection Comm Rep

Community Interest * The community has an interest in the decreased concentration of DNS infrastructure in the developed world.

3. Governmental Regulatory Developments and Community Discussion

Group/Affiliation * GNSO CSG

Contact Name * Mason Cole

Brief Description (max 250 words) *

As envisaged, the proposed plenary session should provide an update from governmental authorities from the European Commission and United States regarding Congressional directives (US) and proposed directives (EC) that, when enacted, will fundamentally change the current landscape as it relates to collection and maintenance of and access to domain name registration data (Whois). The update should be followed by an opportunity for questions from and discussions with the ICANN community.

It will be particularly important to hear from governmental representatives themselves as qualified authorities on what this legislation and these proposed directives are intended to accomplish. Via this discussion, the ICANN community will be much better informed about the direction of and necessary changes to policymaking activity.

Rationale/Desired Outcomes *

These governmental actions represent the most significant approaching regulations to apply to registration data and its availability since the implementation of GDPR in 2018 and will have a significant impact on registrars, registries, and those that seek registration data for legitimate purposes. Even as ICANN policymaking continues, the community would be better equipped for taking policy work forward in a correctly focused manner by gaining a better understanding of the goals and outcomes that the governmental authorities seek to accomplish with these regulatory efforts.

The objective of the session, thus, would be for governmental experts from the US and EC to inform the community in detail regarding the desired outcomes of legislation and proposed directives, so that policy work can proceed with knowledge of all relevant facts, and so the community's time and resources are not wasted.

Session Format * Presentation by US governmental representative(s): 15 minutes
Presentation by EC governmental representative(s): 30 minutes
Community discussion / Q&A: 45 minutes

Session Leaders/Facilitators * Panelist: Representative from US National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)
Panelist: Representative from relevant EC authority
Panelist: Representative from ICANN EPDP Working Group
Moderator: TBD

Community Interest * Given the intensive focus over the past two years on registration data policy by all sectors of the ICANN community, it should be anticipated that most SOs, ACs, SGs and Cs will attend and actively participate.

4. Technical Internet Governance or technical aspects of Internet Governance

Group/Affiliation * GNSO NCSG

Contact Name * Bruna Santos

Brief Description (max 250 words) *

What is the notion of technical Internet governance and how does it differ from technical aspects of Internet Governance? In an Open Forum during the IGF 2020, ICANN CEO & President argued that the widespread concept of IG would be directly linked to access and network usage and that the term "technical Internet Governance" was particularly focused on the operation of the Internet.

This session is, therefore, dedicated to discussing Technical Internet Governance, Internet Governance and what are the conjuntural challenges presented in today's Internet that would enable the creation and adoption of a more specific realm of IG dedicated to technical Actors.

Additionally, the goal is to understand different stakeholders perspective on the matter, as well as the rationale adopted by ICANN Org when defending a " technical Internet governance with the aim of improving the understanding of the technical underpinnings of Internet operation among legislators, regulators and other non-technical stakeholders".

With this conversation, we also aim to start a dialogue with the ICANN community about the use of this concept as well as any risks and questions this may bring.

Rationale/Desired Outcomes *

- This is a session that is mainly focused in understanding what are the possible approaches and concepts used to discuss the differences between Internet Governance and Technical Internet Governance (TIG).

- Understand if there are enough conjuntural changes that requires us to create a new and more specific realm inside the Internet governance discussions pertaining only to the technical actors.

Session Format * Roundtable. The idea is to discuss the - TIG concept adopted by ICANN with the Organization and also community members.

Session Leaders/Facilitators * NCSG

Community Interest * This has been a topic of interest to parts of the community. Although it may be hard to define, we anticipate that there would be interest from BC and ALAC on this topic.