
YESMIN NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, the 31st of March, 2021, at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees, as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge, will be recorded after the call.

We have received apologies from Priyatosh Jana, Roberto Gaetano, Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet, Sebastien Bachollet, Maureen Hilyard, and from Eduardo Diaz.

From staff slide, we have Evin Erdogan, Kathy Schnitt, and myself, Yesim Nazlar. I'll also be doing call management on today's call.

As you know, we have Spanish and French interpretation, and our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Claudia and David and, on the French channel, Camila and Isabelle.

Before we get started, another important reminder is for the real-time transcription service. I'm going to share the link with you here on the Zoom chat. Please do check this service provided.

With this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

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.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call, where we have quite a few guests coming to speak to us today. We'll start with a presentation on SAC115 and 116 from Rod Rasmussen, Julie Hammer, and Andrey Kolesnikov. All three are from the SSAC and are some names you will remember. They have already come to speak to us a number of times. SAC115 is the report on and interoperable approach to addressing abuse handling in the DNS—DNS abuse being something we're particularly interested in. And 116 is the SSA comments on the second Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review Team final report.

We'll then have a debrief of the ICANN70 policy sessions that have taken place last week. Then we'll go to our work group updates with the IGO work track, the Expedited Policy Development Process, and the Subsequent Procedures. There's been some movement in the past two weeks.

And we'll continue with the policy comment updates, focusing, particularly on this occasion, on the second Security, Stability, and Resiliency Review Team final report (SSR2). I guess we'll speak about this on two occasions on today's call because that's due on the 8th of April. So Greg Shatan and Alejandro Pisanty have shared a document on the mailing list. I believe it's probably also linked to the agenda page. And we will be collecting comments because this has to be filed shortly.

Finally, Any Other Business. That's when I need to ask anyone on the call today where they wish to make amendments to the agenda or suggest other topics to be addressed today.

I guess it's already quite a full agenda. Not seeing anybody put their hand up. So the agenda is adopted as it currently is on your screen.

Thank you, Yesim, for putting the real-time text transcription screen text in the chat. Always very helpful.

So we can now go into our action items, which are collected from last week. One action item remains, and that's for Justine Chew to finalize and confirm the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures. But we'll be dealing with this when we speak with Justine in a few minutes' time a little bit later on this call today.

All the other action items are complete, so I open the floor is there are any comments or questions on those action items.

I'm not seeing any hands up, so that looks as though we can proceed forward in our agenda. Thank you.

We can therefore welcome Rod Rasmussen, Julie Hammer, and Andrey Kolesnikov to our call today. They have a very nice presentation. Now, if it doesn't appear on your agenda, page, you'll need to reload it and you will have access to that presentation. But we will also have it shared on the Zoom call. So welcome, ladies and gentlemen. You have the floor now. I'm not sure who wishes to lead on this, so I'll let you sort it out. I see probably Rod Rasmussen. Welcome, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Hello, everybody. Andrey, I didn't want to know if you wanted to say any words before I dove in here.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV: Well, I'm fine. It's your stage, obviously. So I'll just say hello.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Good evening to you, I think. It's morning time for me. So this presentation here is from our full public meeting. We'll just be going through a few slides from that. The whole presentation is available for folks who would like to take a look through that.

If we could go to Slide 7, please. I'm going to start with SAC116. This is our public comment response to the SSR2 report. Both this one and SAC115 we released last week. Apologies for doing that in the middle of an ICANN week. In the virtual world we're in, it doesn't seem to matter as much, but when physical meetings are happening, we try not to do that—overloading folks.

But, anyhow, those came out last week, so you may not have had a chance to take a look at what we did with SAC116. In our public comment response, we really gave a very brief response to the rather large and long-running SSR2 review that took several years to get done. Obviously, it being SSR, this is an area that is what SSAC is all about.

So in order to really have gone in and done a thorough point-by-point perspective on this for us probably it would take, I would imagine, six months or so to really do it justice. So instead of trying to hurry something through and come to consensus on high-level areas or have a whole bunch of things that would need follow-up, we're very straightforward about the fact that the things that were brought up

were very important in general. We didn't endorse or formally criticize any particulars of the recommendations themselves that the SSR2 team provided. Rather, at the high level, these are all areas that need to be looked at. In general, SSR issues should be prioritized. The SSAC stood ready to work with the ICANN Board, ICANN Org, etc., when these things are looked at in detail for any particular implementation, especially for areas where there may be some of these recommendations that are contentious, or some further digging into by folks with the right kind of background here for advice. At that point, we would be able and willing to provide further input. And we may take on a few of the points that are in there as we have time to do so, especially as they may come up in other areas that we may be looking at.

We did point out that there were a few things where our comments ... We'd go through this in detail when the draft report ... Most of those comments were taken onboard by the SSR2 team and either directly were reflected in their final report or were part of some area that ends up being out of scope or fairly radically changed between the draft and the final report. So there were only a few areas where there was some contention between the advice we gave and their eventual interpretation and final advice coming out of the SSR2 report in the end. And we just noted that there are different approaches to solving the same problem—there's nothing wrong with that necessarily—but we would be looking at those, in particular if those some of the areas where further assistance is needed.

So it's a little of a "Hey, this is a great. They've gotten this all done. Thank you very much. These are high-priority things. Let's get it done," but without specifically saying that's particularly the right approach to

doing so. I know that other groups are taking a look down to the detail level. As I said, for us to have been able to do that even within an extended time period probably would not have done it justice.

So that's where we're at. We're going to dig into areas that come up where we are asked for our assistance by Org and the Board and some other areas that we've come up with that are of particular interest. We'll be addressing those.

So I'll stop here to take any questions or comments on that before I talk about the other document. I know have about 20 minutes total here, so I don't want to abuse my time. Were there any questions on this one before I move onto the other document?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment, so I gather you can probably proceed forward.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Let's go to the next slide. I think I may have—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just bearing in mind, Rod, that SSR2 will be discussed a bit later on on the call as well. So I think some of the points that you're making here should be taken note of and perhaps discussed then as well if there are no questions from participants. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. I see on the second slide here that one point that I didn't make is that we did have some concern about just the sheer number of things, even though a lot of the stuff from SSR1 was incorporated into SSR2 with measurables, etc. That was one of the other things we did appreciate: being able to provide measurables on this. So that is a concern we have and I'm sure everybody has. There's a lot of things to do. Do we have the time, resources, etc., to be able to do that? So prioritization is a key thing.

Let's move on to the next slide, please. SAC115. This is thing we've been working on for over a year now on DNS abuse.

Please move to the next slide. So this document is one of what may be multiple documents in this space. You can see here a list of topics that it covers within this one. This was primarily focused around the question of abuse handling or incident response, which is another way of phrasing that.

So things we didn't look at were things like preventing abuse from happening in the first place, some of the other areas that people are having discussions about. This is really focused on the ecosystem that exists in how you respond to abuse, both from a perspective of being somebody in the world that feels they're being victimized and being abused or may represent somebody who is doing so and how that can be turned into effective actions with the right parties to get the right outcomes for your resolution of those issues.

So some of the things we did not try to do is redefine DNS abuse yet again and [we] pointed out the commonalities of some of the definitions

that have been used within the space. We focused on things more along the lines of what're some of the things that need to be done in order to provide effective abuse reports and responses to those, who to take them to, what are escalation paths to work with, what were some of the things to expect from a timing perspective based on operational realities, and how various entities are set up to respond.

What we also came to some findings on were that there is this ... Well, we provided a path forward. So let me talk about that in the next slide, I think, if you can move to the next slide. There we go. Perfect. That's the findings. I have a bad habit of sometimes talking ahead of the slides that actually have the points on them.

Despite this being a problem for 20+ years, there is no single process or universal standard, etc., for how to approach doing these things. It's not just within the DNS system. It's throughout the entire Internet ecosystem. When you think about various providers that are involved in various types of abuse, whether it's content of a webpage, it's spam e-mail, it's infrastructure set up to run botnets, etc., there are a lot of different players involved, including people within the ICANN world when you have identifiers being used. In particular, we think of the most applicable area being when there's a domain name that's registered in order to be part of some sort of abusive activity. So we talk about that in the paper when it's appropriate to request the DNS be used as a tool for handling that abuse versus that it's more likely to be something you have to go to a platform or web-hosting company or e-mail service provider, etc., to deal with.

But, regardless of that, there is this lack of standards for how evidence is gathered, presented, etc., how people respond to that, how things are escalated, how things are coordinated between entities that may be involved in abuse—or it could be multiple entities involved, if you think about a malicious registration for a phishing campaign. There's going to be e-mails. There's going to be a website, etc., etc. There may be multiple parties needed to work on their aspects of that.

So one of the things that we pointed out and actually moved towards on our recommendation is that there is an opportunity to bring a broader group together to finally put some standards together and perhaps have some sort of common facilitator that would be able to help with these practices, be able to help with providing contact information or ways of being able to obtain that, etc. Then we've seen ICANN play a role in helping with such efforts that are within and beyond its focus in that we've had universal acceptance and a series of DNS symposiums that have looked at the DNS beyond just the registrations of names and numbers but also resolution—things like that. So there might be a role for the ICANN organization, the ICANN community, to play in convening something to deal with that.

That gets us to the recommendation, which is the next slide: the community and the Org should take a look at putting together some sort of convening of discussions on this and take a look at trying to move a path forward towards creating some sort of common abuse responses [elevator] and take some of the principles that we came up within this document as input to that but not necessarily being an end product and that, at the very least, the folks that are part of the registration services themselves that are within the ICANN community but also people who

provide DNS hosting, CDNs, etc., plus the folks that are doing incident response itself, come together and try to put together what that might look like. That could be a particular organization or it could be more of an ongoing project, so to speak, where you have an industry organization like where you have interoperability as the goal—at the very end of the day, make it interoperable just like we’ve done for the technical side of the Internet with the IETF and other organizations that try and make sure everything is interoperable. The idea here is to make handling of abuse on the Internet interoperable.

We point to many efforts that are out there that are looking at things in various sectors. I was thinking that we need to bring those kinds of efforts together. There’s several different standards out there. Some of those need to be accepted universally so everybody has the right expectations and we can try and move forward from there to solve this problem, which cannot just be solve in one space in its own silo without thinking about the broader spectrum of abuse.

That is the summary of the document. I will also note, in the document, several of our members have some alternate views—they’re included in there—about some of the approaches that were outlined in the paper. Those are important discussion points. As I’ve mentioned in the prior work, there’s more ways than one to solve problems. So I think those are important to take a look at, too, as part of the conversation.

We also brought in a few outside experts as well from the SSAC for this work party from both the abuse handling for the contracted side of things and law enforcement and incident handling sides as well. And

those folks are listed in the document. So we tried to be inclusive of a broad swath of the community in this particular work.

So that is the summary there. I'm happy to take questions, etc., on this document.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: First in the queue is Heidi Raiche.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Apologies. I just saw there's a direct message that the interpreters weren't hearing me clearly. I just saw that. Apologies if you did not get that clearly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rod. First in the queue is Holly Raiche.

Holly, you are muted at the moment.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry. Two things from the report. First of all, one of the things that [Anicus] is thinking of doing is coming up with a standard definition of DNS abuse. But what I'm reading from your paper is it goes more broadly than what the registries and registrars are doing.

I'm really, I suppose, asking if it makes sense to try to confine or actually say that it's a very broad thing, that it can mean different things in different contexts. So if we have a concept of DNS abuse, it needs to be

broader than just what the registry/registrar group is saying. It should include other things [in] the group that you're proposing.

But before you respond to that, when I was reading the SSR2 report, I came across one sentence that worried me, and I'm just wondering what you think. I'll just read it. "The SSR review team finds the way that ICANN Org is apparently structuring agreements with data providers to be a significant inhibitor of these goals and processes ..." "An overhaul of its DNS abuse analysis program with transparency, reproducibility, and action should be its primary object." So I'm wondering what they mean and if it's something you spotted as well. It sounds like some of the actual agreements themselves get in the way of DNS abuse. I'm just wondering if that ties in with, say, what Compliance feels it can do, what it is doing, what it's not doing, and if that's part of the problem or the solution. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks, Holly. Those are all really important issues. In the first part about creating standard definitions of DNS abuse, that's one of the things that we believe should be done by the broader community. And that's looking at abuse in general. There is probably not enough time to get into all the whys and wherefores around the history of the term "DNS abuse" that's been used within ICANN. It has served as a handy tool, but it's a very imprecise definition.

I would point out that one of the things we tried to make sure to talk about in this paper is, regardless of whether you think that any particular abuse is, by the nature of the abuse, that something to be

actioned or not is clearly immaterial from who needs to do the action. So, in the case of registry or registrar, if a domain name was registered for the purpose of abuse—whatever the definition of abuse is—that is an appropriate place to go to try and get that resolved. Whether or not the type of abuse being reported has been provided enough evidence, whether something was actionable based on the terms of service or local laws, etc., are a separate question from the very technical issue of, was this domain name created for the purpose that it's being used for and is that purpose something that falls into the abuse category for some actionable area? I'm trying to divide those various blocks up. Oftentimes, we got caught up in the idea of "Does it fall into this definition thing that we must act on?" That's a different question from who must be doing the acting.

On the SSR2 question, I think that's in response to access to the underlying data, if I remember correctly. There's a whole set of issues around being able to get access to data from commercial vendors and things like that that I think are tangled up in the question of the contracts that ICANN is setting up with data providers to address that. I think that's one of the areas where we would have plenty of things to talk about in regard to our SSR2 response that would take some time and some careful introspection on because there are several reasons why you can't just take the data that ICANN has and then just publish that or use that. But at the same time, it might be doable to take a look at that process and those types of providers and be able to do something to be able to either publish or do more analysis with broader sets of folks.

I think that's just a lot of complication around that, but it's certainly an area where it's worth having a conversation around how the things are being done as far as when it goes to criticizing it right now because there were certain purposes for why that was set up. If it's not fit to purpose, then we need to take a look at how that's configured and rethink that going forward.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next in the queue is Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you very much for this very interesting presentation. I have no expertise in this field, to be modest, but a track record of seeing what's down the road. Look, there is evidence of a certain dragging of the feet in this field, particularly among some of the contracted parties.

My main point right now is that we will get actions and regulations and penalties about DNS abuse. If ICANN doesn't get this done very quickly, globally we will have such regulations in different countries and in different regions which will, in the future, make the coordination effort, which you have referred to, much more difficult.

So I had a firsthand case to this issue in the new gTLD PDP, where the consensus of a few of us was that the PDP would not doing anything

about this because it should be done for all TLD. But the practical, political effect of that, unless your recommendations are acting on decisively, would lead to further fiscal success and, above all, leave political space at the national and regional level that will people say, “We will deal with this,” about. Then the coordination will become troublesome. Thank you. Apologies, Olivier, for being a little long.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It’s okay, Christopher. Rod, any comments?

ROD RASSUMEN: Yeah. It wasn’t question, but certainly your comment was well-put. It’s a concern we all have. That does tie a little bit to one of our points we made in SAC114, which is our subsequent procedures response in that the particular area of DNS abuse should be addressed prior to delegation of new TLDs—at least “delegation” as in putting in the zone and having them active—based on some of the activities that happened in the 2012 round and having some better solutions there because one of the things we’re certainly seeing is activities around blocking and filtering the TLD level, which leads you to all kinds of interoperability concerns. Given the nature of DNS being interdependent upon each other, if you’re filtering one TLD, that might be give you bad effects in others, depending on where names are [resolved] and things like that, as just an example.

And there’s also efforts and more and more regulatory looks at how people are reacting to different issues. So I agree that there’s concerns that ... The frustration as to why we have a paper here is not just the

domain name registration portion of the problem. It's much broader than that. ICANN happens to be positioned to have some authority to be able to have providers of registration services do certain actions. A lot of where the problems are lying are outside of that scope as well. But at the same time, if we're going to have a response system that works, we need to have standards and processes that apply across the board.

So it's a little bit of a chicken-and-egg problem of how you do that. So we're saying, hey, let's all just go and do this work and try and get some resolution here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I'm not seeing any hands up, so back to you, Rod.

ROD RASMUSEN: Okay. Well, that covered the two ... I don't think there's one slide. If we can check—yeah. No, that was the slide. So that covers what you'd asked to come on and cover this morning. I know we're at the end of our time, so I'm going to pass it back over to you. Thank you for having us.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. We really appreciate that you are up that early in the morning. I know that it's a weird time. But we work on strict rotations, so this is why—

ROD RASMUSSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Can I ... Thank you for that. Julie ... I forgot totally. Can we just take a minute—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's what I thought. I know she wanted some time at the end of this. So at the other end of the [joke], Julie Hammer.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Olivier. I promise I'll be very brief. If we could just scroll down to Slide 31. I just wanted to take this opportunity, because of the breadth and diversity of your community, to do a little bit of outreach. Our planned outreach efforts within SSAC have been stymied by the last year of lockdown and not being able to meet with everyone face to face.

But I just wanted to share the fact that we have developed quite a comprehensive skill survey that we use in a number of ways within the SSAC. One was to identify and record the skills of our existing members so that, when work comes up, we know who to target for work but also to provide to prospective members—people who might be interested in applying to join the SSAC—the ability to us whether their skills lie.

The skill survey also includes some questions about more general non-technical skills, as well as some diversity questions.

Next slide, please. And we've used this skill survey to identify areas where we would specifically like to target skills that we don't have in abundance. They're listed on this slide.

We're also very interested in increasing our membership representation from Africa, Latin America, and Asia-Pacific, and we do recognize that you in ALAC have wonderful links into all of those areas.

So what we would ask is that, if you're aware of any people with a technical background and skills who you believe would be good SSAC members—next slide, please—please do reach out to them and point them in the direction of either Rod or myself or any of the SSAC support staff. We will give them further information about the process of applying to join the SSAC. Thanks very much, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Julie. Much appreciated. Some of you might not remember, but Julie Hammer was our liaison—the ALAC liaison—with the SSAC a number of years ago. Now, of course, Andrey Kolesnikov is assuming this task. We had always a great relationship with the SSAC, so it's great to see that the outreach could be helpful for some people in our community. So hopefully you'll get plenty of people speaking to you, Julie. I know that there some people out there that certainly fit within the knowledge that is required in the SSAC.

I am not seeing other hands up at the moment. Just before we close off on this topic, the presentation that's in the agenda actually also has some details of SAC114, the SSAC comments on the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures draft final report, and also updates on the Names Collision Analysis Project and SSAC current work. Unfortunately, we haven't got enough time to go through these on today's call, as we have quite a full agenda, but if anybody who is on the call is interested in

those topics, they can read them in their own time by having a look at the presentation.

So thanks very much again, Rod, Julie, and Andrey, for joining us. We're going to have to continue on our wonderful call today and now move on to the debrief with Jonathan Zuck and myself, perhaps [inaudible], about the ICANN70 policy session and the talking points that we've had in the past week. Jonathan, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. How's everyone doing? So we had an ICANN meeting. This was a significantly lighter ICANN meeting, I think, than the last one. So we seem to be pendulum-ing around a little bit in terms of trying to find the right balance. We're going to have at least one more virtual meeting in June, so we'll see how that works out. It's an average. I'd be interested in feedback from all of you at some point in terms of what you thought of the number of policy sessions there were and things like that.

But let's go ahead on to the next slide. One of our talking points for the meeting had to do with the EPDP and GDPR compliance. We continue to talk about setting aside the SSAD recommendations that came out of the GNSO because it doesn't seem as though it does enough to be worth the expense that was estimated. But we've been supportive of nailing down that cost estimate because it seems as though something could be, for a ticketing system, whipped out in Salesforce fairly quickly and not require the same overhead that a true SSAD would require, given that the system doesn't have built into the flexibilities we had

anticipated in terms of growing the number of people that could use it. So there's still no clear path for non-government actions to get necessary data. As always, we've been talking about consumer protection as our number-one priority in this particular context.

Next slide. In discussions about subsequent procedures, we talked about PICs and registry voluntary commitments, and we had a session that was a plenary session on registry voluntary commitments, where we got this conversation rolling. It became clear from this session that people still have a lot of differing opinions. There was a lot of [swirl] in this particular session in terms of how people felt about the enforceability and the ethics of registry voluntary commitments.

So I think there's still a lot more conversation to be had, and there's still an issue that we need to pursue, which is the clarity, measurability, and enforceability, if you will, of these registry voluntary commitments going forward because it's clear that there's the need for registries to be able to make commitments to the community that [are] enforced by ICANN, but at the same time, there's trepidation on the part of ICANN if what's being asked of them treads the fine line of their mission. There was some discussion of the mission.

But I think where there started to be consensus is if there's a sufficient specificity in the way that they're worded and some way to measure whether or not they're being adhered to. In other words, if you make a voluntary commitment as a new registry or an existing registry, part of that has got to be to give ICANN a tool by which to evaluate your performance on that commitment so that it's more readily auditable.

Then, on the whole, Jamie seemed fairly optimistic that, given that level of specificity, they could be enforced.

So there's a lot to be discussed there, but we got the conversation going. I think the At-Large is playing a valuable role in getting some of these conversations out of the closet and into the sunlight for discussion.

Also, Subsequent Procedures continued to talk about applicant support and geo-names. Applicant Support was a session that didn't make it as a plenary, so we held it on our own. It was very well-attended. There was a great discussion there as well. We were just trying to get people to start thinking about the new program, and that was pretty tough. Everyone was still talking about the old one and who did what to whom and why and who said what and who was right and who was wrong. It would much more of the meeting, unfortunately, than we would have wanted. But we did push people in the direction of trying to set some real goals for the Applicant Support Program. It's clear that the majority of the panelists would like to see some actual successful applicants from underserved regions more so than just a more successful outreach program.

So that was a little bit of movement toward the end there, and I think that we can then build on that because having that objective will help design what an outreach program looks like. So I feel like that was a really good ... And a lot of people were attending, including Goran, who talked about it afterwards. So I think that was a good session and something to build on as well.

Next slide. We didn't talk about that.

Go on to the next slide. DNS abuse continues to be an issue, but where this came up at the meeting was in a kind of open house being held by the Contracted Party House's DNS Abuse Working Group. There was some discussion of Graeme's new DNS Abuse Institute. I guess he has actually given a presentation to one of the RALOs. I don't remember which one it was. It might have been LACRALO. But we should probably try to get Graeme in to talk to us about what they're going to be doing at the DNS Abuse Institute. I don't think anything changes with regard to this issue. It just continues to be a high priority for the At-Large.

So I think that's my summary of the ICANN70 through the prism of our talking points. I think, once again, we've played a leadership role in getting some conversation started. So that much is good. And I don't know if folks have questions or comments or observations that they want to make about ICANN70 related to At-Large priorities. I'd be happy to hear them.

Marita, go ahead, please.

I think maybe you're in mute, Marita.

MARITA MOLL:

Oh, God. How often does that happen? Yes, I was on mute. Sorry. I just wanted to share that I found the talking points most useful way before the meeting in that our GAC members called together a group to share whatever we're thinking about before the meeting. That's where I found I could really use the talking points.

So I don't know. We maybe ought to see where people are using these because they are very useful. But I didn't have an occasion, for example, to actually use them during the meeting. I don't know if those kind of [inaudible] work at all during the meeting. I wasn't in any of them. But I definitely used them before the meeting even started.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Marita. That's great feedback. It's hard to predict when people make some utility of these. I guess the thought being that there's a Q&A period of a session or an intervention via a chat during a session or something like that could be an opportunity to use some of them.

Does anybody else have any feedback on them and whether they're finding them useful during a meeting? I'd be certainly interested in hearing feedback from others. But thanks, Marita.

All right. That may be it. Thanks, Marita, for speaking up. Olivier, I think it's back to you. We're going to be starting the planning for ICANN71 right away, so we might want to have some conversations inside the CPWG or perhaps even as early as the next meeting on what conversations we'd like to try and influence.

I know one of the things that Sebastien has brought up on multiple occasions but again on this occasion is that a lot of these panels that we put together are people by the usual suspects and that we need to try and get some new voices into these panels. I use the excuse of the early deadline of getting the panels finalized for ICANN to excuse myself for going to my usual suspects and the people's whose names I already know. So maybe we can try to get going a little bit sooner and think

about some different speakers or, at the very least, as Sebastien suggested at one point, shadow speakers, so that, if we take some veteran and pair them with a newcomer or something to be part of the panel, then we can get some of the newcomers exposed—relatively newcomers, I guess I should say—exposed to the panel process. So that’s something we should give some thought to as well.

But I think that’s it. Thanks. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Yes, indeed, the next ICANN meeting will be only in a couple months’ time. So it’s going to be very quick until we’re there. Indeed, we’ll have to start as soon as possible to prepare for that.

Now, what we have in the meantime is the work group updates. I’m not sure if there’s very much to do. I see Holly Raiche has put her hand up, actually. Before we go into the work group updates, maybe she wanted to add something. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes [inaudible]. Jonathan, the panel that Hadia and I put together wasn’t on the topics, per se. It wound up being really interesting because—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, please summarize it. I meant to ask you. It’s early in the morning for me.

HOLLY RAICHE:

It's very late at night for me. The value of that is that we had [inaudible] for a start. Then Keith and the ... We had a discussion about siloes, getting out of siloes. We have a broader look at the structures that actually was an interesting discussion, even if it wasn't directly on any particular policy.

So I'm wondering if having those kind of thought pieces might also be an interesting component. Just a thought.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Holly. Yeah, that was a great question. I feel like it was a good set of panelists and a good discussion about what those impacts are. Those who were not in the session, I highly recommend going back. All the recordings are posted now. I recommend listening to the ones that we had.

The other one ties to the session talking about the future ICANN mandate and having a discussion with newcomers on that topic. I recommend taking a listen to that session as well. I enjoyed that one as well.

So, like I said, looking through the prism of the talking points is a little bit limiting. Make sure and check out those other two sessions as well. Thanks. Sorry, back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. We're now moving to the work group updates. First in the work group updates is the IGO (Inter-Governmental Organization) Work Track. Who wishes to provide us with a quick update on this? Is Yrjo with us?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Yrjo Lansipuro.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. Before I go to the last meeting or the work track, which we had on Monday, I'll just mention that our [work group, the other] being mentioned in the GAC communique from ICANN70 ... That is to say, in the section where they remind of previous GAC advice, they reminded everybody about this communication with Johannesburg and Panama, where there are some conditions that the IGO (Inter-Governmental Organization) curative dispute resolution should follow. That is to say they want a process which is modeled on the UDRP but separate from it.

Second, an IGO (Inter-Governmental Organization) should have standing as such without going to any trademark problems.

Third, they asked for respect for IGO jurisdictional status. That is to say, the IGOs have immunity in courts usually, and the facilitation should be exclusively via arbitration.

Now, our last meeting of work track gave some hope that we would actually come to a solution somehow acceptable to the GAC and also to the GNSO, let's hope. First of all, everybody on the work track seems to think that the solution is arbitration. That is to say, after an IGO has won, the UDRP procedure ... And even if the losing registrant wants to go to court, the IGOs have immunity and the solution. The only solution as the final step would be arbitration according to everybody in our work group.

There are three other points that are still discussed. One is whether the UDRP, the arbitration, should be automatically the next step or whether there could be a court action, where basically just the court acknowledges the immunity of the IGO.

Second, the question of the standing of the IGO: whether it should be on a list prepared by the GAC or some sort of construction using the Paris Treaty's 6ter article. The last one is whether the criteria for this sort of process for the IGOs could be a little bit narrow. That is to say that the IGO has to show that the registrant is using or planning to use the domain for fraud or impersonating as the IGO rather than the wide criteria where the IGO would claim its abbreviation back from a registrant [just as essence].

So we have a two-week pause now and we'll continue after two weeks. I really have high hopes that we come to a solution. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yrjo. Looking out for any hands.

I'm not seeing any hands at the moment. So thank you for this update.

We can now move on to the Expedited PDP, our second work group update, with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg.

YESIM NAZLAR: Olivier, I'm not seeing neither Hadia nor Alan on the call, if I'm not missing it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Indeed. I was just looking at the list, thinking, "Where have they hidden?" I was hoping that Alan might be just on the phone, but he is not on the phone. That means we can swiftly move on. They might be already on a call. I don't know. But let's move on then to the Subsequent Procedures. Here I know that Justine Chew is with us. So let's have Justine for the Subsequent Procedures.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Glad to be here. It's early enough for me. I have a couple of—well, I see more than a couple; about four—items to bring to the attention to this group, the first being that I just wan to mention that some of the ALAC/At-Large positions for Subsequent Procedures were referred to in the GAC communique of ICANN70. I'm going to put a link to the communique in the chat. [Let me fix it. Or it could be some ...] Anyway, basically there is some support within GAC membership on two of our positions, which is to do with private auctions—not supporting private auctions—and the other one was to do with CPE. They were in support of our two positions on the final [omissions] with respect to the

recommendations from the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group with respect to CPE. So that's an outcome based on our ongoing collaboration with GAC. So that's at least something coming out of that.

The second point that I wanted to make was that, between the last CPWG meeting and today, I've made, I would say, significant improvements to the draft ALAC advice. So now we're looking at Version 2. I believe [Yesim] pulled up the document. Yes, it's on the screen now. So there's now Version 2. If I may just take you through some of the major changes that I have proposed to make. If you can scroll down the executive summary, please. Page 2. Yeah. Okay, just keep going. Stop where you see highlights. Okay.

So, in essence, I've included an executive summary now, although the executive summary is six pages long. But we have a lot to say about subsequent procedures, so six pages isn't all that much, really. But the executive summary now takes the form of bullets within topics that we have raised concerns or we continue to advocate positions on.

I just wanted to bring your attention to the bits that are highlighted as a key change. So now, in terms of Topic 3 (DNS abuse), we're proposing to retain our position of disagreement with the holistic approach recommendation that the SubPro PDP Working Group made. But we've also said that, if the Board is minded to go with the holistic approach, which everyone else seems to think is fait accompli, then we would urge the ICANN Board to also look at Bullet #1 to ensure that the intended ICANN community discussions take place and are completed and that any outcomes from those be put in place prior to the launch of the next round.

With respect of the community discussions, we suggested that the Board should also consider some new inputs, which I have put down in bullets here, including the prior ALAC advice on DNS abuse, [and] the SSR2 final report recommendations to do with the contracts, compliance, and transparency around DNS abuse, which is basically Recommendations 8 to 15. I had a chance this morning to have a look at the draft statement that was prepared by Greg and Alejandro in relation to the SSR2 final report recommendations. I don't think there's anything inconsistent that they're proposing that we adopt—in terms of Recommendations 8 to 15, anyway.

Then the third one would be the SSAC114 Recommendation 3 regarding best practices for mitigation of domain name abuse. That's something that the CPWG has already considered beforehand and the resource to provide support for that. Jonathan has actually mentioned that earlier in the ICANN70 wrap-up,

On the fourth bullet—SAC115—the reason why it's in orange is because I wanted to wait for today's presentation by Rod, Julie, and Andrey on SAC115 to see if there would be any appetite for CPWG to support the recommendation in SAC115 or if we want to mention or if we want to omit a reference to it altogether.

The last bullet is something that I picked up from ICANN70, which is the ongoing work of the GAC Public Safety Working Group and their goal of coming up with a proposal for concrete action on DNS abuse mitigation.

So the bullets that I have inserted from the previous Version 1. So that's something for consideration.

Can we scroll down to the next page, please, Yesim? I've also gone back and reinserted some of the points that we made in our statement for the SubPro PDP final report to do with a possibility of PICs and RVCs, which you see here—in the highlighted blue bullets, anyway. That's something that I neglected to put in the earlier version, which I think should be included in this version—Version 2.

The last thing that I basically included is ... Well, if you on to Page 7 on [next steps], the full context and the rationales for these summary bullets just provides better context of where we came up with these summary bullets.

The last thing I added was Appendix A, which is a combination or collection of all the suggested metrics that we have provided earlier—within the public comment process, anyway. So I just thought we should bring this up to the Board's attention. If they want to consider it or not, that's up to them.

To the extent that the draft Version 2 is ready—well, I would say we are about 95% there—it's just a question of whether we want to include things like a reference to SAC115. Of course, based on CPWG's consideration of the draft statement on the SSR2 final report—as I said, prepared by Greg and Alejandro and that we're going to talk about later—then I think the draft advice is more or less there. It could possibly go out for the final call for comments.

The reason why I would like to draw a line at some point soon is that I understand that the GNSO Council has now submitted the SubPro PDP final report to the Board. So that has gone to the Board, and, technically

speaking, the Board may look at it in April, but by in terms of the bylaws provision, they have to look at it probably at the latest in the [May] [inaudible]. So we should try and [huddle] for this ALAC advice and submit it sometime early next month, I would say, so that the Board can at least refer to it.

In terms of if there's anything that's omitted in the current Version 2, there's nothing really stopping ALAC from producing, say, another [inaudible] advice on DNS abuse, for example. So I don't think it's not prejudicial. We have[n't] omitted anything. We've done a good job pointing to various sources, collecting all our past relevant advice, and also, new information, new sources, references to comments by other parts of the community which we find relevant and which we may have indicated our support for. So I think it's [there.]

If there's any questions, I'm happy to take them. Otherwise, I would suggest that—oh, and I'd like an indication, really, of whether we want to make reference to SAC115 in terms of either supporting it or omitting to refer to it or just mention that the Board should take a look at it. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Justine. Quite a few questions and quite a few points that you've made here.

Now, halfway through, Justine ... So let's try and go back to where you were asking your question, if we can scroll back, because I think there was a lot there in your update. So, first, thinking about SAC115 ...

YESIM NAZLAR: Sorry, Justine. Which page would you like me to display?

JUSTINE CHEW: Just go back to the executive summary.

YESIM NAZLAR: Oh, okay.

JUSTINE CHEW: Page 3, I think it is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [Against] the very beginning there. There we go.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. One page down, because Olivier mentioned—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: There we are. So the different bullet points here. So you have several questions here. I wonder whether anybody has points to make here or to add. We've all heard the inputs on SAC115.

Holly, I know you wanted to comment on this. Or you did speak about this. You did ask a question a bit earlier.

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I really think we should at least support 115. I'd like to support their broader definition of DNS abuse, recognizing it goes beyond just what the registry and registrars groups are. I'd also like to pick up their recommendation about having some kind of coordination body. I think, if we pick up those two ... Justine, maybe it's up to you to see how specific, but I think we need to at least say that there are recommendations in 115 that we support. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Next is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Just taking off my Co-Chair hat and just speaking personally, I think that the SAC115 is pretty easy to support. It's pretty non-controversial. The SSR2 final report is a little bit more inflammatory, but I'm inclined to be supportive of what they're pressing for as well. I think we probably share the concern about the level of effort to implement the recommendations in the SSR2 final report, but that's really a function of prioritization. I don't think it means that any of the recommendations are bad. So I feel like we should be willing to support those recommendations as well. But I'd be interested in hearing other perspectives.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Olivier. Just a question back to Holly and Jonathan, I suppose. Holly, you mentioned that you think we should support this comment about the broader definition abuse raised in SAC115. Can I just clarify, because we have been consistently saying that we have an existing definition of DNS abuse based on what the registries and the registrars have come up with ... So that should be a sufficient foundation for us to take progressive steps to mitigate DNS abuse to deal with the increasing abuse that's happening now.

So, if we're going to now say that we support a broader definition, can I suggest that we frame it in such a way that, notwithstanding that there is an existing DNS abuse definition that we can work off, we should be looking at a broader definition in terms of updating the work that's being done to meet new challenges of DNS abuse?

HOLLY RAICHE:

What I'm saying is that the point that Rod Rasmussen made ... For the registries and the registrars, the definition that they use is appropriate to what they do, but the point that Rod and SAC115 make is, if you stand back and go, "The misuse of domain names for abuse purposes ..." When you look at that broader definition, it brings in other parties. It brings in other issues. But I'd like to leave us open to say that, yes, there's a nice definition and it works for the registries and registrars. That's fine. They're working within their jurisdiction. I totally support it.

But let's not confined ourselves to that because the way that Rod expressed his issue, which is, if a domain name is being abused, that's

what we're looking. Let's have a definition or an understanding that it goes more broadly than just registries and registrars. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Holly. Let's go through our queue. There are quite a few people queuing up here. So first is Yrjo Lansipuro. Was that regarding this topic specifically, Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes, it is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. Justine already mentioned that the GAC communique referred to ALAC's positions at some points, but there's also in the GAC communique, when they discuss next steps, three alternatives. One is a review of advice envisaged by At-Large for ICANN70, which would be a wider basis for GAC consensus comment in the forthcoming public comment proceeding. Then the second possibility is a potential intercessional statement from the GAC to the ICANN Board separately or jointly with the ALAC. The third possibility is a potential GAC [contentious] advice.

Of course, I'm staying in contact with the GAC. They select from these three alternatives, of course. Then, with Justine, we'll act accordingly.

Personally, I think that it's quite important that the GAC is pretty much aligning themselves in these questions with us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Yrjo. Next is Gregory Shatan. Greg, you have the floor.

And you need to unmute.

GREG SHATAN: Oh, sorry. The double mute got me. Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. With regard to the DNS abuse definition, there's a problem with the registry and registrar definition, which they are pushing very hard to try to make the standard definition, regardless of lack of true multi-stakeholder processes to get there. I think it's just too narrow for many of the purposes that At-Large would like to see covered. It seems that's the same with others who are looking at this. There may be some who would want it to go even broader than At-Large and perhaps get too directly into content, for instance. But trying to turn this into something that's only about plumbing and not about what's in the pipes is too far in the other direction.

I applaud the contracted parties for their persistence in trying to advance a definition that works well for them. But it's not our definition.

So I think that's key. [inaudible] but it was not sufficient. So I think we very much need to support SAC115 in that regard.

I'll also note that the SSR2 final report also covers some of the issues around DNS abuse and has a similar comment as well: that it needs to be a multi-stakeholder approach, and the question needs to be answered in that regard.

I'll let Jonathan answer the question that's in the chat regarding what our definition of DNS abuse is because I know that's something Jonathan has been shepherding in that regard.

I just wanted to chime in on those items and more generally with regard to the SSR2. We'll get to that in a minute. I have only a limited sympathy with ICANN because, looking at the SSR2 recommendations, I would say a number of them are things they should have already done based on SSR1, and others are ones that they should have already done just based on standard industry best practice, if you will, or, even more generally, standard best practices for any organizations that conduct any kind of business relating to information or the Internet or technology. It's not like these are a bunch of bold, radical proposals that will require some sort of getting used to. It's more of a list of things that sadly should have been done. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Greg. Thank you. We'll come to that in a moment. I'm a little concerned at the time, but let's have Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. I'll just follow on with what Greg said. We began the conversation to come to a definition abuse ourselves but haven't finished it. So we should pick that up again as well because part of, I think, what we were also trying to get it is a notion of responsibility that might be separated between the contracted parties and ICANN Org—in other words, what we think should be the responsibilities of contracted parties to address. But the mechanisms for that might not all be contract changes. So I feel like to come out with a definition right now that we have consensus on is impossible.

But I think, getting back to Justine's initial question, there is wording that says that, even given the conservative definition as proposed by the contracted parties, there's plenty that can be done. But the At-Large believes that the community will eventually settle on a broader definition of DNS abuse, such as the one that was proposed by the SSAC. Something like that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much. And Greg is saying he's too wordy for me. No, not at all, Greg. I really appreciate, like everyone else on the call, your explanations and the way you're explaining things. I'm just concerned of the time that we have. It's a fascinating discussion here, but we should have another hour on top of the usual one that we have to go to the depths that we want to go to.

I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. Justine, you have the floor to summarize and close on this, if you wish.

JUSTINE CHEW: No, I'd rather give the time to Greg and Alejandro to deal with the comment on the SSR2 final report. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. Thank you very much, Justine. Of course, we'll hear more from you next week with all the updates that you are currently building into the statement.

Now, the policy comments update is the next thing that we have, and that's with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogan.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. I'll be very quick, given the time constraints. There are two recently ratified statements by the ALAC which are on the agenda, as well as the upcoming public comment proceedings for the next few months. So ones in March—today is the last day of March—will presumably be bumped to this next month (April).

There is one public comment for decision and a related presentation by Barrack Otieno. He's the At-Large liaison to the ccNSO and is prepared to discuss the initial report for a few minutes. Then there are several current statements and/or advice under development.

There was a public comment on the EPDP Phase 2. That closed yesterday, but Alan and Hadia are working to draft ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on this.

Then, as just noted, there is an ALAC statement that's just recently been circulated on the CPWG list regarding the SSR2 review team final report by Greg Shatan and Alejandro Pisanty.

So I'm not sure if you would want to go to Barrack first on the ccNSO public comment or to Greg and Alejandro on the SSR2 ALAC statement, but I'll turn it back over to you, Olivier and Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'd say let's dive into SSR2, but ...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'd say I think that we've got a 15-minute extension. So if Barrack mentioned he needed just five minutes to take us through the ccPDP 3 retirement of ccTLDs, we could just have a quick update from him and then move straight on to the SSR2, which obviously is the piece of meat for today, if that's okay with you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So Barrack Otieno.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you very much, Olivier. I will move very quickly. Just to give a brief presentation on the ccNSO PDP, just to—

YESIM NAZLAR: Barrack, I'm sorry. Before you start, is it possible to increase the level of audio for yourself? Maybe you need to adjust your microphone.

BARRACK OTIENO: Is this a bit better?

YESIM NAZLAR: Could you please keep speaking?

BARRACK OTIENO: Is this better?

YESIM NAZLAR: I think ... Yes, it is.

BARRACK OTIENO: [It's maximum].

YESIM NAZLAR: Oh, okay. Let's try again. Thank you. Thanks, Barrack.

BARRACK OTIENO: All right. Thank you very much. I will try to speak in the five minutes just to inform the audience that, insofar as the ccNSO PDP 3 is concerned, there's an going public comment. So far, in the last meeting that we had

for the ccNSO PDP, no comments had been received from any member of the community. So far, we have the final report that has been presented to the community.

For purposes of anyone that is new, I'll just give a brief background. This process has been going on for the last slightly over three years. The background of the ccNSO PDP 3 is that it was determined that there is no policy that deals with retirement of ccTLDs.

If I may take us back a bit, RFC 1591 says that IANA is not in the business of deciding what is and what is not a country. The selection of ISO 3166 as a basis for country-code top-level domains is made with the knowledge that ISO has a procedure for determining which entities should and should not be in that list. So, in 2014, the ccNSO, through the framework of interpretation, confirmed that RFC 1591 still applies to the ccTLDs.

The other important point that I would wish to stress is that the ISO 3166 list is dynamic. Regularly, country codes are added and removed. When a country code is added, a ccTLD can be added via the standard delegation process, by the IANA function operator. However, it was identified in 2011 by the ccNSO delegation and the Delegation Working Group that there is no formal policy available for the removal of a ccTLD from the root when a country-code is removed from the ISO 3166 list of country names. For the purposes of anyone who may be new to the conversation, this informs the decision to start this ccNSO PDP 3 proposal for retirement of ccTLDs.

I will move to the presentation that is on the screen. In the previous round, the ALAC was among contributors of a public comment to the ccNSO PDP3, and you can see on the screen organizations and groups that submitted public comments. That includes the At-Large Advisory Committee.

I will scroll down in the interest of time and just touch on ,for example, some of the comments that the ALAC presented in their response from the working group. So I will focus on general comments here. So the ALAC, the Registries Stakeholder Group and the Business Constituency explicitly supported the proposed approach definitions and the feature, in addition, each of these groups raised some points for consideration.

There were other contributors that are also listed in the report above. You can see [Clément and] Lawrence Olawale-Roberts. I will move to specific comments. The ALAC raised two points that were to be considered from an end user perspective. That is removal of a TLD will mean less likelihood for [inaudible] as usually, the removal of one would make room for a new one, and number two, retirement would pose a problem for some registrants when they are used to an old address which will become obsolete after the retirement of the ccTLD.

I'll move to the working group response. The issues were considered by the working group, and the working group has discussed and considered the issue of the impact of the removal of a ccTLD from the root zone database quite extensively as part of its stress testing of the policy, and believes that the time allocated for the retirement of a ccTLD will significantly mitigate any issues associated with losing the old domain name.

You can see the reference to the [stress test] annex [inaudible] which is listed above. So in the interest of time, I'll not go into detail to refer to the [stress test,] but I will note that this is a published opinion that is available on the ccNSO website. Later on, I'll share the link with the group for those that may not have access to it.

The second point that was raised is that the ALAC noted that the replacement of a nonfunctional manager should be transparent and follow due process. In addition, the IFO and the functional manager should work together in good faith and ensure the interests of the registrant are taken into account.

I will read the working group response. The working group agrees with the spirit of the ALAC comment but not the following from section 3 of the interim paper with respect to the [inaudible] comment. For the purposes of this policy, a functional manager is an entity listed as a ccTLD manager in the IANA root zone database or any later variant who is acting with respect to the management of the ccTLD or with whom the IANA function operator can officially and [effectively] communicate.

Secondly, if a ccTLD is to be retired but does not have a functional manager, the IANA functions operator cannot transfer the responsibility to a new manager according to [standard process.] [inaudible] deadlock situation which would prevent the IANA function operator from ever retiring the ccTLD.

To avoid such a deadlock, and only under these specific conditions, this policy allows the IANA functions operator to [inaudible] for the ccTLD to establish a functional manager and ensure the ccTLD can be retired.

Such a transfer should follow the standard IANA functions operator transfer process where possible.

And for the second point, section 4.1 of the policy—yes?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Barrack, yeah, I'm sorry, we're really pressed for time. I wonder whether you could continue through this next week perhaps. I know that we've got a little more time to respond to this rather than the SSR2 which needs to be filed in a few days' time. I'm just a little concerned that we're spending more time and we're just over time already. Is that okay?

BARRACK OTIENO: That's okay, Olivier. Well, just to mention that in the current round of public comment, there's no comment that has been submitted proper, so if that would be of interest to this group, [if there's anything to submit] over and above the work that was submitted previously. But otherwise, I'll be happy to present again next week.

spr3 Thank you so much, Barrack. And if you could send a link to this report, that would be really helpful. I don't know whether it's linked to the agenda page, because then everyone can read through it before you take us through a few points next week.

BARRACK OTIENO: It's already been linked, I believe. I have shared it [with the secretariat.]

spr3 Perfect. Thank you. Let's go to SSR2 with Greg Shatan and Alejandro Pisanty. And apologies for this slight delay, but we've had quite a full call today.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Should I share my screen, or can staff put up the draft report that was circulated?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Greg. If you could please give me one second. I'm quickly going to open this up. Here you are.

GREG SHATAN: Why don't we go to the next page? Hopefully you'll have a chance to look at this all if you haven't already, and I thank Alejandro for his contributions and persistence in pushing this forward. The important things to note here, first, are that there was full consensus reached on each of these recommendations, which to my mind at least is a plus factor in terms of our supporting these recommendations as well.

We've taken the position over all of supporting all of the recommendations but highlighting certain of the recommendations that we believe are of particular importance. There's really only one point at which we make a somewhat constructive criticism point. After we begin

with acknowledging that the SMART criteria—specific, measurable, assignable ... I think they left out the R, and trackable, so it's the SMAT criteria, are appropriate for moving forward [inaudible]. And noting that we've lived in interesting times in the next few bullet points.

[Echoing] my earlier remarks about this not being as big a burden in terms of implementation as one might think, we've broken this down into kind of three main groupings. ICANN's managing itself, essentially, ICANN's management or influence over the ecosystem, and issues of how ICANN relates to the rest of the world. A number of the comments are really internal, operational best practice type concerns.

Many of the first recommendations are indeed kind of internal, what I would call professionalization, and maybe that's a slightly insulting way to put it, that ICANN has in fact professionalized itself significantly over my time, but it needs to continue to do so. The first recommendation we call out in particular is the recommendation to have a CISO or CSO position, a chief security officer which ICANN is, to my mind, woefully behind the curve in having, a very important recommendation and ties into some of the others as well.

Recommendation four is recommending a standard risk management framework and one that ties to ISO global recognized standard. Really, it's just move of the same. Obviously, not quite as critical in a sense as the CISO, but in terms of ICANN kind of being on a similar footing with many of the organizations it deals with, it really should be dealing with risk management in less of an ad hoc or kind of bespoke approach and one that is more normalized. A number of other recommendations also [cites] down to recommendation 5, which again, also recommends the

use of industry standard ISO 270001 [inaudible] all the latest kind of infosec standards and auditing standards.

Going down further, recommendation six, again, we call out in particular, which recommends more transparency and vulnerability disclosures and trying to, on a voluntary basis, have more disclosure consistent with appropriate security measures on part of contracted parties and others.

Recommendation 7 really goes back to recommendation 2 and 4, Business Constituency and disaster recovery policies are another industry standard where ICANN has not standardized itself. Recommendation 8 is one which I think is near and dear to our hearts, discussing the more specific representation of the public interest in negotiations with contracted parties.

The SSR2 reference is really primarily to having abuse and security professionals who are not part of the stakeholder community, or really the SO/AC community coming to the discussions and negotiations with the contracted parties, including contract negotiations. I've added here—this public interest should also include a seat at the table for us as well, to be blunt, or those we represent.

Recommendation 9, we've touched on in the chat earlier, that Compliance needs to deal with contractual compliance and the contracts are only really as worthwhile as the compliance that is taking place and the enforcement thereof.

Recommendation 10 goes to what we were just discussing. DNS abuse definitionally. So there's again a recommendation there to try to get this

defined properly. Recommendation 12 is aligned with that, more transparency in DNS abuse reporting, and recommendation 14 and 15, I thought of Jonathan Zuck as we [were writing this,] defining and promoting metrics for action or lack of action and measurability. Metrics man was at least at one point Jonathan's nickname until he went on to being even more important than that.

Recommendation 18 on privacy as well, and also not to distinguish these, but at least [inaudible] recommendation 17, name collisions, and recommendation 18 on informing the policy debate, really just hopeful that ICANN can provide more of an informative function [incoming stuff.] Probably the least important of the recommendations here, only because ICANN as an information carrier is probably less important than making sure it does what it's supposed to do.

So that is the comments. Those that we didn't call out, we support but there's just no particular reason to highlight, otherwise we'd just be commenting on every one, which is unnecessary.

And I'll note that hopefully by the time we get around to SSR3, we're not still discussing about SSR1 implementation. Any comments?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. Thanks, Greg. There's a heck of a lot there. I just have one kind of clarification request. In the recommendation 4 and others where you're talking about standards, ISO standards and all of those, do we know for

sure that ICANN is not using those standards? Just curious, because it's a big corporation. I would think this would be one of their things they'd have to do. But leave it to you.

GREG SHATAN:

I don't know for an absolute fact, but it's my understanding both from informal conversations and reading the SSR2 report that they do not in fact adhere to those standards. And ICANN also makes the point—as Jonathan said, I'm sure they would have checked this especially since they had a six-month enforced vacation from doing any actual work when the Board put them on pause, but ICANN also likes to make the point in response that they're actually not a very big organization, that they only have 300 odd employees, by which I mean approximately 300 employees and that therefore, it could be potentially unfair to hold them to a standard.

I think that's not true. I worked primarily for an organization with fewer employees and these are standard—and we're not in the technology space, we're a law firm, but we're very much aware of these standards and discussing how we would align ourselves to them, and in many cases, are aligned to them. And one of my clients is a much bigger organization and these are almost of biblical importance to that organization.

So I think [inaudible] existing worldwide standards from ISO or from the AICTA or from NIST or from other organizations, this is a matter of adherence. We don't need to invent anything for ICANN. So I am always surprised at what ICANN doesn't do because in many ways, you look at

them as a large, sophisticated organization, but they have all the detriments of a large organization but perhaps none of the benefits.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Thanks, Greg. That's really interesting, and I'm glad that we're pointing that out.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah. It's not us, it's the SSR2, but frankly, we're all part of the same thing here and it is important to point out. Just imagine how much—they've made considerable progress. You can imagine what it looked like 10-15 years ago. Anybody else with anything?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Greg. Unfortunately, Jonathan had to run. He's late on a meeting. And we are at the end of our extension. I realize you have had some feedback and you've also got some on the chat at the moment. Will that be enough for you to finalize this, or should we just call upon people to get in touch with you if they have further comments for you until a deadline that you set them?

GREG SHATAN: I would say yes to both. If we could get any comments through the next, say, by close of business tomorrow UTC, 17:00, I do have a bunch of good comments so hopefully anything further won't be shocking. I'll take back what I've learned here and look for anything further and look for this to be finalized and into the ALAC system after tomorrow. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fantastic. Let's do that. Thanks for this. And we need to move on. We don't have any time for the EPDP phase two recommendations, but that's of course something we can deal with next week. We're now in Any Other Business. Marita, I gather this is not a hand for Any Other Business. I'm not seeing any other hands, so we just need to find out when our next meeting will be.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thanks so much, Olivier. Next week, we have a clash with the AFRALO monthly call. As you know, it has a fixed date and time. So what I would suggest is to hold next week's call Wednesday at 16:00 UTC if that's okay for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It certainly works for me. If it's a major problem for anyone else, could they please let us know in the next ten seconds? I'm not seeing anybody shout out. It's a horrible time for some people still, but there you go. So 16:00 UTC on the 7th of April. Thank you so much. Thanks to our interpreters, to the real-time transcriber as well, thanks for staying an extra 20 minutes on the call. And I understand that the organizational and financial group will be meeting in ten minutes' time, so it's time for us to go. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night. Thank you. Goodbye.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all very much. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.
