

Zoom chat: Thursday, 17 June 2021 - Joint ALAC & GAC Meeting

01:02:36 Gulten Tepe: Hello, my name is Gulten Tepe and I will be monitoring this chat room. In this role, I am the voice for the remote GAC participants.

GAC Members who wish to submit a question or comment that you want to be read aloud on the mic, please type your question or comment in English and start with a <QUESTION> and end with a "</QUESTION>" or <COMMENT> </COMMENT>. Text outside these quotes will be considered as part of "chat" and will not be read out loud.

Time permitting, we'd like to get to all comments and questions, but we will give priority to comments and questions from GAC members. Be assured that if we don't have time for reading all, the chat transcript is preserved in the meeting records.

This session includes "live" interpretation in the 6 UN languages, plus Portuguese.

All chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: <https://meetings.icann.org/en/expected-standards-behavior>.

01:03:04 Herb Wayne Ombuds: Greetings from the ICANN Office of the Ombuds. Our virtual Office is open for drop-in visits during ICANN71. Details are posted in the Conversation forum on the main ICANN71 page. Anyone wishing to speak with the Ombuds team of Herb & Barb can also reach us at ombudsman@icann.org

Stay safe and be kind.

01:03:35 Dave Kissoondoyal - ALAC: Hello everyone.. Greetings from Mauritius

01:03:44 Roberto Gaetano: Hi all - greetings from Trieste

01:03:58 Gulten Tepe: Hello everyone, welcome!

01:04:40 Nigel Hickson: Good morning; I opt for "Mauritius"!

01:05:17 KR - SHI YOUNG CHANG(GAC PoC to ALAC): Thank you Manal.

01:06:10 Yrjo Lansipuro: Manal, thank you!

01:06:15 KR - SHI YOUNG CHANG(GAC PoC to ALAC): Thank you Maureen.

01:08:31 Dave Kissoondoyal - ALAC: @Nigel welcome to Mauritius.. Our borders will be opened as from mid July 2021

01:10:29 Jorge Cancio - GAC Switzerland: more than 5 years of SubPro now...

01:10:37 Nigel Hickson: Was a privilege, as has been before, to work closely with ALAC colleagues on the Plenary Session on ICANN and Multi-stakeholder environment earlier in the week.

01:10:58 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Jorge - I feel your pain ;)

01:14:12 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: As do I...

01:14:14 Jorge Cancio - GAC Switzerland: @Jeff: no pain at all - I feel that since Helsinki we have done our best to improve many things on how we work together, and if we compare with 2007/2008 (when the policies for the 2012 were prepared) I guess we can see some important progress :)

01:14:43 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Agreed @Jorge

01:15:14 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Jorge - Yes, I agree. I actually really enjoy all of these discussions. We have come a long way and I believe that our collaboration for SubPro has been incredibly positive for the multistakeholder model.

01:17:11 Goran Marby: <https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/specific-reviews/cct>

01:18:00 Dave Kissoondoyal: We hope the collaboration between the ALAC and the GAC flourishes in the best interests of the end users

01:18:40 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes

01:18:56 Luisa Paez (Canada-GAC): Agreed with excellent cooperation between GAC-ALAC!

01:21:12 Luisa Paez (Canada-GAC): Thank you very much, Justine for the informative presentation and continued collaboration on these important issues to GAC and ALAC.

01:22:15 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): IMHO, For the multistakeholder model to succeed, we must not equate agreement on issues with collaboration. I believe the GNSO/GAC/ALAC have all achieved great levels of collaboration to date not just where we agree, but in many respects it is greater in areas where we do not agree, but can work together on a mutually acceptable solution.

01:23:45 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: we can here you fine now @Maureen

01:24:25 Manal Ismail: Indeed @Jeff

01:25:43 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): Said another way, collaboration is much harder on issues where we disagree than where we agree. And it is where we can find mutually acceptable solutions that collaboration should be celebrated :)

01:25:45 Dave Kissoondoyal: The ALAC always bring to discussion with other stakeholders issues affecting the internet end users

01:26:45 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: @Jeff so far ALAC and GAC have done an admirable job of collaborating whilst still recognising difference in opinions and even primary interests at times...

01:27:10 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A work in progress but worthy work IMO

01:27:15 Jorge Cancio - GAC Switzerland: indeed Jeff - there are many learnings from different workstreams... one fundamental question to consider is how to cut back on complexity in order to spur inclusive and meaningful participation

01:27:38 Nigel Hickson UK GAC : @Jeff. Agree, we may all have differences (that can be healthy) but as noted in Plenary for the "model" to work (and importantly to be "seen" to work from the outside) we need this form of cooperation and collaboration which has been fostered in ICANN.

01:27:38 Kavouss Arasteh: The most important things from the second round is 7 are resolutions of many or all of those issues that we have raised with board and highlighted by Jorge and Luisa

01:27:38 Dave Kissoondoyal: +1 @CLO

01:27:44 Jonathan Zuck: Sure @Jeff. Perhaps one caveat to that sentiment is that often there are times when we DO agree (or almost agree) and have failed to collaborate in affecting change, based on those agreements. Accordingly, a increased level collaboration, even on those topics on which we agree, is to be celebrated as well.

01:27:59 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Cheryl, I am not making any judgments here, just reflecting on my perceptions on what the speakers are saying. And it sounded to me that the speakers were equating collaboration with agreement.

01:28:19 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: NP @Jeff

01:28:27 Jonathan Zuck: So, in other words, Jeff. Not exactly equating the two.

01:30:20 Reg Levy - Tucows: is there data on that? That end users don't want another round?

01:30:48 Rubens Kuhl: It's not just a business interest for ICANN to have new TLDs added into the root. Without it, ICANN becomes an oligopoly and will suffer the full force of competition authorities.

01:30:54 Martin Sutton: Interesting point Jonathan - what would end users have expected when radio and tv expanded globally?

01:31:05 hadia Elminiawi: one of the main goals of the new gTLD program is expanding the domain name market space and the IDNs are one of the aims of the new round program

01:31:41 Jorge Cancio - GAC Switzerland: a non-brainer is that we need to promote the global public interest. This means IMO: more TLDs from developing countries and emerging economies, more diversity and innovation in business models, which also means more community applications, more

IDNs, and a respectful consideration of geographic denominations as strings for TLDs

01:32:28 Susan Payne: @Jonathan clearly most end users would not be applicants individually, but they can certainly benefit from community applications, from applications in IDN scripts, from the secure and trusted spaces that brands and restricted TLDs can bring, etc etc

01:32:39 Martin Sutton: Hopefully we will get to the stage when we can reflect on this with actual data, i.e. get to implement and realise more TLDs, including a growth of IDNs

01:32:56 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Hadia - indeed that is one of the aims. But we actually need to move forward and announce a new round to prepare developing countries and emerging economies to start thinking about applying and get the resources together. If we keep discussing the issues and throwing more and more pre-requisites in the way, then aren't we also part of the problem.

01:33:01 hadia Elminiawi: Looking forward the success of the applicant support program could be regarded as a must

01:33:03 Rubens Kuhl: As for users expectations, it's frequently quoted that people wanted faster carriages, not cars.

01:33:10 Bill Jouris: It may be useful for both of us to recognize that, whatever our disagreements, our views align with each other far more closely than either of us align with the contracted parties.

01:33:29 Roberto Gaetano: @Martin - in particular a growth of IDNs!!!

01:33:40 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well @Martin in some regions IDN's are indeed an important interest for end users of course! (APAC bias here :-)

01:33:50 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): Restated: The more pre-requisites we put in the way, the more we stand in the way of expanding the multilingual Internet.

01:33:54 Jonathan Zuck: Hmm. Interesting questions. @Martin, more labels, pasted on the internet, is not exactly same as broader availability like your example of radio and TV. @Reg, not enough data, and perhaps we should address this. Certainly the CCTRT surveys (perhaps completed too soon) indicated a very low level of interest or understanding and their "preferences," such as they were, were not reflected in the outcomes.

01:34:18 Reg Levy - Tucows: do you have a link to that CCTRT survey?

01:34:42 Martin Sutton: @Roberto it would be good to see the demand come through for IDNs, so early communication by ICANN will help those in underserved and unrepresented areas. That also applies for all types of applications.

01:36:08 Jonathan Zuck: @Reg, I'll dig it up. There were actually a pair of surveys, a year apart, that had hoped to capture a delta but it was a flawed effort, in many ways. I'll dig it up and post it.

01:36:31 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Jonathan - the survey is now 7 or 8 years old now? There have been a lot more changes, a lot more adoption of new gTLDs, etc. So what may have been true in 2013/2014, is very different than what exists today. I have seen many uses of gTLDs other than .com. Brand use of TLDs have exploded. But until we get a predictable mechanism to introduce new gTLDs, we are just standing in the way of what I personally believe is possible.

01:37:05 Roberto Gaetano: the point is that IDNs will change the paradigm, allowing underserved communities to join, while a large part of the new TLDs have been more of the same soup

01:37:21 Jonathan Zuck: @Susan, I guess that's part of what I was trying to say. More communities, more IDNs, perhaps more restricted TLDs are interesting. Things that didn't work out last time, are worthy of addressing. Let's not pretend that those things are creating the momentum for a new round.

01:37:22 Martin Sutton: @Jonathan - think of the many radio/tv channels, local, regional, national and international - huge expansion and choice for users. Did they demand that from the start, no. But they quickly adapt and create the demand once in play.

01:37:32 Chris Lewis-Evans (UK - Co.Chair PSWG): sorry having audio issues

01:37:35 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Roberto - I agree. But we need to get the program off the ground in order to test out that theory.

01:37:47 Gulten Tepe: Chris, would you need a dial out?

01:37:52 Roberto Gaetano: Agree @Jeff

01:38:04 Bill Jouris: For the next round of (IDN inclusive) gTLDs, there will be a REview Board of some kind making final decisions. Have either of us taken steps to be sure that we are well represented on that Board?

01:38:49 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Bill - who is the "we" in your statement?

01:39:11 Bill Jouris: @Jeff, I was thinking of ALAC and GAC

01:39:19 Bill Jouris: as groups

01:39:56 Bill Jouris: Otherwise, we will see primary membership from the contracted parties.

01:39:58 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): Thanks Bill. But the Board does not represent the communities from which they come, but rather the entire Internet community.

01:40:15 Jonathan Zuck: @Reg, here's the first survey: <https://www.icann.org/en/announcements/details/icann-announces-phase-one-results-from-multiyear-consumer-study-on-the-domain-name-landscape-29-5-2015-en>

01:40:33 Reg Levy - Tucows: I would very much like the details, Hadia, of how you gathered this information about end users and which end users your intervention represents. I understand that this may not be the forum for it, so please feel free to contact me directly.

01:40:36 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Bill - Are you talking about the ICANN Board of Directors?

01:40:36 Reg Levy - Tucows: Thanks, Jonathan!

01:41:00 Goran Marby: Sorry for adding something, the temp spec was based on official guidance from the European Data Protection Board when it comes to natural legal persons.

01:41:05 Bill Jouris: @Jeff, in principle, true. But having people from ALAC and GAC will significantly impact how much the broader Internet community and it's needs are actually heard.

01:41:28 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): The ICANN Board of Directors do not have any contracted parties on it to the best of my knowledge.

01:41:28 Bill Jouris: And no, the new gTLD Review Board, not the ICANN Board

01:41:52 hadia Elminiawi: +1 chris we need to use the model effectively and efficiently

01:41:56 Jonathan Zuck: and here's the second one. We tried to learn a little from our mistakes on the first one so they are not perfect duplicates. We actually, tried to investigate a little bit, the issue of whether folks were using alternatives to domain names, etc. but there's some interesting stuff: <https://www.icann.org/en/announcements/details/icann-commissioned-study-finds-increased-awareness-and-trust-in-domain-name-system-23-6-2016-en>

01:42:07 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): Sorry Bill, I am lost. What gTLD Review Board?

01:42:42 Reg Levy - Tucows: Thanks again, Jonathan. I had thought there might be an ALAC-specific study, or perhaps local studies by RALOs

01:43:42 Bill Jouris: @Jeff, according to the members of the IDN project that I talk to, applications for new gTLDs will first be checked for conflict (variants) with existing names. But then they will be reviewed by a Board/Panel, since machine judgement of what will confuse users is imperfect (to say the least).

01:43:43 Jonathan Zuck: @Reg, I figured that was your question and these are pretty old now. We have some plans to conduct some research and this might be an interesting question, if we can figure out a way to ask it. ;)

01:44:21 Bill Jouris: @Jeff, I don't believe that the Review Board is set up yet. But that's the time to get ready for it.

01:44:39 Justine Chew (ALAC): @Bill, from what I understand, the (regular) next "steps" for "putting the next round into motion" is the ICANN-Board initiated Operational Design Phase and the ICANN-Org managed Implementation Review Team. We don't know as yet if the Board will establish another New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) like they did for the 2012 round.

01:45:33 Bill Jouris: Sounds like we need a bit more information on what is actually planned. Perhaps Mr Sarmad Hussein can help us out there.

01:46:08 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): Correct @Justine. But remember the New gTLD Program Committee was all ICANN Board Members that did not have a potential conflict.

01:46:34 Justine Chew (ALAC): @Bill, what I do know is, in relation to IDN TLDs, the EPDP on IDNs' work is needed to complete/finalize the consensus policy on IDN variants and the IDN Implementation Guidelines v 4.0 prior to the next round

01:47:44 Justine Chew (ALAC): Which is why I sort of alluded to the EPDP on IDN as being a "prerequisite" i.e. completion of the EPDP's work.

01:47:44 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Justine - The GNSO does not believe that the IDN Variant work must be completed prior to the next

round. We can absolutely have IDN TLDs under the existing IDN Guidelines.

01:48:51 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): Would we like to have the work done prior to the delegation of new IDN TLDs, sure. But IDN TLDs can still be introduced and flourish under the existing policy until such time as new policy is phased in.

01:50:28 Rubens Kuhl: ICANN Org is also clearly trying to minimize their risk of being fined.

01:50:32 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): Again, the more pre-requisites we put in place, the more we are standing in the way of a multi-lingual domain name system.

01:51:21 Justine Chew (ALAC): @Jeff, sure, that is GNSO's position. I prefer to look at the Board's 2010 resolution on the issue of IDN variants. If we want to be pedantic, the EPDP on IDNs' work, doesn't stop the next round from moving forward, but it does stop the delegation of IDN variant TLDs.

01:51:25 Goran Marby: Rubens...ICANN org has not the same risk as the contracted parties. They have the risk for disclosure of data

01:52:39 Goran Marby: And ICANN org went to the EC and asked to be responsible legally, so I would not say that we are not willing to take risk

01:52:56 Donna Austin, GoDaddy Registry: Is there still an Internet Governance WG, and if so is it possible to join the mailing list?

01:53:19 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Donna - it's still there

01:53:29 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): I'm on it for some odd reason

01:53:33 Rubens Kuhl: Goran, by requiring collection of data, ICANN increases the overall risk when deciding to disclose. Most privacy by design systems reduced their data collection instead of maintaining it.

01:53:46 Luc Seuffer: That's not really a choice. As long as one processes personal data they are responsible for the consequences of the processing.

01:54:02 Donna Austin, GoDaddy Registry: What would that reason be Michele? Got nothing else to do?

01:54:12 Jonathan Zuck: @Jeff, seems as though there's a lot of UA work we should be doing if we want to realize the multi-lingual benefits of a new round, no?

01:54:41 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Justine - it does stop variant TLDs, yes. But technically variant TLDs will likely only be allowed from "same entities". Therefore allowing variant TLDs is not essential to increasing the diversity of Registries. Rather, it is only beneficial for existing TLDs and future TLD applicants wanting multiple TLDs.

01:55:08 Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Donna - I never said I read the emails :)

01:55:42 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Jonathan - absolutely. But what work would you suggest be done that isn't being done. And why can't work proceed in parallel?

01:55:43 Nigel Hickson UK GAC : Coffee? Yes please and cinnamon buns...

01:55:53 Jorge Cancio - GAC Switzerland: re the Internet Governance session, two take-aways for me: (1) meaningful and inclusive participation is key for ICANN's performance and acceptance, and for this we need to cut back on complexity of process and policy outcomes; (2) ICANN is dependent on a well functioning Internet Governance ecosystem - otherwise problems "on" the Internet trickle down on ICANN in search for solutions

01:55:54 Goran Marby: Thanks to good co-operation with the data protection authorities we received for the contracted parties to collect the data.

01:56:23 Goran Marby: And OK to collect whois data

01:56:59 Justine Chew (ALAC): @Jeff, and the IDN Implementation Guidance v 4.0?

01:57:01 Luc Seuffer: @Goran so ICANN received a reply from the EDPB?

01:57:35 Martin Sutton: @Jonathan, UA work would probably benefit from increasing the demand and implementation of IDN TLDs to spur changes needed (which are predominantly external to ICANN)

01:57:41 Joanna Kulesza: @Donna, the IG WG/JP mailing list has been harbored within the At-Large, we wanted to make sure the platform for advancing IG issues remains available. This discussion may indeed lead to its invigoration. Both: Nigel and OCL have been wonderful in keeping the WG discussions alive. I am certain however all further input thereon will be deeply appreciated.

01:57:42 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Justine - Implementation Guidelines 3.0 works well until the new policy is finalized.

01:57:43 Goran Marby: Yes we got advice back just a couple of days after the law was enacted.

01:58:15 Justine Chew (ALAC): @Jeff, let's see

01:58:47 Luc Seuffer: Oh, so nothing more recent that would allow to ramp up the Data Protection Agreement signature process

01:59:17 Jonathan Zuck: In theory, @Jeff but we've already seen situations where "working in parallel" creates deadlines and expectations whereby a new round suddenly becomes the new priority, rather than a byproduct of having fashioned an improved environment. Using the "multilingual web" as a fig leaf to justify a new round is very different than making it a priority. I don't have all of the answers as to what we should be doing but if we're going to pretend that's our motivation, more has to be done.

01:59:35 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks @Nigel!!

01:59:53 Dave Kissoondoyal - ALAC: Thanks @Nigel for the feedback on the session

02:00:23 Donna Austin, GoDaddy Registry: Not just GAC members Maureen!!

02:00:36 Martin Sutton: +1 Donna

02:00:41 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Jonathan - I hear you. And we can spend another decade talking about our aspirations for a multi-lingual web. Or we can put take action to try and make it happen. (Personal View).

02:00:52 Sivasubramanian M: The reason why ICANN needs to be involved in the Internet Governance arena and even wider, even if it gets a bit hot as Nigel wondered, is this.

02:01:12 Goran Marby: I can assure you that we are.

02:01:20 Yrjo Lansipuro: @Jorge, your point about unsolved problems "on" the internet trickling down to the ICANN layer is very good

02:01:30 Jonathan Zuck: @Martin, that's an interesting assumption. I certainly can't prove the contrary and I agree that much of work needs to happen outside ICANN but that doesn't mean that crossover players cannot play a role in affecting change.

02:01:43 Nigel Hickson UK GAC : I should have also mentioned the good work ICANN Org does in Brussels, not least on issues such as NIS2 and ESA.

02:02:06 Sivasubramanian M: "One World, One Internet" on a deeper layer means that One Internet could make One World, bring the world together every way...

02:02:23 Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Geneva, Brussels and New York - ICANN is present in all of these arenas

02:02:57 Goran Marby: Thanks Nigel, especially now when the EC wants to regulate the root and root servers

02:02:57 Jorge Cancio - GAC Switzerland: @Yrjo: thanks, and this interdependence really calls for continued and strengthened active participation and support by ICANN of the multistakeholder Internet Governance structures being developed :)

02:02:59 Sivasubramanian M: While on a superficial level, One World, One Internet seems to be a simpler argument of making a case for One Global Internet in the world.

02:03:27 Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not just @Sebastien :-)

02:03:28 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Jonathan - we need concrete suggestions and not just rhetoric. At the UA Pre-ICANN session we discussed actual action. That is what needs to continue to move forward with action.

02:03:30 Jonathan Zuck: @Jeff, sure, and if we manage to make a few bucks, in consulting fees and auctions, along the way, what's the harm? Would you be open to a new round that ONLY included IDN and community applications, since we clearly have plenty generics?

02:05:01 Jeff Neuman (GNSO Liaison to GAC): @Jonathan - I would not be comfortable with artificially limiting freedom of expression on the Internet. Who are we to artificially constrain what is allowed.

02:05:08 Rubens Kuhl: @Jonathan, the same term might be wanted by communities and non-communities. So a community-only round is not possible. OTOH, an IDN-only round is possible.

02:05:16 Mokabberi: ICANN could be an international organization based in Geneva

02:06:21 Dean Marks: @Jeff--given that a 2019 CENTR study indicated that "new gTLDs, which include over 1000 TLDs, have a little under 10% of the market"--what is the big rush on subsequent rounds and now is freedom of expression in any way being limited?

02:06:38 Dean Marks: "how" not "hot"

02:06:41 Michel TCHONANG LINZE CAPDA CMR: Great meeting, thank team and all bye bye

02:06:49 Chris Lewis-Evans (UK - Co.Chair PSWG): +1 Jonathan Really good to get a fuller understanding of what the CPH are doing and look forward to joining all the efforts together

02:06:55 Natalia Filina: Thank you all for great session!

02:06:59 KR - SHI YOUNG CHANG(GAC PoC to ALAC): Thank you all.

02:07:04 Reg Levy - Tucows: thanks, all!

02:07:05 Jorge Cancio - GAC Switzerland: thanks all and bye!

02:07:06 Gulten Tepe: Thank you for attending. The meeting is now adjourned. Links to Transcripts and recordings of this session will be posted on the GAC website and the ICANN71 meetings page. All remaining lines will now be disconnected.