
ICANN75 | AGM – At-Large Policy Updates
Sunday, September 18, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 KUL

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Hello, and welcome to At-Large Policy Update. My name is Yeşim Saglam, and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat.

Taking part via audio, if you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone. For those of you in the main room, please raise your hand in the Zoom, and when called upon unmute your table microphone.

For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Onsite participants may pick up a receiver and use their own headphones to listen to interpretation.

However, please remember to take off your headsets when using the table microphones in order to avoid interference. Virtual participants may access the interpretation via the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to Olivier Crepin-Leblond, At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Co-Chair. Thank you.

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. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and as you might notice, I'm not in the room, I am in Istanbul, which makes this a hybrid meeting. So welcome everyone to Kuala Lumpur, and then welcome to everyone around the world who are following us for this exciting event today, the Consolidated Policy Working Group call, where we will first have an update from Justine Chew on the subsequent procedures.

She is going to speak to us from her hometown Kuala Lumpur. So that's going to be great to actually see her in action. Then we'll have the shepherd update from our different shepherds taking part in generic name supporting organization policy development processes, the various working groups that develop policy for ICANN. We have people that are sitting on each one of these, and a representative of each one of our subgroups will be able to provide updates.

First Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka on the transfer policy review. Then we'll have Alan Greenberg who will be speaking to us about both the registration data accuracy and the system for standardized access and disclosure with the, well, the SSAD, and he'll be speaking to us, and I've said both because he'll also be speaking to us about the Operational Design Assessment, the ODA, so the whole SSAD ODA thing.

What I mean by both is he will have to tell us a little bit what this SSAD is, and then the ODA. Internationalized domain names will be covered by Satish Babu, and then the close generics will be done remotely by Greg Shatan out of New York.

So it must be very, very early in New York, much earlier than in Instabul, so welcome Greg this early hour, and then we'll have the domain name system abuse, DNS abuse, a very important topic for At-Large, and that will be our co-chair of CPWG, Jonathan Zuck. In fact, mentioning him, is there anything that I've forgotten to mention, Jonathan, at this point in time?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, that was a perfect introduction Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well, let's then go straight back to Malaysia and see where Justine Chew is in the room for the subsequent procedures. Welcome, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. This is Justine Chew for the record, and I guess I'm speaking in my capacity as the subsequent procedures lead now. I have to keep my glasses up. Okay, very briefly, I'm just

going to address where we are in terms of subsequent procedures.

So you see on the screen, there's a complicated timeline, but I just want to highlight a couple of things leading to the next round. Of course, I'm assuming that people know what subsequent procedures is because I have limited time.

Suffice to say that the next round is still some way ahead of us because although the Policy Development process has been completed, we are now going through what is called the operational design phase which is something conducted by ICANN Org to establish the assumptions coming out of the recommendations of the SubPro PDP so that they can answer certain implementation questions and put forward to the board ideas about what to do with them, I guess.

After that, then the board has to approve the recommendations before it goes into what is called the implementation phase. So, anyway so far as the PDP, the policy development process phase was concerned, we at ALAC participated in it, it provided numerous inputs through working groups calls, and we had like five work tracks, so provided as much input as possible during the five year plus that the PDP actually took.

It culminated with the ALAC submitting a statement to the SubPro PDP. Also, ALAC submitted advice to the ICANN board

back in, I think it was April 2021, and the particular advice that the ALAC submitted to the board covered 12 areas, and I'm going to touch on a few of those in the moment.

Then we had a call with the board to clarify certain questions that they had pertaining to the advice that was submitted that happened in October last year. So now we're still waiting on the board to provide the actual formal answers to our advice or formal response anyway, to our advice.

I believe we have a joint call with the board tomorrow, right? Yes, tomorrow at 3:00 PM. So that is one of the things that we're going to be following up with the board on. At the same time, as I said, I mentioned earlier that the SubPro ODP, the Operational Design Phase, that's still ongoing. It's not expected to be completed until November at the earliest.

So we don't have the output of that process yet. When that happens, when that comes out, then I'm pretty sure that ALAC would want to comment on that as well. All right. Also, there are parallel activities happening along the way because the SubPro outputs may not have covered everything and may have been lacking in terms of certain directions that's needed for implementation, and I will come to that in a little bit as well.

So, suffice to say, the process is moving on, and we probably still have opportunities to comment along the way in some way or

another. If you want to know more about the ODP and what it's coming up with, then there is a session on Wednesday at 9:00 AM. It's the SubPro ODP update. The SubPro ODP team is actually meant by ICANN Org Star.

So they're going to take question and answers during that session, so if you have questions, you can pose it to them directly. All right. So that's pretty much what the chart says. We can go to the next slide, please. I'm trying to keep it as brief as problem as possible. So, sorry, this is very colorful, but I like colorful things, evidently.

So I mentioned earlier that the ALAC advice actually covered 12 issues, so these are the 12 issues that you see. The reason why they're kind of color coded is there's a purpose behind it. So obviously, because of time constraint, I'm not going touch on every single one of these 12 and just pick a couple, the ones that are more pertinent, I suppose you could say.

So the dark blue ones are things that are question mark, I would say, there're still question marks tagged to them. The green ones have a parallel process that's happening, and the light blue ones are questions that I don't know if the ALAC advice is actually going to be answered or taken up. So that's how the color coding works.

So just touching on a couple, in terms of the issue number one, Program Objectives and Metrics, the ODP process has got some mention of it, so to the extent that it is kind of touched upon is a check mark, but in terms of the depth of it, I cannot say at this point in time, and we won't know really until the outputs of the ODP process comes out.

When you see a yellow highlight, that means that it's actually mentioned in the ODP. DNS abuse. Okay, we had a session earlier with SSAC, I talked about DNS abuse, and what I wanted to say at this point, and I will repeat it here is the SubPro PDP recommendation was not to have a recommendation.

They decided to defer the issue of DNS abuse mitigation to a community-wide level to make it more holistic, because the idea about the SubPro PDP, it only covers the new gTLD program, meaning the new round that's coming, so it doesn't deal with legacy issues.

The thought was that DNS abuse is still happening, it's happening with the existing TLDs, so it's something that you need to tackle from a community-wide perspective. That's why the, the recommendation came out the way it is on a SubPro.

The thing is and I mentioned this earlier as well, what we see is we see different parts of the community working on DNS abuse, and

it becomes like a silo thing. So everyone sort of working on their own projects, and some of the projects are listed there.

So the GNSO council has a small team that's been looking into the DNS abuse issue, and the discussion of the report will be taken up when the ALAC meets with the GNSO council on Wednesday. Then you have GAC with their public safety working group, you have SSAC with their SAC 114, and then you have the registry stakeholder group with their, sorry, the registrar stakeholder group with their DNS abuse tool and so forth.

The point is like, now you can see that the different groups are having silo projects and we need a way to-- and for me, this is not really acceptable. Why are we doing things in pockets? We need a way to make sure that all of them are coordinated. I mentioned earlier that the SSAD has now proposed to drop a framework for DNS abuse.

They proposed it to the GNSO, and GNSO were quite happy with the proposition. I think based on the conversation that we had with SSAC earlier today, I think they might extend the same offer to the ALAC. So I think we should take that up seriously.

So moving on, Public Interest Commitments, the mainstay of the ALAC advice on this particular topic is how do we ensure the enforceability of public interest commitments and registry volunteer commitments?

Now, this topic has been mentioned in the ODP, SubPro ODP, there aren't definitive answers per se, but I also note that the board has a particular interest in this topic, so that's probably something that we want to take up with the board as well.

Name collisions, moving on to name collisions, there is a parallel process and the SSAC Matt Thomas explained to you about NCAP. So that is what that is about, the name collisions and project. Just to note that the SubPro recommendation was actually to keep the existing mechanism for dealing with name collisions, and until and unless the board decides to adopt another mechanism, which potentially could be the Name Collision Analysis Project that the SSAC is working on. By the way, I'm also on the NCAP DG, so I keep an eye on that as well.

Close generics, moving on, close generics. So the board has invited the GAC and the GNSO to have a dialogue on how to move close generics forward. I think the inclination is to try and have close generics, maybe put some guard rails, safety guard rails around applicants who might want to have TLDs, which are considered as close generics.

Now, I don't have time to get into specifically about what close generics is, I'm hoping that Greg would cover it. Suffice to say that ALAC has now been invited into that dialogue, and it's great that both the GAC and GNSO have elected that discussion.

I don't think that's going to start at this meeting, it's probably going to happen after this meeting. Applicant support is one of the things that the SubPro ODP is looking seriously into, but also, there is a parallel process that's happening on the GNSO site, which is the guidance process, the GNSO guidance process.

So we are going to have another a working group. Yes, it is a working group, sorry, with ALAC as one of the participants to discuss the specifics of the implementation of the application support program. Maybe I'll just touch on auction.

So, the mainstay of the ALAC advice on auction was that we were against private auction as a mechanism of last resort to resolve contention sets, but there is no recommendation within the SubPro outputs to ban private options, so I seriously don't know what's going to happen with this. Some of the other things, Community Priority Evaluation also is touched upon in the SubPro ODP. I think most of the work is done because ALAC had a major input into the CPE, the Committee Prior to Evaluation, the revamp on that.

It's just missing a couple things, so I'm hoping that we can still try and get those two missing things through when we talk to the board maybe. I think 11 and 12, well, 12 is something that we probably want to touch base with the board on because we can't

do that through the GNSO and SSAD anyway. So I think that's pretty much it. Thank you, Jonathan. Sorry, Olivier. Back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Thank you very much, Justine. Thanks for this action-packed slide as well. Very, very interesting indeed, and it's such a huge topic. It's very, very difficult indeed, to be able to cover so much in so little time. So I, of course, invite people to look further and dig into your work, which is all well documented and the consolidated policy working group pages has got a link to that.

Now, we've got our shepherd updates next, and I'm going to ask for the shepherds to be very, very tight to their timing. It's seven minutes each, because we can't run overtime today. We'll start with the Transfer Policy Review, Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yes. Hi, this is Steinar Grøtterød, and I'm the representative together with Daniel Nanghaka in the Transfer Policy PDP working group. This is a process that started in February last year. Our first meeting in the working group I believe was in April or May, and we have weekly meetings every Tuesday for discussing these kind of topics.

The policy development is divided into two different phases. We have phases one A and B, and also the phase two is coming up. We have submitted the first report, the initial report for phase one A, and that was up for public comment that ended in August 16 this year, and this covered the gaining and losing form of authorization, the old info code, and the criteria for knocking transfer, knocking means, not approving transfer when there is a transfer coming in.

This initial report had a set of questions that At-Large in general supported. We believe that there is improved security in the trans authorization code, which is no easy to pronounce as attack. We believe that there are improved communication to the registered name holder in the transcript process that I know replace the present form of authorizations.

Today, we are now working on viewing the incoming public comments. Sorry, the updated recommendation will be presented to the large consolidated working group when it's been ready for that kind of discussion. We have no kind of had a short stop in the discussion about the change of registrant policy.

That is what sort of action what sort of -- now, let me rephrase that one. As of today, when there is a change of register data in the system, this creates a transfer look, meaning that the domain

name can't be transferred from one registrar to another, and that kind of criteria is is been discussed.

This is, in my view, kind of very important for the end users because it is of importance to have accurate data, and it's also important to have a possibility to change the registrar or record if you want to do so. So this is going to be an intense discussion, and Daniel and I will keep you updated in the call CPWG.

We hope to reach some sort of consensus within this group and also within the working group. This process with the PDP, the phase one A and B is likely to be out for public comment sometime next year. It is a question whether the working group should ask GNOS to be implemented, at that phase four, it should be where wait for phase two, the dispute resolution, that is also a part of it, how to deal with things when things go down, go incorrectly? So that's my update within seven minutes, I guess. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Steinar and it's good to put also a face to the name as most of our CPWG calls don't actually have video component all the time. Thank you for sticking to the seven minute mark. So that's the update on this topic.

Now, the next topic is the registration data accuracy and the system for standard access and disclosure, the SSAD operational design assessment. For this, we have a well-known face, and that's Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. As, as a reminder, the EPDP's various sections on registration data, one of the items was accuracy. You may recall there was an accuracy program to test accuracy, which came out of the first WHOIS review, it died completely when GDPR was implemented.

As a result, we have no program measuring accuracy at this point. So the issue was not resolved in phase one of the E PDP, it was not resolved in phase two of the E`PDP, it was not resolved in phase two A of the EPDP, but the GNSO decided to create a small scoping team, which essentially is tasked with reviewing whether we need policy or not. So the group has been meeting for a while now.

There were four sections, four questions asked in the charter. The first one or two are on the screen right now. The first one says, the scoping team will assess measures, including proactive measures used by ICANN compliance to monitor, measure, enforce, and report on accuracy obligations in the RAA and the RA.

Now, given that almost all data is hidden, the actions compliance takes is if they get a complaint, then they will investigate it, and of course, that shows up in their monthly reports, unfortunately, because the data is hidden, they get very few complaints.

Okay, I've now reported completely on the analysis of phase question one. In other words, there's nothing really going on. Question number 2 is measurement of accuracy. The scoping team is expected to provide recommendations on how accuracy levels can be determined and measured.

Again, the data isn't visible, how can we possibly measure it unless we can get access to it? So, neither of these questions have real answers. Nevertheless, we have created a report on the first phase and the next slide shows recommendation number one. And it's a shortened version, of course.

Since we can't measure any accuracy, we're going to try to assess what registrars are doing with respect to accuracy. Exactly. How are they measuring? How are they assessing whether something is accurate or not? What methods do they use? And there's a whole bunch of questions that are being proposed.

This is not fixed at this point. An example is for email addresses, what methods do you use to assure email addresses are correct, and possible answers or things like we look at them or there has to be an ad sign or what's to the right of a sign has to be a real

domain, or we send a message to it and see if it bounces, there's all sorts of answers.

If you're not doing more, why aren't you doing more? The answer is because we don't have to, or it's too expensive or whatever. So there's a whole bunch of things that will be potentially included in this survey. If it goes ahead and it's not clear at this point, whether it's going to go ahead or not.

Next slide, please. So recommendation number two is the scoping team recommends that further work be undertaken by the scoping team in collaboration with ICANN Org to explore the option of conducting a registrar audit.

As part of this work, the scoping team will further explore with ICANN Org what type of testing can be done in such an audit with the aim of better understanding the strains weaknesses, so and so. The scoping team appreciates, appreciates that a careful analysis will need to be formed to ensure that the testing does not violate agreements or laws.

Now, does anyone know what this means? I challenge anyone. What this means is a suggestion was made that we test the registrars that is we try to register a domain name with bad data and see if they notice, see if it's caught, do it with different registrars and different things.

The immediate response from ICANN is under no conditions will we or anyone we contract with submit false data, because that's in violation of the registration agreement. When you register data, you certify the data is true, and we're not going to knowingly do false data.

So, it was an interesting concept, and the question really is, can you come up with an interpretation of your registration agreement that allows this kind of testing? I won't go into a lot of details. I only have a few minutes, but an innovative lawyer should be able to figure it out.

There's not a lot of will to figure out, nevertheless, we went ahead with this recommendation saying, you can't ignore it completely. Let's look at it because it may be a viable way of testing. Whether in fact the current accuracy rules work.

Recommendation, number three, next slide. The scoping team recommends the GNSO council pause the work of the scoping team in relation to proposals requiring access to registration data until such time, as it's clear, whether we can get access to such registration data.

The ARS, the old review of accuracy allowed ICANN to look at who is data, which was public and then tested. It is not clear even though ICANN sets the rules for WHOIS and for art registration data, whether we can ask registrars to please tell us what's in it.

So, the intent is to go indirectly, but to go to the European data protection board and say, is it legitimate for ICANN to get access to this own data so we our rules are being followed that may or may not happen.

Now, the original version of this recommendation said paused the scoping team period. In other words, let's stop working for nine months and hope we get an answer and it has been changed to say we shouldn't be talking about things we don't know, but we can talk about things we do know, so the group will go on.

On the other hand, the chair has resigned. He has said he committed a year to this and the year is up and now we cannot really continue until we find a new chair. So that's an extra challenge. The scoping team recommends the GNSO council request ICANN Org proceed with outreach to the European data protection board and so on and so forth.

So at this point, we have spent, I don't know, good part of the year, very, very little has been accomplished. It's not clear exactly what is going to happen in the second half. If you look at the questions three and four, the three says, based on what you found in one and two, go ahead and do some work, but we didn't really find anything.

So, are we going to be flexible enough to try to answer the question, even though we didn't get data from the first half? That

remains to be seen. So overall I'd like to say it's been a productive exercise and I'm very happy to have participated in it. I can't really be that positive. I haven't resigned yet however, so I guess that's a positive statement unlike some people who are in this room.

That's really all I have on that. On the other subject of the SSAD ODA, the ALAC in its comments and in its advice to the board said, don't implement the SSAD, but go ahead and do a cheap ticketing system, probably based on some system you already have with some minor tweaks through a convoluted set of discussions that is exactly what the board has requested the GNSO to look at.

ICANN Org has designed such a system, it pretty well meets the specs that we talked about. Not all, but close. We also said, if you do this, don't try to charge for it, because otherwise you're going to completely make sure no one ever uses it, they're not charging for it, they're absorbing the costs. So the one interesting thing is they said, if you can come up with a recommendation to proceed with what we have designed or minor tweaks, we will do it first half 2023.

There's some if and but ends there. Nevertheless, that means the GNSO council has to recommend it in its October meeting, which means we need to get a recommendation to the GNSO to do that by October 10th, which is exactly two calendar weeks

from next Monday. I deem that to be completely impossible, but that doesn't mean we can't do it soon after, and hope to meet some later -- ICANN does scheduling in the half year, so in theory, if we miss this deadline, it has deferred to the second half of 2023.

I would've hoped a more flexible organization could say, well, if you can't meet it by one month, we'll slip it by one month. Whether that happens, I'm not going to propose in a public meeting. My report's over. I forgot to start my timers, so I have no idea if I did it in seven minutes or not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or 14 perhaps.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. No, you did well, and I just wonder whether the whole issue of stalled groups in the GNSO is not an Alan Greenberg issue because you always report to us about stalling of groups in the GNSO on whatever group you are on.

So you might have to look at that, but no, thank you so much, and that was a joke by the way, the starting of groups. Of course, it shows the difficulty of the work and the fact that there's no silver

bullet answer to many of these issues. These are complex issues and that have to take everyone's position into consideration in order to reach consensus, so it's hard.

I can thank you for spending the time and not resigning on these things, which seem to be taking forever. The next update now is from Satish -- okay. We'll have to scratch the yet out of the transcript. Thank you. We're not allowing you this.

Now, the next is the Internationalized Domain Names, domain names which are not based on the Latin character set or which are not the Latin character set itself, and for this, Satish Babu is going to provide us with a full details.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Olivier. This is Satish for the record. As Olivier just said, internationalized domain names that those domain labels that use non-Latin scripts. Now, we have had internationalized domain names or IDNs for quite some time now, but there are a couple of major issues that surround the use, popular use, I should say, of IDNs.

One of them has to do with something called IDN variants, which generally only exists in some languages. These are labels that the language community would consider as equivalent, but the technical side on the DNS label itself, they are completely

different labels. So from a technology perspective, SSAC would say, they are completely independent labels, but the language community would say they are the same.

Now to manage these variants, so far we've been differing this whole issue of variants, and now we have this PDP on audience, which is directly trying to come to policy on how to manage variants. The second problem that was there as an outcome of audience was a Universal Acceptance.

Now, what this means is if you have an IDN, first of all, you have to ensure that it resolves, and you can go to the website or whatever, but that problem has been more or less sorted out, and most of all, resolution is now taking place.

What has not been sorted out is if you create an email ID out of IDN, that email ID is kind of treated as a second-class citizen in many systems, this is on account of the way the programming has been done. So, if you can register say in Wikipedia, if you want to register an account, you go and give a Latin email ID, that's no problem.

If you give an email ID where the, either the mailbox or the domain part is an ID, or in non-Latin script. Wikipedia refuses to accept your email ID and says, it's an invalid email ID. Now this is a major problem because it blocked many new would-be users of the internet, especially the next one, billion who do not use

English as their regular language and who may be using other scripts.

So these are the two core problems, one of, one of variants, another of Universal Acceptance of domain names and email IDs. There are two distinct initiatives currently that the community is managing. One is the EPDP on IDNs. The EPDP tries to resolve the problem of variants, how to ensure that variants because the -- language communities consider them to be the same, but technically they are very different and there is no way to connect them.

If you have one primary label, it may have multiple labels of various dispositions, which means status. So they can be allocated, they can be blocked for technical reasons. Bill here is an expert on the roots on LG, where those kind of decisions are taken, whether this is a allocatable or a blocked variant.

So, and the variants can run into many thousands in some languages. So we are actually dealing with a fairly complex situation and this EPDP, now it is almost more than halfway through and Justin, there is the one of the wise stage of EPDP. We've been making good progress and we hope to finish it maybe somewhere around mid-2023.

So that's with the EPDP. Now, EPDP basically stays that the assumptions are that IDNs are critical to individual user equity,

which basically means that the right of every individual to have their scripts in use on the internet. IDN variants can support better in user experience because the language communities expect this.

The third is that while bringing in these variants, they're useful to the language community, but there are some technical challenges. Have to ensure that the security and the stability of the road zone cannot be compromised, even while we are bringing this variance to the road zone.

Therefore, also we might need adjustments to the relevant processes and policies for the domain name life cycle. So all the contracts, because now you're saying that there is a source label, that's a primary label, and then a bunch of variants, which have to move together in every step of our process.

So that's a major challenge that we are trying to do, and basically we have several sessions. We have had two sessions on the EPDP audience on Saturday, that's over now, we have some more sessions on the CCPP4, which is also working with IDNs, that is a ccNSO. We also have our own session on ICANN's goal for a multilingual internet through IDNs, which is an ALAC organized session.

On Universal Acceptance, we have also several sessions and we have one on Tuesday, this morning we had with the fellows

explaining what Universal Acceptance; Tuesday, Wednesday we have ccNSO and UA, Wednesday also we have the middle east and UA for the registry and registrar systems, and Thursday, we have something new, which is the UA day.

16th of February every year from next year onwards is going to be celebrated as the UA day. Initial decisions have been taken on this, and the UA day is planning out a number of activities for the UA day, and this session will cover some of them, and anyone who's interested in organizing a program in your own community can participate in this because they're providing all the resources required for these sessions.

We are hoping that this will create a splash and bring together various stakeholders who can collectively drive this whole universal excellence gap, the process of closing those gaps. So I'll stop here. Thank you very much. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Satish. I remember the early days, 10, 12, 14 years ago of IDNs, and this community really has gone a long way. This community, as an ICANN, has gone a long way for IDNs and this community, the At-Large community has been involved that every step of the way, and it's great to see still so much interest and so much action coming from our part of the ICANN sphere.

Now, next is the closed generics issue, and for this, we have Greg Shatan, who's joining us from New York city. I said earlier that it was very early for him, apparently, it's very late for him. So I guess it's more like a Saturday night fever for Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Olivier, for that introduction. It is indeed late, the bar is in New York, it'll be closing in about 15 minutes. I'll try to keep this short so that I can go get a night cap after I speak to you all. So Justine set the stage earlier for a discussion of closed generics, and to add to what she stated, there is a new effort which will be coming together, I believe.

During ICANN75 there is going to be a small group consisting of several representatives of the GAC, several representatives of GNSO and one representative from At-Large. I have agreed to be that representative and Alan Greenberg is the alternate in his copious free time. Hopefully this will not be one of those things that goes on forever without any positive result.

Although I will note that the Beijing communique that initially set the stage for this discussion of closed generics was issued nine and a half years ago. So this is a long simmering issue. It's my understanding that GNSO council has asked each stakeholder group to come up with one individual.

So that it would be one from the registry, one from the registrars, one non-commercial, one commercial. I had also understood

that their group might be six people, so I'm not sure if it's going to be four or six, but at least there'll be one representative from each of the stakeholder groups.

And I believe there'll be an equal number from whatever that is from the GAC. I don't believe they've chosen all of their representatives, but that's probably also going to happen this week. So it is possible that at the very end of ICANN75, that we will have an informal meeting of the closed generics small group.

Just to make matters a little more confusing, the official name for, or the technical name that was used at least by, by the GAC in the Beijing communicate for closed generics is exclusive registry access. So that's also sometimes used as a term, but it means the same thing. So, the is going to have a facilitator.

ICANN has nominated person named Melissa Peters Allgood, I am not familiar with her personality. She actually is an ICANN employee, she is a conflict resolution specialist, that's her title. She's been with ICAN since 2019, she's an attorney, a certified mediator. Her background is in i-Conflict and Family Law dispute resolution dealing with things like divorce, child custody, adoption, and other such things. So, probably well-suited for this discussion. Judith mentioned that she has talked to At-Large often that I'm just drawing a blank on having heard from her.

I believe that both GAC and GNSO have accepted that recommendation. While we were not asked for our opinion, I certainly am not going to stand in the way of progress since progress is hard to come by in this in this area.

The basic concept is that the group should be aiming for something that is neither a ban on closed generics, or closed generics without any restrictions. So there'll be something in the way of guardrails or safeguards most likely organized around the idea of operating in the public interest, how that will be implemented and defined is, of course, a good deal of the work that the small group will need to do.

So, I hope that in the near future, after ICANN75, or even at the very end of ICANN75, there'll be a lot more to say about the work getting underway. There was a framing paper that was put together in March by ICANN and some commentary on that by both the GAC and the GNSO, I don't believe the framing paper has been rewritten as a result of that, but it's possible that it will be, or that it'll be turned into some sort of a charter document for this group.

Not clear exactly what besides the framing paper and the commentary together will the work of the group and define its shape and timeline. I look forward to reporting on all of those

unanswered questions to At-Large as this process develops. I'll stop now, and thank you for keeping me up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg, and thank you for sticking to the time. You may run out and get yourself a beverage of choice now, so thank you. Now finishing off on the shepherd update, we will turn back to our co-chair of the Consolidated Policy Working Group, and also real strong shepherd for this Jonathan Zuck, the domain name, system abuse, DNS abuse. Jonathan, that's also a big, big story with At-Large.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier, and thanks Greg, for your update on close generics. I think we still have some more work to do to explore this topic creatively within the At-Large community. So we should probably put some action items on the books to bring it up in the CPWG and have some more discussions about it so that there's some understanding of what kind of compromises are possible to prepare you as well as possible for those meetings.

So on the topic of DNS abuse, it's very interesting to be identified as a shepherd because this is certainly a case where the animals being shepherded are cats probably, and spread over a very, very

large field. As has come up in a number of different sessions thus far, there's a lot going on now at DNS abuse.

I think the at large community has played a very important role in being the impetus for a lot of this work. And so the question then becomes, which of these initiatives are ones that we want to be a part of, which ones we want to just support remotely, and what else do we think needs to happen that isn't currently happening. It's a complicated question.

There's a contracted party house, DNS abuse work team. The GNSO has a DNS abuse small team, the registry and registrar stakeholder groups both have DNS abuse working groups, the contracted parties have kind of gotten together and gotten behind something called the DNS Abuse Institute that Graeme Bunton is in charge of. So there's a lot that's going on.

As we mentioned in the SSAC meeting that we had prior to this, a large part of what's going on now is a hardening of the definition of DNS abuse to really be about maliciously registered domains.

There was a plenary couple of meetings ago about maliciously registered domains versus hijacks domains and how one is more easily considered within the remit of ICANN versus the other that the hijack domain is very often a perfectly working domain, but there's one page that's been taken over for abusive purposes.

So it's been suggested that that should be more in the remit of internet hosts than registrars for mitigation, and so there's a lot of conversations that are going on. The DNS Abuse Institute just yesterday came out with a preliminary report on its proposal for how we might measure DNS abuse.

One of the challenges I think that the community has faced on this topic is a lack of agreement on the facts, which is something that many of us are having as an issue in our home countries these days. If you can't agree on the facts, you're not likely to agree either on the urgency of the problem or on the solutions that are being proposed.

Any kind of solution that gets proposed has to be measured against some kind of a yard stick so that we know that we set objectives and see if the measures that are being proposed, move us closer to those objectives. So the DNS abuse technique for measuring DNS abuse at this juncture is about the number of maliciously registered domains.

I think that they're backing off of the rhetoric that we heard from Org, which is that DNS abuse is going down and instead making the claim that the number of maliciously registered domains might be going down, but that might not speak to how often they're used, how many people are affected by them, how many phishing and farming attacks are taking place, et cetera, but simply

looking at the number of maliciously registered domains, and they've promised in their next report, which is due out in November to name some names and actually look at individual registrars, for example, and seeing where there's high concentrations of abusive registrations.

So it's interesting what's going on, we continue to monitor it. Calling my activity at this point, shepherding is a very gross exaggeration of what we're able to do in this case, but we're certainly monitoring across all of these different efforts in providing input where we can with them. The GNSO small team on DNS abuse asked us some questions, and Alan Greenberg helped compose some response to those questions.

The response coming out of the small team certainly shows a recognition of those responses that we made, so I think we had an impact on the report that's coming out from that small team, so that's good. So I think it continues to be a very important issue for At-Large.

One of the complicated things is that we get so embroiled in so many different kinds of topics within the ICANN community, that it's sometimes easy to forget that our area of focus is the day-to-day interests of individual internet users.

So, the challenge with that, of course, is that if we really sat down with individual internet users, my guess is that DNS abuse would

be -- once we explained what it was, would be at the top of that list, that many of the things we're engaged in is not and that this is, and so that the fact that the issue is minimized or narrowly defined, et cetera, within the ICANN remit doesn't change the fact that it is probably the biggest challenge facing individual internet users.

So we have to keep that in mind, we have to keep banging the drum on this issue, and again, I think we're often asked by Org leadership to concede that they are in fact working on this issue, and I think we can concede that many are working on the issue including Org, but we should be constantly asking the question whether we're doing enough.

I think the answer to that is going to come from setting concrete objectives based on an agreed upon measure and setting out a roadmap for what the organization of the community should be doing on DNS abuse.

We semi-announced we'd be doing that with the SSAC in the previous session. So I'm going to be the worst offender in terms of going over time, but I see that Alan Greenberg has raised his hand. Please, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you. Just very brief comment. You use the term hijack domains to talk about people taking over webpages. Hijack domains has an established meaning of someone actually stealing the whole domain name and taking custody there.

So I'd suggest we use a term like hijack websites or something instead of using a term that already has an existing meaning that is different. Just a comment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. That's very good point, and I believe the term that's actually used as compromised domains as opposed to hijacked anyways. But yes, more often than not, so I've started, and I recommend all of you doing the same because as these tools become more and more available, like the abuse Institute has created a centralized reporting tool, for example, on DNS abuse, and I encourage everyone to try it.

So when you receive one of these phishing emails, save it, don't delete it. See if you can use the reporting tool that DNS abuse Institute has put in place. What I have found is that very consistently a maliciously registered domain is used to send the email to me, but that where I'm being sent.

In other words, the fishing site itself is a compromised domain. So both end up being in place, but you can imagine how the

absence of visible DNS abuse on a maliciously registered site might get missed in a study of whether or not that domain is in fact, maliciously registered.

So I've gone over time. I'm getting the arm poke here, but we'll continue to work on this issue a pace. Back to you, Olivier, to close things out.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. In fact, we're going into any other business and you had just a quick announcement to make on the topics, the At-Large talking points.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, oh, thanks. I was just going to say, you've now heard about a bunch of these different policy talks again. If you recall, from our introductory session, we circulated a document with At-Large talking points that are all derived from these reports, but one an important part of that document is a list of the sessions that are coming up during ICANN75 that are relevant to those issues.

So if any of these has piqued your interest, please refer back to that document and try to attend some of those sessions. We shouldn't just stay in our own worm, looking at each other the whole week. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. I note that we are out of time and there is one person in the queue, Achille. Should we just quickly, do we have a ten second just to take the question?

JONATHAN ZUCK: 10 seconds.

GBÉÉRÉ ACHILLE EYE: Hello, my name is Achille Eye, I am a fellow and I would like to ask you how you can detect DNS abuse cases, and when you do so, what kind of measures do you usually take? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can you repeat that? I'm sorry, I didn't hear it right at first.

GBÉÉRÉ ACHILLE EYE: how you can detect DNS abuse cases, and when you do that, what kind of measures do you usually adopt? Do you block the sites whose domain names have been abused, or what other kinds of measures do you usually adopt? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks for your comment. We will get back to you offline because we have to shut down the session right now, but thank you, and we'll respond.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Perhaps Jonathan, you can go and talk to Achille with an interpreter or someone that can liaise between you two, maybe Sebastien can help on this.

Thank you so much. I'm about to get unplugged and Jonathan is about to get strangled, we have to end this session. So thanks, everyone, for these updates. Thank you, everybody.

As you know, this is a Consolidated Policy Working Group and you can join the group on the mailing list and take part in the policy input that goes into the ICANN policy processes. Thanks, everyone, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]