
ICANN75 | AGM – ccNSO: Informational Meeting
Tuesday, September 20, 2022 – 16:30 to 17:30 KUL

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO information meeting session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I am 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. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

With that, I will now hand the floor over to Giovanni. Thank you.

GIOVANNAI SEPPIA: Thank you so much. Nice to be back in this community. So my presentation, this update, is about announcing the effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder model, which is a project that

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.

ICANN started some years ago. And it's a project that aims to improve the current ICANN multistakeholder model.

Today's presentation is to provide you with an update about this project. And further updates I'm going to be providing also on the wiki space that we have built for these projects under community.ICANN.org in MSM section.

Today's presentation is given by me, together with my colleague Negar, with the support of Ivette remotely, and in my role and capacity as Vice-President of the Implementation Operations Team, which is in charge of the implementation of the specific review [of] Board-approved recommendations, as well as other projects like the MSM project.

That said, I'd like to invite you to log in the Zoom room there are going to be some polls which we will invite you to participate in, as well as a nice Jamboard session at the end, where we would like to require your help to, let's say, help us focus on some [inaudible] project that we are expected to evaluate that are currently supporting the multistakeholder model.

That said, and without further ado, I'd like to leave the floor to my colleague Negar, who is going to take us through the project, what we have done, and where we stand now. So thank you, Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you, Giovanni. And hello, everyone. Thank you for your time and giving us the opportunity to provide a quick update to you.

If we can go to the next slide, please. Thank you. So I'll be briefly talk about where we stand with the MSM project. We'll talk about consensus-based decision-making—and I'll explain in further detail what that's all about— and some of our next steps. And the fourth agenda item is where we go forward from here with our MSM project. And that is when Giovanni is going to walk you through the Jamboard session.

Let's go over to the next slide, please. Thank you. And one more. Thank you very much. So as you're all aware, the multistakeholder model being at the core of ICANN's operating model is one of ICANN's five strategic objectives. The Implementation Operations Team—myself and my colleague Giovanni Seppia—are spearheading this project into full implementation and, in effect, helping ICANN Org achieve its strategic objective.

Now, there's some key steps that we are taking to continue to advance this project forward. One is to evaluate a number of the projects and initiatives that were identified in the final workplan back in October of 2020, when the MSM project finalized its set of issues and the associated projects identified that could address

those issues. We're going to be investigating other projects and initiatives that were not really in existence back when the October 2020 paper of the MSM project was finalized but we think were important-enough projects that could actually help improve the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. And as such, we don't want to miss the opportunity of looking at those and evaluating them.

And of course, given how critical the community's involvement is and your input is to the success of these evaluations, we're going to continue to engage with you to help resolve the six identified issues that were determined by the community as those hindering the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model.

Let's move to the next slide, please. Thank you. As a reminder, there were a total of 20 projects that were included in the October 2020 paper of the Enhancing the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model project, of which we ended up selecting four projects for evaluation. These projects are those that have been fully implemented and also involve the whole community. The four projects are about improving communications between ICANN Org and the community, the Consensus Playbook, the Fellowship Program, and ICANN Learn. The remaining projects that are not currently fully implemented will be evaluated once their implementation has been completed.

As I briefly noted, we're also going to be looking at a number of projects and initiatives that really came into existence after the publication of the October 2020 paper. You can see a brief list of some of them here on this slide. We have a much more detailed list on the wiki space that Giovanni noted and that Ivette kindly posted the link to in the chat. So I encourage all of you at that convenience to look at that link, look at the projects. There are descriptions included with the projects and how tie into the MSM program and what issues they could help resolve if implemented and when implemented. So a lot of data is on that page for your reference.

Next slide, please. So where we at, and what are we going to do next? We have completed design of the evaluation methodology, which was something out the final work plan of the MSM project. That document is also posted in the MSM wiki space. And currently we're in the midst of applying the evaluation methodology to the four projects that I noted in the previous slide. During ICANN75, we've had a number of engagement sessions with various constituencies and have had hands-on discussions with everyone because we're looking to get your input on one of those four projects specifically.

And if we can move to the next slide, please, I'll talk a bit more about that. And one of the four projects we're looking to evaluate is pertaining to the Consensus Playbook and consensus-based

decision-making. While the MSM project was being conducted, the community had different views about how consensus is applied to a give project and raised concerns really about all voices being heard and being heard equally in decision-making.

There was a project that was identified as one that could help alleviate this issue, and that was the development of the consensus playbook. The idea was maybe some people don't quite know how to make decisions on a consensus basis or how to apply it effectively throughout the process. And so this project was deemed as one that could help resolve the issue. The playbook is premised on the assumption that consensus-building takes place throughout a project and not just at the end of it. It also includes a lot of practical tools and best practices for building consensus, bridging differences, and really trying to break deadlocks within our processes and is supposed to be used not just for GNSO-based work and activities but really for all the other constituencies too throughout the ICANN ecosystem.

So what we're looking to do now is to ask you a series of question to better understand how you have applied consensus-based decision-making to our work, what your perception of the process is. And from that data, we are trying to gauge if there have been any changes since the last discussion with the community took place on this process and where we need to go next.

So with that, let's go to the next slide, please, Ivette, and let's start kicking off the first question in our series of questions we're going to be asking you. The first one is really simple.: Do you know the basic principles for making decisions on a consensus basis? Let's give it a couple more seconds so everyone has a chance to participate.

Okay, Ivette. Let's go ahead and close this poll, please. Thank you.

Let's move on to the next question. All right. So are you aware of the existence of the Consensus Playbook that was released about a year ago and socialized to an extent within the community?

Okay. Great information.

Let's end this polling—thank you—and move on to the next question. All right. So now we would like to know if you've used or referenced the Consensus Playbook within the context of ICANN work. And that could be anything from PDPs, reviews, cross-community working groups, any working group that you've done throughout your experience within ICANN over the past [inaudible] years.

Wonderful. Thank you, Ivette, let's close this poll out since the numbers have stabilized.

And let's move over to the next question. All right. Did the consensus-based decision-making contribute to the project's

success? Again, the project could be of any nature within the ICANN ecosystem.

This is quite promising. Wonderful. Thank you, Ivette. Let's the close this down.

And let's move on to the next question. Did you achieve better consensus of goals and objectives as a result of using or learning from the Consensus Playbook?

Thanks, Ivette. Let's close it down.

And moving on to the next question, please, did goals and objectives become clear as a result of consensus-based decision-making?

This is great. The spirit of the multistakeholder model is really working here. Thank you, everyone, for your responses.

Let's close this question down as well and move on to Question #7. Did you reach better mutual understanding as a result of using consensus-based decision-making?

Fantastic. Okay, great. Ivette, I think we can close this one down as well now.

And let's move to the next question. And do you think differing positions successfully converged as you applied the consensus-based decision-making?

Great. I think we have our answer here as well. Let's close it down.

And we are now moving on to the last question in this section. And that is, was there communication and context when converging differing positions?

This is great. Thank you very much, everyone. Ivette, we can close this down now. I do appreciate your time in helping us answer these questions. This is very useful data for us as we are moving forward, deciding how we can help improve things.

One of the things I wanted to mention is I realize a lot of community members may not have had a chance to participate in responding to these questions, so we will be sharing these poll questions with everyone and request that you please share it with your constituency members and have them participate if they so desire if they haven't had a chance to but would like to. We would love to hear back from anyone with any additional input you may have.

With that, I'm going to go to the next slide, please, and just quickly—and one more, if you don't mind—mention that, as a next step, we are going to be sharing the results of some of our analysis of the four projects that are noted after ICANN75. We of course want to gather more data regarding consensus-based decision-making and the Consensus Playbook from everyone. So we're hoping to have enough data to share the results of our

findings with everyone by November of this year. As noted earlier, there's a dedicated MSM wiki space for this project, and of course we're going to continue to look at an expanded list of projects for evaluation. And this is when the next part of the presentation comes into the picture.

With that, let me hand it over to my colleague, Giovanni Seppia, to walk you through the next section. Giovanni, over to you, please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Negar. And thank you for participating in the polls.

The next and last part of this presentation is about this Jamboard exercise. And if we can please have the Jamboard on the screen so I can explain what you're requested to do, it's a time-machine exercise. And as Negar explained to you, part of this multistakeholder model project is to evaluate the projects and initiatives that are currently supporting the multistakeholder model to identify possible gaps and issues within those projects and initiatives and fix them so that they can contribute further and answer the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model.

And the list of those project initiatives is a long list. We are talking about more than 50 currently managed projects and initiatives that are supporting the ICANN multistakeholder model at different levels. And what we have done here is to list eight of

them And my request is for you to interact with this Jamboard via the sticky notes and place sticky notes—three for each of you—next to those projects that you believe we should focus on to evaluate them and make sure that we identify possible gaps and issues and eventually propose a strategy to fix those gaps and issues so that those projects that can continue to support the ICANN multistakeholder model.

So the eight projects that you have in front of you on this Jamboard are streamlining of reviews, which is an initiative to improve bylaws-mandated review processes. The second one is the operational planning process, which you know very well, as you have the strategic and operating plan in the community. The PDP 3.0 probably is a bit less known to this community, but it's about announcing the efficiency and effectiveness of the GNSO policy development process. There's the operating standard for specific reviews, which are helping review teams to produce reviews and manage reviews. There's the strategic trend process, which is helping ICANN in its planning to identify priorities and future trends. There's the language service, which is supporting the multilingualism within ICANN. There's the community onboarding program, which is a mentorship-based program to improve engagement and retention of new participants. And we are seeing more and more of former new participants in high-level roles at ICANN. And there's the holistic review, which is a

brand new review recommended by the Accountability and Transparency Review (the last ATRT review), and it aims to introduce a global review to help, let's say, refine eventually part of the ICANN structure. So those are the eight project initiatives that we have selected.

I'd like to invite you to again interact with the Jamboard now and place any sticky note next to the project that you believe we should focus on in the coming months as part of the evaluation of the project initiatives that are supporting the ICANN multistakeholder model. So the sticky notes are those that you have on your left here on my screen. And please place possibly three per participant. And in exchange, you'll be given this nice little sticker that you can put on your badge. And it's the MSM Time Machine Champion. It's a time machine because we would like to move forward. And so it's really like moving some projects to the future, for that is the time machine—not to go back in the past but in this case to go to the future.

So please start participating in the exercise. Again, it's a Jamboard, so if you place the sticky notes somewhere else or if you move the time machine—we have been seeing everything in the past days [because] this is a session we have been having in a different format with other constituencies ... But please interact with the time-machine Jamboard and place your sticky notes next to those projects/initiatives that you believe we should focus

on as they are, let's say, contributing the most to the ICANN multistakeholder model. Thank you.

Okay. Who's getting the first sticky note? Wow, that's a big one.

All right. Let's place the sticky notes next to the projects or on the projects. We'll manage that at the end. And, again, as Negar pointed out, we will post the outcome of all the sessions that we will be having at ICANN75 on the dedicated wiki space.

Okay. The other one is ... yes. It's a Jamboard. You are not going to get bitten. Whatever happens, it stays on this Jamboard. And whatever happens is not going to have been having a collateral effect on you. So feel free to interact with this Jamboard. Don't be shy. Don't be Jamboard-shy. I'm not going to pick up any those and say, "Why have you done ___?" No, that's not what it's going to be.

All right. The community onboarding program is going well. Yeah, I knew somebody was going to hijack the time machine. It happened with the treasure island. At the end, we found the treasure, but the island was gone. That was with the GNSO.

Okay, you're doing really well. Please continue. As I said, possibly three out of eight per participant. I'm going to close this Jamboard in one minute. Wow, okay. All of them? Okay. Don't worry. It's a Jamboard. Again, nothing wrong with pressing the wrong button or speaking out or whatever.

And ten, nine, eight, seven, six, five, four, three, two—yes—one. That fit. [It was all the places they are going]. Very well-done. Okay, got the first speaker.

Thank you so much. It was a very interactive and nice exercise at the end of such a long day for you as all of us. As Negar said, we'll place the findings of this exercise as well as the polls on the wiki space for the multistakeholder model. The multistakeholder model is a project that we want to continue to do together. So it's not something that is on ICANN Org only but is something that all of us—all the community, all ICANN Org—should do together. And we'll continue to provide updates to you in the coming months as soon as we complete the evaluation of the four selected projects and move into the evaluation of new projects and initiatives.

That said, we still have a couple of minutes for possible questions, so I'm happy to answer any question that you may have. Also, those connected remotely, feel free to ask any questions.

Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Hi, Giovanni, and thank you for this interactive session. I was wondering how this exercise is related to the prioritization framework, for example.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Sorry. With what?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSOS: The prioritization framework.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: So that's a very good point. So the first pilot prioritization was on the specific review Board-approved recommendations on those 45 specific review Board-approved recommendations. This one is more relating to the projects that are currently ongoing. So usually the prioritization ... I don't know what the planning department is planning for the next fiscal year ('24) prioritization exercise. Usually the prioritization is on projects and initiatives that are not already ongoing. What you see is, with the exception of the holistic review—but now we have the pilot holistic review that is coming up—those projects are all running projects while the prioritization is mainly about future projects and initiatives.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: You're welcome.

Okay. If there is no other questions, sharp as only an Italian can be, I conclude this session. Thank you so much for participating.

Very interactive. I'm going to have the stickers handed out to you. And I'd also like to thank Negar and Ivette, who have been doing a great job remotely, and also all the secretariats here for facilitating this session. And the tech people. So thank you so much. We'll stay in touch. Go on the wiki space for more updates on this project. Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you. You can now stop the recording.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Okay. As our next informational moment here, we have Angela Matlapeng, who would like to give us an announcement. Please, Angela.

ANGELA MATLAPENG: Good afternoon, all. Good time of the day to everyone, even those joining us online. Speaking of the multistakeholder engagement following the previous presentation, mine is just going to be a brief announcement really to the 10th anniversary of the DNS Forum of the Africa region.

By way of introduction, my name is Angela Matlapeng. I am the current Vice-Chair of the AFTLD. And for the benefit of newcomers, the AFTLD is basically a platform that allows ccTLD managers within the African region to discuss issues around

technical and policy that affect the different ccTLDs and the management thereof.

So the theme for this year's tenth DNS Forum will be speaking on attaining inclusivity and diversity in the DNS ecosystem in Africa. And we will be having this as a hybrid event that will be hosted in Kenya on the 5th to the 6th of October. So it's two weeks from now. So it's open to everyone, not just ccTLD managers. We'd also like to hear from different partners that play a role within the Africa region as well, even though they are outside Africa.

So just maybe to go through some of the discussions that we look forward to touch on, we're looking to inclusive leadership, what it actually means to us in the Africa region, how do we ensure the multistakeholder engagement, how do we collaborate with other organizations to achieve common goals. We will also look at some of the hot topics, like universal acceptance, how to use that to promote local content, as well as looking to infrastructure in acceptance of different domains that are not in ASCII characters.

We will also look at the security and stability of the DNS, which is also a very hot topic in the region, how to combat or mitigate DNS abuse, different cybercrime that the region is experiencing, and how to really make the Internet a stable place and very inclusive to end users where they can enjoy the benefits of digitization.

We will also look into inclusivity and diversity in the policy and capacity-building area, basically speaking to how to attract new players in this space and managers, as well as development partners in order to even diversify the solutions themselves within the Africa region, as well as innovative and creative solutions.

We will also have a look into digital rights and privacy, how do we make sure that we are aligned to the different data protection legislation within the region, and how does that then translate into the different ccTLD functions and the registries?

We also look forward to having an awards ceremony. So there's going to be a total of 12 awards going to two categories. So two are going to the Excellence Awards, and ten going to the Recognition and Acknowledgement Award. We would have a ccTLD manager or an individual to demonstrate how they've been effective and impactful within the region and the space of DNS.

We will also have a chance to have members express interest in joining the ccTLD board, as a few of our members will be exiting during the period of October.

So that's about it from my end. And I hope to see you in Keyna or online. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. Sounds like a very interesting agenda. So thank you very much, Angela, for inviting us.

And for the next item, we have Alvaro Alvarez, who is the general counsel at Identity Digital, please. And Chris. Sorry.

ALVARO ALVAREZ: Is it okay if I take my mask off?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes. No problem.

ALVARO ALVAREZ: Good afternoon, everyone. So a big focus of the past few ICANN meetings, I think before for gTLDs and ccTLDs, has been on DNS abuse. That's something that we take pretty seriously at Identity Digital. It was something that was core to our foundation when it was Donuts, and I think it was very important to the Afiliis family as well. And we've continued carrying on, doing our very best to set a high standard for ourselves and hopefully help build best practices with other registries and registrars. And of course, ccTLDs are a part of that.

There are a lot of opinions about DNS abuse. There's lots of different definitions about what DNS abuse is. And that's okay. I'm comfortable with that. There are, on the spectrum of opinions

when it comes to DNS abuse, some who say that the sky is falling and that things are worse than they've ever been. And then on the opposite side of that spectrum, you have people, entities, and organizations that think this space is already over-policed.

We fall somewhere in between those two ends of the spectrum, and we are so lucky to have an excellent compliance program at Identity Digital, both at our registry and our registrar as well. We serve primarily gTLDs, but we also serve ccTLDs as well. And we employ our practices a little bit differently between the gTLDs and the ccTLDs, but the differences are not extreme. We do have a great team. We rely a lot on very smart people. Machines alone can't do it. We have a great team that are really curious who want to be an active part of the community and take advice from people. So for those who are active in this community, feel free to continue talking to our great people.

We have great processes. So we try to maintain some discipline in how we handle DNS abuse. And we have great software that we employ. And so we think having those three things and a real deep curiosity as to what causes DNS abuse and what's the best way to mitigate is what makes a great program.

Earlier this year, I had an idea that it would be a good thing to produce some sort of transparency report so we could really communicate with the community and everyone at large about

what we do and what we're finding in the domains that we help manage. What we found was quite interesting, and we thought we'd share it with the community. And that should be coming out in the next two to three weeks. It's a rough draft right now but I think I'll share some of the findings, just a broad scope.

We do cover here in this abuse transparency report how we intake reports, both from individuals, from organizations. And that may include law enforcement. We talk about how just a mere report will not necessarily elevate to a case. We do focus a lot on evidence-based reports. So just merely saying, "Hey, there's a problem with this (sending an e-mail anonymously or in a web form)?" We need to have some more information on that because we need to be able to act on these things and also sure there's due process to the registrant, the registrar that has taken on this service.

So you probably are all aware of the different broad categories of technical abuse, including malware, botnets, and things like that. We're pretty swift, and I think there's very little disagreement on how to handle those things. But we will be publishing raw numbers so you can see what we're finding. When I take a look at these numbers broadly, you're in the tenths of a percentage point as far as report[s] of abuse. And it objectively seems pretty small.

But I think what's more important is really not what's [inaudible] DNS abuse is reported and what's even elevated to a case but really how you mitigate and how quickly you do so. And what we've found both internally and through external reports, including working with the DNS Abuse Institute, is that [they're] pretty swift at taking down cases of abuse. And the more evidence that's provided, the better.

You may all be familiar with the framework to address abuse. We were founding members of that group and drafters. So in addition to the technical abuses that are, again, not very controversial, we committed to continue taking down cases of child sexual abuse material, human trafficking evidence—we do human trafficking—online opioid sales, and really credible and specific incitements to violence. So that's something that we do on the content level, but I know it's a little bit more controversial. And we actually go beyond that, but that's just the baseline of the framework.

Again, our report will also talk a little bit about the actions that we take. Who took the action? Because that's not in this ecosystem of the domain name system. You have not only registries but registrars, and you have the registrants themselves, and hosting providers and things like that—website providers—that are all part of this ecosystem. So we talk a little bit about where in the chain things are broken up.

And the good news is that we saw our registrar partners doing a tremendous amount of work for us, which was really great. Sometimes we get well-evidenced reports of abuse. We take a look at it very quickly. And we were very happy to find that our registrars had already taken care of it. And then in other cases, we'll refer back to the registrars, which we think is probably the more appropriate place to handle these things, given the contact with the registrant itself. And by and large, our registrar partners, when they have not already taken the action themselves, when we alert them of it, they tend to be in agreement and do some work. There are exceptions, but that's what we found.

In this report, we will talk a little bit about trusted notifiers. And I think everyone has a little bit of a different definition of what a trusted notifier is, but in our world, it's usually at least a formal arrangement—it doesn't have to be heavily written—with some sort of organization that we, one, have trust in that organization. And usually that's trust based off of longstanding relationships. And usually they have an expert. They have to have some sort of expertise in the system, in the thing they're reporting—for instance, in the United States, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. When they tell us there's a report of child sexual abuse material, we believe them. And they've never failed us. If we ever wanted them to document this somehow, they would. But we have such a longstanding relationship with them

that we take them on their word and we act very swiftly on those things. And there's lots of other examples that we've worked with, and those are presented in the report, in our first report.

We are also looking at trends. This would be our first report which we intend to put out quarterly. And the first report will have a little bit of data because we tracked what happened in the first quarter to a certain extent. But then in the third quarter report, which will come out sometime in late October, you'll start to see trends. And by and large, what we're seeing is evidence that cases of DNS abuse are going down, which is great news. And, again, we all thought this would be very interesting to the community and specifically the ccNSO.

We also respect that, for cc's in particular, there's a complex path to how jurisdictional requests are handled. And that's something that we don't address here in the transparency report, but that's something that we take very seriously. And it's hard to comment broadly on how we do so because we have to look at that through the lens of if it's a ccTLD customer of ours or it's a gTLD that we run.

But we are absolutely committed to working with law enforcement. We have a long history of working with law enforcement and have good relationships with those really

around the world. But we are also governed on our gTLD by our contracts, so we need to be mindful of that.

We absolutely welcome any learnings that the ccNSO members may have on this point and any best practices that they'd like to discuss with us. We're all ears, but we're also happy to talk to you about what we do and lend a hand if that's helpful.

With that, I'll pause.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hi, this is Chris. I will send a link to the ccNSO Council and members list once you've published the document so that everyone can have a look at it if they'd like to do so.

ALVARO ALVAREZ: Yeah, that's a great idea.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you very much. I wonder if there are any questions or comments for Alvaro.

ALVARO ALVAREZ: A lot less controversial in this room than in others. So thank you again for your time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Well, thank you very much.

And with this, we are concluding our informational session. Please remember that tonight is the ccNSO event at the Mandarin Oriental on the third floor. So those who have the invitation, please don't hesitate to attend. I'm looking forward to seeing all of you there.

Thank you very much. And now this session is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]