ICANN75 | Prep Week – GNSO Policy Update
Wednesday, September 07, 2022 – 22:00 to 23:00 KUL

TERRI AGNEW:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. And welcome to the GNSO Policy Webinar on Wednesday the 7th of September 2022.

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 during the question and answer session at the end of this webinar.

If you would like to speak at that time, please raise your hand in Zoom and you'll be placed in the Q&A queue. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

All participants are welcome to access the interpretation as well as all available features via the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I'll hand the floor back over to Philip Fouquart, GNSO chair.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Terri. I hope you can hear me. Hello, this is Philippe from Paris, the GNSO chair. I'd like to welcome everyone to this webinar during Prep Week. It's always a pleasure to have you here.

As a reminder, we are to comply with the Expected Standards of Behavior, and this is intended to prepare for the meeting that we will have in 10 days from now at ICANN75. And hopefully that will give you an overview of the various sessions that you'd like to attend. A number of working groups will be meeting small teams, including those under the GNSO that you have on the screen here.

You will hear during this webinar about the Transfer Policy Working Group. You'll hear about the IDNs EPDP as well as non-PDP work, small teams and scoping teams such as the DNS Abuse and the accuracy Scoping Team, as well as activities that are under the GNSO Council.

So this is what you have on this screen. I want to thank the various presenters that are with us for this. So you will hear about the Transfer Policy Review PDP from Roger Carney. You'll hear about the Internationalized Domain Name EPDP with Donna Austin and Justine Chew, as well as ongoing non-PDP work as I said.

You'll hear about the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team with Michael Palage, the SSAD ODA, a small team on the Council from Sebastien Ducos. And you'll also hear about the Small Team

on DNS Abuse under the GNSO Council with Paul McGrady and Mark Datysgeld. And I'll say a word about the soon-to-start closed generics discussion that we'll have with the GAC and with ALAC.

So this is, in a nutshell, the overview of what you will hear today. As usual and as a reminder, we put this—and especially the ongoing PDPs—on the "Z" shape of the policy development process. And the two of them are under the initial report stage at this point, and those initial reports will be put to public comments.

With this, I just want to take this opportunity to give you a brief on two items that are under Council. The first one is ongoing work by a committee that's under Council who reviewed the working group self-assessment as well as the Statement of Interest. And this is put very soon under public comment. So look out for that, as well as …

The second element that I'd like to draw your attention to is what we call the PDP Improvement Tracker. We've had several discussions within the community and Org on how the policy development process could be improved. And we had several threads to this with Org, within Org, with the Policy Team, with the Compliance Team, with the ODP Teams as well as with Org.

So we put together a number of suggestions that could help the post-Council [approval and] delivery of policy, if you like. So

we've arranged that according to their complexity. I would encourage you to have a look at this. It's under Council. [And she'll] track down the link and have that in the chat later on. And the ultimate objective, as I said, it's to facilitate the delivery of ICANN as an organization.

So with this, just a couple of housekeeping words for questions that you may have or you will have during this webinar. There are, as usual, three ways to ask questions. Either you can raise your hand, if time permits, during the various sections. You could put that in the chat and use capital letters asking questions. Or you can wait until the very end of the webinar where we will have a Q&A session.

So with this, I'd like to hand over for the first part to Antonia Chu, GNSO councilor, for the Transfer Policy and the discussion with Roger. Antonia.

ANTONIA CHU: Thanks, Philippe. About the Transfer Policy Review EPDP, we have the team chair Roger Carney here. So hi, Roger. Can you tell us a bit about what your group has been working on since your last update before ICANN74?

ROGER CARNEY: Great, yeah. Thanks, Antonia. Since ICANN74 we've been focused on our Phase 1B work which details out the Change of Registrant changes to the transfer policy. So we'll be reviewing all of the Change of Registrant requirements in the policy as it states now. And we've spent the past two months doing that, so it's been going well. And it looks like we will be making some recommendations to change that as well.

ANTONIA CHU: That's great. I see that the working group published its Phase 1A Initial Report shortly after ICANN74. Has the group received any helpful input?

ROGER CARNEY: Yes. And actually, we received 34 public submissions for comments and quite a few comments internally. So we have probably six recommendations that we need to look at, really, in detail that a lot of comments came back on. And maybe another six that have a few comments that we need to resolve. But the majority of our recommendations did get good support. It's just that we have about 6 to 12 that we need to take a look at.

So we're looking forward to that. We actually started our review of that this week, so we're going to be doing that for the next few weeks.

ANTONIA CHU: Yeah, good to know. Can you tell us a little bit about what the working group will be discussing during its sessions at ICANN75?

ROGER CARNEY: You bet. Again, we're going to continue our work on the Public Comment Review. And the majority of it probably at ICANN75 will detail around the Losing FOA and possibly the Gaining FOA recommendations that came through and the comments associated to those. So we'll be spending most of the time on those aspects.

ANTONIA CHU: Thanks. I think the group will have very fruitful sessions during ICANN75. Lastly, a more fun question. Apart from being reunited with colleagues and friends, what are you most looking forward to at ICANN75 or during your visit to Kuala Lumpur?

ROGER CARNEY: So I've never been to Malaysia, so I'm looking forward to that. And I'm looking forward to the food, especially, to try. But I want to get out and do some walking around, too, and see the sights. So that's my goal. We'll see if I get anywhere near outside of the conference hall.

ANTONIA CHU: Okay, great. Hope you enjoy the journey. Thanks, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thank you.

ANTONIA CHU: Okay, so the next policy PDP is about IDN EPDP. We have both the chair, Donna Austin, and the Vice-chair, Justine Chew here with us. Hi, Donna and Justine. Can you tell us a bit about what your working group has been working on since your last update before ICANN74?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. I think I'll take this one. Well, to date we've managed to complete the first pass of substantive deliberations of over half of the Charter questions that's been assigned to this EPDP, the Expedited Policy Development Working Group. We've mostly kept to the areas to do with IDN variant management at the top level as opposed to the second level. And we've been able to develop three groups of preliminary recommendations so far.

And the first group is around the consistent definition and technical utilization of the Root Zone Label Generation Rule, the RZ-LGR.

The group two one is around the same entity principle at the top level which is basically the concept that a set of allocatable variants at the top level should be made available just to the one and the same entity. So that's the simplified explanation of the same entity principle, in my own words anyway.

And then the group three questions which are around the impact of variants on the new gTLD program. But because of the time factor, I'm just going to focus on a couple of things that we've done most recently. This particular EPDP is tasked with questions related to IDN generic top-level domains, or gTLDs.

There is another working group that's under the auspices of the Country Code Names Supporting Organization, or ccNSO. So they have another working group that's referred to as the ccPDP4, and they are looking at IDN ccTLDs. Obviously, the Country Code Top-Level Domains. And in some respects, both of the working groups at the GNSO level and the ccNSO level are kind of grappling with the same questions or similar questions.

So what we did was, we conducted a joint session with the ccPDP4 Working Group just to summarily compare the preliminary recommendations that both groups have arrived to, to date, just to see whether the directions being taken are similar. And what we found was that they are quite similar, and any differences that arose were deemed not to be very significant.

Also, the group three questions of the Charter require the EPDP to consider any adjustments to the String Similarity Review, also the objection process, String Contention Resolution, among other things. You know, we've got a pretty large Charter, over 40 questions.

But if I could just take a little bit of time to just focus on the string similarity aspect and possibly the objection process. So one of the key principles that the EPDP has arrived to, or has pretty much settled on, is that the RZ-LGR, the Root Zone Label Generation Rule, is to be the sole source to calculate the variant labels for existing delegated generic top-level domains as well as future sought-for top-level domains for the generic side, [anyway].

And what this means, generally speaking, is that if you think of the RZ-LGR is a tool that anyone can use to calculate and generate a set of valid variant labels for any particular IDN labels that you input into the tool as a source label. Then the set of variant labels that is returned for that source label that you input may include allocatable variants as well as blocked variants. And allocatable variants are the ones which can be requested for while blocked variants are ones that you cannot request for. They cannot be requested for at all.

And the issue here that we're grappling with is what role, if any, should such allocatable variants and blocked variants play vis-à-vis the String Similarity Review process and also the objection

process. So in other words, to what extent should a comparison be conducted for the purposes of addressing the possible confusability between …

We've got an open mic somewhere. Thank you.

And the EPDP discussed three possible levels of comparison. And you see on the screen here is Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3. I won't go into very much detail, but from the graphic itself you can see the potential complications that could arise.

So what happened was that we had a small group—what we called the String Similarity Small Group—set up with a narrow remit just to aid the discussions at the EPDP level. And this small group had three tasks, essentially.

One was to actually develop concrete examples of strings with allocatable and/or blocked variants that may be visually confusable with other labels in the same script or across scripts. And the task was to also demonstrate how such developed examples could be compared with each other according to the three levels that were shown on screen earlier.

And the goal was to come up with a String Similarity Review model that had the aim of minimizing security stability as well as user confusability risk. And basically trying to address the twin failure modes of 1) denial of service and 2) misconnection.

And the third task was related to the objection side of things, which is to demonstrate how these developed examples will undergo the objection processes, again, according to the three levels that were shown earlier. Right.

And the thing is, the small group did come up with a recommendation but it wasn't tasked with considering the element of complexity in terms of implementing this complexity issue. It was actually sent back to the full EPDP for that deliberation.

So this particular slide ... I won't go into specifics because of the time factor, but it gives you an idea of how ... And this is a simple example, as well. So it gives you an idea of how we would apply what we came up with, which is the hybrid model. And the hybrid model that is recommended by the small group is actually a mixed-level approach between Level 2 and Level 3.

And we thought that this was sufficiently conservative but yet helped mitigate the two types of failure modes which I mentioned earlier, which is denial of service and, particularly, misconnection. It would also help detect more pairs of visually confusable labels, which Level 1 and Level 2 alone—the comparison of those—would probably fail to detect and therefore wouldn't help reduce the risk of failure modes.

We came to the conclusion that the Level 3 comparison wasn't necessary because it would mean comparing subsets of blocked variants against blocked variants. So if you see the two pink boxes on the screen there, we were essentially trying to compare … Well, we were trying to avoid comparing the two pink boxes against each other because we accept that it would unnecessarily lead to an exponential increase in complexity both in competition and comparison.

And we took a similar approach with the objection process, applying the same principles to try and come up with a solution for the objection process. And at this juncture, we're still considering the recommendations and we're also actively looking for more ways to draw input to better inform the deliberations going forward. Thank you.

ANTONIA CHU: Thank you, Justine. These informations are very helpful. We heard that the team may have a revised a plan regarding the Initial Report. Can you tell us more about it?

DONNA AUSTIN: Can you hear me, Antonia?

ANTONIA CHU: Yes, I can hear you.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Okay, great. Thank you. My name is Donna Austin. I'm the chair of the IDN EPDP. And thank you, Justine, for walking us through the challenge we had, certainly, with the String Similarity Review. And that's an ongoing discussion in the group.

The EPDP is looking at a lot of questions associated with the process for applying for a new IDN gTLD and variant labels. And also there's the retrospective aspect to it about existing IDN gTLDs. They weren't allowed to apply for variants in the 2012 round, so how do we make provision for that?

And then separate to that, we also have Charter questions which are related to second-level IDNs and questions around variants there. During some of the discussion we had on second-level names and the discussion around whether the same entity principle could apply to the registrant, it became obvious almost immediately, I think, to our Registry and Registrar colleagues that this is a very difficult thing to make happen operationally.

So as part of that discussion, what we agreed is that the Contracted Party House Technical Operations Team would actually take this on as a project and have a look at how the same entity principle would work at the second level for registrants from an operational perspective. And we kind of came to realize

that that's going to slow our progress down. We don't know how long it's going to take them to do that.

So what we've more or less agreed to do, but we'll discuss this in KL, is with the [artful form] of chunking. So what we're going to do is separate our PDP out into two parts. And the first part will deal with top-level gTLDs and those processes that are related to application for a new gTLD. And the second part is going to be about second-level issues and those processes that probably apply post delegation or post application evaluation.

And we think that will allow us to do have an initial report by the end of the year. We haven't looked at timing yet on Part 1. And then we can start to work on Part 2 as the we get more information about the same interview principle on the registrant. So that's what we're looking at doing—separating the work so that we can ... It allows us to move forward and get one chunk of work done and have an initial report. And then we'll have the second one.

Hopefully, we'll [follow] up pretty closely after that, but it just gives us a little bit of flexibility in the way that we're doing our work.

ANTONIA CHU: Thanks, Donna. So what will the EPDP Team be discussing during its sessions at ICANN75?

DONNA AUSTIN: So we will be discussing the chunking. We've been looking at that from a leadership perspective, so we'll have more conversation with the team around that during KL just to see if everybody's on board.

The other thing that we're looking at doing is what Justine was just explaining to folks with a String Similarity Review. It's not a criticism, but one of the comments we often get is, "We're dealing with edge cases, so is this really going to happen? Do we really need to be this conservative because, probably, what we're talking about and concerned about isn't going to happen."

So what we're going to do is leverage some risk assessment expertise within ICANN Org with the hope that we can get some basic tools for our EPDP Team to think about when we're drawing up recommendations, whether we are actually creating recommendations for an edge case and whether that complexity is really the best option in front of us.

So we'll spend a little bit of time on that, but the bulk of our time is going to be looking at … Our fabulous support team has put together a new gTLD application flow, and we're going to review that application flow and see where our recommendations fall from the Charter questions that we've reviewed and see if they're legitimate and make sense.

So the CC group have done ... Oh, what do they call it? Some kind of testing of their recommendations. So this is probably a variation of that, but we're just trying to make sure that the EPDP Team understands what the gTLD process flow is because that's what a lot of our recommendations will relate to. And then just to review—these are where these recommendations are going to come into play on the process flow and do they seem appropriate, I guess.

So we're just doing that kind of review. I think it's a great opportunity for us being face to face to be able to do that rather than trying to do it virtually. I think that's what our plan is, Antonia.

ANTONIA CHU: Thanks, Donna. So the last quick question goes to Justine. We know you are based in Kuala Lumpur. So what are your most recommended suggestions for visitors?

JUSTINE CHEW: You'll find a lot of things in Kuala Lumpur. We're melting pot of different races, different cultures. So there's a [hell of a lot of] things to do in Kuala Lumpur. Probably the only thing you might not see are beaches. But other than that, we have skyscrapers. We have old houses. We have shopping—luxury goods to crafts. And the food? The food is amazing. I will say that the best thing about

Malaysia is the food. We have parks in town as well that you can walk around when you have some free time.

So I hope everyone has an opportunity to actually venture outside of the convention center, the conference venue, and imbue themselves in a little bit of what KL has to offer. Thanks.

ANTONIA CHU: Thank you, Justine. That's very good suggestions. So I will now pass the mic to Manju for the next session. Manju, please.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Antonia. We are starting the phase of non-PDP work. And the first will be the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team. And we have the chair of the scoping team. Hi, Michael. Can you tell us a bit about what the Scoping Team has been working on since your last update before ICANN74?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes. Earlier this week, we successfully forwarded to Council a write-up on Assignments 1 and 2. So that was a very important milestone. It took a little longer than expected, but that now has been delivered to Council. And with the timing, they shouldn't be in a position to review and discuss it at the upcoming KL meeting.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Michael. And what do you see are the challenges? Maybe share some of the challenges the group is facing right now.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes. So I think one of the things that is actually unique is if you look at the ... This is a Scoping Team. So a lot of the other stuff is PDP work. This is kind of what comes before a PDP. Now the original genesis of this Scoping Team was as an output of the EPDP Phase 2A work that was asked to see whether there could be any improvement with Registration Data Accuracy.

Since that original, if you will, request or genesis of this group, there actually has been a lot of other activities that have fed into this group. Two things specifically. One has been the NIS 2 Cybersecurity Initiative within the European Union, Article 23 that details data accuracy and access. So that has some potential intersection with the group's work.

But perhaps more importantly, in advance of ICANN74 the ICANN Board reached out to ICANN Org and asked them to engage the European Union to see if they might be able to facilitate a dialogue with the European Data Protection Board to see what ICANN Org could do or could not do within the context of GDPR to enhance overall data accuracy.

So those are, I would say, some of the things that had been challenging. It is a very dynamic and timely topic with a number of moving parts.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Michael. So it seems like we're facing a lot of challenges. Despite all of those challenges, what do you expect we'll discuss during ICANN75 in the Scoping Team?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Sure. So one of the things that we will be doing is ... One of the output recommendations from Assignments 1 and 2 is the potential use of a registrar survey. And the purpose of this registrar survey is to feed the potential work in connection with Assignment 3, which is effectiveness, and Assignment 4, impact and potential improvements.

So during ICANN75, we will be meeting Saturday morning to begin to discuss what that registrar serving may look, how it could be crafted in a way to maximize registrar participation, particularly since this will largely be a voluntary survey. So that is one of the things that we will be doing heading into ICANN75.

MANJU CHEN:	And just on top of that, we're all going to … Well, I know both of you and I are going to ICANN75. So what do you expect the most while in Kuala Lumpur or from ICANN75, probably?
MICHAEL PALAGE:	So it's been about two decades since the last time ICANN held a regional meeting in Kuala Lumpur. So I'm looking to see how the city has changed. And I am looking to meet up with some old colleagues and friends, particularly Sharil Tarmizi, who was the second ever GAC chair. So that's what I'm personally looking forward to doing from that one.

One other thing, if I could, just before turning over to the next group. When I originally volunteered to take the position as chair of the Accuracy Scoping Team, I basically committed one year. And that one year is basically expiring, so one of the things that I will be doing, now that I have submitted Assignments 1 and 2 to the Council, I will be stepping down as chair. So one of the other tasks that the Council will have to do before moving forward with the other assignments is locating a new chair.

So if there is anyone on this call that has expressed interest in this particular topic, please reach out to any GNSO Council representatives or ICANN Org to express your interest.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Michael. Thank you for your hard work. I was in this this thing, too, so I know how hard you have been working on this. And we're sad to see you leave. I don't know anyone who can do better than you.

But we'll move to the next section which is the SSAD ODA Small Team. Hi, Sebastien. We have Sebastien to answer our questions. Can you tell us a bit about what the small team has been working on since ICANN74?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure. Thank you, Manju. I hope you can hear me. I didn't really have time to test. I will try to speak slowly for the interpreters.

So this is the small team within the GNSO that has been working on the result of the outcome of the SSAD ODP which was delivered in January. Just to make it very short, the ODP came out with an analysis that the SSAD that was planned—or that would be derived from the policy [as what has] been presented—would cost upwards of $100 million to build and run. And so we were asked to try to see if there was any way to reanalyze the scope and the project and see if there was a way of doing it more simply.

So essentially, shortly before ICANN74 we came up with what we call a proof of concept which is not a simplified but a system that is reduced into the core functionalities, the core needs, for that policy. And [we were] able to basically take requests from the

public request for disclosure of data—the data that has been, because GDPR, essentially hidden—and route those requests to the appropriate registrar who then, based on the request and the rationale behind the request, will make the disclosure or not, but at least respond to the request and explain what they're doing.

At ICANN we went back to staff and asked them to develop this proof of concept to essentially look at what would be involved redesigning and recosting according to this new concept. Which they've done, essentially, I understand. Yesterday we had a meeting where they presented the first markups of this new concept. And they will present to us on ... I'm sorry. I'm jumping a bit ahead. But on Saturday, on the 1st—we'll see that in detail in a minute—but they will present to us next week a final document on their findings and we'll have a meeting on Saturday to discuss their findings.

At this point, again because I'm waiting for their paper, I have only the limited amount of elements that they showed us yesterday. All I can say is that it looks very interesting and promising, and I'm looking forward to that to that document.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you, Sebastien. So seeing that you will be handed this paper next week, do you expect to talk about this during the

ICANN75? Or are you going to need to talk about something else? Do you have plans?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No, no. So we have two back-to-back sessions on Saturday. So, first thing, one where the ICANN Team will present to us their report. And the other one where, as a small team, we will discuss on how we want to proceed. And then we've got several community touch points where I will be presenting and updating the community on what we've decided on Saturday.

So, yeah, definitely a theme in development, and there should be development during the week. So I believe that we will talk about it in particularly with the GAC in our GAC session if anybody wants to have the update there.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you again. So last but not least, a bit of fun probably for all speakers. We know you've been to KL before. Are you coming this time? Or if not, what do you think you're going to miss out on the most? And if yes, what do you want to do the first time?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sadly, I won't be able to come. I have been to Malaysia, to Kuala Lumpur, actually on an ICANN mission, on an ICANN trip with

ccTLDs a few years back. It would have been seven or eight years back. And I enjoyed it thoroughly.

I'm not going to repeat what everybody says, but it's true. Try the food. Try all of the food. Try all of the different foods. Malaysia is a melting pot of many cultures from the region that all bring their food and their angle and their culture. Absolutely there's other stuff that I love.

And if you get a chance to go, go and check out ... Again, from those many cultures, you'll have many religions, a lot of very interesting temples and religious art and all of these things to go and visit if you have [inaudible]. I certainly have a very fond memory of it.

MANJU CHEN: Thank you very much. We're sad that you're not coming to Kuala Lumpur. But without further ado, I will hand the mic to Tomslin. Here you go, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Manju. And thanks, Sebastien, for that update. So we'll now look at the DNS Abuse Small Team and get an update from Mark and Paul on what they've been up to.

And my first question will be to Mark. Can you tell us a bit about what the Small Team has been working on since the last update

before and at ICANN74? It looks like Mark is not on, so I guess it's to you, Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: All right. Well, I'll do my best. So we have been taking, together, the community inputs on the questions related to DNS abuse, trying to figure out what issues we saw common or unique across the community. And we have been building what we call buckets for our eventual report. And those buckets have to do with, do we think that this particular issue would best be handled by some community outreach and more talking? Do we think that this particular issue sounds more like a possible voluntary contractual amendment? Or do we think that this particular issue ultimately is something that if the community can't solve it, it will need to be solved by PDP? But always keeping in mind the hopes that PDPs are … At least I've kept the hope that PDPs are the option of last resort because if the community can solve something on its own, then we don't need a policy process.

So that's what we've been up to. We are in the homestretch on that. And we are, with staff's wonderful help, building our report to Council. We had hoped to have it in before Kuala Lumpur. It looks like it may be at or slightly after. But good progress all of the way around.

EN

And if I can say so, spirits are high. We are a small group of Council members. Small but mighty. And we are getting along famously and, I think, making good progress. So this has been refreshing.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Paul. I understand that there was some community outreach and so I'd like to know, what are some of the highlights of inputs received regarding DNS abuse?

PAUL MCGRADY: So again, we had inputs from all over. What I found particularly helpful was quite a bit of feedback from staff. I know that when we think about the community, we tend to think about this supporting organization or that supporting organization or its various chunks underneath—you know, constituencies and stakeholder groups, things like that. But staff is an important part of our community as well. And the Compliance staff, I thought, gave us some really thoughtful feedback on how they see things. And the Policy staff has been helping us digest that and figure out how it relates to the other inputs from the other parts of the ICANN community.

I am especially thankful that we've got input from all over. It's not just a GNSO-only club. We've heard from other groups outside of the GNSO. And I want to thank everybody on this call for the time they put into ... Every group that gave input, I want to thank them

ICANN PREP WEEK 75

for taking the time to do that because we're always busy in this community and there's always some other priority. But those who took the time to do it, it was well received. Thank you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks again. And what will the Small Team be planning to discuss at ICANN75?

PAUL MCGRADY: Well, we're going to spend a little bit of time giving an update and some specific details of where we are, things that we can't ... You know, we don't have time on a call like this because of the time frames that we have. So we're giving a little more detailed update on what issues we uncovered, which bucket we put them in, and spending some time talking about sequencing. Because some of these things do seem to be, "Try this then try this. And if necessary, try that." And so we'll spend some time doing that.

And then the rest of the time that we have allocated, we're going to be working towards trying to wrap up the work and get that letter to Council with a Small Group Team's recommendation. So it'll be a working session for the most part, but all are welcome. And it's not going to be closed working session. It's going to be open-door and we look forward to hearing from everybody in Kuala Lumpur.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Paul. And in keeping with the theme, what are you most looking forward to on your visit to KL?

PAUL MCGRADY: Well, I was going to say the food like everybody else, but I just heard that Justine is going to be giving a walking tour for some of her friends. And I am looking forward to that walking tour. I love metropolitan environments, and I've never been to Kuala Lumpur before. So I'm very excited to see the city from a local's point of view.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thanks, Paul. I guess I'll also be joining Justine. All right, we'll pass it on to Philippe to look at the closed generics facilitated dialogue. Philippe, over to you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tomslin. And thanks, Paul. Before we get to the Q&A, we thought it would be good to give you an update on something that is a follow-up to the policy work that was done in the SubPro Working Group and possibly the beginning of another policy work to be initiated. That's the closed generics discussion that we will have with the GAC and ALAC.

So as most of you would recall, the SubPro Working Group couldn't come up with one single workable approach with closed generics. And that the various "positions" were recorded in the SubPro Final Report and approved by Council, and subsequently handed over to the Board.

In March this year, the Board reached out to Council and the GAC—the GNSO and the GAC—to consider initiating a dialogue on the topic to try and come up with a workable framework on closed generics.

So the GAC put forward a set of parameters for that discussion which the GNSO Council reviewed, as well as the criteria for the choice of the facilitator. And Melissa Allgood will help the group with this task. It's a new sort of effort. I think we all appreciate that. But eventually, if there is some policy work, as I said, needed up to that process, that will duly fall under the GNSO policy development process.

In those discussions at Council and with our GAC colleagues, we also agreed to invite ALAC, given the importance of the topic, as a member of that discussion. So overall, we will have six members from the GAC, six members from the GNSO, and one plus one for ALAC.

Realizing that that's just about voting members around the table, that's [inaudible] for you. But there we are, anyway. And the

selection of the GNSO participants is ongoing. Hopefully, we'll have that during ICANN75. At this point, we may have an informal get together during the ICANN75 meeting, but the work will actually start after ICANN75.

So with this, I think that's pretty much all I can say on where we are on the closed generics, other than saying that for the GNSO—and I know from the GAC's perspective as well—we're all looking forward to trying and coming up with a workable solution on this topic.

So with this, I think we can move to the Q&A. I think there was one question which was answered in the chat. And that is, yes, the slides will be shared. You will be able to find them on the ICANN75 website. They might be there already. We'll double-check, but they will be shared.

There was one question. Terri, I think it was answered by Roger on Transfer, directly in the chat. Thank you, Roger. Any other questions that you'd like to ask to the panelists? Please raise your hand if you would like to ask a question?

Eunice, you're first. You have to unmute yourself if you want to ask you a question. Eunice?

EUNICE COELLO: Yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: We can hear you.

EUNICE COELLO: My name is Eunice. I want to ask something about [inaudible] security, if you have the topic of Internet of Things in DNS?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Eunice. Hopefully, I understood your question. The topic of domain names for IoT has been debated somehow during some of the plenary sessions that we had. We could probably track down some presentations for you. There has been no specific policy work under the GNSO on this particular topic on how DNS can be used for IoT. That's all I can say, given the general nature of your question. I hope that's helpful. Hopefully, we can provide you with the [inaudible].

EUNICE COELLO: It's about the topic in the DNS and denial of service. And the topic of [inaudible] and Internet of Things, I think, is important in DNS. So in one [inaudible] we do have [inaudible] talk about a fifth of these topics and denial of service. But I didn't hear again about this, and I'm not sure if these [inaudible] this topic.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Only on [DoS], likewise. And whether that's on IoT or on anything else, I don't think there's been any policy work on this particular topic. I know SSAC has worked a lot on the DoS for DNS. Likewise, we can probably provide you with the pointers on SSAC's work and others on DNS DoS. But there's certainly no current or past, that I'm aware of, activities on this particular topic. But we'll reach out to you after the call with a couple of pointers. Thank you, Eunice.

Any other questions?

EUNICE COELLO: Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Okay, seeing no hands I just want to thank everyone, every presenter, and Council for taking part. Looking forward to the meeting in Kuala Lumpur. Thanks to staff for putting this together. As usual, you do most of the work. And for those who go to KL, safe travels. I'm looking forward to seeing you there. And all of the best. That's goodbye for now. Thank you.

TERRI AGNEW: This concludes today's GNSO Policy Webinar during the ICANN75 Prep Week. Enjoy the rest of your morning, afternoon, or evening. Goodbye. You may end the recording now.

ICANN PREP WEEK 75

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]