MONTREAL – Joint Meeting ICANN Board & CSG
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MATTHEW SHEARS: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Matthew Shears of the ICANN board. This is the joint meeting of the ICANN board with the CSG.

Welcome.

What I'm going to do is, we're going to start with the board's question to the CSG first, and then we'll get to the questions from the CSG. But before we do that, I'd like to just turn it over to Wolf-Ulrich to say a couple of words.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Matthew.

My name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm the chair of the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency, and I'm chairing, at the time being, the Commercial Stakeholders Group.

So thank you for having us here for this experience, as usual. And thank you especially to Cherine, being (indiscernible) here and up to the last moment of his tournament.

And so we hope we will have a lively discussion. Thank you so far.

And, Matthew, your outline going forward.

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.*

MATTHEW SHEARS:     So we have an hour and a half.  I really would encourage us to have a good discussion.  So those of you who are sitting out there, there is and will be a roving microphone.  So don't hesitate to use it.

Okay.  So could we have the first question, please.

Thank you.

Go back one.

Perfect.

And here's Goran.  Thank you.

So this is a question that we posed to the CSG.  And I think you're very familiar with it by now.  We've also posed it to all parts of the community.

And I'm just going to turn it over to Cherine to give us a little bit of an overview, and then turn it to Wolf-Ulrich to kick off the questions and the responses to this topic.

Thank you.

Cherine.


CHERINE CHALABY:     Thank you, Matthew.  Really appreciate it.

So for about a year and a half now, we worked with our community in developing a new strategic plan, as mandated by the bylaws. And this plan was adopted by the board in Marrakech.

And the plan on its own is very strategic and cannot be implemented. It needs an implementation plan. That implementation plan, ICANN org is working on it. It is called the Operational and Financial Plan for FY21 to FY25 and will be posted for community comment in December.

One subset of this plan is to do with one of the strategic objectives, which is to improve the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. And this work is currently being facilitated by a community member, Brian Cute. And it is scheduled also to be available for public comment in December.

It is worth noting that this last plan is only about identifying approaches that will lead, over time, to solutions to some of the issues identified by the community.

So what's going to happen now is in -- by the end of December, we're going to have with us as a community three plans: The strategic plan, which you've already commented on and approved by the board, but supported by an implementation plan, which I mentioned. It's called the Financial and Operating Planning, and with it, a work plan for improving aspects of our multistakeholder model.

So the question to us as a community is -- then we will comment on it and so on, knowing that the strategic plan and the operating plan, and

so on, the bylaws mandate, that they will be effective 1st of July next year.

So what do we do?  Do we say our job is done, we leave it to ICANN org to implement?   Or do we all get engaged and make sure the implementation of this plan is successful, albeit not every constituency is affected by every part of the strategic plan.  But, nevertheless, some are affected by one or two; some, by more.

So we posed that question to you, the community, in Kobe, not in a plenary session, but in individual meetings like this one.  And we asked for suggestions.

So we received a lot of these suggestions.  We distilled them together, we synthesized them.  And we would like to share them with you today and see if it makes sense or not and how do we -- if -- how do we take it forward from here so that by 1st of July next year, we're all ready to start implementing the new strategic plan and the financial operating plan.

So you told us as a community, here are some suggestions to the board.  You said, well, the strategic plan has a new vision.  It is to be the champion of the global open, interoperable Internet and the steward of its unique identifiers.  And you said, well, what are you going to do as a board? How are you going to champion this? You need to demonstrate to us as a community that you walk the talk.   And you need to demonstrate that you're really championing this new vision and helping us all to do that.  So you need to do that, number one.

Number two, you said the strategic plan has outlined five key strategic objectives.

Can someone scroll back a couple of slides, please.

Yeah, this one. Those are the five strategic objectives to the strategic plan. One on security; one on governance; one on unique identifiers; one on geopolitics; and one on financials.

It's not important in this meeting to talk about the actual objective, but just to know there are these five ones.

So if we go forward again to the board responsibility, you are saying to us, the board, okay, so we've all agreed on those five strategic directions. How are you, board, going to align your work with those objectives? In a way, we don't want you to do things outside the mission but also outside these objectives. So what are you going to do about it?

Next, you said, we want you, the board, to engage everyone -- the board, org, the community -- in getting ready for successful implementation. Hence, for example, this meeting and all the other meetings we're going to do in Montreal and what we've done in Kobe before in terms of trying to engage the community for the successful implementation.

Number 4 is important. What you said to us is, okay, so we will start implementing these plans 1st of July next year. We see that you have a responsibility, an oversight role, to ensure the successful

implementation of these plans. You mentioned just the word "oversight."

And then, finally, you said, we don't want the strategic plan to be a -- anything else than a living document. And we task you, the board, with the responsibility of finding a mechanism to engage us as a community in reviewing that strategic plan at regular intervals so that we can adjust the course if it needed be. All right?

So those are the five things you, as a community, suggested are actions to the board.

The next slide -- I only have three slides to show to you.

The next slide is about ICANN org. So it's one slide for the board, one for org, and one for the community.

For ICANN org, your suggestion is as follows. The first, you're saying these three plans will have to be implemented. There ought to be some implementation manager or someone really coordinating all these activities. And your suggestion is that ICANN org should be the implementation manager, because they have the resources, they have the skills, they have -- so on and so forth. And in so doing, ICANN org needs to prepare detailed plans, need to align its work with all of these objectives. And importantly, I'll jump to number 6 quickly, you are tasking ICANN org to produce a progress report to this community, right, on the implementation of the three plans. So not only we want them to manage, but you have to produce a progress report so that we know as a community where we are on implementation of each plan,

what are the issues, things are going well, things are not going well, what corrective action, and so on and so forth.

The second point is that one of the objectives of the strategic plan is to ensure ICANN's financial sustainability. So you're telling us or you're telling ICANN org, if that is the case, then we want you to tighten control of operating expenses and make sure that this happens so that we ensure the long-term sustainability of ICANN, financial sustainability.

The third one is also interesting. You're asking ICANN org to engage with other partners, appropriate partners, IRRs, root server operator and IETF, in order to achieve a couple of these goals from the strategic plan, in particular, the goal about unique identifiers and the goal about security. Because I think we recognize, all of us, that on our own, we cannot achieve everything to do with the security of the DNS or the evolution of the identifiers. We need to work with partners.

And then number 4, you are saying we need to anticipate, understand, and respond to all global regulatory and legislative environment and changes so that whatever we do, we're ahead of the curve and not doing catch-up, as some of you have said we're doing with GDPR.

So you're asking Goran and his team to provide the resources so that we can plan and anticipate any changes to the regulatory environment.

And number 5, the last one -- I touched on 6 already -- is that your yearly operating plan has to be a subset of the five-year financial plan.

That's what you are saying to ICANN org.

And now I'll move to the last slide.

These are suggestions that you are telling each other. This is not the board saying and it's not you saying; it's in totality what we managed to synthesize you are telling each other.

The first thing you're saying, okay, the strategic plan, if we really believe in it, then we have to get the buy-in. And we have to get the buy-in by our members, by our constituency, by the community. In other words, we need to walk the talk.

And if I ask a question now, some of you may know it, but some of you may not. Does anyone remember the strategic objective of the current strategic plan, not the new one?

Probably not. All right? And I've just shown you the five strategic objectives. I'm sure you remember them now. But a month from now, you'll probably remember one or two.

So if we think, truly, that ICANN is going to face more external challenges than ever before in the next five years -- and we talked about security risk, we talked about geopolitical risk, we talked about Internet fragmentation, and so on and so forth -- then if we're really are serious about taking ICANN where we want it to be and we believe in the strategic plan, so we have to walk the talk and believe in it and talk the same language.

The second thing you said, which I really like this, you said, okay, we demand and ask the board that you align your work with the strategic objectives. We ask the same from ICANN org. We want to apply the

same to ourselves, to a certain degree.  Because not all of them apply to every constituency.  But wherever possible, you need to align your work with the strategic objectives.

Number 3 is what I mentioned earlier.  One of the work plans at the moment is to find approaches for improving the effectiveness of our multistakeholder model.  We're not looking for solutions, not at all.  This is just approaches that can lead to solution over the next three to five years, i.e., the life of the new strategic plan.

And if we believe this is something we need to do -- and remember, this is one of the transition commitments.  We committed during the transition that we will enhance our multistakeholder model and support it.  Then, if we believe in that, then we need to commit to make some effective changes, not replacing it, not changing it, just looking at some aspects of it where we can make some improvements.

For example, prioritizing our work.  Right?  We're all suffering from having a lot of work.  And everybody has priorities, but there is no one and there's no mechanism for prioritizing the work, and giving also that we have such limited resources.  I know Steve and others, for years, we have been talking about -- right? -- what are we going to do about this?  And we talk about it, and we kept it on the back burner because there were other burning issue.  There comes a point where this becomes a burning issue.  And I think it is a burning issue now and we're all feeling the pain.

So that was number 3.

Number 4, interesting one, this is you tasked yourself -- you said, okay, we're asking the board and ICANN org to find the mechanism to keep the strategic plan alive and for us to be engaged in reviewing it on periodical basis and make changes.

So we need as a community to be current with external trends that impacts ICANN so that when the time comes for doing a review, we provide informed advice and informed guidance to the strategic plan.

And then number 5, given that one of the -- one of the strategic objectives is to improve our financial sustainability and effectiveness, you said, well, we ourselves need to be more productive.  Of course -- and you expressed that in three ways.  One, we need to increase our pool of volunteers.  Because at the moment, there are -- it's the same people doing the same work year after year after year.  And the pool is growing, but very, very small, and in a very slow way.  And we're suffering.  So how do we increase the volunteers, because that will help us?

Number 2, we believe as a community we need to deliver timely, effective recommendations, policies, and advice.

And number 3, we need to foster awareness among our community that ICANN resources are limited and there has to be an optimum and efficient way of using them.

So these three sets of recommendations, of suggestions coming from the community.  Not necessarily all from you.  This is our synthesize of all of the community.

And we'd like now to open discussion with you and say, are they okay? Are they not okay?  How do we commit to making them happen or not?

To you, Matthew.  Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:          Thank you very much, Cherine.

And, Wolf-Ulrich, if you'd like to open up the discussion.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:     Thanks very much, Cherine, for that.  And it is very helpful to get this in this form done.

This is a challenge, really.  So it is -- we have time from six months, I learned here, so -- to implement that.   And if I think about implementation, sometimes -- so we have to find ideas in which way we could implement it under these conditions of six months.  So this is one thing.

The other thing is, so, from -- I have put it the first question here, with regards to the board (indiscernible) ICANN -- because we are sitting together with them -- board.  And something which I also mentioned yesterday in another session is, from my point of view here, is the ongoing oversight from the board is one of the major important things here.  So that is really what we need, what the community needs, in terms of -- of reactions on time from the board to do that.

So I wonder -- this is my question here -- how is this going to -- this, number 4, is going to be implemented on the board level itself? It means, what are you doing on the board? Do you have a specific committee for that? Do you have a team for that? Or how -- what can we expect from the community in order of oversight here?

So that is from my side the question. And then we are going to follow up with other questions.

Thanks.

Let me say -- Let me summarize.

So, in total, we are -- we are satisfied with that altogether, and this is all good. We have to do these items. But there is our open questions.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich.

Specifically to number 4, which I think was one you were focusing on in terms of staying current with external trends, we have now put in place -- there is in place a trend monitoring process --

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I'm sorry. I was referring to the board-suggested items, not the community-suggested actions, number 4.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Could we -- Ah, there we are. Okay.

All right. Who would like to take that? I started down the road talking about external relations.

Becky.

BECKY BURR:
So I think with respect to this particular issue, one thing that we've been very clear about in the board is that within the board, we have to take ownership of -- for what our responsibilities are for contributing to different aspects of it. So the committees have all been asked to go through both the strategic goal -- objectives and goals and to identify their responsibility for contributing to the successful implementation of those.

We've also asked org to be providing regular reporting on implementation of the strategic plan. And it will be incumbent on the board to carefully review -- ensure that the reporting is regular and to do regular check-ins to make sure we're moving forward at an appropriate pace.

MATTHEW SHEARS:
Thanks very much, Becky.

Are there comments, questions, from others?

Steve, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO:
Steve DelBianco, with the business constituency.

If you go to the next slide, please.

Cherine, for you and all the board, we fully appreciate that the board's role is to have this big picture vision, this long-term vision, in trying to set out aspirational goals for five years, get the community on board, and then put into place the means necessary to achieve it. You've done that. That's one of the reasons we've loved your tenure here.

And with all of that appreciation, there has to be a realization on a part of the board that these three plans, the strategic, financial, operating, the five initiatives, they all set on top of the community's actual daily work. So item 2 on there, the -- actually, go to the next one, please.

Aligning our work with the strategic objectives of the plan. That isn't remotely how it happens.

The SOs and ACs align our work with the actual imperatives of organic and external things that land on our limited pool of volunteers. The organic are things like the organizational reviews every five years, the specific reviews done by the community, ongoing PDPs and evaluations, and let's not forget contract renewals, which have a calendar-driven element. We also have things like new gTLDs.

So, for us, our own operational priorities are partly organic and then partly external. When GDPR changes the nature of the way WHOIS works; right? When DNS abuse begins to undermine trust in the Internet and, in an associated way, trust in ICANN.

So we are dealing with those pressures on our volunteers. So it's only when we can see past that that we even look to these three overlaying

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

plans and the strategic objectives. So we're working to memorize all five of them, and it's what the board should do. I understand that. But you shouldn't assume that we are conscious of driving those five objectives when we can barely keep up with the organic and externally imposed problems that are on us.

And having said that, we did in the BC submit comments to one of -- one of the initiatives, the multistakeholder model evolution. And in there, we expressed something you've heard many times from the BC, the IPC, and the ISPCP, this notion that the structure in the body where we work in GNSO makes it extremely difficult to achieve the objectives of the business community in the face of a contract party house divided, the differences we have on the noncontract side. And those frustrations are not something that can be solved with incremental but important process improvements.

So those frustrations persist. You already knew all of that. But you may not have known that we regard the strategic objectives as things we can get to, but only if we take care of our daily work first.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:          Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:       Yes. Thank you, Steve. And thank you for making that remark.

Basically, if we look at the board's priorities, it's also our daily work. And I think the strategic objectives are there to help us to align and to set the focus and to put in our work in that light, consider that, rather than stop doing what we do today and doing something different tomorrow.

So I think in that way, the guidance is very important. And in that way, we also seek to integrate feedback in ongoing processes.

So I hope that helps. It should help us to make our life going forward more effective and easier.

CHERINE CHALABY:

So I do take your point. I mean, it is probably easier for the board and ICANN org to align our work with the strategic plan than for you guys. We understand that.

And we also understand that those five objectives, not all of them apply to everybody.

So all we're saying is, I think, whenever possible, if there is part of your work -- of your daily work, right, that is aligned with the strategic objective, that would be good.

Because I don't think all of it is totally detached. But there will be moments where things you do, like GDPR, if you're working on that, that's part of our strategic objective.

So I think your point is well taken and understood. There's no -- I mean, so that's the benefit of having this discussion, is to gather input.

So thank you for that.


STEVE DELBIANCO: I would only remind you that ICANN as a corporation is administering something that, well, you might think of it as a utility, an electrical utility. We need to keep the lights on. And if we do, nobody knows we exist.

But Pacific Gas & Electric is also an electrical utility who had strategic plans, too. Their board does strategic plans every five years. And the government of the state of California imposes a lot of unfunded mandates on things they have to. And it turned out that they took their eye off the ball at Pacific Gas & Electric in terms of maintaining the infrastructure of the electrical grid in California. And people have paid with their lives, and shareholders have paid with their fortunes. It's a disaster.

And we are nowhere near a disaster. But for us, the infrastructure we have to take care of is probably the -- something we'll cover later on in our interaction with you, which is the degree to which we can put teeth behind the enforcement of what's in our contracts to the satisfaction of the global public interest.

We look forward to that conversation.


WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Any further question here?

So I do have one, one comment.  Also for the number -- it's for the number 5 of the community-suggested actions, becoming more productive in the implementation, especially with regards to the -- increasing the pool of volunteers.

Okay.  I think we are all agreeing that this is necessary to do so.  But I wonder whether we could be better in doing so.

So from my experience, we -- as our constituency, we did a lot over the last year.  We had outreach events and -- supported by ICANN as well.  However, I must say, in the end, you know, if you look to what is the outcome of that in terms of engagement, real engagement, being active, taking part in the PDPs and that, that means, well, there are still a lot of things to do.

So this is -- So I wonder how that could be done better.  And I would say this is not only a suggested action here, therefore, for the community itself, other than to ICANN org as well.  I know I understand you have the engagement department, and they are doing well.  So -- But we all together, we have to think over what we are doing in order to be -- that we get more from those efforts to be done.

Thank you.


MATTHEW SHEARS:          Anybody like to comment on that from the board?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I -- maybe a reformulation makes it more clear. Maybe it should say "to the extent possible, aligning," just to help us to move forward in the realization that we don't want you to drop all your current work.

MATTHEW SHEARS: I think -- I think the issue you're also touching on there, Wolf-Ulrich, is the issue under number 5, right, which is the challenge of finding the resources to be able to engage fully in the policy development process and substantive work. And I think that's an issue that is felt across the community. And there have been -- there are always a number of discussions about, you know, the same people are doing all the work.

And I'm not -- I don't know, open it up to others as to what, you know, the -- the challenges and what maybe the opportunities are there. But I think it's something that's recognized as being something that we talked about for a long time.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: So if there are no comments on that, are there further questions to the strategic plan, operating plan here?

If not, then we can swap over to the question session part.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich.

If we could go over to the other questions.

And a number of these actually come up again in your questions as well. So we'll touch on them again.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. The first goes -- is the BC here with their questions.

And we're going --

STEVE DELBIANCO: I'm sorry. Wolf-Ulrich, would you repeat that? I just couldn't hear that.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: So we are now moving to the question session. So we had questions from the BC, from the IPC, from the ISPCP. We had the order. The BC goes first here with their questions, and then we follow up.

STEVE DELBIANCO: The BC will go first, and keep it brief, because I think Dean Marks of the IPC has quite a bit to say about the EPDP and WHOIS.

But the BC wanted to be sure and register with org that we fully appreciated the initiative it was taking to sending the Data Protection Board a proposed unified access model. Starting at the Barcelona meeting, we just stood at the mic with the contract parties to say that's

the right angle to pursue. We realize it's really difficult, this chicken-and-egg concern between what comes first, the policy or the legal. And when you're confronted with a chicken-and-egg dilemma, don't be chicken. Give us the egg. We'll bring home the bacon.

Which is exactly what we can do.

GORAN MARBY: Steve, why do you always start talking about food when you come into --

STEVE DELBIANCO: And the bacon in this case would be bringing home a UAM, an SSAD that would actually work in compliance with the law and restore WHOIS to some semblance of the usefulness it had before in combating abuse.

That is a long row to hoe, and I appreciate that you're taking parallel effort on that. Chicken or egg, whichever it is, let's try to bring home that bacon.

So that's appreciated.

And we realize that in the EPDP that there are differing opinions about whether and how we'll ever get there. But without the first step having been taken, I don't believe we'd ever get there.

So, Dean, I turn it over to you.

DEAN MARKS: Thank you, Steve. Dean Marks for the record, and I won't repeat your food analogies, but I will say that on behalf of the IPC, we also support the effort by ICANN org and want to communicate to the Board that we felt the paper that was submitted to the European Data Protection Board on a possible UAM model to seek legal guidance on issues of not only liability of contracted parties and trying to limit that but compliance with the GDPR was -- was very helpful, was very clear, it was very thorough, and we very much appreciate that.

We wanted to say that.

We did have a question for the Board about -- and it goes somewhat to the degree about the issue of productivity of the whole multistakeholder model. And that question is when there is a policy that's gone through the whole multistakeholder model and it's been approved by the GNS Council and it's been approved by the Board, what's the formal process that's used if that policy is put on hold by ICANN org because it's determined that it's not the right time?

And what I'm alluding to here is the privacy/proxy policy, and none of you will be surprised to hear me raise this. And poor Goran has heard me raise this about 300 times. But our feeling is the EPDP is not going to address the issue of registrant data that is masked by a privacy/proxy. It's not in the remit of the EPDP, and yet there are increasingly number of registrants for abusive sites that are making use of privacy/proxy.

That policy contains a disclosure framework. It's much more limited than the unified access model, and our hope -- but it's very consistent in terms of issues of accreditation and authorization.

And so there is a general question to the Board about how that happens when a policy is put on unilateral hold, but also in this particular instance, doesn't it make sense to try and move that along with getting the advice from the European Data Protection Board and proceeding with the work of the EPDP instead of having it on indefinite hold?

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Becky is going to take this and we might ask Cyrus to jump in as well.

BECKY BURR: Thank you very much, and thank you, everybody, for your kind words about the strawberry paper. We thought it was a very good paper, and -- and it was -- it really was a chicken-and-egg situation. We needed to put those -- that questions in front of the European Data Protection Board, not really as a parallel process, because that makes it sound separate, but as a way of supporting the community policy development process.

I think that's really very critical for us all to remember, and the Board is keenly aware of this, that the responsibility and authority for policy development lies in the community and not at the board or org level.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

So this was very much intended to support and facilitate the community policy development process. So I just wanted to take a minute to say that.

I'm going to speak generally about policy implementation, and then I'm going to turn to Cyrus on the particular. We've become very -- we've been actually quite focused on policy implementation issues and understanding where we have all of these sources of community recommendations, their policy development process, review team processes, cross-community working groups, and they all have implementation cycles, and we don't actually have a very good formal mechanism for considering at any point in time where we are in the implementation process and what the dependencies on other processes are. And so one of the conversations that we're having this week with respect to -- we're calling it sort of budgeting and prioritization, but you will see that we have proposed some principles for effective recommendations and effective implementation. And one of the things that we'd like to get to is something that involves sort of an implementation register so that we know, at sort of all points in time, what everything -- what all the stuff that's in implementation is, where it is going, how it's moving forward, what the dependencies are, so we can have a clear discussion about the dependencies.

Now, I'm going to defer to Cyrus on the specifics of privacy and proxy, but I just did want to take this moment to point out that this is actually an example of a problem that the Board has identified and wants to address.

Cyrus?


CYRUS NAMAZI:     Thank you very much, Becky, and thank you, Dean, for this question again.

I'll go back to the first part of your question in regards to what you characterize as unilaterally stopping the implementation of a consensus policy. I hope that's not the perception that we have left you with.

We in the ICANN org take our role as implementers of consensus policy quite seriously and follow the GNSO recommendations to the letter, basically. In particular in regards to privacy and proxy, this was not a unilateral decision nor was it actually taken lightly. As you likely know, this was is in alignment with the IRT. We actually consulted with GNSO Council. I'm sure you've seen the letter that I wrote to them and asked for their guidance. They came back and said there was varying degrees of opinion, and they couldn't reach a particular single consensus on this and deferred it back to us.

Now, our judgment has been that based on where we are in implementation of Phase 1 of EPDP as well as the policy development process that's going on in Phase 2 of EPDP, there are certain unknowns that would be basically necessary in successfully completing the privacy/proxy policy implementation. This has to do with data processing agreements that are not in place yet. This has to do with the

system for accredited access which is the SSAD that Phase 2 is looking at, and a number of other open issues.

I know the policy itself, the privacy/proxy policy itself has actually prescriptions on accessing data for intellectual property, for law enforcement, and I believe that actually in Phase 2 this is being looked at as perhaps being a template for an expanded model for accessing data.

And I'll be very frank with you. As you likely know, part of the recommendation 27 of Phase 1 of EPDP also has to do with a review of all the policies and procedures that may be impacted by Phase 1's consensus policy. And so far we've identified at least a dozen policies that are going to be materially impacted by the change in the nature of registration data services consensus policy.

All of this is going to take a lot of time and energy and review of all these policies that most of which are actually in various stages of implementation. We have to go back and review them. From our perspective, privacy/proxy falls into that category.

DEAN MARKS:             Thank you, Cyrus. The explanation is helpful. I understand, you know, the view of org is that there are unknowns in the policy and disclosure framework that have some dependencies on the EPDP or the guidance that may be obtained from the Data Protection Board. We would just, again, urge to know that the policy went through the whole process. GNSO Council has not advised to put a hold on it. My understanding is

there was no consultation with the Implementation Review Team when the hold was put on, so I do consider that somewhat unilateral. If you believe there was consultation with the Implementation Review Team and a discussion before the implementation review was put on hold, I'd love to understand that, because that was not my understanding.

And so if you or anyone else could speak to that and why the process is that there was no discussion with the Implementation Review Team and the decision came straight from ICANN org, I think it's a worthwhile question to be discussed here and now.

BECKY BURR:	So I can't actually speak to that off the top of my head. I promise to get back -- to look into it and get back to you.

DEAN MARKS:	Thank you so much, Becky. I'd appreciate that, Becky. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:	Thanks. Thanks very much for that discussion. So we are moving ahead with other discussions.

At first, still the BC, isn't it? Have us overlapping here a little bit.

STEVE DelBIANCO:	Wolf, It's Steve DelBianco from the BC. To close off on number one, I wanted to mention that as we wait on the Data Protection Board for guidance that we hope will be clear and hope will be timely, we may, in

the communities' Implementation Review Team for Phase 1 decide to push ahead, on a consensus basis, push ahead with something the contract parties want to do and that we desperately need, recommendation 18 setting up a standardized system where we make a query and get a reply that acknowledges it, that there's a standardized format. There's no automated disclosure under that system, but at least there's an automated submission and acknowledgment.

The contracted parties would like to be able to start building that. We had a meeting with them yesterday. We're going to do our best to get consensus in the IRT, Implementation Review Team, on that. If we do, we're going to ask board and org to be flexible and allow one recommendation to proceed while the rest are still being worked on in the need of urgency, because right now we're not getting the response we need from these queries.

So that's just a request to be -- to be ready to be flexible in case a single recommendation moves ahead of the rest.

Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:    Okay. Thanks very much.

So let me close that part. And the next question from -- still BC? You're the one?

I'm sorry. Oh, okay. I'm sorry about to see that because we decided first to go constituency by constituency. That was in my head. But I take it. No problem. Number two is next steps on ICANN reviews.

So it's on myself here. Yesterday I was participating in a session here in the afternoon about improvement of a user. It was very helpful, very good session on that. And I intervened there, and I would like also to place this question here to the Board, with regards to the effectiveness of reviews and how to better deal with that. So that comes from my experience from the -- having taken part in two roost of the GNSO, and even I was co-chairing the implementation of the last review. And so I thought that it took us for more than four years to go through that cycle from beginning, having the first ideas about the review and then implementing that.

The one question is here we -- again, from my side, with regards to the oversight. I'll give you an example.

So when we start the reviews, we get all the support from ICANN, from ICANN org. With the staff, and we get funds for hiring an external advisor for helping us and so on. But after, it seems to me that the real oversight in terms of timing and these things, so overlooking that, should be -- to some extent should be done, should come from a higher level. From the Board, I would say. And that is what I was missing there. Because when we're talking about, you know, be more effective, being more -- saving time on that, there should be really -- somebody should be in charge of that, overseeing that.

It's not just saying, okay, that's the community.  They should do that.  The community is working on -- also on all these things, on discussions and on consensus level, and everybody is going to be asked.  But in the end, every time come up and saying we have additional questions or we need more time and so on and so on.  But somebody should say, from my point of view here, okay, there's a deadline and you keep it.  And I'm of the opinion if a deadline is really set by an oversight body, so it will be taken into consideration.

So that's our -- not concern, but our observation with that.  And I would like to hear whether there is some observation on the Board side as well.

MATTHEW SHEARS:          Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.  Avri is going to kick us off here.

AVRI DORIA:                    Yes.  It is actually an interesting and somewhat difficult question in that the Board is always very careful with those issues of telling a community review what they can and can't do, especially on those reviews that are, for example, specific reviews where those are reviews that are sort of oversight, the bottom-up oversight of the organization and of the Board itself.

So to say we've set a deadline and you have to keep -- and certainly we do try, for example, with ATRT, committed to its one year, but other reviews really haven't had a deadline.

One of the things that is being looked at in the OEC at the moment is the notion of should other reviews have limited durations. Part of what we're doing there is waiting for ATRT to come back and give us advice on what it is we're supposed to do about reviews. I don't know if you know that basically they're looking at reviews and looking at making perhaps some radical recommendations on how to change them.

So there is that -- one step that's been taken is certainly each review is given a certain budget and is helped by the BC -- I mean by the -- I'm talking to the BC -- is helped by the org to sort of keep within that. When a review asks for further time, asks for further funding, that is reviewed by the Board and then would either be approved or not, and such.

But I think that there's really a big problem in the Board sort of stepping in and saying you've had enough time. It's the same problem we've had when we have the caucuses in the board that work on the specific topics of a review where when we're asked a question, there's a lot of comfort in answering the question. But when we haven't been asked the question, the sort of careful, gingerly, not wanting to put fingers on the scales of what's being decided.

So I agree with your question. I sort of understand the "Board you need to help a little with getting things done" and such, but we also have to be incredibly careful not to sort of disturb the bottom-up nature of the reviews. And so it's more of a help than a telling.

As I say, we are now looking at various things to help various timing mechanisms, various assistive mechanisms, various things like that. We're also waiting for ATRT to sort of tell us what's going to happen with

reviews in general or what they recommend happen with reviews in general.  So some of that.

There is the work that Becky's caucus on budget and priorities did on sort of giving advice on how to -- how to create a good recommendation that is helpful in terms of budgeting and how to do that, and she's already talked about that stuff somewhat already.

So we're trying to help, and I think it's going the direction you're looking, but we'll really be very careful not to presuppose, not to command, not to do anything more than help.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:       Thanks for that, Avri.  But it's fairly good, and it's really clear.

So I didn't want, you know, really to have a kind of, let me say, top-down, you know, approach here to say, okay, to do that.  But, you know, we all want to have it to make shorter.  So we are looking for ways to do that.

And one of the thing -- the other things in that context is, you know, when it comes to that that we are -- that we have, let me say, set up a team for starting the review, the review so at this moment there could be -- could come also ideas from the Board into that team, to all that team, giving a sort of guidance for that.  Not just letting this team, you know, meandering through the whole stuff.  So from a kind of idea.

And there might be ideas including also deadlines, thinking about that from your experience.

So that's my…

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, to add, for example there is an initial stage. One of the things that we started doing now is basically we do review the scope, we do review the work plan. So those things are being established in the reviews now.

Now the degree to which the Board would try to hold a review to that work plan remains to be seen because we haven't really run into many difficulties, but there really is a need to be careful.

So if we see that a review isn't keeping to its plan, is going beyond its scope, there certainly would be a conversation, a how-can-we-help type of conversation.

So, you know, gently working with reviews is something that's definitely envisaged and something that's actually started. And we have that, and we're still learning in the process of how to best do that without, as you say, without being top-down but without being completely laissez faire, how do we help a review achieve its goals, the timelines it set, the scope it set.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Any other comment to that? You, Matthew?

| MATTHEW SHEARS: | Yeah.  I just wanted to reinforce what Avri said.  We, as a Board, are looking holistically at this issue.  So -- And we're doing it through, as Avri said, through looking at timing, we're doing it through presenting principles on what might consist of an effective recommendation, what it might have to do, what it might have to look at. |
|---|---|
| | So I think that what we're trying to do is through looking at prioritization budgeting, how do you -- scoping in the sense of what is an effective recommendation, for example.  We're trying to put a set of ideas and principles out there that will help make these recommendations and these reviews perhaps more effective and more timely. |
| | So we hope -- It's not a direct oversight, but we're hoping these improvements will actually help those reviews be more effective without actually having to impose from the top, which is of course something we don't want to do.  Hope that helps. |
| WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: | Thanks, Matthew.  I saw that yesterday introduced by Becky, so -- and I'm fully in agreement with that. |
| | So when we had our reviews, so it reminded me, so we did that things, you know, creating ideas how we can do that, and there are a lot of things have been taken over. |
| | It would be good now to have this in a kind of -- kind of standardized form, you know, as a basis for -- for all who are working on reviews. |

SARAH DEUTSCH:    Yes, thank you, Matthew.  I would like to add in terms of the reviews, some of the responsibility also falls to the Board.  And one of the things we're looking at is the role of the Board liaison.  And we're going to be talking to community leaders and ultimately to all of you to find out how we can be more effective, how we can help in this role.  And, you know, we do think that role plays a valuable place in the system here, and we also want to make our portion of this better.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:    Thanks very much.

So if there's nothing about that, so let me move ahead to the next -- sorry, it's ISPCP again.  It is about the DoH and future identifier.

Let's hand it over to Tony Holmes, I suspect.

TONY HOLMES:    Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich.

To start with, I think from our constituency we would like to recognize the efforts made by OCTO recently in terms of working on future identifiers, producing a few papers that have been quite informative and quite helpful to the community.  So we recognize that as certainly a positive step.

The issue that we bring to the table here is really one of awareness, because certainly DoH or DNS over HTTPS is something that has been

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL 66
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

raised in ICANN before, and I think interest in that is building. There's a lot of activity taking place here, driven an awful lot by the rounds for an application side of the industry, and it's been progressed in various standards organizations. But there's a lot of discussion around this, not only those international bodies but also in many national organizations across the piece. And if you look from the outside, there is potentially some positives that come out of this. Certainly in terms of the protocol, then from their perspective it delivers good privacy and security aspects but it also brings many challenges with it. None more so than for the ISPs as part of the ICANN community.

So we have looked quite carefully at this, having an interest in how this discussion goes, and we certainly believe that there is a strong case to make sure, across our part of the industry, there is a really broad awareness of the issues that come with this. In terms of implementation, it will certainly have an impact on our business, and potentially the way the Internet operates in the future.

So we have decided as a constituency that we are going to look to produce a paper on DoH, and that will outline what is being proposed. It will outline many of the issues from an ISP perspective. And we are looking, then, to make sure that the broader parts of our membership, being aware that not everyone can get to an ICANN meeting, gets the level of information required. And we'll have some further discussion upon that.

So really it's bringing attention to that and inviting members of the Board, and also the broader ICANN community who may have an

interest in this particular area, to discuss with us as a constituency being at the very heart of some of the contentious areas. As this moves forward, we welcome your engagement and to make sure that we have the level of understanding and not misunderstanding that certainly was the starting point of discussion around this issue.

So really it's for awareness and welcome any input or feedback or discussions with us offline on this particular topic.

It's an ongoing issue for the ISPCP.

Thank you.


WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:        Goran.


GORAN MARBY:        Thank you very much.

Thank you for bringing this to Board's attention. I also want to bring to your attention that OCTO has presented a paper about this. I also know that the SSAC is in the work of presenting a paper about this. And if you didn't know it, your own organization in Belgium -- what's the name of it? The -- Sorry?


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:        It's ETNO.

GORAN MARBY:    ETNO -- sorry -- has also presented a paper.  So there's a lot of papers around it.  But I look forward to your conversations with OCTO about this.

Thank you very much.

AKINORI MAEMURA:    Thank you very much.  Akinori Maemura for the record.

Almost all thing is said by Goran.

At the ICANN Board, especially it's Technical Committee is really interested in the developments by this kind of new technology around the DoH and the DoT.  And then I'm really happy you shared your perspectives and the input for the future, and let's talk about that.

Thank you very much.

TONY HOLMES:    Thank you, first to welcome the comments we received back.  It is appreciated that as ISPs we come at this probably from a certain perspective, a certain viewpoint.  But the fact we are meeting here as ISPs as part of the ICANN community, putting forward something that really helps our membership get to grips with that was the focus for this.  But we're very pleased to work with the other parts of the organization in moving this forward.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:     Tony, I think this is very welcomed, not the least of which because we have identified as part of our strategic plan the need to understand trends broadly.   And that, of course, includes technical trends and Internet architecture trends and routing trends as well.   Thanks very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:     Thank you for this part.   And moving ahead, next question, so now we see global public interest framework.

STEVE DelBIANCO:     Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.   Steve DelBianco.   We discussed for well over an hour yesterday with Avri, with Matthew and Leon this topic in a specific session designed for it.   And it was an excellent discussion.   We'd prefer then to just jump to our only other intervention with this slide and skip over the global public interest framework, which brings us to the topic of DNS abuse.

You are well aware of the GAC's statement of DNS abuse in September. The BC did its own statement in late October.   A lot of that was, I think, supplemented by the work of PIR and ten other large registries and registrars that came up with the DNS abuse framework last week and published it out.   The BC is completely in support of that kind of independent action being taken by responsible parties in the DNS and ICANN ecosystem.   We're quite pleased and we want to stand ready to help PIR and others who signed on to do it well.

What we worry more about is a thousand or so rogue registrars who won't sign that document who don't belong to the Registrars Stakeholder Group and are never seen at an ICANN meeting. Because of that we are particularly concerned and don't agree with the final part of that framework published by PIR and the others. That's where they characterize ICANN's role as being limited to hosting conversations about things. And they come to that conclusion because they cite the ICANN bylaws provision, which was added as part of the transition. The ICANN bylaw provision (1)(c) is quoted in the framework that they came up with where ICANN shall not impose rules and restrictions on services that use the Internet's unique identifiers or on content that the services carrier provide outside the expressed scope and if that is the end of the story and ICANN has no role.

So our purpose in discussing this with you is not to say that the PIR framework was inappropriate. It just simply closed the door too early on ICANN's role. And ICANN's role is not necessary for the companies to sign the framework. It's necessary for the companies that would never sign the framework. And for those companies, you do have a role because right below Section 1.1(c), which they quoted from the bylaws -- we're glad to have Becky Burr here with us because it was Becky, Matthew, Leon, Avri, all of us were part of that three-year forced-march episode of the IANA transition.

And near the end of that episode, as we tried to draw a limited scope around ICANN's remit, we became very concerned that that tight, little limited scope could be used to blow up the public interest commitment

Specification 11 in the registry agreements which had just been finalized before the transition began.

So Becky led the way on designing the rest of 1.1(c) which picks up at 1.1(d). I won't read it all. I will summarize it for you. But it starts with a great phrase, "For the avoidance of doubt and not withstanding the forgoing," it goes on to say, "ICANN can enforce the Registry Agreements that were in place in 2013 up to 2016" and, quote, ICANN shall have the ability to negotiate, enter into -- and here's the keyword -- enforce agreements including public interest commitments with any party in service of its mission.

I was very grateful at the time and look forward to Becky helping to explain that because I believe that was designed specifically to protect from challenge the public interest commitment known as Specification 11.

So why do I bring that up to you? The very end of Specification 11 goes right to the heart of DNS abuse that we're worried about. It requires that every registry who is selling names, distributing names in the new TLDs, to have each of its registrars have a policy and impose consequences on any registrant who distributes malware, botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, or counterfeiting, otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.

So a lot of us felt so good about the protection clause -- we called it the grandfather clause or the grandmother clause at the time because it

grandfathered in the previous agreements and protected them from the way the new bylaws drew limits around ICANN's scope.

That would suggest that the PIR framework sells ICANN short, as that ICANN can do more.

I wanted to see if we could clarify that understanding on the part of the Board and the author of it and then go on to discuss what we can do to actually use that power.  Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:     Becky, please, go ahead.

BECKY BURR:     So Steve is absolutely correct.  And many of us around this table understand that in the transition bylaws we defined ICANN's mission as an enumerated mission, and we included -- we grandfathered into that the existing Registry Accreditation Agreements and the Registry Agreements, and that would include Specification 11.

And Specification 11 as Steve mentions does require registrars to include a provision in their agreements with -- registries to include a provision in their agreement with registrars that requires registrars to include that prohibition, that provision in end users' agreements.

So I, frankly, did not read the PIR framework as you're calling it to be excluding that or discounting that.  I think they're pretty clear it's a -- sets the sort of bottom.  There can be more.

I do want to take one moment and be a little bit controversial. I am not going to opine on what Spec 11(3)(a) requires because I think it would be inappropriate for me to do that.

But I will say that this does point out to me a problem about attempting to use the contracting process to route around the policy development process.

What it allows and what it allows ICANN to enforce and all of those things, that is to be tested. There is a PIC DRP and ICANN does have enforcement processes. All of those things are there. But I think that the -- if you want to have very clear understanding about what the -- let me say this in a different way.

I really think that we are best served when we look at the contracts between ICANN and the contracted parties as a commercial agreement between ICANN and contracted parties and we look at the policy development process as the way for the community to impose rules and obligations on the contracted parties. I think you will get better results, and I think you will be less disappointed than people are about this provision.

STEVE DelBIANCO:       Thank you very much, Becky.

To suggest that we're disappointed could have two different routes. One would be a conclusion that ICANN can't do anything, even when given evidence that a registrar is not imposing any consequences, including suspension of the domain name in accordance with

Specification 11. If ICANN cannot do anything in the face of that evidence, the disappointment would be there for sure.

So are we ready -- are we ready to give up on ICANN having any capability at enforcing what we told the whole world back in 2013 was going to help to safeguard the public interest and be a public interest commitment? We went to the effort of grandfathering it in when we did the transition bylaws and it was part of what we promised the world. But you're right, we would be disappointed if you can't enforce that in any way.

Is that what you are really saying?

BECKY BURR:              Actually, that's not what I'm saying. As I said, I'm not going to interpret that because I really do think it would be inappropriate for me to do that.

There is a provision for ICANN to enforce it. There's also the PIC DRP mechanism for enforcing that. All I'm saying is that those words mean something on paper and ICANN clearly has in Spec 11 the right to enforce violations of the public interest commitments, and that is within ICANN's mission.

STEVE DelBIANCO:        Becky, that's helpful. I'm well aware of the abundance of time and patience it would take to go through another policy development process to come up with a PIC offense-type policy, which is different

than the black letter words that are in contracts. But when the black letter words are right there, you can sense our eagerness to use them.

If in this case, it's not at all clear how we can use them, I'd like to have Mason Cole, who is also in the BC, to ask you about one other provision. This time it's not in the Registry Agreement but in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, the very same ones that are grandfathered in at the time.

Mason.


MASON COLE:              Thank you, Steve.

Mason Cole with the business constituency. I did want to ask about an agreement on the other side of the house, specifically on the RAA. And to be very specific, it has to do with Section 5.5.2.1.3, which would -- hold on, Steve -- which would allow ICANN to seek declaratory judgment in a registrar's home jurisdiction that it is knowingly permitting illegal activity and then terminate the agreement.

So this is an opportunity for ICANN to take a stand on abuse. And to be specific about what the provision says, 5.5.2.1 says, "ICANN can terminate the registrar if it is convicted by a court of competent jurisdiction of a felony or other serious offense related to financial activities or is judged by a court of competent jurisdiction to have with actual knowledge or through gross negligence permitted illegal activity in the registration or use of domain names."

Is this a provision that ICANN is willing to enforce?

BECKY BURR: So contract enforcement is not in the purview of the Board. The Board has an oversight obligation, but the Board does not make calls about contract compliance.

So I'm going to turn to Goran or Jamie on that one.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Please. Further questions of the Board, please.

STEVE DelBIANCO: While he's coming up, part of his segue, Becky, to raise it now was that it's another of the tools that we protected with that grandfather clause. That's the relevance, I think, to the Board and those of you who helped to write that.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thank you. With respect to the previous discussion about Spec 11, we just did an audit of the registries on Spec 11(3)(b). So the suggestion that we don't enforce Spec 11 I don't think is completely accurate.

We do continue to work with -- sorry. We should back up and say that we also published a report not that long ago on the registry audit where we found 5% of the registries not in compliance with Spec 11(3)(b). They all were remediated, and now all the registries are found to be in compliance.

Mason, the thing that you just suggested, if someone were to file a complaint that a registrar had, in fact, received this court-ordered -- this declaratory ruling from a court of competent jurisdiction, we would, of course, enforce it. We have not on our own gone into court to find a registrar in violation of, you know, laws. But we -- but if there were a registrar who was, in fact, so convicted, we would, of course, take action against that.

STEVE DelBIANCO: Thank you, Jamie. I think you've concluded -- confirmed our worst submissions about the disappointment we should have in the PIC spec, in that an audit of the registry simply revealed whether or not a registry's -- registrars had the policy in writing. 5% didn't and you were then satisfied that they simply forced those registrars to put it in writing. There's no leverage from your compliance department, though, to enforce those registrars following through on that by taking action, including suspension.

JAMIE HEDLUND: We're talking about two different provisions right now. Spec 11(3)(b) is about the obligation of registries to scan their zone, report -- monitor their zones for security threats, create a report, provide that report to ICANN compliance. And that was -- in the vast majority of cases, 95% of the registries did, in fact, comply with Spec 11(3)(b).

I mention it because we enforce the provisions in the contract as they are, and so...

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:    Thanks for that.

I think we might get to this conversation also following in other circles in detail.

I'm wondering whether we covered both at the time, being global public interest and DNS abuse?  Are we done with that?

Cherine, we have saved time.  I can see being so organized, it fits with your schedule as well.

Are there any other questions?  Still one but the very last one.

But before -- I have to be brief because Cherine has to leave right now.

So I wanted to say a few words to him and thank him for his dedication to the work over the last years here and especially for taking his time to discuss with us at every ICANN meetings.  So, Cherine, thank you very much for that.  Wish you -- we wish you all the best time and see you around hopefully.

[ Applause ]


CHERINE CHALABY:    Thank you very much.


WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:    Now to your question, please.

JENNIFER GORE:     Jennifer Gore with the IPC.  First, I would like to express the IPC's support for the concern that the BC has as it relates to DNS abuse.

Becky, thank you for stating that the Board is focusing their efforts on policy implementation.  Well aware that there's a lack of insight as far as which policies have been implemented and which ones are still on hold.

Today all the ICANN-accredited registrars are on the 2013 agreement.  Within that agreement, there's a WHOIS specification that requires registrars to validate that all postal code fields are consistent where such information is technically and commercially feasible within an applicable territory or country, otherwise known as across-field address validation.

ICANN has identified several solutions that are deemed to be commercially technically unfeasible.

Article 5 of the GDPR addresses data accuracy.  It states the data is to be kept accurate under every reasonable means.  Article 5 also addresses inaccuracy data that should be erased or rectified without delay.

Under the proposed SSAD UAM model within the EPDP

Phase 2, it is of the utmost important that once a data requester does, one, garner access to the data and, two, receives the response to the nonpublic registration data, the data needs to be accurate as possible.

So for six years, the RAA has been in place.  For six years, ICANN has been enforcing the RAA.  For six years, the IPC and the BC have been seeking an answer to this contractual obligation.

How and when can the Board hopefully intervene and focus the org's effort on this implementation and enforcement of this current contractual obligation?

MATTHEW SHEARS:          Goran or perhaps --

GORAN MARBY:              We've been trying for six years to make the obligation to work.  And it seems that one of the problems is that address systems doesn't work the way it is anticipated despite the efforts, including many ways of looking into the system.  Maybe North America and I think Canada, maybe U.K. is using the same sort of addressing system.

It's been a very long road, and it's been very hard to be able to do this.  And you know that very well.  I actually have another background as well.

I was the founding father -- I'm one of the founding fathers of the European Regulators for Postal Services and also representatives in the UPU, which actually tells me it's hard to implement things that the addressing system doesn't work the same way in the world.

I will ask Cyrus to help me with the rest of the answer.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Hello.  Okay.  Thank you very much, Goran.  Thank you, Jennifer, for your question.

Yes, it's been a number of years.  In fact, of all people, you would know.  You were in charge of this particular service when you worked for the org.

But the gist of it is we have not been able to come up with a solution that is technically and commercially feasible to the agreement of both parties.  Both parties in this case being both the ICANN org as well as the registrars.

So our determination has been to focus our resources on other work that's on the pipeline for us.  Put this one on hold for the time being, revisit it in perhaps a year or so to see if newer solutions have come about that can actually meet the criteria that's specified in the RAA.  Thanks.

JENNIFER GORE: Thanks, Cyrus.  Thanks, Goran.

I would just like to identify that the RFI that was put out by ICANN in 2016 and 2017 did identify several commercially feasible solutions to this issue.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:	Okay.  Thanks for these questions and reactions.

Last question?  Is there any question open?  Not yet in this circle.

So we really saved some time.  Thank you very much for doing this.

And I hand over back to Matthew, please.


MATTHEW SHEARS:	Just wanted to check, is there any last comments from any of the Board members?  No.  Okay.  Wonderful.  Thank you very much, everybody. We'll bring this session to a close and save you a wee bit of time. Thanks.


**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**