ICANN74 | Policy Forum – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Meeting
Thursday, June 16, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 AMS

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello, and welcome to the ISPCP Membership meeting. 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 the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form, which I will note in the chat shortly. Taking part via audio, if you are remote, please wait until you are called upon and unmute your Zoom microphone. For those of you in the main room, please raise your hand in Zoom, and when called upon, unmute your table mic. In the secondary room, please raise your hand in Zoom and go to the stand-alone mic when called upon.

For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. Please begin.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank very much, Andrea. Hello to everybody participating in this room in person or remotely. We are still waiting for some people actively participating here in the room, but we can start with the agenda as usual. Welcome also to guests to the ISPCP here. We are a constituency taking care of issues to be discussed in the circle of ISP, Internet Service Provider and Connectivity Providers, and that's where

we are. So we are discussing policy but mainly also technical aspects of these policies.

With that, let me formally ask you whether there are some statements of interests to be disclosed here in participation? I don't see—none. Thank you very much.

We welcome also our Council member, Thomas Rickert, on time. Thomas, we just would like to start a little bit talking about the takeaways from the Council meetings here in The Hague, and what it means for our constituencies for the future work. Could you just give us a very brief overview on that, and then maybe also touch on what is important for us here?

THOMAS RICKERT: Sure. Thank you so much, Wolf-Ulrich. Sorry for being late. In parallel to the session, there is the GNSO Council-DNS abuse small team session. So I will need to go to the other room later to attend that because I'm part of that small team as well.

We had a GNSO Council session yesterday. And actually, there was just one resolution that was unanimously passed. That was on the EPDP on Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs. That's a topic that those of you who've been around for the last 10-12 years, they haven't had a couple of months without IGO discussions. So that's a topic that's been discussed in the community for quite a while. Actually, this is the last piece, if you wish, on the curative rights side of things dealing with the possibility for IGOs that cannot register trademarks and that therefore could not previously use the UDRP to open up an

avenue for them to use the UDRP and the URS, the Uniform Rapid Suspension system for the names and also for the acronyms. That's one topic.

The other topic in that context is that these organizations as treaty organizations enjoy immunity. As you will surely know, the UDRP has a provision in it whereby UDRP decisions can be challenged in competent courts. Therefore, if a registrant that loses the UDRP case wishes to challenge the UDRP decision, the IGO could claim its immunity, and then the court would not hear the merits of the case. That was a big issue because it was in the interest of us. Osvaldo was a part of this PDP that the registrant's rights are adequately protected, and therefore, now a compromise was found which was part of the recommendations out of this EPDP that registrants could then use arbitration to have their cases heard. So that that topic, as I mentioned, has been resolved now. So there was a full consensus or unanimous decision in the GNSO Council on that.

I think that as far as the small teams are concerned, there's not too much to report. We have spoken out about the small teams in the previous ISPCP call, so at the moment, we have the small team on the SSAD, where now this idea of an SSAD Light is being discussed, as you will know. And during this meeting, ICANN Org has actually suggested WHOIS disclosure system approach, which is basically sort of a ticketing system where requests for registration data can be submitted, and then they will be passed on to a given registry or registrar for making the disclosure decision, and then disclosing data.

That approach that has been suggested by ICANN Org has received quite a lot of positive feedback. Because I think it's perceived as an important project by most in the community that ICANN delivers on its promise to come up with a system that facilitates the handling of disclosure requests for non-public registration data. So I think that's something that should really be applauded that the Org after having provided us with this Operational Design Assessment, whereby the SSAD development would be very costly and time-consuming, that we now have sort of a feasibility study or test drive for a centralized system that can be operationalized at pretty short notice using ICANN's existing current infrastructure or just building on that.

So I think that's on that on the Council. Before I move to the accuracy topic, I would like to share with you an idea that I'm going to present to Council again, I should say, during today's GNSO Council Wrap-Up session, and that is on how we can potentially tweak our GNSO PDP process. There is a lot of discussion in the community about the time being too long between the GNSO Council submitting policy recommendations to the Board until the Board actually deals with them. So some say that this feels like a black hole in which you throw recommendations and you never know when they're going to resurface again. Also, ICANN has introduced the idea of these Operational Design Phases to spec out the cost and the time and the processes involved with the implementation of recommendations that are coming out of the GNSO. That adds time and complexity. Also, we've seen a lot of recommendations coming out of the GNSO that were not just accepted by the Board. But where the Board has raised concerns, some of the stuff they've sent back to the GNSO Council for

reconsideration. And that either leads to a situation, as with the EPDP SSAD, where we need to come up with completely new approaches, basically, completely rendering GNSO policy mute or where we need to reconvene PDP working groups to revisit the recommendations that they came up with in a consensus call, and that's all bad. That's very time-consuming, and it's bad for ICANN as such, it's bad for the reputation of the multistakeholder community because ICANN is seen by the ICANN world as an organization that doesn't really deliver results.

Therefore, I've given this a lot of thought and one idea that I've already mentioned during the GNSO Council Strategic Planning session is that I would like the PDP process to have one additional step before the PDP working group does the consensus call. When you're chairing a PDP working group, you can sense that at the beginning, everyone is presenting their own views. And then at some point, the group is converging to something that could be a consensus solution. And at that point in time, I think it would be wise for the working group to share the potential recommendations in the draft form with ICANN Org to do something which I call the implementation preview for the Org to check what the implications in terms of time, cost, and other efforts are, and then give that feedback to the PDP working group to enable the PDP working group to readjust its recommendations should there be a need for that.

That would actually have the beauty of killing two birds with the stone. One is that we increase the chances of the recommendations should they be adopted by the GNSO Council to go smoothly through the Board. Because the Board, when they receive recommendations,

they give it to the Org anyway to do exactly that work, right, that we anticipate that step, and thereby facilitate and expedite the process at the Board level. And the second thing is that we have a written documentation of this check, of this test being done. So we have something to go back to should there be concerns at a later stage and say, "Well, actually, we think that you could manage this and the time with this and that budget because you've already done that work and given that to you in writing." So it's sort of also increasing accountability, both at the community as well as the Org level so that we can't ask for all the bells and whistles during the implementation. And the Org also has a playbook, let's say, by which the policy recommendations can be implemented.

Mentioning this to you in that level of granularity or detail, because I certainly welcome your views, because if you think it's a crappy idea, I should bet I keep my mouth shut at the upcoming GNSO Council session. But maybe I should pause for a second and see whether you have any feedback for me on this.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Thomas, for that insight on this interesting discussion about it. I remember, if I'm right, we had a similar discussion before the ODP was imposed. This is the thing. So there was a question also, what is it about the ODP? Is it just a kind of additional work to be imposed here and consuming time in the entire PDP process? What is it about? Could we take some of the elements of the ODP and shift it before the decisions are going to be taken by the Council? It reminds me a little bit. My question would be here—is that what you're talking

about here, before it comes to the consensus call to incorporate such a step here, could that replace to some extent some elements at least from the ODP and help to save time?

THOMAS RICKERT: I hope so. I sincerely hope so. I mean, certainly, this takes place or this shall take place, in my view, before the group does the consensus call. So the recommendations might undergo some refinement or further work by the working group. So I think in that regard, depending on whether they stay the same or they're altered, there might be the need for some additional work at the Org level. But if all goes well, I think this could entirely eliminate the need for an ODP at a later stage. And maybe I should also say that I've been toying with this thought since the IRT PC disaster that we had a couple of years back where a working group has come up with recommendations with the best intentions, but it turns out that there was a design flaw in the recommendations that actually jeopardize domain names, I think, at the transfer level or the data could be disclosed. So there was some complexity. I think that this could have also been avoided had there been a thorough assessment of the impact of the recommendations for the industry during the implementation.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Any other thoughts/comments on that? Christian, please.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: One quick note. I do think that this is a very intelligent solution to an extremely real problem. We, as ISPs, need to have the

multistakeholder model continue to work. And indeed, a lack of sort of good showing through to implementation as of late is something that we cannot ignore and something that we need to work on figuring out how to ensure that ICANN is, as you're saying, producing. I love this idea.

Having been learning a little bit about how European policy works, I'm looking to have the trialogue process works and how they arrive at a political agreement before they go into further technical trialogues to nail down the exact text. I think maybe there's an analogue there that—I don't know. It seems to work in that regard and that could work very well here. So I think it's great work. Thank you. I fully support it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Christian. Anybody else on that?

TONY HOLMES: Wolf-Ulrich, it's Tony. I'll have my hand raised.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Oh, I couldn't see that. So, Andrea, could you help me? I don't see hands here. Yes, Tony, how are you in Africa?

TONY HOLMES: I am fine. Thank you. And I'm sorry I can't be with you all. So it's good to be able to catch up this meeting. On this point, I think there are potentially some good aspects of this. But I think there are also some

negative aspects, if we're not careful. I can see it in some cases being used as a method of making consensus at the consensus call that much harder to achieve, and that could be a good thing or it could be misused.

So I would suggest, Thomas, if the proposal is going to be made to GNSO Council, I think it should be on the basis that we troll this for a period of time and see if it really is helpful or not. I wouldn't want to see it endorsed as change to the PDP without the benefits be improved. So nothing is going to put it forward. And I hope it works, I hope it assists, but I don't think it should become a permanent part of the PDP process until the benefits of this have actually been assessed. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks for that. Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks so much, Tony, for that thoughtful intervention. I think that in order to make this permanent, we would need to change the PDP manual. I think that you are spot-on that we should probably do a test drive with this before we spec out the exact parameters for this that could lead to PDP manual change. Let's not jump the gun here. It's just a little Thomas coming up with an idea. I need to convince Council first that this is a good idea, and then there are some additional steps that need to be taken.

But again, during this week, having seen how many hours we're spending in prioritization discussions and discussions about ODPs and

all that, I think we need to find ways to streamline the process, get better, get faster, get more cost-efficient. And if this is one idea that could spark off a discussion around those things, maybe not exactly what I've suggested, but something of that sort, I think that could help us all focus more on the things that we're really tasked with.

Okay. Wolf-Ulrich, should I say a few words about accuracy as well before we move on?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Not yet. We have other hands up.

THOMAS RICKERT: Oh, I'm sorry.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I heard Susan Mohr's hand is up. Hi, Susan. How are you?

SUSAN MOHR: Hi, Wolf-Ulrich. Hello, everyone. Thomas, thank you so much for your thought on this. I agree that there does seem to be a large amount of time spent on prioritization and sort of revisiting some decisions. I think, in theory, your idea of inserting a step before the consensus agreement is a good one. I understand your early stages, and it's just an idea at this point, it feels like it may result in shifting the ODP prior to a consensus decision and create a fairly large delay before that decision gets made. I think it's a good idea, I agree with the comment on perhaps seeking a trial and scoping out what that structure would

look like. It sounds like you're going down that path but I just wanted to reinforce that thought, and again, appreciate your contribution and in considering something that streamlines the process. So, looking forward to hearing more about that.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you, Susan. We give it to Thomas to take it to the Council. We will be looking forward to hear more in the future. Thomas, we switch over to the next point, data accuracy.

THOMAS RICKERT: Exactly. Thanks so much. On the Data Accuracy Scoping Team. Now, the Scoping Team is tasked to take a look at data accuracy, but what we're really lacking is data, and to determine whether there's smoke or whether there's fire.

During this week's session of the Accuracy Scoping Team, there was quite some discussion around whether the work of the small team should be paused or ended. Until such time when the working group is or the GNSO is provided with data based on which the Scoping Team can actually come up with suggestions on how to deal with the accuracy topic.

Now, we basically have two camps in the small team. One is in favor of pausing or ending the small team and reconvening the work once we are in a position to take a look at data. The other fraction or the other team is eager to continue the work maybe at a slower pace, moving from weekly to biweekly meetings or something of that sort. I, for one, think that the notion of us needing data to conduct our work is a very

valid one. I think that we should probably not have too many open small teams. Small teams can easily be formed, they can also easily be disbanded, and I think that pausing something and reconvening it might be maybe more cumbersome than just ending this exercise now until such point in time when we have the data to actually do the task of writing a meaningful report to Council.

Again, the small team is not tasked with coming up with solutions for the accuracy topic, but it's just a scoping team that shall help the GNSO Council to assess what, if any, policy work in the area of maybe renegotiating the contracts in the area of accuracy should be taken. So my suggestion to the ISPCP would be that we join the team of those who are in favor of ending this work for the time being and reconvening it once we have database in which we can do the work.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for this, Thomas. [Inaudible] judgment at the time being on the work of this group is hoping to gain. Now, we have interest from a technical point of view to some extent. There may be many aspects maybe also coming up, showing up there. What is the balance? What would you say here and how much we are affected here?

THOMAS RICKERT: I'm not sure I heard the question right. The question was on how long it will take until the work can be … This is difficult for me to say. I think that pretty much everything, the options or legal asset that we're getting. This idea of actually pausing or ending the small team was only discussed this week, that during the next call we will get more

clarity what the implications and timing would be. But the technical as well as the operational as well as the legal aspects of this of once we have data, but I'll report back to this group once I have information on that.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Are there any comments, any questions to Thomas? You got to chance. Because he has to leave the meeting. We are continuing the debate internally with that. Thank you, Thomas, for your contribution.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you so much. Sorry for joining [late]. [Inaudible] right next to this one.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Next we have on the agenda from ICANN OCTO. People here [inaudible] or Yrjo? They're not yet here in the room maybe. They will come later. So we are flexible in our agenda. Then, Karen, I'm happy to have you here, Karen Lentz from ICANN Org and her team who are heavily working on the ODP of SubPro. We had an internal debate about that as well and had some questions to you. We would like to welcome—you had a chance already. We'll also follow in the big meetings on Monday, interesting to hear about predictability and these issues. We have some questions related to IDNs specifically and others. But if you could, just for the audience here also, just to summarize a little bit, so we have 15 to 20 minutes available for that. Thank you very much, and welcome.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you. Thank you for the invitation to come join you today. My name is Karen Lentz. I work in the Global Domains and Strategy area of ICANN. With me are some team members who are also working on the SubPro ODP that includes here in the room, Sarmad Hussain and Chris Bare. Also on the Zoom Room, Lars Hoffman is working on this as well as part of the team. So we had a couple of slides. Oh, there they are. I'll just, as you suggested, remind people of what the ODP is. Next slide, please.

We'll remind you of what the ODP is, and then the top two topics that you mentioned for discussion were IDNs and name collision. So we will touch a bit on those, and then go to any questions. Next, please.

As I think most people know, the objective of the Operational Design Phase is to review and assess the impact of a set of policy recommendations. So in this case, we're looking at the Subsequent Procedures recommendations that talk about getting to a new gTLD application round. The information that we developed in terms of the operational impact goes into a report that is called the Operational Design Assessment, and that is meant to inform the ICANN Board's decision and consideration on the recommendations. I'll add here that I thought the suggestion by Thomas of considering some of these implementation questions during the PDP as a preview step that that was also quite interesting as a possibility to collaborate on some of this work. Next, please.

I think Chris is going to cover the timeline, and then we'll go to you, Sarmad.

CHRIS BARE: Thank you, Karen. My name is Chris Bare, and I work on the Strategic Initiatives Team under the Global Domains and Strategy Group. What you see on the screen here is a high level timeline that represents the ODP itself. As you may recall, the Board in their resolution said that the ODP should take 10 months, and that is what's reflected here. You'll notice that the start date is in January, and the end date is towards the end of October.

The small red arrow indicates where we are. You'll see that there's three items in blue and those actually reflect the ICANN meetings throughout the year. There are also three items in green and that reflects the community status updates, which are basically reports that we put out during those timeframes. We have another one coming up in August, as you can see.

The other thing you'll notice on here is the item in red, which is our pens down, and that's an internal indicator to ourselves is when we should be pretty much finalizing our contents to be ready to put it together for the Board. That has changed since prior versions. We had it just before ICANN75 but we realized that with preparations for ICANN75, it was more realistic to have the pens down after that, and that's what's reflected here. I believe that's all we have on this one. We go to the next slide. Okay.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: This is Sarmad Hussain. I am with the IDN and UA Programs within GDS at ICANN. Just to give you a brief overview of IDNs and UA in the

context of SubPro. Just as a bit of background, you all know that it's ICANN mission to help ensure stable, secure, and unified global Internet. If we look at the use of Latin script, it's only used by about a third of world population, and even a smaller percentage for languages which just use letters A through Z. So to, of course, make the domain name system accessible to the rest of the world, the IDNs or domain names in other languages and scripts need to be supported.

So for the top level, we've been working with the community over past many years to determine what would be good rules to develop or determine valid top-level domain and their variant labels through what is called the Root Zone LGR. We are now at a stage where we've completed the work of all the active script panels and integrated 26 of the 28 scripts which were originally identified to be in the Root Zone LGR. Earlier this month, we published the fifth version of Rules on LGR which actually integrates all these scripts. Next slide, please.

So, as far as the SubPro is concerned, SubPro reaffirms to continue to support IDN gTLDs. One of the main things which has been asked by the community over the past many years was also allow for IDN variant TLDs. Initially back in 2010, as we did not know much about what variants are and how they should be managed, there was a Board resolution which said that variants of IDN gTLDs will not be available or delegated until we know what IDN variant TLD management mechanisms are.

So, there were two, I guess, problems which had had to be solved first. We needed a consistent definition of variant TLDs across the scripts.

And then we also needed variant TLD management mechanisms. That work was done by the community. Root Zone LGR addresses the first question on what is a valid top-level domain in a particular script through the Root Zone LGR, and also identifies the variant levels as defined by those communities. Also there was a staff paper in which we work with developing variant TLD management mechanisms and propose some recommendations.

So, SubPro has incorporated the Root Zone LGR in its policy recommendations to address the first part of the questions the Board actually had raised and also incorporates many of the recommendations in the staff paper to address the variant TLD management mechanisms. So based on the definition of TLDs using Root Zone LGR and management solution proposed, SubPro now attempts to address the concerns in the 2010 Board resolution to allow for moving forward with the application and delegation IDN variant TLDs. So, in addition to supporting IDNs which was already there in the 2012 round, this is a significant addition for IDNs in the next new gTLD round.

As part of that staff recommendations, there were some high-level recommendations provided, but then there was additional analysis provided on how those recommendations will impact the application and operation for IDN variant TLDs. That part was not completely analyzed by SubPro. So GNSO has actually started an additional policy development process specifically on IDNs which is now working on those details and will advise on how to address some of those details. So in some ways, the work on variant TLDs is also going to be

dependent on the recommendations which come out through the IDN EPDP process which is currently underway. Next slide, please.

So, on the UA side, of course, for those of you who are not familiar, Universal Acceptance means that all domain names and e-mail addresses work in all applications. And it is, of course, critical to the commercial success of the new longer and local language top-level domains, including those from the previous new gTLD round from 2012, as well as those which are expected to come in in the next new gTLD round. So, of course, if and all applications are UA-ready, they provide broader access to potential registrants and also better serve the current registrants.

We actually have a very active community group, it's called Universal Acceptance Steering Group, which is working very hard through its different working groups to identify and address the UA challenges. There is still a reasonable gap. Just to share some numbers that we've recently done. We do studies on how, for example, e-mail addresses in Chinese or Arabic may be accepted by different websites. We found that still if you are using a Chinese e-mail address, almost about 89% or 90% of the websites reject that e-mail address, saying that it is actually an invalid e-mail address even though it is valid. So that's a large gap.

On the e-mail side, what we do is—we are now on a quarterly basis—pinging all the mail servers which are listed in the gTLD zone file. So we have access to about 35 million mail servers, about 2.5 million IP addresses. What we do is on quarterly basis, we actually send all those mail servers a Chinese e-mail address or an Arabic e-mail address or a

Cyrillic e-mail address, to find out how many of them actually respond to such e-mail addresses. The latest figures from last quarter, we have 7.34% of the mail servers are responding to such e-mail addresses, which means that still about more than 90% of the mail servers are not configured to support e-mails in local languages. So we still see a reasonable gap.

In addition to these gaps, the USG has looked at a host of technologies. We have found issues and we are in the process of now reaching out to those players to fix those issues. But one thing to appreciate is that this really includes a much broader community globally, it's not just within ICANN space, and so it is a slower process. As far as the SubPro recommendations are concerned, the SubPro has suggested that as part of the application process, ICANN should make available the status of UA or Universal Acceptance to all the applicants so that they are aware of the limitations. We do publish and will report on UA-readiness globally. We'll continue to do that and make that available to the applicants as asked by the SubPro recommendation as well. Let me stop here. Thank you. We'll take any questions. But before that, I hand it back to Karen. Thank you.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Sarmad. Can we go to the next slide? I know you had some questions. I'll just give a couple of remarks on name collision, as you flagged this for us also. What you see on this screen there are the recommendations from the SubPro Working Group, what they said on the name collision topic. The key recommendation was to have a

mechanism for evaluating risk, both during the evaluation of an application and after a TLD is delegated.

There is work going on that's supported by SSAC called the Name Collision Analysis Project that involves a series of studies. If you were at the NCAP session here this week, that group talked about approaching name collision as a risk management problem. They did suggest some mechanisms that they were discussing to help evaluate and manage risk, which included especially the ability to identify high risk strings, make sure the applicants had that information before they applied, and also to collect key data to help inform some of those recommendations.

So the scope and when it comes to the Operational Design Phase and this topic, the scope of our work in the ODP is to consider the policy recommendations themselves and what the operational impact of those is. We do, as I've discussed in other places within the project team, have several work tracks. One of the work tracks that we have is tasked with following all of the work in the ICANN ecosystem that would have an impact potentially on the operations of a round. So in terms of our scope, we're not looking at any of that work in progress as recommendations. Those are things that are being discussed. But in terms of how we're following them, we're making sure to note the context and have sort of a placeholder as to things that may be also coming.

We noted in the NCAP work previously that this group, the ISPCP, gave some feedback and was suggesting or being willing to collaborate, encouraging the work, collaboration with the work. I think the phrase

you used was help desk for Internet users, but just noting that this group has an interest in that topic in case there would be any feedback for us. As far as the ODP, we'd be happy to hear that.

So that was the end of our slides. We can go to any questions.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Karen, and your team for providing us his insight more clearly. In the past, we were very interested in participating in the Universal Acceptance as well and the name coalition work on that and the studies. We have gentlemen here who are prominently participating in these circles. Just a question. Christian, did that cover your expectations, your question from your side, please?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: It certainly did. I'd be happy to make a couple of comments, one of them may be a question. First of all, I want to commend you for hitting upon the areas in your presentation that are of real importance to ISPs. We have been very involved in both the subject of UA and the subject of name collisions. And regarding name collisions, I wanted to say that we've spent a good deal of time keeping a close eye on the work of the NCAP study, and it is something that we feel is going in the right direction. I feel like there were many concerns that the ISPs had in the last round of gTLD procedures that left us a bit concerned. And we are going into the procedures as they are stacked up now, feeling much more confident that there is smart work being done and enhanced. I do want to reiterate that the ISPs stand ready to help.

When it comes to issues surrounding UA, I wanted to thank you, Sarmad, for the presentation that you gave on the status of that area. There is an issue where there is certainly still a lot of work to be done. This is an area of particular concern for ISPs because we have these help desks and we are the first line of defense in many cases of people coming to us saying that their infrastructure is not working.

In that regard, I note that when I look at the Board priorities, I see that the third operational priority involves a focus on IDNs and UA, and I know that the Board is going to be driving this next round of gTLDs towards increasing the number of gTLDs that are going to be focused on IDNs. I want to know if particularly the Board IDNs UA Working Group or other resources will be increasing the commitments that they're making to the outreach that's necessary to external communities in order to do that. I'm thrilled at the work. We have been parts of the working groups that focus on the IDN tags, and I think that's very important work. But it is the outreach out of our community that is most important to making sure that the concerns of ISPs are addressed. I want to know if the Board is working on figuring out ways to increase those resources.

SARMAD HUSSAIN: Sure. As ICANN Org, we provide very regular updates to the Board IDN UA Working Group on not only just—well, we apprise them regularly on what the current status of the work is. And also, of course, if there are any issues, we bring those to them as well for their advice and guidance. So the Board IDN UA Working Group looks at this very actively. It is also not just, I think, Board's priority but it is also a

priority which has been identified in ICANN Org's FY21-25 strategic plan. So, IDN and UA implementation is part of and a focus of the plan. In addition to the Board priority and ICANN Org strategic plan, IDNs and UA are also part of the CEO goals for FY22. So there is certainly a significant focus from all the leadership and the Board on IDNs and UA.

We're also increasing our IDNs and UA Program team size to address more areas and increase our outreach, as you said, not only just to general community but also to the technology developers specifically where the technology needs to be fixed. So what's happened over the past couple of years or last three years or so, USG has done all these gap analysis studies on programming languages where there is actually one going on on web hosting tools, which is, I guess, very relevant to ISP community. Also authentication tools, as well as e-mail tools and so on. So there's a host of studies which identify which technologies are now supporting you and where the gaps are. Those are all available at USG.tech in case anybody's interested to look in some of those details.

With those, I make two observations there. First, it is actually promising to see many of those technologies are now becoming UA-ready. So, for example, many of the e-mail tools or servers are becoming supporting UA. But where there are gaps, actually we're bringing full-time role in ICANN's team where that person is actually going to be engaging with these tool providers to put in bug reports, work with them, try to fix them. And then there is always if needed, when needed. We will also be interacting not only at technical level

but management level with those organizations. So that role is being added within ICANN Org to start addressing the tool side.

We've also been continuously doing training. So there are two sides to it. One is addressing the tool developers. But then even if the tool is available, it needs to be properly deployed. So even if a mail server is available, if it is not deployed by those who are actually managing mail servers on the ground, that still doesn't help. So we do, for example, consistent outreach and training to system administrators. So we've actually been doing a lot of outreach to NOGs around the region where the system administrators come. We did outreach—recently we did a presentation on NANOG platform, North American Network Operators Group in Montreal, and we continue to reach out to NOGs and all the other relevant platforms to create not just general awareness but technical awareness on how to deploy the technology the right way to address UA. It is a large problem. We are making efforts. We are also increasing our efforts. There's more in plan. But we do continue to address it to the extent possible. Thank you.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you, Sarmad. That's very encouraging as an update. I appreciate it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Do we have any hands raised in the chat or any other comments, questions for Karen, her team. She will be around, she will be available. That lines as well. So thank you very much for this. Thank you. You're going to move ahead to the next item, which is an item we

have to discuss with OCTO. Is Alain in the room or will he participate remotely, Andrea?

ANDREA GLANDON: He's remote.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: He's remote?

ALAIN DURAND: I'm remote. Can you hear me?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Hello, and welcome, Alain Durand from ICANN OCTO. Yes, we are happy we are to get an overview on your paper with regards to Challenges with Alternative Name Systems. Just to give you a short insight, we have internally discussed in the past a lot about in our different upcoming systems in discussion—DOA, DoH, blockchain systems, all these. I'm happy that you put together this paper really to make it transparent what's going on in this parallel world of the DNS system. If you could summarize that and give us an insight what's going on there and we will have a fruitful discussion. Welcome, Alain.

ALAIN DURAND: Thank you for the introduction. Is Adiel in room?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: No, I didn't see him.

ALAIN DURAND: This is about a paper called OCTO-034 that I published a few weeks ago. And if you go to the next slide, please. So I'm going to talk a little bit about this paper. I'm not going to solution space or anything like this, but talk really, about the findings from the paper.

So when I started this paper, there were a set of goals and a set of non-goals. The goal was to look at the technical challenges that happen when you start to deploy those alternative namespace alongside the DNS. If you deploy it in a vacuum, that's one thing, but if you deploy it in parallel or integrate with DNS, there are a set of challenges that are coming up, and that's what I would like to describe in this paper.

The non-goal of the paper was to talk about how each of those alternative namespace worked in details. This is a different topic. There might be other papers on that. For example, on DOA, I published a paper a couple years ago explaining how it works, that's a different type of paper. I didn't want to go there.

Another non-goal was to talk about the policy-making processes of each of those alternative naming systems. They are not governed by ICANN so they have their own processes, and I decided this was an area where this paper should not focus. It does not mean that this is not important. It just means it was not focused on this very paper. I apologize for the background noise. I'm outside here on the cell phone. Next slide, please.

The story about alternative naming systems is not new. Actually, this has predated ICANN. I can remember some of the discussions that led

to the publication of a document called ICP-3 back in 2001. But those discussions died down for a while and they came back to the forefront, essentially due to the popularity of blockchain in general, and some of blockchain naming system more in the recent months and years.

So today there are three quite popular alternative naming systems. One is called Handshake. it's a derivative of a specific version of bitcoin. Another one is called ENS or Ethereum Naming System based on the Ethereum blockchain. And the third one is called Unstoppable Domains, which is a derivative of Ethereum but was designed in order to deal with a scalability issue of Ethereum. So next slide, please.

Another factor that makes this discussion more timely is that there are a number of ICANN accredited registrars which have been starting to sell those blockchain-based names, and that's creating some confusion. You may remember I published a blog post a few months ago talking about this. And essentially, not all names are created equal. The idea of that paper was to take this blog post and bring it to the next level and really talk more in details about those technical challenges. Remember, again, those domains are not bound by ICANN policies, they have their own independent policies. So next slide, please.

So the challenge is not how to deploy those names as how do I register a name, how do I use a name internally? That's easy. The difficult part is how can regular Internet user resolve such a name from an alternative name system? So we'll have to use specific applications for that, and the question is how to build those applications. So there

exist some dedicated libraries in many different languages so we can build an app that will work with that.

For legacy [hats] that you want still to use those domains, you need some kind of transition mechanism, something that we learned in the IPv4 to IPv6 transition. The transition mechanism are not perfect. There's a bunch of them that exist. You can use some dedicated browsers that have some mechanism in place, you can use some plug-in to existing browsers, you can use some resolvers. The paper goes into the details of the pros and cons of each of those different techniques.

But the point here is that a manual intervention from the user is required to use those things. So the manual intervention really does not scale much. It works for early adopters, enthusiasts. But past that point, it's a bit of an issue. Proof to that point is another paper I published recently about the use of public resolver in the EU by large ISP consumers, and the numbers showed that only about 4% of consumers of large ISPs in the EU go and modify the resolver configuration. That's not a lot. So if we ask people to go modify something in order to access those domain names, we can probably expect some kind of a similar uptake. Next slide, please.

But there are some challenges. The problem is really about how do we connect all those namespace with the DNS, and how do you get in there? So let me take one example. Let's say that we go through a solution where we use recursive resolver to do the bridging. So, if I use this recursive resolver, I will be able to see this particular name in the alternative namespace. But let's say now that I moved to another

place, for example, a restaurant where there is a public Wi-Fi, this public Wi-Fi network may or may not use the same resolver, most likely not. So it may be that this resolver doesn't do the bridging. That means I will not see the name. Or a variation of this is I'm at home and I have a similar device that has both the Wi-Fi and the cellular attachments. And in some rooms in the house, I may have a good Wi-Fi signal, in some other rooms, I may not, and then I have to fall back to cellular. If my Wi-Fi network at home, and my cellular network use different resolvers, I will have different results from the same device in the same location. So those unpredictable results will potentially lead to user dissatisfaction and probably lots of support calls. This consistency is really an issue. Next slide.

Now, that was when we're deploying one particular alternative namespace. But now what if there are multiple alternative namespace to choose from, which is actually the case because I mentioned at least three very popular ones today. The point here is that there is no community-driven coordination between those alternative namespace and no coordination between those namespace and with DNS. So at that point, name collisions are unavoidable.

So sometimes I've heard [inaudible] naïve approaches. It is great to have multiple alternative namespace because if I cannot get the name I want where I want, I just have to go to an alternative namespace, and maybe the name I want is available there, and that's great. All I need to do is to tell my users go to that namespace. But how to you tell them that? Not only do you have to communicate to them the name but you may also have to communicate which namespace and which app to use, and which ISP will work and which will not work. It will

start to get really complicated. So if we put this bridging system in place, then we can go to one of those namespace. But if there are multiple of them, we have to define the order in which you do those queries. Somebody may decide a specific order and somebody else may choose a different order. So we have essentially the same problem that I described a few minutes ago, but now it's magnified because depending on which order people decide to put things in place, then you will have very, very different results. So it becomes really difficult for users to navigate this world where you don't have one map but you have multiple maps that essentially point to different directions. So next slide, please.

So the risk here is very clear. It's the risk of fragmentation of the Internet by creating separate ecosystem, one ecosystem per naming system. So you may have an ecosystem for DNS, an ecosystem for Unstoppable Domains, or another one for Handshake. And have [hats] that work within those ecosystems but they don't work in other places, and that quickly becomes a nightmare. Next slide, please.

So I started this presentation talking about a document called ICP-3. The issues that we are facing today are somewhat similar, actually very, very similar. The technology is different but similar. I just present some excerpts of ICP-3 which was ICANN's commitment to a single root. The reason, essentially, was that if you want to make sure that users can have a good map, they need a good map that always points to the same place. They don't need multiple maps that point potentially to very different places. ICP-3, of course, does not apply to this alternative namespace today. But this is something, a document that is, I believe, interesting to keep in mind in this conversation.

So I think that's the last slide that I have. I'd be happy to entertain any questions if you have. Thank you very much for inviting me and thank you for reading my document.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Alain for this condensed presentation. I think that it's really, really, really useful because it makes transparent where the pros and cons, where the risks are. To some extent, when I read your report, I got your opinion well. This is a kind of playbook for somebody who tries to step into this parallel market. He gets a nice idea and where the risks are already. So there must be a lot of work behind of that study in detail. My question would be what is from your point of view—because you have you have shown these different parallel worlds going on—what you would charge as the main risk? Can you say something about that? The main risk I understood is fragmentation of the Internet. But is it related to a specific system? Or how would you judge on that? And then I hand over to other questions. Thank you.

ALAIN DURAND: Thank you. So yes, the risk is fragmentation. If there was one alternative namespace, we could probably find some ways to do some coordination. But when there are multiple ones, it becomes very daunting task to try to coordinate all that, especially when sometimes interests are not aligned. Having this multiplicity of choice can create a massive confusion and massive instability. That's what I will identify as the main risk.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. I see there was a question in the chat from Lutz Donnerhacke. Lutz, would you like to ask this question by microphone? Thank you.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Lutz Donnerhacke for the record from At-Large. If a government requires a special alternative name resolution space to be in place, does this scale for the country? Does this work? Next idea about this, how about negative modifications for namespace so that deletions from the underlying original one modify the namespace? Does that count as alternate namespace? Does this apply to DNS4EU proposal? And does this apply for the Crimea sanctions the ISP has to fulfill, too? Thanks.

ALAIN DURAND: I'm going to address the technical parts of this question and I will leave the policy parts to our people that are more qualified than me to answer them. So the question will be what is the potential maximum scale of an alternative naming system? If you do this in an environment where you control absolutely every single piece, it is doable. For example, you can imagine that you have a factory where you control every single device, you control the [specs] of every single device, all the software that is being deployed, all the configuration that are being deployed from a central point, this type of thing is perfectly deployable. The more you grow and the less control you have on which version of software, which configuration you have on

all the different equipments, the more complex it is to actually make this work. So if you try to extrapolate this to the scale of an entire country with millions, potentially billions, of people living in there and multiply by 100 the number of devices, that becomes actually quite challenging. It's very, very difficult to maintain the system.

But at this point, you may ask the question, are we still talking about the Internet or are we talking about simply a giant Internet for that country, whatever they decide to do, whatever they feel is the right choice, and mandate whatever technology they decide to mandate? This is not the definition of the Internet. This is more of a definition of national Internet. I hope I've answered the technical parts of the question.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you very much for that. Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Sure. I know we are at the end of our time. This is an issue where we can certainly talk about for a long time, and I'm certain that we will be talking about it for quite some time. I wanted to thank you for your presentation and looking forward to getting a copy. As ISPs, we spend a good deal of time. We were just talking about name collision and I have been asked as an individual who works within the constituency on that issue if there are name collision issues in this space. I think that this presentation will do a good job of helping us show people that we are looking at an issue where collision may not be the right name, it may be confusion. So I would like to get a copy of this and

make sure that we can share it with our constituency. And I want to thank you for your time.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Alain. Thank you. We are at the top of the hour but I was advised we have two minutes left, which is not enough for the charter topic, I would say. Christian, I would suggest—you're prepared so you will, in the last round, send around the e-mail if there is any question open.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Is there time to give a two-minute status report? Yes? Okay. So as we close out the meeting, I want to note that after four years of work, we are at the close of a very important point in our efforts to generate a new charter for the ISPs in the effort of trying to be expeditious. We are currently at the end of our ISPCP member review period. And at the end of this week, we will close the ISPCP member review period. The link to the document that you need to comment on has been sent out a number of times in ISPCP list. I encourage you to go and take a look at it.

I want to explain very quickly how things will work next. We will complete the process of comment at the end of this week. At which point, in two weeks time, the drafting group will meet. The drafting group is going to look at comments and we'll look at them in two different ways. There are the areas where we are simply making recommendations on doing things like modernizing and clarifying language, removing gender references and leadership sections. We're

just going to go ahead and do those things. We're going to address whether we want to accept or reject those and not go back and talk to people. If there are substantial comments that changed the meaning or context of the things that we've produced, we'll go back and engage the people to discuss those items and determine whether we can accept or reject them to work to get a final draft as quickly as possible that we can pass along to ICANN Org. We've been informed by ICANN Org that they will require more than the 14-day period that it states in order to review what it is we are putting forward before we can move on into a public comment period. But we're going to expedite that as much as possible. So within the next month, you're going to see a tremendous amount of movement from the drafting team and completing and moving on the charter process. Thanks to everybody who's contributed a great deal of work on that effort.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Christian. Thanks very much. The process is very clear here. Just being short with the next item, public comments, I recommend everybody from the membership looking to the ICANN website for the upcoming public comment proceedings. There's one thing which is of interest to us with regards to the upcoming NCAP study as well. So we have people having an eye on that. There may be others as well. We will come back to this at our next meeting with those items.

Under AOB, we have only one. I think Osvaldo is working with the Terms of Reference group for the holistic review, and he keeps us

updated from time to time with the outcome of that. Please continue to do so.

I have a point to make with regards to it because we are already asked to provide who is going to get travel support for the next ICANN meeting in Kuala Lumpur. The ISPCP leadership decided upon to allocate for the five slots we have available and I will send that around. So we'll provide that information to ICANN Org as well.

Andrea or Brenda, could we have a look on the suggestion for the next call to talk about? Usually we have that on a Monday within the next three or four weeks. What can I suggest? It's in July then—

BRENDA BREWER: Wolf-Ulrich, this is Brenda. May I suggest that … We should do that on July 11.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. In July?

BRENDA BREWER: July 11.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: July 11, okay. So it's a suggestion July 11. Please send it around, Brenda. And if there's some suggestions, people will raise their hands.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. With that, we come to the end of the meeting. Thank you very much for your participation for the discussion. Thank you, ICANN Org, for participating and then the presentations. Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]