
ICANN69 | Prep Week - Q&A with ICANN Org Executive Team
Thursday, October 8, 2020 - 20:00 to 21:00 CEST

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: All right. Well, welcome, everyone. I'm so pleased to welcome you to the prep week session executive Q&A with the ICANN organization executive team.

My name is Sally Newell Cohen, and I'm the senior vice president of global communications at ICANN Org.

I know I speak for the entire executive team when I tell you that we look forward to this session and the opportunity to meet with you and to provide updates on projects and initiatives we're working on at ICANN Org. And most importantly, we look forward to answering your questions.

We welcome and we appreciate the dialogue.

Now, ICANN is entering a period of intense effort as a result of the culmination of several initiatives in the community, such as the final report of the subsequent procedures policy development process, the final report of the expedited development process, phase two, implementation of recommendations as a result of the work of the Review Teams, including ATRT3, Work Stream 2, and CCT.

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.

There's also the final report of the GTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group, and other important initiatives, like migrating domain name system security threats.

So in addition to our day-to-day activities in interior of the ICANN community and board, ICANN Org, through the executive team, is preparing for the work ahead through collaborations and cross functional planning.

So during this session, we're going to take a deeper dive into these initiatives and the efforts that are under way at ICANN Org.

We're going to be breaking it up into four primary blocks where we're going to discuss the expedited PDP and GDPR, subsequent procedures, the implementation of reviews and DNS security threats.

But we would like to make this a truly interactive session, and we invite you to ask your questions throughout.

There are two different ways that you can ask a question or make a comment during this session. The first is, you can submit a written question or comment into the Zoom Q&A pod. And then the session's remote participation manager will then read your question out loud.

Alternately, you can raise your hand to join the queue to voice your question. And you can find the raise hand icon at the bottom of your screen. Selecting it will automatically add you to the speakers' queue. Your microphone will remain muted until it's your turn to speak. We will unmute. And that's unmuting it on our end, but it will also trigger a note to you on your screen requesting that you unmute your mic as well.

And that lets you know that it's your turn to speak.

Again, please make sure your mic is unmuted when we call your name to speak. And please, if you would, don't put questions into -- for the executive team directly into the chat, because we're not monitoring that. We're only able to answer your questions verbally or those that are placed in the Q&A pod.

Also, real-time interpretation is available for this session in Spanish, French, Chinese, Russian, and Arabic. And information on how to use this feature is available on the session's page on the meetings schedule.

A link to that page should also be available in the chat.

If you'd like to ask your question in one of those available languages, we ask that you just give participants a moment to put on their headsets.

Okay. Now, before we begin, I'd like to introduce the rest of the executive team. Joining us today are Xavier Calvez, senior vice president planning and chief financial officer; Mandy Carver, senior vice president, government and IGO engagement; David Conrad, senior vice president and chief technology officer; Sally Costerton, senior advisor to the president and senior vice president, Global Stakeholder Engagement; Jamie Hedlund, senior vice president, contractual compliance and consumer safeguards; John Jeffrey, general counsel and secretary and co-deputy to the CEO; Ashwin Rangan, senior vice president, engineering, and chief information officer; Gina Villavicencio, senior vice president, global human resources; and standing in for David Olive, senior vice president of policy development and support is Mary Wong. And she's the vice president of strategic community operations, planning and engagement.

So welcome to you all.

Next, I'd like to invite Göran Marby, ICANN president and CEO, to share his opening remarks.

Göran, over to you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. Thank you very much.

And this is a very -- as Sally said, this is an important opportunity for us on the executive team to interact with the community.

I speak for my whole executive team that we dearly miss interactions also in the physical form to actually meet you, which makes this event even more important, because we don't run into each other in corridors, we don't have a lot of the social setting we usually have during an ICANN meeting.

So as Sally talked about, we tried to change the format a little bit. And this time, to find questions that we know that the community is interested in and instead of us giving presentations, try to drill into them.

But, of course, you can ask questions about absolutely anything. We are here to answer questions.

As a part of our -- part of our reach out when it comes to transparency as well.

Welcome and thanks for joining us. I'm looking forward to this session.

And over to you, again, Sally.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Okay. Thank you, Göran.

Next, I'd like to introduce James Cole. James Cole is a member of the communications technical at ICANN Org, and he's going to be facilitating this session. He'll be asking questions and legislation calling on you for your questions.

-- also calling on you for your questions.

James, please go ahead.

JAMES COLE:

Thank you, Sally. As a reminder, as you said, if you have questions, please put them in the Q&A pod as we go. And I'm going to do start with the first question, which is for Theresa Swinehart.

The GNSO Council recently approved the final reports of the expedited policy development process. How is the org preparing to support the recommendations, if approved?

THERESA SWINEHART:

Thanks, James.

And I think everybody can hear me. Great. Thank you.

First, welcome, everybody. And the GDPR and EPDP process has been one that's been under discussion obviously with the community and with ICANN Org and the board for quite a bit of

time. And so during that time period, we have also had the opportunity to engage with the community around the different work stream areas and as an organization prepare for other recommendations that are coming in from the EPDP Phase 2.

We've been in discussions with EPDP Phase 2 as we prepared the recommendations, and now as we are looking at the recommendations that are going to be coming to the board, many of the different aspects with regards to the implementation and preparing the teams internally for execution on that.

As you know, a lot of that also does relate to legal analysis and preparing for that. And we'll be touching on that briefly, and also, how do we operationalize this and put this into effect.

And with that, have also put forward for discussion -- and I know we're going to touch on this briefly -- around the operational design phase, as in how do we operationalize many of these different aspects around that.

So happy to delve into any of those more deeply. But that would be where we are starting to prepare for this next phase of building, obviously, on the EPDP Phase 1 and now EPDP Phase 2.

JAMES COLE: Göran, can you talk a bit about this proposed operational design phase or ODP.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. So one of the -- so many of the things that we get from -- as recommendations right now or other things are actually quite complicated when it comes for the board to make a deliberation about it.

We always have done a sort of design phase before the board makes a decision, where the org goes back and looks into many things and we go to the board and we discuss it with them.

And I realized there was a couple of things in that, and then one of the things is the transparency of that process. So the operational design phase is very much to make sure that before it goes to the board, we have answers to the questions. So we would like to be transparent to the community. It's really about taking over after the NSO recommendation.

But the interesting thing is that to some extent, it was also the GNSO Council who pointed to this in the GDPR recommendation, because there, they basically said we would like to have -- at one point in time, we would like to sit down with the board and have a discussion about some of those things and recommendations when it comes to costs.

For the board to enter into that conversation, what -- the board needs us to ask us to do design work, how do you actually design a system like this? What is (indiscernible). All of those things, but also the costs for it.

So it's -- was a problem also defined by the GNSO Council. And we decided then to give a proposal how to structure that process, so it becomes transparent.

So thank you for asking that question.

JAMES COLE:

Thanks, Göran.

John Jeffrey, can you speak to some of the legal considerations.

JOHN JEFFREY:

Yes. Definitely.

I think one of the things that's interesting about GDPR for us all along and the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations, of course, is that so much legal work has gone into this already, and so much is still yet to be done. And so we're currently analyzing the issues from the Phase 2 recommendations in preparation for the implementation phase, which will kick off after the board's consideration and approval of the recommendations.

The most significant issue at this stage appears to be the question of whether, and if so, how, safeguards can be implemented to legally allow personal data to flow across the borders in the recommended system for standardized access disclosure or the SSAD. And other issues we're exploring include how the GDPR's principles of controllership would apply to SSAD envisioned by the EPDP Team. And we're continuing to request additional guidance from the data protection authorities relating to this area.

Also how to build the SSAD, taking into account the principle of, quote, "privacy by design," end quote.

And last, whether and how data subjects can exercise their rights within the recommended SSAD, such as objecting to processing and requesting deletion of data.

We're expecting that the analysis on these topics will be an input during the proposed operational design phase, and we believe these issues can be addressed during the implementation, but it's going to be a challenge for all of the participants in it, our outside counsel, and our internal lawyers.

JAMES COLE:

Thank you, JJ.

Mandy, why is it so important to get input from the European Commission and data protection authorities?

MANDY CARVER:

Thank you, James.

As JJ's mentioned, there's been an enormous amount of legal work that's been done on this. There's also a lot of legal question marks that still exist.

And because the ICANN Org and the ICANN community have embarked on an effort where we're trying to ensure the rights of data subjects protection, but also not sacrifice the critical efforts of other stakeholders, we need the -- and we've had a lot of requests from public authorities, including the E.U. member states themselves, they're asking for stable, predictable, workable methods for accessing nonpublic WHOIS.

That means we really need clarity on a number of the issues and the (indiscernible) the Commission meant.

I do want to say, ICANN Org is grateful for all of the Commission support so far, and their support for our efforts to gain greater legal clarity.

We have several topics where we think that it would be helpful if we got greater clarity around the GDPR application so that we can

better implement a mechanism for access to these nonpublic gTLD registration data.

Among these areas that we would benefit from additional clarity are the concept of controllership. We'd like guidance on the mechanisms available under the GDPR on internal international data transfer, as this has already been mentioned. It would also be of benefit if we had greater clarity on the principle of GDPR data accuracy. There's a level of uncertainty surrounding potential liability related to inaccuracy of personal data. We've got various statements that go to who might be responsible for accuracy. And that has an impact on liability.

So for all of these and many more issues, it would be helpful to gain more information and greater clarity from those that actually promulgated the law.

JAMES COLE:

Thank you, Mandy.

We're going to go to some questions from the room now.

The first is from Fabricio Vayra. Could someone speak to how ICANN Org plans to do compliance on the temporary specification, specifically regarding registrars who ignore requests for reasonable, slash, legal access to WHOIS data?

JAMIE HEDLUND:

This is Jamie Hedlund. I can take that.

So thanks for the question, Fabricio. As you know, under the temporary specification, registrars are required to provide reasonable access to -- to redacted registration data. And under certain circumstances, that means they need to decide whether or not a request and providing access to it would be reasonable. Ignoring a request would not be in -- would not be consistent with the obligation to provide reasonable access. And were we to -- we, compliance, to receive a complaint, we would certainly pursue it and ensure that the -- that the registrar provided reasonable access.

I'd like to add one thing, though, which is, we hear anecdotal -- anecdotes about registrars not providing access or not -- otherwise not complying with other obligations under the temporary specification. But to date, we have gotten, actually, very few complaints, particularly on third-party access requests. I think we've only gotten about a dozen over the past six months, and very few before that.

So, obviously, we can't act on complaints that we don't receive. And we would encourage you, your clients, and anyone else who run into a situation which a registrar simply doesn't respond, to - - to submit a complaint to compliance so that we can follow up.

Thank you.

JAMES COLE: Thank you, Jamie. I'm going to take the other question from the Q&A pod.

This is from Pelle Wechsel (phonetic).

Is there going to be an EPDP 3 now?

GÖRAN MARBY: I hope it's Pelle, because then it's actually a Swedish name.

That is not up to us. You can look around in this room and ask the GNSO or other ones who make that decision. We can only say that we will support it, of course, as we always do with the PDP.

But that decision really belongs to the community, where it's not -- it not only belongs, it should be, in a bottom-up process. Thank you.

JAMES COLE: Thanks, Göran.

I'm going to take the last question from the Q&A pod.

This is from Mark Datysgeld.

I would like to know what department or departments at ICANN will lead the reform of the MSM project internally and how the CEO intends to oversee that process.

GÖRAN MARBY: I -- I oversee the people who are doing this. I would leave over to Theresa to answer the question.

THERESA SWINEHART: Hi. And I'm going to actually very shortly pass it over to Xavier.

So, initially, the project was overseen within MSSSI, which is now integrated also into what is the GDS function. As you're aware, that was overseeing the work with the community and the execution of the input to the public comment process.

The implementation now is actually with Xavier, as part of the new implementation area.

And, Xavier, I'm going to turn it over to you to answer that part.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Theresa.

As Theresa just indicated, there's been a creation in the org of a specific department to focus on all the community-led

recommendations that have been produced or that are going to be produced in the short-term future, as well as the work of cross-community working groups and also the evolution of the multistakeholder model, which is a significant and critical program that has been announced by the ICANN board a number of months ago.

So all these projects are now going to be the focus of implementation work supported by the new department created, which is called implementation operations. And that focuses on all the non-policy-related implementation work. And this is a group that will support and coordinate all the parties involved in all these implementations, whether they are community organizations involved, and, of course, the board and the various functions of the organization that will support the implementation of all the recommendations.

Thank you.

JAMES COLE:

Thanks, Xavier. I'm going to move back to subsequent procedures real quick.

Theresa, how is the org preparing in anticipation of the PDP's final reports?

THERESA SWINEHART: Let me get myself off mute.

Thanks.

As you know, this is another big project, another big area. And so what we've done within ICANN organization is create a steering group, which is a cross functional group. And we have different names for different work streams, so this one is called Milky Way. And it consists of a cross-functional team that's really responsible for looking at the different substantive issues that are coming up in relation to Sub-Pro, and also been tracking the discussion within the community and the recommendations that are coming out of the Sub-Pro-related group and the recommendations around that.

So this is a very -- it's a complex project. And, obviously, it's going to have to scale in the right way. So we're looking at the potential resourcing needs, the -- how we're going to be addressing some of the different issue areas, and then working, obviously, with tracking what's happening with the community and preparing also for any briefings to the board around this area.

The steering group was also responsible for helping to prepare ICANN Org's comments to Sub-Pro. And those are available and well worth a read, I think, and also support the board in the work of the comments that they are preparing for those.

But I think as with any of the very complex projects that are happening, and as Göran had touched on earlier, this is also an area that we're going to be looking at the operational design phase to really make sure that as we're preparing for the resourcing discussions and preparing for supporting the board in its assessment of the recommendations, that we can provide that in a transparent process as well.

So a big cross functional effort in order to make sure that we're looking at all the different moving parts and the best we can do to prepare for what's coming ahead.

JAMES COLE:

Thanks, Theresa.

I see some questions coming -- I see some questions coming in from the Zoom Q&A pod. We'll get to those in a moment. Just want to ask one more question about Sub-Pro.

Mary, can you address how ICANN Org is going to support the policy aspects?

MARY WONG:

Hello, everybody. I'm Mary from the policy development support team.

Maybe I'll address that question by taking a slight step back. The role of ICANN Org and specifically ICANN Org's policy team, is not to write or develop policy. Our role and our job is to support and facilitate the community's consensus-building and multistakeholder approach to developing policy.

So to that end, that is true not just within the Generic Names Supporting Organization, which is where the Sub-Pro development process is taking place, with the participation of many members from across the community and different supporting organizations and advisory committees, but our facilitative role also hold true for those of our other teams that support the other groups, such as the Governmental Advisory Committee, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the Country Code Name Supporting Organization, and so forth.

So to give you a flavor of what is it that the team does in supporting this community work, when a policy development process is launched, in this case, Sub-Pro, there is extensive research. There are reports, such as a scoping report, known as an issue report, that is prepared by the policy team. And throughout the process of the scoping, through to the actual initiation of the policy development process by the GNSO Council, we would support and facilitate meetings of the council and eventually of the PDP working group.

At this point, I do want to do a shoutout to that PDP working group and to the co-chairs, Jeff and Cheryl, as well as to all of the leadership teams, subteams, work track chairs of that group. That group has something like, I think, almost 200 members, and I think over 50 observers. It's been a big lift, just as many of the other policy processes have been. The group has gone through five consultation periods, with the fifth one closing just recently.

And what the policy team does, as I said, is we do do a lot of research and drafting and support of the groups.

In reviewing the public comments that come in -- and as I said, there have been five consultations for this particular policy process -- the team will prepare a tool, which is, essentially, a giant spreadsheet or a giant table, that goes through all of the comments that are submitted. This is really critical in the multistakeholder model and the policy development process. The solicitation of community input, both from (dropped audio) within the ICANN community as well as the general public.

So all of the comments are sorted categorized, and then passed to the working group for their review. And it is a rule in the policy development process that the working group must consider all of the inputs received. And to the extent that it deems it necessary, to then alter a preliminary recommendation that it had or to

create a new one, it has to be based not just on its own deliberations, but also on the community input that's received.

I did want to emphasize that point.

And if and when those policy recommendations are complete, sent to the GNSO Council, approved by the GNSO Council, and then forwarded to the board, the policy team's role changes a little bit in that we then assist our colleagues, and Theresa had mentioned the cross functional teams working on the projects, and on Sub-Pro as well, to shepherd the process through the board action. And when it moves to the implementation phase, we advise and support our colleagues in the global domains and strategy division as they move towards implementation.

So, finally, of course, if this operational design phase that Göran and Theresa have mentioned and for which we're looking forward to the community's feedback, if that goes forward, we expect to be involved in an appropriate role there, supporting and working with the cross functional team as well.

Thank you, James.

JAMES COLE:

Thanks, Mary.

We're going to go back to the Q&A pod questions. The first one, again, is from Fabricio Vayra.

His question is, ICANN CIO Ashwin Rangan¹ explicitly stated in an August 5 webinar that DNS abuse has been increasing dramatically. Can someone speak to what ICANN Org plans to do to curtail DNS abuse?

In the same vein, does ICANN see a connection between decreased access to WHOIS data and increasing DNS abuse issues?

¹ The comments made by ICANN Org Chief Information Officer Ashwin Rangan were taken out of context.

*While developing a presentation called "Staying Safe in Cyberspace – 8 Attacks You Should Know" for ICANN Org staff and at the invitation of the Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry of India, Rangan noticed that COVID and related terms were used to register 500K+ domains, with approximately .5% (roughly 3K at that time) being used for abuse. As such, **the context** was that **DNS abuse, using COVID and related terms as a scare vector, was on the increase.***

This presentation was delivered on 5 and 6 August, with the intention of educating and informing the audiences about the typical ways in which Fear-Uncertainty-Doubt (FUD) about COVID and related topics could be used to entice users to take inappropriate actions. The purpose was not to present ICANN's data or analysis specific to DNS Abuse.

It is unfortunate that the content of this webinar was quoted out of context, and inadvertently cast doubt on ICANN's work in the broader context of DNS abuse. ICANN's OCTO is the definitive source for DNS abuse data and analysis within ICANN org, and the most up-to-date information can be accessed via the [Domain Abuse Activity Reporting](#) project. One of the roles of the Chief Information Officer is to ensure that ICANN org staff, the Board and the community are aware of potential cyber threats and armed with trust-worthy information to address those threats.

DAVID CONRAD:

This is David Conrad. I'll take this question.

What we've been seeing in the statistics that we're gathering within the office of the CTO has been a general decrease in the amount of DNS abuse that is at least being recorded into the reputation providers that we collect data from.

The security threats that we monitor -- phishing, malware distribution, botnet command and control, and spam when it's used as a vector for those others -- over time, if you look at the statistics that we publish either in the DAAR reports, the DNS abuse activity reporting system reports, or in the identifier technologies health indicators, the M2 metrics, all have an obvious downward trend.

In terms of what we're doing to help address DNS abuse, you know, obviously, there's been significant ongoing discussions with regards to what DNS abuse is within the community. And the primary role that my team has within the -- that context is to provide information and objective data in order to help the community actually understand the reality of DNS abuse, at least as -- as we see it.

We are undertaking additional studies to try to understand sort of event-based abuse, so, for example, the efforts associated with a project called the Domain Name Security Threat Identification

Collection and Reporting System, DNS STICAR, which focused on trying to identify abuse, specifically, phishing and malware distribution associated with the COVID pandemic. We started that project pretty quickly after the pandemic took over and monitored the DNS abuse as we saw it.

And we have, of course, other efforts that are involved in attempting to provide information to the community in order to address DNS abuse.

JAMES COLE:

Thank you, David.

The next question is from Gangesh Varma.

What are the challenges, anticipated concerns raised by SO/ACs with the Work Stream 2 implementation? And any particular priority areas identified for deliberation at ICANN69?

GÖRAN MARBY:

Xavier, I would guess.

But could I say something before I let it over to Xavier?

So one of the -- not really sure about the challenge and anticipated concerns raised by the SO and ACs. But one thing the board has discussed is the sort of -- the Work Stream 2, which is

not a review, it's a part of the transition. It's the end of the -- really, the end of the transition itself. And it's an important thing for us to do.

But one thing that many of those recommendations is not hitting sort of ICANN Org or the board, it actually goes back to the community itself. So different -- but different SOs and ACs actually have to do a commitment to implement themselves.

We did have an interesting discussion about that. Part of the multistakeholder model is and the way we set it up in ICANN, which is really a part of how we do things, is that the SO and the AC is itself who should be making that decision how to implement Work Stream 2 by themselves. It shouldn't be the board and it shouldn't be the org. We don't have -- because then it would not become a multistakeholder model. The power belongs within the SO and the ACs

It's just checking that they've checked the things they're supposed to do. Because some of them -- and one of my important ones is the question about diversity.

If SOs and ACs are by design diverse, do they really need to -- do they really need to implement diversity recommendation, et cetera, et cetera.

So just before we go into that, when the SOs and ACs are responsible for the implementation of the recommendation of Work Stream 2, and, of course, in a transparent and accountable way.

I don't know if you would like to add something, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Göran.

No. Just to confirm that not necessarily all their recommendations are for the SO and AC organizations to implement, but many are. And the concerns that have been raised are, of course, simply in the challenges to -- to implement some of those recommendations. If I take, for example, diversity as one of the eight areas of the WS2 recommendations, this is, of course, a very important topic, like all those that have been included in that work stream. But this is also a very challenging topic to be able to address in the multistakeholder model of ICANN.

So there's a lot of work. There's a lot of attention to be able to put into the implementation of those recommendations. And this is one of the concerns that the various organizations have been expressing. And this is one of the focus areas that the

organization will be helping with to be able to facilitate the implementation of those recommendations for WS2.

Thank you.

JAMES COLE:

Thank you, Xavier and Göran.

We have another question, this one from Mark Carvell.

He asks, I'd like to know, what are the current ICANN priorities for IGO engagement on Internet governance? In particular, is ICANN contributing to the U.N. secretary-general's road map and its set of options for improving the global architecture for digital cooperation in support of the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals?

GÖRAN MARBY:

Again, may I start and then hand over to Mandy?

So, no, we don't is the simple answer. Because we believe that we represent the multistakeholder model. And ICANN is, to some extent, an alternative to some of the things that happen in the government space.

If that sounds harsh, it's not. Because, for instance, we are fighting always to fight and make sure that DNS and all the related

things actually belongs -- the questions about them are belonging in the multistakeholder model. That's why we support IETF when it comes to the discussion about new I.P. That's why we disagree with others that the U.N. system should put in having the DNS system as a critical infrastructure.

With that said, we are good friends with the U.N. systems in many ways. But here is one of the things that we have -- by -- one of the reasons why ICANN was created was because -- to be able to have a bottom-up, multistakeholder model for the governing sort of things we do.

Mandy, I don't know if you want to add something to it.

MANDY CARVER:

Just briefly, Göran.

And you've answered Mark's specific question about the road map.

Just briefly, overall, ICANN has active engagement with IGOs, the national and regional governmental organizations as well. But our emphasis son what we might call technical Internet governance. We are prioritizing those areas that have the potential to impact the use of the unique identifier system and those initiatives that might occur in various U.N. processes

outside of this question of the road map that could impact ICANN's mission and remit.

And we are actively engaged in the IGF. We have representation in the MAG and in the dialogues about the improved MAG, et cetera. But our focus is more on the technical.

JAMES COLE:

Thank you, Mandy.

I'm going to move back to some prechosen questions.

This one is for Xavier.

In the next six months, the community will provide the ICANN board with final reports stemming from ATRT3 and the CCT Review Teams. This is in addition to the hundreds of recommendations resulting from Work Stream 2.

Xavier, how is ICANN Org planning for this work and what is its approach?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. This is a very important question, and thank you very much for asking it, because as -- as you indicate, when you aggregate together all the reviews, whether organizational or specific, when you include WS2, as we just discussed earlier, as

well as the evolution of the multistakeholder model, which is another program that we need to consider the implementation of, and the auction proceeds report from the CCWG, when you bring all of these topics together, this is more than 400 recommendations that are already available for implementation or will soon become available for implementation. And you mentioned ATRT3. That's one. There's also the SSR2 recommendations that are going to come up as well. So that's an enormous amount of work that is in front of us.

And it is very clear that it will take a long time to deal with the entirety of this volume of recommendations, notably because some of them also individually are very complex and require a lot of design work.

So we will need to be able to plan for the implementation of these recommendations over time and carefully so that we are able to at all times evaluate the work required and the participants to that work, the responsibilities of that work. And, of course, that will involve community organizations, the board's oversight, and the organization's support across the entirety of that pool of recommendations.

So planning, analysis of the recommendations also, because it's important to understand that many of these recommendations, if not all of these recommendations, touch on subject areas where

ICANN already carry out some work, or that are also new. And in both cases, there are dependencies between these recommendations among themselves or dependencies between the recommendations and the work that ICANN does. So that creates, of course, complexity in the work of implementation, and it requires a lot of preparation work to be able to implement.

So there will be a necessity to prioritize that volume of recommendations and be able to determine priorities among those recommendations, which will be a process that the organization is going to propose to the community and to the board to look at so that we can all have, together, view of those recommendations and make decisions as to what we think is most important to be carried out, knowing that not everything can be carried out all together at the same time, it will need to be staggered, in quotes, over time so that we can absorb the volume of work and not overwhelm the community, the board, and the org with this enormous amount of recommendations, which are all very important in their own ways to the multistakeholder model but that cannot all be implemented at one time.

Thank you.

JAMES COLE:

Thank you, Xavier.

I'm going to move back to DNS abuse, something Fabricio brought up earlier.

Jamie, can you give me a bit of perspective on compliance efforts?

Sorry, Jamie, you're still on mute.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sorry. I'm very high tech.

Can you hear me now?

JAMES COLE: Sure can. Go ahead.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay. Terrific.

So the role of ICANN contractual compliance is to ensure that the community-developed policies and other obligations in our agreements with registries and registrars are implemented and enforced.

We enforce the contracted parties' DNS abuse obligations by processing external complaints, through proactive monitoring,

and by conducting contractual audits to assess compliance with these obligations.

For registrars, the primary abuse obligation is section 3.18 of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. Among other things, it requires registrars to receive reports of abuse and to take reasonable and prompt steps to investigate and respond appropriately.

So when we get a valid complaint alleging that a registrar violated this provision, we require the registrar to demonstrate how it investigated and responded to the abuse reports and, where applicable, whether and to what extent their response was consistent with the registrar's own domain name use and abuse policies.

So some interesting data points on our recent complaint handling activities:

From January of last year through August of this year, we received approximately 200 abuse complaints about registrars. More than 80% of these complaints were invalid and not processed. This is because a little bit more than half of those were closed because the complainant did not provide evidence to sustain the complaint.

In 13% of the cases, the domain names had already been suspended.

And 12% involved ccTLDs and were therefore, obviously, out of scope.

For the complaints that we did process and forwarded to the registrar, 70% of those registrars demonstrated having taken steps to investigate and respond in accordance with their obligations under 3.18. And in a little bit more than a quarter of the cases, the registrar had actually suspended the domain name.

For registries, the primary DNS security threat obligations are found in specification 11(3)(a) and 11(3)(b) of the registry agreement.

During that same period, January 2019 through August 2020, we received nine complaints. And all of those were invalid.

It's not just through complaints that we get insights into DNS abuse. We also conduct contractual audits. And last year, we conducted the first registry operator DNS security threat audit. So first one focused solely on DNS security threats.

And it was -- we looked at specification 11(3)(b) compliance, which requires registry operators to periodically scan their zones for DNS security threats, phishing, malware, command and

control botnets, and to maintain reports that include any actions taken by the registry.

At the end of that audit, we found that most registry operators undertake significant efforts to address DNS security threats, significantly beyond what's required in the agreements. And we also found that the prevalence of DNS security threats is concentrated in a relatively small number of registry operators.

We attended -- we intended to immediately follow the registry audit with a registrar DNS audit, but due to the pandemic, that's been delayed. We will launch it, and when we do, it will focus on registrar compliance with section 3.18. And we hope to launch that audit before the end of this calendar year.

Anyone who is interested in our efforts on DNS abuse and enforcement in general, we encourage you to look at our audit reports, our monthly metrics and dashboards, all available online at [ICANN.org/compliance](https://icann.org/compliance).

Thanks.

JAMES COLE:

Thanks, Jamie. As a reminder, if you have questions, use the Q&A pod or raise your hand.

ICANN Org relies on cross functional collaboration to conduct its work. In addition to the subject matter expertise of the identifier, research, operations, and security, or (indiscernible)'s team compliance, policy development support and global domain strategy, collaboration and coordination between the many support teams is critical.

Gina, how does human resources coordinate with teams to provide resourcing support and training?

GINA VILLAVICENCIO:

Thanks, James, this is Gina Villavicencio, head of global human resources for ICANN.

So as my colleagues have mentioned, there's a variety of intense cross-functional effort across the organization described today, in addition to the day-to-day work that the operation continues to provide.

So my teams, during this busy time, will provide training and education to make sure that staff can perform at their best levels. We continue to try and find ways to foster and share knowledge internally, along with expertise that's been accumulated over the years to grow and develop our staff. You know, during a pandemic and during this remote, virtual work-from-home time, we're also making sure that health and safety and best practices

continue to be shared so that we're all taking care of our most valuable resource, which is our staff. You know, continuing to attract and retain talent through our recruitment process to make sure that we are tapping into expertise that we may not already have and skill sets that we need across the globe.

We also work to foster better development opportunities for our people managers so that they have the skill sets necessary to lead teams and to grow and develop those areas in -- which are essential to the projects that we're undertaking: project management, business writing, specific technology or platform experience. So in addition to prioritizing all of those technical and hard skills, again, we also want to make sure that we're being mindful of staff, you know, their mental health and well-being during this pandemic and time, as we embark on a lot of the work that our teams will rely on each other to help to bring to success.

Thank you.

JAMES COLE:

Thanks, Gina.

This -- the next question is for Sally Newell Cohen.

Can you talk about both ongoing communications support and long-range communications planning.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: Sure, yes. James, thanks for the question. It's Sally Newell Cohen, for the record.

We have communications team members that are assigned to each function within ICANN Org. And they assist with the short-term needs, such as messaging, content development, like blogs and announcements, and graphic design. We work closely with those teams, really, to ensure that the community is well informed and the groups that are responsible for engaging with the community have the same consistent information as well.

So it's more the short-term. But some of these larger efforts that we've been talking about today -- Sub-Pro, GDPR, DNS security threats -- the communications team, we have several members that are a part of each cross functional team. And although we're not the subject matter experts, we are there so that we can help continue to support the short-term and the long-term needs and provide strategic communications planning.

To tell you a little bit about what we do, we've recently instituted this idea of narratives. And we develop a narrative for each of these topics. Typically, they're foundational documents that can be used by people who aren't the subject matter experts. And it sets the tone and it sets the understanding, what is the history of the topic, what is the background, what's happened in the past, what are the issues, the activities coming forward, the obstacles,

and the messaging. It creates an alignment and a consistency of message across the teams.

For some of these multiyear, high-visibility efforts, particularly GDPR or the EPDP recommendations and subsequent procedures, we're taking a holistic approach to ensure that our communication is consistent, it's transparent, it's proactive, it's clear, and it's timely. We take into account -- using Sub-Pro as an example, there are many stakeholders that need updates and information along the way and at different times. So we tend to look at who the audiences are and what are their objectives and needs. What are the milestones. And what are the challenges -- or channels, excuse me, that we need to leverage to develop the right mix of media and message and medium over time.

So those are some of the things we do. We stay actively engaged. We provide support where we can. And most importantly, we ensure transparency when we're working with the board, the org, and the community.

So, hopefully, that's helpful to get an understanding of how we approach this.

James, back to you.

JAMES COLE:

This one is for Sally Costerton.

How is Global Stakeholder Engagement helping to keep the community informed?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, James. Sally Costerton, for the record.

A variety of ways during this difficult time. We have continued to support regional stakeholders through regional virtual events. DNS fora, ICANN readouts, capacity-building sessions, and talks in local languages.

Whilst we can't meet in person, our engagement teams continue to seek ways to keep the community informed, connecting stakeholders together, and to attract active participants.

We are continuing to focus on bringing in fellows -- newcomers through the Fellowship and Next Gen programs. And everyone will understand that this is particularly challenging. When you can't meet face to face, it's very difficult for somebody who has never experienced the ICANN community to attach themselves to it when they don't know what it looks like and feels like.

So we have put particular effort into expanding the availability of our online content, particularly through ICANN Learn, our online university and capacity-development platform. And the results

are really encouraging. For virtual events, we've seen a very high participation, often from countries that we would struggle to get participation from through face-to-face events. So that has been, if you like, a gain from the virtual world.

And also, on ICANN Learn, during the pandemic period, we've had twice as many participants on the platform as we did this time a year ago.

So I hope that gives you some overall headlines of the kinds of techniques and tools that we're using to keep our stakeholders engaged and able to participate in our processes.

JAMES COLE:

Thank you, Sally.

This last question is for Ashwin.

How does the engineering and I.T. team manage short-term and long-term priorities?

ASHWIN RANGAN:

Thank you, James.

For the record, my name is Ashwin Rangan. And I have responsibility for a composite of services that are I.P.-oriented,

and for all of the spoke engineering that we provide for the organization.

The question is about how we manage short-term versus long-term strategies and priorities.

We've evolved a fairly well-articulated system over the last several years, maybe two and a half years now, where we look at the alignment of our projects, both short- and long-term, with the organization's strategic objectives. And all of the SVPs who have spoken prior to me engage in this process to determine what's really important and urgent versus what's important but can wait.

The result of that is the creation of what's internally called as a frozen delivery pipeline of projects. Essentially, we take time slices of roughly six months, and we line up priorities based on urgency and importance into the six-month delivery pipeline. That helps us to keep focus on the short term while at the same time considering the longer horizon of what's coming up.

So as an example, for instance, in the short term, we are very focused on delivering ITI, the result of which will be a refurbished icann.org website. But in the longer horizon, we'll be leveraging the same infrastructure that we have deployed for ITI to redo some of the other websites that we currently have on a variety of

other technologies so that we can gain the practicality of leverage in addition to the economy and efficiency of leverage.

Thank you.

JAMES COLE:

Thanks, Ash.

We're nearing the end of the session, so I'm going to hand this back -- unless quick -- quick check if there are any other questions, please, now is your chance. If not, I'll hand this back to Sally.

Sally, by all means.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN:

Great. Thank you, James.

Again, it's Sally Cohen for the record.

Thank you, all. These were great questions. And it was nice to cover so many topics and so many important issues. So thank you for your engagement and participation in this session.

And thank you to the executive team for bringing their thoughts and details for you.

I'd like to hand it over to Göran if he'd like to make any closing remarks before we close out the session.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Thank you. Thank you very much. And thank you, everybody, for the questions and the interaction. I hope you liked this format which we tried to test this time. I thought it was really interesting.

We are going into ICANN69. We are doing that -- we're doing that for the first time for a general meeting that we're going to do virtually.

One thing I would like to say: We are cautious about the fact that we are now seeing a sort of catch-up effect. Sally started by talking about that in the beginning. There are so many things that we need to do together now: Work Stream 2, SSR2, RTP2, and whatever -- and GDPR. All of those things are very major projects. Sub-Pro, we're talking about a very long time. We have to work together to do this. I'm comfortable about the -- that we will get the work done.

But we also have to figure out maybe new ways to interact with each other. I want to make sure that we are transparent in what we do so we become accountable in what we do. That's one of the reasons why we're looking at this operational design phase. I

also think we need to share and talk with each other, because we don't want to have burnout in staff, either.

Coming back to you in this ICANN69 meeting, that's a theme I will have a lot, because we won't be able to produce everything that everybody wants in a very short period of time.

With that, I'm looking forward for ICANN69, which will, of course, be the best ICANN meeting ever in recorded history.

I would like to thank you for this executive team. I would like to thank my executive team, and also a special thank you to Mary, who came in on very short notice.

And I'm looking forward to all the interactions with you. And I will miss you dealer, not meeting you in a physical surrounding.

So bye for me.

SALLY NEWELL COHEN: All right. Thank you so much. Thanks to all of you for joining.

Thanks to the executive team and to James for facilitating this session for us.

And I think we'll close. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]