ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Session: CPH and NCSG
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 16:30 to 17:30 IST

This session will now begin. Please start the recording.

MODERATOR

Hello, and welcome to the joint session CPH and NCSG. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session, and I will also post them in the chat shortly for your reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as a question will be read aloud during this session as time permits and when directed by the chair of this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. And I will now hand the floor over to Beth, Owen, and Rafik. You may begin.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

I'll jump right in since we didn't decide. Hi everyone. This is Owen Smigelski. I'm the chair of the RrSG. So welcome to the session with

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.

our friends from the NCSG. Got a decently packed agenda, so I don't know if, Beth, you want to say anything first before we start the agenda?

BETH BACON

Nope. Just this is Beth Bacon. I'm the chair of the RySG, and we appreciate the time with our friends from the NCSG. Looking forward to chatting.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Owen and Beth, for this opportunity and to have this continuous dialogue and discussion. So I want to keep having this, if possible, in every ICANN meeting. And as it was said, we have a quite packed agenda, and hopefully we will cover as much as possible today.

BETH BACON

Hello friends. So we did want to just put on the DNS abuse mitigation PDP that it's kicking off, and we thought it was a good time to check in with NCSG and then share some perspectives and thoughts, maybe flag any concerns that you guys might have.

From the RySG, we are looking forward to what I think the technical term is a zippy PDP, so that we can make sure that we are being thorough but also swift, and deliver some really tangible results and tools to the community. Anything?

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, yes. So we will be starting with the lightweight topic, I guess. Since the DNS Abuse Working Group just started the first session yesterday, I think it is a good opportunity here to align together and to coordinate our efforts. We have the mailing list, but I think we are still not using it yet.

We added members from NCSG, those who are in the working group, so that is maybe one thing to kickstart using. And in turn, maybe for some kind of thoughts or initial reaction from the yesterday session. I could not attend myself, but looking forward to hearing from those who attended what your position is and any concern that we should know, and try to work out those points. So maybe those representatives from NCSG, if they want to jump in anytime, feel free to do so. And I see Michaela in the queue.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Hello. Can you hear me okay?

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah. Please go ahead.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Fantastic. Hi everyone. Good morning. Sorry to not be there in Mumbai today. Just from yesterday's meeting, I think a couple of things stood out, some of which being around the pace of the work and the timeline of the work. It seemed like there's still a little bit of a debate regarding the number of meetings per week and the hours to be dedicated. I think there's a general consensus and

agreement that this is a topic that people do want to resolve relatively quickly for a number of different reasons.

From our end, of course, we want that to be balanced with the kind of concerns that were flagged in the HRIA session, which I know a few of you were here for. I think a concern that came up in that discussion yesterday as well was just ensuring that we stick to the scope of the issues so that, for example, continuing to distinguish between malicious versus compromised domains and ensuring no scope creep, I guess, for lack of better terminology there. But otherwise, as others have mentioned, it is really early stages, and we just had that one initial scene-setting discussion and one more consensus-building exercise. So I think the real work will be starting on Monday. So it is great that we're starting to align today. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADII

Hi everybody. So yesterday's session that we put was just the beginning of the sessions that we are going to organize for human rights and DNS abuse. And the idea that we do this human rights check from the beginning of the process actually has been received by others really warmly. So we are excited about it, but I just wanted to mention that the human rights check is not to block any recommendation. It doesn't have that power. It is not to block any process or progress. What it is, is that when you're going through and coming up with the recommendations, you just have a few questions in mind, and you have a list of rights, and then you think

about what are the possible effects, and if there are mitigation mechanisms, you can provide mitigation mechanisms.

What it can do is that the community can see that this is genuinely a problem, and if they decide that, then they can help you. The HRIA can help you with adding more recommendations. So it is nothing scary. But I want to say that there is also a global public interest framework. They also do that checklist. I wanted to bring your attention to that as well. And so for the PDPs, they are doing that, so we are going to probably do a global public interest check as well. We are not as active with that one. Thank you. I am going to go down, and then if you want to know our concerns and our position, we can cover that briefly.

BETH BACON

Thank you, friends. This is Beth Bacon. I think, Farzi, from the registry side, we're supportive of the inclusion of the requirements for the human rights checks. So we're happy to see that and really appreciate your guidance and expertise as the PDP tackles those. I would open the floor to any registry reps that wanted to offer any thoughts, but really appreciate the input. I think we think it's starting off pretty well, and right now it's just in the getting ourselves together so that we can do good work phase. So really looking forward to diving into the substance. We do have the joint mailing list, so we'll make sure that we keep that fresh and just shoot over any notes or questions, and we can use that to its best advantage. Oh, I see Jen.

JENNIFER CHUNG

Thanks, Beth. Thanks, Farzi. This is Jen for the record. I'm just going to be a little sly here and put half a hat on because I am the liaison for this PDP. I think we will be looking at implementing the human rights impact assessment throughout the ADC PDP. And what that might look like is that after each section or after each question, there could be a lightweight, high-level check on it, not running the full framework every time we look at exactly the questions.

I don't know, and this is quite preliminary as well, because I know that for the Latin diacritics—and I'm sorry that I missed that part in the council meeting when that was gone through, I'll review the recording again—I think for that, they applied it at the very end. But for this one, I think with all the scrutiny and the potential for this impact, it was very briefly mentioned in an administrative meeting that this is something that we might attempt. And of course, Farzi and others, especially from the NCSG, your members, your reps, your participants, your alternates, your observers, we value very much your expertise on this, so you can definitely give us guidance on how to do this in the PDP. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADII

Thank you so much, Jen. We really appreciate all you're doing at the council leadership. Really a voice of reason. Okay. So I want to raise one thing you might want to pay attention to. When we were discussing the human rights impact assessment as the council, we also asked them, "What is your plan?" And one of the things that

they said was that they would like to see Article 17 and Article 27 of UDHR to be included. Article 17 is about a right not to be defrauded, and Article 27 is about intellectual property. I just put that out there. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK

I think there was a question if we want to share if there is any concern or any issues, but if there's nothing to flag, maybe we can move to the next topic. Let's move then. You have always to be careful of what we wish. So this is the human rights impact assessment. I think kind of, maybe to some extent, a continuation of what we were discussing. But I will leave it here to Farzana and Michaela to go deeper and to share about this for discussion. Farzana or Michaela, who wants to go first?

FARZANEH BADII

Michaela, do you want to go first to do the high-level thing?

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Yeah, I'm happy to. I think I wasn't involved in adding this particular agenda point, so I just wanted to clarify if this is just a general note about how we're thinking through a human rights impact assessment. Is that right? I see some nods, fantastic. And these are just points that we have discussed throughout the different topics when it comes to DNS abuse. But if I understand what we wanted to bring up today, it is a few of the main concerns when it comes to mitigation of DNS abuse, ensuring that whenever a suspension

order or a mitigation effort is implemented, that this is in line with the questions that we have already laid out related to necessity, proportionality, and legitimacy.

There should be a clearly laid out and definable understanding that is clearly accessible for the registrant to understand why a decision was made, how it was made, and the decision-making process. So really the key terms here are about necessity, legitimacy, transparency, and accountability. I think that gets to a potential question that we had been discussing in other contexts, which is where we want to see not only just this DNS abuse mitigation PDP, but the topics that we would like to see as priority coming up. But I see, Farzana, you've typed into the chat. If this was specific to the LD, I'm happy to turn to you at that stage. I hope that was helpful, but very happy to give more detail. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII

Yeah. So if you have any questions about this—what is a human rights impact assessment—at this point. But we want to tell you also that we want to have as a staple for each ICANN meeting a town hall for human rights issues. So we will have fifteen-minute blocks, like four blocks of issues that you can raise. And they can be preset topics, and people can also tell us what human rights issues they think go across ICANN. There can be human rights issues with RDRS that they think are important, or they can talk about the new gTLD.

We also have a separate session on the new gTLD application and human rights impact assessment. The thing is that when we do these sessions, it doesn't mean that there are human rights issues with the process. It just means that we need to discuss it and see whether there are human rights issues or not, especially with the upcoming launch of the new gTLD application. The town hall is an innovation that NCSG is presenting, and I think it is going to happen on Wednesday or Thursday. It's only for an hour. And we are going to have four blocks. You can join, and we can talk about RDRS and human rights, authentication of law enforcement and human rights, or any other issue that we see, and we hope that you find it useful.

I also wanted to point you to the Latin diacritics human rights impact assessment, which I think the staff has done an incredible job of being very thorough. This one was one of the easier ones, but staff still has done a great job. This was a little bit easier than doing DNS abuse, but it's a very thorough work that I think you can go and have a look at and see how the human rights impact assessment plays out in these groups. Anything else? Are there any questions?

BETH BACON

This is Beth Bacon. Thanks, Farzi, and thank you, Michaela. I think just from a personal perspective, I have found the sessions that you've done thus far really informative and interesting, so I'm looking forward to the series as you continue it. If there are specific things that come out of that that would be interesting to speak

about during these sessions, that would be great. And if there's ways that we can be helpful, let us know. But I thought they've been really, really well done. Appreciate it. Try again. Oh, there we go. Oh, now it is working. Yay.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, yeah. We can maybe move to the next topic. I think we covered to some extent about the PDP from human rights, but maybe talk more about the access standpoint. So this is with Farzi.

FARZANEH BADII

Yeah. So we frame access as a human rights issue. But I think that we need to shed light on how our PDPs can have an impact on access as a highlighted issue. Because these days, as we see, there is the DNS abuse PDP and there is also going to be some kind of API access. Then we are going to see the proliferation of laws that will—I mean, of course, that's not related to PDPs—but it is about identification, like handing in identification in order to register a domain. I don't want to go into the scary territories of age verification.

But I think that we need to think about how all of these regulatory measures at ICANN and how our PDPs and our policies and recommendations have an impact on the end user access. And by end user access, I mean registrants, but also those people who use the services of the registrant, that by suspending their domain, we impact their access too. I have been trying to discuss this during

charter drafting, and I have been trying to talk about it as end-user access, but I haven't succeeded for now to talk about end user as the person who is using the services and the registrant. I see two hands up, so I am not going to continue. Go ahead, Walter.

VOLKER GREIMANN

Yes. I think that's an interesting point because it reflects also a recent trend I've observed in how the GNSO operates. Seems that we are currently much more on tracks of a railroad that's going for a certain goal and doesn't allow for deviations. That is how the council has been operating, that is how PDPs are being set up, and the representative model that has been chosen in this PDP especially. But that is also seemingly becoming more and more prevalent.

It seems to be replacing the general all-access kind of PDP where everyone could participate and have their voices heard. I get where they're coming from because we did have our regular crazies and the people with their pet peeves that joined PDPs just to have their voices heard that didn't have anything to contribute in the past. But excluding everyone that might have something to say and basically just having a group of insiders decide on internet policy, and excluding the wider internet community that might also want to say something, even though in most cases they didn't, I think is the wrong way for an organization as ICANN is to present itself. It's becoming more exclusive than inclusive, and I think we should aim for the latter.

FARZANEH BADII

Am I chairing? Yes, I absolutely agree with you one hundred percent. But I got to say there are some NCSG members that say in some circumstances it might be preferable because we don't want to be outnumbered by others. But then when it comes to that, we have the issue of parity between CSG and NCSG, which we have tackled so far. But yes, I completely agree with you. I think that as much as possible, the representative model should be an exception and not the rule. Go ahead, Rich.

RICH

Thanks. I like the focus on human rights when we do things here at ICANN because it affects real people, and that is very important to remember. When I think of human rights, I think of freedom of speech and association, freedom to have access to information, that kind of thing. When the IPC thinks about human rights, they think about intellectual and moral rights in art and creative property. When law enforcement thinks about human rights, they think about the freedom to be free from harm. I'm not certain that one is a human right.

So with a focus on human rights, we need to be prepared for people to misuse this. I'm not trying to say that there are human rights that are better than other human rights, just that this is a way for a lot of special interests to get their foot in the door and to advance other things that we have been historically trying to keep them from overriding. Anonymous speech, I think, is one, but how does

that human right balance against the right for law enforcement to be able to pursue wrongdoers? I don't have answers. I just want to raise that.

FARZANEH BADII

I wanted to answer that, Chair. Can I? Or are we on halftime? I'm sorry. Yeah, I think that's a really good question. I think that we do have some human rights balancing tools that could answer the question, Rich. I will go back and talk to Michaela, and then we can come up with a plan on how to balance these things. These are the issues that the human rights community has been talking about for a long time, and we knew that it might happen. So we're not caught off guard. But yeah.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yeah. Thanks, Michele. Not Michaela. The one with the mustache and not the other one. Just to reinforce what Volker was saying about participation, I think this is something that we all need to look long and hard at. I understand why we got here and I understand what drove a lot of it, but I think it's an over-correction. You try something, you go too far, and you need to course-correct. Because what's happening right now with the way these PDPs are being run is that this kind of participation model, or whatever they're calling it, seems to be the default, not the exception.

I don't think that's good overall. I think it's something that, as Volker put more articulately than I will, undermines the entire

model in many respects because you're ending up where it's only those who are able to participate actively who can contribute, and the number of people who can has been reduced in a kind of artificial way. And I don't like that. There were problems previously, and there is probably a happy medium because the free-for-all was problematic. The PDPs went on forever, and there's always going to be a level of criticism that says ICANN won't get anything done and nothing will change. But sometimes that's a feature, not a bug. Just because something hasn't changed does not necessarily mean it is a bad thing. And maybe the lack of consensus on a change means that there is no change, and that's okay. The internet won't break.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Michele. I guess we covered this topic. If there is no further comment, we can maybe move to the next topic. Okay. So this was proposed by us. Just wanted to share some position from NCSG about this topic, about the representation parity in PDP. To some extent, maybe it's linked to what Volker and Michele were talking about, the representative model, and maybe how we will have the balance there in terms of representatives. So we wanted to share our thoughts. My understanding is that maybe it's not something that you discussed already within the CPH, or you don't have a position yet, but just to hear more, exchange, and share with you. We are looking forward for your input later on, but maybe we

can explain more. Farzana, if you want to give more details about this.

FARZANEH BADII

Oh, I'm so sorry. Thank you. Okay. So what is this parity thing? At this stage, we're talking about parity in representative models, especially when it comes to NCSG and CSG. Not parody. That would be really funny. Parity. Basically, a recurring problem is that a certain group wants more slots and members on the PDP, and they advocate for that at the expense of how many members non-commercial stakeholders can have. We have to go through this loop all the time of disagreeing and raising it. Because this has been historically a contentious point, we don't have a template in the charter that says the number of NCSG representatives should be equal to the number of CSG representatives. That would be the point of discussion.

It's always like because CSG gets six members and the NCSG gets three, and then we have to fight it out until we have an equal number of representatives. This happened ten years ago as well. I co-authored a blog about it. And we don't want this to keep happening. So we want once and for all—we have talked to our CSG colleagues as well—a principle that allows us in representative models to be represented on equal footing with CSG. We don't believe that the interests or the expertise that they have or the issues that they bring means that NCSG doesn't have as many interests and expertise. And also, we think that it's more like a sport

thing. You have a team and you need to have the same number on each team. Like it or not, we are really in a football match. So anyway, this was an issue that we are working on. We are not talking anything about how CPH wants to do it. But we are raising it at the council and we want a solution. We are also talking to the CSG.

BETH BACON: Thanks, Farzaneh. Just to say thank you for sharing this. I know that you also presented some of this at the council meeting just prior to this, so I think that is probably the place for discussion of that. But appreciate you guys presenting this to us. As we noted before, we weren't able to discuss this at a registry level, so we don't have any direct comments back, but do appreciate it.

RAFIK DAMMAK: We understand and appreciate that, so we will see how things go from here. With that, maybe we can move to the next topic, and I believe those are proposed by you.

BETH BACON: Thank you very much. This is Beth. This was just a follow-up on our discussion that we had in Dublin to note that as registries, we are noodling on how to enforce the code of conduct on SOIs. Because the code of conduct on SOIs is now fully in force. And again, I say this in every session, but selfishly in the position of chair, I don't want someone to come to me and say, "Well, we need to figure out

how to do this," and do it one way the first time and a different way the second time.

So we're working in the registries to identify a process that not only works for us but also works if there is an issue outside of the registries, if someone from the registries has a concern about someone in the NCSG—not that we would ever—or vice versa. So we're still working on that and to figure out what the actual words will be in that, but we're also trying to follow the principles that are enshrined in the code of conduct. So just keeping this on the radar, wondering if you folks are thinking about this at all and how you might handle enforcement or complaints and that sort of thing? Happy to discuss it as we finalize, but we are still very much a work in progress for registries.

RAFIK DAMMAK Just to understand what you were saying. I thought when we talked about the SOI implementation, it is that kind of continuous effort that started with GNSO and after the board came up with some process. But what you are saying is that you are trying to implement that at the registry levels?

BETH BACON Yeah. So there's the code of conduct, and then it has an appendix that is guidance on enforcement on how each SOAC stakeholder group can handle any complaints. And so we are trying to make sure that it's very clear in the registries how we will handle those

complaints. I think it is best if there's a predictable process that we can point to. So we're just trying to fulfill that and make sure we're not missing anything with regards to enforcement.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks for the clarification, and it's good to flag this. I mean, personally I missed that. Each stakeholder group is supposed to implement on their side how to enforce it. Let's see if there are any comments or any reaction to this. Okay, but maybe another question from me. It's quite interesting because there was no really follow-up that we should implement from ICANN org. So it's kind of left to each group to figure out that they should do it.

But if it's possible to share later what you are coming up within the registry, that can be useful for us. I mean, we don't need to reinvent the wheel. If we can reuse that, then yeah, I think it will be of interest for the whole community, not just for us. Good.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, let's double-check. Okay, we are on the same page. Maybe next. I think this will be the last topic to finish with. It's a super lightweight topic: the review of reviews. It's coming also proposed, but what I can share from our perspective, we know that we have the draft or proposal that is being shared during this ICANN meeting, and we had more or less exposure during our meeting yesterday, and I think also today in GNSO.

So we don't have any position yet. We have to catch up. But it's good to see what the Cross-Community Working Group is coming with in terms of proposal and the different ideas. And maybe we need some clarification about what these ad hoc reviews are. I understand how they split in terms of focus and when it can be initiated and so on. But at least for NCSG, we will care about what were the specific reviews. One of the concerns or something we are cautious about was the holistic review, the structural review, because we always sense there are some risks there. But we are still reviewing the review of reviews proposal and we'll have to build our input, but looking forward to hearing from your side what the concerns or any highlights that can be useful for us are.

BETH BACON

This is Beth Bacon. For review of reviews, the registries have been trying to remain pretty active and engaged. I am an observer on the group. We also have several other active members that are participating. As an observer on the group, I have submitted registry stakeholder views. Specifically, I'll share the tenets of what we've submitted, which is the foundation. We are looking forward to crafting a review that is grounded in—for lack of a better term—immovable documents, things that are a bit quantifiable, like the strategic plan and the bylaws. These things that are foundational to ICANN, but then allowing for flexibility.

So a little bit of grounding in foundational documents and then allowing for flexibility as new issues arise as our environment and

our organization ICANN changes, as it is continually doing, to make sure that the reviews are structured in a way that allows for that and also are able to get done and implemented, so making sure they're well scoped. So those are the fundamentals that we are focusing on. That first round was the buckets A and B. Becky's been involved. Buckets A and B were the first proposals, and now they are on to the C buckets. And so registries will remain involved, and I'm happy to coordinate, and if there are ideas or thoughts, let us know.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Beth. I think the main challenge in terms of participation is that we don't have any representative in that Cross-Community Working Group, just two from GNSO, so we are left to, as you are doing, have an observer follow. It's not the same. And I understand that the Cross-Community Working Group opened the possibility for input anytime, which is welcome, but still it's not the same to have a representation there.

But what do you mean by the bucket? Because what I am seeing is mostly the table where they separate between the different reviews: accountability, CIP assessments, structural review, review of reviews, and the ad hoc or on-demand reviews. Just a clarification so we're all on the same page.

BETH BACON

I'm not sure what chart you're looking at, but I think that it might be one of the resources from when they were doing their preparation, saying what are the things that exist now and what needs to be in scope of the review of reviews and what the review of reviews team is not looking at. So I think that might be what you're looking at. The buckets A and B were proposals out of the review of reviews team on how to structure reviews going forward. It's starting to get to the scope, the foundation documents, and how to measure those things. So I think it maybe is one step beyond what that is.

I will say that group has been quite open to observers. If you don't have one, I joined as an individual and then I noted for them that I would love to be able to participate and submit some views on behalf of the registries, and they're very open to that. It's been very welcoming, so there is not really a limitation as an observer, which has been very nice, and I think it is a great way to have them work.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yes, Michele. I still think that calling anything "review of reviews" is just such a ridiculous ICANN-esque mouthful that trying to explain that to anybody who doesn't come to these meetings just reinforces how ridiculous ICANN is in many respects. It sounds bonkers. But at least it's better than the food analogies. I was getting really, really tired of trying to see how far they could stretch pizzas and other things that various people were talking about for a period of time. That did get a bit weird.

It's like they weren't actually serving us the pizza either, Rafik. I mean, it's like they were talking about it, but they weren't giving it to us, so you had the calzone. Did anybody get a bloody calzone? I don't remember getting one. Snap didn't either.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Michele. Yeah, it's all a nice name created in the best times prior to the PDP. Okay, but just to come back here, I think we were also trying to get more people to follow. We should have done that before, but we know that there is opportunity and we will get people to follow. I think it is good that if we can coordinate if there is any need about input.

I do agree that they are adding more about the strategic planning and so on as input, and something to assess as progress, because at the end, a lot of things or how things are planned or prioritized is through those documents or plans. It makes sense to review them and to see really how much ICANN is delivering and how much we are doing.

Because if we can link that to another topic that has come up a lot, which is about efficiency and effectiveness. Something I shared with some is I feel that when we mention that, it's kind of the GNSO getting the blame that we are not moving quickly or we are not efficient, while the GNSO spent so much time in terms of improvement, PDP 3.0, and after that. But it just kind of tried to link

to the whole topic of review of reviews. But yeah, something to have in mind.

Okay, I think in terms of time, we are doing too well. We have thirteen minutes, but check if there is anything else to add to this topic. And yeah, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADII: Yeah, sorry, I thought we had urgent requests on the agenda if you want to talk about that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I guess we are wrapping up for this and moving to what is the AOB and wrap up, but I am not sure if we can bring the urgent request.

BETH BACON: If Farzaneh wants to make a comment, then others are free to listen. I can't guarantee a response.

FARZANEH BADII: Okay. So for the urgent request, because I also saw that I'm not very—sorry, I don't want you to tell us whatever position you have, but I want to tell you our position. So for the urgent request and authentication, basically what we want to happen is that first of all, we need more clarity on the criteria based on which these urgent requests are responded to. There are three criteria for urgent

requests: imminent threats, critical infrastructure, and something else. In our public comment, we said that those are not clear.

Also, another thing is the matter of authentication. We don't look at these two in a separate way because if law enforcement gets authenticated, we don't want this to be an impression that if they have an urgent request, the registrar should just submit the data. So looking at this more holistically, we recommended that there should be some additional policy, especially for authentication, and to clarify those criteria for urgent requests.

And I know that you are talking about the timeline for authentication. I just wanted to know what your position is on authentication. Do you believe that there should be some additional policy? And by additional policy, we mean not internally how law enforcement authenticate themselves, but we want to see more transparency reporting, also categories of the requests and what the requests are about. And when it comes to urgent requests, we want to see numbers, the number of urgent requests that you get, and the criteria based on which you got them.

Urgent request has potential human rights implications. We have been saying this and we are getting challenged basically because urgent requests could disclose data quickly without a subpoena and could have some potential implications. But I see Ray's hand up.

RICH

Thanks. So I said this in one of the earlier sessions this week, so I don't want to belabor it too much, but I think it's going to be really useful to have a list of domains that law enforcement officers around the world use. And that will be helpful in terms of each registrar's validation of the requester. That says nothing about our evaluation of their requests, that says nothing about our evaluation of their jurisdictional issues, but it is a useful thing to have.

The easier way to get what law enforcement is looking for, which is fast access to information, is for ICANN to share the information that registries and registrars share with ICANN on a, I think, triannual basis with our information. And every time we renew our accreditation, we have to provide them with that twenty-four hour contact information. I'm fine with law enforcement having that. It's a little silly to me that we aren't required to publish it. I'm not saying we should publish it. But we just have to have it.

So if ICANN has that list, I have no problem with them giving it to authenticated law enforcement representatives so that when they need to, they can contact me, they can contact Volker, they can contact the right person at the right time. Because if they really want what they say they want, which is fast access to information to literally save lives, they're not going to send an email.

MICHELE NEYLON

Yes, Michele. I think the key thing here is that if you want fast access, you need a phone number or something else, because an email won't wake most of us up. And that just is a statement of fact,

I think. Also, I have been echoing what Rich says. I mean, I have absolutely no issue with law enforcement agencies having access to those contacts from our side. Sure, have at it.

I wish they would give them that, because it's something that when we were asked to provide it years ago, they never had a method to provide it to anybody else, which just seemed really weird. So you have an obligation to give ICANN this, but ICANN has no way of giving it to law enforcement. So what is the point?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Yeah, thanks for that, Michele and Rich. Also just to clarify, it's not an obligation to provide ICANN with that information. It has to be available to law enforcement upon request. So you have to designate something, but you don't necessarily have to tell that to ICANN, and my understanding is ICANN does not collect that. The only time ICANN deals with the law enforcement contact is when it has to check it in an audit or if there is a complaint from law enforcement.

So you just want to be careful to not create the perception out there that ICANN has a master list of every registrar's contact. And that contact is for law enforcement abuse and illegal activity reports. Do we want to also tell law enforcement that they can contact us for that for disclosure requests? I think that might be something we'd have to consider when we take that wording from the RAA and purpose it for something else in there as well. But certainly that exists, and all of us have to have that at some point, and it's been

audited and tested for those of us who have been through that. So why not leverage that? Thanks.

MAXIM ALZOBA

Maxim Alzoba for the transcript. Actually, under local law, usually the law enforcement agency is well described as to who they are, what they can do, and what they cannot do. And if you're a registrar or registry from a particular jurisdiction, the only law enforcements are those who are from the same jurisdiction. Others, at best, are third parties. And at the worst, contacting them or answering them might lead you to very tight spaces for quite long sentences.

So in my opinion, to some degree Interpol works, but quite badly these days. And that is it. If the law enforcement domain is not like your ccTLD—for the United States, it is going to be .gov—it is easy. Most probably, you shouldn't answer. Thanks.

BETH BACON

This is Beth, calling on myself. I don't want to comment on the nitty-gritty, the ins and outs, the things that are still all the considerations of how complicated an authentication mechanism for law enforcement might be. I will note that these conversations are happening all over ICANN because the policy workpath has completed with the drafting of the policy and public comments. And it is clear that we need to come together on what happens next. So I think that is the conversation that we need to switch to rather than diving in on all the details, because right now that

conversation is not a community one. So that would be my thought.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Beth. Yeah, we had quite an interaction for the last part. And I think it's a good time maybe to wrap up since it's the last session of the day. I think one point, as we said, maybe to try to continue those meetings. Of course, we can improve in terms of the agenda and the topics so we have even better interaction. Let's do it maybe for ICANN86, knowing the challenges of a shorter meeting, but we can figure out how we can make it.

Other than that, just if there is any feedback or any further comment, I think that will be helpful. Otherwise, yeah, I want just to thank you again for this opportunity. We will continue to work, and in particular I think intersessionally, so like we said, the mailing list. And for a specific topic, maybe we can have calls for that to focus on some of the issues to have more coordination. We will probably identify that in the next days. Yeah. Over to you.

BETH BACON

This is Beth. I think just appreciate—it's always nice to hear the perspectives from the NCSG. You have expertise in things that are so very different than the registries and registrars, specifically human rights and HRIA, which I think are really important to incorporate. I am very glad we are. So I always like hearing about those things and appreciate this time with you.

	We do have, as we go into the PDP, the mailing list. So I do want to make sure that we use it. I think just as ExComm, maybe we can commit to the folks here that we will start a cadence of either a meeting or using the list to say, "These are the issues, how are folks feeling?" and just get that going. But thank you guys very much.
OWEN SMIGELSKI	I'll say no need for me to take up more time. So I think we can go ahead and mirror what the other two colleagues said, and we can go ahead and close the meeting. Thank you.
ICANN MODERATOR	Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]