

---

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 17<sup>th</sup> of April 2019, 1300 UTC. On today's call we do have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Kaili Kan, Hadia Elminiawi, John Laprise, Jonathan Zuck, Glenn McKnight, Gordon Chillcott, Alan Greenberg, George Kirikos, Vanda Scartezini, Satish Babu, Greg Shatan, Lililian Ivette De Luque and we also have Maria Korniiets.

We do have apologies noted from Bastiaan Goslings and Abdulkarin Ayopo Oloyede. From Staff we have Andrea Glandon, we have Evin Erdogan and myself, Michelle DeSmyter, on call management. As reminders to everyone, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you and over to Jonathan Zuck. Jonathan, the floor is yours.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Welcome to the CPWG call. Is there anyone with an updated Statement of Interest? We might start to get them as the elections draw near in the RALO's. The agenda is talking about EPDP. Some things on policy comment updates and a little bit on various ICANN65 policy topics and a timeline for some talking points, some things that we have more a process this time than we did last time. Is there anything that anybody else wants to

---

*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.*

---

have on the agenda that they don't see there? Okay, is adopted. Without further ado, hand the microphone to Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll go first, I only have a brief thing. The EPDP is still in recess, there's not a lot going on. There have been some proposals from the intern leadership, specifically Rafik Dammak on proposals for how to go forward. There has been a comment from a number of people, including myself, that we should delay at this point until the new Chair is in place. The new Chair is going to Jānis Kārklīņš, the former GAC Chair, former MAG Chair, former head of UNESCO, a number of illustrious positions and he'll be taking on the role of Chair of the EPDP. That's about all I have. I see Hadia has her hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Also, I don't have much to say but I would like to address the issue of when should the next phase be concluded or what's the deadline of the work of phase two? I would just like to state my opinion on that. The EPDP policy should be implemented by the 29<sup>th</sup> of February 2020, therefore, to have a fully functioning system that would actually replace the retired WHOIS System, a standardized access model should ideally be also ready and implemented by that date. For this to happen, we need to finish our work by November 2019 at most. I just wanted to share my

---

opinion on this matter and maybe listen to yours as well. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. Alan, more to add?

ALAN GREENBERG: I just realized the vote on the advice to the Board, I think is closed now, I'm not sure. Evin is it closed and if so, do we have a result?

EVIN ERDOGDU: I'm sorry, it's a rather loud café because internet was down in my flat where I'm staying but the vote closes at 20 UTC today. As of yesterday, we just had two people who had yet to vote but I expect they have voted by now, so that will close today shortly and then I'll submit with Maureen to the ICANN Board and cc the public email address as you suggest.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, sorry I had the time wrong, I thought it was closing at noon today, not 20. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great Alan, thank you, thanks Evin. Anybody have any questions on the next phase of EPDP? I think it's pretty exciting to have Jānis as Chair.

---

Policy comment updates, Evin do you want to go through where things stand?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sure, I'll do my best and apologies again for the background noise. Recently ratified by the ALAC there are none but today we will be submitting as noted, the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the EPDP. Then there are two additional comments being drafted which I think the penholders are Greg and Judith, which have some comments on their statement regarding the .org Registry Agreement. Then there are two public comments for decision, these are also registry agreements .BIZ and .INFO and as noted on last week's CPWG, today's session was having a discussion on registry agreements and pricing and the ALAC approach to commenting on these public comments. I'm not sure if you would like to go ahead and discuss this now Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess there's no time like the present. I threw together some slides to kind of summarize a little bit what the discussion that George and I did for Glenn. I hope people have had a chance to look at it. I've got a bad echo, somebody's still got it wide open, I think. Thanks. If you want to, we got actually a draft document from Greg Shatan and I will give him a chance, is he on the call? You are there, okay. I'm going to run through some slides just to get everybody's juices flowing a little bit on this topic and up for discussion. This is dealing with a couple of the key issues associated with several of the comments.

---

This is in no way definitive, either substantively or procedurally in terms of whether or not we want to combine comments and give a generalized comment or come up with some comment sections that we use in addition to some customized sections. That's one of the discussions that we need to have to today. This is just meant to be a little bit of a place setter on these two big issues of pricing and URS just to get the conversation going and I suspect it will. I did these last night, let's see how they go.

If you recall, when we were trying to set our policy for the EPDP process, it began with an analysis of different types of users, one was registrants and the other was non-registrants and the distribution looked a little bit like this and we can concluded it was our responsibility to At-Large to be focused on the non-registrants end users, both because they represented the majority and because they were under represented in the EPDP, that's why Alan and Hadia have focused one. Wherever there was a conflict of interest.

I think we're going to have a similar type of discussion now about different types of users and the context of these renewals as well. If you think about the folks that are in fact registrants, people that have registered domain names, there's a similar distribution between high volume and low volume registrants. High volume registrants include businesses that have done lots of defensive registrations to protect their trademarks. We use to joke that E owned everything with eBay in it other than Chesapeake Bay. There were instances where there were thousands of defensive domain registrations for large companies, so those are fairly high-volume registrants.

---

The other sort of category of volume registrants are folks that are investors in domains, that purchase domains on speculation and hoping that those domains either they can generate value in them or that over time people will recognize value and then pay a premium to get those domain names. I don't know what the best word is, the other type of high-volume registrants and again they represent a minority of overall registrants so it thinks it's important to start to think about where there may or may not be some distinctions and interests between the two.

If we think about characteristics of high-volume registrants there's very high price sensitivity due to large portfolios, a small price increase actually results in a big check because you own a lot of domains and they want the value to be captured in the secondary market rather than the primary market. In other words, they prefer to see the price volatility and the value capture to happen in the auction context or resale context and keep the prices in the primary markets less. Then there's also, because of the volume, a higher likeliness of running a fowl of trademark as well. Those are some of the characteristics of high-volume registrants.

If we think of characteristics of non-registrants, again, still the biggest piece of our pie, there's a desire for less infusion. There's a desire for less DNS abuse, desire for less fraud, that's what we've seen in some. When names are similar etc., people purchase things that are similar to brands etc., bring the false products and things of that sort. Those are some interests.

If you look at low volume registrants, there's less sensitivity to price due to low volume portfolios. I own 20 domains, a small price increase or even a large one, say 30% is not going to have a

---

high impact on my bottom line because of the low size of my portfolio. These low volume registrants perform more availability in this kind of a market, in other words, as group they would prefer to see more strings available at lower costs rather than having to go to an auction market or a secondary market to get them.

They prefer less strength infusions, a registrar string, they'll just as soon that there not be a bunch a strings registered very similar. They prefer cheaper conflict resolution. If you look at the third world, there's more of a desire for URS rather than PIP and the cost to there is a much greater one than there is between the price of a base domain. The context of trying a website, the actual price of the domain is the cheapest part of that whole price and so URS is something that is interesting to folks with less money to spend despite some of the issues associated with it, we'll talk about that more.

One of the distinctions we've been talking about is price caps, this is a complicated issue because as we studied in the CCTRT, we found that very likely the price caps are below market value and that made it very difficult to do a competition assessment because if some of these larger legacy TLD's are price capped, they're able to sustain that because of their economy of scale but they actually create a price point that's difficult for new gTLD's to compete in in a lower scale. It wasn't at all clear that the price caps right now were any resemblance to where the market would settle if it was open. It's also important to note that any price increase with the ability to lock the price for 10 years and you have six months to make the decision. If you are making an investment in the domain you want to keep for a long time you have the capacity to do that.

---

End caps elasticity of domains is a good thing in having a real understanding of competitions in the marketplace. It's difficult for us to access now, which is why the CCRT asked for more data.

The other issue that comes up is whether or not there's a distinction between a registry or registry service provider. I see George has his hand up. George and Zack from ICA talk about registries as though they are registry service providers and a cost-based justification for their prices, which carries with it an assumption that ICANN is really going to be an outward price regulator and I think that is something that ICANN has tried to avoid and the community has tried to avoid.

Again, it's still up for discussion but we have in the past, told registries that they're on their own to compete, so .COM as popular as it is in the US, it is not the number one domain in Germany where .CE is most popular, so a lot of money get's spent on marketing, advertising deals, etc. in places for example where .COM is not the most popular. They're put in a position of doing their own marketing and they're also going to be – if these registry agreements are updated, there's going to be new RPM's that we're going to have to implement. It's not just a simple question of their costs as much as a role that we put them in of market creators that changes the way that we think about them to some extent.

The discussion we need to have today is a little bit about where the At-Large should fall. Should we be focused as we did on EPDP on the majority which are non and low volume registrants? Should we, as Greg suggests, URS because it wasn't community created policy, still a lot of discussions going on about it? I think



---

those are sort of the two big issues that we need to discuss today. It's meant to be a level set. I see George has his hand up, so George go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Thanks Jonathan. This not really a balance representation of all sides of the issues, this basically Jonathan's view of the issue and I very much disagree with it. Even going through the slides, the first slide compares end users with registrants, registrants verses non-registrants, I think this is basically trying to send out a position that registrants are somehow unusual and should be treated differently than the broader communities interest which I think is not correct. Any costs that are imposed on registrants are ultimately going to be passed on to end users, either through compliance costs with URS or higher fees with the actual registration fees.

The next slide talking about high verses low volume registrants, as I mentioned on the conference call last week that I had with Jonathan, Glenn and Eduardo, it's really not a fair comparison to say that folks that own more than one .ORG are somehow different than people that own a single .ORG domain name. The interests of registrants are perfectly aligned, whether you have one telephone line, say one mobile phone or 50 mobile phones, you generally want to have the same policies, reasonable fees.

People that have higher volume of domains or a higher volume of phone lines, there are more likely to speak out just because the impact is higher in an absolute sense. Not too many people are going to speak out if their phone bill goes up by \$5 a month but if

---

they have 1,000 phone lines, they're probably going to be more motivated to speak out. The views of higher volume registrants are perfectly aligned with those of lower volume registrants. One person that owns a .ORG domain name and wants to sell their website in the future, their interests are going to be affected in the same manner if the .ORG fees double or triple in price over time due to these unlimited prices or sorry, fee increases. These slides talking about high volume registrants, in my view it's trying to set out the position that the high-volume registrant is not a fair spokesperson for the general registrant and I obviously disagree with that position. It's not a really fair characterization.

Higher volume registrants or lower volume registrants wanting cheaper conflict resolution. It doesn't cost anything to respond to a URS or UDRP, so the point of view of a registrant defending a UDRP or URS, going with one person on UDRP, the fees are identical, zero. I don't think they necessarily want to have the costs be lower for the complaint, mainly the trademark holder. These characteristics seem to be artificial.

In terms of registrants that are higher volume being more likely to be cyber squatters, that's probably not the case either. My portfolio is very clear and I don't face very much trademark risk but I do face risks from people that are overreaching in terms of trademarks, making claims that are not going to be supported by the law. To that extent, I think the interested are again aligned, that people want to see the rule of law applied and they don't necessarily want to make it easier for the trademark holder or any complainant to make a complaint easier than that allowed by the law itself in their country.

---

We've seen how forced arbitration system can be anti-consumer or an anti-respondent in general. There's not really a level playing field often and I pointed that out in the URS for example, where the complain is always in English, which is very disadvantaging to non-English registrants and there are other problems with the URS, I won't go through them all.

I made various policy improvement recommendations in the RPN PDP. This idea of the price cap being below market value in the CCTRT, that's really not a fair statement. The idea that the fees should be disassociated with the costs of providing a service. The registry operators are really providing two services, namely the management of the central database of their TLD, so who the registrant of each domain, that's reflects through the WHOIS and the zone file essentially and the actual resolution of the domain name.

If you own example.org and it has a couple name servers, you're browsing the internet and there's a query made to the registry operators name server for how do I locate this domain name, it will spit back those name servers, that's all the registry operator does. We know that inter-competition, the fair value for those services is below a dollar per year. When Jonathan's talking about the price caps being below 'market value' that's kind of conflating two different issues. The costs under competition for actually providing the service, the registry services, those are the actually fees which are below a dollar.

Then, the idea that if the registry operator actually owned the domain names, which they don't, if they registry operators owned the domain names what could the charge the maximum renewal

---

fees? That's entirely different from the actual state of affairs in .ORG, .COM and .NET, the registrant is the owner of the domain names and wants the service, sorry the registry services provided at the lowest possible fee that would exist under a tender process. They're not saying, what's the most that the registry can charge us and still cause us to renew the domain names, that's entirely a different question. That's looking at the value of the domain name itself, which is something that – the value belongs to the registrant not the registry operator. The registry should only be concerned about what's the cost of actually providing their registry services, which is below a dollar from the .IN, India, ccTLDs.

That slide about price caps in .ORG, testing the otiosity is a good thing, blah, blah, that's treating in the new gTLD philosophy where the registry operator actually owns the TLD and has unlimited price increases and fee increases. Where the registrant is kind of a tenant instead of an actually owner in their own right and that philosophy is entirely wrong and totally different from the legacy TLD's, which all the value belongs to the registrant, they're all the true owners of the domain names. If any other registries need to compete and so on. What has .ORG done differently in the last 10 years or however long they've been the delegated operator of the TLD's? There's a huge switching costs if you actually had to switch your domain name. The current registrant is really locked in unless they plan to give up the domain name entirely and 10 years is insufficient to allow for such a transition, they would be basically forced to walk away from their investment.

If there is going to be limited fee increases, then it should only happen for newly created domain names, where the registrant

---

knew going in that the fees would be entirely at the whim of the registry operators with unlimited fee increases possible. If people knew that going in, which they do for the new gTLD's, then that's fair but to change it in the middle of the game is really unjustifiable in my view. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks George. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Jonathan, you started off mentioning the perhaps similarity of this discussion to that of the users verses registrants, where we have long taken a position that if registrants are users and we support them and we work to help them but if there is a conflict, then we support users based on the numbers. I'd like to ask, what is the real relevance of this topic to users?

To the individual users? Remember, the buy low words are individual users, that is those who are not there as businesses or something else. Yes, there may be a difference between high volume registrants and low volume, George argues no, you are UDS. I would claim that most high volume registrants are in fact running business, whether it's Facebook doing defensive registrations, someone who essentially does business in domains, it's a business, or for that matter, cyber abuse people who are registering large numbers of domains for abuse, it's all a business. I'm not quite sure that falls within our domain. The argument that the value should not be in the registry, I'm afraid we're past that,

---

.COM's annual revenue from just renewals and new registrations is a billion dollars a year.

Now, they run a really, really reliable database, that's what they do, they run database. We've set up rules that allow them to have revue of a billion dollars a year from that, I don't think we're going to go back on that. I would ask, what is the relevance to users? Why are we spending this much time on it? Is there any relevance? Now, I can give you my personal opinion. I think .ORG has been subject to price controls and we shouldn't remove them in one fell swoop, we should do something more gradual than have a large discontinuity. But, I'm still not quite sure that it's an issue relevant to users. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Alan and it's always a legitimate question. I appreciate you asking that question. That's where I was trying to get to with the idea of having less string confusion etc., less availability that end users have some interest in there being in many respects more expensive domains because there's fewer of them as a consequence less string confusion, there's less DNS abuse because the very low prices that started come out in the new gTLD program etc., is where a lot of DNS abuse migrated. That was my theory on why was important to non-registrant end users. Again, that's all open for debate. Greg Shatan, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Can you hear me?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: A little muffled but I think so, yeah.

GREG SHATAN: I will try to speak more directly into the mic. First, some of you have missed focus, the very end of your presentation Jon where you said that [inaudible]. I think you meant George or you said George and I heard Greg, that was from George's intervention clearly, his position. I was asking myself as penholder a similar question to what Alan deposited, what is the relevance to the individual end user and I think the relevance is limited and to the extent that there is relevance, the changes in the .org agreement are positive developments for end users.

I think that cheap domains have been shown to be a haven for abuse, there have even been penny domains and those new TLD's that sold very low-price domains were particularly full of abuse to the point where they're blacklisted in some cases by threat assessment companies. I think that the URS overall benefits end users for the reasons that Jon stated. It's been introduced into a number of the legacy TLD's before the new gTLD program without any comment by ALAC. There would need to be a big reason to change that now.

I think for the reasons I said, if anything, we would want to put in a statement in support of that, not an opposition. It's a very interesting argument, the rule of law is somehow benefited by removing a right's protection mechanism, if there are abuses of the mechanisms it's an educate. Since the URS is decided by clear and convincing evidence which is a higher standard than the UDRP, if anything the URS has greater protection for registrants

---

in that way than the UDRP, whether that's too much protection or not is a different question but it is definitely a higher level of protection. The fact that we know, anything from the .IN situation is obviously an argument even its data as knowledge.

I agree with Jonathan's assessment of that, that in fact we don't know. If we do know something it's not that registry operators' services are worth less than a dollar. Overall, the question is whether we should submit any comments at all? Last, on the issue of price caps, ICANN has generally disfavored price caps, they are a legacy of a much earlier era and generally speaking the picket fence disfavors price caps, it doesn't eliminate the idea overall and there maybe reasons for price caps, where they go to the issue of discriminatory or abusive pricing.

But, just the ability to price generally as a business as oppose to a controlled carrier is where things have been going for some time and will continue to go. This is not a black and white set up, there are various transitional provisions and notice provisions written into this .ORG agreement which mirror those of largely of the standards-based registry agreements. There is some grandfathering if you will and some warning period as to whether there is 'high' switching costs. I think certainly for an individual registrant probably not the case, maybe for a higher volume registrant, maybe a business registrant but in any case, I think that's really not domain for our kind of constituency, for the individualized users.

It's not to say the positions of other stakeholders are incorrect or unfair, it's just that there's the issues of other stakeholders. Sometimes ALAC will find itself aligned with one group of



---

stakeholders, sometimes with another, sometimes with none, sometimes with all, in the case of full consensus but it does not necessarily mean that other groups are wrong, it's all a matter of presentism. We just need to hold on to our perspective.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: I'm sorry to interrupt, we're having a hard time hearing, the interpreters are, if you could maybe speak closer? Your line is sounding a little muffled, if you could just speak closer to your phone or microphone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe just wrap up, we got to keep going.

GREG SHATAN: I'm about to wrap. I didn't time myself, hopefully I didn't take more time than either of you. In any case, overall as I was about to wrap up. I was saying that the – as I puzzled over whether there was a comment to write here, largely the answer I came to was no, rather than providing a draft document for discussion what I provided was a discussion document for discussion, which we can look at but I think kind of flows naturally from Jonathan's slide. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. Everybody, I guess try to keep to a couple of points here because people lose your thread. John Laprise, go ahead.

---

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. After listening to all perspectives here, I am disinclined to put At-Large issuing an opinion on this issue, however I think that in doing so, I think we should explain, we should actually issue some sort of an opinion about why we're choosing not to get involved in this. From my perspective, while I see that there are some end user issues, both on the end users who are not registrants as well as end users who are registrants, I think in the long run, it's more important to keep our cover dry as it were, to conserve our capital, to fight out their battles. I think at this point; I'm leaning towards a non-opinion but with an explanation of that non-opinion. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, John. Sebastien.

SABASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. It seems that we need to be really becoming professional to be able to participate to the discussion [inaudible] I will say. No, I hope we don't need. First of all, I don't know where it's coming from that when a TLD, it's one dollar for backend registry, my figure really different. It's maybe because we have so much taxes in France that we can't compare with other countries. Joke.

My second point is, if we come back to some history, we know why ICANN's gift to ISOC [inaudible] to run the .ORG. When somebody is writing that .ORG didn't make anything good for end user, I am quite stand, really, really, really. I need to see there is

---

one TLD in the G space that I hope we can trust it's a .ORG and the people who run the .ORG, if they are doing wrong, we have some possibility to make them change as member of ISOC for example but I really think that we need to avoid this type of comparison between .COM and .NET and .ORG, they are not in the same puzzle for you anymore and that's good. If I have to support one, you know which one I will support. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Sebastien. I guess as another datapoint, PIR has had the ability to raise prices all along and hasn't raised them in the last five years. I'm not sure this contract change would necessarily lead them to doubling and tripling their price. Are there other issues that people want to raise? It sounds like there is starting to be some consensus around potentially not commenting on this. If people want to specifically to that issue that John and Alan both have suggested, if other people feel different about whether or not we should comment on the renewals please speak up. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Pretty well. It's a little distorted.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Besides the issues that George mentioned, we also have the issues that Maureen has brought up on a couple other things that are common in .ASIA and .INFO and that is the issues of universal acceptance and some other issues. I think that are definitely issues to comment on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Judith. You think that we should try to do a comment on universal access, requirements being imposed on renewables?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, all the different ones on that because I think those are the same issues. Maureen brings them up in .ASIA in her comments on Wiki and there are relevant to a lot of different areas. I think we should have a common statement across.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. That might suggest that we want to just do a comment on universal acceptance that sort of applies to everybody, opposed to calling out anybody in particular on that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks Judith, I just wanted to clarify. Anyone else want to speak up on issues?

---

I guess the question on the table is, a comment that suggests that we're going to stay out of this as John suggested but also mention some areas generally that are important to us, such as universal access. Is that something that everybody sounds like they can get behind?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jonathan. I did make a little mention last time mentioning the basic dues that registries pay ICANN, suggesting that we might wish for the sake of ICANN finances and certainly for our operation in ICANN cost being reduced because of the costs of operations growing due to inflation, that the dues that are paid to ICANN, the sold called tax that some people call it, would need to follow inflation. In the long term, we really are in a losing game as the budgets are going to get smaller and smaller. Thank you. I did put by the way just in writing, in the chat I think it was on the .ASIA wiki page. This can be copied across for all of the TLD. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. That's possibly another thing we could add to a generalized comment, which is that we've outgrown the six dollar amount fee and need to look towards something that goes up based on inflation, some inflationary rate or something like that to keep up. Any feedback on that idea? Greg, go ahead briefly.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Just briefly, while I'm a big supporter of universal acceptance, universal access, I don't think it's really on point for

---

these legacy registry agreements and we should save that point to be made where it's remains. In any case, I don't think these agreements are going to change but frankly know that we see anything that really should be put into these agreements relating to universal acceptance. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I take Olivier just mentioned something that is relevant to end users. He mentioned the issue of ICANN fees. You may recall, I think it was Olivier but I maybe wrong, at an open forum session a year or two ago, he suggested that to address certain budget issues and I think it was in reference to things like the crop program, that we raise fees by a penny and there was a huge outcry from contracted parties saying, we're going to have to pass it on, that means that costs are going to go up.

I think if there's one message that comes out of this discussion, is ICANN needs to be consistent. If we are blessing and approving the concept of fees that go up, the we stop playing this silly game of saying, our fees must be frozen because it would increase costs to users. If there's a single message out of this, I think it's that one, that ICANN needs to be consistent and if indeed it is approving this and as it has on all of the new gTLD's, that is no price caps, then we should stop playing game that price sensitivity because of our fees is a relevant issue. Thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Greg, is that an old hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: He was up before me, it is an old hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. George, go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: I agree with Alan, there's a huge amount of hypocrisy involved. ICANN doesn't have any suppliers of its own that can charge ICANN any fees they want. It's like really some extraordinary, you have basically a monopoly provider being able to set their own fees and not having to justify them. You have this in the military where you have a markup model, they develop weapon systems and have a fixed margin but to have a monopoly provider, a registry service being able to charge any fee they want doesn't make any sense.

Registry operators don't do that themselves to their own supplies as shown by PIR's own tender process for the .ORG contracting. Their own employees get to set their own wage rate, I'm sure they'd love to be able to do that if that's the president. There needs to be some underlying economic model to do that. If people have the ability to have unlimited price increases, have that for newly created domain names, people would know the

---

risks upfront but to change it in the middle of the game that's entirely unacceptable. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, George. Any other comments on this? If not, I may ask Greg since he got started drafting something, to move the draft over to wiki and try to incorporate some of the suggestions, if you are up for that Greg, that we heard on the call today? Really limiting what we're asking for, we're making a few general points. Are you able to take that assignment Greg?

GREG SHATAN: I will take it on, thanks Jon.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot. Evin, is there anything left in your slides in terms of open policy comment issues?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Nope, I think we've covered these topics and I note Maureen was an apology for this fall but she's working her proposal of .ASIA registry agreement. That's all, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great Evin, thank you. Thanks everyone for that lively discussion. I think we moved quite a bit over the course of this so thank you.



---

The next topic is about ICANN65 policy topics. What we did at ICANN64 is a number of things related to the open policies. One was that we had some talking points, we had kind of a talking point memo. This didn't get a lot of vetting because it was sort of a last-minute request by the ICANN64 planning committee and so we want to put that through more process this time so that people have an opportunity for input into what those talking points look like.

We're going to try to come up with some kind of a timeline for that, that's based on what topics look like, are moving to the surface as it evolves. We hope actually in the next week or so to know more about what's going on, what meetings are taking place at ICANN65. I'll take first cut just as a presentation, in terms of what topics should be included in that talking points memo and some bullets as to what those talking might be and we'll have a conversation about that here with the CPWG before we actually draft such a memo.

In the meantime, if you feel strongly that a particular topic should be part of a talking points memo for ICANN65, please let me know that as well and we'll make that part of the open discussion. People seemed happy to have that memo but wanted more input in its creation so that's what we're going to try to do for this meeting.

The other thing that I think we're going to try to do once we have a better understanding the flow of the show as we say for ICANN65 is in addition to doing sessions ourselves, perhaps do some assignments with people and talk about what sessions they

---

should participated in outside of the At-Large room and then have some mechanism for reporting back from those meetings as well.

We don't need to have all policy discussions as Cheryl is always to remind us, we don't need to have all of our policy discussions by ourselves, we can go out an compete in the broader arena of ideas. I think part of what we'll try to do is an experiment for ICANN65, is prior to the meetings get some volunteers in advance for handling some of these meetings as the schedule comes together and then create some responsibility for some reporting back.

Those are some of the things that we're talking about doing for ICANN65. We'll put up some kind of a timeline quickly but the goal will be to have the talking points in advance of meetings and get them translated at least into Spanish or another language if it's useful prior to the meeting as opposed to just handing them out at the meeting.

Are there any questions about that or recommendations or comments that anybody wants to make? I just wanted to give you guys an update on that content. Alright, then is there any other business, things that people want to bring up? Alright, that's great.

Staff, what's the next call time on our rotation?

GEORGE KIRIKOS: May I speak?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry, I didn't see your hand, go ahead.

GEORGE ZUCK: I just wanted to ask, this was originally scheduled for 90 minutes, is that normal or should we stick to 60 minutes in the future? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess there's been some variability. We're not always perfect at predicting how long a call will last. Generally, when Olivier manages them, they go longer. I think we make them variable based on what we think the agenda is going to be and sometimes we get it wrong. Thanks for the question George. To answer Justine's question, how will submit input on the talking points? As we know more about the schedule, I'm going to make a strongman PowerPoint on what we think the main issues are going to be and some bullets on what some potential talking points for At-Large might be and then we'll make that CPWG discussion. We will put the time down for the time of the next meeting via the list because I'm not sure when it is.

ANDREA GLANDON: Sorry Jonathan. It's next Wednesday at 1900 UTC and we'll get that set up today.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, next Wednesday at 1900 UTC, I'll see everybody there. Thanks a lot, and thanks for participating in the discussion.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks Jonathan, the meeting has been adjourned. Have a great remainder of you day everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**