
YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 6th of May 2020 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room as well as on the phone bridge, will be recorded after the call.

We have received apologies from Bill Jouris and Maureen Hilyard. [inaudible] that she'll be joining slightly late. Before we start, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. As you know, we have Spanish and French interpretation.

One final reminder that we have real-time transcription service provided on today's call, just as usual. I'm going to share the link here with you, also. Please do check the link to have the service. And now, I would like to leave the floor back to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone, for another fantastic call of the Consolidated Policy Working Group. We will start after reviewing our action items with Justine Chew, who will be taking us through the Subsequent Procedures. There are four presentations. They are actually rather short but she will have 30 minutes to take us through these. There are some that need to be continued and, certainly, some input to be had from participants on this call.

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.

After that, we'll have a short update from the Expedited PDP with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg, and then we'll move swiftly onto our policy comment updates with two that are at voting stage, the two remaining ones.

The one that's for comment is the ICANN Africa regional plan for fiscal years 2021 to 2025, and that will just be presented for your information here. And then, we'll go for any other business. So are there any amendments or additions to the agenda at this stage? Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Olivier. I'm happy to defer Reserved Names to next week if necessary. I wanted to add one item of AOB.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you, Justine. Well, we'll see how you get along with the 30 minutes, and if you want to refer to Reserved Names then we can deal with the other three. And then, if you've reached your 30 minutes then we'll move on and I shall add an item on AOB from you. Thank you. Any other comments or amendments? Not seeing any further hands up.

Let's, then, go to our action items from the last week. They are all completed. I'm not going to read through all of them. It was great to see all the boxes checked and done. Is there any follow-up on any of these action items from those people that have affected them? I realize some of them relate to discussions that we will have later on today.

Okay. So, no comments on the action items. Thank you. And so, we can now move back to Justine Chew, then, for the Subsequent Procedures. Justine, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you again, Olivier. Just before I get onto the first presentation, which is basically consensus affirmation for role of application comment and application change request, I just wanted to point out a number of housekeeping things. Well, three in particular.

The first one is ... I can't remember when, exactly, but many weeks ago I referred to a letter sent by the GAC chair on behalf of GAC to the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group co-chair, basically, if I can paraphrase, inquiring after the condensed work plan that the SubPro PDP Working Group is adopting, which in essence ... And we're also working toward a timeline, now.

But essentially, what that results in is the fact that the SubPro PDP is working toward releasing the draft final report by ICANN68. So, it would have resulted in cutting off about three to four weeks extra that we may have had time to consider the recommendations.

Anyway, what I wanted to say was that the SubPro PDP Working Group co-chairs have replied to the GAC chair's letter, essentially saying that we are still going to proceed with the condensed work plan but, insofar as the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group can accommodate GAC interaction as far as possible, then they will do that. Okay.

So, the second housekeeping item I wanted to say was I believe Christopher, either yesterday or the day before, forwarded a correspondence from GAC, also, to the CPWG mailing list, which contains, essentially, a collection of inputs from quite a large number of GAC members and observers, pertaining to inputs to the five topics of SubPro that were discussed at ICANN67.

So, the small team will have a look at those and see whether we can draw any useful inputs from there when we consider the remaining scorecards in the recommendations of SubPro.

The third housekeeping item that I wanted to mention was related to the second point. One of the five topics that are contained in the GAC input that I referred to pertains to Applicant Support Program. So, I don't think we're going to go back and have a look at what the GAC set for ASP at this point in time because we have pretty much settled our own inputs to the Applicant Support Program.

In that respect, I'm pleased to announce that the version seven of that scorecard is now available under the table in agenda item 3.4. So, please feel free to have a look at it. Of course, we'll eventually come back to that when we look at drafting the full statement after the draft final report is out. Okay.

So, moving onto consensus affirmation. If I can just point to the first one, the one in the green, here. Because of, obviously, short of time as always, I'm just going to skim through and pick out things that have a little bit of outstanding matters or require some confirmation.

So, jumping straight in, slide two is just an intro so you don't need to worry about that. Slide three is affirmation one. There weren't any issues raised so, as far as we're concerned, it's acceptable. No further intervention needed.

Slide number four, moving onto Recommendation 2. This is pertaining to a recommendation from SubPro that anyone who is making an application comment, as far as possible, the identity of the person should be ascertained. That task is going to be placed on ICANN Org, who is basically responsible for the systems, anyway, that are going to be used for Subsequent Procedures.

In terms of implementation guidance, there was a point that Christopher Wilkinson made which was to do with definitions of conflicts of interest. Now, you see under implementation guidance the second bullet. More so, it talks about identifying or at least ... Anyone who submits an application comment will be asked to inform ICANN Org whether they are employed by, or under contract with, or have a financial interest in, or are submitting a comment on behalf of an applicant. And if they are, then they are supposed to review such a relationship.

So, Christopher was talking ... There is this, obviously, an element of conflict of interest that we're trying to identify against anyone who submitted a comment. So, Christopher talked about varying levels of conflict of interest. I'm just wondering whether we actually need to get into that level of detail. I'm trying for us not to get too much into the weeds of this. So, I'm going to suggest that we leave that at this point in time and, as I said, not get into the weeds too much.

The other thing I wanted to mention is, post the presentation on this particular slide, I have raised the query with SubPro PDP Working Group as to the consequences of a commenter who did not disclose any pertinent relationship with an applicant, basically in violation of this second bullet under the implementation guidance where they're required to state a relationship with any of the applicants by which they are either opposing or in favor of, I guess, and, basically, whether there should be some burden placed upon each applicant to be responsible for anyone that is found to be actually acting in the interest of that applicant.

So, this is not something that I'm asking for feedback, per se, except to maybe enquire whether it's going too much or whether it's necessary. I see Alan has put a green check, so I'm assuming that he's supporting that notion. Yes, okay. I assume that. If no one else has any other questions, per se, then I'm going to move along. Please feel free to put in stuff in the chat or raise your hand if you want to [inaudible].

So, moving onto slide number five. No issues, here. So, we can move onto slide number six. Slide number six is tied to the use of the application comment, basically. One of the new issues and omissions that was talked about before was in terms of the period of application comment that would apply to community-based applications.

Remember that we said, before and also during the CPE single-issue call that Jamie participated in, there was this issue about once the application period closes there is supposed to be a 30-day period. I can't remember exactly but I think it's 30 days. There is a 30-day period for application comment for everyone to review the review applications and to

comment on them, whether it's in support or whether they're raising concerns or such.

That period is supposed to be finite. So, it's supposed to be limited to X number of days. That's 30 days. But with the CPE process, which comes in the later part of the cycle of evaluation, there was this extraneous exercise by CPE panelists calling for letters of support and, inadvertently, also letters of opposition.

But as was pointed out, there is actually no provision for letter of opposition, per se. It's just support or opposition, but support comes in the form of letter of support.

So, [into earlier], what we are looking at, or what at least I've started looking at, putting together the outputs for the CPE single-issue-purpose call. One of the things that are likely to come up from that exercise would be proposing that the change be had to the CPE criteria guidelines to do away with that extraneous call for support or opposition as part of the application comment process in the beginning, after the application period closes.

So, you won't have an extra period of commenting for just community-based applications that are going through the CPE process. So, it makes it fairer. All these comments, all letters of support or notes of opposition, would come during the application period and it would be upfront and everyone can look at it and respond to it. And anything that is not resolved or even is resolved, the output of that process will be informed to the CPE panel.

So, the essence of it is, the CPE panel, we're going to be looking at recommending that they do not make another extraneous call for letters of support or opposition. Okay. I hope that's clear. Okay. I don't see any hands up or questions.

Moving onto slide number seven. Okay. This is something that was outstanding. I suppose it's a minor question, really, which is pertaining to ... As I said before, as part of the application comment process, the applicants are supposed to be given a fixed amount of time to respond to any comments submitted, especially if the comments are going to impact on any evaluation scoring that might dumb-down their application or the nature of the application.

So the question then is, if, say, for example, the period is four weeks and someone goes in on the second-to-last day of the period and puts in a comment, do we agree that, by right, the applicant should be given, still, reasonable time beyond the application comment period to respond to the comment? So, that is one thing that isn't clear in the set of recommendations from PDP Working Group.

The second question that's not clear is whether commenters should then be allowed to respond to the applicant's response. So, I hope those two questions have been posed clearly. Of course, I can ... Yes, correct. Where does it end? That's absolutely right, Jonathan. I'm putting across the question, anyway. So, I'm not saying that we should go one way or the other. I'm asking for input.

But I think, insofar as the comment comes in late in the process, there should be some reasonable time given to the applicant to actually

respond. It's something that we mention in our comments to the initial report, anyway, but for some reason, it wasn't taken up by SubPro PDP Working Group. So, I think we should raise it again. Okay.

Jonathan says that applicants should have the last word. I think that's correct, also. In process, anyway. Okay. So, it looks like that's how we're headed. Yep. I see comments of support in the chat for what Jonathan has proposed. So, good. Barring any objections, I think we have our answer to that question.

Moving onto slide number eight. No issue. Slide number nine, no issue. Slide number ten. Sorry, we'll move onto application change requests. So, it's a related but separate topic. Something that Sébastien raised the last time ... I can't remember whether it was last week or two weeks again. Anyway, in terms of there is a potential that the applicant could avoid real evaluation costs: if, say, for example, they submitted an application change request early in the process to do a joint venture or to do a business [compilation] of some sort, to try and get out of a contention set.

So, that means that they may not necessarily have gone through the initial evaluation yet for the financial aspect of continuing the applicant review aspect of things, anyway. So, it could be the situation where they may not incur a revaluation cost but only just the initial evaluation cost. So, I don't think that's an issue, per se. It's something that I need to bring back to SubPro PDP Working Group. Okay.

The last slide, slide number 11. This is on allowing the change to the applied-for string where the original string is in contention. I've tried to

capture most of the comments or feedback that was provided in the previous call on this topic, which is reflected in the green box on the right. There were two additional questions that I thought were outstanding.

Number one is the fact that we said that the applicant must justify the selection of a different string in that it must be closely related to the original string in order to be allowed consideration to change that string. So, the clarifying question that I had is not necessarily for this group but it's also for SubPro. So, the clarifying question I had was, who gets to decide on what "closely-related" means? So, who gets to decide whether a new string that the applicant wants to change to is actually closely related to the original string?

And the second question that I thought was outstanding was—it was brought up in the SubPro PDP Working Group—this potential question of whether we should limit the allowance of applying for a change in the string applied-for to just .brand applications. The reason for that is, I think I've mentioned a couple of times before, one of the examples that was always used to "justify" allowing a change in string is the two applications by one, the SAS, the software vendor, and SAS the airline.

So, both of them opted for .sas as the applied-for string but they then, I suppose, had a bit of a chat and they tried to apply for a change in string. So, SAS Airlines wanted to change their string to .sasairline instead of .sas, and that would actually eliminate the contention set.

But we didn't have a process to allow for that kind of a change request to a string applied-for. So, that couldn't happen. So in essence, this is something that the SubPro PDP Working Group is considering that is

good, to possibly have some kind of process, but it's asking whether we should limit that process to just .brand applications.

So, the question I want to pose back to this CPWG here is whether we think that limitation should be adopted or whether people see any harm in not limiting such opportunity to just .brand applications.

Yes, correct. Jonathan has put that there could be a fear of abuse by investors, which is true, which is why this question rose: in essence, whether we should limit the allowance to change a string to certain types of applications. So, there is something that wasn't really discussed the last time so I didn't get a clear answer on this.

So, I would appreciate, if people had thoughts about it, to put it in the chat because I do want to move on. Unless somebody is dying to make an intervention here? Okay. Seeing no hands and no further input in chat, let me move onto string similarity.

Okay. String similarity. Slide number three, affirmation one, no issues. Slide number four, recommendation number two. Just a couple of additions that were highlighted from the last time we went through this set of recommendations. I think that's quite clear. I don't think I need to expand on it a little bit more.

Oh, okay. Just to say that I think I'm going to go back to SubPro PDP Working Group and see whether we want to input a reference to the mandatory PIC as a means for governing a registry's use of a string that could be distinguished as not being similar to another string that's in existence.

The reference to the mandatory PIC was included in the rationale. The working group wasn't included in the recommendation text but I thought it would be useful to actually put it into the recommendation text. So, that's what it is. That's what I'm referring to in slide number four, anyway.

So, again, unless there are any objections, I think we can move on. Slide number five, nothing controversial. So, I think that's pretty much it for string similarity. I'm just going to do a time check right now. Do I have time to get into Universal Acceptance?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You still have about ten minutes, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Ten minutes should do. All right. Thank you very much for that. Can we move onto Universal Acceptance, please? Okay. Universal Acceptance. While that slide is coming on, basically, the key issues under Universal Acceptance is the fact that, if I could just provide some background comment, we know that Universal Acceptance has continuously been driven by the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, the UASG, under the auspices of the Universal Acceptance Initiative.

We know that UASG is a civil society group that undertook to drive the initiative of promoting Universal Acceptance. So, there is a little bit of disconnect in terms of where ICANN Org 's role is.

It obviously works very closely with the steering group, the UASG, to push the UA agenda, but it doesn't actually have a department within ICANN Org that is mandated to push this UA.

So, the question then is, in respect of the recommendations coming out of SubPro, is there anything that SubPro needs to do or is there anything that ICANN Org needs to do to further improve the promotion of UA and advocate for wider adoption of UA in the Internet community?

So, we can just go through slide number three. Slide number three and slide number four is basically a regurgitation of what we said in the past under the topic of Universal Acceptance. So, slide number three is the comment that we made to the Community Comment Two, the CC2. In summary, what we said is that the UA initiative can inform and guide but cannot make binding policy. So, ICANN policy-making for UA should proceed as a regular ICANN process.

So, the difficulty that I'm trying to point out is the disconnect between the UASG and ICANN Org. So, UASG promotes the initiative and the cause but it doesn't have policy-making powers, per se. Policy-making is still under ICANN and, in particular, GNSO. So, that's how it connects back to SubPro, per se. But as I said, most of it is being driven by UASG.

So, what is it that we expect SubPro to do that is not already being done by UASG? Slide number four, if we can move to slide number four, that is our comment to the Subsequent Procedures Initial Report. We essentially said that the ICANN committee must engage in substantial outreach on Universal Acceptance and it believes that more can and must be done to advocate [co-division] of the Internet.

So again, all this points to what I said before. What else is there that you want SubPro or ICANN Org or do? So, moving onto slide number five, the

final slide. These are the set of affirmations and recommendations that are coming from the SubPro.

Affirmation one basically says that we welcome and encourage the work of the UASG and also the Universal Acceptance Initiative. Affirmation two ... What is affirmation two? Okay, I think that's a technical aspect to do with notice. Okay. So, we won't go through that, per se.

But recommendation three is revision to the principle B from 2007 policy which says that, with the amendment, some new Generic Top-Level Domains should be IDNs, although applicants should be made aware of UA challenges in ASCII and IDN TLDs. Applicants must be given access to all applicable information about UA that is currently maintained on the UA Initiative page through the UASG, as well as future efforts.

So, in essence, they acknowledge the importance of the effort that's done through the UA and UASG and there could be more clear and thorough examples to illustrate to potential applicants the possible problems that registrants of IDNs in particular may face in using those domains.

The question is, we look at the At-Large consensus-building box, the blue box. We had mentioned additional interventions in our comment to the initial report which haven't been picked up by SubPro to date. So my question, do we still want to push these two bullets on the right-hand side? Okay.

The first bullet is talking about getting ICANN Org to invest itself in being able and ready to communicate with registrants. So, they question things like, ICANN Org staff who, say, for example, evaluate applicant applications, or receive comment about applications, or do some kind of

clarification on application, are they ready to accept e-mail that is in IDN? So, is ICANN it's UA-ready? Should the also encourage registries and registrars which are owned by the same entity to also be UA-ready with any gTLD application?

So, those are the two questions that I want to pose for thought and answers. I see a queue building up. So, Christopher, you are first in the queue.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Good afternoon. A very great thanks to Justine for these comprehensive slides. Very briefly, I think the last point you touched on is the most important one. I have always thought that Universal Acceptance would be a victim of the decision in 2010/2012 for vertical integration. We have built into the registry/registrar system incentives for the portfolio operator not to conduct and accept Universal Acceptance.

I think the solution has to be along the lines of severe structural separation between the registry and registrar, of activities of such companies, and that this should be reflected in ICANN's contractual structures. I believe that Jonathan does not think this is universal assistance but universal access, and I remain surprised that the CCT did not address the vertical integration problem. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Alan, you're next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. To be honest, I really don't understand the relationship between Universal Acceptance and the vertical integration. So, perhaps in the e-mail or the chat Christopher can elaborate.

I put my hand up because, although words like "strongly encourage" are nice, I really think that, in this process, we need to require action. A very vague action, but action. I think we should be explicitly asking the applicant in the application to explain to what extent they plan to have policies in place related to Universal Acceptance and to what extent they, themselves, are in a position to respond to IDN e-mails and the like, and that should be linked to a question of whether they plan to accept IDN second-level domains.

So, I think, by forcing them to actually think about it and answer the question, we're doing more than just a strong encouragement, which has no real effect. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you for that, Alan. Jonathan, you're next.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. First, I'll second Alan's comment. I made that comment in the chat, as well. That kind of has got to stop being used. It's what the contracts are filled with now that give Contractual Compliance so much difficulty.

But two points I want to make. One is, just to be clear, Universal Acceptance is a very specific term that has to do with being able to accommodate those non-standard strings, if you will, whether they're

longer than three characters or they're IDNs, in your e-mail systems, in your website forms, etc.

It doesn't have anything to do with whether or not registrars are selling those names. That's a different issue. It's not that I'm in disagreement with that issue. We shouldn't conflate them at all because, unfortunately, Universal Acceptance is much less about our own contracted parties or our own relationships. Although, I think we should make that mandatory. UA-readiness needs to be mandatory and part of the contract for every registry and registrar.

It's a problem of the Internet generally and evangelizing the change of 30-year-old JavaScript code at American Airlines to actually accept these new TLDs. And I think that that process is a very difficult and time-consuming one of getting people to dig into old code and finding programmers that are now retired to the beach.

It's a little bit like Y2K in that regard, but that's the effort that has to happen. Without it, we're just going to keep adding strings that are meaningless to the Internet and will continue to make ICANN's position in this a joke. So, we may need to do something stronger. I mean, right now, it's something like 80% of the websites on the Internet don't accept IDNs or new TLDs.

I mean, those are the numbers that need to change, and I feel like we need to actually build some metrics into this that are, in fact, a prerequisite to a new round because that would incentivize a lot of people—a lot of people with money—to get engaged in changing that aspect of things. But that's just my thought. I feel pretty strongly about

this. I feel strongly with the At-Large to get involved in this, too, but now is not the time for that discussion. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks for that, Jonathan. If I could ask you to think a bit about what you've said a bit more and to actually even just send a couple of bullets to me. The issue about metrics is quite an interesting one. I just wonder whether we could come up with examples of metrics that might work for our purposes. Okay. And moving on to Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yes, thank you. I have a personal frustration because I was on the board when we started the process of having the short track for the IDN ccTLDs. I was absolutely convinced that that was something that needed to get done, and that was something like 15 years ago.

So, the problem is that we need to understand, if we want to be able to make meaningful statements, we need to understand the complexity of the matter. I'm talking having had the experience of six years on the board of a registry that was really serious about introducing IDNs.

And then at the end, last year, when I went off the board, the general frustration in the registry, in PIR, was so strong that there were some people that were even thinking about asking to just stop the laws. The problem, although right now we have, in the contracted party, a serious opposition, they are not able to solve the problem by themselves.

I think that right now we have, as Jonathan has said, software that is diffused everywhere. We have the problem with websites, with

browsers, with e-mail programs, and software, and so on, that make the effort by contracted parties—if they want to get engaged—useless because that is not going to get solved only by them.

So, I think that we need to fully understand what the problem is and what are all the actions that have to be taken. It's really a complex issue. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you for all those interventions. I find them quite helpful and I will definitely listen to the recording of this call again to try and formulate some text inputs in terms of our additional interventions required. I still see four hands up. I'm assuming that those are old hands. In which case, I will thank everyone and hand the floor back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Justine. Thanks, again, as usual, for your exciting and interesting updates. And just to remind everyone, these always go, then, onto the Subsequent Procedures updates workspace. So, if you've missed some of them, please look back at these and look through the PowerPoint presentations that we have here. We're going to move on and we're going, now, to have an ePDP Phase 2 update—a very fast one—from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'll start. There is nothing to report at this point on the ePDP itself. I just wanted to note that we have submitted the ALAC statement, which was pretty well agreed to last week, and we have also endorsed the GAC

statement. That latter one is what I want to focus on for 30 seconds at this point.

To my knowledge, this is the first time that the ALAC has ever formally supported a GAC statement. We've made a couple of joint ones but, in the past, either just because of the mechanics, because they didn't ask, or because there were some, perhaps, areas where we disagreed, I don't think it has ever been done.

This time, we did do it, and, moreover, it was done unanimously by the ALAC. It required some effort to get a draft statement out to them confidentially because the GAC hadn't released it yet. In the end, within a small number of days, we had positive acknowledgment from all ALAC members that we had supported it.

I think that's a rather seminal change in what has happened and something that should go on the record. Thank you, and thank you to both the people from the GAC we were working with and to Maureen for being flexible and helping this happen. I'll not the Business Constituency and the IPC also supported that statement. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I'm not sure if there is anything from Hadia in this week.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Oh, okay. Thank you, Alan, for that. I actually have nothing to add. As Alan mentioned, we submitted the ALAC statement and we have endorsed the GAC one. So, thank you so much, all of you, for your support and for your thoughts, views, and continuous support to us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Hadia. Are there any questions or comments? I was just going to see, since we do have a few minutes on this, whether either Hadia or Alan could just take us the helicopter view of the GAC statement. Because as you mentioned, this was a very brand-new statement and this, of course, was not discussed in the wider mailing list. So, you'd be able to give us two minutes on what is in there, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll try. I'm not going to actually do that. All of the points they made are ones that we were also making in one way or another. So, they are very much in line with what we were talking about. They have a different style and have emphasized, perhaps, different rationales in some cases. But they were talking about legal very natural, accuracy issues, privacy proxy, and anonymized e-mail addresses. So, I think that makes interesting reading but I don't think we really need to introduce the topics because they're the same ones that we have been talking about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I presume that the ALAC's point of view is aligned with the GAC's point of view on these topics?

ALAN GREENBERG: Very much so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Any comments or questions? Not seeing any hands. I see some congratulations in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I'll make one more comment. There are a number of congratulations to Alan and Hadia in the chat. I think we need congratulations to the GAC, who have explicitly reached out and worked hard to make sure we were kept up to date on how they were progressing and working with us. So, that's really where the initiative came, this time, because that has been something that we haven't seen before. So, I think we need to take our hat off and thank the folks from the GAC who made this happen.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Just to be absolutely sure on this, this GAC statement will go into the ePDP Phase 2 feedback process, or where does it go to?

ALAN GREENBERG: It already has, just like ours.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, same thing. Okay. Fine. So, we'll see, with anticipation, how this is dealt with by the group and where this goes afterward. Not seeing any hands up. We can move on and we can move to the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Olivier. So, we'll run through the most recent updates and then turn it back over. Recently ratified by the ALAC since last week's CPWG, there are none, but there were a couple submitted which I'll go over next. But there is one public comment for decision, which just opened recently. This is the "ccNSO PDP3 Initial Proposals for Process to Retire ccTLDs" and it closes on the 10th of July.

So, current statements in development or being ratified by the ALAC. There were two that were just submitted this week, one on Monday, one yesterday, Tuesday. Hadia and Alan commented on one of them, which was the ALAC statement on the ePDP 2, as well as the ALAC's endorsement of the GAC response on this issue.

And the other was the Phase 1 initial report review of all rights protection mechanisms. This was submitted by Greg and Marita. And so, those two are currently out for ALAC vote. We have an AFRALO statement that has been drafted regarding the ICANN Africa Regional Plan for fiscal years 2021 to 2025. This closes at the end of this month on the 27th of May and the drafting team members are on this call and will provide comments on this in one moment.

Finally, we have an ICANN public comment on the draft PTI FY 21-24 strategic plan. This closes on the 1st of June and it has been circulated on the OFBC list—which was formally the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, now it's the Organizational and Finance and Budget Subcommittee—and it will be discussed by the group during our next meeting. So, I could turn it back over to Jonathan or, perhaps, the drafting team members of the AFRALO statement. Thanks very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. Do any of the folks that are on the call from the AFRALO statement want to give a brief summary of the comment? All right. I see no hands. And then, I guess the other question is the ...

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Sorry, [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry. Oh. Abdulkarim, go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I'm sorry. I just wanted to mention that it was supposed to be Seun that was supposed to talk about the comment. But I'm not sure who is on the call right now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Seun is. He's got his hand up. So, Seun, do you want to go ahead?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, I have been saying hello. Hello? Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, now we can.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. All right. Thanks. Yes. This particular draft statement [started out] a couple of weeks ago. It was supposed to be published [inaudible] strategy for the Africa region. This is the second of its kind, I would say. A couple of things that we just tried to address ... Before I continue, I will note that even within the draft itself because it was indicated that the draft was really drafted pre-COVID-19 so some of the realities [on the ground] at the moment were probably not factored in in the draft.

But in our statement, we tried to touch a couple of them and we tried to make the comment ... I don't know whether the staff's sharing the statement. So, we tried to make the comment by covering five aspects of the proposal. The proposal itself is looking to address five key areas, mainly the security, ICANN governance, the unique identifier system, geopolitics within the region, and finance aspects.

So, in the same vein, we tried to comment on each of the sections of this proposal and make some suggestions. I don't know within the time limit, can I just quickly go through some of the suggestions that were made?

With regard to ICANN governance, we actually also suggested that in order to improve engagement and also, perhaps, to some extent, development when it comes to domain names within the region, that when meetings which [are usually zone finally comes] to the region, it would be good to also look at how possible it will be to actually host them in other countries within the region.

We looked over the last decade and saw that it's in four countries, actually. However, this is also recognizing that each country also has some challenges that may not make them suitable for being a host. But

we are suggesting that more effort should be put in place to have those who are really, really into trying to host and who are committed [inaudible] to be able to.

This could also mean relaxing some of the stringent rules that may not make some people qualify. But of course, there also needs to be a balance in there.

We talked about unique identifier system. For us in the region, we feel this is very important, even within our AFRALO level. We are kind of also trying to encourage our members to also be ready, especially when it comes to Universal Acceptance and things like that.

So, we made some suggestions on some of the things that have been stated in the proposal. We supported them. And then, we also, actually, asked them to [add this] particular one.

And finally, because of time, we recommended that this item that has to do with unique identifiers be actually put as priority, but more importantly that they should try to include timelines and priorities on the strategy so that we'll be able to track the key indicators and we'll be able to know which one of these five areas are [weighted,] which one is of more importance, which one is of less importance, in terms of looking at how best to finally evaluate what are the goals and objectives [as really moving fast] within the region.

I think these are just the few things. Okay. I think I should just mention this, as well. In the [previous] strategy, there was a section about improving registry and registrars within the region. We feel that [that will need to] come back on this particular strategy. There is still a significant

effort that needs to be made locally to encourage and improve the DNS market.

We feel that the current plan needs to reflect that for the next five years. Those are the things that we need to ... The statement is still in a draft state. As has been mentioned, the end of this month, it should be due for submission. My other colleagues are on the call. I don't know whether they want to add anything to this but I will just pause here and then see if there are any questions. Over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Seun. That's great. We appreciate the overview. The next question I have is if someone would like to take on looking at the ccNSO proposal for the retirement of ccTLDs? I can see an individual end-user perspective there but I strongly suspect that we don't have the unique perspective to bring to that comment. But if somebody would like to take a look and confirm that fact, we can feel more certain about that.

So, the first task would literally just be to take a look at it and see if there is something that would be worth us adding to that discussion. Is there anybody that's interested in that? I'm also okay letting it go but I just wanted to raise it on the call. All right. I see no hands. Oh, Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, thank you. I'm not volunteering. However, a TLD which exists conceivably is being used, and if it's going to be retired there almost inevitably are impacts on users, whether they're registrants or someone

who uses a domain within that TLD. So, I think there is a user impact and we have to make sure that this is being considered in the process. So, I think at least a cursory review of it is necessary. Whether we need to comment or not is a different issue. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, I'm still looking for a volunteer to make the cursory overview. Okay. Hadia, "Give us time." Who is "us"?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, "us" is ALAC but definitely myself.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I see. Okay. Yeah. So, just take a look and see if there is something that jumps out. That's all.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'll definitely do so, and I encourage others to take a look, as well. But I'll definitely do that, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks, Hadia. Yes. So then, the draft PTI FY 2021 meeting is going to be reported to by Holly at the OFBSC. And I guess the last thing is, does Roberto want to give any kind of report from ... Is Roberto on the call? He is. I think I've seen him in the chat. Did you want to give a little bit of a discussion of what has been going on over in our sister committee? Holly, what do you have, first?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to say, basically, to repeat what you've said, that it's going over the OFBSC. The plan itself was a pretty motherhood statement. The only real issue was a couple of registries that are still run by PTIs. It was mostly stuff they don't do. The thing they did do, of course, was the KSK rollover which, in February, was a complete disaster. There will be one in May which is going to have absolutely skeleton staff instead of the usual observers.

At the best, it's going to be a motherhood statement for the OFBSC, at the best. Unless anybody has got any other thoughts, it's just ... If you think about it, aside from the few registries that it runs, PTI's role is more of an oversight because it has an MOU with the RAR ...

No, sorry. The SLA with the RIRs. It has got an MOU with the IETF. So, what's in its actual control is not much, aside from a few registries, as I say, from the KSK rollover, which up until now has gone really smoothly except for the last one, which was a disaster. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. I'm sorry, Roberto. I meant Ricardo. Ricardo, did you want to say anything about what's going on or coming up with the OFBSC?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Good afternoon. Do you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST:

Thank you, Jonathan. We're expecting to have our call this month. We were waiting for the approval of the budget and the strategic plan from ICANN. I understand it will be handled by the board in the meeting. Also, for the PTI, there is a webinar on May 14th.

So, next week. I sent a note to Holly—I guess I have a wrong e-mail from Holly—asking if we wait for this webinar to [end] this plan and have our meeting. In case we are not going to wait for that, I guess we are going to meet next week to review this PTI strategic plan and also whatever the board decides to approve this week.

In this approval should be, also, the ABR, the first matter of the FBSC, [now] including the "O," including this kind of strategic plan. You are all welcome to join the OFBSC as the participants. That's all for now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's great, Ricardo. Thank you very much. I think that is back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. Thank you for all this policy work that is taking place, here. I just had a question for you, Jonathan. You touched on the ccNSO PDP3 Initial Proposals Process to Retire ccTLDs, but did you touch on the one just above that? I'm just looking at it. Oh,

okay. On my screen, it has disappeared. Sorry, I thought there was one above that up for decision. Okay, thank you. I'm well confused.

Right. We're now moving onto the next agenda item, and that's any other business. Now, we are actually quite far ahead at the moment. I didn't know whether we wanted to have a little more from Justine. I'm not sure whether she had another ... Because she did mention about one of the presentations that could be moved until later.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Reserved names, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Reserved names, yeah. So, I don't know whether Justine wants to speak a little more on this. We do have another 20 minutes. In the meantime, what I can do is go through the any other business. So, the ICANN Board withholding the consent for the change of control to the public interest registry, I think we touched on that and it's raising all sorts of questions, now, of course, as to what happens next.

Then, of course, there is the PDP 3.0 initiative, which I invite you to read through. There is a consensus playbook, also, that has been made available. All that can be found on go.icann.org/consensus, or also on the At-Large PDP 3.0 workspace. Highly encourage to read through the consensus playbook.

I've read some calls, some people saying, "Well, we need to have a similar consensus playbook for At-Large." This one focuses primarily on other processes at ICANN. So, I guess it's the start of a discussion that we can

have in our community. Although, I am aware of several documents that already exist regarding the process by which At-Large policy is put together, or at least policy commenting. Then, of course, there is the CPWG single-issue call on the At-Large GeoNames survey that will happen in the future. Now, I also had, and missed—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, I guess I could ... Oh, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Do you want to expand on this a little bit? Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, just a touch, because I want to reserve as much time for Judith as possible. The idea behind the single-issue call in the survey is to accommodate folks that would like interpreters and the ability to ask questions as they take the survey.

We'd love to get more people to take it, and so, if we could encourage the RALO leaders to get interested parties on this call, we could read out the questions one by one, the interpreters could translate them, and if there is confusion they could ask questions and we could just, of the course of the call, get 50 more entries on the survey.

I think that would be a good thing. I think that we've got about 50 not but, to be statistically significant, I would love for it to be more. So, we're thinking about just scheduling a call to help people take the survey if we can pull that off. That's the idea. So, that's what that is. That's what that

single-issue call would be, for people who haven't taken it to get on and take the call. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I've just checked with Justine. She's happy to continue with one more presentation. Just before that, I did miss my chance to ask a question from Alan. I hope he's still on the call—I can see him still on the call—with regard to the ... Well, Alan and Hadia, actually.

I've seen some discussions on the ePDP relating to the costs of the SSAD, the whole database of names and things, and [we access] database, and I've seen astronomic numbers. The question I had was whether anyone had actually seen how that compares with WHOIS. How much did WHOIS cost to put together?

And the reason asking for this, of course, being that, for some reason, WHOIS was set up and nobody ever, supposedly, had to pay for it somehow. Someone had to. But SSAD seems to be that it will have to be paid for by someone.

I just found the numbers to be ridiculously high, taking into account that it looks as though it would all be made in high-salary countries and things, and not make use much of the global nature of ICANN. Not quite sure how that was working out. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a couple of brief points. The messages came out yesterday. I spent a good three minutes looking at it, so I'm certainly not in a position to walk anyone through it or talk about it. But not that

this does not replace WHOIS. So, it's not a matter of, "How does this compare to WHOIS?" unless you're just interested in the academic discussion.

I don't think anyone has ever costed out what WHOIS costs. The cost is largely borne by the contracted parties, although there is now an ICANN centralized WHOIS portal. So, I'm not sure what the discussion we can have at this point is.

This is something that was produced by ICANN. It has not been discussed or reviewed in the ePDP. There will be, no doubt, significant discussion. Whether these are reasonable costs or unreasonable costs, certainly I don't think we're in a position to talk about right now.

There was no secret that this was going to cost money, and since the costs, if I remember correctly, were implementation costs, I think my impression was somewhere in the order of ten million dollars, and then some operational costs, I'm not particularly surprised at the numbers, nor am I perturbed that they're too high.

How to pay for it is a different issue altogether but that's one of the things we're going to have to look at going forward. Is there enough benefit to the SSAD, given how little we are actually doing at a central level other than collecting data and reporting on it. Is it worth that kind of cost?

It's a good question. I think it's going to have a lot of examination but I'm not certain I'm in a position to talk about it in any more detail than that. The mailing lists are public if anyone really wants to go look at the document. Someone can forward the cost document to the CPWG if people are interested.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. I have three points and they are very similar to what Alan said. So, historically it has been the contracted parties and ICANN who bear the cost of the [inaudible] system. And going forward, it also should be the contracted parties and ICANN, and especially that, now, ICANN does have a significant fallback it did not have before as the central gateway manager of the SSAD.

Again, we have not discussed this yet and, yes, the costs seem huge. But then, we cannot comment on that unless we start discussing it. So, yeah. As Alan mentioned, it is difficult to give a briefing about this, now. However, ICANN has, this time, a role that it did not have with WHOIS and it's a significant one that is expected to evolve and, maybe, be of more importance and bigger in the future with this [modification to WHOIS].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Hadia, and thanks to Alan for this feedback. Certainly, something to look for in the future. Right. Now, let's go back to Justine's point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I just had one more comment. I've seen various estimates of what GDPR implementation and other privacy legislation around the world has cost. It's certainly in the hundreds of billions of dollars, perhaps more. This is just another one of those costs. If we value privacy, there is cost to it.

How we're going to pay for this is not at all clear but it's not particularly surprising that, if we're trying to implement something complex, and providing privacy when it's warranted and access when it's warranted, there is going to be a cost to it. I think this is just yet another one of the many costs associated with privacy efforts around the world. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Gone are the days when you could run an Internet around the world with just a few boxes under someone's table. Right. Well, let's go down to Justine Chew, then. Let's go back to agenda item number three, I believe, with one more presentation.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Okay. I'll try to keep this to ten minutes. We have ten minutes left. Okay, reserved names. Can we go to slide number two? Okay. Just as by way of recap, when we say "reserved names," it's not just only reserved names because there is a definition to reserved names.

But when we say “reserved names,” we’re also talking about other unavailable strings. So, it is actually “reserved names and other unavailable strings,” but we just basically shorten it to “reserved names.”

And what is included under these reserved names and other unavailable strings? Well, they are certainly strings that would not be available for application, so that either the application would not be allowed to be submitted for those strings or, even if they are allowed to be submitted then, for one reason or another, they may not be allowed to proceed or they may not be approved and certainly wouldn’t be delegated, per se.

So, what is included under this class of reserved names and other unavailable strings? The first one, obviously, is what is called a “list,” per se. It’s a top-level reserved names list. Based on what’s in the 2012 AGB, there are 34 such names listed in the AGB.

Examples of these would be things like AFRINIC, ALAC, ICANN, and so forth, as you see on the slide – includes, also, tests and example, and all of the translations of tests and examples. So, these ones which are part of the top-level reserved names list, they are not allowed to be submitted. Applications are not allowed to be submitted for these names.

The second group would be where a string similarity review determines that an applied-for string is similar to a reserved name. So, obviously, the review would fail and, therefore, the application wouldn’t proceed anymore.

The third group would be what’s called the [inaudible] list, and this has got to do with IDNs. Basically, these ones can proceed. They may not necessarily be approved but that’s a part of the evaluation process.

Ultimately, it wouldn't be delegated unless there is a [inaudible] management solution that is developed and implemented. Okay. That's just for protection to avoid string similarity or string confusion, so to speak.

Okay. And the third small group of unavailable strings would be what's called "strings ineligible for delegation." So, they're neither strings that are on the top-level reserved names list or fall under string similarity review.

These examples of these strings are in two categories. Basically, strings that are tied to the International Olympic Committee or the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. There is a list of the different variations that are tied to these two names in the AGB. These ones will not be approved. Applications can still be submitted but they will not be approved.

Moving onto slide number three, the key issue here is, basically, we're trying to answer the question of whether we should alter the list of reserved names. And obviously, when I say "reserved names," it's again reserved names and ineligible names. So, it's the full groupings.

ALAC's past statements have talked about avoidance of end-user confusion as being the paramount consideration so, if anything were to be done to alter the list of reserved names, there must be practical, reasonable measures considered and implemented to safeguard against end-user confusion. So, that's a parallel consideration that we are still keeping to.

And the second element of support would be that any special-use domain names should be added to the AGB reserved names in the top-level section to prevent applications for such strings.

I'm not going to go into the 100 domain names that can be reserved by [arrows]. We haven't actually touched on that in SubPro. So, I am not quite sure what happened to it but I will see if it's picked up in another topic, per se.

All right. Moving onto slide number four, this is where we come to the actual consideration of the recommendations. The first affirmation – just to keep it short, I'll let you guys read it yourself. Basically, the impact of this is there would be no change to the policy and implementation for the 2012 round.

This is what I've described before in terms of the four groupings of what we define as “reserved names,” or what is considered as reserved names and ineligible for either application, or approval, or delegation.

So, the result is that strings that are unavailable at the top level in the 2012 round will remain unavailable, and strings that, at the second level, are currently unavailable will remain unavailable. So, that is the impact of this affirmation which covers three parts of it.

Move onto slide number five. Recommendation number two is quite simple but there is one minor question attached to it. Recommendation two squarely focused on PTI, the Public Technical Identifiers. PTI, obviously, there is a public comment open for the strategy if you are familiar with PTI, as in the entity PTI, Public Technical Identifiers.

Now, PTI, obviously, was incorporated after the 2012 round. So, it was incorporated in August 2016 as an affiliate of ICANN. So, obviously, PTI didn't exist when we had the 2012 round, which is why PTI doesn't feature as a reserved name, per se.

So, this is something that the SubPro PDP Working Group is looking to rectify. Because of the importance of PTI, we are suggesting that the string "PTI" be included in the reserved names list at the top level and be made unavailable for delegation at the top level. So that is, in essence, the impact of this Recommendation 2.

The supplementary and minor question attached to this Recommendation 2 was—and this could well be a typographical error on the part of someone in the SubPro PDP Working Group—in the initial report of the SubPro Working Group it was actually mentioned not only PTI as a string but also the full name of PTI, which is Public Technical Identifier and Public Technical Identifiers. Please mute your line. Okay.

So, the question then is, do we only put the string "PTI," or do we put the other two, which is Public Technical Identifier and Public Technical Identifiers into the reserved names at the top level?

The point being that if we go back and have a look at what's in the list of reserved names at the top level, it's all just acronyms. So, things like AFRINIC, ALAC, ICANN, and so forth. They're all acronyms. They're not the full names. So, in this respect, I suspect that we should keep just to PTI and not extend it to the other two strings, the full-name strings that I mentioned.

So, unless anyone has a different opinion, I'm going to leave it as that and move onto slide number six, recommendation number three. Yes? Sorry, Alan. Yes, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The difference between PTI and ALAC or GNSO, or even ICANN, is it is really a core service that the Internet relies on, and the impact of someone masquerading as it is much, much larger than someone trying to reserve the At-Large Advisory Committee. So, it may well warrant special treatment because of that. There is far more impact of misuse of that term than there is of misuse of any of the terms related to ICANN, for instance. Just a thought.

JUSTINE CHEW: Would the same logic apply to something like NRO or ASO?

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe.

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, if that's the case then the full name of NRO and ASO are not in the top-level domain list.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. I'm not saying which was the adjustment should be made. I'm just saying, when you think about it, the impacts are potentially much larger. It may warrant some consideration.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. That's fine. Then do we need to go back and extend some of the other ones?

ALAN GREENBERG: If the decision is that PTI is crucial enough then, yes, we might want to go back and look at that. I don't have a really strong impression, I just know that the impact is far much larger, potentially, than At-Large Advisory Committee or the full name of the GNSO.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure, sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: I mean, I think it's worth mentioning if it hasn't been mentioned. I was only part of a very small discussion on this at a recent meeting, and not the original discussions. I've made my statement. I don't think I have anything else to add. I'm not really in a position to evaluate whether it's something we should do or not but I think it's something we should consider.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, noted. Thanks for that. It could very well turn out to be that we only put PTI on the top-level reserved names lists and have the other two, the full name and the one with "S," in another category under the other three groups of names, which could still end up protecting the names.

Anyway, it's something to think about. Moving onto Recommendation 3. Time-check, 10:30. Do I carry on, or do we stop, or what? It's half-past, so I'm just looking for some—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Justine, we're just trying to find out if the interpreters are able to extend by a few more minutes, by maybe five/ten minutes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Can I, then, just jump to the AOB, first? Because I want to—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, go for the AOBs since I know you want to push this. Yeah, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure, the AOB that I wanted to raise is slightly related to the single-issue call on GeoNames survey. Now, I didn't want to clash or conflict with that effort that Jonathan is leading but I wonder if it's too much to try and arrange for two single-issue calls next week.

And from where I'm coming from, I actually want to try and arrange two back-to-back single-issue calls over the next fortnight, depending on what Jonathan does with the GeoNames survey.

But I wanted to try and arrange two single-issue calls over the next fortnight; one call to do with dealing with the topic of registry commitments as well as GAC advice and GAC early warnings. And the

second one would be sort of related, on metrics, DNS abuse mitigation, Base Registry Agreement, and Contractual Compliance.

So, I'm trying to address certain topics in groups which I think are related. Okay. And for the first single-issue call that I mentioned, I want to do registry commitment, and GAC advice, and GAC early warnings. I'm wondering whether anyone would object to us sending an invitation to, maybe, the GAC reps to attend that call? So, what does leadership think, or members of the CPWG think?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm certainly not having any objections for anything but anyone here is able to comment. It's good. You asked the question. If anybody wants to follow up by e-mail afterward, then they should. It might be that this is not something that we want to discuss in the call, here. But I was going to ask, when you mentioned back-to-back, did you mean that you wanted to do 90 minutes plus 90 minutes, a total of three hours?

JUSTINE CHEW: No, absolutely not. I'm talking about a fortnight. [cross talk] No, no, no. Over the course of a fortnight. So, it would be two calls over two weeks, one each. It could well be just 60 minutes. I'll just have to see how much content I can get through.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'm not seeing any objections to this so it's [cross talk].

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Then could I have an action item for staff to follow up on arranging a ...? Well, let's start with the first block of single-issue calls for next week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That is noted. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: And obviously, we will make arrangements to invite the appropriate rep from GAC for that. So, do we still have an extension time or do I ...?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We still do and you're currently eating into your own time, so you can proceed forward.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, cool.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You've got about another five/six minutes. After you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. All right. Right. Very quickly, slide number six, recommendation number three. This one, I think, is kind of straight-forward. It's basically suggesting or recommending that we look at reserving at the top-level all the special-use domain names. That is basically generated by the IETF through the RFC 6761. It's in recognition of ICANN's MOU with IETF.

So, I think this one is ... I don't think this is controversial, per se. I think it's necessary. The only question I had that I can clarify with SubPro Working Group would be whether, then, this goes under a new category of special-use domain names.

So, would it be a fifth category of the reserved names and other unavailable strings, or would it fall under and of the existing four? So, that's something we'll need to clarify with SubPro. I don't think there is any controversy here, so unless anybody has objections I will move onto recommendation number four. Okay.

Recommendation number four, basically, if I can just sum up, is more housekeeping than anything. It's just to update specifications number five, section number two, for consistency because what it is in the Base Registry Agreement now doesn't reflect what has already been authorized in terms of two new authorizations.

The first one is the measures for two-character ASCII labels and the other one is to do with activation ... Anyway, sorry. It's the two bullets on the bottom left. What I wanted to say is those two have been already authorized by negotiations and updates to contract but it doesn't feature as policy at the moment. So, it's just a matter of housekeeping. We need to bring that into step and make it policy. So, that's what Recommendation 4 and 6 do.

If I can just draw attention to two quick new issues? The first one is two-character letter-number combinations at the top level. There was no recommendation out of this issue—on this issue, anyway—because the working group considered the possibility of addressing this as a potential

confusion situation by way of conducting analysis as part of the string similarity review.

But again, we had a discussion on how to tackle this and there was no conclusion, per se. So, therefore, there was no recommendation to eliminate the reservation of two-character letter-number combinations at the top level.

If you remember correctly, we did have things like O2, but that's at the second level. So, that's permissible at the second-level. This, we're talking about at the top level. So, because there is no recommendation to change the current policy, it stands that any two-character letter-number combinations at the top level would be unavailable.

And the last issue, or the second new issue that we talked about, was the ISO 4210 Currency Codes. Now, this was something we originally raised under the geographic names topic but it was subsequently deemed that ISO 4217 Country Codes are not considered geographic names.

So, therefore, the Work Track 5 did not want to make any recommendations or take any further action in terms of ISO 4217 Currency Codes. Or the protection thereof, I should say.

So, it was then brought up as a potential issue under reserved names, as in whether we need to look at protecting ISO 4217 Currency Codes as a category of reserved names. And what happened is, basically ... Sorry. Yeah. We're looking at the last slide, now. Slide number nine.

Basically, what happened is there was no consensus as to whether such protection or such high-level protection as to put it as a reserved name was warranted for ISO 4217 Currency Codes.

A number of reasons for this were that there was no clear risk or threat that was identified with the ISO 4217 Currency Codes. There was always the opportunity for people to file an objection if somebody were to apply for anything that falls under the ISO, this particular code, or if GAC were concerned, and they could still put in a GAC early warning or GAC advice as a curative protection mechanism.

So, that was something that, if I could say, Christopher Wilkinson championed, and unfortunately he has left the call so I can't really get him to speak on this today. But yeah, to the extent that, from an At-Large perspective, there is actually, if I remember correctly, pretty much a split between groups of us supporting the protection versus not seeing the risk needing for this to be protected.

Okay. So, I'm going to leave it there. If people have comments, obviously much they are welcome to put it up. I might try and put this back on the agenda once I've had a chat with Christopher. So, that's it for me today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. Jonathan, anything else that we need to touch on today?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so we just have to find out when is our next call, next week.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thanks so much, Olivier. So, our next call will be on the 13th of May, next Wednesday, at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 19:00 UTC next week. Thank you for this, Yeşim, and thanks to everyone for having attended this call. Thanks to our interpreters for having added nearly 15 minutes and, of course, to all of our presenters. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, night. Have a great week. Speak to you next week for more policy work in At-Large. Goodbye.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]