

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 8<sup>th</sup> of July, 2020, at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing the rollcall 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 Alfredo Calderon and from Nadira Al-Araj. And today, from staff side, we have Evin Erdoğan and myself, Yeşim Nazlar, present, and Heidi Ullrich is expected to join shortly.

Our interpreters today are Paula and David on the Spanish channel and Claire and Isabelle on the French channel. Before we get started, [a formal] reminder is for the real-time transcription service. I'm sharing the link, here. Please do check the link for the service.

And one final reminder is to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And now, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim. Welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call, the first one after our ICANN68 meeting – virtual meeting, as we know. But the last call that we had of the CPWG was on the 17<sup>th</sup> of June, so that was nearly a month ago. We have a few things to catch up with.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

First, of course, the working group updates with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg, followed by Subsequent Procedures with Justine Chew. And then, we'll move onto a follow-up on the At-Large GeoNames survey. with Jonathan Zuck letting us know if its results.

We'll then move on with the policy comment updates. Not very much there. And just noting that, later on today, there is also an Organization and Finance Budget Working Group call. So, some of these will be punted over to the next call.

After that, Jonathan Zuck will take us through a recap of what happened at ICANN68. Goodness, that was a fully packed week. So, I don't even know how he's going to do it in ten minutes but, hopefully, we'll be able to go through that quickly, and then any other business at the end of this call. Are there any changes, additions, and so on to be made to this agenda? I see Yrjö Lansipuro has put his hand up. Yrjö, you have the floor.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. I would like to suggest an AOB item on tomorrow's call we have with the PSWG of GAC. As you remember, this is a call that was suggested originally by GAC PSWG. It has been postponed a couple of times and it's finally, now, penciled in for tomorrow at 13:00 UTC.

So, there will be suggestions for the agenda from the GAC side, as well, but I just would like to have agenda ideas/agenda suggestions from the CPWG. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Yrjö. So, what I suggest is, would five minutes be okay with you at the end of this call during AOB? So now, everyone on the call has the question that you've asked, agenda items for this meeting, and then they can think about them over the call, and then come back at the end of this call.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yes. Five minutes will be okay. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Thanks very much, Yrjö. So, that's one more thing on the any other business. Anyone else? I'm not seeing any other hands up. So, that means we can, with this additional item, swiftly move onto the action items from last month.

And as you could imagine, they're all done/complete. Staff can just put it on this screen for 20 seconds if there is any comment, or is anyone wishing to make any point about these action items? Then, please speak now.

They're all closed, thank you. And yes, we do speak, here, about the third Accountability and Transparency Review Team final report. So, that's coming up soon. And as you know, there are a number of other things that will come to us this summer. So, we have to get ready to take on quite a bit of work during what some parts of the world take as a traditional holiday period.

Right. Let's move on, and let's go, now, into the working group updates. First, we have the Expedited Policy Development Process, Phase 2, with

---

Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. Do we have Alan or Hadia on the call? I thought that I saw Hadia. I'm not sure.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, yes. I am here. So, as you might all know, we already finished the final report and we need to make the final comments by the end of July. The new things that we did up until now, we started with or concluded with, are finalizing the automation recommendation, which is now recommendation number eight, and the mechanism recommendation, which is now recommendation number 18. And the mechanism for evolution now has a different name [inaudible]. I had some slides I cannot locate, now.

Anyway, the name, now, of the recommendation with regard to the mechanism is called "Review of Implementation of Policy Recommendations Concerning SSAD Using a GNSO Standing Committee." So, the name has been changed. And we are using a GNSO Standing Committee, which would have the same representation as the current ePDP now.

Something that's not so good about this implementation mechanism, that we now call it "Review of Implementation of Policy Recommendations," is that there is no clear distinction between what is policy and what is implementation.

So our understanding, for example, that adding automated cases would be an implementation issue, and, most probably, that is the understanding of the other groups, as well, but not for sure.

---

And what's not good about it is that, through this recommendation, any member can put forward a topic. And then, if the team deems that this topic is actually a policy and not an implementation issue, it will be marked as such and put forward to the GNSO in order to initiate a PDP to address it.

So, I hadn't the chance to discuss with Alan this frequently, but we were discussing that our agreement to the report should [have] conditions on that; that we should clearly state that we agree to the report, if we are to agree to it, based on the understanding that adding automated cases is considered an implementation issue and would be addressed through recommendation number 18.

So, I don't know if Alan is here. Maybe he could also ... I'm not sure, also, if the other groups will support it or not. So, we haven't been recently talking, but during our talks last week the BC were not sure that they were supported, but they needed time, yet, to discuss. I think this is the most important ... That's the real change that has happened to the report since our last discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. I'm not seeing Alan Greenberg on the call. Unless he's just on the phone, in which case, please speak up. I'm not seeing any hands up, either, regarding questions.

I do have one question/answers because I haven't paid attention to the process, and I gather, maybe, others have not. But where are we with regard to the ratification of Phase 2 work by the GNSO Council? Has this been ratified? Has this gone through? Are we still yet to cross that bridge?

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I guess that question is both to you and to Cheryl Langdon-Orr, as well, our GNSO liaison.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, it hasn't gone through yet. The report is still up to the 10<sup>th</sup> of July for us to review and note any changes that we think need to happen. So, the report was posted on the 5<sup>th</sup> of July and is up until the 10<sup>th</sup> of July. I can put you the link, now. I was trying to find it. I have it. I will put you the link, now, for the [inaudible] report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. I note from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, our GNSO liaison, that the council is discussing, but not resolving matters yet. I see a hand up from Eduardo Diaz. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, sir. I do have a question. We have been on this for two years. I'm wondering when this is going to end, if there is an end date to this ePDP. Expedited for two years is not expedited [inaudible] or anyhow. That's one question.

The first question is, when is this going to end? Period, end, nothing more, no more meetings of ePDP? And second, I have another question.

---

I read a very disturbing document that came out of the SSAC, of a little thing – that they were concerned and they were not going to be a part of this [consensus up to by the end].

So, if you care to comment about this, [have things] to discuss during this meeting or at another level, I would really like to know. Because I found it very disturbing that they were writing this document after all this time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, the SSAC ... Yes. No, this has not been discussed. So, the SSAC, they were not speaking much. But for sure, there are a lot of things in the report that could be disturbing. I'm not sure, yet, to what extent, and I need to discuss, also, with Alan. But no, this has not been raised. All of those concerns have not been raised during our meetings and have not been discussed by the SSAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I note that you have your hand up. Maybe Cheryl could answer, since she has put her hand up on this.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. But it ends, by the way. We end our work this month. So, we are done. We finished on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June, and now the report is up until the 10<sup>th</sup> of July. We should finish this end of July. That's it. No more ePDP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl, if it's for an answer to this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I think Hadia has covered it exceptionally well. I note Holly's hand is up. Perhaps you want to hear from her, and I'll pick up anything that's missed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl. Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Yes, there are two major issues, and maybe three, that, in fact, have been hanging around and really critical to us. And thank you, Ed. Yeah, the SSAC people are saying much the same thing we're saying. But really, the big issues for us were accuracy ... It was legal versus natural were the two ones, and also whether or not we're going to have an automated process.

So, Hadia, you were saying it's over, but they are the critical issues for us and for others. So, are you saying we're just not going to talk about them anymore, or they're going to be part of, say, three, or they're going to be



---

called “implementation”? What has happened with the things that, actually, we have identified as critical? Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

So, with regard to automation, we do have automation within the system. The recommendation actually says that contracted parties need to automate in cases that are deemed technically and commercially feasible and legally permissible.

So, there is a clause there for automation. However, we have only identified three use-cases for automation. And again, that was one big argument during the discussion, that we think that it is enough to say that contracted parties must automate cases that are legally permissible and commercially and technically feasible, and that sets the policy.

And then, we could have stopped there and identified zero cases, and, as we go along and cases are identified, it could be added. So, this is, basically, our understanding to this recommendation.

And yes, we have stated three. But our understanding, again, is that, through recommendation number 18, as more clarity with regard to legal clarity is available, we will be able to add more use-cases through recommendation number 18.

So, our understanding to this is that automation now exists with the available information, and more use-cases could be added. The issue is that, as I explained earlier, we are not sure 100% that the contracted parties and the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group have the same understanding that this is just an implementation issue.

---

However, I do note that I would say, most probably, yes, they do have this understanding. During the period where we were putting comments on the report, I did elaborate on this part and wanted to add a part that says that could be addressed through implementation, examples of that, and put the automation of use-cases.

And this, actually, did not receive objection. This particular part did not receive objection from the contracted parties. So, again, we can condition our agreement to the report on this basic understanding of ours. And if this understanding is true and supported by the other groups, then we do have automation.

With regard to accuracy and legal versus natural, well, yes, we are where we are with regard to those two topics. However, through recommendation number 18, recommendation number 18 allows for topics to be put forward. And definitely, those two topics can be put forward. Also, my understanding is that the GNSO will be looking into the accuracy issue and setting the way forward.

So, I would say it is not over with regard to accuracy and legal versus natural. So, we have no recommendation with regard to legal versus natural so, definitely, it's not over. And accuracy has been taken off the table in order to be discussed later. So, yes, we have nothing with regard to those two, but it's not over.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: "It ain't over until it's over." Title of a song, somewhere. Let's look at Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: “It” may not be over until it’s over, but the Expedited Policy Development Phase 2 project is going to be, and I think our compliments should go to Alan and Hadia for the outstanding work that they’ve done in this arduous process.

But the GNSO has received, noted, and discussed the letter from the SSAC, and that’s pretty much all that’s going to happen with this. We’ve received it, we’ve noted it, and we’ve discussed it, and the outcomes are very much in line with exactly what Hadia has just outlined – that those things that are deemed to be done in this next implementation phase will be handled in that Standing Committee way forward.

Anything that triggers actual policy will come back to council. As the manager of gTLD policy development issues, it will decide in its normal way if there is a new or fresh PDP process required for those things, and that those outstanding things reach our community the At-Large community has particular interest in, in the main, should be picked up either in the implementation, as Hadia has outlined, or in the situation with legal versus natural – be picked up in a timely ... And committed to be appropriately reacted to with not the “nod and put on the shelf” approach.

A separate look at the ePDP, per se, as Hadia has outlined, has drawn to an end. It doesn’t mean that what’s still outstanding won’t be done, it just means that it won’t be done under the banner of ePDP.

By “timely,” Holly, the concern that we’ve heard from Alan, and Hadia, and others, including some in our community and other advisory

---

committees in the past, is that, if it wasn't pressed to the [inaudible] in the Expedited Policy Development Process, it could, as a topic, be somehow shelved and not approach or not dealt with.

And it is not, as far as I can ascertain, and as far as being stated, the intention of the GNSO Council, as the manager of these process, for it to be treated in that way, but rather than it will be dealt with and it will be dealt with in a timely ... Noting all the new approaches on policy development now in play that weren't even in play when the ePDP was put together. It will be dealt with in that manner, not any historical basis. [inaudible] timely. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. It's somehow a bittersweet end, in some way, because this has gone on for so long, as has been mentioned. I would, perhaps, put on the table that the ALAC should ask for statistics, or at least get staff to check on the statistics, on the number of calls that Hadia and Alan have been through.

And I know that some others in our community have been through the number of hours, the number ... Well, all the statistics that go with that, because that just seems to be an incredible piece of work. Really incredible. Oh, and speaking about Alan Greenberg, he has suddenly appeared. But first, Hadia Elminiawi. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes. I just wanted to add that, with regard to the work of the Standing Committee, it will start either somewhere between three months and

---

nine months of the operation of the SSAD because the recommendation says that, no earlier than three months and no later than nine months after the operation of the SSAD, ICANN Org will publish a status report.

And, based on that status report, the status report will include: the number of disclosure requests received, average response time to disclosures, number of requests categorized by third-party purposes, number of disclosure requests approved, number of disclosure requests automated—and that's listed—number of requests processed manually, information with regard to the financial sustainability of SSAD.

And then, based on this report, the Standing Committee will strive to suggest operational improvements. And also, if, by then, we have new legal information with regard to some of the possible use-cases, that could be discussed, as well.

So, any improvements to the operation of the SSAD is not expected before, definitely, three/four months, and not after ... Somewhere between that and ... Basically, within a year from the operation of the SSAD. So, there is a time, there, to when improvements will be added.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Hadia. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I presume Hadia has given a report on where we are right now. The final report is being worked on and will be revised or reviewed over the next few weeks. My recommendation, and I believe Hadia and I had agreed this, but I won't speak on her behalf, is that the ALAC offer a conditional

---

support of the report, pending a number of things. I suspect one of them is what Cheryl was talking about, of when the Phase 1 issues that were deferred will be dealt with.

And the second one is that the evolutionary mechanism will, in fact, be allowed to [talk about] and to make recommendations, which will not be considered policy, on additional cases that the SSAD can process centrally.

So, we'll be working on something like that over the next little while. We've got to look at the report, first, and see exactly what it says. But I believe that the short of the unfinished areas and the evolutionary mechanism ... It ain't perfect, but it's probably better than nothing.

Now, it'll be interesting to see, however, presuming the GNSO approves it—and there are some reasons to believe that it might not get approval, but probably will—whether the board will approve it. We're talking about a rather expensive ... And will be a very long implementation.

It's going to take anywhere from a year to three years, is my best guess, to actually put this in place, and probably closer to the two to three years, and relatively high expense. And the question is, is there a belief that it's going to do enough to warrant that?

If it doesn't do the things we need, it's a very, very expensive ticketing system. So, it's not fully clear to me that the board will approve it, should it get that far, but that's the path we're on right now. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for these words, Alan. I think we're running out of time for this topic but, certainly, we're reaching the end of this process as we currently know it. Hadia, you have closing words for this topic. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. So, I would just like to add that the problem with the current report ... Yes, it is not perfect. But also, the language as written does not really support our understanding of the outcome. So, though we think that this is what the SSAD should be doing and this is how it should be operating, we are not sure that ... The wording does not really guarantee this 100%, and that's why we need this conditional agreement to the report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. Thanks, Alan, and speak to you next week on some more discussion on this, hopefully with some progress. Now we have Justine Chew joining us, speaking about the Subsequent Procedures. And of course, the work has continued with the small team that she has been working with. I'll hand the floor over to Justine Chew. Welcome.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Just to start with some housekeeping matters, the SubPro PDP Working Group calls are still ongoing, unlike ePDP. We're not going to be finishing up. Well, we expect to finish up soon because I do expect the draft final report to be out at some point in time in July. We had anticipated that it would mid-July, according to the co-chairs, and Cheryl can correct me if I'm wrong.

---

So, mid-July was the target timeline for the release of the draft final report but we are still discussing the final recommendations for two topics. So, I don't think it's going to delay the timeline too much, but just to let you know that there are still things happening.

So, by way of timeline, now, this is what we're looking at. We are at stage number four, you see on the screen the chart, and awaiting, as I said, the release of the draft final report, which will then kick off a 40-day public comment period.

So, in terms of the actual date, I don't have that for you at the moment. Okay. Cheryl says, "Before the end of July." Right. Okay. Fine. So, that's where we are at the moment, and the work that we are doing within the small team will continue because we still have quite a number of topics to report, and present on, and to deliberate on.

If we move to the small team work plan, Yeşim? Okay. Just to let you know that we have gone through a hell of a marathon ourselves within CPWG, there being all sorts of topics. And if you scroll down, Yeşim, you'll see that there are still a number of topics that we have not dealt with, either at all or properly within the CPWG.

So, that needs to be figured into our discussions at some point in time in order to develop At-Large positions for the ALAC statement that we're going to submit in response to the draft final report.

So, these are just indications of the topics. Depending on when the final report comes out, obviously, the timeline will change a little bit, but we will still press with what we can do in the meantime.



---

And also, to let you know that the SubPro PDP Working Group is at the last stages of really finalizing the text of the draft recommendations. I'm pleased to report that, in some cases, we have been able to either insert some of our positions from the scorecards that we've developed into the draft final report.

So, in some instances, they have been taken up as a recommendation, if it's a new thing. In some cases, some of our inputs have been incorporated into, say, for example, the deliberation section. And in some cases, we have been asked to submit our inputs by way of the comment during the public comment process.

The impact of that is we'll probably need to go back ... Well, we will need to go back, but the small team will need to go back and have a look at all the scorecards that we've done up to see whether there have been any changes. And there have been some, so we will adjust our ... When we get into drafting the comment, the ALAC statement, we'll look at making sure that those things sync up. Okay. All right.

Moving onto ... Can we have the slides on the agenda? Yes. Can we go to Continuing Subsequent Procedures, Metrics & Monitoring, please? Okay. So, this one, this topic, I have, I believe, presented twice. But both times, we may not have come to anything conclusive and [did so] working out or figuring out how to respond to this. In my opinion, anyway.

So, what I have done is I've tried to put together some bullets to try and help folks think about what our responses should be. So, we move swiftly to slide number three. Okay. So, I'm thinking affirmations one, two, and three together. They're kind of related, anyway. But the impact of

---

affirmation one is that, supposedly, there is no compelling reason to not develop a systematized way of applying for new gTLDs.

I did want to point out that part of the working group's rationale—and this is something that we may want to consider responding to—is that the SubPro PDP Working Group did consider the CCT recommendations, especially the ones that were directed to it by the board's resolution of March 2019. But the working group also did say that it is not necessarily required to agree with all the outcomes and suggested solutions.

So, to the extent that they've considered those CCT recommendations and have reacted to them in some way, then there would be a recommendation in the respective topics where the CCT recommendations appear or are related to.

Affirmations two and three. The impact of them are quite self-explanatory. They're short affirmations, so you can read them on the screen. They are very high-level. In my opinion, not objectionable. But as we say, the devil is in the details.

So, just to kick off some thinking around our responses to affirmation one, two, and three, I've put together some bullets. So, in terms of ... I mean, people are free to disagree with me. Obviously, this is just a proposition.

But the way I see it, there is actually no compelling reason to override policy for continuing the program, whether it's a restrictive application process and so forth.

---

But we may want to maintain our earlier stance that there is no rush to have new applications – that it’s more important to improve the application process and get it right than to rely on ad-hoc fixes post-implementation, especially ones that have not undergone community input.

Having said that, there is a new area entitled “Predictability” where it seeks to create a predictability framework in a standing Implementation Review Team called SPIRIT. It’s spelled as SPRT, but it’s pronounced as SPIRIT.

And that is, apparently, the ... Well, not “apparent.” That is supposed to be the group that is going to look at issues that come up post the opening of the new round, opening of the applications of the new round.

So, insofar as the SubPro PDP Working Group has considered issues from the issues report and trying to address those issues to include them either in the next AGB or by way of implementation of policies. We’re hoping that the number of issues that might crop up would reduce the [inaudible] compared to the last round.

Having said that, obviously, we cannot foresee everything that would happen or that might happen. Therefore, that is the reason why this predictability framework has been proposed. Now, that is one of the topics that is still being discussed by the SubPro PDP Working Group, which is why I have not really talked about that topic, per se, so far. But just to let you know that that is the plan for coming out of SubPro PDP Working Group.

---

So, coming back to this slide, here, insofar as our earlier stance of requiring the prerequisite and high-priority recommendations of the CCTRT, and possibly RPMs, the review of those two areas, those recommendations need to be implemented first. That is, obviously, a high-level stance that we've been taking so far, and it syncs up with what GAC is taking an opinion on, as well.

The specifics of that is still being [inaudible] out, I guess, and I'm proposing that we look into the specifics when we cover a separate internal topic on all the CCT recommendations, where we actually will review all the CCT recommendations that have so far been addressed, or not addressed, for that matter, in the various topics that we're going through.

And something that came up the last time, I believe, was that we should look at taking a stance that the policy development, or any policies developed by SubPro PDP, must continue to be subject to future reviews based on issues stemming from implementation as well as community input.

And obviously, this primary purpose of new gTLDs being to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance agility of the DNS, should come in all aspects of the program. So, that is some bullets that I have put together, just consulting on what people think at this point in time to those. Holly, I see your hand up.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah. Most of them ... It looks fine. I'm just wondering, there were some really good points made in Olivier's session on new applications, both by Edmon and Constantine.

Some of it may sound like it's just a little bit of detail, but, in the Applicant Guidebook, the apparent contradictions, the apparent way in which the approach was made to stop any kind of gaming, those sorts of comments have ...

Because you've woven those in because, even though, perhaps, it sounds minor, if we're interested in diversity and we're interested in new applications, that was a really good session for hearing from two people who had a great deal of difficulty, who found some real problems.

And it seems to me, if we're going to say, "Well, maybe we need to [just apply diversity]," have you gone through ... Some of the things that Constantine said sound as if they've been addressed by some of the procedures that have been cleaned up, but I'm not sure that Edmon's have. So I guess my question is, have we gone through that session and picked up the really important pieces that stand in the way of the kind of diversity that we're asking for? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Holly, we're not talking about community applications, per se. The things that were taken up in all these sessions come under the topic of community-based applications and CTE. So, you'll note that there is a draft scorecard, and there are also two papers that have been produced. Actually, you're part of the small team, so you should know this.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:                    Yeah, I know. I know.

JUSTINE CHEW:                    Yeah. So, if you want to review those and see whether we have missed out anything that Edmon and Constantine have shared, then, by all means. I think we are probably 99% there. The only one that we may not have addresses, maybe, adequately, is the issue which Edmon brought up, which is there should be standardized approaches in how you assess community between the [inaudible] and the CPE, the panel.

HOLLY RAICHE:                    Yeah. There were some contradictions, as well.

JUSTINE CHEW:                    Other than that, I think we have addressed most of the issues that were brought up. Edmon did provide input to our CPE process when we were discussing CPE at length. Constantine's issues, a lot of it, probably, I would say, off the top of my head, about 60% of them have been dealt with with the recommendations that are coming out of SubPro under the topic of community applications. The rest would have been addressed in our interventions for the CPE document.

HOLLY RAICHE:                    Thank you. Look, I understand it to be the case. Constantine said that a lot of his issues had been cleared up.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: All right. If you want to just go through what I said just now, because I want to carry on with this current topic and not digress too much, all right? Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: That's fine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thanks. Any more questions on these bullets? Okay. I see no hands up, so let's move onto slide number five, please. Okay. This is to do with metrics and monitoring. Recommendation 1 speaks to trying to address the issue of having metrics and how best to monitor the program, meaning two metrics and how to monitor the program.

In principle, this recommendation isn't objectionable, in my opinion, anyway. Well, it does refer to guidance in terms of the metrics that were highlighted in the CCT report and elsewhere, but it does also imply that this particular task of coming up with metrics would be dealt with through the IRT, the Implementation Review Team.

So the question I have for this group is, are we happy with this situation? Are we happy to input in the work of the IRT and monitor this effort to come up with metrics that way, or do we want to make any substantive comments to this recommendation? Jonathan, I see your hand up.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Justine. I guess the question ... As always, the devil will be in the details in that the metrics are going to have to be mapped to objectives that are set by Subsequent Procedures, because the objectives themselves, I think, are policy. So, the metrics may not be. The objectives are.

And so, I guess the real question is whether or not, in going through this process, you believe that there are clear objectives that have been set by Subsequent Procedures Working Group, that they can simply be implemented via the creation of metrics for those objectives. I hope that's clear.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks. It's clear to me. Well, your question is clear to me, anyway. But in answer to your question, I wouldn't say I'm 100% confident ... And Cheryl may want to jump in as co-chair for the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group.

In terms of looking at metrics, the implementation guidance here does say that whatever metrics the IRT come up with should focus on the areas of trust, competition, and choice.

So, it's really leaving it up to IRT to look at how those focuses are going to come into play within the recommendations from the entire report. So, it's going to be interesting, I guess, whether they get it right or they get the full picture or not. So, in short, I don't know. I really don't know. And I see Alan's hand up. Maybe he wants to contribute to this.



---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I do. The problem with deferring this to the IRT, or certainly deferring it fully to the IRT, is, when you look at who tends to participate in IRTs, and I don't only mean put your name in for it but actually actively participate, this is going to be a really heavy load.

And I'm afraid that those of us who are most concerned with metrics, and consumer trust, and those other good things we're talking about here, are not going to be the ones who are very active on the IRT – that you're going to see the registries, and registrars, and other people who have a financial interest, to be blunt, in this game are going to be the ones who are heavily participating.

So, leaving it to the IRT implies they're going to make decisions, and are these the people that you want to make the decisions? So, especially if you don't provide them with any guidance as to real, hard details about what they're going to be measuring, I'm afraid what may come out of it was not something that will really satisfy us. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Alan. You've put into very explicit terms what my concerns are. When I say that I'm not confident, that is exactly what I mean, about not being confident. But you've expressed it very well.

The reason for my intervention here, in red, is I'm mostly trying to take a fair approach, I guess – not trying to be needing or anything in any way. But in terms of if we think that this is insufficient, then we really need to be able to come up with substantive responses by way of coming up with a list of metrics that tied back to the objectives the way that Jonathan has said.

---

I do realize that, in past statements, we have made a short list of metrics. We may want to go back and have a look at those, and see whether we can put together a more substantive response that we can submit through the ALAC statement in the public comments. Because by that way, then, at least, we can say the IRT can look at that for guidance. So, that's a possible way to approach it. Marita, I see your hand up. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Justine, if I could just add one more comment?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: The same people who are likely to be the ones heavily participating in the IRT are also not going to have a lot of patience for long debates in the working group itself on what those metrics are. So, I'm agreeing with you strongly; we need to come up with some concise, understandable concepts of what we want to eventually measure. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Marita, you're next.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. Yeah. Alan's point is really well-taken. You could find yourself on a permanent ePDP-type thing, here, if you wanted to participate in this. It

---

seems wholly unrealistic that we could expect public interest to be held to that kind of a thing. Most of us do have other lives.

I think it ought to be outlined/articulated that there has to be a way found for the public interest view to be in there without having to spend the rest of your life on this, where other people who are doing it actually have a financial interest in the way it goes. It's extremely concerning. Thank you. Sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Don't apologize, Marita. So, I'm not seeing any hands but I'm hearing that we do need to do something proactive about this. I'm going to ask if people want to volunteer to come up with some points, to begin with, that we can then shape into a proper commentary for inclusion in the ALAC statement.

Don't all volunteer at the same time. People can reach out to me. I suppose that will be the best way. People can reach out to me to contribute thoughts. And I would suggest that, anyone who is interested, please look at our ALAC statement to the initial report, where we had come up with a very short list of metrics, and we can start from there.

Small team's job? Well, Holly, if nobody else volunteers then I suppose it may have to fall onto the small team to do it, I guess. Okay. Just moving onto the last—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Justine?

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Justine, I'll just have to jump in. We are a bit pressed for time, so if we can finish at the top of the hour with you then we'll be able to do the rest of the agenda, because I guess—

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I realize that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Some of those things need to be addressed. So, you've got another five/six minutes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I realize that. Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Right. Because I was just going to come onto the last slide, and this shouldn't take very long. Slide number seven. This is two recommendations, also to do with metrics and monitoring.

But these ones ... Well, Recommendation 2 doesn't have that much of an effect on end-users, per se. It's more to do with metrics and service-level requirements for each phase of the application process. So, it affects applicants more than end-users. So, we may not actually want to comment on this but I will leave it to the group.

---

And also, Recommendation 3. This one may have some impact on end-users because it could possibly act as a trigger for the emergency back-end registry operator process because it talks about developing ... Like Recommendation 3 talks about developing service-level monitoring to allow for more robust monitoring.

And what happened is we ... Well, the SubPro isn't really clear on what are the circumstances that will actually trigger EBERO. And there have been some reports in the past where potential events should have triggered EBERO but didn't, and ICANN Org sort of dealt with this internally, and it didn't become a major issue.

So, we're trying to get into the bottom of it to make sure that there is sufficient data that will show these things being done properly so that they can trigger whatever necessary actions need to be triggered if certain things happen. Okay.

So, unless people have objections to that, then I'm going to say that we definitely should agree to that, if anything at all. Okay. Seeing no hands. Okay. I was hoping to get through more but, since we haven't been able to, fine. I shall end the intervention here. Back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Justine, and thanks for your presentations. We do realize that this is a little bit like the ePDP. Maybe even more than the ePDP, there appears to be no end to this topic. Also, very, very large set of topics, not just one.

---

But just reminded you all, there are pages linked from the agenda that go through all of the presentations that Justine has done over the months, and we are going to have to, at some point, look through all of these and come up with a statement, and that time is getting sooner rather than later.

In the meantime, we're going to go for something a little more fun, and that's the At-Large GeoNames survey, with Jonathan Zuck presenting some results about this work. Jonathan, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. It has been a long time coming, obviously, and the whole nature of this is a little bit late. But we did this both as an exercise specific to GeoNames, but also an exercise in beginning to do some polling on a broader basis to incorporate more people in the At-Large community in our Policy Development Process.

And so, it has been a little bit of a pilot project in a number of different ways. But I just wanted to share some of the results with you. So, next slide. We have a lot of issues with GeoNames, but they sort of came down to two different questions. One is, for whom are we protecting these names? Is it governments, or communities, or both? Next slide. And the second is, how much are we trying to protect them?

So, those were sort of the two main questions associated with the survey: who are we doing this for, and how much protection are we trying to offer? Next slide.

---

The survey was made up of a series of 16 scenarios designed to poke at the two questions from different angles with real examples of possible outcomes of its future. Our reactions to those help us to understand where we might have common ground.

Next slide. So, as is often the case, it results in what we call a four-quadrant diagram. It's maybe the most popular thing in that business school, the idea of a four-quadrant diagram.

And so, if we look at the Y-axis of this, it's the level of protection, and the X-axis is the level of sovereignty. In other words, the level of deference to governments. And you can see that ends up with four broad categories of respondents – those who believe in a high-level protection but think that we should be focused on protecting the interests of communities, or those with a high-level protection but that we want to focus on the rights of governments.

There's low protection for communities and low protection for governments. So, you get the idea that these are sort of the categories, in very gross terms, or broad terms, that respondents would fall into. Next slide.

So, ideally, what would happen is that we would see a whole bunch of dots, and responses fall into one of these categories. We kind of classify what the consensus would be inside of the At-Large. Next slide.

Still, a vertical line such as this would suggest consensus on whose interests we should focus. In the example above, we don't have consensus on how many names to protect. We have a clear indication

---

that we believe permission to register those names should come from governments.

So, does that make sense? If we dot the line in this way, in a perfect vertical line, it means that we do have consensus on the level of deference to governments, just not consensus on how many names should be protected. Next slide.

Similarly, a horizontal line would imply a lack of consensus on whose interests we seek to protect, but would have a sense of how deep into the 11 million possible reserve names we should try to protect. In this hypothetical consensus, we should have a light touch when it comes to protecting geographic names. Next slide.

So, what we'd really want to avoid is a diagonal line, because this would only serve to underscore a lack of consensus in both the questions, with no clear path for policy development and comments on Work Track 5 conclusions to remain within this status quo. So, if we go to the next slide.

And wouldn't you know it? These are our results; a diagonal line through the four-quadrant diagram. And Alp did a great deal to help us get this [scatter pod] going, this visualization of the data. So, that suggests there isn't a clear consensus among us as to what position we should take on GeoNames. Next slide.

Of course, while the line is diagonal, there does appear to be a majority of responses that fall within the "low protection on behalf of communities" quadrant of our diagram.



---

So, in other words, the extent to which there is consensus, there is consensus around the notion that we're more concerned about the interests of communities and that there isn't ... The people who believe that we need a very aggressive approach in terms of how many names to reserve are in the minority. The next slide?

So, some possible takeaways from this is that Work Track 5, essentially, got it right that the status quo is as close to what we have as a consensus within the At-Large as we might have expected.

And we also know that we're more focused on the interests of local communities and, perhaps, [between use an exile], etc. than we are with the interests of governments. So, that will have some implications for our discussions on this [difficult topic], at least with the GAC. Next slide.

So, what it also suggests is that we might want to try to bake GeoNames into our discussions about community priority evaluations. And looking ... As we respond to that part of Subsequent Procedures, what we might want to suggest is that a community that is in contention with a non-community for a geographic name might be given some priority over that.

And so, that would be one way to proceed if we had consensus around that. So, the poll suggests this consensus. But we wanted to go ahead and do a poll here, on this call. So, Yeşim, if you could bring up the first poll, would this group be supportive of us trying to bake some language into our CPE recommendations to add GeoNames as part of the criteria for Community Priority Evaluation.

---

I'm happy to take questions if it's unclear what I mean by that. I'm not positive I know what I mean by that, but the idea is that we would try to incorporate the notion of GeoNames into this CPE process. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. I think what you're asking is, should we give a community that is using a GeoName priority over someone else who is using a GeoName? I think that's what you asked.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: But that's not how this process works. If you qualify as a community, and that's in isolation of who else wants this name, other than the fact that someone else must want the name, or you wouldn't go through the evaluation.

Then, you're evaluated on your own grounds only, not comparing to them. And that begs the question of, what if ... I guess you can't have two community groups asking for the same name and one of them not treating them as a GeoName. That's not really a practical situation.

So, what you're asking, really, is not something that is evaluated in communities. You could say, I guess, that if you are picking a GeoName, you get an extra bonus point.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's what I was—

ALAN GREENBERG: Which helps [cross talk] something.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. But you wouldn't want to penalize a community application because they are not using a GeoName. So, it's really a bonus point, not one in the normal scheme. Probably going to be really hard to sell.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It might be. But that does appear to be something around which we have some consensus. So, if that's true then it might be worth trying to advocate for a bonus point, or something like that, because everything is a negotiation.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's just that we don't have the concept of bonus points, yet, so introducing it at this late time may be a bit of a hard push.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Other questions? Well, go ahead and just click the poll, whether it's something you want to ... Oh, Tijani. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: Thank you, Jonathan. My response to this question is no, of course, and Alan has said it very clear. So, I don't think that it might be help, in any way, the Community Priority Evaluation, because exactly ... Alan read my mind and said what I wanted to say. So, the answer is no. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I don't need everyone to vote verbally, just vote the way that you would like to vote in the poll. Thanks. I don't have the answer. It's about whether we should try to find a way to incorporate it. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to show the complexity of these issues, Tijani said, because of what I said, the answer is "no." Because of what I said I answered "yes," assuming we can get [and update going] as a bonus point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly. All right.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Jonathan? So, 20.8% of our participants have voted. So, it's 17 out of 35.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Everyone go ahead and click the poll.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: [cross talk] 52. Please let me know when you would like the poll to be ended.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know how to assess that, but we'll do one more minute. Please click on your answer in the poll. Thanks, folks. Okay. I guess let's close up the poll.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jonathan, unfortunately, some of us are on dial-in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Unfortunately what?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Some of us are on dial-in, so we can't vote.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, yes. Ah, that's true. I guess, put your vote ... Yeah. I'm not sure what to do about that. E-mail me with your thoughts, I guess, as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: The result is pretty conclusive.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I think the result's fairly conclusive, that it's something we should explore. We may not be successful, as Alan suggests, and I agree with that. I was just searching for something that might be an innovative way to address where we ended up on this. Next slide. And then that's just the poll. So, the next slide after that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, just jumping in for a point of order. Of course, there is a vote taking place here, but this is taking a temperature of the room in a general direction on whether these are going in one direction or another. Obviously, the end decider on this has to be the ALAC members themselves.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And we're very much aware of that. And I just thought I'd put this to the record, just in case some people do question this. That's all. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay. Yeah, definitely. This is about whether we're making a recommendation to the ALAC to make a recommendation to Subsequent Procedures. Okay. So, the other thing that's a little less scientific that we tried to look into is the notion of priority scenarios.

---

And so, of the scenarios, we tried to look at whether something was likely but considered a bad outcome or unlikely but considered a good outcome, because those might be things that we had prioritized looking at directly. So, next slide.

This is a little bit geeky, but Alp actually tried to make a statistical effort to look at the respondent curve using kurtosis and skew analysis to see if there was consensus around a particular scenario, and there wasn't strong consensus around any particular scenario.

But taking a—next slide—brute-force analysis of results, it revealed seven instances where the majority deemed the scenario to be both likely and undesirable, and there were no instances where the majority found something unlikely but desirable.

Of course, the actual likelihood of a number of these scenarios has diminished—as we say in the U.S., overtaken by events—given the recommendations of the Work Track 5 team.

So, again, there is somewhat of a lack of timeliness associated with this survey. So, these are the scenarios that sort of came up as ones that the community saw as possible and likely to occur, but that they wouldn't like that outcome.

So, we can go through these fairly quickly. Next slide. So, these ones with slide three are ones that are no longer possible because of the Work Track 5 recommendation.

And so, that's why it obviates our own consensus around them. Next slide. In fact, you might just skip to the one without the bar. And the slides

---

are on the agenda, if people want to look more at those scenarios that people were concerned about but that aren't likely to happen anymore.

This particular scenario could still possibly happen, so it might be something for us to think about. The Coachella Native American tribe in the United States applies for .coachella, but the city of Coachella located in Southern California successfully blocked the application.

So, this is an example of a scenario that could still happen, given the current Work Track 5 recommendations. And so, it might be something on which we try to focus, as well, and that will just require a little bit more thought about what protections might be put in place to prevent this scenario from recurring.

Checking for questions. Okay. And then, the last thing was that the ... And it might be worth having Marita or Yrjö present this, but one of the other questions that came up during Work Track 5 deliberations, but on which there wasn't consensus reached, was the idea that, rather than outright protecting too deeply into the list of GeoNames, there ought to be a way to add some measure of protection for cities that aren't paying attention to this process.

And so, this second poll is about the idea of requiring ICANN to somehow notify cities whose names are about to be registered, or have been applied for, I guess, is a better way of putting it.

So I guess one question is, would you support requiring ICANN to notify all cities, not just capital cities, that their name has been applied for as part of the new gTLD process? Holly, please go ahead.



---

HOLLY RAICHE: Are you going to notify Paris, France, or are you going to notify Paris, Texas?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, both. That would be the idea, notify everyone just so that they can be aware of ... Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, okay. That's fine. It's just that there are so many cities that, in fact, they've got the same name, particularly, say, English towns, where, in England, the same names appear. Loads of places in the United States. They appear in all Commonwealth countries. So, that's a lot of notification.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, okay. Just clarifying.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But there are probably plenty of cities that ... It's not a terribly difficult task if it's something we decided to do.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to point out that there are a lot of cities named Paris. There are about 50 of them. I don't know how many are named London. It's not clear you can find out all of these. I'm not sure they public paper atlases anymore to allow you to even find out them. So, making a requirement that you notify all of them, and finding out just where to notify them, I think, is a problematic thing. I would not support it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, maybe it's making a reasonable attempt to or something like that. Again, I don't know if we should parse language at the moment as much as decide whether or not it's something that we want to try and support. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. Just want to throw in. I'm sure everyone here knows this, but the way it stands at the moment, you can apply for a city name. And don't forget we're talking about cities, here, not hamlets or tiny little ... We're talking about cities, although that is something that needs to be defined in the end.

---

But as it stands right now, you can apply for any city name as long as you don't say you're going to use it as a city name. You can be a beer company and apply for a city name. That's okay. And then, you could turn around and sell it to the city if that was your intent.

The whole idea around this little tweak is that, well, cities should at least get a heads up on this, and if they don't care, that's fine. But if they have no idea and somebody else applies for their name without knowing, it seems like a reasonable and not too onerous thing to put in something to say ... Some kind of a notification is just plain good behavior. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Marita. Yrjö?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yeah. Thank you. Well, the question in the poll does not reflect accurately the idea that was presented by Jorge Cancio at the WT5. It was not a question of all non-capital cities; it was much more complicated. And we have been discussing this with a few people: Justine, of course, Marita, and so on and so forth. I think that this will be part of the deliberations of GeoNames that is still coming for the CPWG. So, I just think that, to present the question in this form, is now premature. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Yeah. It's just a temperature-taking exercise, I guess. Christopher, go ahead.

---

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Good afternoon. I apologize if some of you think I've been off-limits for the last few days but I was otherwise engaged. I think, first of all, on the specific question, which I've already voted yes, the drafting is not correct. The real question is whether or not there should be advanced notice.

What has been asked for on several occasions, and particularly—and I speak from local knowledge by the Belgian government—what has been asked for on several occasions is that there should be an early warning, that as soon as an application is adumbrated ... I'm not sure how early it should be, but it's certainly not waiting until "about to be registered." No. This information must reach the local authorities concerned as soon as the application is made.

Regarding the survey, I must say I find the sample rather small to reach global conclusions of great importance. And one point which is not captured by the survey, or by many other people commenting on this, is that it has to be future-proof.

It's not a question of what we, as a small sample of interested parties in At-Large, think. It's what the effects of the policy will be in five, ten, 20 years' time. And from that point of view, I have argued, and will continue to argue, for a very strong credential dimension to our policy.

This is because I'm aware of the long and difficult experience of countries whose ccTLDs had been hijacked in the early days of the Internet and found it very difficult indeed to recuperate their domains. Some of you are really exercised by the question of .london, .paris.

Please bear in mind that some of these examples that seem to exercise us have, for better or worse, already been delegated. But taken overall,

---

this is a very limited problem. Most names are not duplicates. All the duplicate names—nearly all of them—can be traced back to colonial and migrations [cross talk].

JONATHAN ZUCK: We need you to wrap up.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes, I'm going to wrap up, and there is more to be said but I will say it in writing. I don't think this study really ... It's certainly not future-proof and I think it's an unduly small sample to reach any conclusions. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Christopher. I agree. I wish the sample size was larger. And unfortunately, as an exercise in going out to the broader community for response, we could have done a better job. So, it's something for us to work on, for sure. Great. [cross talk] we've got to move on. Thanks for that. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Two points. I did find a database that has ... I'm not exactly sure how official it is, but it contains all, or substantially all, of the geographic terms online. It has roughly 11 million entries.

So, there's a lot out there. And even if we exclude hamlets and only include cities, there is no definition of "city" that is generally applicable. And we spent quite a lot of time in Work Track 5 trying to see if we could

---

come up with a definition of “city” that was objectively reasonable, and there just isn’t one.

So I think, rather than individual notifications, general education and awareness to communities and geographic jurisdictions so they know that this could happen is a lot more reasonable and likely to occur than notice to either the 50 Parises, or the 50 Middletons, or whatever they may be, or the one [great, smoky repeater stations]. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Greg. I guess we should wrap up the poll at this point. Again, it’s just a temperature-taking about whether or not that was something ... And I, again, agree with Christopher; the wording was meant to be “applied-for,” not “registered.” So, go ahead and end the poll. Okay.

So, there is just an indication that it’s something that we’d like to try and pursue. And again, we don’t have the time on this call to delve into the details of that. But this was an exception in broadening beyond this committee and trying to reach consensus on things. So, we’ll need to work harder on that in the future, but it was just the first attempt. So, I appreciate everybody’s patience. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Jonathan. Next are the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu.

---

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thanks, Olivier. I'll just be brief. There aren't too many updates this week in terms of discussions on policy-related public comments. But you'll see recently ratified by the ALAC was the Name Collision Analysis Project, NCAP Study 1 final report.

This was submitted by Justine in advance of the public comment deadline. ALAC ratified it, and so it was submitted already ratified, which is great. And that's actually what's happening for the ccNSO PDP3 public comments, as this was finalized very recently and it's already under ALAC vote. So, that will be, hopefully, submitted already ratified on the 10<sup>th</sup> of July. So, thanks to Hadia and Barrack Otieno for this.

There is currently one public comment open for decision. This is on the topic that, usually, the ALAC does not comment on. It is the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone Version 4, and it closes on the 11<sup>th</sup> of August.

And besides that, there are currently three other public comments that are being handled by the OFB Working Group, which will be meeting today, shortly after the CPWG. Those three are the LAC Regional Strategic Plan, the ATRT3 final report, and the ICANN Multi-Stakeholder Model Next Steps public comment. All three have extensive drafting teams, so that's great. With that, I'll turn it over to Olivier or Jonathan for further feedback. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Jonathan?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't have anything more, Olivier. We can go back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Just one question that I had for you, Jonathan, was the label generation rules for the root zone version. Should this be punted? I know it's a long deadline. Should this just be sent over to our IDN Working Group? This is all to do with IDNs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that makes sense?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. So, that's noted. And the ccNSO statement is, obviously, going to a vote. So, that's it. As we said, OFB WG is going to deal with the other statements that are there. Now, we've got a quick recap of ICANN68, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. We, once again, stirred the pot on a number of different issues at ICANN68, and had good attendance and good participation from the At-Large in a number of different sessions.

We continued to press on the issue of DNS abuse, and we know that we're having some effect because the registrars, in particular, but some registries, were there in force to make their views heard on those conversations. So, I think we have some work ahead of us in terms of making more specific some of our recommendations around DNS abuse.



---

And we also had a conversation about PICs, or what are now called Registry Voluntary Commitments, and there were some interesting revelations around that, as well, which is that part of the biggest problem may be people even knowing about them in order to complain about the violations of those PICs. And so, Holly is working hard on trying to take those discussions to their next stage.

We had a great session that Olivier and Justine put together on the idea of expanding the circle of applicants that will ... Again, hopefully, that discussion will feed into our recommendations, our comments, to Subsequent Procedures. And finally, Joanna did another one of her wildly popular sessions, also about DNS abuse, but in the geopolitical arena, and that was well-received, as well.

But I think, as a whole, during ICANN68, we were asked a lot for specifics that we didn't necessarily have. And so, I think we're going to need to do some work as we've put together our recommendation in these different areas to come up with specific examples and scenarios that we want to see changed in order to take these discussions to the next level.

But overall, I think we represented well within the community, and our sessions were well-attended. So, I think that means that we're being effective in terms of raising up the issues that matter to the At-Large. Thanks. Yrjö, is that a new hand or is that an old one still up?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Old hand.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, keep an eye out. We'll be working on how to take these conversations to their next level in the coming weeks. Thanks, Olivier. Back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jonathan. We now have any other business. And as you've heard from Yrjö Lansipuro, earlier, he is the liaison with the Government Advisory Committee, the GAC. The Public Safety Working Group of the GAC has a call. So, Yrjö, over to you to discuss this. You need to come up with a few points. We've got just five minutes on this. Very tight for time. Yrjö Lansipuro.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Olivier, some people [cross talk].

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. The Public Safety Working Group, as you remember, they expressed interest in talking to At-Large already, before ICANN67. This informal meeting has been postponed a few times, but it finally will happen tomorrow, 13:00 UTC. Now, the topic will be DNS abuse but, since it's a large issue, I thought it would be ... If we can be more precise and have some more specific ideas that we would like to discuss at this meeting. So, basically, I'm listening. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Yrjö. I understand there are a number of people with their hands up, and I apologize for zapping them. I didn't

---

quite zap them. I thought we could have everyone contribute, now, to both the points that you've asked for now, and also the earlier points that people wanted to make. Alan Greenberg, you're first in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG:

At this point, I seem to be the only one in the queue. My comment was on the virtual Kuala Lumpur meeting. Our first meeting attracted a huge number of people, particularly because it was entitled "DNS abuse."

Unfortunately, two-thirds of the discussion—or at least, I think there were about two-thirds of the discussion—was about the part after the colon. The full title was "DNS abuse: COVID-19 and End-User Issues," and the second part of that meeting was about COVID-19 and end-user issues, but not about DNS abuse.

So I just think, going forward, we need to be really careful to make sure the content maps the title. I know titles may not be legally binding but they are what attracts people. So, I think we need to be careful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Alan. Next in the queue is Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL:

Hi. Thank you. I just wanted to point to a little issue that happened at the very end of ICANN68, which was that open session in which chairs and ICANN Org were giving their opinion on how we were going to go forward, COVID, and all that stuff.

---

Maureen had, I guess, the courage to say something about the fact that a lot of At-Large people are already disadvantaged by this new virtual meeting, and that there might be a consideration for some assistance in that area with bandwidth issues, etc.

There was a lot of very nasty talk that happened in the chat. It ended up being a pile on. At-Large, not Maureen specifically, but At-Large as a group. Who are we to have the nerve to be even opening up this topic?

I thought it was really abusive and I just want to say I actually lodged a complaint with the ombudsman. I don't think it's going to go anywhere, but I really don't think we should let that sort of thing go. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this point, Marita. Are there any other points? Let me just try and find the window again. There we go. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I want to support what Marita said. The comments, they were from the usual suspects; largely registrars, but not completely. Basically, they were saying, if I can summarize, that it's outrageous for people to ask for support for meetings they would be going to anyway.

And there is that assumption that we are going to have people going to things, anyway, and ignoring the fact that it may be causing significant impact on them, and many people might not participate at all because of those things. It was a standard perception we see from certain groups, that this is part of the business, and they just don't understand where we come from.

---

I support what Marita said strongly. I don't know how we can fix it. Unfortunately, Maureen did say, at one point, that there should be compensation for their time, as opposed to saying this should help offset other costs. She said that, too.

But at one point, she basically said we should pay them to come, and that part is what triggered a lot of the negative comments, but they went on from there. So I think, number one, we have to be a little bit careful how we phrase these things, but that is the world we're dealing with in ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. We do have to end this call very, very soon indeed. I just wanted to ask again on Yrjö's question, which he did ask in the beginning of this call. Does anybody wish to say anything to that, make any suggestions? Do you all remember Yrjö's question? Yrjö? Yrjö, could you repeat it and then get the response by e-mail? I think people are pretty much cooked for this call.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah. The question is, what DNS abuse-related topics you would like to take up with the Public Safety Working Group of the GAC tomorrow when we have the call with them at 13:00 UTC? So, please send me e-mail. But please, if you have ideas, please do it pretty soon because I have to put the agenda together, together with the GAC, today. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yrjö. Very helpful. Obviously, this is all as a follow-up to the great collaboration that's currently taking place between the GAC and other parts of the community, including the ALAC. Next meeting. I'm not seeing any other hands up, so when is our next meeting supposed to take place?

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thank you, Olivier. So, next meeting will be next Wednesday on 15<sup>th</sup> of July at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next Wednesday, 19:00 UTC. Thanks to everyone who has been on this call and, of course, to our interpreters, who have kindly remained an extra 15 minutes. Yes, we've done it again. We're late. But great discussions, today. So, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, and please follow up on the mailing list. This is not just about the call, but we can discuss this on the Consolidated Policy Working Group mailing list. Have a very good time, everyone. Take care, and goodbye.

[CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:] Thanks, everyone. Bye.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**