
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 12th of January 2022 at 19:00 UTC.

We will not be doing the roll call today but we will note attendance from the Zoom Room as well as the audio bridges. I would however like to note the apologies we received from K Mohan Raidu, Priyatosh Jana, Christopher Wilkinson, Justine Chew, and Satish Babu.

We do have French and Spanish interpretation on today's call. Our French interpreters are Isabelle and Jacques, and our Spanish interpreters are Claudia and Veronica. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

We also have real-time transcribing on today's call. I just added the link to the chat for you all to follow along. A friendly reminder for everyone to please state their name when taking the floor so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels, and to also please speak slowly to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you all very much. And with this, I turn the call over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Claudia. Welcome to today's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. So today's agenda is going to first have the Board advice with a status update on the ALAC and At-Large processes, on the advice to the ICANN Board on the Expedited PDP Phase 2, and also on the on the Subsequent Procedures, which I believe the response is in

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.

progress at the moment. We'll have an update on this first. And then after that, our workgroup updates with various working groups, Transfer Policy Review, Expedited PDP on International Government Organizations, the ones on Internationalized Domain Names and the one on the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team. And after that our policy comment update with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu with the two processes that are currently moving forward, the two streams, should we say, moving forward in Any Other Business. At this point in time, I'd like to ask if there are any suggestions to make amendments to the agenda or to add items to it. I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. So I believe we can proceed forward with the agenda as it currently is displayed on your screen.

Therefore, that takes us to the action items from last week, the 5th of January. All action items are completed apart from one, which is why Evin and Heidi called to coordinate a meeting with Alan Greenberg and Steinar Grøtterød regarding the Transfer Policy Review PDP. I believe that's probably moving forward. But are there any comments or questions on any of these action items? Evin Erdoğdu?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to comment on that one AI that's in progress. I'm not sure if we want to do it now or later in the meeting. But we just wanted to determine the participants for this call that Alan and Steinar have requested. So we could perhaps do it later in the meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. And also a hand up from Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just a question, Olivier. What is that meeting about? What's the purpose of that action item, to coordinate a meeting with them? It doesn't say why, regarding the Transfer Review Policy about what?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. We need some kind of coordination. But, Evin, maybe you have an answer for this.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Sure. I think if Steinar and Alan are on the call, please feel free to pipe in. But yes, it was to coordinate on some topics that had been discussed a couple of weeks ago now. But there was also some discussion regarding—well, I see Steinar's hand up, so please go ahead, Steinar. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Actually, Alan Greenberg sent out to the mailing list at some time—I guess it was in November, I don't recall it actually—a print screen of information from GoDaddy saying that there were more than 170,000 domain names hijacked every year. During one of the updates from the Transfer Policy Review team, Alan kind of asked the question about why

is this data, this these from GoDaddy, so significantly higher than the one that is being addressed by ICANN Compliance and so on. And there was a small discussion about that, and we kind of agreed to put together a small team to try to find data, and try to analyze the data that has been found, and report back to both this group and also send some questions to the Transfer Policy Review team.

I believe that Michael Palage was one of the spokesmen that was of interest to join this group, and there were some others also but I can't recall their name and the persons. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a minor comment. I'm looking it up right now but I don't think GoDaddy said there were that many hijackings. I think they said there were that many attempts, just to be clear. I've got it now. Yeah, attempted to steal domains was what the number reflected, not actual hijackings. So just to be clear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. Thanks, everyone, for this precision. I'm not seeing any further hands so we know this is in progress. This will happen soon. We can then move to—

ALAN GREENBERG: The question is who else should be involved in this small group? Steinar was correct. Michael was one of the people who said he was interested. I certainly said I was interested. Was there anyone else? Or should it just be the three of us? Jonathan and Holly may have expressed some interest. I'm not sure, though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. If there are any further volunteers, then just put your name down on the chat and that we'll follow up. Thank you. Let's move on, please. Let's go to our next agenda item. That's the Board advice, then we have a status update, starting with Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi, the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase 2. Over to you, Alan and Hadia.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. On the advice, I presume that has already gone into the Board, get confirmation from staff because I think Maureen said there was a 48-hour consensus call and that's long passed, I believe.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Alan. Yes, to confirm, the ALAC did conclude its 48-hour consensus call. It supported these responses, and it's been sent to the Board AR team which is processing it and they will be providing it to the Board for their input in the coming days.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent. The only other thing I have to report, which I think is worthy, is some activities going on regarding Phase 2. I presume this is a good enough good time to do it, Olivier, or do you have it scheduled for somewhere else?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we can talk about it here. But I do point out a note from Evin that at the time when this was a public consultation—

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, hold it. That's yet another thing. Okay. Let's do that one first. The recommendation for Phase 2A has gone to the Board, and the Board has an open consultation which was opened at the end of November, apparently—and I'm quite willing to believe it happened and I probably even took part in it—we decided we didn't need to submit a comment. After some discussion with some other people, I'm wondering should we submit a very brief comment just to get it on record saying our comments and those of the other like-minded people, the minority reports, still stand and should be factored in by the Board. Because at some level, they form part of the report that was issued by the GNSO but they don't report necessarily form part of the recommendations that the GNSO sent to the Board.

So I would think a one sentence statement saying the Board should take into account the minority statements in the report issued by us, the GAC, the SSAC, the BC, and IPC. I'm happy to draft such a statement. To some extent—I don't know. Is Maureen on this call? Maureen isn't on the call right now. This is due tomorrow, which is the reason why either

we need to get permission to submit something late or we need to do this within the next 24 hours. Do other people think we should say it? Or is it enough to presume the Board will look at the comments and not worry about it? Anyone? Greg has his hand up I see.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I would say that I think in this case, it's worth pointing out that these are there. And I think it might make a little more sense that you can point out the unusual number of minority statements. And I was wondering, Alan, it hadn't occurred to me to ask this question before, but how many total seats on the EPDP are represented by the minority statements out of the total number of seats?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, we've got two from us and the SSAC, three from the GAC, that makes seven, and two each from the BC and IPC. So that makes 11 out of 21, I think. I think it's 21, I'm not 100% sure.

GREG SHATAN:

It's worth pointing out that 11 out of the 21 have been deemed the minority. Therefore, the minority statements should be given particular attention by the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. How about—

GREG SHATAN: That's how I put it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Thank you. Another suggestion, an alternative to the ALAC making a suggestion is I can submit something on behalf as the formal representative—I and Hadia, as formal representatives to the EPDP, can point out to the Board that the minority statements still stand and should be factored in. That way, we don't have to get ALAC approval, it's still something goes on to the record. Olivier, does that sound something maybe it's easier to finesse instead of going through a formal statement?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Alan. I do have one concern and that when we originally looked at that consultation, the recommendation was not to produce a statement. So now the 11 are going through a process by which there would be an official statement, etc, etc. with the ALAC approval, it's probably a little pulled by the teeth. That being said, though, just a reminder of a previous advice, I don't think requires—there is no shift in policy or anything like this. It's kind of a reminder saying this still stands.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I mean, I'm not authorized to speak on behalf of the ALAC but I can make a statement equivalent to that. I see Jeff has his hand up.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. I was just going to say, which is what Greg said, it's a little misleading to say that—well, let me go back. I agree with what Alan said that to reiterate the minority statement is important. But let's not re-characterize the vote as to what it was because for whatever reason—and this is interesting—but for whatever reason, the IPC, BC, and all those other groups decided to vote in favor of the report, which is always interesting to me, something needs to be done about that and the whole policy process. Maybe not the BC, IPC, but others voted in favor of it even though they submitted minority reports, which is interesting. So bottom line, let's do what Alan said. I think that makes a lot of sense and let them know that “Pay attention to these minority reports.” Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just the comment. It's been discussed within the EPDP far more than it was worthy. The nomenclature calls these things minority reports. They are really statements in regard to the report, not necessarily espousing a minority report, a minority position. So it's a nomenclature issue that, for whatever reason, we don't seem willing to change. But it doesn't necessarily imply disagreement with the report. So even though in some cases it doesn't, it is.

All right. I see Jonathan is on the call now, I didn't think he was going to be. If people are happy—and I'll double check with Maureen to make sure that she doesn't object—then we'll simply put a comment in as the representatives to the PDP pointing out that the minority statements are still in effect. Is that okay? Olivier or Jonathan, does that sound

okay? And if so, we can go on to the other part of what I wanted to present.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think it sounds fine.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, fine. I'll take that under advisement. The other thing I wanted to talk about is the current activities, and there's a lot going on very suddenly on the SSAD on Phase 2. As people are probably aware, the Board commissioned an Operational Design Phase, which essentially is a staff review of the recommendations so the Board could understand all the implications of these recommendations going forward. The ODP is not completed yet but a preliminary version of the findings had been published in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, which was given to the GNSO in December. I've sent a copy or pointed to a copy of it in an e-mail I sent out earlier today. Following that, there was a GNSO private meeting which was completely closed so we don't have any recordings or anything of that. But out of that private meeting came a document of possible things the GNSO could do before or after the Board takes action. In fact, there is going to be a Board consultation with the GNSO, which is a bylaw mandated thing that will be taking place probably later this month, the date is not yet set. And the Board is essentially asking the GNSO for what do they plan to do about it. The GNSO had a meeting earlier today. That was a closed meeting but with observers. And it was quite an interesting meeting. Again, my e-mail points to that meeting and you can listen to it. It's an hour and a half, an hour and a quarter

long and it's probably worth listening to, for those who are interested in this. The tone is varied in the GNSO. It's very different than it was when the recommendations were approved, which was basically, "Hey, we made the PDP completed. Here's the recommendations. We're passing them on to the Board."

The ODP so far—I will misquote Kurt Pritz who said he has sat through an awful lot of presentations like this one on a staff assessment of something. And he's never seen one, which so clearly says, "Don't do it," by the staff. Now, the staff don't say that, but that's his reading between the lines. Among other things, the implementation cost is about what I was predicting. I said \$20 million and they're saying 20 to 30 or so. The operational cost for the SSAD is an unbelievable range of between 14 and 104 million per year. We don't really have any idea where those numbers came from, who developed them or what they're based on, but clearly a huge range. And the number of users is projected as anywhere from extremely low to extremely high.

So clearly, there's more work to be done. But it doesn't look very rosy for the SSAD as recommended at this point. Now, the Board still, of course, hasn't come out and said what they plan to do or even where the direction is thinking at this point. But one could presume that it would be a rather risky thing to go ahead with it as is. So the GNSO document talks about a number of different options going forward, including rewriting recommendations and looking at a stripped-down thing, which is something that we had recommended. It's not clear how the GNSO could do this without reconvening the EPDP and to do it without any involvement of the non-GNSO groups doesn't seem right either. So there's a lot of questions going on. But there are things going

on and those working in that area probably should look at the documents that I sent out. Nothing that we have to do at this point. But just be aware of what's going on. Clearly, there's a lot of parts to this activity and it's not clear exactly what's going to happen, but it surely bears some focus from us. That's about where it stands. Jeff, is that a new hand or an old one?

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. I was just going to say that your summary is right on. I think Kurt did make that statement. And I think although it was so early in the morning, I think I said something right after that. I basically said ICANN does that a lot. When the Board doesn't want to make a statement, it heavily implies something. But I think in this circumstance, we need the Board to actually—or staff and the Board or the Board needs to make the point crystal clear that they do not want to go forward with this under the current conditions, and also to set the guidelines as to what the Board and/or staff believe would fit within the guidelines is something that they would approve. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The other part that I didn't mention, I mentioned costs. I didn't talk about the timeline. The timeline that they are looking at is three to four years of development following an implementation review, which essentially is firming up all the specifications, which they are guessing at two years. So we are looking at a system which will not be available for potentially five to six years from now when we know there is legislative activity which may require it to be changed. An extraordinarily high cost

with an unknown user base, whether it's actually going to be used or not. That all doesn't sound like something that I would invest my money in on a personal basis.

So I think the writing's on the wall. I agree with Jeff, it would be really nice if the Board were to say, well, we're not making a decision today. But based on our discussions, this doesn't look really feasible or we think it is feasible. It would be nice to have a straw vote sort of thing from the Board to know where they're heading before we decide what action to take.

Anyway, I don't want to put a lot more time into it. The documents are worth reading and the meetings, both the discussion with The Board on December 20 and the meeting earlier today are really worth spending your time on if you have any interest in the subject. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. It would have been—here we go. Yeah, we have that slide, summary of Org's assessment with all of the numbers that you have quoted in which have gotten quite a few people to raise their eyebrows, if not their hand. In fact, there are two hands up at the moment. Sivasubramanian Muthusamy first.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: If there is some hesitation in implementing SSAD due to whatever complexities or due to uncertainties concerning aspects of the proposal, how was the requirement for nonpublic data access by law and order agencies and government and other stakeholders to be met? And how

is it to be serviced? There must be either this solution or an alternate solution by which that need needs to be addressed. What did the community discuss about alternates?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The alternates are very simple. The alternate is you go directly to the registrar/registry and ask them. Remember, all of the numbers that you see on the screen would still only result in a system at this point anyway because of how we understand GDPR is being interpreted where the registrar or registry, but normally the registrar, is still making a decision one by one by hand. Even though the request was submitted via the SSAD, it still comes down to a one by one manual decision on whether to release the data or not. So that doesn't change even if we've implemented it. But the answer is today's practice would go on that if you want information about a domain that's registered with registrar XXX, you go to registrar XXX or the registry in case of a thick domain.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY:

If I may comment. If all that we are talking about by this design, as it is a system whereby ICANN will collect the form and then pass it on to the registry/registrars, in effect, is it that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, that's right. Well, let me put it this way. The registrars' understanding is that due to GDPR, they must make the decision where they have the liability if they do it wrong. They cannot allow someone else to do it on an automated basis. Now, the European Commission

seems to believe that there are other options but the Data Commissioners have not confirmed that. And therefore, we seem to have a problem where the Data Commissioners within the European countries have a different position than the EU has, and that's not resolved at this point. Whether it will get resolved in the future is not clear. But it's not resolved at this point. Greg has his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Greg Shatan next.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I wish I had hands-on experience in software and systems development and budgeting but I don't. So I guess the question is whether anybody who does or whether people think these numbers are at all realistic, or are they just designed to make people throw up and walk away? It just strikes me as huge, huge numbers for what shouldn't be such a huge, huge project. And obviously the spread is huge, but it seems like it's been hedged to the point where this is useless. If this were a commercial question, I'll probably send them back and say the numbers seem unrealistic. The spreads are too wide to make a decision. It seems designed to get people to say, "No, thank you." We may want to say "No, thank you" for other reasons but it's just basically like spraying pesticide on something to keep the pests off of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think the development costs are out of range. My gut feel for a number for the development costs have been \$20 million, as long as

we've been talking about this. So that one I don't think is totally out of range. The operational costs ranging from 14 to 107 are just not comprehensible. It would be nice to know how they develop them but we don't know that at this point, at least not publicly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that was an old hand.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: No. That's an old hand. I left a comment on the chat. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Then after that is Jeff Neuman.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank you. One of the things also that came out of the call last night was the request for the information. I think Mike Palage put something in the chat. There was an RFI. And so there were people that responded or groups that responded with their own estimates of costs. Of course, none of that is out in the public. So we don't know what ICANN based its numbers on. Anecdotally, I've heard from more than one of the bidders that submitted their estimates, and they're not even close to what ICANN has projected its cost would be. And when I say not even close, I mean much lower. So ICANN's costs are multiples higher than at

least what some of the respondents to the RFI put in. So I think Greg is right, that this presentation was designed for us to have this kind of visceral reaction and say no, but we do need to see what the responses to the RFI were. And even if it doesn't say, "Well, this bidder said this amount, and that bidder said that amount," because that could be confidential, it could say that bids for these functions range from X dollars to Y dollars. So that came out last night, too, that we need to know more about how ICANN based its numbers, including the RFI responses. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I also heard somewhere and I can't remember at this point where I heard it, that none of the bidders submitted a full bid. They were all partial bids of some aspects of the RFI, but none of them fully covered everything. I don't remember where I hear that, but I did hear it somewhere.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, you did hear that from ICANN. But I've also heard that that may not be a correct statement.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That shouldn't be debatable.

JEFF NEUMAN:

True, but until we see it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Matthias Hudobnik?

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Hello. I don't know, maybe I missed it, but the question which strikes me a bit is how is it possible to make this calculation without even knowing which company or sort of organization will make the implementation? So is it just a rough estimation about—I don't know. How is it possible to make this sort of calculation without deeper knowledge in terms of a concrete implementation? Maybe some of you guys know a bit more about it. I would be curious to hear. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, remember, this is on a rough spec. So it's an RFI. It's not a formal bid. And ICANN did go out with a public RFI and a number of organizations responded. So that information is known in ICANN. I don't have it. It hasn't been published.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Okay. So, when will be then more information like public related to the organizations which filed the request?

ALAN GREENBERG: That information may never be public. ICANN doesn't normally publish the bids that are submitted in confidence. They might give a list of who bid maybe. Remember this is just an RFI so the whole thing may be

subject to non-disclosure. Nevertheless, the GNSO Council has made it clear that the numbers are so wide ranging that they really need more information of how they were created before they can make any judgment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, everyone, for this. I think we need to move on. But yeah, at this stage, it's bewildering to see those numbers. But hey, often when you do have those things and the brief isn't particularly tight, you do have a very wide range of responses because ballpark assumptions are being made. And you have to remember that this is a global offering. So it might well be that some offerings are much, much cheaper in some parts of the world. Also, you have various levels of quality, should I say, quality of service that you might get from the big, expensive cloud systems out there to the smaller ones that are trying hard to keep their prices low and it's very competitive market indeed. But what you get at the end of the pipeline is often very different products from the cheaper one to the most expensive one. Unfortunately, you only find out at the end. Usually the higher numbers are the ones that end up being the ones that worry everyone. Anyway, let's move on please, everybody. Thank you very much, Alan. Is there anything else you wish to address?

ALAN GREENBERG: Nothing I can think of at the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Now, there is also an ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures. Justine Chew isn't here today. I'm not sure whether Jonathan Zuck wanted to tell us anything about it, or do we just move on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. It's still in process, making progress along the way. And we should have a document for you to comment on by the next meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this. And Matthias, you still have your hand up. Is this a new hand? No? Okay. Thank you.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Sorry. It was an old hand. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthias. Right. That means we can now proceed with our workgroup update. We'll start with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process with Steinar Grøtterød, and welcome back to Daniel Nanghaka. Steinar?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. Hi. I can start and hopefully Daniel can supplement me. Good to hear that Daniel is back on the track, so congrats to him. We had a meeting last night/evening. We are now finished with the second round

of discussion of the wording for the criteria for the TAC, the Transfer Authorization Code. So I have some sort of a plan to put that into some slides at some point and present that to this group. I think it's not too much—it is important but it's not that critical for At-Large from an end user perspective because it's kind of very technical in the way the TAC has been set and so on. We also started the second round of the losing Form of Authorization policy process. And that is definitely more of interest for the At-Large group. I think we will report more topics that should be discussed more in details in this group. So that was my short memo. Daniel, please complete if you have any comments on that one. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Steinar. Just a quick update. I'm glad that at least I'm recovering well from my surgery. Yeah, just to add on that, current discussions that are ongoing are a little bit technical, just as has been mentioned. But I think with them, we shall be able to give more comprehensive recommendations after the deliberations are done, and we shall be coming back to the working group to give updates or request whereby there is any information that will be required by the working group. So that's just what we're looking forward to. Probably the next meeting, we shall have at least a more comprehensive presentation to the workgroup. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Daniel. And the floor is open for comments and questions on this process. No hands up. So that means we can move to

our next group. Thank you, gentlemen. Let's go to the Expedited PDP on Intergovernmental Organization on IGOs. And for this, I believe that we have with us a presentation with Yrjö Lansipuro. Yrjö, you have the floor.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Olivier. Not a big presentation. It's just one slide. The IGO EPDP has received its work after the year-end break. We're still tackling the public comments that were given to the initial report from this EPDP. So on Monday, we talked about comments given to Recommendation 4 where the arbitral review is suggested as the main avenue following a UDRP proceeding in the case that the losing registrant wants to continue this process.

Now, according to this recommendation, the registrant can still opt for a court proceeding. But if the court decides not to hear the case because of the immunities and privileges of the IGO, there are two options. Option one, that the original UDRP decision will be implemented. That is to say that that's the end of the process. And option two, that after being thrown out from the court, the registrant may still submit the dispute to binding arbitration. So, this situation is that option one is supported by the IGOs and by the GAC in their statements, their comments, and also by ALAC according to what was accepted at the CPWG in September when we had this comment going through this EPDP. It seems to me now that that if we eventually come to a consensus here that the option two is likely to be an element of that compromise. Of course, in the first instance, it's up to the IGOs whether they want to make any concessions at this point, but if they do, then of

course we, in my opinion and Justine's also, should switch to option two. Because in the end, thinking from an end user point of view, the main thing for us is that a compromise, a consensus, is finally reached after 14 years talking about this problem. So heads up, we are not there still, but I expect that at some point, option two might become this sort of keystone to a compromise. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Yrjö. Let's open the floor to comments and questions. And first, we have Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yrjö, I'm just wondering, is there any kind of categorization or grading or some kind of an assessment of good standing among IGOs. These are IGOs with immunity, all of them have immunity. But is there any distinction between them at all? Take an example from the private sector in India, like under company law, if a company is registered, it can fit for a government contract. But there is a sub rule that says that the company should be operational for three years and it should be a company of good standing to be eligible to bid for a contract or whatever. And taking that and blowing it up to the proportion of an IGO, is there any distinction at all that would make a distinction between UN which has been in operation for a hundred years or new IGO that complies with the requirements and criteria for an IGO, but in effect not serious NGO or not a NGO that has been in operation for 10 years? I mean, if that distinction can be made, then there could be some compromise on the rights of the registrant to go to court, wherein the

court could say, “Look, this is a very important IGO. This is an IGO of great importance. So we are not entertaining your claim any further.”

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Siva, for the question. Yeah, we have sent spent actually a lot of time on this. It’s in the Recommendation 1, which is almost finalized. Basically, the question is what is an intergovernmental organization? We have come to a definition, which is actually quite simple, because an intergovernmental organization is an organization established by a treaty among sovereign governments and that has a legal personality in itself. In addition, we are adding a list of intergovernmental organizations that have a permanent consultative status with the United Nations General Assembly. But yeah, we have given a lot of thought to this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Yrjö. Thank you, Siva. I’m not seeing any other hands up on this topic. So we can move on to the next topic. Thank you. The next topic is—if I manage to go to the right screen—the Expedited PDP on IDN. I’m checking if we have Satish Babu on the call today.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Olivier, this is Claudia. I know he’s an apology for today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I did think that. So I'm not sure if anybody can step in. I haven't received any notes. Evin, did you receive any notes on whether there would be someone for this?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: I'm so sorry, Olivier. Sorry, I missed the question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evin, did you receive a confirmation note that there would be somebody from the EPDP on IDNs to provide a quick update? Maybe Abdulkarim or—I'm not sure who is on the call.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: I did receive a note from Satish. He noted, unfortunately, this week they won't have a presentation. So unless anyone would like to provide comments, they do not have a presentation this week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's then move on and we'll look forward to the future week. So we're closing this workgroup updates with the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team with Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, there's not much to report at this point. There'll be a meeting tomorrow. Maybe something will come out of that one at this point. We're just going over the gap analysis that various groups have

submitted. I think I've given you a pointer to that document. It's a Google Doc, and there's nothing else to report at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've just introduced the next topic to no one since I was muted. Thank you very much, Alan. And that means we can close this agenda item, if there are no hands up, and move to the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thanks so much, Olivier. Recently ratified from the ALAC, none since last week. But there are several upcoming public comment proceedings, including a few more for this month of January. You'll see on the agenda there a few listed as well as the next one, which would be in March. You can click on those tabs to investigate. So there's currently a couple—actually, just one now, a public comment for decision. This is a new one that opened on additional Unicode scripts for support in Internationalized Domain Names. It closes mid February, and it was noted before that, we may wish to share it on the At-Large IDN's mailing list. But this is for decision. Alan had provided some comments. And there was a decision made earlier in this meeting regarding, of course, the EPDP Phase 2A public comment that's closing tomorrow. So I've noted that action accordingly. Otherwise, there are a couple of public ALAC statements in development regarding public comments. One is through the Operations Finance and Budget Working Group separate from this, but the other is the ccNSO proposed policy on the retirement of ccTLDs. Hadia and Barrack have been working together on an ALAC

statement for this, and I believe Hadia would like to provide some comments on this draft ALAC statement. I'll turn it over either to Jonathan or Hadia then. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. So just to clarify, under the budget here and the second one listed here, that should be the Overhead Budget and Finance Committee, right, not the CPWG?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: That's correct. I can remove it. Sorry—

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just wanted to make sure. Then back on the previous panel, there was one about SOIs. That feels like one for the Overhead Budget and Finance Committee as well. Can you click back to the January?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Claudia, could you scroll up a little bit? Yeah. Oh, I see there. Oh, there we go.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, so if you scroll down a little bit—where was it? This is it here, the updates, the GNSO Statement of Interest, procedures and requirements. That sounds to me like a OFB WG as well. So those were just procedural things. I would then at this point go ahead and ask Hadia to give her presentation.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Jonathan. Thank you, Evin. Just to note, Barrack hasn't yet provided his input. So basically, what this is about, if we could have the Google Doc on the screen, that would be great. So the ccNSO proposed a retirement process for ccTLDs with the objective of providing predictable guidance and document a process. The two triggering events were mentioned. For IDN ccTLDs, the triggering event will be identified in the policy on the deselection of IDN ccTLDs. So, actually the triggering events are out of scope. The policy is direct at ICANN. The ALAC had previously provided a comment on the proposed policy.

Generally speaking, we agreed with the policy. We mentioned that removal of a TLD will mean less likelihood for confusion, as usually the removal of one would make room for a new one. We also mentioned that the review mechanism was not clear. However, this review mechanism is actually part two of this process. So, if we go to the document, I start by saying that we support the approach definition and process a description. Actually, this is what we also mentioned in our previous comments. I highlighted the importance of three main things. First, ensuring a transparent process that guarantees end users have confidence in a ccTLD retirement mechanism. Second, assessing the impact of the retirement of a ccTLD on national interest and registrants. And third, having a clear review process for the two issues that could trigger a review mechanism.

The policy mentions that two issues could trigger a review mechanism. First, that the ccTLD manager does not agree with the retirement of the

ccTLD, and second, that the ccTLD manager does not agree with the decision of not providing an extension to the removal of the ccTLD. The ccTLD is supposed to be removed five years after the notice. However, ccTLD managers could ask for an extension. So basically, those are the three points that I highlighted. Again, we have we have reviewed this before. We agreed to the process. Just taking into consideration what end users might think or national interest. I put those three points.

Siva, he's saying retired or otherwise, when is a ccTLD not a ccTLD? Okay. So those are the triggering events. A triggering event is when the two-letter code, the ISO 3166-1, the two-letter code does not anymore exist in the ISO 3166-1. So that's a triggering event. That's when a ccTLD is no longer a ccTLD. I'll stop here. Thank you. I shared the link to the document in the chat. So please go ahead and provide your—

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Hadia. A quick question. Talking about the assessment of the impact of the retirement, is that built into the process today? Why are we mentioning it? It feels like it's either in there or it isn't. And if it isn't, then we need to say more.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

It is not clearly in there. But there is a stress test that I think does speak to this. I do not see it as a clear process in there.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So should we be making a more concrete proposal to have an impact assessment done prior to the retirement of the ccTLD?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. This is a good comment. Let me go back to the original document and see how we could actually put a more concrete proposal.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. It was a question not necessarily a demand. But I'd be happy to get your thoughts on that possibility. Olivier, you've got your hand up. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. It's an interesting process because historically, of course, there have been some ccTLDs that have been retired. But back then, it was a different Internet, I guess, and it was a little bit more artisan in nature than it is today. And I guess the need for a unified procedure that would be potentially used by ccTLDs, it was something that triggered this work. I really recall a couple of ccTLDs having been retired, one of them being, for example, the .YU domain, Yugoslavia, when the Yugoslavia was partitioned into the Balkans. At the time, it was just a case of, "Well, just strike it off," and voila, done. It wasn't really done with any concern for users or whatever, especially in the way that Yugoslavia partitioned back then. There was also, I believe, Congo, that also changed code, etc. And there's a few more historically. But none of them were really considering the needs of users and impact assessment and all these sort of things. This is all language that's being introduced now, and I guess the default is nothing. So having this, I should say, is something that we should really welcome as a community. And perhaps I should—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, we stopped hearing you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: I'm checking his connection. One moment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Hadia, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think I was dropped, of course, after the one-hour mark for some reason. I'm not sure where you lost me but I was just going to conclude by saying that because the default is nothing, this process, I think should be welcomed by the ALAC in particular because of the defense of the end users and the concerns regarding the users of this, the registrants of those domains under the TLD that's being retired. Thank you. And that's Adigo calling.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess my question—and I'm completely unfamiliar with this that's why I'm asking—is that whether or not there is in fact as part of this proposal a process with some sort of impact assessment, and Hadia seemed to indicate that there was not an explicit one. It's something we want to ask for, not necessarily welcome if it's not yet included. Hadia, is that a new hand?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, thank you. I do agree with everything Olivier said. The triggering event, as we said, is the removal of the country code. And then when the country code is removed, you have one of two paths. So a notice of retirement is sent to the ccTLD manager. After five years from the notice has been sent, the ccTLD is removed from the DNS root zone file. However, the removal itself is outside of the scope of this policy. This policy does not speak to the removal itself. So if no arrangements happen between ICANN and the ccTLD manager, after five years, it is removed. But what this policy allows for is an arrangement, a retirement plan. The ccTLD manager and the IFO will come up with a retirement plan and update removal date execution plan, conclusion plan, and then the ccTLD is actually removed from the DNS root zone file, which is definitely very different than what used to happen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks so much, Hadia. Any other questions or comments from anyone? Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Just for the sake of completion on this topic, actually, because there was no actual retirement plan as such so far when the two-letter country code was removed from ISO 3166, there was no requirement or no default by which the ccTLD would be retired. And that's how you end up with some ccTLDs that still exist while their country code has been long removed. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Evin, was there something else that we had for decision?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Nope. Not for this meeting. We've already discussed the EPDP Phase 2A.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We did.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: I'm sorry. The Internationalized Domain Names public comment, it was noted before. It could be circulated on the At-Large IDNs list, but of course, anything else.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think we agreed that it wasn't something this group was in a position to comment on. So the process should be driven by the IDN group. Siva, you've got your hand up.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: The trigger events that Hadia was talking about—can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Hello? Okay. The trigger events that Hadia was talking about are extreme events of ccTLD country code being removed from UN or some other scenario where it's completely to be retired. But in between, there are scenarios where a country decides not to focus on country code TLD, and then it goes to an external operator who continues to operate the TLD. These are intermediary scenarios. Why not also consider a process whereby the change of status from ccTLD to gTLD is considered and quicker. Not 5 years, 10 years. But a quick process whereby a country says, "Okay, we are not operating that ccTLD. We don't consider it as a country domain and the third party's lead operator," whichever he likes. Then the change of status happens to that of a gTLD with or without change of fee structure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Siva. Olivier—

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Not exactly changes to a gTLD. Something like [inaudible] status where it's deemed the gTLD, which may not involve increase in fees and increase in other commitments but deemed gTLD status.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you. Olivier, you've got your hand back up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Not an answer to Siva's comment, though. I don't know whether you want to take Hadia before me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. I just wanted to note that triggering events are out of scope of this policy. So the policy only speaks about the process, but does not speak about the triggering event. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. I was just going to ask with the closing date for this public consultation being the 19th as we had a one-week extension. Since there are no further comments here, is this going to be proceeded forward to be sent to the ALAC for adoption, etc.?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry. Which comment?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The ccTLD's retirement.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess so, although Hadia is still waiting for some feedback from Barrack, I think.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Exactly. I did not get any feedback from Barrack. I will take another look at the draft statement and maybe incorporate some of what we had during our discussion today. And I'll also wait to see Barrack's opinion on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess, Hadia, you're also taking a look at whether we might want to make a concrete proposal with respect to an impact assessment. Is that right?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. To answer your question, Olivier, I think the conversation is going to have to continue to take place on the list. It's not quite ready to go to the ALAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I should just say this extension was specifically extended because the ALAC asked for it. So if we don't submit something by the 19th, which I remind everyone is next Wednesday, well, we definitely are not going to be able to have a call about this anymore. Yes, the discussions will take place on the list, but at the same time, the ALAC has a number of days that they need to, one, consider the advice and, two, actually vote on it.

So, one really needs to look at this because we cannot have another extension beyond the 19th on such a topic. That's all. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. We'll have to stay on top of it this week because our time is short. I think that's it for the policy comment updates. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. That means we can move to the next agenda item which is Any Other Business. And before we do that, by the way, I was going to ask Jonathan regarding the FY23 Operating Plan and Budget and the overall Operating and Financial Plan that the Operational Finance and Budget Working Group is working on. Is there anything that Holly or Ricardo would like to talk to us about or points in this group here? I'm not actually even sure whether either of them are with us. I'm not seeing either of them. Okay, fine. It's just here for anybody who's interested in this topic.

Any other business? I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. Vanda Scartezini, you have the floor. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just to remember about the Universal Acceptance, that NARALO will have the training series for 2022 repeating in English what we have done in Spanish and Portuguese last year about the scheduling. I send the scheduling to Evin, that the schedule is 20th of January is Introduction to Universal Acceptance. 27th of January, Email Address

Internationalization. February 3, Universal Acceptance for Software and Application Developers. February 10 is Outreach and Engagement Life of a UA Ambassador. Please share the information because maybe there's a lot of people in ISPs mostly that are in need to understand those issues related to Universal Acceptance. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Vanda. Is there a link somewhere that can be posted to the chat for people to consult?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah. I don't have the link but it is NARALO. You can enter NARALO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. I believe it was a Twitter feed that has just been sent to—I can see here Evin posted it on Twitter. Evin Erdoğdu?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. That's correct. There's a link to a Tweet that has information and more resources. Thank you, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you, Evin.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Vanda. Thank you for pointing this out. Very important, Universal Acceptance. As you know, the At-Large

community has been key in pushing this out there. And that just doesn't only include the Universal Acceptance of non-Latin character sets but Universal Acceptance of all new generic top-level domains in which there is a real difficulty out there with some software and some websites and some mailing systems, etc, etc. Unbelievable.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. Universal Acceptance is not all—if anything, even in Latin characters, there is more than three letters. It's pretty much any domain, .photography, dot anything has issues.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The new domain is quite important. Because the longer they are, most people do not receive that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you so much. I'm not seeing any other hands up. Thanks to everyone for having contributed to this call. Let's find out when our next meeting is going to be.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Olivier. Our next call is next Wednesday, the 19th of January at 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we go for a strict rotation, 13:00 UTC next week. Thank you very much. I don't think that it's clashing with anything. I can't see anything

at that time. Jonathan, is there anything else you'd like to touch on? We are 15 minutes early today.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's just fine. I'll wish everybody a good week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Thanks, everyone. Thanks to our interpreters and to the transcriber for the wonderful work today and of course to all of you who have come to today's call. Let's continue on the mailing list. Of course, looking forward to our next call next week. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, wherever you are.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]