

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call taking place on Wednesday the 19<sup>th</sup> of January 2022 at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call.

Just to record our apologies, we have received apologies from Judith Hellerstein, Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Bill Jouris, and from Claire Craig.

From staff side, we have Evin Erdoğan and myself, Yeşim Saglam. And I'll be also on call management. And just a small note that Heidi Ullrich will be joining us as well.

As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. And our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Marina and David. And on the French channel, Aurélie and Isabel. And one final reminder is for the real-time transcription service. I'm going to share the service link with you here. Please do check the service.

And with this, the final reminder is to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but it will support the interpretation purposes as well, please. And with this, I think I'm good to leave the floor back to Olivier. Thank you very much.

---

*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.*

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. And welcome, everyone, to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group Call. I'm sorry to be a bit late due to technical challenges, but hopefully things will work well from now on.

We've got a full agenda, starting with follow-up on the Board advice and a status update on the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the Subsequent Procedures. You have both Justine Chew and Jonathan here to provide us with an update on this.

Then we'll go through our workgroup updates. And after that, policy comment updates with the various policy comments that are currently being worked on or that are coming up in our pipeline. And after that, we'll have Any Other Business and Justine will provide us with a reminder on the ALAC and GNSO session agenda request that's coming up.

That's pretty much this week's meeting. And also, we have to adopt the agenda, or add or delete or amend. And the time is now, so the floor is open.

And first I see, Justine Chew has got her hand up. So Justine, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I had two AOBs. One was posted on the agenda already. But it actually should say "suggestion on discussion topics" rather than "session agenda." Okay. And the second AOB that I wanted to raise was an update on the SSAD ODP, there being a GNSO Council

---

and ICANN Board consultation scheduled for the 27<sup>th</sup> of January. I can post the details in the chat so you can put it into the agenda. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Justine. Helpful. And so we'll put both of these as Any Other Business, and we'll make sure we've got more than just three minutes to cover both of these points. Thank you.

Let's see if there's anything else. I'm not seeing any other hands up, so that's it for the changes to the agenda. And the agenda is therefore adopted which means we can check out last week's action items. And there's one remaining that needs to be ticked, and that's the one where Justine and Jonathan will propose ALAC responses to the ICANN Board clarifying questions regarding their advice on the Subsequent Procedures. That's exactly what we're going to do next.

So, are there any comments or questions on any of the action items currently on your screen? If no comments, that means we can early go to Agenda Item 3 and hand the floor to Jonathan Zuck and to Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Jonathan, do you want to go?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, Justine. Thanks, everyone. We have been on a small team working on some draft responses to the Board's questions with respect to our advice on Subsequent Procedures. Evan is bringing up that document

---

now. And so we've been trying to get this into a shape that would be easy to comment on, and we think that we're there.

I still have a little bit of work to do on DNS abuse, but we are going to make a commenting link available to it so that you can begin to comment on it. It's not the kind of document that you would easily go through in a meeting like this. So if you scroll it, there's a preamble at the top which addressed some of the general issues that came up during our discussion with the Board. And then if you scroll down you'll see the structure of the document.

So, in each case there's the advice text, the clarifying questions from the Board, and the Draft Response. So in each case, there's an attempt to summarize the question from the Board and then to provide our proposed response. So as you look through this document to comment on it, look at both of those things in case we got the question wrong as well, and provide your comments. And this is a living document, and we will turn it into a structure that's most helpful to the Board in terms of the response to their clarifying questions.

Justine, go ahead if you have more color you'd like to provide.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure. I believe that the draft text that you see under the Draft Response column is based on the presentation that was done on the 15<sup>th</sup> of December, I want to say? I wasn't actually present at the call, but I believe Jonathan took you through the presentation. So that gives you an idea of the proposed positions or the bullets that we wanted to cover in the draft response. So what I'm saying is that the draft

---

response text that you see here on this Google Doc is based around those bullet points that were presented on the 15<sup>th</sup> of December.

So I went back and had a listen to the call recording. I didn't think I heard anything that was out of step with what Jonathan had presented. So if, in the event we missed something, then by all means please comment on the document.

We also would like to remind folks here that we're trying to keep our responses as tight as possible, not necessarily introducing new things because we don't necessarily want to be accused of trying to open up and having positions [relitigated] or [that sort]. It's an opportunity to give the Board our perspective on queries that the Board is asking us with regard to the advice that was presented to the Board back in April of last year.

But if, for example, things have developed in such a way that maybe we need to update our advice in some shape or form, then we can consider that. But by all means, please comment and then we'll review those and take those forward, I guess, over the course of the next few weeks. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Justine. One area that may deviate from that is with respect to the CCT Review Team recommendations. The CCT Review is something that finished its work about eight year ago, and the natures of the recommendations were such that they became sort of dispersed, if you will, so that the Board accepted some and they're being implemented. The staff are still evaluating some to figure out whether the Board can

---

accept them. And many were passed through to other groups within ICANN, including the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. So they're sort of spread around in that way to understand the state of those recommendations.

And so one requests that the Board made was us perhaps taking a look at the recommendations in the current state of affairs, if you will, and restating them as new ALAC advice to separate them from that sort of dispersal that happened with the CCT recommendations over time. And so that's a broader effort that we'll take on that might end up being part two of this response or a separate piece of advice or whatever form it should take. But we're going to take a crack at revisiting those recommendations to add greater specificity to our advice instead of simply saying, "Do Recommendations 13, 14, and 15" as we did in our advice.

So that's one thing the Board suggested and that we will take a look at and spend some time on in conjunction, potentially, with the GAC and the SSR2 Team that also had made reference to those CCT recommendations. So that's another effort that may change things, if you will. But for the most part, Justine, I think, is absolutely correct that we were just attempting to clarify our advice. Not to introduce anything new, but be sure and look at whether we were successful in that. That was our objective.

And John, to answer your question, I think the competition metrics in particular were of concern to you at the time. And I would like to schedule some time to talk to you to make you part of this effort to refashion this because I think, ideally, it's not you lobbying objections

---

over a wall that's most productive. But if we can actually figure out what parts of this we should hold on to and restate together with the knowledge of what changes have happened [inaudible] it would be a good idea.

I think the particular recommendations that the At-Large have focused on are related to the GAC safeguards and sort of their failure. And so therefore, things that should be done or attempted around DNS abuse as well as issues surrounding the applicants support program and the community priority evaluations. That's where we focused a lot of our efforts with respect to the CCT Review recommendations.

But I think the whole document probably needs some revisiting. And in fact, I've proposed a session on that for ICANN73. But whether or not that happens, I think the effort needs to happen and I look forward to your input into it. Thanks, John.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Just to chip in, I mentioned a presentation of 15 December. If folks are wondering where they can find that, then you just have to click on the link under Agenda Item 3, Board Advice. The link that says "See: At-Large Workspace." And that should take to the workspace where I believe that presentation is posted. Thank you.

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Sorry. Is anyone speaking?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

No one's speaking now. I guess I was trying to tell what was going on on the screen, if you were trying to show how to get to that document or something as Justine had outlined.

I see a question from Steinar in the chat which is not a simple question. And it's one, in fact, that we're trying to wrap our arms around because I don't think that the ideas that there are specific showstoppers with respect to a new round as much as there are areas in which some concrete progress would be necessary in the view of the ALAC prior to a new round.

And so a lot of that is addressed in this document. There are some issues related to DNS abuse, powers of Contractual Compliance that might require changes to contracts, specific objectives and goals related to applicant support, some goals and objectives related to Universal Acceptance. Those are some areas ...

If you think about it, there two different categories, if you will, to our advice to the Board with respect to Subsequent Procedures. The first is taking a look at the 2012 round and sort of plugging the holes. Right? The analogy has been made in the years since we stepped off a cliff and then built a plane on the way down. And I think the idea is to endeavor to not go through that process again if possible, and making sure that the round itself is as successful as it could be.

The second category, if you will, of advice are references to ongoing reform issues inside ICANN that sometimes lose some momentum and that view the momentum surrounding a new launch of applications as an opportunity or an inflection point within the community to refocus



---

our efforts on some of these ongoing reforms and make the most of the significance of a launch of a new round.

And so I think those are sort of the two categories that are in there; some that are related to specifically to the success of a new round and others where there are more general concerns that transcend a new round, but that a new round provides the necessary momentum and community consensus, etc., to perhaps drag some things further along at a quickened pace than we normally see.

Hopefully, that helps with the question, Steinar. I see your hand up, so go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Yeah. I haven't studied in detail your response, but what I kind of feel is that it definitely has taken too much time for what we kind of expected after the 2012-2013 round to have the new round going on. And one of the things that I think we should mention is, like the example with DNS abuse, the industry itself has kind of improved how they handle the DNS abuse, the technical stuff at least. There's a lot of initiatives that are going, in my opinion, in the correct direction.

What I understand, this is one of the ... Maybe "showstopper" is not the correct word, but this is one of the toughest criticisms about the present regulations and agreement. So I think that we should not be seen as the entity that kind of doesn't want to have new TLDs. And I'm a little afraid that we kind of put that between the lines. Sorry to say that, but that's my gut feeling sometimes. Thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Steinar. And your concerns on that are justified. In fact, in our discussions with the Board, it was clear that we've given the impression that we were somehow against a new round. And so that's on us. That's our challenge to overcome because it's not an opposition to a new round that we've been attempting to express, but instead a desire to kind of get it right out of the gate—unlike the 2012 round—and take the opportunity to get some changes.

A perfect example is that there's been an ongoing issue about whether or not Contractual Compliance as an entity has the tools it needs in the contracts to deal with the so called “bad actors” in the contract community. And this is a debate that's been swirling around where one day Contractual Compliance says, “We don't have the tools we need.” Then the next day they say that they do. The Contracted Party House says that they do, and doesn't understand why Contractual Compliance doesn't act using the tools that it does have. And this has been this merry-go-round confusion for many, many years.

And so part of this is using this opportunity to drive that particular discussion to some conclusion. And if a new change is necessary to the contracts since some changes are likely to take place anyway, making some changes with respect to Contractual Compliance's ability to deal with bad actors feels like something worth trying to accomplish as a predicate to a new round.

That's a perfect example of something in the end that we're trying to accomplish, and it does make us feel like we are trying to throw up

---

unnecessary blockades. But at the same time, I think that we'd be foolish not to take advantage of the opportunity that a new round represents. I hope that helps to clarify that we're not against a new round. And you know that. And if we've given that perception—which, obviously, we have—then we need to address it. And we do, to some extent, in the preface to this document.

I see comments from Jeff in the chat that I've not yet read, but Michael Palage has his hand up. Go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Yeah. Thank you, Jonathan. I would agree with the comments of Jeff. The one thing I think would be important, perhaps for ALAC to give perspective, that I think is sometimes missed ... I've tried to raise this before, but I think when you step back and you look at ICANN as an org and look at how they have done new gTLDs in the past ...

Jeff and I were around back in the day when we did the first proof of concept, back in 2000. So, the first round when ICANN added new gTLDs was 2000. Then we had the Stuart Lynn Memorial sponsored round in 2004. And then we had 2012. We're now in 2022.

So ICANN started and basically was able to knock out a first round in two years. It then took four years. It then took eight years. We're not on a decade. And I find it amazing. One would think, as an organization matured ...

That first round was done with a staff of about 10 people. ICANN now has a staff of over 400 and a budget of over \$130 million. I think we just

---

need to point out that that is not reflective of an organization that is maturing and learning from an experience when it takes longer and longer to basically do the same task that has not changed that much in the 22 years.

Sorry for that. But again, it is incredibly frustrating that the multistakeholder model just is not working. It's becoming less and less efficient the longer we go. And I don't think that bodes well, not just for the issue, but a number of many issues that ICANN's confronting. And when you have that delay, that just means other people will abandon this and seek other for a to resolve their issues.

So sorry for ... I'll get of the soapbox. My apologies.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

No, Michael. Thanks. And I think that your comments have some merit, and I can ... Speaking for myself, I think there are a number of indicators that there's an inefficiency to the multistakeholder process. There's no question. At the same time, it's probably overly simplistic to suggest that the environment is the same as it was in those early rounds, considering that during that same time period there was a transition and the GDPR, etc., that have all acted to put a lot of priorities on hold.

For example, the CCT recommendations in particular, there's literally none of them that have in fact been implemented. So they're in process. Some are still being evaluated. And then there were some that got discussed in Subsequent Procedures, but they haven't been implemented. And that was, in fact, eight years ago.

---

So the suggestion that somehow the organization should make its top priority to get a new round of applications going is, I think, what we find somewhat vexing because it's probably not the top priority for the organization as a whole or the community as a whole. Even though it is a priority for all of us to regain momentum there, it shouldn't be at the expense of other areas of concern within the community. So that's a complication, and to suggest that the environment is not any different than it was when the first round launched, I think, is a little bit overly simplistic.

But thanks. This is an ongoing discussion, and ALAC doesn't stand alone in raising concerns about a new round. It's literally most of the constituencies and advisory committees inside ICANN that are expressing caution with respect to a new round. So let's work together to make it happen.

Jeff, unfortunately I'm going to have to go back over. So much of what you've written has scrolled past. But I'm pretty aware of your position on the new rounds. And so I'll just say let's work together to get some of these reforms accomplished and get a new round off the ground. I think that we're all hoping to accomplish that.

Any other questions? Okay. Then I will pass the baton back to Olivier. Take a look at the document, folks. Provide your comments, including Jeff and Michael. Provide comments on the discussions. We can't relitigate the positions we've taken via this document. We can always relitigate them here, but in the document look for clarity, better understanding of the Board questions. If you understand them better than the small team did. And better clarity in the answers.

---

But it's not a document to discuss the substance of our positions so much as to clarify them. If we need to change our position on something, this is the forum in which to do that and we always remain open to doing that.

All right. Thanks, Olivier. Back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Just a quick question. Do we need to ask Evin or Yeşim to send out a note to the mailing list maybe referencing this document as well?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a great idea. Yeşim or Evin or someone, please make a note to circulate the comment link to the Google Doc to the mailing list. Thanks, Olivier. Good idea.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. So let's now continue. We're now reaching the workgroup updates, and first we'll look at the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process with Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka. Over to you, Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, hi. We had a meeting yesterday and we are now close to finalizing the initial discussion about the Form of Authorization. That's one of the charter questions. And there is some interoperability very good

---

discussion here. What I think we should do, with my At-Large hat on, is to summarize the proposal at it is by now and put it in a form that we can have a 10-minute, 20-minute discussion on the CPWG call. That's the short story, and we will go into the Gaining discussion. Well actually, that was more or less finalized. There was a common agreement that the Gaining Form of Authorization cannot be used in the way it was in the old policy for the Transfer Policy.

And now I think we will go into the process of discussing the Change of Registrar and some elements in that realm. But I will take some time and summarize the work so far and present that to do this group so we can have a common understanding and point of view from this group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. Let's open the floor for [inaudible]. Daniel.

DANIEL K. NANGHAKA Thank you very much, Steinar. Just to [inaudible] yesterday's discussion, when we looked at the Losing FOA, we looked at mainly the 13<sup>th</sup> recommendation. "The registrar may choose to send a notification of the TAC together with a single communication." So when the TAC notification is provided, there should be at least a various mechanism of how this TAC can be delivered, either it should be delivered through the e-mail notification or via some other methods.

---

It was also mentioned that the TAC can be included in the various notifications that are being sent during the transfer of the domain through registered name holder.

Then we went into the discussions of the Gaining Registrar, and it's almost coming to a conclusion, just like Steinar mentioned. Despite the fact that some key recommendations were being made, some of them, it was agreed not to include them.

From there, special thanks goes to Berry Cobb who went and did a visual presentation of how the whole domain name transfer process takes place, together with how it affects the policy recommendations that we kept on drafting. Discussions went deeply into the various notifications of how the TAC can be sent and then also how the domain registrar can be able to remove the lock.

So there are various locks that are included in the domain. And all of these are going to be updated probably in the next presentation, next meeting, which we shall be having more discussions regarding the various transfer locks—what is the necessity of these locks and when should they be activated?

So that is just a brief of the various discussions. Thank you. Back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Daniel. We now open the floor, and first in the queue is Michael Palage.



---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. Steinar, as I said, I've just begun to get up to speed on the transfer process, so my apologies in advance if this question has been asked in the past. Over the weekend, I was reading an article about some of the disruptions that happened at Tucows and GoDaddy, and I was reading some of the Twitter feeds about how people were negatively impacted. And one of the Twitter feeds that caught my attention was that someone was like, "I'm mad, and I can't even transfer my domain name." And that's where the light bulb went off.

In the transfer process, at least from what I've seen, this process has really been focused on how to facilitate the business practices between registries and registrars. And I don't know if the end user has always been first and foremost in the discussion. And specifically, here's my question. In some ccTLDs that I have looked at, there is what they consider—I think they call it a Registrar of Last Resort.

So if a registrant is having a bad experience with his registrar, there is the ability to go to the registry and change the domain name. Has there been any discussion to date in empowering the end user to transfer his domain name to another registrar without the involvement of its current registrar? Or does that Losing Registrar always have to be involved in the transfer process? I guess that's my question.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Always tricky questions from you, Michael. First, no, we haven't discussed, and as far as I can recall, we haven't touched the thing of the last resort registry, that the registry can take the action as some other ccTLDs do.

---

This has been a varied process that has been focused on the inter-registrars, and the registry has a limited effect on this. And how the Registered Name Holder will be notified and be aware of what is going on also to track if there is a legitimate transfer. So the discussion so far has been, in general, kind of focused to ensure the successful transfer and that, in my eyes, the Transfer Authorization Code is being provided in a secure manner to the registrant and also to the registry from the Losing Registrar.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

And I guess that's the question I have for the rest of, I guess, ALAC as a whole. Do we want to advocate empowering the end user, the registrant here, to somehow have a voice? Because, again, everything that you have discussed here is about how the Losing and Gaining ... It's all contracting party-focused. And if an individual is having a problem with their current registrar, that process is not going to work.

And as I said, what I will do is, I will do some homework. I believe that cz.nic is the one that comes to my head, and I believe there are one or two other registries where the end registrant has the ability to go to the registry and say, "Look, I'm having a bad experience. I need to switch registrars" and they go to the registry.

Is that something ... As I said, if we're just happy and ALAC is like, "Great. All registrars are great. We have no problem." But when I was reading some of those Twitter feeds over the weekend about people that were just frustrated—"I'm launching a product. I can't do anything," and I'm like, "Wow."

---

As I said, this appears to have been just a technical glitch, but what happens if someone is locked in with a registrar? And if the answer is, “Well, you could go to ICANN Compliance,” I don’t ... To me, I would to me empower a registrant to use the free market and switch to a different registrar instead of having to go to ICANN Compliance.

And maybe everybody's just happy. I don't know. I just wanted to raise this to see whether this has ever been brought up a within the ALAC before—this perspective of empowering the registrants to go directly to a registry when they have a bad registrar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I think you have to have in mind that some of the ccTLDs that have this business model being the last resort have a policy that enables this. And I’m not sure that the registries, as of today, want to have that if ...

I don't believe, necessarily, to forcing the registries to have that option because there's a conflict between the contracts here between the registry and the registrar. And that’s purely that part. And the registrar has the contract with the registrant. But what I’ve seen and what I’ve experienced is that not necessary the ...

Let me phrase it this way. Most of the challenges with disputes about transfers has been sort of between the two registrars—the Gaining and the Loser. Going to ICANN Compliance is a long road. That’s for sure. But I think what we should focus on is to make a mechanism that makes the registrant aware of the technique and the responsibility add the possibilities he has in the selection of registrars and how he can control that. And I think that we are on a good path to do that.

---

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Okay. And if I can maybe just respond to John in the chat. So, yes, a number of CCs have gotten out of it, but the iron is that the gTLD space started out that way but has been going in the opposite direction. Donuts owns a registrar. Tucows owns a registrar and a registry. GoDaddy owns a registrar and a registry. So the irony here, John, is that while the CCs have, if you will, respected that bifurcation, the gTLD space has gone in the opposite direction. And the question then comes back. Even though the CCs have done this, there are some ccTLDs that will empower an end registrant to say, "We will help you move from one registrar to another." So it's not that they're saying, "Come to us. We'll be your registrar." They're just saying that they will help move.

And I guess, as I said, everything I've looked at in the transfer process has been, "How do we make the business interaction registrar between registrar and registry simplified?" I don't believe there really has been the voice of the end user or the end registrant when they're having a bad experience and how they go about switching registrars. It always seems like you're beholden to your current registrar, and that just seems wrong to me. I'll stop with that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Michael. I'm mindful of the time, and let's continue through our queue. Let's go to Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

---

SIVA MUTHASAMY:

I raised my hand to agree with Michael that a registrant should have access to the registry. And also not as a last resort, but very much when the issue reaches a certain point, when matters have not gone out of hand and he has not lost his domain name and his business has not suffered. At that stage in the middle of the process, there must be a way by which registrants should reach the registry which is the body that registers the domain name. I mean, a registrar, for all practical purposes, is an intermediary.

So the registry is the one to whom ICANN delegates the top-level domain name. So the registrant should be able to reach the registry. And here, we also need to understand one thing. The broader aspects of the domain name does not start ...

When you register a domain name, there is a \$2 profit for the registry, a \$2 profit for the registrar, which is probably not what the registrar is interested in. I mean, at least most of the registrars are not interested in the \$2 per domain name per year. But on the legitimate value-added services that might translate to, let's say, a big figure—\$200 per year. Or in the case of some domain names, the premium value of the domain name or whatever it is by legitimate or subtle means to \$2,000 per domain name or \$20,000 per domain name.

So these are the factors that cause resistance by some of the wrong registrars—one or two. I'm not talking all. One or two create hurdles in the transfer process or in the registration process. So I think we need to pay attention to that.

---

And as for Steinar's defense of what can or cannot be done based on what Michael said, I would like to observe that this is a discussion point brought forth by a participant of this working group and it is not to be defended from the point of view of the registry or registrar right here in the working group which, in effect, filters out comments. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: How should I take that? I don't understand, Siva. Are we not doing our work?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Probably I can come in.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Go ahead, Daniel.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, please.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Looking at the position of the TPR, on various circumstances we have done our best to present the end user perspective and the end user experience. At one point, there was an issue that came up that most end users happen to register their domains through resellers. And the

---

discussions went in, “How would we what the resellers to be considered? Would the Transfer Authorization Code or the domain locks be granted to the resellers or to the domain name handler or the registrar?”

So in that various discussion, various issues came up. One thing that TPR is looking at is the successful transfer of the domain from one registrar to another. Since this issue has come up, when that point reaches, we shall have to solicit discussion from At-Large on how can the end user successfully transfer his domain without any hindrances. I think that will be the discussion that would be happening when the right time comes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that you broke up a little bit at the end of your sentence, or maybe it was my line that was bad.

Alan, your hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I also was commenting on Michael’s statement. With regard to involving the registry, I don’t believe we have mentioned that, nor do I suspect it would be ...

Well, and I suspect it would be considered out of scope for the PDP right now. Not necessarily justifiably, but based on current GNSO practices. But that notwithstanding, our position has always been the registrant point of view who is the user in this case. And to the extent that we can influence the direction of the PDP, that should always have been our

---

focus. I suspect the other participants, and largely the Registrars, are not particularly receptive to that.

So we are perhaps stuck between a rock and a hard place, but hopefully—and I haven't been participating, so I can't speak from my personal observation—hopefully, we have been presenting the registrant's perspective and need. And that's why one of the things we have, certainly within this group, talked a lot about is making sure that the registrant is given the ability to make sure that transfers that are being done are in their favor and following their own personal requests and not hijacking or not the result of some registrar who is not acting appropriately. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alan. Go ahead, Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Just a very, very short comment. It always has been in my head that having a system, a policy that makes any transfer seen from a registrant point of view as secure and a safe way to change registrars. And I believe that we are on the track of doing that and we have been focusing on the different mechanisms. That's how the registrant is being informed in all the processes. And when it comes to ...

This is something that we haven't touched upon yet within the working group, is the policy for the NACKing of a transfer from the Losing Registrar. What sort of criteria should the Losing Registrar set? "No, we cannot accept that because of some criteria that we haven't discussed



---

yet.” But if there is an alleged transfer and there should be nothing to stop the transfer, then it should be in the process that is in favor of the registrant.

So we have discussed that and we have commented, both Daniel and I and all other proxies, that in many ways and put questions into the discussions that we think is of relevance for this. But I’m not sure that we have done our job then. Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Steinar. Next is Sivasubramanian Muthasamy.

SIVA MUTHASAMY: Yeah, I agree with Steinar on making the registrant aware and which, in effect, is educating the registrant on the processes and keeping him informed. But the [gross fact is] that hardly 10% of the registrants are so methodical, thorough, so well educated and attentive. And some of the registrants are technically not educated. Some of the registrants are careless. And don’t say, “Don’t be careless.” But that is the average registrant. An average registrant is also expected to be careless, uninformed, and is prone to be taken advantage of.

So the design of the system should be such that their interests should be safeguarded. When we talk about an average user, we talk about a user who is not technically well informed, a user who is not methodical like a professional company or a professional. So we have to think of ways to define those safeguards. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Siva. If I could jump in on this. I guess there are number of things and having been around for some time as well, reinforcing what Alan Greenberg was saying, historically the ALAC has always taken the point of the end user and defended the end user point in all of the PDP and its various ways of expressing itself such a statements, letters, etc.

But one has to remember also that the PDP process, as it currently is now, is somehow geared towards a very GNSO-influenced PDP, and that means the ALAC is one of the outsider groups that is allowed—or actually, we maybe say even tolerated—to go and take part directly in there. So the work that Steinar and Daniel have in that PDP is not only difficult because they’re just a couple of people among a larger group. But also, their work is heavily constrained by the terms and definitions of the PDP as it was originated and as it was built to start with.

Bringing in further topics into the PDP when they have been specifically excluded because some members of the PDP just don’t even want to touch on those is extremely difficult for Steinar and Daniel and others that are working in this way. That’s one point.

And the second point is that I think that we also have to remember the end users, or the registrants of a domain name are very varied. And I’m not sure whether there are any statistics to what are the specific registrants of domain names.

John McCormac or others who work in this field might have better statistics on who are the people that register domain names, whether they are investors on one hand—sometimes called domainers—

---

whether they are corporations, individuals, large corporations, small businesses, etc. I'm sure there must be a resource somewhere about this.

But their needs are very different from each other and indeed, also, their access to the market is very different. Some go through a representative of some sort, either a law firm for some or some through their web designers. And others go through their advertising firm. Others go directly maybe to a reseller or even to an agent. And of course, there are various degrees to which they have control over those domain names and being able to transfer them from one place to another.

That being said, it is not new. It's something that I've heard as well, myself, very often of people complaining that they have the most difficulty in being able to transfer the domain name from the current provider that they have that they're unhappy with and that they want to move elsewhere. Some of whom have had perhaps even difficulties in reclaiming a domain name because of now no WHOIS, etc., making it very difficult for them to find out what's going on with their online presence.

Alan Greenberg, your hand is up. And sorry for taking the time to say this. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's the chair's prerogative to monologue, Olivier. I put my hand up to comment. Steinar said, and I'm paraphrasing because I didn't capture the exact words, that our job is to facilitate a transfer that a registrant

---

wants to do. But the converse also should be true. Our job is also to ensure that a transfer that the registrant doesn't want is not facilitated. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I agree with you on that one, Alan. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Thanks, everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't expecting you to disagree. I just wanted to make it clear that both aspects are relevant to us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And apologies for the monologue. Let's move on. I realize it's the top of the hour already. Let's go one. I'm not seeing any other hands up in the room at the moment. So thank you, Steinar and Daniel.

And we can go to our next group, and that the Intergovernmental Organization's Curative Rights Protections for IGOs which is now a work track. No, not a work track anymore. It's an EPDP. Yrjö Länsipuro and Justine Chew are on this group. I know Justine is here, but perhaps Yrjö will provide us with his usual update. Yrjö Länsipuro.

---

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah. Thank you, Olivier. No update today because there was no meeting of this EPDP on Monday. Monday was a holiday, Martin Luther King's Day in the U.S. and the meeting was called. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yrjö. I wasn't expecting such a quick boomerang session, but I guess when one deals with intergovernmental organizations, speed is not one of the things that pushes things forward so fast. So we can go the IDNs. Hopefully, there's some movement there. Last week we were told that, perhaps, there would be an update this week. I'm not sure whether ... I guess I didn't pay attention on who is going to be able to provide us with an update, but I certainly see Satish babu on the call. So Satish, you have the floor.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Olivier. So we have a very short update for you. We had already presented the charter questions A1 through A3 to the CPWG in our last presentation. So currently we have not finished the next steps yet, but I'll mention what those are. These are charter questions A4 through A6. And for your information, A4 has the context that SubPro was done earlier. They had provided an Implementation Guidance that if a script is not yet integrated into the Root Zone LGR, applicants should still be able to apply for the string in that script and it should be processed up to but not including contracting. So the initial part of the processing could be done. That is what SubPro had said.

---

Now the charter question for EPDP on IDNs is that should that recommendation from SubPro be extended to existing TLDs that apply for a variant TLD whose script is not yet support by the Root Zone LGR?

So this is currently being discussed. We have not closed this thing, so I think when the set of 4, 5, and 6 get closed, we'll come back to the CPWG. That was question A4.

Question A5 quotes "SAC060 documents advice that ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible." The Technical Study Group and the staff paper also supported this position that it should be conservative as far as the number of variants that are considered for allocation.

Now the charter question A5 is that, should there be a ceiling value or other mechanism to ensure that the number of delegated top-level variant labels remains small, understanding that variant labels in second level may compound the situation? So there is a kind of combinatorial explosion that leads to a very large number of allocatable variants.

So the question that has been asked of the PDP is whether there should be a ceiling on the number of variants that can be delegated. Additionally, should additional security and stability guidelines be developed to make these domains manageable at the registry, registrar, and registrant levels?

So since SAC060 provided this guidance and the SSAC had already kind of given written early input to the EPDP, we had a meeting with some members of SSAC in the last meeting, last Thursday. This was not a formal meeting between the EPDP and SSAC, but it was only a few

---

members of SSAC who came for that meeting. I will summarize what their position was a little bit later.

The third question that we are discussing now is related to the fact that the Root Zone LGR can be updated over a period of time. And what happens to the already delegated names if there's a collision? Meaning if the new updated Root Zone LGR says that the already delegated name is invalid, then what should be done? So the TSG had recommended that the ...

Okay, so now there is a problem that we have already agreed that the Root Zone LGR is the only source of variants, but if the Root Zone LGR accepts changes over a period of time then [inaudible] there is a kind of change in their position. So the TSG, Technical Study Group, had recommended that the Generation Panel must call out the exceptions where an existing TLD is not validated by the proposed solution during the public comment period and explain the reason why this has happened.

So the question to the EPDP is, does the EPDP agree with this approach? If so, to what extent should the TLD policies and procedures be updated to allow an existing TLD and its variants which are not validated by the script LGR to be grandfathered? So, some special treatment may be required if this happens.

So these are the three questions being discussed currently, and it may be also interesting to very briefly mention what SSAC in the last meeting basically told us. So SSAC's position is very clear. It is a technical position. So they said that there is nothing in the DNS protocol or any

---

other technical protocols that indicates a relation called “variants.” And technically, once delegated, the original and the variants are simply two distinct domain names.

There is no connection as far as they see it. So the connection is all in the language community’s perspective that these are actually equivalent. But technically, there is no connection at all between these two. They are simply unconnected domain names. So they have used this word “synchronized TLDs” later in the context of ccTLDs.

So basically their point is that therefore, whatever we do, the underlying protocols are not going to recognize the fact that these are variants. And they also agree that the root zone must be the only one source for validation of the variants. They also said that if a script is not integrated into the Root Zone LGR and someone applies for a variant, then the best way would be to put it on hold until the script community can go back and update the LGR for it.

SSAC recommends the term “synchronized TLDs,” as the phrase “variant ccTLDs” they feel is wrong. It’s actually [that they] don’t blanket delegate all permissible variants. The larger the set, the harder it is to keep everything synchronized and stick to the minimum that the script community expects.

So one of the things they recommended is that, okay, one thing that has worked in the past is to activate one name and block all variants. But that goes counter to the whole concept of variants because the language, the script communities expects these variants to work



---

similarly. But SSAC's position is basically, "Be conservative. Allocate only the minimum number."

There are some more details, but I don't want to get into those right now because of time. So back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. I am opening the floor for any questions and comments. And whilst people are thinking about this, I do have a question and it's to do with the recent public consultations on Label Generation Rules that we've seen—Root Zone LGRs on the Greek script, the Latin script, the Japanese script, the Myanmar script and so on.

Are these taking place in parallel and—you mentioned the LGRs—does the current PDP have absolutely nothing to do with those? Is this a completely independent process?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. So the language community's and script community's work is asynchronous. So what happens is that they work independently and there is no direct connection, and the EPDP does not interact with the language communities in any way.

So I would say that the language community's work is kind of autonomous. Now we are looking at some of the interfaces between the two. There are some things that we are looking at where a particular step in the EPDP [inaudible] processing may be resolved only if the language communities get to work. But there is no direct way that the EPDP can interact or ICANN can interact with the language

---

communities because they're completely on their own speed and pace and their decision, basically. So the only way that ...

Suppose an applicant has a problem that the LGR says the your applied-for string is invalid, the ICANN system can't do anything, but the person, the applicant, has to go and contact the language community and get them to change. But that takes a long time. So to be very brief, there is no direct connection between the EPDP'S work and these LGRs.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Satish. Are there any comments or questions? No hands up. Thank you so much for the update, and we look forward to seeing the next one in a week or a couple of weeks' time. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: We will come back with a presentation most likely around the first week of February.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you. Let's therefore move on. And now we've got the RDA Scoping Team, the RDA being the Registration Data Accuracy. And that's Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Very little to say right now, but I have distributed a document. It's on the page on the screen right now. As part of the process, the members of the Scoping Team formulated questions to ask

---

ICANN Org—to some extent with Compliance, but it involved other parts of ICANN Org as well.

I'll just note that these were not necessarily questions agreed upon by all of the members of the Scoping Team, but really it was an opportunity for people to ask questions that they believed had some relevance. And ICANN came back pretty quickly and has given us the responses. They're all included there. There are 25 questions.

And I'm distributing it just for people's knowledge. If you want to go through it, if you have any questions about clarity or needing further elaboration, then please get in touch with me.

So that's all I really have to say on the subject matter itself, but I'd to take this moment to raise an issue with Olivier and Jonathan. I distributed this last night and Gopal made some comments. And he put the comments in as comments to this meeting's agenda. And I think he made reference to someone, perhaps Jonathan, having suggested, "The Wiki is a good place for this."

I have real concerns if comments are going to be made on specific agendas because they're going to be almost impossible to track or look for if you're looking for it. And I'm wondering, on these ongoing processes, the ones that we are now having updates on, should we have a Wiki page for any ongoing discussion or documents or things so that we consolidate everything on a single PDP, or whatever the activity is, in a single place. We do that for public comments or things we're responding to, but we don't do it for the actual ongoing activity, and I'm wondering if perhaps that's something we should institute.

---

I don't necessarily need an answer right now, but I think it's something relevant that we want to consider. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. I confess I don't completely understand what you said Gopal did with respect to the agenda. I'm sorry. I missed the core of your concern. I think I agree about creating a Wiki page, but what is it that happened that you were describing? Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Give me a moment and I'll tell you exactly what the situation was.

JONATHAN ZUCK: In the meantime, I see Evin has her hand up, probably on this issue. So Evin, go ahead.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Jonathan. And Alan—yeah, there we go—thank you. Yeşim, I just wanted to display the comment by Gopal. It was on this meeting, the CPWG meeting's agenda page. But I did just want to note that there are Wiki workspaces that At-Large space creates for the PDP working groups for the At-Large perspective. But I can create one for this RDA Scoping Team one as well. I hadn't done that yet, so I'll create one. And hopefully that'll be sufficient for Alan's request.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Evin, can you share where they are? Because I wasn't ... Maybe I'm having a senior moment here, but I don't recall workspaces for each ongoing PDP, that are being actively used, anyway.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Under the workgroup updates, Agenda Item 4. And apologies. That is on a macro for Confluence, so it may be a little more over-engineered. But if you click on the tabs for each PDP working group, there are links that say like "At-Large Workspace: Transfer Policy Review PDP" and then for the EPDP on IGOs, IDNs etc. They're not always utilized, but they are there just in case anything would like to be posted or commented on. So hopefully I could do that for the RDA Scoping Team and it could suffice for collecting comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, as someone who has participated in a lot of PDPs, and very actively, I wasn't aware of them. I never focused on them as a place to either post something or look for comments. So yes, thank you for creating one for the Scoping Team. But I think we need perhaps to focus on the concept altogether.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. I think the Wiki has always had that challenge that a lot goes on there that people aren't paying attention to unless there's a specific effort. I see now what you're talking about in terms of a comment to the agenda itself. I hadn't even noticed that before and certainly didn't suggest to Gopal [to place] his comment there.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: No, sorry. He made reference to Justine Chew saying we should put things in the Wiki. So it wasn't you. That was my mistake.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, but I guess even "putting things in the Wiki" doesn't mean the agenda. That's a good catch and I didn't even notice that was in the agenda, so thanks for bringing that up. And we'll draw out a process.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, he sent me a private message saying that. And since I was mentioned in the postings, I got alerts from Confluence.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: In any case, I think we have to think a little bit about how we want to use these workspaces and make better use of them. Clearly, as I said, I wasn't even aware that they existed as something that we could or should be using and [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I see Justine's hand is up so I'll call on her, but she certainly made extensive use of that workspace during the Subsequent Procedures work. That's' where all of [inaudible].

---

ALAN GREENBERG: No doubt. I [inaudible] ones where I was participating. So I'll take responsibility for that, but just a thought going forward. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. I, for one, make use of the Wikis. You see that Göran and I have posted updates on the IGO one. And we use that as a place to just collage the reports that we've been giving. And it's something useful for tracking purposes and also reporting purposes, really.

But I heard my name being mentioned by Gopal. Well, Alan said that Gopal mentioned something. I think that was actually in relation to the SSAD ODP webinar, really. Not Wiki space, per se.

Just one thing, though. Alan is right that we have challenges because certain people like to use the Wiki, certain people like to use e-mail. So the challenge that I've experience personally is how to actually get hold of everything and put it in the one right space. So that's something that perhaps staff would like to think about. Thanks .

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, Justine. To be clear, the reference to you was in a private e-mail, not something that was public.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: I see, okay. I don't know about that then.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. You don't need to. I'm just mentioning that someone had suggested to Gopal that he did it this way, and that's how he did it. But putting it in the Wiki for the agenda is probably not a wise thing. And Gopal is not on the meeting right now so we don't need to keep on discussing it. It was only an issue saying that we should be focusing on activities. Wikis, Evin tells us they're there, so we just need to use them. And, yeah [inaudible].

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. I know for a fact that Gopal likes Wikis, so I guess you just have to tell him where to post things.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. We'll get that organized. Thanks for raising it, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And tell me where to post them, too. I'm obviously not as wise as you. Let's move on, please. I didn't want to make this a large thing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan, for raising the issue. Evin, separate from these agenda, is there a central page that's like a launch page for all of these different workspaces?



---

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thanks, Jonathan. There are two pages I had referenced that everyone bookmark. One would be the At-Large and ALAC Policy Development page on the Wiki. There's also the At-Large website, but that has then the final content like the statements. But for comments and community updates, the Wiki would be one. I'll share these in the chat.

And then the second would be the CPWG workspace. And that would have links to these PDP working groups for At-Large. I'll share in the chat.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. I think that's a good starting point just to get people focused on some kind of a core page and the Wiki that gives direction where to go for the different topics. Thanks, Alan, for raising it.

And back to you, Olivier, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Let's move on with our agenda. And the next part of the agenda is our policy comment updates, again with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğan.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. So as you'll see on the agenda there, recently ratified by the ALAC is the ALAC statement on the ccNSO Proposed Policy on the Retirement of ccTLDs.

---

And Upcoming Public Comment Proceedings. There are two remaining for this month in January and one in March. You'll see those on the agenda. There's currently one public comment open for decision. This closes on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of March, and that's the Proposal for Myanmar Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules.

Otherwise, there's just one other public comment that has the draft ALAC statement in the works, but that is being shepherded by the Operations, Finance, and Budget Working Group.

So I'll just turn it over to Jonathan in case you'd like to make any comments or discuss the public comment for decision. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evin, for your summary. As far as the recently ratified statement by the ALAC, the only updates to that document from what you saw was a result of the discussions that took place in the meeting which was to provide further emphasis of the notion of an Impact Assessment associated with the retirement of a ccTLD. So that's all we did, was add emphasis on that particular topic and made a specific recommendation that an Impact Assessment should be part of that retirement plan.

And beyond that, it was still the generally supportive statement that you say on the last call. We just didn't have time to have another call before the comment was due. But feel free to take a look at it. But that's the primary change.

Does anybody have any thoughts on the Proposal for Myanmar Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules and whether or not this is something

---

we should take up? My sense is that we don't have anyone excited to take this on, probably. And as Satish mentioned, we probably don't have the need to provide an ALAC perspective.

Olivier go ahead, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks, Jonathan. You're quite correct. I think that except in some exceptions such as the Latin script where there was something quite blatant that we had to mention, most of the Label Generation Rules public consultations are consultations that we respond with "no statement." And I have a feeling that without having an ALS in Myanmar or a language community that is part of the At-Large community in Myanmar, we probably have not much to say about those Label Generation Rules in the local script.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So there you have it. Evin, you can take it off as being a public comment for decision. And I think that is it for the public comment for decisions. So back to you, Olivier, for Any Other Business.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And we are not reaching Any Other Business with two pieces of Any Other Business. And the first one is the SSAD ODP—

---

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Sorry. Is it me only not hearing Olivier?

JUSTINE CHEW: No, I think [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, and I've been cut off by the local telcos.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, you're back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I managed to jump from one device to another.

JUSTINE CHEW: Let me just take over, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The ODP. I was just about to ... Is that Operational Design Project?  
Probably [could be] wrong.

JUSTINE CHEW: Phase.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Over to Justine Chew.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Can I just go ahead, please?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's what [I did say].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Justine, go. Olivier stopped.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, okay. Sorry, you're cutting in and out. Anyway, it's four minutes to half-past so let me go.

So I had two Any Other Business, the first one being the SSAD Operational Design Phase, ODP. I believe some of you would have attended the last SSAD ODP Webinar Update #5. I think it happened yesterday. I'm losing track of the days. And that would have been quite interesting for those of you who are following the SSAD ODP.

There is another activity that's coming up, which is what you see in the agenda which is a meeting between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board to consult on the next move—I guess would be the right way to say it—on the SSAD ODP. And that's scheduled for the 27<sup>th</sup> of January at 21:00 UTC. It is open to observers, although it's a conversation between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. Pre-registration is required, so please do register for it if you're interested in following this.

---

And I am made to understand that the ODA, the Operational Design Assessment, I believe it's called, which is the result of the ODP will be published before this consultation on the 27<sup>th</sup>. So I suspect that part of the conversation is going to be revolving around that ODA.

The second AOB is something that I brought up with the ALT-PLUS group, but at the, I guess, request of Maureen, I'm also bringing it up here with the CPWG. In the past, GNSO and ALAC had bilateral meetings during ICANN meetings, and for some reason that we're not sure—or at least I'm not sure—that stopped happening. But the GNSO Council now is interesting in reinstating that practice. So there is an intended joint session that's been fixed. I can't remember the date, but it's going to be during ICANN73 where the ALAC can have a bilateral conversation with the GNSO Council.

I've been asked to get a list of topics that the ALAC might want to bring up with the GNSO Council, so we're opening up that suggestion to CPWG members. I suspect the best way to do this would be to, I don't know, set up a Wiki page or something. I probably have to work offline with staff as to how best to collect inputs from CPWG. So, yeah, there's still time. ICANN73 doesn't happen until March.

I'm still waiting on advice from At-Large staff as to timetables, when would be the last date that we need ALAC to finalize the topics for the agenda. But we'll keep people posted. If you have ideas, you could put them through the list at CPWG or you can contact me or contact staff and we'll get those collated. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. Actually, Heidi mentioned that there is a workspace set up for all of these questions ahead of time. And I believe the one for the next ICANN meeting is already set up, so I should ask staff if they could please put the link in the chat. Then they can put this, and you can of course monitor the work status and help with filling it up.

Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. On the two pints that Justine raised, in terms of the ODP you may recall that when there was a public comment on the ODP itself—the concept of an ODP—the ALAC put in a pretty strong statement saying that it shouldn't just be the GNSO that this allowed to liaison with the ODP. But it should be the community. Remember, there were multiple ...

There was a proposal from staff which the GNSO knocked down, saying there should be a multistakeholder community working with the ODP. And that got changed to a liaison from the GNSO, and we objected to that—unsuccessfully, of course. And we we're in the position where the ODP is a Board function which liaisons with the GNSO. Period.

In terms of the current ODP on the SSAD, there are a number of interesting point in it where, from my perspective, the ODP did not following the recommendations as written.

---

Justine, can I assume that you are willing to act as a conduit for these comments since you're the only one with a voice on the GNSO? And I presume you will have a voice on this meeting.

JUSTINE CHEW: Absolutely. I'm happy to facilitate any inputs that ALAC may have with regard to anything GNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. What was the other ... You made another point. Sorry, I've just lost track. What was your second point on?

JUSTINE CHEW: The bilateral coming up for ICANN73.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, yes. Okay, right. My recollection is that they were stopped because we were confronted with a more and more busy and conflicted ICANN meeting schedule, and there was relatively little merit seen in these meetings. We would meet every meeting, there would not really be anything coming out of it other than perhaps a few platitudes. And they just sort of went the way of the dodo because there didn't seem to be any real reason to devote time on the schedule. If there's now interest from the GNSO—and certainly we have more activities—let's give it a try.



---

JUSTINE CHEW: That would be helpful. I can certainly think of two topics, but I'm not going to mention them because I want people to think about it and suggest [things].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much for this, Justine. Just a couple of comment because Heidi has put some links over in the chat and I'm a little concerned because one is to do ... Well, one link is to the At-Large questions, and that this the wrong location because these are not questions for Göran Marby.

But then when I also looked at the overall ICANN73 Community Forum page, I note that it is actually doubled. It's a double page for some reason. It seems to have a bug in there. It certainly comes up twice on my screen so something has to be done to clean it up. And perhaps have a separate section for the At-Large-GNSO bilateral.

On the At-Large-GNSO bilateral, Justine, I wanted to find out is it with the GNSO's leadership team or is it the whole GNSO Council? Because remember that the GNSO and the GNSO Council are two different things, as one has the overall constituency chairs and the other one has representatives.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. It's abbreviation. It's supposed to be ALAC-GNSO Council.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Council, right. So it is the full Council.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine. So that's fine, then. It can be put or described as that in the ICANN page. Good stuff. Please then publicize this afterwards on the mailing list [when] it's all ready.

Thank you. Any other business? I am not seeing any further hands up, so thanks to everyone who has joined this call. Let's find out when we meet next week.

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Hi, Olivier. So as we're rotating, next week will be at 19:00 UTC, as usual, on Wednesday the 26<sup>th</sup> of January. So, 19:00 UTC, it says.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Yeşim. And a quick question is whether there's any conflict with something else external [for the team].

YEŞİM SAGLAM: I'm not seeing anything on the calendar that I've got access to and not hearing anything from anyone on the call. So, assuming—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It looks like, yeah, we're set for 19:00. Thank you very much, Yeşim. So 19:00 UTC next Wednesday the 26<sup>th</sup> of January.

---

And until then, I'd like to thank, of course, all of our interpreters from having done a great job yet again today and the real-time text transcription or closed captioning as it comes up on our screen—very accurate, very good, very helpful. And of course, thanks to everyone who has participated in today's call, and in particular those who have presented to us what's going on and given us the updates. So thank you.

Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are. Take care. Bye-bye.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**