YESIM SAGLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 2nd of March 2022 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees and for the sake of time. however, all attendees both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call.

And just to go over our apologies, we have received apologies from Bill Juris, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alberto Soto, Daniel Nanghaka, Eduardo Diaz, Clare Craig, and Vanda Scartezini.

And from staff side, we currently have Heidi Ulrich, Evin Erdogdu; and myself, Yesim Saglam. I'll also be doing call management for today's call. This time we only have Spanish interpretation provided due to the unavailability of the French interpreters. And our Spanish interpreters are Claudia and Lilian.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the interpretation but also for the transcription purposes as well please.

As usual, one final reminder As for the real time transcription service providers, I am going to share the link here with you on the zoom chat. Please do check the service. And once we end the call, there will be a survey popping up on your screen. Please do take one or two minutes to complete the survey to help us evaluate the service.

Thanks so much. And with this. I would like to turn the floor back over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. I hope you can all hear me well. Welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. we have in store for you this week, first we'll have our usual agenda with the At-Large talking points, which Jonathan Zuck has taken us through in the past couple of calls. ICANN73 is happening next week, so obviously we have to finalize those At-Large talking points.

After that, we'll have a look at the GNSO SSAD ODA small team, otherwise known as Generic Names Supporting Organization Standard System for Access Disclosure Operational Design … I can't remember what the A was. Small team.

JUSTINE CHEW: Assessment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Assessment, there you go. Thank you for this, Justine. With Alan Greenberg. Then we'll have our work group updates, starting with the Expedited PDP on IDNs because my understanding is that Satish Babu has to leave early. I'll turn to Satish now, actually. That would mean that you would be on in about 25-30 minutes. Is that okay with you, Satish, or do you need to do your updates ASAP? Satish Babu.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. That's fine with me. That will be fine.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. Let's do that. Thank you. So, [inaudible] will have the transfer policy review, the policy development process, the Expedited Policy Development Process on intergovernmental organizations, curative rights protections, the one on IDNs which will be the first one to go through and then the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team.

Then, after that, our policy comment update. And finally having an update on the ALAC meeting that took place yesterday which featured Philippe Fouquart, Chair of the GNSO Council as a guest speaker. A very interesting call, indeed. The ALAC/GNSO Council bilateral session at ICANN73 finalizing the discussion topics on that.

Now, at this point in time, are there any amendments, any additions to be made to the agenda? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: just to note, the operational design assessment does not seem to be listed as under current projects, but I will have a very brief report.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, super. Thank you very much, Alan. We will look forward to that. Seeing no other hands, the agenda is adopted as we've just mentioned it and we'll go over to our action items for last week, with one action item from last … From the 23rd of February and that's for Satish Babu to

present to us on the Expedited PDP on IDNs. That's coming up shortly. Let's move on.

Let's go swiftly then to our ICANN73 next week ALAC and At-Large talking points, and for this we have Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi. Thanks, Olivier. As I think most everyone on the call knows, what we try to do before each meeting is come up with some talking points related specifically to that meeting. Maybe by the next meeting in June, in Hague, we will actually be talking about hallway conversations again which is where a lot of the talking points I think get their most use. are you having trouble hearing me?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I don't.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I guess it's just Steinar. I don't know why. Okay. So, the idea between talking points is that if you find yourself in a position to comment during a session, perhaps make a social media post during a session on Twitter or elsewhere or find yourself in a verbal discussion, potentially, making an intervention during a session, etc., it's kind of a reminder of where the At-Large community has landed in terms of its positions and priorities with respect to the different issues that are the hot topics of that particular meeting.

So, I just threw together my impression of what the hot topics would be during this particular meeting and I put up some straw man talking points. I've reached out to the issue owners or shepherds within the At-Large community to get refinement of them, but I just [threw them up]as straw man For the purposes of this call. And I welcome feedback both on whether or not we think an issue was going to be hot; if I've left one off that we think we need to make part of the talking points and any changes that they might want to the talking points themselves.

So if you look at the talking points page on our wiki, And presumably Claudia or Heidi or someone can put the link to this in the chat so you can see for yourselves but here are some thoughts on what I thought the big topics of the meeting were going to be.

One is universal acceptance. That's an ongoing conversation and there's a session on it as far as the way forward. One is the EPDP and GDPR Compliance. DNS abuse is an ongoing topic since Montreal, basically. Subsequent procedures and where that stands. Public interest framework is one of the plenary sessions that our own Marita Moll will be moderating so that's going to be a great session. Then IDNs and recommendation prioritization are also hot topics for discussion and haven't thought of what the talking points for those might be.

So this is kind of an outline of what the talking points would look like and I opened it up for feedback and commentary and hopefully also updates via email so this is as good of a document as it can be. Hadia, I see you have your hand up, so I will call on you first. Go ahead, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan. I was going to comment in relation to the EPDP and on the General Data Protection Regulation. I was wondering if it is beneficial to be a little bit more specific. Maybe mentioning that the recommendations or the policy in itself [is short of] enforceable recommendations that it does not allow for publication of data that is not covered by the General Data Protection Regulation or that does not fall under the General Data Protection Regulation.

This actually reflects on usage because if we are talking about a system that is costly and that cost is not justified, some of the reasons include that the policies in itself are not—that we came up with in phase two are not enforceable—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hadia, I think that's a great point and we definitely should. These are just headings, so I definitely think there should be some explanatory text for all of these to provide backing for these for the top line points, if you will. So, I think these are perfect things. If you could either make an edit to this page or just shoot me a quick email with those, I think we'll get bogged down if I try to actually transcribe what you're saying into this document live. But let's definitely interact and flesh out the justification for the top line. This isn't the whole document. This is really meant to be the outline of the document. I think your point is great.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. Thank you. apologies because I don't have the points written in front of me, but yes, I will send you something. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. so, my question for this call is whether or not you think there's another high-level point that needs to be made. They all need to be supported but is there another top line point that we should be trying to emphasize for folks that are coming in to the ICANN73. Does that make sense, Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, sure. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is there something else relevant that we need to be saying at the high level?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I think also we could refer to upcoming policies like NIS2 and how this system actually will not meet the requirements of NIS2 when it comes out. So if we're talking today about implementation that's going to happen in four years, for example, or even three years, by the time we are ready to implement this system it's going to be absolutely obsolete.

I think this is an important point as well. It's not only about cost. If we say, okay, let's go ahead and do it, we need also to factor in that after two or three years, it could be an obsolete system that does not satisfy the requirement.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. That sounds good. Next is Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I would I would like to understand where we see a list of topics and the ones where [inaudible] is the same. as a matter of fact, I would like some talking points about the two who were not here. I would really appreciate it that somebody tells us that it was not necessary and eventually some [thanks] of the work done even if it's not useful.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, sure. I don't know where you got your list of topics from, so this is just my first cut at what seemed to be the hot topics for the meeting. That's why I'm asking. So, if there are things that should be on this list that aren't, then let's add them for sure.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We received a mailing. This is call volunteers on subject matter blah-blah-blah, and a list of topics and you can send your POV to the co-chair. we received a mail on this list and I answered that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll look at that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The Second point is I wanted to take this opportunity to say, Hadis, please, NIS2 is not yet done. If you talk about proposal under the

[inaudible] NIS2, it's something different and it's not yet [voted]. It's difficult to say it's not compliant with NIS2 because we don't know. Maybe it will be what it suggests today but there are a lot of discussions going on in Europe about the topic and we need to see what will really be decided.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Sebastien, I've gone back and seen your mail so I will follow up with you on that email. I didn't see it before. I found it so I will follow up with you on it. And I guess the key is this document it's meant to be kind of a reaction to what seems to be on the agenda for discussion during the meeting. So that's the filter that I guess I am trying to apply to it is whether or not we think there is going to be active conversation about those topics during this meeting in particular. But I'll go back and go through your email and go back and forth with you to flush this out. Thank you, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: What is important although, Jonathan—thank you—not what I wrote, but the mail was sent [inaudible] topics and I thought that it was a decision of the co-chair and sent by staff. Therefore, [inaudible] process. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. Process is in transition. Marita, please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, Jonathan. Thanks for [inaudible] my ad hoc comment into some little bullet points like that after last night's quick discussion. If you want us to do that on the document, I'm happy to do it. I would probably combine the first two into one thing and I could probably add a little sentence that says, "Yes, we're having a meeting to discuss this," and seeing what the community feels about the usefulness. The third one might just be massaged a little bit to talk about, yes, end user interests are sent to … Everyone's interests have to be taken into consideration and that includes us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. Yes. You can make edits directly or send them to me.

MARITA MOLL: I'll do it directly just to make it easier. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. That sounds good. Thanks, Marita. Jeff Neuman?

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes. All right. I'm going to be very controversial.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go for it.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. So for those of you that saw the list and have seen the news, there is a request by the Ukrainian GAC rep to take action against the Russian root. I think from a technological perspective, I think end users should oppose something like that and ensure that the root is neutral with everything.

However, that being said, it is possible that as an organization and as a community we may want to stand with our friends in the Ukraine and there are other types of "sanctions" that can, as an organization, can be done including things like not funding travel for the Hague and not funding other kinds of things.

Anyway, the point is that call my number one, we should ensure that the root stays apolitical in terms of the politics of what's going on but that doesn't mean as an organization things can't be talked about and done from an end user perspective.

So, I know it's very controversial but I think as we all live in this world I think it's incumbent upon us—all of us—to take a position. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jeff. That's a great topic and it's something that's definitely part of the active dialogue that's going on and probably will be into next week, so I think you are right to bring it up.

Just to clarify, When you are talking about as an organization, you mean At-Large community or were you talking about ICANN as an organization.

EN

JEFF NEUMAN: ICANN as a community report a bunch of … The reason why ICANN funds community members to travel or the reason ICANN does a bunch of stuff. But there are also things that we may want to recommend to ICANN as an organization, such as contractors that may be in Russia, things like that. I know this is very political and controversial, but given what's going on in the world, I think it's incumbent upon us not to just ignore the environment.

But If nothing else, I think end users would agree that the root itself should be neutral and should not have to be pressured. No matter how justified and how bad we feel, end users need to still have universal access to the Internet. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jeff. I'm trying to read the chat while you're speaking. A couple of things. One is Sebastien has put out a communique on behalf of EURALO that I think in many respects echoes the sentiments that you have just expressed with the exception of organizational punitive measures. But I think the sentiments of keeping Internet open is still a priority and then making sure that dot-UA still works is a priority and there's a link there in the chat.

Justine raised the issue whether this is a CPWG issue. I don't know. That's a good question because whether or not something ought to be done to the root or something feels like it is a policy issue.

JEFF NEUMAN:	And also—maybe it does go to the full At-Large but this is At-Large talking points in general, so that's why I bring it up.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	It is, yeah. Thanks Jeff. We need to have a conversation about this. I'll go through the queue. Hadia, please go ahead.
HADIA ELMINIAWI:	Thank you. I raised my hand first to respond to Sebastien to just clarify that I'm not saying that we should take NIS2 into consideration. I'm just pointing out that the entire scene is not known yet. And if we are going to have this system in operation, in like two or three years from now, the entire scene might have already changed and that system might be useless.
	Then, to Jeff's point, I just wanted to point out that the ccNSO is putting out a statement that they are committed to staying neutral for the sake of course of the Internet users. I personally also think that At-Large could also put out a statement or maybe just include it in the talking points that we would also support and encourage neutrality, again for the sake of Internet users whether they are Russians, Ukrainians, or from wherever. Thank you.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Hadia. Sebastien, go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I don't think that it's the best place to have this discussion in depth but I think if we want to have hot topics, definitely the situation in Eastern Europe is to be taken into account. But please when a group tries to make a position, it's very easy for everyone to say, "Oh yes, but …" We spent part of last night to set up this communique.

And the last point, please, we are supposed to have a EURALO General Assembly. I hope, even if there are no planes going on from Russia, that our colleagues from both Ukraine and Russia will be able to come to our General Assembly. Therefore, if we say no trouble, no please, no. We can say no trouble to the government. We can say something very specific but not a general point of view on that. And I will stop here. I think it's important to have this discussion. Thank you for opening this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastian. Siva, please.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAM: Yes. What I think is not a political or right versus wrong [comment], but [inaudible] has to be approached very carefully even before it is received as a proposal on the table. That is to say that the optics are very bad. [inaudible] we all know that the GNSO is neutral, its apolitical. Then [inaudible] and we have to support them and all that.

[inaudible] such as not funding for travel to Hague or paying attention to DNS abuse, particularly in a country that is aggressive, those are

different. Those are separate matters that may be routinely attended to. But ICANN getting involved and even At-Large getting involved into some measure which [inaudible] interfering with the root or introducing some form of intelligence to the root to the way the DNS operates makes ICANN very, very political and will make ICANN see as a western institution or an institution that excludes certain regions or certain political [blocks]. So I think we should not get into that in a formal [inaudible]. It's not to be discussed formally, I'm sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Siva. We'll take Amrita. Then I guess what I'm going to recommend is that staff try to organize a single issue call on this for those that are interested in having this discussion because I can see this conversation taking over this entire meeting if were not careful. It's clear that a lot of people have passionate views about it but before the At-Large in particular can take an actual position a lot of discussion needs to take place.

These talking points are meant to be reflective of consensus already obtained within the At-Large, not just spit-balling on the week before the meeting. So I think we probably need a dedicated call on this issue to really have this conversation. Amrita, go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Jonathan. I kind of agree with what Siva has mentioned. This situation, as all have mentioned, is something which is horrible and unthinkable. However, ICANN should maintain its neutrality if the GAC—the Ukrainian GAC—representative has reached into the CEO.

Perhaps the CEO should revert. The At-Large, I don't know if we should make a comment or anything.

However, if in fact ICANN actually moves from its neutral position in some way, it will create a precedence for others and that is scary. They may be right, they may be wrong, but [inaudible] with the DNS system I think would set precedents which is scary and that is where there were discussions, if you remember, during IANA transition of legal impunity/immunity given to ICANN even though it was registered in USA was discussed. Those issues were again resources because not all areas of the globe would feel secure with ICANN.

So we need to look at the bigger picture and what [inaudible] situation happens this kind of implication will have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Yes. I see more hands going up. I really like to This conversation. We aren't going to make a decision on this call whether or not to make a statement about this issue. So I'll work with Maureen and staff to get a single issue call scheduled on this topic and will devote some time to it. But we can't … We are going to resolve this on this call. Jeff, I don't know where you were trying to go if you are trying to respond. My goal is not to keep the debate going [inaudible].

JEFF NEUMAN: Understood. The main point was to get it on the agenda and discussing because it will be a topic of discussion and we shouldn't just ignore that it is a real discussion. So that's number one.

Number two is how can we talk about the global public interest and be completely apolitical? Part of the CCWG accountability was elaborating on ICANN's commitment to human rights.

I'm saying it's a difficult discussion and I said from the very beginning it's controversial, but I think we all agree, number one, is that with respect to the technical operation, it's got to be neutral. Everyone has to have access to the Internet.

But everything else and every other benefit and giving money for things… I mean, this is something that's an organization. We can decide something different. So I will stop there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We definitely can. Mohan, again, I don't want to advance the debate. Do you have something that needs to be said on this call or can it be brought to the single-issue call?

MOHAN RAIDU: Thank you, Jonathan. I fully agree with Amrita and our friend Siva and just recently who spoke. We can't interfere. As a neutral body, we cannot take a stand on this. That's what I wanted to say.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks for this. Will try to get a single-issue call scheduled. Thanks, Jeff, for bringing it to our attention though. I think it is going to be a topic that's discussed, so it makes sense, if possible, to at least… We won't necessarily have a consensus position but we might be able to

move toward each other and get to some foundational principles prior to the meeting.

All right. Any other questions or additions, thoughts on these talking points for the meeting? Okay. Siva, I'm assuming that's an old hand.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAM: Yes, it is. Sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Thank you. I'm looking forward to hearing from people [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If you'll allow me, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: On this topic, I think it's important that the OFB have a discussion on the same topic because I feel that they may have something specific to add about the budget and the strategic planning who will be discussed during ICANN73. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	We'll make the call open to all interested parties. It doesn't need to be a CPWG or OFB call. It's kind of last minute so I don't know whether we'll even have an ALAC position on this entire for the meeting but I think it's good to get some discussion going and here everybody, everyone's perspective on it.
	Okay. That's the talking points. Olivier, back to you.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Jonathan. We'll go now swiftly to the GNSO S SSAD ODA small team with Alan Greenberg. Alan, over to you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. Just a couple of comments on it. As part of the homework within the ODA I've been doing a detailed assessment of the ODA, of the Operational Design Analysis.
	These are points that were raised during the ALAC meeting, the ALAC leadership meeting with ICANN Org staff but I'll bring them up here for the wider audience. There are a couple of points.
	None of these change our overall position that the SSAD will not deliver enough in a reasonable timeframe to warrant the development of it, and moreover, because of the changing regulatory environment it may well be very out of date by the time it would be implemented.
	And presuming that it could change as regulations change is not necessarily a given because some of these things are pretty well set in concrete by the PDP and would require other PDPs to change.

The points, however, I think are interesting. Number one, the costs were presented as between $14 million and $107 million per year. I won't say it's deceptive but it certainly obfuscates and confuses the issue because when you look at the actual costs of running the system they range between 5 million and $7 million per year. The vast bulk of those costs are actually showing the costs that users will pay for the services they get but the bulk of that is accreditation costs and verification of trademarks and things like that.

So presenting it as those costs really do not represent I think a fair position as to should we invest the money in it because were not investing that class of money. There may be flow-through if that, but it's slow going through directly from users and the actual operational costs are not at all unreasonable in my mind.

The second point is the PDP report said that ICANN could or may recover its development costs but didn't require it, whereas the ODA assumes all development costs will be recovered and builds it in.

My view is I think it should have been presented as an option to the board, because if indeed costing is a problem, ICANN could subsidize the cost. We're talking about $20 million over five years. It's not a huge amount to ICANN in its overall budget.

The next issue is they changed the design of how requests are made. If you remember correctly, the SSAD had the concept of authenticated users and the Authentication Authority is the entity that verifies that you are who you say you are and we can go forward.

The concept was that the Authentication Authority would provide some sort of credentials, a sign-on ID, to save you are who you say you are. The design had the actual requests being made through the Authentication Authority, which if it is ICANN is not really much of an issue, but for governments, each government is its own Authentication Authority and to have them in the operational path would simply be unfeasible. This was done in the name of a single point of entry for everything, but in my mind and most other people it's a large diversion from what was already being requested.

And the last thing is the design had the concept of signed assertions, which are essentially statements that someone could make when applying to use the SSAD. They could be, "I am intellectual property attorney and I promise I will only use the results I get in the pursuit of trademark issues." You will abide by the various rules.

These are things that the to give them a higher level of comfort in releasing data. Most of those were eliminated without comment in the operational design analysis and there were some rationales given again during the ALAC meeting but they don't seem to have understood some of the reasons.

As I said, none of this changes our overall position but I think it's really important that if we went to the extent of designing this thing in the PDP the design analysis has to reflect all of these issues, and reflect them in a way that's very transparent. Many of these issues were not done in what I believe a transparent issue.

That doesn't detract from the huge amount of work that was put into this. This was not a trivial design analysis, but I did find it lacking in a number of ways. That's about all I have. Welcome any comments. Is anyone else there? If someone is speaking, Olivier, we can't hear you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. No, I was just waiting to see if there was anybody wishing to take the floor. And finally I see hands going up, so Alan, you still have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have Greg. Please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I just want to fully support what Alan said. I think it's a very [inaudible] analysis of both the work and the shortcomings of the current work. So while I don't have anything new to add, I didn't want Alan to feel like a voice in the wilderness. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Much appreciated. Siva?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAM: [inaudible] leaves legal decisions to registries and registrars and still makes them liable to penalties and legal action which more makes them hesitant to be a full participant of process, thereby nonpublic data is released and they are usually resistant to release nonpublic data.

[inaudible] the design [inaudible] still keep the data separate registry wise but decisions are not made by the registry or registrar. They are made by SSAD coordination body which will assume all legal obligations, all legal risks. That should make it easier. That is just a thought.

Second question is what happens to public data which was [inaudible] while WHOIS [inaudible] going to be any different from what it has been for the last 10 years. Is there going to be any change for public data for most domain names without the user having to go through the process of authentication and so on? There are many questions on SSAD. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Those are questions for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the EPDP, which for better or worse is gone, is done. We've already done the analysis. At this point, the belief is contracted parties and of ICANN Org that the contracted parties are, to some extent, controllers. We could have lots of debates over whether we are joint controllers, two independent controllers, whatever. And there are some comments in the ODA about that but they're very confusing.

The contracted party is a controller, then they bear liability for the decisions they make. There are some hypotheses that a joint controller agreement or data processing agreements might be able to alleviate that but there is a lot of controversy on that and it's not something that's given.

So as long as we have those potential risks, the contracted parties don't want to take them. That's not a particularly hard to understand

position. The question is are there ways around it? At this point we don't have any answers to that. NIS2, if it's enacted, may force the issue on some of the data, but it still doesn't change the basic assumptions.

So those are all really good questions, not by this group certainly. Thank you. Greg, is that a new hand or an old one?

GREG SHATAN: Old.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I want to be quick because I'm aware that Satish needs to leave soon. Just to say that the numbers do seem to be rather high and perhaps ready-made off-the-shelf CRM systems (Customer Relationship Management system) might have been something to look at as well as a solution. But it might well be that some operational requirements do require a system that is completely custom-made. It's a bit unfortunate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to quickly respond. In my mind, the cost and the development time are not out of bounds. They seem reasonable based on my experience in this field. The amount of total time it will take because of the implementation review, which essentially will put details on to what the

PDP did will add I believe several years to that and that pushes the timeline way out of whack. And second of all, of course, it won't deliver very much.

But I believe if we need everything that was specified, including the full gamut of authorization and authentication, then the costs are not unreasonable and I don't believe any package system would do it. That's my belief. We can argue that off-line. All right. I'll turn it back to you then.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Let's now go to the next agenda item. That's the work group update. We'll start with the Expedited Policy Development Process on the internationalized domain name (the IDN). For this, we have Satish Babu and his team. Satish, over to you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Olivier. Apologies for having to leave early. I have to leave in maybe something like 15 minutes and I'll ask my team if there are more questions to be answered.

So this is an update on two charter questions. The first question [inaudible] is the [code] issues. Should there be a [inaudible] within? The context of that, [inaudible] mentioned that ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated should be as small as possible. And the [Technical Study Group, TSG] also agreed with it.

Given the EPDP, there was a general agreement that there are only a limited number of [inaudible] that actually impacted [potential] or

production of variants. And the GPs of most of the scripts—in fact, all except Arabic—have decided to limit the variants to two to four. That's quite a small number.

Therefore, since it's a small number, there should not be any [inaudible] value beyond the existing measures imposed by whatever the GPs have done.

Nonetheless, there should be additional guidance to make variant domains manageable. So the manageability has been pointed out.

It has also been pointed out that it's very hard to put an available number because [inaudible] number on the base of [inaudible] would be [inaudible] hard because there is no logic that can really work for [fixing] a particular number.

And in fact, members who interacted with us, it's not an official delegation but a bunch of members—they agreed during discussion that there is no technical reason to prohibit large number of variants from a security or stability standpoint. But they did mention that the manageability becomes an issue for the registry as the numbers go up. Next.

So the draft recommendations [inaudible]. Basically, the recommendation says—because there's a lot of text, I'm going fast. It says that there's no reason for [inaudible] because as [inaudible] in root zone LGR to [inaudible] top-level variants within [inaudible] and market forces combined will keep the number of activated TLDs conservative.

Now, [inaudible] below the recommended language. Now, generally the PDP team disagreed with this, saying that this language is fine. But one of us had a difference of opinion about this particular thing, which is that without [inaudible] are we really opening up the doors for DNS abuse, especially in terms of confusability. Where there are a large number of variants, it will be harder to—at least for the people who are not well versed in this—to differentiate between variants and DNS abuse. So this is one question that we would like some guidance from CPWG in this whole presentation.

There is also another question similar to this where we would like some feedback on what position … That's basically because there is a little bit of an, I would say … One or two people might have some reservations but there are several still fine with it.

The next one is market forces as a policy instrument. When you mention market forces will contribute to keeping the variants conservative, it's a bit confusing for us and we feel that we should not … Without defining clearly what is market forces and how it is likely to impact, we cannot put that in the language. And besides, market forces apply to all [inaudible] and it is not clear to us as to why this particular recommendation is talking about market forces.

On the fact that most of the GPs have a self-imposed limit, except Arabic, it poses two questions to us. First is on what basis have [the script]] communities decided on two to four and why has Arabic not adopted such an [internal restriction]? Next.

Recommendation 1.5. Best practice guidelines to develop for the management of the [gTLD] and the variant labels by registries and registrars. It will be to ensuring a consistent user experience.

So the team generally feels that we are okay with this additional guidance because it's the first time we are trying out variants. But there is a question that is again posed with which we would like CPWG to give us some guidance.

Should these best practices be actually policy or voluntary perspective? The question stated here right now if it's for as manageable fee or even for other reasons also.

That's all the relevant questions. But just before the CPWG meeting, we had our prep meeting whereby the additional point raised was that should this just be best practices guidelines which implies a certain degree of voluntary adoption or should there be actual binding policy? Next.

The next [inaudible] and this is about what are the future updates to the root zone LGR [inaudible] existing IDNs. Basically, the dependencies of the GPs [inaudible] and Unicode. So, this keeps changing not very frequently but infrequently.

So, if that [inaudible] change, that can possibly affect the work of the GPs. In addition, the GPs may also be influenced by their own sub-community's requirements which may also change across time.

So, therefore, these are the reasons why the root zone LGR might [inaudible]. And what happens … It's very unlikely but there is a

possibility that a future update may break existing TLDs which are already delegated and in the last prep week we are asked this question also and the GPs and IPs said, "We always try to maintain [backward] compatibility."

So I will not get into the details of the actual question. Basically, the important part is grandfathering. What happens if there is an update and one or more existing delegated TLDs are not compliant with the root zone LGR? In that case, we look at the conditions. Next slide, please.

So, the draft language says that if that happens, then there must be [inaudible]. That particular TLD or TLDs must be grandfathered. In other words, the proposed update will apply to future new gTLDs and their variant labels and will not be [inaudible]. There will be no change to the contract [inaudible] delegations to [inaudible]. So this is [inaudible] important from a registry perspective.

So, our comment was that we [inaudible] grandfathering. But first of all, it is not very precisely defined anywhere, and secondly there are other [inaudible] in future that will have a bearing on grandfathering itself and the boundaries and the scope of what is meant by grandfathering, so we might want to revisit the topic later on. Next.

Recommendation 1.7. For all future versions of root zone LGR, GPs and IPs must make best effort to retain full backward compatibility. The LGR [inaudible] must be updated [inaudible] exceptional circumstances that would result in the proposed update to the root zone LGR not being able to retain full backwards compatibility.

So, generally, from what we have learned by talking to the various groups, it is very unlikely that this will happen, so we tend to agree with the text. But we see that there are three separate reasons why an update may be required. One is the IDNA 2008 standard, [inaudible] Unicode standard. But the third is the script community's requirement to maintain [inaudible].

So, we were wondering if … The particular recommended … The language says that the LGR [inaudible] must be updated to specify the exceptional circumstances.

So, if you look at the changing requirements of script community, it will be very hard to capture that as [inaudible]. So we were wondering if there is a mismatch there of some kind. Next.

Recommendation 1.8. If there is a problem when a new update comes and [breaks] something else, then the relevant GP must … Because this information can easily be found out. There are tools that will tell you whether the new root zone update is going to break anything.

So the GP must call out the exception during a public comment period and explain the reasons for such exception. So we agree with this, that we have to share to a public comment process. Next.

Then we also have [inaudible] implementation guidance. So here we [inaudible] that the GPs should analyze what are the possible risks of this update and what needs to be done to mitigate this risk.

So, we were wondering if the GP's competence is not in estimating or mitigating risks up to the root zone. The GPs are linguistics and other

experts of language. So if you are going to ask them, [the risk that] they may not end the text in brackets if [inaudible] GP.

What if the GPs does not know and understand the risks? So, [inaudible] by saying that GPs, together with ICANN and [inaudible] entities should do this analysis. Next.

There's a lot of text. So, at this point, we [inaudible] this. The slides are [inaudible]. We're just pointing the fact that a [inaudible] on the gTLD registry operator, their customers, and end users [inaudible] advice [inaudible]. So we were wondering if there's any particular significance of the phrase and if it was more inclusive than the normal text of registries, registrants, registrars, and end users. So that's just a comment. Next.

So, that's it. There are two key questions that we would like place before CPWG. One, whether there should be a limit—upper limit—prescribed by the policy, to EPDP on IDN, or it should be left to the [inaudible] which basically means that the GPs have restrictions that they themselves created in order to kind of ensure that there's no [inaudible] number of variants. And from what we hear, that is enough to manage the numbers issue.

But at least one of us feel that are we opening up the room for DNS abuse if you are letting the registries decide on the actual number of variants? That's one question.

And the second question is the addition of the new guidelines for variant management, should they be binding policy or should it be

voluntary guidelines? So these are the two questions that we would like some comments from CPWG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. Let's open the floor for any comments and questions. Steinar Grotterod?

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Can you explain why you see that there is a chance for more DNS abuse when you add more variants to the top level? I'm having some problems understanding that. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. So the main point that one of the team members highlighted was that if you have a larger number of variants, then from a confusability perspective, it may be harder for, especially an inexperienced user, to differentiate between variants and DNS abuse attempts. That was the point that was raised.

But I'd like to request my colleagues to also respond if they have anything else to add. Would anybody like to add anything?

JEFF NEUMAN: It was discussed. I'm on the IDN PDP as well. It was discussed but I think there's a lot more of the group that is a little skeptical that adding more variants will result in more DNS abuse.

I mean, in theory, any TLD you add, by definition, if there's one abusive domain registered, then I guess you have more DNS abuse than you had the day before.

But the reality is that if the variants are all going to the same entity, then I don't see how that is going to contribute to more abuse at all.

Also, let's not … I hate using this word. Let's not confuse confusability with abuse. Just because an end user is confused doesn't mean that there is DNS abuse. It means that there's confusion and that may be innocent confusion or malicious confusion and we should not treat them as all being malicious.

So, I think there are a lot of important things that we need to think about in terms of best practices and how registries and registrars can, with multiple variants, reduce the potential confusion but I don't think DNS abuse is one of those reasons. Thanks.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Jeff. I have no comment because we understand what you're saying completely. So, back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Satish. Jonathan Zuck has his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Satish, for that very comprehensive presentation. I feel like you sped your way through into the questions you wanted to ask the CPWG

and I think the CPWG would benefit from slowing down and focusing on the two questions that you asked and what your initial personal perspective on those so that we can have a more fleshed out conversation.

I think that Jeff addressed one of them about DNS abuse and confusability and I think it's a fair point that if variants are allowed but are all [inaudible] to the same entity, that can actually be a plus in terms of confusability because everything goes the place that it's supposed to. And DNS abuse occurs more when we allow variants across registrants that are confusingly similar and lead to the wrong site.

So, I guess if we could clarify the questions before us that would help facilitate the conversation. Thanks, Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Jonathan. Yeah. I kind of add one point to this question about the feeling on the number of variants. SSAC had said that increasing the variants is not going to directly have any affect on the stability, security, and all that. But at the registry level, it may lead to a manageability problem. That means there are too many variants and the managing of that potentially could be a problem.

So, we have discussed both in the EPDP as well as in our IDN team here in [inaudible]. Most of us feel that it is an acceptable risk and therefore the feeling does not have to be fixed. But since there is one person who feels differently we thought we should ask the CPWG [inaudible] rather than not take into consideration that particular point.

So, overall our feeling is that the language that's drafted right now is okay but the point that now we get more feedback that it's not a significant DNS abuse possibility. So that gives us more clarity on what we should be doing. So that is the first question.

On the second question, the actual here is that, if it is policy, it is a contracted party problem. The EPDP on IDNs is not going to discuss that if it's a guideline. If it is policy, there's a possibility that EPDP has to discuss it.

So, the question was most of us felt that it is best left as best practices itself, best practices guidelines. That is [inaudible]. And it is the contracted party's mandate to work that out. And we do not feel that it's significantly a very big problem. But some of—at least one person, again—had that [inaudible]. It's not even a significant [inaudible] because the first time we are going to delegate variants and we are not sure of the impact on the stability.

So, on a precautionary level should we make it binding policy rather than guidelines, voluntary guidelines? So, that is a little more context for these two questions.

So, one way to handle this is that we will take the feedback that you have already provided, but before we move on to the next topic, if anyone has any further input [inaudible], it's most welcome.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There are hands up.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I thought you were running your own queue, but yes, there are three hands up.

SATISH BABU: Sorry, then I'll—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We'll close the queue after those three because I do realize you have to go and we also have to move on. But next is Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, thank you. Just a few points. We concluded that no feeling as a group, that no feeling should be provided. The reason for that is there is no one size that fits all, and as long as variants do not pose a threat to the stability of the DNS, then they should be allowed.

From the manageability point of view, which actually SSAC referred to, I think each registry should be able to identify the number of variants which it could safely manage. Therefore, the group definitely cannot come up with a number because that will differ from one situation from another and from one registry to another, and that's why guidelines are a good way forward. Not to put feeling but to put guidelines that ensure consistent user experience. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Olivier, I think I'll hear all the three questions and if there's anything to respond, I'll respond. So we can go to the other hands up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you for this, Satish. Next is Abdulkarim Oloyede.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much, Oliver, for giving me the floor. Let me start by saying [inaudible] IDNs but I also believe that coming from a developing country and understanding the fact that in terms of education, in terms of exposure, there are different levels.

I want to say that I want us to … My own perspective is for us to be a little bit careful and put in gradually. I'll talk about two things. Number one is issue of confusability. Confusability is the biggest problem from my own perspective, if there is going to be confusion as a result of these IDNs and that is why I believe there should be a cap. The sooner we can start this—

I'm not saying we're going to have a cap for life. What I'm saying is let's start with having a cap and we go gradually, [inaudible] confused especially depending on their level of understanding. And by the time we expose this, I know in some parts, in some places, it might not be a problem. But a lot of people who are not as exposed as we can be, it might be a problem and that's an issue of course with [inaudible] in terms of DNS abuse.

Yes, I agree that if it is managed by the same entity, there is less probability for us having DNS abuse issues. Yes, I totally agree with that. But at the same time, I think when you mix up confusability and the fact that even somebody who understands it cannot actually say this is a

variant. Well, there is a possibility for mixing the issue of confusability with DNS abuse and that leads to greater confusion.

So, there's a thin line between DNS abuse and the issue of confusability. I understand they are different and I agree that they are different, but they are different to us because we understand them. They are no different to somebody who doesn't really understand them and we cannot equate everybody to do the same thing especially when it comes to education about the use of the Internet and things like that. That's my point number one.

Then on the issue of the best practice guidelines, for me, I think when we're doing things, there has to be some uniformity, and when we call something a guidelines, that means we can either take it or leave it. So, when you have it as a guideline, I disagree with having a guidelines because it's take it or leave it and I believe once we are talking about best practice, best practices come from experience. Some people will say, "I've done this in the last ten years and this is the best practice and this is what we achieved," and they put that together. But in this case, there is nothing. There is no experience because this is something new to everybody, so you cannot say it's best practice guidelines.

So that is why I disagree with the term best practice guidelines. Best practice because there is no best practice and guideline because it's take it or leave it. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Abdulkarim. Finally, we have Jeff Neuman on this topic. Then Satish will be able to respond to all three comments.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. While I sympathize—or not sympathize, that's not the right word. While I understand the argument for going gradual and slowly, the reality is that ICANN will not … ICANN has never just done one thing, evaluated it, and then quickly introduced the ability to do more. It just doesn't happen in ICANN world. So although it's a unique—or not unique. Although it's a good idea in principle it's just not something ICANN really does well.

But also as I put in the chat, it's not our job to determine today what a future registry or the number of TLDs a future registry can handle. It's a job of that future registry to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the community that it can manage that number of TLDs and part of that is its commitment to educating users and all of that.

When you adopt the same principle—or sorry, same entity rule—for second-level names, which is what the group is heading towards, then the issues of confusability, as was said before, they pretty much go away. So I'm not sure …. I think the [whole] for this particular conversation I think confusability is a red herring.

And as far as guidelines versus mandatory practices, there are different ways that variants can be used. So you could have variants that all fall into the same page. You could have variants that forward to different pages by the same entity because those variants represent different cultures or different communities that use that different, that other variant. So that is perfectly acceptable.

There are many ways that registries in the future can innovate and I really think it's dangerous, especially with something new, to be very prescriptive as to what registries can and can't do today simply because we don't know the innovation that can happen in the future. We don't want to cut it off. So, thanks.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Abdulkarim and Jeff. So we will not have any further discussions. We will incorporate this feedback that we are getting into the original submission that we are making to the PDP team. So thank you very much for your inputs and back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish, and thank you for remaining behind. I know you were supposed to be on another call. I guess you probably missed part of it, but thanks for your dedication on this.

I'm a little concerned because we're a bit behind, so let's go swiftly now to the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process (the TPRTPD). And for this we have Steinar Grotterod and Daniel Nanghaka.

STEINAR GROTTRAD: Hi. I can be very, very short. At the meeting yesterday, we continued the discussion of the process or the development policy for reasons to deny a transfer and particularly paid some focus on scenarios where you must deny a transfer or you may deny a transfer and it is an ongoing— we'll continue with that on the next meeting as well.

Having said that, I have added to the agenda—and I composed a link here—prepared a document that will maybe on the next meeting or an upcoming meeting have a poll about the transfer lock days, the transfer [create lock] and the transfer lock after the [inaudible] will transfer.

This is a document with a background of the working group and also with some poll questions. I will post that in the chat and hope everybody can take a look and be prepared when we discuss this at an upcoming meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. Let's open the floor for comments and questions. Well, it looks like a lot of people are waiting for that document. So that would be good then to have the document and no doubt there will be further discussion next week. Thank you very much for this update. And here we go, we've got a link to that document. At-Large Input on the Post Creation of Post Transfer Locks.

I have noticed that the crew is working rather hard on this and I note also Yesim has put the document online as well. Anything else you wanted to add, Steinar?

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Nothing from me. I noticed Daniel is absent today. Lutz was attending the meeting yesterday, so he may have some comments [inaudible]. Thank you.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: No, I have no comments. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Lutz. Thanks to all of you for continued in this work. The next one is the Expedited PDP on the specific curative rights protections for intergovernmental organizations. And for this we have Yrjo Lansipuro and Justine Chew.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. I'll be brief also. After 42 meetings, the EPDP has agreed in principle on the procedure to be followed and how to reconcile the right of the losing registrant after a UDRP and the immunity off an IGO intergovernmental organization.

This result is being consolidated into five draft recommendations. The work on the language still continues but I think we'll be in good shape for presenting the final report including these recommendations to the GNSO by the beginning of April.

I also think that these recommendations will be stable enough perhaps at the next meeting of our group [inaudible] so that Justine and myself, we could present them for your approval. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Yrjo. Let's open the floor for comments and questions. I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment, so it looks like we're all set for this. Thank you for the update. Let's move on. The

last of our groups is the RDA Scoping Team, the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team. For this, we have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Again, just a brief report. The scoping team's work is proceeding, although the pace at which we're going is not particularly heartwarming. We seem to still be in a rather endless loop of both defining what accuracy is and the contracted parties really want to restrict it to the definition that is currently in the RAA and most of the other groups have said, "We're fine in saying this is the definition in the RAA but that doesn't define accuracy going forward." The whole purpose of this exercise is to decide to what extent—what is accuracy and to what extent do we have to measure it? And if we limit ourselves to today's definition which was the subject of negotiation as to what the registrars must verify, that's a difficult exercise.

The second thing is we seem to be in a quandary I guess is the word between those who believe that unless you can prove there's a problem, there isn't—a problem with accuracy, that is—and the polar opposite of that is we have documentational proof that there was a problem. Unless you can demonstrate it's fixed, there is a problem. The two sides do not seem to want to vary from those two polar opposites and clearly who we go forward is not clear at this point. So that's where we are today.

I wanted to talk a little bit about something that came up recently and I wanted to—and I could pose some questions to ICANN Org. The specification, the accuracy specification, at this point says that if a

registrar has reason to believe that there is inaccuracy, they must pursue it. And they give as an example if an email sent for the annual reminder—anyone who owns a domain name knows that once a year you get typically an email, but not necessarily an email, from a registrar saying you have an obligation to make sure your data is accurate. You don't have to respond to it but you will receive that.

Some registrars believe it is their obligation to verify, to check bounce messages and if an email bounces or otherwise is reported as not delivered, they must follow-up on that because that is indeed an indication that there's something wrong with the email address.

Other registrars seem to believe that that's not an obligation. It's something they could do, but they choose not to, and some registrars have gone on record as saying monitoring bounces is really difficult, which it is. But others believe it is doable anyway.

So, that changes the environment to some extent. One of our positions has been that the accuracy spec only applies to new registrations, and therefore the bulk of the 200 million existing registrations are just sitting there and will sit there forever until something changes with them.

If indeed the bulk of registrars send out email reminders annually and if they are obliged to check for bouncing, that's a significant number of domains that will be verified that their email address at least is working. Doesn't say the person read the message. Doesn't say it went to the right place. But it does say the email address is at least working.

Although it doesn't alter our position substantially, it does change the numbers considerably. So I had posed a number of questions to ICANN asking is this an obligation, do they believe it's an obligation? If so do they audit it? To what extent are registrars obliged to verify other types of bounces—paper mail bounces, for instance, which may or may not come.

To what extent are registrars obliged to verify that if they post the message on their dashboard which I'm told some registrars do, do they verify that it was ever looked at?

Clearly, if a message is sent via dashboard and no one ever logs on, the message was not received. So we'll see what answers come back on that.

The world is moving slowly. I'm not really optimistic at this point but we're following through the process. And that's really all I have to report. I'll take any questions if there are any.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The floor is open. Not seeing any hands at the moment, Alan. So thank you very much for our update. Just waiting a second more. No, no one else. Okay, thank you very much for the updates, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're welcome.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And thanks of course to all of the people who have provided updates today and to the people who have taken part in the discussions. Now we are pretty much late but we have to zoom—no pun intended—to the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Oliver. So, recently ratified by the ALAC, at the top you'll see a statement that went through the Operations Finance and Budget Working Group on ICANN bylaws amendments for ccNSO proposed changes and this will be submitted later today if it has not already been.

There are quite a few new upcoming public comment proceedings, as you'll see there on the tabs that have been updated. Three coming up this month in March. One in May, two in June, one in August and one in September. So that's the next few months ahead this year. And maybe of note as well in June there will be an initial report on the transfer policy review so this may be of interest of course to the CPWG and we can of course arrange presentations by subject matter experts for these upcoming public comment proceedings.

There are currently no public comments for decision. There was one statement in progress on the Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) Study 2 documents. But to confirm, I think it's now being moved to no statement as it was generally going to be an affirmation in support but I defer to Jonathan on that. So I'll hand it over to you, Jonathan. Thanks so much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. Yeah. On the last call, we reached a rough consensus that there wasn't a need for a statement because these were just feeder documents to the broader public comment that will come out that will provide a richer environment for commentary.

So, let me just echo again to the staff that we would like to get those presentations made for the upcoming public comment period because there is no need to wait because [inaudible]. If we can get ourselves some background on this, that will put us in a better position to formulate positions on that when the time comes.

Are there other questions or comments about these from folks? Because we don't need to linger to long on this, given that most things are still in the [offing].

Okay. That can be back to you, Olivier. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan, for this. Let's move now to any other business. We have the first thing which is the update from the ALAC meeting on the 1st of March. First, I see Herb. Herb Waye, was that on any other business or was that on the previous name collision?

HERB WAYE: Thank you, Olivier. Herb Waye, ICANN ombudsman, for the record. I just wanted to get in real quickly under any other business if you will permit.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, sure.

HERB WAYE: Good. I've just had the opportunity over the last couple of days to observe some conversations taking place in the community regarding Ukraine and I want to commend not just your group today but other participants in the community for their respectful and professional behavior during those conversations.

Now, we have ICANN73 just around the corner. I'm probably guessing correctly that there's going to a significant amount of conversation over Ukraine and the war that's going on. It's disturbing, people's fundamental values. And when fundamental values get disturbed, people tend to modify their behavior, act differently, become aggressive, become defensive, whatever.

I want to just remind everybody and make a call to the participants here today, if you can take this message forward with you to other conversations about Ukraine to maintain that professional and respectful behavior. It will go a long way towards constructive dialogue and any resolutions or decisions that must be made by either ICANN Org, the community, or the Board.

So, just a call for respect, stability, and professionalism, and we move into ICANN73. And once again, thank you everybody today for your excellent behavior as this hot topic gets discussed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Herb. As usual, you're excelling in your role. You're on the pulse, as one would say. So, thank you for being there.

HERB WAYE: If anybody does need my participation as an observer in any of these discussions, please reach out to me. More than happy to sit in on any of this conversation as an independent and unbiased and impartial observer. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Herb, just one more thing. During ICANN meetings, your door is open for anybody who wishes to have a chat with you. What would be the procedure here? Is it just by email?

HERB WAYE: It Can be my email. There is a virtual door. The link to my Zoom room office where Barb and I will be staffed for the full four days of the meeting. We will be available in the conversation. Part of the main ICANN73 page. The name kind of changes every time, but it's either conversation or discussion and it's pinned to the top. So anybody that goes into "Community Conversation" will see the link to my office and availability.

Placed into a waiting room in case there is already a visitor in the office and admitted as their turn comes up. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Herb. Now let's continue on our any other business. The first one was … Actually, no. Sorry. I get a bit confused. It was Siva earlier and I think that his hand came down. Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yeah. Just a question to the ombudsman. It's very abstract So it's not strictly by the letter of the rules of the ombudsman. Observing the behavior of a discussion is one thing but the question is just the topic itself. The idea of the topic, the idea of discussing politics, doesn't conform to ICANN norms of expected behavior. Could you examine that, ruminate over this, and maybe see if the idea of discussing this in ICANN, if it conforms to what is expected of ICANN? Thank you.

HERB WAYE: Thank you for the question, Siva. I can't see any limit topics in the ICANN community. You folks are pretty much free to discuss whatever topics you want as long as the participants remain respectful, professional, can discuss it in a civil manner. Then you are free to really talk about anything you want. I do not believe there is anything either in the bylaws or expected standards of behavior that limit any conversations in the community. I will check on it, though, and if I do find something I will definitely pass the information on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Herb. Let's continue on any other business. First, the update from the ALAC meeting on the 1st of March.

that was the call yesterday that featured Philippe Fouquart, the chair of the GNSO Council, as the guest speaker. Also, the ALAC GNSO Council bilateral session coming up.

I guess I can turn over to Justine Chew for this, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. I'm not going to talk about the ALAC meeting because it's not really for me to say anything. I can talk about the ALAC/GNSO Council bilateral. If Yesim or someone wants to pull up the correct wiki page, that's fine with me.

We have essentially finalized the agenda. It was four of the topics that have been proposed for many weeks now. There were some tweaking as to the sub bullets for one of the topics, which is on SubPro, and that was at the request of GNSO. we didn't see anything particularly problematic with those amendments anyway.

There was one additional item to the agenda and also it was a suggestion by GNSO which is to talk about ALAC priorities. So under item 4, as you see on the screen now, Priorities for 2022. The participants didn't want to limit it just to GNSO priority and suggested that ALAC also provide some insights into its priority for the year. So it was suggested and adopted and agreed that we would talk about recommendations coming up from the ALS Mobilization Work Party final report and also the Individual Members Work Party report.

so now we have Cheryl to present an overview and Alan to talk about the ALS Mobilization recommendations and Roberto to talk about the

individual members recommendation, mobilization recommendations. and then the two of them being the shares of those respective working parties.

So, the agenda as you see is more or less finalized. There could be some minor changes in terms of the time allocation. And I would take this opportunity to alert those [topic leads] from ALAC as you see. Alan, Hadia, Jonathan, Cheryl, and Roberto, you are put on notice to be on standby to react to what GNSO is going to present on those topics if you have any particular reaction. But I know that time is always going to be a crucial factor for the bilateral. So we'll see how it goes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Very much for this, Justine. I was going to ask about Philippe Fouquart's ALAC address. I'm not sure if any … Well, I know that Jeff was there. Was he? No, he was not. I'm mixing things together. I can't remember. So many calls one after the other, you start mingling them. But certainly, Jonathan, I guess you were on yesterday's call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was. Sure. I'm going to feel like it's a good summary of what took place on the call. I don't know that too much more needs to be said. There wasn't anything that was resolved or informs our process here n the CPWG.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks so much for this, Jonathan. I see Sebastien Bachollet has put his hand up. Sebastein, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [inaudible] where he is coming from and how he used to be a chair on the GNSO and how GNSO Council it's organized compared with [inaudible] stakeholder group and various groups within the constituencies And I think it was a very useful point of view. it was the first time we had this conversation with him within the ALAC arena. as you know, he is speaking very often at EURALO level when we invite him for the meetings at the ICANN meetings. And I think it would be very interesting to have the same thing with the leaders of every SO and AC if possible in the future. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Sebastien. I think we can therefore close off with the any other business. Only one bit of any other business that remains regarding Evin Erdogdu has been our policy lead for I can't remember how many years—for quite a number of years—and has done an incredible job. I'm not sure if anyone can pass statistics such as the hundreds and hundreds of calls that she has attended. But certainly quite a few of them. In fact, yeah, I could put my camera on too. Here we go. Evin, hip-hip-hooray! This appears to be your last—maybe not the last one of all last ones but one of your last ones, at least in the position that you're in—calls for the CPWG and for the ALAC. Heidi, did you want to say if you words? Make the announcement official?

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Thank you, Olivier. So, as you have said already, Evin has done an absolutely amazing job supporting this group. It has really come into its own. We wish her all the best in her next pursuit. She is moving—as you know, she is already halfway there over in the Reviews Team.
	So, going forward, it's going to be Claudia in myself supporting you for some time. We look forward to working with you and perhaps changing a few things as well, but in your consultation. Thank you. And thank you again, everyone, to Evin.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you. And Evin, you have anticipated putting your hand up. You have the floor, Evin.
EVIN ERDOGDU:	Thank you, Olivier. I just rushed because it's a little early here in Texas now but I wanted to be on camera just to say thank you so much, Olivier and Jonathan, for allowing me to support the CPWG. it's been a real pleasure. I've learned so much from you both and from all of you here and I'm looking forward to supporting Heidi and Claudia going forward, to continuing to be a wonderful weekly success here for the community. So, thank you so much. I'm really looking forward to working with any of you on the reviews front as well in that new role.
	So, thank you all so much and I'll be dropping in from time to time as well. So, much appreciated. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We'll send you a virtual box of chocolates but real applause.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. You've been a great help and I think you've helped to underscore the importance of the At-Large community download having policy support. Let's also applaud Heidi's efforts to get us a dedicated policy staffer going forward. Let's all put our hopes and prayers behind Heidi's efforts to pull that off because Evin has demonstrated what's possible when we have true policy support for the At-Large policy development activities. So, thanks, Evin, for clearing the path for the At-Large community to be better supported from a policy standpoint.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. And now we only have one more thing which is when is our next call?

YESIM SAGLAM: Thanks so much, Olivier. So, as we all know, next week we will have ICANN73 so the next call could be right after the ICANN73 week which will be 16th of March. Again, on Wednesday at 19:00 UTC this time as we are rotating.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Now, I do have a conflict. No, do I? No, I don't have a conflict period super. It's just the time zones are getting smashed up and so on. That's perfect. Thank you. 19:00 UTC and the week after the ICANN meeting. if of course we change it and so on, we might have to reschedule it or move it or cancel it, whatever.

Anyway, It is so late period we have spoken so much today. I would really like to thank the interpreters, the real time transcription as well. It's been a real challenge for a long call today for you all. So, thank you, thank you. Jonathan, anything else? I guess we're all getting ready for ICANN meeting next week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. So, please, everybody that has additions and color commentary, etc., to share on the talking points, please reach out to me so we can make that document as useful as possible to attendees at ICANN73, because if you recall, we get a much better attendance during ICANN meetings then we do during our normal calls so let's make sure that we are providing a decent background to the people that are coming in to participate in the meeting. Thanks, everyone. I look forward to seeing you all next week.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Thanks, everybody. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, wherever you are. See you next week!

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]