
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday 6th of April 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 homepage will be recorded after the call.

Just to go over our apologies, we have received apologies from Judith Hellerstein, Christopher Wilkinson, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Bill Jouris, Vanda Scartezini, Holly Raiche, Yrjö Lansipuro, Sarah Kiden.

From staff side we have Heidi Ullrich, Claudia Ruiz, and myself, Yesim Saglam present on today's call, and I will be doing call management for this call.

As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretations provided and our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Marina and David. And on the French channel we have Camila and Claire.

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

And one final reminder, as usual, is for the real-time transcription service provided on today's call. I'm going to share the service link with you right now on the Zoom chat. Please do check the service. And once we end the call, a very short survey will pop up on your screen. Please do take a few seconds to complete the survey. We will really appreciate

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.

that. And with this, I think I'm good to leave the floor back over to Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and we are going to go through our agenda today, which is lighter than usual, starting with the updates on the ALAC response to the GNSO small group DNS abuse questions where Alan Greenberg and Justine Chew will take us through the finalized copy of the answers provided to the GNSO Council. The discussion on the UA Day plans, Satish Babu will be speaking to us about this, providing us with an advanced notice on that.

Then we'll have an overview of the closed generics and a discussion on this. Jonathan Zuck will be taking us through a quick set of slides and hopefully we'll have a discussion we were yet to make a decision on what the ALAC's position is on closed generics. You know, there are quite a few points of view. So hopefully you'll be able to take part in this discussion.

And then after that, we'll have workgroup and small team updates with the different expedited PDPs that the ALAC has representatives following and feeding into. And then finally, the policy comment updates after that, which they're very few since the calendar is pretty empty. That's it for today. Let's find out if anybody has any amendments to propose or additions to the agenda.

It looks like everyone is satisfied, I'm not seeing any hands up. So that means the agenda is adopted as it currently is listed on the screen. We

can look at our action items from last week, all of which are complete, and they all relate to this week's call. So I can't imagine many people wish to comment on these. You can see in fact, the previous week's action items and the previous ones and so on, and it's great to see that everything is up to date, which means we can swiftly move on to our Agenda Item number three.

That's the update on the ALAC response to the GNSO small group DNS abuse questions where the GNSO sent some questions regarding DNS abuse to the ALAC and to a number of other organizations. And the ALAC has—well, this group has helped the ALAC formulate a response.-
Over to Alan Greenberg and Justine Chew.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. There's not a lot to report. The document was submitted. It went through a period of a very short but very active comments from a number of participants in this group and I think ended up significantly better for that process and was submitted on Monday. It's available for reading. It's not very different from what it was when we discussed it last week. But there were a lot of little points and minor things changed. And I think that's about all I have to say, unless there were any specific questions. Justine, I think, distributed, but I'm not sure it went to this group. I think it did. The statements that were made by the other groups that had been addressed by the GNSO Small Group, the SSAC, the GAC and the DNS Abuse Institute. The statements were all markedly different. So it's quite interesting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this, Alan. No, I haven't seen—it wasn't sent to the mailing list. So perhaps that would be an action item.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I'll make sure to forward that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, very interesting, indeed, to see the positions of the of the other groups out there, including some very long answers, indeed. But better to be done on the mailing list. I would have hoped that we had a link to the final statement here on our agenda. Unfortunately, I can't see it. Which is a pity. Essentially, was the statement pretty much what you presented to us in the past week? Oh, here we go. It's now being shared.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. That's about all I have to say. As said, thank you very much for the people who contributed and those who spoke last week, and I think it was an interesting exercise that we managed to get done in that short amount of time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Alan. Are there any questions or comments from anyone? I note there is a bit of a discussion already about the other responses received, including one from CENTR.

ALAN GREENBERG: That wasn't a response to the GNSO letter. That was a comment on the EU domain name abuse report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. That's a different story. Okay. Yeah. Thank you. Good point. And I've seen a few other comments on the EU domain name abuse report, including inaccuracies and things. Anyway. Right. Let's move on. No hands up for this. Then the next one is the discussion on the UA plan. I wonder what that is. Fortunately, we have Satish Babu at hand to tell us about this since he is the ALAC liaison to the UASG and the APRALO chair. Over to you Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Olivier. Thank you for the opportunity to speak about this proposal. Now the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, UASG has proposed something called the UA Day during the ICANN 73 sessions.

This is like any other day, it's an annual event on a single day. It's not been decided that it's going to be called UA Day. It could be called something else. So the name is tentative. And the idea is based on UNESCO's international mother language day, which is celebrated annually on 21st February. It was originally proposed in Bangladesh and UNESCO approved it in 1999.

And its vision of that particular initiative includes promote cultural and linguistic diversity for sustainable societies, preserve the differences in culture and languages that foster tolerance and respect for others. And

ensure multilingual and multicultural societies thrive through their languages which transmit and preserve traditional knowledge and cultures in a sustainable way.

Although the vision here, which is kind of borrowed from the UNESCO website, does not talk about technology but the actual programs that they do these days are about technology. Next slide, please.

So here's a quote from The Director General of UNESCO, technology can provide new tools for protecting linguistic diversity. Put simply, they make local dialects a shared heritage. However, because the Internet poses a risk of linguistic uniformization, we must also be aware that technological progress will serve plurilingualism only as long as we make the effort to ensure that it does.

So some of the issues that we're facing in UA actually come through, and for us, UA is not just about the operational aspect of UA, but also it's a fundamental step towards the multilingual Internet. Next slide, please.

So this is currently an early proposal, and we also have to perhaps contribute to the proposal because UASG itself has asked for our help also in fleshing out this proposal, so currently, what it proposes is to identify a date in February starting with 2023, which will be celebrated annually in order to highlight the importance of universal acceptance of domain names and email addresses, both for operational reasons as well as a step towards the multilingual Internet.

UASG has already requested support from other ACs and SOs, and they are particularly keen about ALAC and GAC, the reason being we have really great reach into all the five regions and down to countries and

even within countries, different language communities and so on. So they are looking to us for kind of participating in a meaningful manner.

In the ICANN 73 session, when we were asked about this, GAC, they promised support. And on behalf of ALAC, I said I will offer conditional support, that means I have to briefly consult CPWG. And this is what I'm doing right now, the idea being if CPWG thinks this is a good idea, then we can continue discussions with UASG. If you have reservations, we can take up those reservations with the UASG and so on. Next slide please.

What does UA Day potentially mean for At-Large? This is by no means final, it is in early stages. So this can change a lot. But it could mean the following: a coordinated global series of activities that will involve RALOs, ALSes, individual members, ALS members, that's a fairly large community, linguistic and script communities, UASG UA ambassadors, UA local initiatives, governments, technical community, business, ICANN Org, [inaudible] society, UN IGF, Unicode Consortium, the WHATWG—this is the web hypertext application technology working group, other standards institutions, UNESCO itself.

So it's a fairly big group that we can mobilize for this purpose. Activities could include information webinars, technical consultations, gathering of end user perceptions. I know that Jonathan and team are working on a very interesting survey of a particular language community's perceptions on universal acceptance. I think it's very meaningful thing to do. And there is actually some sense in trying to replicate—may not be at this scale, but at a local scale, using lightweight methodologies, perhaps, other communities as well.

Assistive technology demonstrations. Now the people with disabilities are normally an outlier on many of these things. And we do have an opportunity to bring them into the mainstream using technology. And more of these things have to be planned out.

Now since the focus is on languages and scripts, events may be more focused at the national and sub national level, because they will use that local language. But we do have opportunity for regional events like the Latin America and Caribbean where Spanish and Portuguese or the Francophone Africa where French can be used. And also global events. So we do have options of all level of events like this. Next slide, please.

So what are the outcomes that we expect? Now, this, again, requires some amount of introspection, but what I could think of at this point— and this has not been discussed with UASG because they they're not [inaudible] this level.

Enhance global, local focus on IDNs and universal acceptance. So the local focus is also equally important, as is the global focus, then, the governments and tech companies can make commitments in order to support closing of UA gaps.

Now, when we have a joint program of these kinds, you will definitely have no tech companies and governments but especially if there are national programs. And that's an opportunity for the script communities and the UA communities to extract from governments and the tech community a little more meaningful support for UA [inaudible].

The language script community is made aware of the importance of IDNs and UA. ALAC and At-Large made more visible to local

communities. Ability for ICANN community to assess the interest in IDNs and UA within language communities. Now, I realize that we do not have a very great idea about the demand, the pull from the language community, maybe these sort of events will give us a better idea.

And finally, consequently, it could have a potential positive influence on the next round of IDN gTLDs. So I'll stop here. Next slide, please. So if there are any questions or comments, I'll be happy to receive them. Thank you. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you so much, Satish. Thanks for the quick update on this. Let's open the floor. I notice that Amrita Chaudry has her hand up.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks, Olivier. Satish, A universal acceptance day is a great idea. Just a few questions. One is, looking at how it is being planned, is it just universal acceptance at the domain name level, which is going to be discussed, or even at the content level? That is one aspect because when governments look at things, they just don't look at, specifically the domain names, but also the content part. So would there be others also at national level who would be looking at it?

And the second part is it's good to have commitments from governments or tech companies, but some governments have already committed. Is there a plan to kind of look at where those commitments are? Or even say, some tech companies who had committed to UA or IDNs, etc.? Is there some plan to look [inaudible] where they are?

And another question, which I had put in the chat was, I was just curious to understand—I'm sure the UA team must have reached out to the other SOs and ACs apart from GAC and ALAC. So how has been the response? Thanks.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Amrita. Great questions, I might have to get back to you if I forget one of these questions. The first one, regarding content. Now, this is the UA Day and the UA does not include content per se. But by bringing together the language communities with these other stakeholders, we are hoping that it will kind of create buzz, and a set of debate on the journey towards this multilingual Internet, which is something elusive we've been talking about for quite a number of years now. But we've not reached here. And the UA and IDNs is a fundamental building block of that.

So although the programs are likely to be focused on UA and IDNs, by bringing together this community, we are hoping that there will be synergies that come up and that therefore, the content, which is not ICANN's or UA's central focus, will also get taken up and in the process get done.

Now, on the question of the response from the other ACs and SOs, like I said, GAC, Nigel has very stridently said governments have to do much more. So, some of the governments have actually taken positions on this, but the UA Day would be kind of day or an occasion to kind of remind them and at least for those governments which have not taken a

position, they can take, and for those who have taken a position can measure what has been the progress.

So on the whole, it's a kind of day of reflection as far as governments are concerned and we would like them to use it to ensure that trajectory is positive and it's moving towards the end result that we want. What is the question I missed, Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

The other one was the governments or the tech companies who have committed as in there are few who have committed, there are many who have not, those who have committed, are you planning to—or is the group thinking of even measuring what we have done? For example, there are various other platforms in which certain commitments are made by governments or tech platforms, and that is also reviewed on that day. Is something similar being planned or is it very nascent at this point of time?

SATISH BABU:

Yeah, at this point, we have to discuss all these aspects. And last time—there was a meeting of the UASG coordination group last week, so I had actually brought this topic up because I wanted to come back to see if CPWG to kind of present this.

Now, they were somewhat low on details. So, their position was that you consult with CPWG, come back with ideas and we'll kind of make a plan with that. So I think this is too early to kind of—some of the things we will—at the next consultation with CPWG, we can take all the

details and take it back to UASG and let them look over it. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Satish, there's a second hand up, and that's Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you Satish for that presentation. First, I must say this is a great idea. And my understanding that the purpose of this day is to highlight the importance of universal acceptance for an inclusive Internet. It's a reminder, a constant yearly reminder to all stakeholders about universal acceptance and what they need to do.

A couple of points. Amrita mentioned content. And although as you mentioned, the content is not within ICANN's remit, however, there is a correlation between content and domain names. And in that regard, we as ICANN could look at content as maybe an indication to the importance and necessity or maybe the need for IDNs. It does make sense that if you have the content of a webpage in a certain language, it does make sense also to have the domain name in the same language.

This did not happen before. And we are used to having otherwise. But this is because of the technical availability. And though the technical possibility was there from the late '90s, it was not really adopted, we had IDN second level domains in the early 2000s. But really, this didn't evolve or start being, I would say, more widely adopted, except the past maybe 10 years.

So again, and then maybe you know, because so much time elapsed with us having domain names in a certain content in a certain language and the domain in another language, we got used to having this. But anyway, I do think that we could look at the content from an ICANN perspective.

As for the commitment, am I understanding that this day is not to pinpoint who's committed and who's not committed? But as Amrita said, also, it would be an opportunity to showcase what's happening, and this would encourage others to follow. Thank you. Also, what would At-Large's specific role be and how would we organize and work together on this? How could we as a community work with you on developing At-Large contribution to this day? Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Hadia. On the first point about specifically the point that you mentioned, which is very important, that the content of [inaudible] should match the URL of that [inaudible]. That's a very important point.

So far, we had technical difficulties in implementing that. But right now, once the IDN EPDP also finishing its work, we would have removed all the technical hurdles, technical and policy hurdles also. So this is a point that we can highlight during these days. I mean, the UA days that this is an important consideration. And then now we don't have any more excuses why you should not be doing it. So I completely agree with you on that.

On the second point, how shall the At-Large and ALAC work on this? They are looking to us because we have, like I said, reach through our

RALOs and ALSes and individual members, etc. I think within the whole ICANN community, we have the largest reach, and that's something that they're looking at.

Now, there are also practical constraints, the resources, time, money and all that. So, we have to prioritize and so at some point we will have to discuss with UASG saying that we may have some regional priorities, we may have limitation on funds. So, in principle, if you're willing to take it up, then we have to advance to the next stage where we start thinking about how this can be rolled out in actual practical sense. So some of these points we'll have to discuss at that point.

So currently, right now, what we're looking at is whether there's an in principle buy in from CPWG on the idea, and we can proceed to continue to talk to UASG. At the next set of discussions, we'll have to look at these practical points. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Satish. Next in the queue is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. And I won't take long. Satish just mentioned briefly that the At-Large community has gotten an ABR to do an end user survey. I mean, part of what's challenging for the At-Large is to help understand what the individual end user perspective is on a variety of issues. And so we've chosen for our pilot survey to ask questions of individual users, about their perspective on IDNs. We probably won't ever use the word IDN, but the IDN will be to kind of explore whether the availability of

IDNs might affect Internet usage and what that might help to inform marketing efforts of IDNs and take up of IDNs in the next round. So we are definitely all in on this idea of expanding the use of IDNs, and this pilot survey hopefully will provide some enlightening information.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Jonathan. Yeah, I completely agree. It's an important thing to do. And we really look forward to the findings and the insights that we'll derive from it. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: thank you very much for this update, Satish. I note a lot of praise in the chat for the work that you're doing. So well done. And let's look forward to the next steps in this process and we look forward to some, hopefully, at some point, some success in universal acceptance. There's a lot been taking place at the moment.

Now, let's continue and let's go now to our agenda item number five. And that's going to be back to Jonathan Zuck again, for an overview on closed generics and for a discussion on this quite. A hot topic, this closed generic thing, has been going on for a very long time. And I recall quite a few discussions and debates where people were not totally aligned on this. Hopefully, Jonathan Zuck is going to be able to shed some light over this, Jonathan, over to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. So I'm probably not the most qualified person to give an overview of closed generics because we have people on the call that

participated quite a bit in the discussions around closed generics as part of the small team effort in the subsequent procedures working group and including Alan Greenberg and Greg Shatan. And so I welcome additional color commentary.

The reason we're bringing this up is that we might try to have an internal sort of position development discussion during the next ICANN meeting in June. And this is just really meant to be kind of an opportunity to discuss some of the issues that have come up around this topic of close generics and provide a kind of a background for that conversation.

We did share a session on closed generics during ICANN 72. So the one before the last one. And then we had a small panel that was Kathy Kleinman, and Marc Trachtenberg that were discussing sort of the pros and cons of close generics. And so in the agenda, you'll find a link to that session, and I recommend people go back and review it to kind of gain an understanding of some of the arguments that are being made.

But some folks thought it might make sense on this call, because we had the time on the agenda, to give a little bit of an overview of the issue of closed generics. And like I said, I welcome some additional discussion from those on the call who know more than I do. So without further ado, I will switch over here to my slides. And as I said, just a very quick kind of overview.

So, for those for whom this is new closed, generics can be a little bit of a confusing term, because we're often confronted with the notion of a

gTLD which stands for generic top-level domain. And so we use the term generic to differentiate top-level domains that are not ccTLDs but generic, business driven TLDs. And that's not what we're talking about when we talk about generics in the context of closed generics.

So instead, we were talking about closed generics. TLDs, is a very specific type of TLD that doesn't exist yet but about which there's a lot of discussion. So it's really a reference to recognizable words, being applied for by companies that are in that business. So you know, Amazon applying for .book, and Google applying for .cloud and .app and Estee Lauder applying for .perfume, etc.

And so it's the idea that it's a generic term being applied for as a top-level domain. And the other aspect of it is that what makes it closed, is the idea that only people that are approved by that applicant are able to get that domain. So for example, if Amazon had .book, then maybe only books that are listed on Amazon would be able to get a .book domain, for example.

So in 2012, related to the 2012, round, there was something created called the applicant guidebook, which was meant to be kind of a set of rules for applicants, and what kind of strings that they could apply for and under what conditions.

And while there was discussion on the notion of these closed generics, it was mostly left out of the applicant guide book. And so they were implicitly allowed, not explicitly but implicitly because they weren't prohibited.

And so that led to a number of applications happening, cloud, book, app, jewelry and many others. And that in turn led to some objections to those applications. There was objections from the GAC. There was objections from a group of registrars led by Michele because they were concerned about closed generics violating the nondiscrimination requirements of the applicant guidebook. In other words, if an applicant got .app, they would essentially become the registrar for that domain as well. And so Michele led a group of registrars. Kathy Kleinman spoke up. And in fact, in my old job as the Tech Trade Association, we were concerned about .app and spoke up on this topic as well.

What the GAC essentially said was that they shouldn't be allowed unless they were in the public interest, there shouldn't be closed generics unless they were somehow in the public interest. The ICANN Board took this on, did a public comment, waited to get some feedback from the community. And the net result was to prohibit them, and kind of punt it down the road to the next round of TLDs.

So the next group that addressed this issue was the subsequent procedures working group and there was a very active set of discussions inside of that subsequent procedures working group on this topic, but unfortunately, they didn't come to a conclusion. At the time, there was even a proposal for a public interest exception to the prohibition. And Alan Greenberg and Greg Shatan, along with several others, including George Sadowsky and Kathy Kleiman were involved in authoring a possible proposal for a public interest exception. And the link to that is also in the agenda for this session to see their proposal. But in the end, it wasn't accepted by the group. And the subsequent procedures remained silent on this issue.

Of course, what that meant in most instances was that the status quo would remain but because there wasn't exactly a status quo left over from the previous round, it's a little bit confusing what the path forward is for the closed generics.

So there were basically four scenarios available to the Board, as a result of the final report of the subsequent procedures working group. One is they could have chosen to allow close generics, in other words, just not deal with the issue and say, apply for whatever strings you want. They could have prohibited them. They could have tried to come up with their own public interest exception or use the one that had been proposed, etc. Or they could push this question back to the community despite the community's previous inability to reach a conclusion on this topic.

And that's, in fact, what they chose to do. So they've now gone back to the GAC and the GNSO and told them that they need to find a compromise position, that they shouldn't argue for all in or all out, because those are unlikely to reach consensus. And so the Board is trying to provide guidelines. And I should have provided a link to that document as well. But I'll find it and post the link to the framework that was established by the board for this discussion.

So this is an active discussion that right now is just taking place between the GNSO and GAC potentially, because it was driven originally by GAC objection to those strings. But there will be opportunities for the ALAC and the outlying communities to speak up on this issue. And so it probably behooves us to hone our position on closed generics and to have a conversation, potentially, at the next ICANN meeting about

closed generics. And so that's why we talked a little bit about it here in this session. It's a short 15-minute section of this agenda. But we'll probably discuss it more.

So I guess, with that, that was all that I was really going to talk about today. I would welcome Alan or Greg or anyone else to add some color commentary to that discussion, or even Michael Palage, and have a little bit of a Q&A about this so that people feel comfortable about what the topic is. And we will give some thought to having a broader discussion about our position on it at the next meeting. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. So thank you, Jonathan. That was an excellent debrief or briefing on closed generics and where we stand. To put a couple of finer points on things, beyond there being kind of no precedent, there was really the ask or demand by the Board that a decision actually be made and not kind of the non-status quo just kind of be dragged forward. Yet and still, the community has not come back with anything that could be considered a decision. So this is in kind of a limbo state.

And to add a little more color to what Alan and George and Kathy and myself worked on, what we were looking at—some people criticized it, particularly for not really being closed, in the sense that it wasn't being used by a single entity, was in a sense more of a proposal that for the public interest that if a generic domain were registered or was delegated to a public interest organization, it would have to be a truly recognized public interest organization in that area of interest. So, let's say disaster relief, that if the if .warrelief was in question and the

Doctors Without Borders became the owner and proprietor, that they would need to put together a council essentially, of not only themselves but other likeminded organizations, and that they would need to allow co use of the top-level domain by vetted organizations with an interest in the same thing.

So this was an attempt to deal both with the idea of a single registrant, but the registrant would have certain duties, or possibly that even there could be purpose formed organizations it could be transferred to and to get away from kind of the commercial .perfume sort of thing where really would have been rather than—in the .book example you gave, Jonathan, you're saying it could be limited to Amazon, authors and books that Amazon sells.

The extreme examples where .perfume only has Estee Lauder perfumes and nobody but Estee Lauder gets to use .perfume. And if you're a narrow enough Internet user to believe that anything at the top-level domain represents the universe of things that could be at that top-level domain, you'd believe that Estee Lauder was the only perfumer in the world or at least that Estee Lauder would have some sort of unfair advantage and would essentially warp the taxonomy of the Internet.

So we wanted to stay away from that whole debate about truly one-owner second-level domains that were being exploited for commercial purposes. And we were concerned too that good top-level domains that could do good in the world would go on unused because there wasn't a registry proposal per se for them, even if there was interest by a limited number of companies in being in the domain.

Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Greg, and you raise a really interesting point that I should have covered in my presentation, which is why we would be interested as the At-Large community in this. And the reason for that is that the primary argument against these closed generics is actually end user confusion. In other words, this notion that, as Greg mentioned, if Estee Lauder controlled .perfume, then that would seem to imply to a number of end users that that was the place to go to get perfume, even if it was only one company. And that taxonomy would suggest that that was the destination and would be like .pharmacy or .bank that are in fact open TLDs but with rules. It would instead be a single a single vendor, and therefore confusing to end users.

And the argument against that, obviously, is that there's plenty of other words available so that some other company could get that fragrance or something like that if they wanted to and so that end users aren't so easily fooled.

But that's the argument between sort of prohibiting them all and allowing them all and I think we're past that argument, that we're not going to get to one of those outcomes. And that's why some kind of a public interest compromise seems to be what the board is seeking. Obviously, one of the complexities of this is even defining what constitutes a generic term, and what constitutes the public interest, has plagued the organization for many years. So as John McCormack mentioned in the comments, this may be a tougher issue even than DNS abuse. Alan Greenberg, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Put a comment in the chat for those who aren't familiar with my background. I don't have much more to add to the definition and the details of it that Jonathan and Greg provided. I find it somewhat unfortunate that despite the fact that we made a very specific suggestion on how to deal with the issue, and specifically what we said, was put the discussion on hold forever, until the community comes up with a definition, that is, going back to us and continually saying, please come to a decision, well, maybe it'll work, maybe it won't. But I think if the community wants to do something, then the community will. And I'm dubious that there will be any real definitive answer to this. The two sides are just too far apart and both of them feel the issue is very, very important and don't want to really give any space. And we're one of those on one side.

So I believe that what the ALAC said is indeed as good an answer as we're going to get at this point. And we should leave it at that. Having said that, I'm rather disappointed that they went back to the GAC and GNSO and did not include us in that position. Our advice to the Board is supposed to have as much import as other groups. Maybe we didn't actually say this in the document saying advice. If so, maybe we should. But in any case, I think this is largely a waste of good time and energy among the community, because I'm not particularly optimistic that we'll come up with an answer. If we do, so be it and I'll be happy to see it gone. But I just can't put a lot of energy into it right now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. And, Michael Palage, go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Jonathan. First off, I agree that we really do need to look at the public interest and the At-Large perspective. And ironically, I wrote an article about this before the last round, I think it was actually 2010 or 2011, where I looked at the issue of .kids. So what I'm saying here is something that I've had a long-held belief on for an extended period of time.

This is a complex, this is an incredibly complex issue. But I agree with Alan, if we try to define this, all we're going to do is end up with more delays. And we're probably not going to see the next round of new gTLDs until 2030. Right? The more specificity that we try to impart upon the safeguards, the more it is going to be opened to gaming.

And I really want to hit home on this. We can come up with rules that are incredibly rigid, it must be open, great, company X registers generic term whatever and then they just set the price at \$1 million a domain name, "Hey, anybody could come in and register for \$1 million." The reality is no one's going to do that.

I actually think one of the things we at ALAC, or really the broader ICANN community should be looking at is really concerned about competition or improper influence. What about registries that are owning tens or hundreds of TLDs? What about registries that own an entire sector? There are some registry operators that own all the automotive related or a large number of automotive related strings, some that operate large segments of adult-specific related TLDs.

Right now, I believe ICANN has a problem that we're looking through every problem through a microscope, we want to go into more and more detail. We need to put away our microscopes and pull out the telescopes and look at the bigger picture and say, what is the root cause or what is the cause of the problems that we're getting stuck in the weeds?

So with that, I would actually like to perhaps float a proposal, and it's actually based upon a provision that is already incorporated into the existing gTLD baseline registry agreements. Specifically, it has to do with section 2.9. Now in 2.9, if a registry wants to be vertically integrated, ICANN has the ability to contact a relevant competition authority. Right.

So what I think is interesting here is perhaps we just leverage those same safeguards that ICANN already has in place in the baseline agreement regarding the situation where a registry, perhaps may be abusing its vertical integration, and mimic that and say, If ICANN, or if the community feels that a registry is somehow operating in an anticompetitive manner, there is a mechanism for that to be referred to a relevant competition authority.

It's already there, we're not coming up with something new. This is a concept in the registry agreement, we are just looking to expand it to a situation regarding these closed generics. So instead of coming out with an absolute bar or prohibition that is only going to be gamed or coming up with complex rules in which we're going to be arguing about the public interest and what is closed and what is generic for the next decade, we actually can put in place something where we move forward.

And yes, with regard to multiple competition authorities, that is correct. And in fact, that is what ICANN does right now in connection with .com, the US Department of Justice has opined on that, and that is one of the reasons that they have been involved in and have weighed in regarding .com.

So that is not for us to determine which competition authorities should weigh in. That's not our responsibility. What we should do is we should have a mechanism that if ICANN feels that there is an issue, they can refer to what they feel like, or an individual competition authority could raise it.

But that to me is much more practical, deployable, instead of engaging in esoteric whack a mole, like Alan had just said, so to me, that's again, just, this is something again, I've looked at this in the context of what would happen if you had a generic company—I think I even use Disney and some other nonprofit or public sector groups applying for .kids. So this is something that I have felt rather passionate about for well over the last decade. And I think using the competition authorities and modifying the language in the existing registry agreement is the easiest way to put this to bed and allow us to move forward with advancing the SubPro group work. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Michael. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I have to both agree and disagree with Michael. I agree in that this would put it to bed. I disagree in that I believe the outcome would be one that we and the GAC would be very dissatisfied with. The reason is that competition authorities around the world right now are so focused on the few very large high-tech companies, Google, Amazon, Facebook, that that's pretty well where all of their energy is likely to be. And so I feel they are much more likely to say no, we don't see a problem, because it's just not high on their priority list to really focus attention on. And that would put it to bed. But I don't believe it would be a very satisfactory answer for the individual users and the public interest. But so be it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. Greg Shatan, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I have a confession to make, which is that I started my legal career as an antitrust lawyer, antitrust being the US term for competition law, and worked for over a decade in getting mergers through the competition authorities.

I don't think antitrust scrutiny should be a concern, or antitrust concerns should be a concern. I think it is a positive. The competition authorities are looking at things across many industries. I don't think that they would just take a pass on something that actually raised antitrust concerns. And there are also ways to draw their attention. Most competition authorities will not give advisory opinions or sign off

on things just because you ask. And they do coordinate amongst themselves the agencies, although they don't always agree.

So I would not dismiss it out of hand. I actually think that would be good, and I think there could be an actual answer out of that. Most importantly, usually once you are in the arms of a competition authority, it's usually not a yay or any decision. There's essentially a negotiation/education/revision process that often results in smoothing the antitrust non-compliant edges off of things in the end.

So it could well be a positive process. And right now is probably a better time than under certain attention of an antitrust authority, because they were basically chloroformed a little under the prior administration. But nobody can predict the future. If they could, I would have put all my money on St. Peter's in the Sweet 16. Thanks. Sorry for the American college basketball reference. And by the way, the thing in my picture that's behind me, that's a human Whack a Mole inflatable, that I suggest that should buy for all future meetings. Lifesize, Alan can go in the middle and whack everyone.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Greg. With that, Olivier, we've taken more time and then we were allotted. But you can see how this is a lively conversation. So the question is whether or not we want to add any nuance to the At-Large position on this? Because those conversations are, in fact, ongoing. But back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And indeed what an interesting discussion we're having here. Certainly not the end of it. And unfortunately, we do have to move on on our call today. So the next section in our agenda is going to be the work groups and the small team update. It will start with the transfer policy review policy development process with Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, hi. Very short update from the last meeting in the policy developing working group for the transfer policy yesterday. First of all, the chair announced that we are on schedule to submit Phase One report for public comment by June 15 this year, so we are definitely on track.

Secondly is a letter to the working group by the business consistency. And I have added the wording on this in the comment field on this agenda. And this letter is regarding the transfer locks.

The business consistency are in favor—the way I understand, advocate the present 60-day locks. So there's more distance between their input to the voting group than the common consensus in brackets for the 10 days.

We had a fruitful discussion about their input. And then we continue with the bulk transfer and bulk transfer policy that we kind of reverted into multiple domain names because we can't agree on what's the criteria for how many domain names will have to be when you call it a bulk. But we will continue with that form in the upcoming meeting.

I think there's one interesting question whether there will be acceptable for having one transfer authorization code for all domain names as long as you have other security mechanism, as an example was mentioned, lower TTL for that process. This is something that we may dig into more in details.

That was my update. Anyone else that joined the call yesterday may add their comments. So thank you from me. Back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thanks very much Steinar. I actually put my hand up to ask you a question on this. There was also a discussion on the Consolidated Policy Working Group mailing list regarding this issue of bulk, what constitutes bulk registration, how many, etc.

There was a parallel made or with some quoting that for some ccTLDs, bulk was a specific number. Did the working group itself discuss this from looking at potential examples of what bulk registrations are in some ccTLD?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I think what was discussed on the CPWG mailing list was bulk registration in connection with DNS abuse. The transfer policy review team did discuss bulk and number of domain names being transferred as one from one registrar to one registry or multiple registries in the generic word. So I don't think it's the same discussion and discussion on the CPWG mailing list was not really reflected into the discussion with the transfer policy debate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you. No, what I do mean, though, is that you can't speak of bulk registrations on one side and bulk transfers on the other—at least in my view—having different rules. As in one would be a bulk transfer would be two or more, or the other one being 100 or more. So that's why I wondered with everyone working in their own silos as to whether there was also some parallel processes where one could look at bulk registrations in the context of fraudulent domains and/or malware, etc. and bulk transfer being a different thing, or is there a reason why the two would be very different from each other?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I actually believe it will be kind of different. Because for the transfers, there is already registered domain names. And it's not being machine created as very typical for the bulk registration processes and the problem. But for the transfer, they're already registered domain names that are either newly registered or been there for a while, and then being transferred to another registrar. I hope I understand your question correctly, Oliver.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. That's a very good point, Steinar. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I think Alan has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I do. It's in relation to Olivier's comment. Olivier, there are no rules for bulk registrations. And I'm not even sure there are rules for using the term bulk in regards to transfers. But it doesn't matter whether there is or not. If we ever have a rule on bulk registrations, and there is a reference to it in the transfer policy, then clearly, we should be careful not to use the same word in two completely different ways in related policies, although ICANN has a long history of doing that anyway. But going forward, it would be better to say multiple transfers and bulk registrations or whatever, and define the two. But at this point there is no such policy. So we don't really have to worry about the semantics of it going forward. Going forward, if we end up having something, we should be careful about the nomenclature. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Just a short comment, Alan. There is an ICANN defined bulk transfer policy, but that is being executed when, as an example, registrar is being bankrupt and all the domain names connected to that registrar has to be transferred in a batch to another registrar in a process that is defined by ICANN.

I don't know, that's the only use of the word bulk, as I can recall, but one of the problems we have within the GNSO working group is to kind of set if there is a number, if there is just more than one than it is a multiple transfer process, or is it has to be 10, has to be 100, has it to be all within top-level, or could it be within multiple generic top-levels from the same registrar? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll just note that in those sentences, you use the term batch, multiple, and bulk, almost interchangeably. And that's the problem, of course. So if we have a policy on something, we should be careful about what it is. And make sure that it's moderately consistent, although as I said, ICANN has a long history of using the same term in multiple ways and having very different meanings. But clearly something to focus on going forward. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you for your comment, Alan. I'll actually make a note of that, because we very often end up discussing whether we should—whatever we discuss and whatever we decide upon, do have relevance for other policies that are within this industry. So I'll make a note of that and try to remember it. Thank you. If there is nobody else, so thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for all the updates on this, Steinar. The next update is the one on IGOs. And of course the work was completed last week so no update on this one. The next one is on the EPDP on internationalized domain names. And having heard from Satish earlier, we now will hear from Lianna Galstyan who will be providing us with an update. It does say no update here but she did say she had a short update. Over to you, Lianna.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, it is a very brief update on the progress. So we are in a good progress in our work. We are completing charter

equations A5 and A6 which were presented to CPWG in detail some time ago.

Just to remind, A5 is a question whether there should be a ceiling value or other mechanism to ensure that the number of delegated to top-level variant labels remain small and should additional security and stability guidelines be developed to make variant domains manageable at the registry registrar and registrant levels, and A6 is to what extent should gTLD policies and procedures be updated to allow an existing TLD and its variants, if any, which are not validated by script label generation rules to be grandfathered.

With the input from CPWG, our small team prepared comments and concerns regarding these items, which were addressed at the second reading of this charter questions at the EPDP group.

Currently, we have the draft almost close to final text with the opportunity to make additional comments by 8th of April, so in two days. Again, we had a discussion with our small team and have an agreement on the language presented and it is in line what we presented to CPWG, so no major changes here.

The EPDP meeting will be tomorrow 7 April and if no additional comments or changes received by deadline, the presented text will be final.

Probably just worth mentioning the only slight change in the comment that we are presenting to the team is about the implementation guidelines on our best practice guidelines. And we agreed that the IRT would be responsible for developing the best practice guidelines. And

also, we acknowledged that because variants gTLDs are currently not allowed, it will be hard to fully understand the user experience until they are delegated. And as such the best practice guidelines are expected to be developed over time in an organic manner. So we agreed that the responsibility is on the IRT, but we are raising a comment on when these best practice guidelines should be prepared and implemented. This is the only comment that will go from our team to the EPDP. That is the update.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Lianna. Let's open the floor to comments and questions. And I see Justine Chew has put her hand up.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Olivier. Putting on my other hat as the vice chair of the EPDP on IDNs, just want to make a small correction. So after the second reading of any draft recommendations, if we have no further major changes, then that text will be considered stable, not final. Because final bit, the final designation will only come when the initial reports and the final reports go out. Thanks.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you, Justine. Yes, indeed, we need to be careful with the terms that we're discussing with different understanding. Thank you for the correction. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lianna. And no further has that I can see. Right, we can continue on the RDA scoping team with Alan Greenberg. It does say no update, but it still allocates five minutes to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I communicate via Skype. I'm not sure who updates the agenda. If we can have my presentation on please. Thank you very much. By the way, I note the date is incorrect. IF staff can fix that, or I can send a newer—
Next slide, please.

All right. The small team is currently in abeyance right now. We are supposed to be meeting starting in 14 minutes. But we are in fact not meeting this week because we have submitted a preliminary report to Council and Council has not yet considered it.

The four questions the ODA small team was asked are listed on the screen. And I'm going to very quickly summarize what the responses are. Next slide, please.

So the first two questions had to do with, did the ODA group, the operational design procedure miss anything or misinterpret anything? And the answer was it misinterpreted a number of things. And it missed—not necessarily accidentally, but deliberately, in some cases, missed some things.

It's not clear to what extent those matter. It's a very confusing situation. The ODA is an analysis of a hypothetical implementation. The actual—if this is approved by the Board, the implementation review team is

responsible for doing the actual more detailed design, which does not have to follow the ODA.

Now, once the ODA has written something, there is going to be an inclination to follow it, however. That's human nature. But it's certainly not required. Now, it's not clear whether the omissions and the misinterpretations will have a substantive effect on either the cost or the time involved in doing it. But nevertheless, there were some say very significant and very important issues, where the recommendations were not reflected well, certainly in the opinion of the people who participated in writing the recommendations. Next slide.

This is a very high-level summary of what is a six- or so page document. So I do suggest people go and look at it. The next two questions were essentially, does this document provide enough information? And if so, what else can you tell us? The board raised a number of concerns, or certainly considerations, if not concerns, in their response to the GNSO, many of them reflecting things that were similar to what the ALAC said in its comments and advice.

And the team at this point has basically agreed that as submitted, the SSAD is problematic. I've commented before in this group that it's sort of sad, that we are now having a rather pragmatic discussion on whether the SSAD will produce results and whether the policy we generated was sufficient to allow for implementation. It's a little bit sad we didn't have those pragmatic discussions during the EPDP. In many cases, we're talking about the same people. So it's somewhat of an enigma.

But nevertheless, we are now putting a lot of focus on—we've said that, essentially, the SSAD as described is not something the Board should approve. There are just too many questions, the time involved is going to be far too long, there's going to be a belief by some that it won't be used.

So we are now developing something called a proof of concept. I think the term is a very poor choice. Because proof of concept normally says this is what you do before implementing the full thing. And it's not at all clear that that's what we intend. The proof of concept is very close to what the ALAC and a number of GNSO constituencies were calling a ticketing system. So from that perspective, I'm certainly in favor of it. There are some who believe that it will provide statistics on usage, I believe that's completely false, because the timing and the costs of using the system are inevitably going to be different.

I personally believe that if the system cannot be built quickly and provided free, it's not going to be used. There's another wrinkle to it that since this is not going to be something specified by a formal GNSO policy, it's not clear that we can mandate that contracted parties have to use it. And we're not sure we can convince users to use it. But that's part of the experiment.

ICANN Org has some work to do as to whether this can be implemented cheaply and quickly. We believe things like their current operational client management system could be used for this. We spent a little bit too much time talking about using the contractual compliance system, which I think was a red herring that somehow came up in the conversation. But we could use the underlying base system perhaps, or

buy something similar, but ICANN Org still has to come back to us on that. And it's not at all clear that the Board would be willing to do this at no cost.

So there's still a lot of questions in the air, but we are talking about doing something in what I think might be a productive way. So that's a good answer if we can actually make it work. Next slide please.

On the accuracy scoping team, we are still slogging along, we may have finalize what was originally called the definition of accuracy now is defining the current requirements. You'd think since the current requirements are laid out in the RAA and have been in place for a good number of years, there would be no effort at all required to put the definition of the current specs down in a simple term.

That in fact has not been the case, and it's still not finalized. But we're getting closer. We are spending the rest of our time on what has been called a gap analysis. That's essentially a statement of saying what information do we need to be able to have the accuracy scoping team produce any recommendation to the GNSO? And moreover, what is missing to allow us to assess accuracy on an ongoing basis once we define what accuracy is needed?

Then the question is, do we need to measure it? And if so, how? So that's going on. I'm not sure I see an end to that discussion. But there's a significant time allowed for this group to meet. My recollection is we're sort of scheduled to wrap up sometime towards the end of this calendar year. So there's still some time left, and we may actually come to closure.

I think that's the last slide, but I'm not sure. Okay, sorry. Yeah, I've been talking about the points without showing the slides. Next slide. And if you want to actually read the report, which I think you might find interesting. Certainly the points that the ALAC has made in relation to this were pretty well reflected within the report. And I think it's a pretty accurate document of where we are right now. But you can find a copy yourself, there's one attached to the agenda and you can also follow this link. And this report is in the agenda as well. Thank you. Take any questions if there are any. I see no hands, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Just one question for you. What's the next steps on this really?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the ODA—presumably the GNSO will come back to us and we call this a preliminary report. So I guess there'll be a final one at some point. Exactly what it is will depend on both what the GNSO Council says back to us if they do, and responses that we are waiting for from ICANN Org. I mean, we have suggested that the Board essentially put the SSAD on hold for an indeterminate amount of time and look at implementing this non-policy tracking system that's going to presume that we can do it in a reasonable time at a reasonable cost.

And I believe it will be futile if we're going to assign anything other than a very nominal charge to requests that have to go through it. If we assign anything more than 20 cents per request or something like that, I think it just won't see any usage. But the benefit of the tracking system,

if everyone uses it and if we can compel contracting parties to use it, that may be possible, because contracted parties, according to phase one are required to respond to requests.

If we can establish the policy or the fact that requests coming through this tracking system are deemed to come from the original requester then we can probably compel usage. That assumes that the technical implementation of it is not overwhelming for small registrars. So we're going to have to react to what the GNSO Council says, what the Board says and what the ICANN Org say on whether we go through with his proof of concept system. On the accuracy scoping team, work is proceeding. I see Justine has her hand up.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Alan. Just briefly, in partial answer to Olivier's questions, I can confirm that this preliminary report that Alan's presented on is on the agenda for the GNSO Council meeting on the 14th of April. I am unable to tell you what's going to happen, because it really depends on what Council wants to do. But I can certainly provide an update after the GNSO Council meeting on the 14th. But the idea is as far as Council has been informed, it is meant to discuss the preliminary report and see if they can come to some next steps, including providing an update to the ICANN Board on the status of the work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will note that the small team has met with the ICANN Board twice now and so it's not as if we're throwing something over the wall that

surprises them. They have been involved in some of this discussion and the direction we're going in.

That doesn't mean they'll accept it. But there has been good communication, far better than I've ever seen before in this kind of discussion and this kind of activity. Thank you. That's a good sign, by the way. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Alan. I actually have another question for you. And just looking at the big picture. And perhaps for you and Justine, looking at the big picture, is anything on the critical path of the subsequent procedures related to this? Or should I say the other way around? Could this have an impact on the critical path of the subsequent procedures for another round?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think so.

JUSTINE CHEW: Neither do I.

ALAN GREENBERG: Accuracy, obviously, if subsequent procedures comes up with something—but it wasn't something subsequent procedures really talked about. So I don't really see this as heavily involved in you know, if we come up with policy, we're obviously would obviously apply to new

gTLDs going forward, but I don't see a direct connection other than they're gTLDs and therefore, policy is applicable to them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Any delay or anything like this will not delay a wider process?

JUSTINE CHEW: I concur with Alan, I don't see the direct relationship per se. And I really can't see SSAD delaying the new gTLD program or the next round.

ALAN GREENBERG: But let's be honest, the timeframe of the new gTLD program is rather long and is probably only going to get longer as we look at details. So I don't think that's the worry.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. But not to say that one is the prerequisite of the other. That's what I mean.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, Justine, I wasn't disagreeing with you. I was just talking to Olivier. I don't think it matters all that much.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. I think by the time the new round comes along, we would have solved quite a few problems. Hopefully, anyway,

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure we're that good at solving problems these days. But yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan. and Justine. I just wondered, but Okay, super. In any case, let's move on. Are we are not going to delay this call any further. We actually—I didn't think we would reach that late, but we have. But we're now on policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Claudia Ruiz.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, Olivier. I don't think we have too much to go over at this point. So I think we can skip this part of the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Jonathan, thank you. So we can now go to any other business then. Agenda Item number eight. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, thanks, Olivier. Sorry. I was just trying to stick my hand up for the previous agenda item. I believe one of the public comment opportunities has opened up. I don't know why it still says pending. The one on the RZ LGR 5, I think that's ongoing, already open. And I believe the ALAC small team on the EPDP on IDNs is actually looking at this. So maybe we will come back with a recommendation as to what to do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, thanks for this update. And we'll have this updated for next week. Any other comments or any other business? Well, it looks like we're finished for the day. Oh, that's certainly been an excellent call. We're not too late, just a few minutes beyond the official timing. Thanks very much to everyone. Our next call next week—now, we do have a little problem with the rotating times that are usually 13:00 or 19:00 UTC. Could I please ask what we are going to do?

YESIM SAGLAM: Thanks so much, Olivier. So as you also mentioned next week, CPWG call if we hold it at 19:00 UTC, it's going to clash with another call that Jonathan will need to be attending. So what I could suggest maybe just in order to stick to the rotation, maybe we can push the call for one hour later, and we can hold it at 20:00 UTC instead of doing another 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much, Yesim. And I'm told that for some people, doing twice the same time is a little tough. And I agree. I see Marita has put her hand up.

MARITA MOLL: Yes, I have, Olivier. Thank you. Just on this topic of setting agendas. I want to point out again—and I did it in another meeting—that I am not getting the weekly roundup of the meetings that are coming up since ICANN 73. I haven't seen one. I'm kind of dependent on these for

meetings that float around like this. And I'm wondering whether they can be reinstated Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much, Marita. I think it's staff that does these. I don't know who is in charge of those. Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Hi, everyone. And thank you, Marita. Yeah, we have actually heard you on the previous call, we've taken that into account. We are actually in the process of updating our announcements. But since that's taking a little bit of time, perhaps Yesim, we could continue with the weekly calls. And then as soon as possible, we'll be able to implement the updated version that will include other information as well. So it's a much more comprehensive update for At-Large. That's what's in the planning process right now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for this, Heidi. I must admit, I also like those weekly advanced notices just being able to pick things early all in one page. So looking forward to receiving it again. I am not seeing any objections from anyone regarding moving the 19:00 UTC call to 20:00 UTC, in which case, let's proceed forward with that next week then, and have 20:00 UTC which is one hour later than our usual evening UTC call, but still respects the rotation as much as possible.

And with this, I'd like to thank everyone for having attended today and in particular, our interpreters and the captioner who did a fantastic job

yet again. All of them did a fantastic job. Jonathan, anything else to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's it for me. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks, everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, wherever you are, and continue, of course, the discussion on the mailing list. Goodbye.

YESIM SAGLAM: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]