CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 27th of July 2022 at 19:00 UTC.
	In order to save time, we will not say the names of the participants. However, I will note the apologies. We have received apologies from Heidi Ullrich from staff, Marita Moll, Pari Esfandiari, Satish Babu, Priyatosh Jana, K Mohan Raidu, Steinar Grøtterød, Alan Greenberg, and Claire Craig. From staff, we have Chantelle Doerksen and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. We have Spanish and French interpretation. Our Spanish interpreters are Claudia and Marina, and our French interpreters are Aurélie and Camila.
	I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking when taking the floor and to please speak slowly to allow for accurate interpretation. We also have real-time transcribing on the call. I will put a link in the chat. Thank you all very much. I now pass the floor over to Olivier.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Claudia. Welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which we hope will be perhaps a bit shorter than usual. Since, as you have heard, we've had quite a number of people that have checked out during this week. We'll have our workgroup and small team updates going pretty quickly, as a number of them will not have any updates at all. In fact, I'm just looking at it right now.

It looks like we've got no updates in the small team updates, although we have 10 minutes. After that, some of the participants that are on the call, the alternates, are to provide us with an update perhaps. Then we'll have our policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Chantelle Doerksen. Then Jonathan will take us through the Board advice register update. And of course, the ICANN75 with the ALAC Board advice stats report, and we'll have Any Other Business immediately afterwards. Are there any changes, amendments, additions to the agenda at this point in time?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, it's Jonathan. This can be in Any Other Business. But I think one of the things we might want to talk about is the plenary topics for ICANN75 because the At-Large response to the survey is due on Friday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Jonathan. That's fine. That's noted. That'll be in Any Other Business then. Thank you. So with that one amendment on the policy topics, let's have a look at our action items from last week, both of which relates to this call. But one of them is, of course, the 22nd July deadline for the public comments for the initial report on the Transfer Policy Review Phase 1, and we'll be going through this in our relevant agenda item on policy comment update. Because the 22nd July is an internal deadline, the closing date for the actual consultation is the 2nd of August, I believe. So that's what we have as action items. Are there any comments and questions? I suppose not since we'll be speaking about this shortly.

So we can swiftly move to our workgroup and small team updates. In there, we do have no update for the Transfer Policy Development Process, although I know Steinar isn't there, but Daniel Nanghaka has joined us. Daniel, I wondered whether there was anything that you wanted to contribute at this point in time. I think I saw Daniel Nanghaka, didn't I? Maybe I did not.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Olivier. I thought he joined. He probably dropped. But Daniel did respond to me that he does not have an update and they are going to be on a break, so he probably won't have one for the next month.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, all right. Then the next one of course is the Expedited PDP on IDNs and there too, there is no—yes? Sorry.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Sorry to interrupt again. We have Lutz with his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Lutz Donnerhacke, go ahead. You have the floor.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: During the yesterday meeting, we started the discussion of the change of ownership proposal, so all the differences which can be updated in the domain, owner name, e-mail address, or something else. And we

got some homework for the next week's meeting, the last month before the vacation break.

Steiner has put a link into the mailing list requesting some information up to next Monday. So, I urge you to read through the questions there, very easy, about the discussion. This change in the name of an owner or the address or the e-mail address of an owner is relevant so it changed to the ownership or is just the correction of an error, a typo or something like this. We need to find some information about typical changes which are important and typical changes that are not important. So if you know some changes of name, for instance, by changing of legal state or by noting that something was wrong because you had an accent on a special character in your name and it was mangled during the registration process and you wanted to change it, please provide such examples in the document. That will help us very much because even if you know if there is a possibility to the very small change points to a different person or different organization so that there's a potential in misuse of correction for spellings. That would help a lot. So if you have some information, please put in document before next Monday. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lutz. Let's open the floor for questions or comments. I am not seeing any hands up. I did have a question, Lutz. You mentioned change of name. Would that also be including change of e-mail address?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE:	Yes. There's a separate question. We have questions for change of name for real persons and for organizations. We have questions for change of e-mail addresses, which are truly important because change of e-mail addresses, what the e-mail address can be used for obtaining Authorization Codes, and so the first step in hijacking a domain name. That's really points that need to be considered. On the other hand, if you don't change an e-mail address because you lost the e-mail address to somebody else, you may run into the same problem if you do not change it. They need some examples. That's all.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thank you very much for this. So if anybody has examples, please e-mail Lutz or e-mail the mailing list. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. Thank you for the update. Let's then move on and we can go to the Expedited PDP on IDNs here to—
CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Hi, Olivier, This is Claudia again. Satish said they do not have an update. He's also an apology for today's call. I am not seeing anybody else in that working group on the call.
	Olivier, if you're speaking, you're on mute. Jonathan, it looks like Olivier dropped. Would you like to take the floor for a moment?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Okay. Yeah.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who is next? I guess Alan has said that he doesn't have an update on either of these topics either, right?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: He had a brief update but he had a last-minute clash. So he's going to give it on next week's call. So we can you go on to agenda item number four. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I don't think there's a lot to talk about number four this week. This is going to be a short meeting. We probably should have started by saying this is going to be a short meeting. We don't have a lot on our agenda because it's summertime and a lot of things are either on hold or moving slowly. So we've discussed the Transfer Policy initial report and we actually put out a comment on that. Is that right, Chantelle and Claudia? I think you were finalizing this document.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Correct. The document has been finalized and it went out to vote to the ALAC members and that's going on now. The vote closes on Saturday. Once that vote has been concluded, we will send it out on Monday. What Olivier mentioned was correct. The deadline is the 2nd, so we are in well within time. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Yeah, so this shouldn't say "still under development," I guess. What public comments do we have for decision that are coming up?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: For July, that was it. We have a few coming up in August, which I'm sharing on the screen right now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just the registration data policy implementation?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: For CWG, correct. Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So that's probably worth going over when we have Alan and Hadia back in the saddle on that particular topic. I know that at the next meeting, we're planning on having an NCAP presentation but not this week. So that may be all there is to section four, Olivier. Are you back online? I see a chat from you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Jonathan. I'm back through Zoom. They just tried to call me through the phone and it doesn't seem to work.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You sound fine on Zoom.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine. Well, let's then continue on Zoom. I had Zoom problems earlier yesterday. Anyway, right. Technology is not that great. And yes, that's gone very fast indeed, Jonathan. So now we're going to move on to agenda item five, the Board advice register update and ICANN75. I see your name there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I guess I might be the owner of this. But Chantelle has done some work looking at this spreadsheet, and so what I wanted to do was have Chantelle provide a little bit of an overview of this document and how to read it so that people can understand the Board parlance about our advice. The reason for this is that we're likely at ICANN75 To have a face to face with the Board, and one of the topics of discussion might be clearing up any remaining confusion there might be about the advice that's currently in front of the Board, the status of where things stand, and whether or not there's anything new that the Board needs from us. So this document I think is sort of the core of that. So I ask Chantelle to go over the document and perhaps give us a little overview of what the document looks like and how to read it. It doesn't need to go over everything but just to give us an introduction to the document itself. Chantelle, hopefully I'm not putting you on the spot.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: No. No worries. Hi, Jonathan. I hope everyone can hear me okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: So this is something that is the current way that ALAC advice is tracked. One of the things that obviously we're going to be working on is ways to improve this. So just looking through this document, it tells you where things are from an action required perspective. And then if you could go to the second tab, I think that's the one that might be of more interest. That takes you through the different phases of advice from the Board perspective, from Phase 1, where they received and acknowledged. Phase 2 is a state where ICANN is working to understand it and they might reach back out to ALAC. You've seen this with some of the clarifying questions.

One of the things that we're looking to do is to track how to improve that process. As Jonathan mentioned, one of the things the Board is doing is, as a standing agenda item, to have advice as part of the discussion topics for the joint meeting at ICANN75. This is something that's new, but if it works out, this is something that's going to be a standing item for At-Large at every ICANN public meeting to discuss with the Board if and when it's necessary. So it's not required but it gives At-Large and the Board the space to hold those discussions. I'll stop there just to see if there are any comments or questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll be first, Chantelle. So looking at this summary chart as it stands right now, there are 40 items that are in the Understand status, is that right?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: That looks to be correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So our interpretation of that should be—and, Avri, I don't mean to put you on the spot but maybe you can help us as well. Are those things that we should go over, that we should be expecting something from the Board on? Or are they things that we've responded to and the Board just hasn't had the chance to fully digest our response yet? What does that really translate into in terms of the status of those 40 items?

AVRI DORIA: Hi.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi, Avri. I apologize. I didn't mean to put you on the spot on this call. But it just occurred to me that you were there and—

AVRI DORIA: Right. I'm here. I'd have to get back to we're really just starting to prepare for this. But knowing that this is part of the discussion, I'll certainly make sure to explore it and see if I can come back with an answer at some point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

AVRI DORIA: Sorry. That's the best I can do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No problem. I just wanted to make sure how we were interpreting this document, how best to read this and what that meant, what Phase 2 really meant. It could be that Phase 2 actually could have some phases, because presumably Phase 2 is what generates documents from the Board, clarifying questions from the Board to us, and then we provide responses. I guess that iteration could happen more than once potentially.

AVRI DORIA: I'm sure it could. I'm sure everything can have sub phases. If we don't have any outstanding documents with questions—and we probably don't have any outstanding questions at the moment—and things are getting talked about constantly in the various caucuses and such that relate to the issues. So I would say at the moment that yes, things are just moving along, but I haven't checked on the status and I don't really know it. We are just starting to prepare for the meeting. So I'll try to have a better answer for you the next time I was able to sit in on one of these sessions. But at the moment, I don't.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, no problem. Again, apologies for putting you on the spot.

AVRI DORIA: No problem.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead. Sorry, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Put me on the spot anytime, and if I don't know, I'll say so.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, sounds good. Chantelle, perhaps go ahead and verbally clarify the distinction you were making in the chat.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thanks, Jonathan. This is something that I'm still catching up to speed with as well. But to clarify, my understanding is that those 40 items reflects advice that's broken down into pieces. So multiple items could be from one piece of advice. I note Cheryl's point—and I think this is important as well—that a single advice might have 20 points.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's definitely the case. Particularly, Subsequent Procedures is one that was a fairly comprehensive document that we sent to the Board. That may be a topic of discussion as well, what the most effective way is to provide advice. So yeah, I imagine it is items within a

piece of advice. I wanted to sort of get clarity on what this phase meant. If there's still in an Understanding phase doesn't mean there's still something for us to do or we've done our work and it's still being absorbed by the Board. That's all.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Jonathan. If I could just jump in. That might be something that Avri could clarify or that might be a good discussion topic for the ALAC Board meeting, if I'm not over speaking. Just because it's something that seems to be missing in this document is where are these pieces in between and what's the status, I think that's what we're working to try to understand. Pun intended, is that it's Phase 2. But as Cheryl noted, SubPro has probably more than 30 pieces, and I'm sure there are things similar with the SSAD.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right. Yeah, the purpose of this particular agenda item is just sort of to parse this document a little bit in gaining understanding how we might make use of it internally to generate action items and things of that sort, so things that we need to take care of. I will note— I'm not prepared to make a presentation on today—that one of the things that we provided as advice in the context of Subsequent Procedures was sort of general advice, which is do the CCT review recommendations and the Board I think rightfully came back to us and said, "Stop referring to those in the abstract and make new advice about what those priorities are, given the current world." I think that's still on us to come up with perhaps—I don't know what to call it—a new

version of the critical aspects of the CCT recommendations, perhaps in coordination with the SSR2 folks, and certainly trying to loop back in some of the old CCT folks to see what's been overtaken by events and what still represents critical advice from that CCT review. So I think that's still as an action item for this group, just not one that I'm prepared to lead today. Christopher, please go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Good evening. Just a simple point. If there are 40, there must be a list. Somebody has counted them. So the immediate answer to this current discussion is that under these numbers, there should be a link to a list.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Chris, there is. It's right here in this document.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I see.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The list is there. The question is just really what that phase represents, if that makes sense.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I thought I'd find it in the chat.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's there.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: As far as SubPro is concerned, I'm personally impatient to hear what the Board is going to respond to the many, many points that Justine and colleagues produced on the SubPro advice, which Cheryl has also referred to in the chat. Thanks. Lovely to talk to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Christopher. Avri, you've got your hand back up. Go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: Quick point on the Understand. It isn't just a literal understanding of the advice. It's understanding it in all the context that it's falling in. So a lot of the Understand is being done on our part two, and it isn't just "Do we understand what you've written?" Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Got it. Thanks, Avri. I imagine that was the case. I think we just need to make sure that we're not letting anything drop through the cracks that you're hoping to get from us. That's really my primary objective in trying to parse this. Sébastien, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. I just wanted to know who split the document in two pieces. I guess it is staff possible. We may think about doing that ourselves, it may be a little bit different, the result. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Sébastien. I'm not entirely sure what you mean by that. But this document is advice that we've already thrown over the [inaudible] to the Board. So this is their attempt to kind of document where that stands so that it feels less like a black hole, as Christopher was expressing, and more giving us an understanding of where things stand. There might be an opportunity for us to prioritize some of these things. Because now that the numbers are kind of high, there might be an opportunity for us in our meeting with the Board to give some thought to escalating things. But if I understand correctly, a lot of it is sort of in subcommittee within the Board and there's not a prioritization issue there. So yeah, I think the purpose of this document is to understand where the Board stands, so I don't know why necessarily we would try to redo this ourselves. But maybe you could clarify your thoughts on that, Sébastien.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	My thought was not to redo, it was for the future. Why is the Board taking care of our documents is pretending to proceed? It may be worthwhile to do it within our group and to deliver in two pieces. That is just a thought because I feel that it may end up a little bit different, the document. Maybe not.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	When we produced the advice in the first place, you mean?
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, that's possible as well. It's clear that the Board created this document as a result of how we were submitting advice in Pro's form and wanting to parse it. So making our own decisions about how to parse it could be valuable, for sure. Olivier, go ahead, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Having followed the process of advice on both sides of the wall, not on the Board but for the process, every bit of advice that the ALAC produces goes through this pipeline with this giant machine with a revolving, very sharp knife that chops it into little bits, into bite-sized bits, for any of the processes actually using feedback on some of the ATRT feedback, etc., and it's then put in tables. That's the standard way of ICANN doing it. If we don't want our advice to be chopped up by this big knife, then we need to chop up our advice ourselves and produce our advice in bite-sized points, which have been suggested in the past, where we just have to stick to specific bullet points, one for each of the points that we want to make, and perhaps even arrange it in sections and subsections. It makes it a bit harder to read because it's much more concentrated, but it ends with the same type of document the end of the day.

But that wasn't the reason for me to take the floor. I also wanted to ask regarding the Summary page. There was a mention of closed. Item closed in system, and I'm not seeing that anywhere in the table itself. That's a past Phase 5. I guess there would be open advice items, and underneath that, there wouldn't be closed advice items or what?

Because I can see this table in the Summary page does not show any of the advice that might fall through the cracks or be otherwise rejected by the Board as such, or not explicitly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So you would like to see additions to the Summary page that show—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't see an addition. I see there's already an addition which says closed, item closed in system that actually that doesn't exist. It doesn't exist on that table.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So there's nothing in this document yet that the Board considers. This is all their processing documents. So close would mean that it was either approved and forwarded on to staff for implementation or rejected, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Well, for us, I believe it would be a lot more helpful to find out if it was closed with a yes or closed with a no.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you see what I mean. Accepted or rejected? I think that makes it a lot clearer than just saying closed, and then we have to do the work to try and find out if it really was or really wasn't, or maybe a little, maybe half, or we're not quite sure. We're seeing the 40 mark. For several years, we've seen a high mark like this. I can see that two have been processed in a year. So I'm hoping that within 20 or 30 years, we'll go through that number. And we won't to take another 30 years to try and find out if it's closed with a yes or no.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. A lot of this might come back to our conversations with the Board and internally about whether or not we want to change the way that we submit advice or something like that. So I think that's a broader conversation. I was hoping just to get Chantelle to give us kind of an overview of how to read this document. So maybe just as a final step, Chantelle, if you can go into all items and show what this looks like that rolls into this summary and talk us through that, then we can take an example of one or something like that, and we'll table the conversation for today. But at least we got to start on looking at what the Board is having to deal with in terms of the number of items that we have included in our advice.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Sure. Thank you, Jonathan. I've highlighted one of the rows. I've highlighted row nine. I'm not sure if it just shows on my screen or if it shows in your Zoom. Okay. Well, at least one is highlighted. Thank you, Claudia. I thought this might be a great place to start because it goes to

the Subsequent Procedures discussion. So it's under Phase 2 which is the Understand Request phase. And if you scroll over, one thing I think we need to do is we'll freeze the top row so you can actually see the actual column names. But it's Phase 3 and then it's Deferral Reason, and then it's the ICANN Org department. So right now, it's with GDS or Global Domains and Strategy. There's no actions listed as being taken and there's no description of the Understanding of Request.

This is something I am still not familiar with. It says Action Required and a Case Number. This is something I think I still have to learn, so maybe there's somebody here that understands this more than me, but under the Understanding of the Request, there are notes there for what the Board's understanding is. So it looks like it's not needed for this request. However, if this is something that At-Large decides they want to speak with the Board more just because, for example, closed generics I know is an issue, it might be useful to review that column J, just to understand what the Board's reactions are on any given topic. I hope that makes sense.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It does, Chantelle. I think that column J is the result of the exchanges we've had with the Board so that that text usually finds its way into a communication to us and to which we respond, which then hopefully creates some more clarified version of what goes into column J. So that process is already kind of in place. If it's working, right? So that was part of my putting you up on the spot was whether or not, for example, our response to the clarifying questions to the Board how those were absorbed would be helpful to understand whether or not there was

something remaining for us to do to create clarity on any of the advice that we had provided as part of Subsequent Procedures, for example. So yeah, that's the problem is that at some point, it has to be out of the Understanding phase. That's the only real way that we'll know that we've had enough round trips with the Board that we're on the same page about what it is that we're requesting. Avri, please go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: I would also think, because I'm assuming we'll check on this and confirm it, that after we've had some interaction between At-Large and the Board on this, or ALAC and the Board, or the CPWG and the Board, that this would be updated. You would read this and say—because their understanding is not our understanding, and so you would start to have a clue if we didn't understand. So hopefully this tool can also be used that way. As it gets updated, you can look at it and say, "Gee, they still don't understand what we're trying to tell them," and then you would know. So it's not just there as a marker but it may be there as something to look at and say, "Yes, they understand it correctly," or "No, they do not understand it correctly."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I think that makes sense, and maybe we can build in a trigger or something like that. But when the status changes, it signals to us that we need to explore that column and make sure that your understanding is our understanding. As far as Olivier is concerned—sorry, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: This is all still very much developing as it goes along.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, sure.

AVRI DORIA: It gets better and better at tracking and being transparent at where we're at. It's a work in progress and I hope that gets more and more useful. I think the meeting that we'll have will be a good opportunity to talk about what bits are useful and what bits aren't and what bits could be better. Thanks and I'll shut up now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Don't worry. We welcome all of your inputs. I guess that's part and parcel to that. Olivier is concerned that there's so many of them and that it takes a long time. Is there something to be done on our side, which would be at this point now that there's so many items, should we be engaged in a prioritization effort similar to the accepted review recommendations prioritization efforts in terms of trying to express to the Board somehow the priority items for us or the time sensitive items or something like that. I wonder if that exercise is worthwhile? I guess my question was to you, Avri. Sorry, I didn't make that clear.

AVRI DORIA: Sorry. I was tossing an answer into something on a chat and I did not properly catch the answer because I said I'd shut up. Sorry, I stopped listening. Please, can you repeat the question?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No problem, no problem. My question was whether or not, given the volume of these items now that they've been parsed, and Olivier's concern about the overall time the way that these are aging, at some point it becomes similar to the issue we have to the workgroup and review team recommendations. Should we engage in some sort of prioritization effort to press some things to the top of your agenda based on things that we consider to be time-sensitive or higher priority advice items?

AVRI DORIA: I guess, certainly, if you've got a prioritization, it's good I can say. On a lot of these things, for example, on many of the SubPro ones, they may not get resolved until the decision is made on that because we're going through weekly and biweekly discussions on this issue, that issue, or the other one, and still a lot of discussions to go. And in many cases, certainly until we have the ODP, which is taking a lot of these things into account, and then the post ODP discussions, a lot of these things may be at a kneeling point where we think we know where we're going with the answer. But until it's all put together, I'm not sure that there'll be a lot of answers on SubPro issues, the issue I pay more attention to than any of the others. That may be likewise on a lot of things. As we've done advice that relates to recommendations, we have to make a decision on. We're in that period now where we're taking all the recommendations and all the advice as better and the realities of what can be done and is much more difficult to do and going through that.

So, many of these answers won't actually have fully emerged until that decision point. I don't know if—

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes a lot of sense, Avri. It occurs that maybe there's another status for paused or pause sending ODP or something like that.

AVRI DORIA: But it's not paused. It's not paused. They're constantly being discussed. There's an amazing number of discussions. Schedule within Board meetings is almost as full as schedule within community meetings in terms of issues and the question of the week, and so on and so forth. So it's not that they're paused, they're in process.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you. Olivier, go ahead. Thank you, Jonathan. I absolutely welcome the system and the table, Avri. I think it's a great step forward. My concern is whether this could also be prone to filibustering.

AVRI DORIA: Filibustering? I don't know of anybody in the Board that filibusters or we don't have any filibustering in votes. So I'm not sure what you mean.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Filibustering by prolonging debates. And I'm not saying it's the Board that would prolong the debates, but the advice that is being received might end up prolonging debates. You mentioned that the Board is

considering each issue, and of course there's the advice from the ALAC but there's zero advice from the other groups. If you end up having one table for each one of the other groups plus the ALAC plus all of the other inputs that one receives, I can understand that the Board is going to have a real hard time being able to move forward. I'm a little concerned about this.

AVRI DORIA: That's helped us a lot in keeping track of. We tend to have point discussions on a topic in a particular meeting and we'll come into it usually with a briefing that tells us, "You've got this advice from ALAC on that. You've got this advice from SSAC. Here's the recommendation. Here's the history. Here's everything that's happened in the last 10 years. Here are the open and pending issues, let's talk." And then we talk for a while, and then staff goes back to the ODP. So there's very much a dynamic. Staff is really quite good at giving the Board the briefing it needs to go into the discussion. Sure, the more different points of view, the more bits of advice that are contrary or slightly contrary that one needs to balance, the longer it takes to talk something about. I wouldn't consider the filibuster with so much as you saw it fit to give that advice. Now we have to understand it, take it into consideration with everything else, and come out with something at the end. It does take time but I wouldn't think of it as a filibuster.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not saying it happens. I'm just mentioning that whether this could be prone to filibustering, some parties wishing to prolong the debate.

I'm just concerned that the advice is likely to span—the rate at which it's going at the moment or appears to be going at the moment will span several Board compositions, which means that some Board members will leave and new ones will come in. I wonder whether the process will have to be rebooted at that point or whether it can continue in its way.

AVRI DORIA: The staff is really superb at providing continuity so that when we sit down to discuss an issue, we pretty much got the history and everything. Sure, someone could use the advice system as a DoS attack, one can imagine. But I wouldn't say that anybody's doing that. I think all the advice from whoever it's coming is given in good faith, and no one's doing it just to clutter up the discussion. It's the advice people have to give and it's the place that must be dealt with and understood.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Avri, and thanks, Olivier. Obviously, this is a start of a longer conversation that can feed into our conversation with the Board as a whole at ICANN75. So we will work on the right sort of vocabulary for some of the status items and make our recommendations, and then maybe take on the idea of prioritization or revisiting things to make sure that they're all still relevant and things of that sort, as I've seen come up in the come up in the chat.

That's probably enough on it for today. I wanted to just let people know this document existed and have us walk through a little bit of how to read the document. So if there aren't any additional questions about

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much for this. Jonathan. Thanks very much, Avri, for having taken part in this discussion. Very helpful. Again, I'll say sorry to put you on the spot and to criticize, but I think this process is really great that you guys are actually improving your Board processes and so on. It's great to see movement on that.

how to read the document, then we may be done with this agenda item, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. Jonathan. Thanks very much, Avri, for having taken part in this discussion. Very helpful. Again, I'll say sorry to put you on the spot and to criticize, but I think this process is really great that you guys are actually improving your Board processes and so on. It's great to see movement on that.

Now we are going to the next part of this call, and that's Any Other Business. That includes also a discussion about ICANN75. Over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Staff, are you able to somewhat quickly bring up the proposed plenary topics? I may have caught you off guard on this.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: No problem. Which one? The one that the Planning Committee was discussing, Jonathan? Which are you referring to?

JONATHAN ZUCK: The Production meetings I'm referring to, and for which we received a survey. I might be able to—

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Give me the link. I'll pull it up right away.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know if it's a link. So I apologize. Olivier, go ahead. I've got to find the basis for this conversation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: While you guys are looking for the document, if you're able to find it, I have put in the chat a link to the ICANN75 Meeting pages. You can see here the draft schedule is being put together slowly from Saturday, the 17th of September all the way up to Thursday, the 22nd of September. So long meeting is the Annual General Meeting.

Then there you will see also the Planning Committee working on the suggested topics and groups to meet at ICANN75 and has got the questions for ICANN75, the workspace where we as a community have to suggest topics to ask for specific SO/AC, Org and Board meetings that will take place between the ALAC and the CEO, and ALAC and the Board, and ALAC and maybe with the other SOs and ACs. We often have meetings with the SSAC, sometimes with the GNSO.

So these will just appear there in sub groups. I think it's important for you to be aware that the earlier you put your suggestions—and you do need to login for confluence—but the earlier you put your suggestions in there, the more likely it is that these might be picked up and then end up in those meetings. Did I kill enough time while explaining this, that you found the—

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I thought what I found was the survey. It looks like it has a front end to it. But then I think we can just not submit at the end perhaps to look at the questions. Just fill in stuff, Claudia. We just won't hit Submit. But I just wanted to put this in front of this group for discussion.

So this first question lists all of the plenary topics. To clarify, a plenary topic is only special insofar as unconflicted. So there's actually been some discussion about whether or not we even need one at this session at this AGM because there's a lot going on. But that's really the distinction of a plenary is that it's an unconflicted session, there's nothing else going on at the same time.

So if you look at it, there are a couple of things that we submitted. One is evolving ICANN's multi stakeholder model, which was a suggestion from Marita, and perhaps even involving Brian Cute back again, who headed up that effort. There's this notion of Universal Acceptance that I believe was Hadia's plenary suggestion. I don't know, Hadia, if you want to say a couple of very brief words about that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, sure. Thank you. I haven't prepared anything for this, but the idea is having the ICANN meeting in Asia Pacific. I think a topic like Universal Acceptance is very important because it addresses the issue of a multilingual Internet. So the idea is to present the topic from a point of view of having a multilingual Internet that promotes diversity and inclusion, and addressing mainly Universal Acceptance from that aspect rather than the aspect of—of course, it does include accepting all

domains, but the main focus is actually inclusion in a multilingual Internet. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. There's also a proposal by the GAC to combine a couple of different topics that that we've had fairly recently. One is understanding reputation block lists, which I think was our session, and then evolving the DNS abuse conversation to make this distinction. On the global planning call, if you want to call it, I don't know how to distinguish our Planning Committee call from the ICANN Planning Committee call. They often call it a Production call. There was pushback on this because they were fairly recently plenary topics, and particularly the compromised versus maliciously registered is very recent. But that was a proposal from the GAC.

Another proposal from the GAC was about Internet fragmentation. There was a little bit more friendliness toward that topic, because again, this idea of more closed portions of the DNS.

Then there was another, finally, ICANN's Bylaws in conflict or harmony with national law, international and conventions with the GAC proposal as well.

So it's on us to reply to this survey as the At-Large community. But before doing that, I wanted to just bring it up for discussion here on this meeting because this survey is due on Friday. Siva, please go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN: Of the topics proposed, three are ongoing topics discussed in one meeting or another or continuously, like very important topics evolving multistakeholder model and Universal Acceptance as being repeatedly organized by the Universal Acceptance group. Then Internet fragmentation is also discussed in various forums. It's not that they shouldn't also be discussing and the other perspectives. But two topics stand out of which ICANN Bylaws and conflict—Bylaws, are they in conflict with natural law? That headline could still be improved. But that is a topic that is needed. We have always discussed about Bylaws' limitations, and this is the first time it's brought up as a topic as a cross-community topic. But whatever the intention, the topic could be better defined and the title could be tweaked a little, and then we can introduce this topic and discuss that. That's my view. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, Siva. Thank you. So just because it feels new—I mean, obviously, we've had some sessions that Joanna has led in terms about what's going on in terms of local and international law. But perhaps it hasn't been thought of as an overall plenary before.

Other thoughts from the group? Please don't be shy. I see some comments in the chat. Does anybody want to escalate the chat into a verbal discussion? I see John is mentioning that the DNS abuse thing is good. That's obviously been a frequent topic of discussion and an ongoing one as Siva has put it. That distinction is one that is increasingly coming up because there's kind of a consensus view that it falls within the purview of the contracted parties to deal with maliciously registered domains more so than with compromised websites that might be better

handled by hosting providers. So that's why that distinction is becoming increasingly important and trying to figure out how to make that distinction is certainly one of the challenges that John is highlighting. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. I think we need to answer the question is what is the goal of the plenary session? The fact that we have just one, therefore, we need to pick one. It's the only place where we will be able to discuss with our communities or inside of our community one topic. And the question is which one we can make progress in discussing with the other. It's not just a topic where we will be happy to explore our point of view, but more where we will be able to move from our point of view the other participant, and where we can have a real impact on moving things within ICANN. If not, if it's just a talk show, I am not sure that it's a good idea.

Therefore, I don't have really answered but I love some topics, multistakeholder particularly, but I think it will be discussed in each and every group. I am not sure that if we set up this meeting, there will be any link between what will be happening in each and every group and what will be happening there. Or it may be one topic where we need to be all together at the same page to start thinking in each of our group how to evolve the situation, and for that, even if we have already done one such meeting in EURALO monthly roundtable, but the Internet fragmentation could be a good topic to see if we agree on what that means and how we can start from that to work together. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Sébastien. Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:	With Universal Acceptance, maybe we should add because we're looking forward, I think, to the next round the acceptance of new gTLDs, not just the IDNs. I mean, there is a broad topic there. I think it might be interesting as to the extent to which new gTLDs are being accepted and are being used. I'm actually really more interested in Internet fragmentation just because it's something that we really haven't talked about and it probably is a new interesting topic. Other than that, I think the others are fine. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Holly. One of the issues of importance is that the numbers have really changed in terms of the UA numbers. The survey numbers have really changed in terms of acceptance of new gTLDs. They've gone up significantly as IDNs that are still lagging behind to this point. But the new gTLD, those numbers are more like—and maybe Siva can correct me if I'm wrong—but I feel like they're more like 50 or 70% acceptance, which would surprise me as well, but I think real progress has been made on new gTLDs. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	I happen to like the understanding reputation block list because I think that's a new take on a DNS abuse conversation that we haven't had, and that's also a big problem with the abuse. And then the Internet

fragmentation, if the GAC is suggesting it, I think they're going to take a different perspective than what we usually have, and I think that would make it interesting than the ones I've heard before. But I would say those two, besides the stakeholder model, would be really interesting ones.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Judith. Any other thoughts from anyone? All right. If there's not more conversation, then we can be done with this topic and you can cancel out of the survey itself, Claudia. Thanks for jumping into it. We'll fill it out offline. I think that was probably it. I'll go back and review the chat after the call. So back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Thanks for this interesting discussion on preparations. Is there any other business in addition to this? I'm not seeing any hands up. So I think we've reached the end of this call. We need to check when our next CPWG meeting will take place.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Olivier. In sticking with the rotation, our next call will be next Wednesday, the 3rd of August at 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wednesday at 13:00 UTC it will be. Thank you very much for this, Claudia.

Jonathan, just one thing to note. I have seen quite a lot of things in the notes in the chat regarding the previous topic. So I might just let you know that perhaps you should have a look or could staff save the chat and send you a copy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm way ahead of you. Yes, definitely I got to go through—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've seen a lot of votes and things going on. I see Greg Shatan has put his hand up. Greg, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I'd like to suggest that at our next call, we pick up our discussion of closed generics. We had quite an active discussion of it last week. I don't think we are far from having exhausted the topic. So I would like to return to that, if not next week, then at the same time as that is something I think we need to work through. The first conversation was more introductory in nature or reintroductory in nature.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Greg. Thanks for the suggestion. Jonathan, I guess we can table that for one of the future calls in August.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, for sure. We have the NCAP presentation next week. So I think the key would just be to put this conversation after that so that we don't

impinge on it. But I think it's something we need to continue to talk about as we get closer and closer to Greg's participation in that trilateral with the GNSO and the GAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Thank you for this, and thanks for the reminder, Greg. So that will be again on the At-Large radar. So either next, next call of the call after for that soon. I'm not seeing any other hands up. Greg, is that another topic you'd like to bring forward? Okay. Thank you. So I'm not seeing any further hands.

I just need to thank everyone on the call. But in particular, the interpreters and the closed caption person who did a wonderful job yet again. I know that at least I have had to resort to the help of the closed captions. Usually when you close your browser, there's going to be a little survey, so please answer the survey if it's been helpful for you. Jonathan, is there anything else you need to add for today's call? We're a little early so we're doing well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I expect you to be early. So I think it's okay. We shouldn't be afraid of giving people time back. So thanks, everyone, and continue to enjoy your summer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, and goodbye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]