YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 5th of October, 2022, at 1300 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call.

And just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Judith Hellerstein, Christopher Wilkinson, Alan Greenberg, Mouloud Khelif, and from Justin Chu. From Staff side, we have Heidi Ulrich, Chantelle Doerksen, and myself Yeşim Sağlam, presence on today's call at the moment.

And for today's call, we have Spanish interpretation and our interpreters are Lillian and Marina. Unfortunately, we do not have French interpretation for today's call. However, we will be requesting the transcription using the English recording. And one final reminder, as usual, we do have the real time transcription service and I'm sharing the link here with you. Please do check the service.

And before we get started, my final reminder will be to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and welcome, everyone to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. One thing to mention is the real time transcription has been mentioned a number of times and the link is currently in the chat if you just joined.

It's always helpful to have a transcription when we speak fast or when the connection isn't that great. So this call today is going to see the first call after the last ICANN meeting. We have quite a full agenda because the policy topics keep on piling up even though we were never absent in any way.

So we'll start with our work group and small team updates. Thankfully, a number of them are on a hiatus at the moment, but we'll certainly have an update on the RDA scoping team, registration data accuracy scoping team, and the SSAD, the system for standardized access and disclosure operational design assessment.

After that, our policy comment updates are going to take a large chunk of time as we have to catch up on various, what used to be upcoming policy proceedings, but what are both upcoming and for a decision. And in particular, I'll draw your attention to the ones that are marked with CPWG as the ones OFB-WG are for the operational finance and budget working with that will move tomorrow.

Now beyond that, after this, you will have the ICANN75 debrief with Jonathan Zuck. And of course, all the members that went to the ICANN75 meeting, both online and offline. And then any other business.

EN

So at this point in time, is there any additional agenda item or are there any amendments we should make to the current agenda items as listed?

I am not seeing any hands up. Okay. So the agenda is adopted as it currently is on the screen, on your screen. And of course, you can connect to the agenda by clicking on the relevant link to the agenda, and that will allow you to also look at the different tabs for the work group updates and reach the public comment update, etc. The next thing is the review of the action items.

Now they are dating a little bit. They were from the 24th of August, which seems to be a long time ago, a very long time ago. And the public comment proceedings have two things. Is that really correct, the 24th of August?   I have to read out the page. Maybe that's been changed. But there were a few. Yes, okay.

So the only one that remains on the public comment proceedings is that the volunteer is needed to review the RDAP, that's the registration data access protocol. Contract obligations, public common proceedings requested to open before the end of August. We're going to see all that during the policy comments discussions.

All the other action items are complete. Does anyone wish to comment on these?   I am not seeing anyone putting their hand up. So that means we can proceed forward and we have one agenda item that I didn't mention earlier, and that's a leadership transition. Jonathan Zuck has been very secretive about this. So let's listen, over to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier, and thanks, everyone. It turns out that I'm being punished, I mean, promoted to be the chair of the ALAC, and I'm getting used to that new role, but I'm not going anywhere. I'll be on every one of these CPWG calls. CPWG will always be home for me, but it seems appropriate to give Olivier more dedicated co-chair for the CPWG.

And so I guess I would like to ask all of you to join me in welcoming Hadia Elminiawi as our new co-chair for the Consolidated Policies Working Group. And so that going forward, it will be Olivier and Hadia that are managing the call. And I'll just be lurking and talking too much probably. So thanks everyone for making the CPWG such a great home. And give Hadia all of your attention and respect. And that is really the whole announcement. And I'll give it back to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking and thank you for the years of dedication you've given to this working group. I must admit that I really, really enjoyed working with you as a co-chair and of course, on all the matters of At-Large. And it's first, great that you're now getting also a taste of the overall chair of ALAC. Good luck. It's the right of your life as I called it in the past, but it's fun. It's good, but it's very interesting indeed and certainly eye opening on things.

So great, and I can't think of a better person to be able to hold that position. But also I can't think of a better person to be able to hold your seats, taking over your seats on the CPWG and I'm really, really glad that Hadia has stepped forward and is ready to take on such a role. It's a constant work to follow the pipeline. And I thought, Hadia, did you

want to say a couple of words?   And the sort of great words that you start thinking, this is great, it's going to be fun and easy. And then you'll tell us the reality of it a few months from now.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I just want to thank you all for your trust. I look forward to this role. Of course, with your support, the support of all of you. So thank you again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, thank you for stepping up. And with this, I guess that we can say that we can move on to the next agenda item. Moving on, as I said, it's a busy, busy, busy day. And the first thing we have is the work group and small team updates.   Now the transfer policy review and the expedited PDP on IDNs do not have any update.

However, there are updates for the RDA scoping team, the registration data accuracy scoping team, and also the system for standardized access and disclosure operational design assessment. And guess what? Alan Greenberg unfortunately was unable to make it to this call. And so in order to be able to take us through this, Hadia has again step forward and we'll be able to update us on both. Over to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. So first, in relation to the registration data accuracy scoping team, so Alan has sent to us his notes. So he says, as previously noted, the internal report of the group was submitted to the GNSO Council.   And as he had previously announced, Michael Palage, resigned as the Chair of the Group. At the

wrap up meeting in Kuala Lumpur, the ALAC appointed Michael to be a member of the group representing the ALAC. So previously, Alan had occupied one of the seats and the second ALAC seat was vacant. So now we welcome Michael Palage to that seat.

So that's the first update. And then the second update also it's from Alan. It's in relation to the standardized system for access/disclosure, operational design assessment. So Alan again says that as previously noted, the group had suggested that instead of the standardized system for access/disclosure as recommended by the expedited policy development process Phase 2, the ICANN implement a free system that accepts and tracks disclosure request. This is exactly what the ALAC recommended to the Board.

So ICANN org produce a proposal for such a system, currently known as the WHOIS Disclosure System, and has said that they could implement it in 2023 if approved by the GNSO Council and the Board very quickly, or else the resources would be designated for some other projects. So the deadline is 10th of October. So Alan says this is an almost impossible deadline, but it currently does look that they will make it.

So the group has met twice since Kuala Lumpur and another two meetings are scheduled. So Alan again says there appears to be relatively little disagreement among all of the group members. So those were the two updates that we received from Alan. Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Hadia, for these two updates. Let's now then open the floor for any comments or, well, questions to Alan, perhaps

not, but certainly if one has questions that they want to ask on the call and maybe somebody else could answer them having followed those processes. I am not seeing any hands at the present. No? Okay. Well, thanks for these updates, Hadia.

And that means we've gone through the work group and small team updates already, which was rather fast, but now we have the policy comment updates. And there, there's significant chunk of work to be done as the pipeline has filled up during the ICANN meeting, and in the run up to the ICANN meeting, and the week after the ICANN meeting.

So for this, we will have Chantelle Doerksen, Hadia Elminiawi, and Jonathan Zuck. And I need drafting team members to provide us with an update and shepherd us through the whole process. Over to you, and perhaps I should give the floor to Jonathan on this or? Well, no. Chantelle, I think, usually starts up. So Chantelle. Over to you, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Olivier. This is Chantelle. What we were thinking is that I would quickly run through the high level, the summary of what's open and what's coming up and then pass the floor over to Hadia and possibly Jonathan to go into a little more detail if they would like to explain the specific public comments that pertain to the CPWG. So we'll go with what is open at the current moment, or upcoming, excuse me.

So as you can see on the screen in front of you, there are six slated to open in October. Only one of them is currently open. And that is for

the NPOC charter amendments, which closes on the 14th of November and that is assigned to the OFB-WG for consideration.

There are two in October for the CPWG to consider, which would be the second level reference label generation rule for Armenian, Cyrillic, Greek and Latin. And then the second being the EPDP report on specific curative rights protections for IGOs. Those are two that hopefully Hadia and Jonathan can speak to.

One thing I did want to flag in terms of upcoming public comment proceedings is we now have the NCAP study 2 report opening in January. And so where that was supposedly to open within the upcoming weeks, that's now been moved.

Now moving down to the public comments for decision that are currently open that the CPWG would need to make a decision on whether to proceed or not. We have the first one, which is the Universal Acceptance Road Map for Registry and Registrar Systems. And I believe Satish is also helping the CPWG out by doing a first pass.

Then number three is the proposed amendments to the base gTLD RA and RAA to add RDAP contract obligations. This might be of interest and we'll leave it to Hadia and Jonathan to talk a little bit more about what that is. Then number five is registration data consensus policy for gTLDs, and we believe that one will be of interest. That closes on the 31st of October. So we've got a little bit of time.

And then finally, number seven, proposed amendments to the SLA for the IANA numbering services. And that closes on the 4th of December 2022. And for this one, we assume the CPWG would be the best fit, but

EN

also note that the OFB might have interest in that as well. So with that, I'd like to stop and turn the floor over to Hadia and Jonathan to dive into some details. Over to you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. We can start with the Universal Acceptance Roadmap for Domain Name Registry and Registrar Systems. This proposes how to test registry and registrars systems for Universal Acceptance Readiness based on the Universal Acceptance Readiness Framework. The study focuses on the technical details for the systems used by registries and registrars to manage domains under gTLDs. So it's basically a technical matter. As you mentioned, Chantelle, Satish is going through this. Jonathan, would you like to say anything or maybe if Satish also would like to tell us a few words about this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I would go to Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Hadia and Johnson. I hope you can hear me. This is Satish for the record. So, yeah, as Hadia has mentioned, this is a very technical kind of a report. It lays out the testing plan for the registries and registrars for the Universal Acceptance readiness. So they have also actually did the testing plan and they also tested it on actual systems, two of them out of the mini software that is already in existence.

So I am going through it currently, and there is one gap, which the report acknowledges the gap. This is the ideal variant aspect, which has

a fairly significant impact on the test plan. But it is out of scope for this version of the test plan.

So in that sense, the test plan is incomplete. But also the fact that the IDN process is still happening in the EPDP, and we don't have a policy yet. So it may be okay for the time being. But then when the variants come into the root zone, then this will have to be modified at that point. Thank you, and back to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. For the pilot Holistic Review, I noted that this is not for the capacity for the Consolidated Policy Working Group. However, it is actually policy. The Board is seeking input on whether the draft terms of reference of the pilot Holistic Review are seen fit for purpose and whether it is tailored to the community's expectations based on recommendation 3.5 of the third accountability and transparency review team.

So the Holistic Review will have implications on community members participating. In this pilot Holistic Review participation is up to 18 months. It's for a period of 18 months. Also Supported Organizations Advisory Committees and Nominating Committee. So it will impact all of these. I stop here. And, Jonathan, I give you the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. You don't need to give me the floor necessarily. I think we can go ahead on this call and just skip over the OFB items and just focus on the CPWG ones because there's a plenty of items to discuss.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So third, we have the proposed amendments to the base gTLD registrar accreditation agreement. And the proposal management specified the operational requirements for providing registration data directory services by RDAP, which puts some certain obligations to provide RDDS via the WHOIS protocol. So this one closes on-- yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is the replacement for those that don't know. This is kind of the replacement for the WHOIS protocol as the means by which people requesting information, registrant information will request it. And it's what enables a requester to use a single interface to request this information even though the data is stored on individual registrars. And so the requester doesn't need to go around from registrar to registrar.

We can request the data through a central API. But it does require that the registry and registrar community implement this API so that this new system can be used. It's definitely central to the new world of registrant data. I don't know Hadia, do you got an opinion on this? You've have looked at this since you've done so much work on the WHOIS area, but that's the brief overview for folks that aren't aware of what it is.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan. Yeah, this is Hadia for the record. It's basically replacing the WHOIS protocol with a new protocol, which is the RDAP.

So I haven't really looked at this into details, but I could do that and let's see if we would like to comment on this. Any thoughts?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You've got a hand up from Steiner.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Oh, I'm sorry. I did not see it. Steiner, please go ahead.

STEINER GRØTTERØD: Hi. This is Steiner for the record. Honestly, this change from WHOIS to RDAP in the contract is truly more technical in the sense of the wording has to be replaced. The WHOIS has to be replaced by the RDAP service. I have read through this, and it's okay, obviously. There's nothing to do for the registrars and the registry operators because they have already been forced to do the RDAP repository stuff. So it's purely a text in the registry agreement and the registrar accreditation agreement. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Steiner. Yes, I tend also to agree with you. This is only changing from the WHOIS protocol to the RDAP protocol and nothing more than that. It specifies operational requirements. Olivier, you have your hands up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Hadia. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and indeed what Steiner said is primarily what I was going to say, with the addition that, obviously, the WHOIS protocol and the RDAP protocols where developed outside of ICANN and the IETF. We had a big part to play in those.

So at the end of the day, there is not very much to add apart from to get all the paperwork in line so that the RDAP will be the next protocol that will be used. I guess It is important however because obviously it follows procedure and it's also important that there is consensus that there is a switch from WHOIS to another protocol.

But as you all know, WHOIS was suspended because of the GDPR issues to start with. At least WHOIS is not suspended, but the information that is provided by WHOIS, which cannot have sub information depending on who is the requester, etc. The protocol that is there does not allow to differentiate between all the classes and redact, that's the one, and so on.

So the information ended up being redacted, which for many it is completely useless. Hopefully, having the RDAP and being able to implement whatever is going to be implemented based on that protocol will allow for the right information to reach the right people at the right time, and for the right reasons. So that's it. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Olivier. I think also from a purely technical point of view, even if the General Data Protection Regulation of Europe, this had not came out and no changes would have been required. The RDAP as a

technical protocol is a more capable protocol than WHOIS, which previously existed. If there are no more hands up we can move to the third one, which is the registration data consensus policy for gTLD.

 And that one the public comment proceeding is intended to gather input on the implementation plan for the EPDP prospective Phase 1 recommendations adopted by the ICANN Board on the 15th of May 2019, and the Phase 2 priority 2 recommendations adopted by the ICANN Board on the 21st June 2021.

So the proceedings are intended only to gather input about the implementation plan, to know if the IRC groups were able to correctly interpret the recommendations set forward by the expedited policy development process team. This closes on the 31st of October. And I had previously looked into this, and I think we could actually provide a few lines in that regard. So we have also received some input, I think, from the GAC that we could also look into. So maybe next time I could present the input that we received from the GAC in that regard.

Okay. So seeing no hands up. We can proceed to the following one, which is the proposed amendments to the SLAs for the SLA for the IANA numbering services. And this one closes on the 4th of November. And it basically relates to the service level agreements related to the IANA numbering services. I'm not sure that this actually requires an input from us. But I leave the floor for any comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is that an old hand, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is a new hand.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Olivier, thank goodness.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And this, of course, is again to do with the service level agreement for the IANA numbering services. One of the things in that process is when the service level agreements were originally signed up, no one had any -- well, there were some ideas as to whether service level agreement needed to be, but some were not completely known because data had not been connected with regards to the speed at which some services needed to be implemented, the accuracy, etc., because this was all IANA functions that were running by themselves and there was no oversight over these.

Now, several service expectation and agreements were put together, and one of the clauses in the process is that this would be regularly revisited and checked and in a consensus with those people that are involved with IANA and the various groups that are looking at the IANA services and making sure that they are undertaken properly. Those agreements would be changed from time to time so as to reflect the reality of things. And that's just one of those cases where they are doing the, I don't know if it's the annual check or the periodic check on these, and making some amendments.

Unless it's really likely to change the world, especially when it comes down to stability of the system and of the IANA services, I don't really think the ALAC would have much to say about this. It is highly technical. We might wish to ask our technical expert if they have any specific view on this.

But I haven't glanced over them. I usually trust the professionals that are most closely involved with it in knowing what the service levels are supposed to be like and what service levels can be achieved given the limitations that one had with regards to the earth being round, the day being 24 hours in length, day time being light and night time being light, this sort of stuff, things that we don't really have much control over. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Improvement around malicious registered domains. And so they released this study that I recommend everyone to take a look at. They're looking for feedback, but it's not an ICANN product. So there's not a public comment process. But even as early as November, they're talking about adding names of registrars and registries where there's particularly high concentrations of maliciously registered domain. So that's going to be interesting to see. We've been calling for that for some time and we're now going to see it from an outside source.

Also, the DNS Abuse small team of the GNSO, if you recall, we worked together on answering a questionnaire from that GNSO small team on DNS Abuse to give our ideas about topics on which the GNSO might focus. And so we have been waiting for them to get back to us. And I

think we will probably, at a future CPWG meeting and perhaps even the next one, try to get a presentation here to the CPWG on the recommendations that were made by the GNSO small team.

But briefly, there's definitely some movement. In particular, there was a recognition by the small team of some of the challenges posed by both registrations. Like registering a lot of domains at once because a high percentage of maliciously registered domains are registered as part of a bundle of domains. And so that one of the recommendations from that team was to look into that further.

So that's something that came directly from the At-Large Community and was taken up by the GNSO small team. So there's definitely some excitement I think around some of that. There's also some talk about some bilateral happening between ICANN and the contracted parties to give contract compliance a little bit more power to deal with bad actors.

And so there's been some discussions around that. And beyond that, the next version of DAAR is the tool that's been produced by ICANN is going to include some work on predictive analytics, which is something that we've called for, for some time as well.

The ICANN is not yet ready to share the details of that, but Justine had a meeting with John Crane and talked about the fact that that is coming. And that's something we've been calling for as well because it's in use by dotEU, for example, and might help registrars with some tools to enable them to identify malicious registrations before they happen. So there's a lot of movement going on in the DNS Abuse space, and I think that we can take some credit for that momentum. And now we need to

see how some of it turns out and what improvements can be gained from it.

So that was a big issue. And then the other big issue for us as the At-Large is the subsequent procedures. The upcoming round of applications for a new, I get distracted by John's chest. I have to just not look over there while I'm talking. The subsequent of procedures is the rules and procedures that will go into the next round of applications for top level domain names.

And we are deeply involved in that discussion as well. And so some of those things are just starting those discussions, but there are two big discussions of which we are apart, including the work on applicant support and designing what a new applicant support program might look like.

As many of you know, and in particular Aubrey who's on this call knows that the actual applicant support program that got put in place in 2012 was a pale shadow of the one that folks had hoped for. And so looking for a more robust program, perhaps with concrete goals around actually getting some applicants from underserved regions.

And then another area in which we're participating in the conversations is on the issue of closed generics. And so we'll have Greg Shatan representing the At-Large on what are now high level discussions during the GNSO, and GAC, and the At-Large on this issue closed generics, which is about a company trying to register a top level domain that is an industry term.

So one of the most easy versions of this is dot book being attempted to be registered by, say, Amazon but only for use by Amazon. So that when you went to dot book as a user, you wouldn't necessarily know that it was run by just one vendor. You could be confused. It could allow for some monopolization of a market if the TLD is successful. So finding some compromise between getting rid of these altogether and what are the criteria under which of they're allowed are the conversations we're going to be involved in as well.

So those are two big things that are going on with the next round. Finally, I would say the third sort of big overarching topic for At-Large is two topics that are kind of related. One is Internationalized Domain Names and Universal Acceptance because these two issues work hand in hand to complement each other.

And we had a session, we had a policy session at ICANN75 around Universal Acceptance and the work that ICANN is planning to do to try and improve Universal Acceptance and what some of the challenges are. We heard from Edmon Chung about it.

And we also shared a preview of some results of a survey that the At-Large conducted as an ABR. It was just a survey that went out to field in the Hindi belt, in India, and the survey was in Hindi and asked questions about whether or not users there would prefer to see IDNs. We didn't call them IDNs in the survey, but and we got some positive feedback about that, that there might be greater access to government services, there might be more likelihood for small businesses, or register domains, etc., if those domains could be fully realized in their native script.

So I think we got some good feedback from that survey, and we'll continue to develop those results and put out a final report here before long. So I feel like those were some highlights from ICANN75, but I would also welcome anyone that was involved in a session to raise their hand and speak up on issues of interest and concern from ICANN75.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I see no hands up. It's Hadia for the record. So one of the sessions that we had was a capacity building session. It was about the art of leadership. It was an interactive session where we used the Jamb Board and allowed participants to put in their input to the Jam Board. We did not use a presentation, but we used the Jam Board instead. So that was one of the sessions.

There was also I could also briefly talk about the AFRALO statement. It was about the importance of Universal Acceptance for a multilingual Internet. I don't know if there is anyone else who would like to share their thoughts or maybe talk about any of the sessions that they have attended. Marita. Yeah, there is also the survey. Maybe Jonathan, you could talk about the survey?

MARITA MOLL: Hello, Hadia. I heard my name, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, Marita. Please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Did I put my hand up by accident?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Go ahead. Go ahead, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks. Marita speaking. I didn't put my hand up, but I would say one thing I really enjoyed doing this time was attending everyone else's sessions with the Board and listening to the kind of questions and concerns they had that we're addressing and we're asking the Board for their reactions too. I thought at the GAC level, they had one question to the Board about evaluation and doing more qualitative evaluation, which I thought would be of interest to us.

And now, I think it was MCUC who were talking about recognizing volunteers and what more could be done to make sure that volunteers didn't get burned out or lost in the great massive information. So I thought they were both things that we could be interested in and maybe latch on to at some point. There are other things too, but I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. It's Jonathan here. I guess you reminded me that we did have some CPWG relevance discussions with the Board ourselves. Actually one of those discussions was about streamlining the process by which we interact with the Board. And because the amount and complexity of the advice that we give the Board, I think has increased

over the past couple of years and the specificity of that advice, particularly in the area of subsequent procedures.

And so Board Staff have done a lot of work to take our advice documents and break them into their component parts of individual pieces of advice so they can be addressed separately by the Board. The Board can submit clarifying questions to us that we can then respond to make sure the Board understands the advice that we're trying to give.

And I think some of that will inform us on the best way to submit advice. And it will also, over time, I think at least give us tools to understand the status of the advice that we have made to the Board as well. And so those are some of the important conversations that are going on with the Board in order to make the Board advice part of what we do as efficient and as effective as possible.

So I think that was a good and productive discussion with the Board. And so I think we thank them for that. And thanks for reminding me, Marita about that meeting because that's definitely relevant to this group. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond: speaking. And as someone who's been observing this for quite some time and have been involved with --

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Olivier, I think go ahead. If you're speaking, we can't hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you hear me?   Okay. So that must be Adigo again. Because I'm unmuted on my side. Testing, one, two, three.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: We still don't have Olivier. We can go to Sébastien and then go back to Olivier. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Hadia. Sébastien Bachollet speaking.   Just to say that if you want to know about what happened in other parts of ICANN during the ICANN75, we EURALO organized yesterday and it's now recorded without with participation of values constituency, Board Members, and so on and so forth. We discussed without yesterday and it give a good overview of the different element discussed, particularly policy with the GNSO, ccNSO. And then [CROSSTALK]. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Sebastian. Maybe you can share the link with us. Back to you, Olivier.

JONATHAN ZUCK: He just wrote that he is unable to, that Adigo somehow muted him. so he can't be heard.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: NO, No. I'm unmuted already.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, so Chantelle, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You've got a hand from Vanda though.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I don't know why I'm not seeing the hands. Vanda, please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Thank you. Just a minute just as I share of NomCom. You know, our last everyone that we don't know how in a couple weeks probably the application posted to the new position. So for ALAC, this time, this year 2023, we're going to have Africa, APRALO AFRALO, and LACRAL members. So please spread the word. And we need to have very good members to apply for those positions. It was the last years I have been in NomCom, the number of ALAC application was really few.

So we need much more incentive among our groups to encourage people to apply. We need the people that are interested in those areas. And please spread the word among your group. And as soon as the application will be posted, I will come back and ask for another minute to explain. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Vanda, for sharing this with us. And yes, please continue reminding us about the position. Olivier, I don't know if you can speak.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Hadia. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I'm now using Zoom. There seems to be a problem on a Adigo, the bridge between Adigo and Zoom. So I'm sorry about this, but nothing to do with me on this side.

Look, just commenting on the Board and the relationship between the ALAC and the Board, it's often a case of individuals on specific committees, and the Board is no stranger to this. And I think that thanks to the amount of work that's been done by several people on the Board, of course, Leon being a key item, but there are also a few other people on there that have been very pleased.

And well, checking what the ALAC was doing and pleased with the work of this community here, the relationship between the Board and the ALAC has improved. And it's really great to see that we've passed the point of just bring things over the wall and saying, "Okay, let's hope it sticks and let's see if we get an answer someday."

We actually have a full dialogue going on. And that's actually better than anything in bylaws or anything like that. What would be important, I guess, is to be able to make sure that even though we have a very friendly, ALAC friendly Board at the moment because of the members that are there, you continue being able to have that relationship, working relationship, good working relationship with the

Board and not even a relationship, but a natural whole dialogue, even if we were to have ALAC unfriendly Board members.

And I think that's probably what we need to work on to make sure that this is institutionalized and goes on after people have been replaced in various positions. So that's what I wanted to say. But it's really great watching this remotely. I've have seen and following to action members and credit goes to many people, including, of course, everyone, ALAC Chair as well who's done a stellar job as well. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Olivier. This is Hadia for the record. Vanda, this is an old hand. Correct? Okay. So if we're done with the ICANN75 debrief, I see no more hands up, we go to any other business. Olivier? Jonathan?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, Hadia, it's Olivier speaking. Thank you. And it looks as though there are no hands up at the moment. So that's it. We're done with any other business part of this call. Just to thank you and welcome you again to your first call, CPWG call as the co-chair. I still look forward to continue the work with you.

I'm sorry for having put you in the deep end. But guess what? It's always like this in At-Large, isn't it? You think you're going to be there going in softly, but no, you're put in charge right away. We have to look at the next meeting. And for this, we will turn over to Yeşim, I think.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: So much, Olivier. This is Yeşim speaking. So normally next week's call should be at 1900 UTC. However, unfortunately, that's going to clash with AFRALO monthly call. So in order to avoid the clash, I would like to suggest 2000 UTC for next Wednesday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 2000 UTC? Thank you, Yeşim. I think it's late for some people, but then it's only for one weekend. We do have this happening. We should have thought about that this week and then started with a late call and not had the clash next week. But never mind, that's okay. So 2000 UTC it is, next week. Is there anything else to add? Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Nothing to add from my side. Thank you so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Jonathan, for the last time I'll last you, if you have anything to add and the next time you won't have the ability to say anything, except a hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, thanks everyone. Like as I said, I'm really not going anywhere. So I'll always have things to add. But for today, I don't. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thanks very much. Thanks to our interpreters and the real time text transcription service that has saved me today so that I could actually

follow the call while being offline for a significant amount of time. And [00:56:48 -inaudible]. And welcome back everyone from the ICANN meeting. Let's have a great set of calls.

And of course, please continue getting involved with the working group on the mailing lists because that's where the work takes place. And of course, on our various weekly pages that are going to follow-up from today's call. Thanks very much. A very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are. Goodbye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]