

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 21st of December, 2022, at 13:00 UPC. We will not be doing the 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 the apologies from Daniel Nanghaka, Bill Jouris, Gordon Chillcott, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alfredo Calderon, Isaac Maposa, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond is expected to join us slightly late as he's on the flight at the moment? From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Chantelle Doerksen, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam. And I'll be doing call management for today's call.

And as usual, we do have Spanish and French interpretation, and our interpreters are Paula and David on the Spanish channel, and Aurélie and Jacques on the French channel. And we also have real time transcription service provided for today's call and I'm sharing the link with you right now. Please do check the service.

And before we get started, just a kind reminder 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 Hadia. Thank you very much.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you so much, Yeşim. This is Hadia for the record. Welcome all to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call. First, let's take a look at the agenda. And if you agree with it, then the agenda will be adopted. I will give you a few seconds. So, yeah, if we can scroll a little bit. Thank you so much. So seeing no hands up and hearing no voice, the agenda is adopted, and let's go to the action items of last time.

So the scheduling of this call, obviously, this is done. Public comments, start to open statement on initial report on the ccNSO PDP review mechanism. That's done. And you can all start looking at the wiki page. Start to create workspace for draft FY 24-28 Operating and Financial Plan and draft FY 24 Operating Plan and Budget Proceeding. That's done. You'll confirm that there will be no statement in relation to the final report from the EPDP on specific curated right protections for IGOs. So no statement is confirmed. And that's it. Let's go back to the agenda.

Yes. So now we have the working group and small team updates. We shall start with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process with Steinar and Daniel. We have five minutes allocated to this. I don't know who would like to start, Steinar or Danielle. so I give you the floor.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Yes. Hi. This is Steinar up for the record. Just some information, distributed to the CPWG mailing list, the report given by the Transfer Policy PDP Working Group for the final red line, close to final red line. And I will make a document available for other comments to this report.

The deadline for this report to submit back to the working group is set to January 16. So there is some work to be done and we do have the time, but please make a little bit some time for reading the report as distributed on the mailing list.

A few updates from yesterday's meeting. There was a small team that this among the registrars that discuss the recommendation 16 and 17, and that is connected to the transfer lock of after initial registration or after a successful transfer. And their proposal is to enable an opt-out feature to make the registrants possible to have an opt-out to not being locked out after initial registration and successful transfer. This is a little bit different than what we submitted to the public comment from At-Large.

At-Large recommended and have it kind of single that into the working group that we would like to have equal and same policies for all registrars, enabling this opt-out feature differs into that area. I have posted to this again the wording of the proposal. And by time you will have the possibility to comment this when we create the other notifications and comments to the red line version of the final report for the initial report Phase 1a, that's the name of it. So that's a short update from the Transfer Policy Group. Questions? If needed.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Steiner. Seeing no hands up. I will put myself in the queue. Okay. So I see Alan. Alan go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking. I haven't read your email, so I don't know the exact wording of the registrar. Also, I think I heard you say that it would be an option for registrant to opt out. Is that correct?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes. Meaning that the registrar enables an option for the registrant to opt out from the transfer locks?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Understand. My gut feeling before looking at the wording is that would be acceptable from my point of view only if there is, and I don't know how you specify this, really explicit clarity as to what they are opting out from. In other words, it's fine for a registrant to opt out from it, but we have to make sure that they really understand what they're opting up from. Other otherwise, you end up with confusing wording, which may make it sound more attractive than it is in reality to any given registrant. So that's my concern. But that's before reading the words. So I'll reserve formal comment while I actually do my homework. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you, Alan. That was actually a good point. I do understand that the registrars have to communicate this in a very delicate way. One of the things. I have added to the agenda for this meeting the proposed wording in the common field in the bottom of the agenda. So this small working group, they have concept one criteria is that when the

registrant is some sort of an established customer, this is the criteria for the registrar to enable this opt-out feature for the registrant.

So they have kind of limited even though the registrar will enable this opt out feature, they're kind of proposed to limit it to something called established customers. And that is the idea behind this, is that preventing domain jumping and hijacking, etc. So that's the rationale behind it. But your point in distributing a clear understanding to the registrants in the terms and condition and even better in the ordering process, that's a good idea. Thank you very much, Alan. Hadia.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Steinar. So I'm looking at the established customer definition. And it says who has previously received continuing services from a registrar for a period of more than 30 days. 30 days, that makes it an established customer. Is that sufficient?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

In my view, I don't like this idea at all.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

So if you've been there for 2-3 days, 30 days makes you an established customer. That's for me, like, I don't know.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Well, the 30 days of the initial registration is actually, that's no need to put that into too much discussion because the proposed transfer policy

is saying that domain name is allowed to be transferred after 30 days after the initial registration. So if you have been a customer for 30 days, you are anyway allowed to transfer it to the next registrar. This is more relevant when it comes to the phase after a successful transfer between registrars. That might be the case that the registrants do have an account, so to speak, at the losing registrar and also at the gaining registrar. And the gaining registrar can identify or classify this client as an established customer. Does that make sense to you, Hadia?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

It does. However, I don't think adding much. It's like an opt-out. I don't think making it only for established customers makes a lot of difference, only in one case, which you just mentioned. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I thought I had lowered my hand. My overall comment is clearly, I don't think 30 days makes you an established customer. It just means you had a domain with them once before. That doesn't mean you're a really experienced one. Clearly, we're going to have a comment on this. I think we need to go through the proper process, not try to do everything on the fly here.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Yes. And I think as I said, in my view, it's a little bit confusing for the end user. Because as you put into the chat, Alan, there are not that many that reads the complete terms and conditions for this kind of business. And it will be confusing that for some registrar, you have the option to

do something at a bit using another registrar, you don't have that option at all. I think it will be more user friendly, maybe that's not the correct word, but more user friendly to not enable this opt-out feature for this transfer locks after the initial registration and transfer.

However, have been said, it was quite interesting too that we had some sort of a discussion about the established customers and this could be of value when it comes to the Phase 1b when we're discussing what is to be seen as a material change that will trigger a transfer lock, the material change of registrant data that will trigger transfer lock. So it's kind of useful to have some sort of definition, initial definition on paper before when we enter that discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just one final comment. The concept that the user experience and all registrars should be the same, it is maybe nice in theory, but registrars continually come up with new services they offer people. You know, I should try to get next to dollar or two dollars or whatever a euro out of each registrant. So I don't think we can fix that problem.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

No, but I don't see the negative things that registrars to add services connected to a domain name. I don't see that at all. But just to purely fact, the flexibility and the competition criteria for the end users to change a registrar of record for a domain name, I think that should be very easy to understand, the same for all registrar whatever generic TLD you're operating in and that's it. End of story. Okay. I think our five minutes has passed.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much, Steinar. And if I may, I would just tell you a quick story that the Diplomatic Spouses Association in Budapest had a webpage and a domain name at some point in time. And that was overtaken by someone who actually put a page, like put content totally inappropriate. And two days, that was never able to be fixed. So I think we need to be careful when we actually think about domains are transferred. And in the end, end users do suffer for sure.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: A comment from Steinar here. Yes, there are cases that are connected to illegal or hijacking of domain names, etc. But so far in the generic space, it's at a minimum level. Having also said that we should make pauses that in a reasonable degree prevent this kind of illegal activity. But we can't prevent it by the policy. I think the key here is how the registrars are enabling them, maybe call it, control panels etc. I think that is the key to success. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Steinar, for this advice. Okay, seeing no more hands up, let's go to the EPDP for IDNs. We have no comments there today. So we have no time allocated for it today. The Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team, this is on hold until further notice. The SSAD ODA, we have nothing today also on this topic. Close generics, I believe we do have five minutes allocated for it. We have Greg Shatan and Alan Greenberg. I give you the floor.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. It's Greg Shatan for the record. We've been continuing our work. We had a call on Monday. We've been doing what is called asynchronous work, and had several members of the group proposed examples of hypothetical closed generics. And we had a call and a document where we've discussed the pros and cons of those proposals. The proposals were presented by their creators. And it enabled us to identify some of the pros and cons and pitfalls and options related to concepts of closed generics. And I think we have no more meetings for this year. We'll be back meeting again on January 9th and then we're meeting in a face-to-face in the end of January in Washington, D.C. And both Alan and I will be there. Alan, what would you like to add?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess I have a question for this group. Not necessarily answered now, although it would be interesting to get something. Some of the business cases that were presented use a closed generic, but there's no real benefit, no strong benefit using a closed generic. It would be used internally only within the company. I suspect in most cases no one would ever actually type in the URL. So it would be nice, but not necessarily of any real benefit. I don't remember the exact example, but I'll make one up here. That if you're using the system internally to manage inventory in your warehouses, it would be dot warehouse.

And I wonder to what extent should a requirement be, that there is no practical option, no real option other than using that generic word gives you a very strong benefit other than just it's memorable to the people

inside the company. And again not necessary asking for an answer now, although, any people who have thoughts would be interesting. My feeling is there should be a strong benefit to actually using that generic word not just, hey, it's nice and I like it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Alan, for your questions as well. So how do you suggest that strong benefit be determined or evaluated?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know, but at least it should be claimed and semi demonstrable. Jonathan has his hand up, I notice.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Thanks, Alan and Greg. I'm curious to hear other examples that came up and if any of them give you hope or if they all seem like unique cases or something like that. But In the case you're talking about Alan, it's interesting because I feel like what many in this group fear most is somebody getting too much benefit from having a closed generic.

And so it feels a little ironic to be critical based on not enough benefits to the applicant. I mean, it feels like trying to determine that and determine the degree of it, etc., is another one of those real tough scaling problems for this and that focusing on harm seems more

productive than trying to require that they show a benefit. That's just my first impression.

ALAN GREENBERG: To the ecosystem, it takes a potentially useful word for some real application out of the inventory. I'm not sure of the answer. I'm raising it because it wasn't clear.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Greg, I see you hand up. Please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Greg Shatan again, for the record. I think in response to Jonathan, maybe it's better to clarify it as a public interest benefit as opposed to what we've been concerned about, which is too much of a commercial benefit, or really a commercial advantage over competitors. So you're looking for a public interest benefit.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But, Greg, I think Alan's talking about something different. Because I don't think if you're going to get a public interest benefit from an internal domain--

GREG SHATAN: Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right. I mean, I don't know. I think he was just talking about, is there enough of a benefit that they would even want the string and why is it even worth it to apply for. I feel like that's what Alan was asking. I mean, looking for a public interest benefit to a close generic, I have a feeling there isn't going to be a compromise based on that, but I don't know. I'd be very curious to hear what some of these examples were.

GREG SHATAN:

We can circulate them to this group. One of them was, I think, dot lock, basically a biometric system where each second level domain was a person's unique biometric data. The one that Alan mentioned, I think, was called dot stock. In fact, that was that example. There is the OG of hypothetical dot disaster, which was mentioned as being hypothetically owned by the Red Cross and a number of others. Happy to circulate them.

And then just the last possible point is thinking that the one advantage from a security and stability standpoint of an internal closed generic being used only within a company's own kind of infrastructure is that it avoids name collision and that it's formally registered within the domain name system as opposed to just being chosen by a system administrator and then creating a possibility of a name collision down the road if that's delegated. I'm not sure how big an advantage that is, but having been in the NTAG group for a while, I think that at least that's somewhat of an advantage to tame the wild internal use of that created the name collision in the first place. Thanks.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Greg, and I go to Eduardo Diaz. Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. I need some clarification on the discussion because if I'm using example that Alan mentioned about dot warehouse and I'm using that within my company as insight, do I still need to go to ICANN to request to be that meant to be delegated to me if it's not being used outside my company? I need clarification on that to understand this generic, post generic. Because to me, if it's my company, I do whatever I want to do. It's on my company. I'm not sure I understand what's the difference here. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Hadia, I can answer that very quickly.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Go ahead, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Eduardo is exactly right and that was one of the points that was made, you can put up dot stock on your intranet just by putting a DNS entry in your own DNS without it being in the public Internet, and it would work completely perfectly. That's the whole issue associated with collisions that we're looking at. Of course, if someone else puts up a dot stock in

the public Internet, you couldn't get to it anymore in the future. But that's an internal matter.

So, yes, it could be done on your Internet without any problem whatsoever. But the question is, can it be put into the public Internet? And if you wanted to use it from machines connected outside of your corporation, it would have to be in the public Internet. If you're using it only internally on machines you control, then it could be done internally. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Alan, for your reply. I do agree with Greg that there is a great benefit in registering the name for the purpose of name collisions, just in case the name leaked out of your own network and those public. And the NCAP now they have policy development process in order to determine how do you actually determine which names to call name collisions and how do you identify those names?

And I think or I assume that we start by thinking that all names could actually lead to collisions. And then think, how do we get the names out of the list rather than thinking how do we put names on the list? So I do agree that actually avoiding name collision is in itself a good purpose. Thank you.

So any other comments or hands up? I see none. First before going to the applicant support, Satish would actually want to make an announcement in relation to the Universal Acceptance Day. So I would like first to give the floor to Satish and then go to the applicant support. Satish, the floor is yours.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Hadia, for letting me speak. So I would like to make a brief announcement on the UA Day, which was earlier announced in the last ICANN meeting. There is a change of date. The formal announcement will come out today, later today. And the date is actually 28th of March and the website that I just put into chat as more details on how to apply and all the other details. If anyone has any questions, please contact me. I'll be happy to get it sorted out, whatever questions that you might have.

And this is a good opportunity for us to organize the local programs with our ALSes, regional programs with the RALOs, and possibly there is a global event as well. So we will have more details come out later on the actual structure of the global event. The rest of it is open for us to apply and get some funding as well as other artifacts like videos and slide deck. So thanks very much, Hadia, and back to you now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much for this announcement. And let's go to the applicant support GNSO guidance process. And for that, we have Sarah Kiden. Sarah, you have 10 minutes. The floor is yours.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi, Hadia. Hi, everyone. I'd like to request staff to load the page for report.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sarah, this is Yeşim speaking. Would you like me to display the GNSO workspace?

SARAH KIDEN: No, the report page of the At-Large wiki.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay. I'm assuming it should be here. Yep. Okay. Here you are.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. Yeah. So go to ongoing discussion, please. Yeah. So, hi, everyone. This is Sarah Kiden for the record. We had our GGP meeting on 19th of December. That's two days ago. And I think we started this discussion about a month ago, and we have given updates in this working group. So during the last meeting, we had requested for an update from staff about the 2012 applicant support program. And we received the update that we had requested for.

So basically, the update we received is that a handbook had been developed at the time to help applicants understand what the new gTLD program was all about and what the applicant support program was. And applications were reviewed on three criteria. So the first one is public interest, that they offer demonstrable benefit to the public or suitable community group.

The other one was that they show financial need, that they lack sufficient resources to pay for the application fee and execute their project. And this meant that they would receive waiver on the

application fee by over 50%. I think I mentioned that last week. And the third one was financial capability, that they're able to manage the funds that they generate from operating the TLD and that they can continue to execute the project.

So the results, of course, is that there were three applicants in the applicant support program in 2012, dot Kids by the dot Kids foundation, dot IDN by name shop, and dot Ooma by Ooma digital limited. And of those three only one was successful. So you needed to meet all three criteria to be considered. So dot kids met all three, dot IDN did not meet any of them, and dot Ooma met two of the three.

We were told that there were, of course, a few lessons that have been learned from the process and something may change for the next around. So the first thing is that the applicant support process will begin before the regular application time to give applicants enough time so that if they didn't make it through the regular round, I mean, through the applicant support program, they could apply to the regular round. So what happened last time is that the process was happening at the same time with the regular process, so if you didn't qualify for the applicant support program, then you could not even put together an application. So that will change going forward.

The other thing is that in terms of outreach and awareness, I think the program would benefit from having a bit more information and a bit more awareness and just making it easier for people to understand so that they can meet their criteria, but also so that we can receive a bit more application. The third thing we told you is that right now, because

there are only three applications and one was successful, it's hard to analyze that data. Like, you can't do any analysis on just reapplication.

So it's hard to tell what success looks like by looking at the 2012 round beyond just saying there were three applications and so on and so forth. And the other thing is that not everyone needs support. So some people don't have to apply for the applicant support program, and it's okay that they can still apply through the regular program.

So we discussed other things. For example, we discussed if geographic distribution was metric that was considered in the 2012 round and we were told that it was not considered. But if we want for it to be considered for feature round, it's something that we can raise. Though it's hard. Again, we don't know what success looks like, but it's something that we can make clearer. And generally, I think we agreed that more guidance needs to be put into the process.

The criteria were not well established. So it just a public interest, financially need, and financial capabilities. It's not clear enough for people to be able to understand. So it's something that will change going forward. And the final thing is that our working group is actually not expected to review the previous process. What we are supposed to do is look at the tasks that we've been given from the GNSO and try to work with the tasks that were given.

So we also discussed tasks 3, 4 and 5 that we have started to discuss even the CPWG. Just as a reminder, task 3 is around prioritizing the metric. Task 4 is around identifying additional metrics, and Task 5 was around awareness and education. So I give an update, and my feeling is

that there's general agreement about the need to have clear objectives, what other constituencies were calling key performance indicators. So I know the GAC and one other group expressed the same need.

The other thing is we are obliged to consider the implementation guidance 17.9. If we want to reject some metrics, it's okay, but we have to explain why and give strong reasons why that has to change. Though we have an opportunity to give suggest additional metrics through task 4. Because task 4 is around providing additional metrics. And I'd like to request Yeşim to click on the link framework subtasks. Yes. So I had asked about objectives. I had given feedback from the ALAC and the response is that the staff has tried to create what they are calling a framework or a subtask to make the tasks clearer.

If you recall, I think, two meetings ago, Justin had asked if we can make the tasks more granular and easier to understand. So basically, what this document is doing is trying to break down the metrics into making them easier to measure. So the first thing would be around priority. If you look at awareness and education, then you look at number of outreach events, is it a priority? Yes or no?

Then how do you collect data about that particular metric? What are the measurement techniques that you would use? Who collects the data? Is that particular metric an indicator of success? What represents success if any? And what approaches do you use to measure the impact of outreach education and business case development. So we actually didn't have a lot of time to discuss this because we spent more time discussing the update from the previous round, but this is the part of the response to the question around breaking down the tasks into

smaller subtasks. I think I'll stop there for now. And if you have any questions or comments, I can take them. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much, Sarah, for this comprehensive update. So we have many hands up. So we start with Eduardo. Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry again. Yes, again, I'm trying to understand how these things fit together. And my question is not exactly to what Sarah said, but this applicant support, was that already taken into consideration during the design operational assessment for the SubPro training. I mean, is a part of that process too? This is a question to [00:40:19 -inaudible] can answer that.

JUSTINE CHEW: I can answer that if you let me.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. Just go for it, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thanks. I had my hand up next, anyway. So in answer to your question, Eduardo. SubPro, the PDP process of SubPro came up with recommendations regarding applicant support. Okay. And included in the recommendations as well as implementation guidance was this issue of metrics. Basically, the challenges that we discussed was that

applicant support program was designed late, it was introduced late in the day for the 2012 round, so it didn't get enough awareness. And therefore, we say that it basically led to just three applicants, which is not a good thing. Right?

So our argument is that if you want the applicant support program to succeed, you have to have an indication or an idea of what you call success. Therefore, metrics. Right? And what happens with the SubPro PDP is that it came out with recommendations and it came out with suggestions for metrics, but it didn't go into specifics about how you collect all these, what you can do with them, which ones do we say are a must, which ones do we say that, maybe we can disregard that. And those are the tasks that are being assigned to this particular GGP at the moment. So I hope that answers your question. So GGP is handling unfinished work, so to speak.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Thank you so much.

JUSTINE CHEW: You're welcome. Okay. So I'm going to ask my question. I put up my hand to ask a question. Sarah, this slide, oh sorry, this Google sheet that you have Yeşim showing us, this is the GNSO copy. Right?

SARAH KIDEN: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So I'm going to suggest that staff, our staff, create a duplicate. Because I'm going to say that the GGP wouldn't allow us even if this was editable, I don't think it's appropriate for us to comment on this particular copy. So if the At-Large could have their own copy, and then folks could just contribute as they see fit, then that's probably one way for you to get some input. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Justin. That is noted we will work with Chantelle to create a copy that we will use for our discussion. But thank you for the suggestion. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, thanks. I watched the webinar and I guess we're talking about a little bit later for the ODA in response to Eduardo's question. The applicant support came up, but the answer was, well, there's a group that's addressing it. So that ended up being basically the summary of the ODP findings on the on applicant support, which is that there's a group looking into it now.

But I wanted to say that I'm excited to see column G, which is actually a discussion of what represents success. And so if we do get a copy of this and we comment on it, I think that would be where it would behooves us to really put some thought into what we believe would represent success of these different metrics. Because knowing what to measure is one thing, what to measure it against, in other words, what value for that metric would be considered a success I think is a very important part of this exercise. Thanks.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Jonathan. Sarah, would you like to comment?

SARAH KIDN: Yes. I would like to actually ask Jonathan when he thinks we should start this discussion. So we have our next GGP meeting on 12th of December. And yeah, so when can we start looking at what success looks like for our group? Over to Hadia, sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Justine, did you want to speak?

JUSTINE CHEW: No. Sarah said 12 of December. 12 of December has passed. So I'm assuming she means 12th January.

SARAH KIDEN: Sorry, it's 12th December, 2023.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That just slipped right by. But then yesterday, I wish everybody a happy New Year in 2024. So pandemic brain. So we could have a dedicated discussion around it, Sarah, if you if you want to schedule a sense of thing, I think there would be some subset of this group that would be interested in participating in looking at how to fill in column G in preparation for that meeting or we could all wait for your group to fill

that in and then critique it either one. But if you'd like a dedicated meeting, I think staff can set it up probably in January at this point prior to the 12th. And we could get a little free flowing discussion amongst ourselves.

SARAH KIDEN: This is Sarah for the record. So just for the record, Justin is also an observer in the GGP. So I think for some of the things we can discuss together. So Justine, I don't know, what do you think would be the best way to handle it? Because you're also part of the GGP.

JUSTINE CHEW: I have to think about it. So why don't we have a chat offline and then we can come back with something?

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. That's fine. So we'll get back to everyone. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much, Sarah and Justine. I actually like Jonathan's idea of putting this matrix online so that interested people could start commenting on or filling in column number G, which is like what success looks like. Oh, it's Justine's ideas. Okay. Thank you. So I like this idea and I wonder if we could even do it right after this call. So we could have it open for all of us and we could start commenting until our next call and maybe we can discuss. And maybe you could also fill it and present to us what you already have. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. So maybe once I work with Chantelle to create our copy of the document- sorry, this is Sarah for the record- I can share it on the mailing list. Actually I don't know, because it's an excel sheet. I mean, spreadsheet is hard to track, but I can just put on the mailing list and we can start the discussion there. We shall let you know after.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So is it possible actually to have it on the Wiki page, and then everyone can actually start commenting there?

SARAH KIDEN: Yeah. That's possible. Maybe Chantelle should respond because she'll help with a lot of the behind-the-scenes work.

JUSTINE CHEW: Can I make a suggestion?

SARAH KIDEN: Yes, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: With the Wiki, it's probably possibly hard to target comments to different things. Because the wiki is such, you reply in a cascaded way. So you can't really target certain things. I'm wondering whether a Google Doc might work better than a Google Sheet. And it's not that

much content to just cut and paste onto a Google Doc. At least Google Doc, you can target where you want to make a comment, and we can just replicate this the columns A to G quite easily.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you, Justine. And I see also Chantelle's hand is up. So Chantelle, please go ahead.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Hadia. This is Chantelle. That was my first suggestion, was that we should create it as a Google Doc and not a sheet for the reasons Justin mentioned. Also, we'll take this Google Doc once it's created, and it should be within next the day or so. And we'll post the link on the GGP workspace, and we can distribute that as well.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Great. That makes sense. So you visit the wiki page, you find the link, you click on the link, you go to the Google Doc and start commenting. That's easy and job is done. Thank you so much, Chantelle. Thank you, Justine and Sarah. Any other final comments or thoughts that you would like to share with Sarah and Justine? Okay. So seeing no hands up. Let's go to the next agenda item. So we are done with the working groups and with the policy comment updates. Chantelle, I give you the floor.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Hadia. This is Chantelle again. For public comment updates. At this time, we just have the three public comment proceedings open that we've previously discussed. There will be no statement for the EPDP on IGOs. The statement for the initial report on the ccNSO PDP review mechanism is in progress. There is a link available in the workspace for anyone who's interested.

And the OFB working group has just started work on drafting the statement on the draft FY 24 to 28 operating and financial plan for ICANN org. And more will be coming about that in January. So if you're interested, please join the OFB working group. Hadia, I'll turn it over to you now for any comments or feedback you'd like to make.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much, Chantelle. So we have two upcoming public comments that have not started yet. And we have the initial report on the ccNSO PDP review mechanism workspace. We have agreed on our last call to actually provide a statement in support of the recommendations and ensuring the importance of making sure that end users are not affected by any kind of review mechanism. We have in progress the draft FY 24-28 operating and financial plan. That's with Ricardo and Holly. And if you want to participate in this team, please join the OFB working group.

I won't take much long now because we still have many items on the agenda. So let's go to our next agenda item. Unless, of course, you have any questions or thoughts in relation to the open public comments. Okay. So seeing no hands up we go to the At-Large policy

priorities for ICANN76 and I give the floor to Jonathan. Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Hadia. I don't know that we have a lot to report for ICANN76 for this meeting. There was a movement on the last production call toward adding some more sessions related to subsequent procedures, which are certainly the least potentially sessions in which we would be interested in attending. And so Gisella is going to be working hard to play whack a mole and figure out how to prevent conflicts associated with those new sessions so that we have a good balance between our own internal sessions and leaving room for attendance of these subsequent procedures sessions.

So we should hear the next couple of days, what was selected as a plenary, and that'll be interesting information. And then hopefully, we'll hear very shortly about the proposed topic of procedure sessions from org. And then at that point, I think there'll be more to discuss. But for now, the things are pretty much as they were last week.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you so much, Jonathan. And we go to our next agenda item, which is Subsequent Procedures Operational Design Assessment. And for that, we have Justine Chew. Justine, the floor is yours.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Thank you, Hadia. This is Justine for the record. So I've been asked to impact my impressions on the ODA webinar, the SubPro ODA

webinar, or actually should be two rows webinars. They have taken place in the course of last week and the week before. The week before was more of GNSO Council specifically, and then there were two community webinars last week.

Now I have to, first of all, confess that I've not studied the 400-page report of the ODA. I've had quite very little time, spare time on my hands, and whatever the time that I've had had to be prioritized for GNSO work. So I'm going to ask that you bear with me, but I will just perhaps try and indicate some key points. And then people who have actually attended any of the ODA webinars can probably add their input as well.

A couple of things first. One is the background of the ODA or the ODP. So the operational design process is something that the ICANN Board instructed ICANN org to undertake. And in particular, the SubPro ODA was actually to investigate issues, challenges, whether something can be done, whether something cannot be done, how much it might cost, how long would it take, what are the things that we need to look out for? It's generally on those lines. But in relation to the subsequent procedures, recommendations and implementation guidance that have been approved by GNSO Council, of course, that was coming from the subsequent procedures PDP, the policy development process which took five years to complete.

So this particular ODP, the operational design phase, is something new. It's the second one that's been done. Obviously, the first one was SSAD. And whether you think it's good or not, you should understand that it has actually made the process of examining recommendations more

transparent. And when I say that, I mean, the 2012 round, this was done without community input, without really [00:57:03 -inaudible] reporting done by ICANN org to the community. So it wasn't done structurally, but it wasn't done in an open, not in this manner that has been done this time around. So that's the benefit of it.

But having said that, there are a lot of things that are still up in the air as far as I'm concerned. And I think we will need some time to actually study the report a bit more and the implications, especially of the bits that pertain to issues that are of interest to ALAC and the At-Large. Right?

Now the thing also is that the ODA, the output of the ODP process, which is called ODA, operation design assessment, which is that 400 page report that I mentioned, the target audience is actually the ICANN Board. All right? So it's been prepared for and it's been submitted to the ICANN Board. But as I said, part of the transparency process, ICANN org has conducted community webinars to basically give an overview of the report, focusing on certain bit, which would probably attract more attention than other things like how long is it going to take until the next round of applications open? How much money are we looking at spending? Those sorts of things.

So having said that, there isn't going to be a public comment process tied to this ODA. Because it's not a recommendations report. Therefore, it doesn't follow the process that GNSO adopts for public comments or even the ICANN Board adoption. Well, the ICANN Board has not specifically said that they are not going to open a public

comment proceeding, but we should proceed with the assumption that it won't be.

But having said that, we need to also understand and maybe we need to put inquiries with ICANN Board or at least Staff supporting ICANN Board, as to their timetable for coming to a decision on the ODA. Okay? So the thing is the ODA represents what the ICANN org thinks about how to run the next round in context of subsequent procedures, the recommendations of subsequent procedures. And I said before the ODA is targeted to the ICANN Board, because the ICANN Board asked for it, basically.

The ICANN Board now has to look at the ODA and decide on whether it's going to adopt or whether it agrees with the ICANN orgs assessments, whether it's going to adopt the suggestions that ICANN org come up with for different things. And it's quite intense. Just intense. And so we don't know what the Board is going to do at this point in time. That is, there is good and bad. So the good is that it would give us time to examine the outputs to see if we want to examine them in context or against the advice, the previous advice that we've already given to the Board, the ALAC advice.

So a couple of things that I have in mind is, like, we can go through the ALAC advice to see whether the ODA has tried to address some of the concerns that we post to the ICANN Board. If not, then what do we do about it? If yes, do we accept it? Do we agree with the suggestions of ICANN org? So that's one way of doing it. So we need to understand also the timing for the ICANN Board when might they look at coming up with the decision so that we have time to actually prepare advice or

even have a couple of calls with ICANN Board possibly to discuss our concerns.

But before then, I think we really need to spend a little bit of time to examine the report and come up with questions or request for clarification on things that may be not so clear or maybe not detailed enough for our purposes. And if there are such questions, and I believe there would be, then we may look at possibly scheduling a call, a special call with Karen Lentz's team, the ICANN ODP team to run through those questions and hopefully get them to answer those questions. So that's the sort of the process that I'm looking at in terms of the way forward.

As to the actual ODA and some of the things that were raised in the ODA webinar itself. Okay, so let's start with some good things. The ICANN org has highlighted the fact there are outstanding things that the ICANN Board needs to look at, including ALAC advice, GAC advice, RSAC advice, SSAC advice, as well as CCT recommendations. So that's clearly in our favor so as to speak that we also know in the back of our minds that some of these things are still hanging up in the air. And the board really needs to take care of them really. So that's in our favor.

I think ICANN has also suggested some, what they call, dependencies or prerequisite. And two in particular, were highlighted. One being the IDN, and I will probably come to that in a minute. But it's more to do with the events or IDNs rather than IDNs itself. And the second one is name collisions, I believe, the NCAP project.

Now the rest, of course, like Jonathan has said, they've basically said no, with applicant support, there's this group looking into it with close

generics. That the close generics dialogue that's looking into it. So there are parallel things happening that attempt to find more answers to some of the questions that are still lingering.

But I think in the case of close generics and applicant support, the timetable for those processes to be concluded isn't extensive. So they're not going to run like into more than a year, for example. So that is still time for those processes to conclude, answers to be provided, and is factored into the implementation for subsequent procedures, the recommendations.

But in the case of NCAP, there isn't any indication on when NCAP will be completed. And I'm a member of NCAP. I'm a member the discussion group, at least. We are still, we use the word struggling, but we're still trying to put the finishing touches to the NCAP 32 and that has to go through a public comment process. So that's going to take a while. And there's still study 3.

So the NCAP project encompasses three parts. So there's still a study three and we don't know how long that's going to take. Right? And then the first prerequisite that I mentioned, the IDNs, that is in relation to IDN variance management. Recently, the IDN EPDP has had a change request to its timetable to its project timeline approved by GNSO Council. And what's happened is, well, at least the first phase of its work of that in particular EPDP, in regards to top level of variant management, that particular report isn't going to be done until August 2023.

And then you have Phase 2 which uses the second level variants. So that is going to go on until 2025. So you can imagine that while subsequent procedures is trying to be implemented, you have potentially things that could affect the implementation that's not going to be completed until 2025. So there's all these things to open yet. So anyway, that is the Board's problem. So the Board has got to figure it out and work out what it might want to do.

In general, the ODP team, so Karen Lentz's team has basically said that overall, most of the recommendations that have been produced in the report itself are implementable. So they don't foresee it being not implementable. So it's implementable, but there could be challenges in terms of complexity as well as cost. So logically speaking, the more complex something is, the more cost it would probably take to implement.

But they do highlight seven particular issues for the Board's attention that may offer challenges. And these seven challenges, or these seven issues are, number one public interest commitments and voluntary registry commitments. Basically along the lines of how do we, number one, ensure that any public interest commitments or the voluntary ones do not go beyond the limits of ICANN. And number two is, how do we enforce them in that situation?

And then the second issue is with regards to application fees. Okay. I'm not going to go into specifics. We hope we have to cover that in separate calls maybe. The third one is regarding applicant support. And again, basically, well they have taken the short term and say, well, no, we have the recommendations and implementation guidance. We also

have a bunch of metrics and we have now the GGP that's looking into how to sort out this and how to prioritize how to do certain things.

And then the fourth issue is regarding terms and conditions, basically legal risks and risk of ICANN be sued for certain things. The next one is regarding closed generic. And again they've mentioned that there is a closed generic dialogue that's happening right now because there were no recommendations within subsequently pertaining to close generics. So we have to wait for the close generics dialogue to be completed to see if there's anything that the Board might want to approve and therefore gets implemented for the down the line.

The next one has got to do with limited appeals and challenge mechanisms. Because this is a new thing altogether. We didn't have this in the 2012 round, so there could be some challenges that arise from new things. The next one has got to do with community applications, specifically about the community priority evaluation that received a lot of criticisms from the 2012 round. And the last issue of highlight was in regards to private resolution. Specifically to do with private options, whether that's allowable or not?

Okay. And then things like, well it's still going to be on a cost recovery basis, the next round, but interestingly, they have, for now, allocated \$2 million for applicant support to fund the applicant support program. The same amount that was pulled out from 2012 round. And they are also anticipating only 2000, or there's basic assumptions on 2000 applications in the next round, similar to the 2012 round. We had about 1900 plus application. So they don't seem to think that it's going to go

up or go down. But they did caveat that. They're saying that they don't really know. So they just based it on the last round.

Now the thing is with the 2 million support, applicant support that has been marked, so far indicated, ALAC did say that 2 million isn't really enough if you want to have a proper applicant support program. We want a lot of applicants to be able to take advantage of the program. We did suggest that ICANN maybe could do some fundraising with certain agencies and so forth, but that doesn't seem to have been taken up anywhere in the ODA.

So there could be work to be done on our part at least. And there's definitely going to be more complexity in terms of implementing the next application round. Because as I said more new things, more layers of evaluations, and things like that. So the application fee is going to be more than what it was in the 2012 round.

I'm not going to go into resources. They talk a little bit about resources. They said that it was going to take up about \$470 plus million to implement. They did offer two options in terms of implementation. Now that's something that I found interesting. Number one, the first option is that to implement 18 categories of recommendations for the single round. For a single round would take up to five years. So that's what they said.

And five years from when the Board says go. So we're not even at that stage where the Board is anywhere close to saying yes, go. And that's because the five year they say that's the amount of time they need to actually build all the systems, get all the vendors in place, make sure

everything is spick and span running properly, so that everything that has been asked for is made available when the round opens next.

But I think they knew that certain parts of the community would jump at the suggestion that it might take five years. So I think they cleverly chose to propose as an option two. And now I would say that this option it's still up in air, and again, it's up to the Board to design it. And I think even by Karen's own admission, they're not quite certain about how option two might be done really. They have a big idea of how it might be done.

Option two basically covers the fact that you have four annual rounds. So instead of having one single round, we break it up into four rounds on annual basis. And that is to cater for certain things being implemented first. So it's going to take a priority. So some exercise has been taken to prioritize the implementation of certain things ahead of others.

Now the reason why I find this interesting is because that implies that certain things won't happen first. Alright? And the foremost in my mind would be IDN. Applications or requests for variants of IDNs won't be available for intake in the first year. So they are going to be implications for staggering the application process. And I can foresee that it's going to benefit certain types of applicants, for example, dot brands and disadvantage other types of applicants. And that is a question that I have a concern about because we did say that, no, we didn't want to discriminate against any type of applicants, and ICANN itself is heavily promoting IDN. So question mark there.

So those are some of the key things. I know that it's quarter past the hour. So I'd probably like to leave some time for comments and if anybody else wants to add anything, if anybody wants to raise any questions that I could try and answer, I say I could, but I'm not part of the ODP team, so I can't give you. I can try and give you an answer insofar as my knowledge allows. Thanks. Do I run the queue? Maybe I should just run the queue. Hadia?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you, Justine. So I actually raised my hand in order to speak more about or talk about option one and option two. So the main difference between option one and option two is that option one is one big round which would take five years to implement, and option two is basically for annual cycles, which will take 18 months to implement. And it seems to me at least that option two would be more. Again, it's 18 months from when the Board action to start implementation. Yeah, from when the Board determines that implementation should start.

So you mentioned two things. You mentioned the NCAP and the IDN EPDP. And I think the IDN EPDP would be done by then because, again, it's 18 months from when the Board says implementation starts. So I think this is not a factor here. Like, we did not have IDN variants the previous round. And definitely, we do want to have variants this round. But again, why do you think if we go for the four annual cycles that it won't be possible to have IDNs?

JUSTINE CHEW:

I'm speaking from a personal perspective. So I have to be very careful here because I'm the vice chair of that EPDP. So we have an official stand and we have an unofficial, well, my personal opinion. My personal opinion is that even though we have segregated the work of the EPDP into Phase 1 and Phase 2 such that Phase 1 deals with, as I said, for top level variance, which is expected to be completed by August 2023.

So assuming that for argument sake the Board says, okay, everything looks alright, let's start, and they do it in March. So by the time the initial report for Phase 1 to do with top level variant management is out for public comment, then there's a public comment period. And then he has to go through approval processes. And not only just the GNSO Council, it has to go through the Board, of course.

So it's not about just August 2023 when it's done. The lead time for getting it to implementation can be anywhere between two months to six months. Right? And I can't be certain that the cycle for when implementation takes place would line up. I don't know. I'm just foreseeing that there could potentially be an issue for the top level at least.

But you see, the thing is with IDNs, there is also the second level. And we always talk about predictability. I can foresee that when the applicant applies for an IDN, they might have a variant in mind, and they need to have their second level tables ready also. You see? And in order for that to happen, they need the criteria, all the rules pertaining to second level.

Now we haven't we haven't even started talking about second level and the EPDP. So I don't know whether those rules or the availability of those rules is going to affect what the applicant needs. So there's a question mark there. I hope I answered your question. So I think we should move along. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Justine. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And apologies for the background noise. I've looked at the deck and the whole presentations and so on. I think that we would really benefit as you mentioned, we have made recommendations for so many of these topics. We would benefit from actually having a table that shows what our recommendation was and what the actual consensus ended up being in the ODA. I note that there are a lot of places where there's actually no consensus as such just as well. This needs to be studied further and so on.

On the PICs at the RVCs, I see that the way forward shows basically what we've been saying all along that none of the PICs are enforceable if they fall outside the ICANN mandate as given by the ICANN bylaws. And this is one of the main problems, is that we have with those ICANN bylaws that came out of the accountability process because it restricted ICANN's mandate so much that we can't really-- I mean, the public interest doesn't seem one of those things in there.

Anyway, on the closed generics, I noted again that you mentioned the GNSO is against any restrictions. It's a free for all scenario. So we basically have the GNSO against the GAC and against, I guess, the points

of the ALAC and it hasn't moved an inch forward. On the community applications, also I didn't see any big difference to the way that the applications we're going to be evaluated. Maybe I'm wrong on that one. On the limited appeals and challenge mechanism, the ALAC did have a strong way to make challenges to the application and so on. Well, I'd be interested in seeing what's the difference now.

The applicant support program and the auctions. Again, the applicant support program mentions is that it seems to not be changed so much from what we've had. It doesn't appear to want to actually do a lot more than what it did last time. You mentioned \$2 million being put on the side. But it doesn't actually. I don't know, it seems to be kind of stuck with the same old, same old.

And on the auctions, again, it's got a suggestion that applicants should actually commit to applying for strings that they will actually be using or implementing, and not applying for speculation where they trade off the strings in private auctions outside the ICANN system. And I'm not even sure this is legally enforceable given the fact that you're dealing with commercial law here. So it would be really interesting to have an analysis based on what we said and what is actually on the table. I'm not sure who can do that, who has the time to do that.

And finally, regarding option one and two I think we need to have a significant discussion on that one. I'm not sure. I don't even know if it will affect us as such. It might affect the amount of work that we might have because what you effectively have with the ongoing option is that you have rounds which just happen all the time, all the time, all the

time. And that might actually get, if policy is then changed on the fly, it might exhaust us. Anyway, thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yeah. Okay. I obviously won't have time to address every point that you mentioned. But I'll try and just highlight a couple of things. With the PICs, the ODP team did suggest solution. And again, it's for the Board to decide whether the solution is something that they want to take up, which, interestingly, is to amend the bylaws. Okay. So I'll leave it at that. In terms of limited appeals and challenges, I have to correct you there. ALAC has had and still has the option of objections. So objections is different to changes and appeals. We did not have challenges and appeals at all in the 2012 rounds. So this is something new.

Community priority evaluation, community applications as I said earlier. It's mainly to do with the CPE, the community priority evaluations. I can tell you for a fact that many of the suggestions that the ALAC put forward for CPE were taken into consideration. I think we argued for a lot of it to be absorbed into the revision for the CPE. There's just a couple, I think it was three, that wasn't taken up. So we need to figure out whether we still want to pursue those three or whether we can find a way to sneak in somewhere. I'm going to stop there, and I'm going to go to the queue. Chantelle?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thanks, Justine. This is Chantelle for the record, and I want to speak really quickly on a project that we are doing. And then I see Jonathan's

hand is up as well. So maybe he'll want to expand on this. Staff along with the numbers of the ALAC, or At-Large, are comparing what the original ALAC advice was against the ODA. It's a big document, and so we're looking for shepherds for several of these areas. There are seven that we identified as priority that we'll be looking at ahead of ICANN76.

And last week, we also reached out to Karen's team to see if there's someone that would either want to work with us or possibly join a future call in January to help walk us through this. I posted in the chat that we are looking for one volunteer to help us with community priority evaluation, or CPE. And we have reached out to our proposed shepherds on those seven topics. And once they have confirmed, we will go forward. But I'll stop there in the interest of time. Thank you so much, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

No worries. Chantelle, I can tell you that I am probably the best person to do CPE because I actually wrote the white paper on CPE. Okay. The just back to this process that Chantelle has mentioned, a few things, I think, it is useful just as we did with the SubPro as we were doing the SubPro PDP. We had a small team that was looking into all the recommendations. And considering them in a more detailed fashion, they're coming back to keeping up with the recommendations as to what to do with them. What to do with them. Sorry.

So I think that that particular process has worked well. And I think what Chantelle has suggested is mirroring that I do also want to open up that process, as you said, to volunteers, the new volunteers. But I would say

that each section that has been identified and I probably need to do a more detailed review to see if there's anything missing, that each have what I would call a subject matter expert, and I'm using that loosely.

And the reason for that is it's not so much that we don't want fresh eyes, but a subject matter expert would be someone that participated or at least followed closely the SubPro PDP process, the five-year process, or at least towards the end of the process. Because we do not want to get into the trouble or we do not want to get into position where we'll potentially be accused of trying to really legate things.

So that's where the subject matter expert would come in and say that. If some someone new says, why don't we suggest this? And then we'll say that, well, that's been discussed in the PDP and we're shut down. So put that she can't go that way anymore. All right? Yeah. Okay. Subject shepherd, that's a better way. Yeah, shepherds.

Okay. So I think we need a combination of at least one shepherds for each topic and anyone else who wants to volunteer to help with reviewing and new suggestions. I do value new input though because there may be things that the PDP or even us as the as the shepherds hadn't considered or maybe we think we can work it into any new advice or any new reactions that we want to put forward from here on. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. A lot has been said since I raised my hand, so it's a lot to cover, but I think Chantelle has put a good start on identifying the seven key issues that came out of her advice and what we advised. And so I think

that from there, we'll try to have these subject matter experts and shepherds as Justine discussed, try to identify what the differences are. I think that there are going to be some areas that might be called re-litigating such as auctions or something like that where things didn't reach consensus, but that we know that the majority of the community are interested in preventing the kind of gaining of the system that took place the last time. So that's the general issue.

And I think the other issue that Justine raised that I think is very critical is these two options, one is an 18 months, which is probably unrealistic. 18 months plan, is probably a three-year plan. And then there's a five-year plan, which is probably really a six-year plan or something like that. But we need to be very careful because a lot of how this next round is being sold to us is on the basis of the things we want such as community applications and IDNs. And if suddenly those become deprioritized, then a lot of the momentum that this effort has may be lost after brands, etc., have already had their round.

So I think we need to be cautious about what gives sort of shoved out of the 18 months. Because I think there could be a real loss of momentum after that period if IDNS are not part of, for example, any initial work because now there's a lot of people that want this to happen. And if we just meet those needs at the outset, that momentum I think will disappear. So just to be vigilant about it.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Just to sneak in there. With option two the presentation does indicate IDN EPDP. And it has an asterisk that is dependent on ongoing

community work. So they are trying to factor in IDNs for the of variant management anyway for the 18 months implementation option two, but they think that it's going to be dependent on the work of the EPDP. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Comments on that latter point, my understanding was of these, I don't want to call them rounds, the segmented, they'd only handle certain number of applications per year. There was a definite statement saying that they wouldn't be targeted, that the first ones would be brands and the next ones would be x types of things and the third one would be IDNs. They would be intermixed, perhaps grouping together the same names so that ones that were competing with each other would be handled in the same round. But there was no intent to segment them functionally. So that's the good news, I think. My head was up on the issue--

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I would just say that the issue is not an intention, but the outcome of prioritizing things that you hear might result in [CROSSTALK].

ALAN GREENBERG:

I understand that. But I think if anything, they would be particularly sensitive to IDNs, particularly in line with the statements Göran has been making recently. Any case, I raised my hand on the issue of the enforcement of PICs. The concept that we might have statements that are made in a contract and those statements are made perhaps to

respond to criticism and problems with the original agreement, with the original application and are not enforceable is just ludicrous. So that that's my stake in the ground.

But I'll note that the wording in the current bylaws, the fundamental bylaws, saying we basically, saying these things may be out of scope was forced by a relatively small number of people who had strong voices in the accountability process. If the Board were to, as suggested by staff, were the pose a fundamental bylaw change, which would ensure the contracts are enforceable, I believe it would pass.

I don't think there would be enough opposition based on how the empowered community is constructed to stop it from passing. Whether the board has the stomach to propose this and as their first fundamental bylaw change, it's a different matter altogether. But if it were to be proposed, I suspect it would pass. But that doesn't make it obvious that it will happen. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Well, it's 35 partial. I think I'm going to give this back to Hadia.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Justine. Hadia, audio isn't working right now. Can we turn it over to Olivier to close the call?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much. It just took me a little while to unmute. Thank you very much, Justine, for the brief clearly and excellent update. And

indeed, we are now going to the any other businesses part of this call. I'm not seeing any hands ups, so that means we are going to have a look at when our next meeting will be.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Thank you so much, Olivier. This is Yeşim speaking. So as you know, this was the last CPWG call before the Christmas break. And ICANN staff will be back on January 3rd. So my question is would you like to hold the next call on Wednesday the 4th or would you like to hold the first call on the following week, which is the 11th?

And once we decide on the dates, we will need to set the time as well because if we move with the 11th, we will not be able to do it at 19:00 UTC as it will be clashing with the AFRALO call. However, we can do something like, 21:00 UTC or we can do another 13:00 UTC, like, today or we can find a difference time, something in between like 16:00 UTC. Sorry, too many questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this Yeşim. It's Olivier speaking. I note in the chat that some are saying there's not very many working days between now and the 4th of January. That being said though, I was looking at the deadline for the statements that were in progress and they are to close on the 24th January, I think for one of them. I would suggest perhaps that we pencil in the January 4th as being our first call of the year. And if nothing has happened until then, we can always cancel it.

And so we start the rotation. So we'd have the 19:00 UTC on the 4th of January and already set the 14:00 or 13:00 UTC, sorry, 13:00 UTC in the second week of January. So you know these in advance. That will be our cycle, so then we don't clash with the AFRALO call in the future, hopefully. And I note here that Hadia mentioned the transfer PDP needs maybe two meetings to discuss the final report. [01:39:05 - inaudible]. Let's get 4th, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So our next meeting will be 4th of January at 19:00 UTC, and I'm posting here on Zoom chat as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would be great. Thank you very much, Yeşim. And that is indeed the last call of the year. Now, unfortunately, Hadia is not able to speak, but I wanted to actually thank everyone for yet another amazing year of At-Large policy. It's really great to see so many people on the call and [01:40:01 -inaudible] worth it and that the significant input. So it's really, really exciting. And you're work is really, really appreciated.

And of course, we've got some amazing stars within our community. And I hope that we get the recognition more often than we have in the past. I think we do as a community. And I'm really looking forward to 2023 on this. And I guess, Hadia can't say anything. Jonathan, maybe did you want to say a few words as the chair of the ALAC. I'm sorry to put you on the spot like this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: On whether to meet on the 4th or words on what? I'm sorry. Say some words on what topic, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Words on it's the end of the year [01:41:06 -inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I see. Okay. Yeah. Thanks. Thanks, everyone. The CPWG continues to be a great call that has attracted a lot of attention. And so I really just want to express my appreciation for everyone's active participation in policy development from the At-Large, volunteering for work within this call, volunteering for work within work groups.

So a lot of volunteers have put in a lot of time on a lot of issues, and I think that's gone a long way to improve the image of the At-Large community within the broader ICANN community. So I'd like to take this opportunity just to thank all of you for all the hard work that you do and let's look forward to an exciting and productive 2023.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier speaking. And I wanted to also thank Chantelle Doerksen and her support has been [01:42:17 -inaudible]. All of our staff who have been supporting [01:42:37 -inaudible]. And see you in the New Year. Thank you and goodbye.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day, and happy holidays. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]