

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 25th of January, 2023 at 13:00 UTC. 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.

To cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Alan Greenberg, Judith Hellerstein, Chokri Ben Romdhane, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, and from Eduardo Diaz. From staff side, currently, I'm the only one, and I will be doing call management for today's call, and my-- please, for the record Yeşim Sağlam, but we are expecting Heidi Ullrich and Chantelle Doerksen to join us very shortly.

As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation, and our integrators on the Spanish channel are Marina and Veronica, and on the French channel, we have Aurélie and Jacques. As usual, we have the real time transcription service provided, and let me share the link with you here on Zoom chat so you can check the service.

Before we get started, the final reminder is to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. With this, I would like to leave the floor back over to Olivier. 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.*

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which has, again a pretty busy agenda. So we'll first quickly go through it, and I'll ask if there are any amendments. The first thing is to look at the workgroups and small team updates with our various people in policy development processes and EPDP, the scoping teams, et cetera, and we'll take about 30 minutes to go through those.

After that, we'll have a policy comment update with Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia Elminiawi taking us through the Current Policy Pipeline with current statement in progress on the draft fiscal year 24/28 Operating and Financial Plan on the OFB that we might just scope very quickly, but the two consolidated policy ones are the proposed procedure for selecting a top level domain stream for private use, and the additional script base reference label generation rules and related updates that's to do with internationalized domain names.

After that, we'll have an update on the subsequent procedures, operational design assessment. Jonathan Zuck will take us through the recent ALAC correspondence to the ICANN Board, and any other business after this. So at this point in time, are there any amendments or additional items to be included in today's agenda? I am not seeing any hands up, so let's say the agenda is adopted as it currently is on the screen.

Let's go to our action items from last week and previous weeks. There are a number of action items still remaining. One is for Maureen Hilyard, Sarah Kiden, and Chantelle Doerksen to review the transcribed complete CPWG chat comments regarding the GNSO homework

---

statement. The GGP homework assignment and At-Large input. I don't know where we are on this. Perhaps Chantelle could let us know, please.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Olivier, Chantelle hasn't joined yet. I think she's on her way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay. Maybe is Maureen or Sarah?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Maureen for the record here. I think we have actually done that, because we needed that for the update that we actually gave to our next to the following meeting, which we've just done. So that's completed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Maureen. Then the next unchecked one is the one of Jonathan Zuck, Michael Palage, consideration of potentially ALAC advice to the board on conducting an economic study of the top-level domain space, something which was touched on at the end of last call. Unfortunately, Michael had to shoot off to his next meeting prior to this being addressed in the agenda. Michael, did you want to address this very quickly?

Later on, would you-- I don't even know actually whether Michael Palage is here. I can't see him in the list of participants. Well, maybe

---

not. I don't see him either, Jonathan. Yes, thank you. Okay. Well, that's still unchecked at the moment. Do you have an update on this, Jonathan, or should we just leave it as such and for a future call?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'd leave it as such for now. I don't think there's anything new.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Jonathan. Then there's Holly Raiche requested that the CPWG members review the drafted ALAC statement on the financial plan and draft fiscal year 24 operating plan and budget. Input is to be provided by the second of February. So this is a kind reminder for all of you here.

Finally, there is another unchecked action item for Jonathan Zuck, Justine Chew, and Alan Greenberg to begin planning for the ICANN76 ALAC hosted community session on the operational design project (ODP). So that's still coming up. Any comments or questions on any of these points? I'm not seeing any hands here, so that means we can move on. Thank you. Let's then go swiftly to our next agenda items.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, is there a hand up? Oh, there is.

---

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Justine's hand is up. Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Justine Chew. I'm sorry, I didn't see your hand. It must have evaded me. Justine Chew, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's okay, Olivier. This is Justine. I stuck my hand up just as you were saying that we would move on because my query is regarding the action items from the previous call on the 11th of January. I think it's number four on the list where it says Michelle DeSmyter and Gisella Gruber to create ICANN76 ALAC GNSO workspace, staff to inform me when it's complete.

I don't think I received any information or notices on that, so I'm just checking whether that's actually been completed. If it has been, then can someone inform me where that workspace is, please, because I'd like to reiterate a call for topics to be suggested for the ALAC GNSO bilateral ICANN76. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for this. Now, I'm not seeing Michelle nor Gisela on the call. So I'm not quite sure. Any other staff is aware of this process?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Heidi just put something into the chat. Go ahead, Heidi.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Hi. This is Heidi. Yes, I will look into that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's move on, then. I note Jonathan says it's actually going to be a virtual call prior to 76. So there we go. All right, let's then proceed forward. First, we'll start with no workgroup and small team updates. We'll start with a transfer policy review policy development process. Steinar Grøtterød has got some information for us.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes, hi. Good morning, good evening. This is Steinar speaking. Just a few updates from yesterday's workgroup meeting. First of all, as you may remember that there was a deadline for receiving comments on Monday, and there were no comments received by the working group from the different stakeholders, and also from At-Large submitted no record, that means that we are more or less in line with what's been proposed as recommendations.

So that's kind of a good. The other thing was that was a proposed language from, again, contracts compliance regarding keeping records of tack the different processes and phases, then tack a transfer

---

authorization code has been issued. I put the voting and the proposed wording into the agenda chat so you can have it as a reminder and read this. The essence here is that the registrar, the proposed language is that the registrar shall maintain these records for the shorter of two years, or the longest period permitted by applicable law.

There was a little bit discussion about the two years because there was some processes, if I recall correctly, IRT that recommended 15 months or something, so that might be adjusted. Finally, we ended up in another discussion about Recommendation 17. That, if you recall correctly, that is the transfer log after successful transfer and the proposal from a small group to have an opt out feature from the registrars.

I think the essence there is that there was no consensus about it for the wording and the process has to be fine tuned a little bit more before it goes into the final review of the ICANN Org staff for the complete set of recommendations. Finally, there was one thing about, was that-- yes, there was something about putting the gaining registrar IANA ID into the notification or transfer completed, also known as the previous losing form or authorization process.

This is also something that has more or less been discussed on technical level between the registrar operators and the registrars. So that was my take from the yesterday's meeting. Any comments, any additional from the working group members? Please come on forward. I don't see any hands, so, back to you, Olivier. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. Thanks for the updates. Now we can go to the next agenda. Well, the next part in the work group and small team updates. That's for the expedited policy development process on the internationalized domain names the EPDP and IDNs. Now, there was supposed to be a big update today, but things have changed, and Hadia Elminiawi is going to explain to us what is happening in this space. Over to you Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. So this is Hadia for the record. So this is just a brief summary of where we are at with the IDN EPDP. So tomorrow, the EPDP team is expected to start the review of ICANN Org input, which was received in November for a subject of draft recommendation. The spreadsheet which ICANN Org prepared maps the Org input to draft recommendations and charter questions. Some of Org recommendations require further discussions by the EPDP team.

So that is what we are going to do tomorrow. Currently, we have five batches of draft recommendations that require our input. The recommendations are in relation to topic D, adjustments in registry agreement, registry service, registry translation process, and other processes and procedures related to the domain name lifecycle, adjustments to the objection process, string similarity review, string contention resolution, which is topic E, reserved string and other policies and procedures, and topic B, which talks about the same entity at the top level, and topic A, which is about consistent definition and technical utilization of root zone label generation rules. Next time, as



---

Olivier mentioned, we will be providing a big update. Thank you. I'm open to questions as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. So thank you for this update Hadia. No other comments or questions? Okay, thank you. We look forward to the future work of this group. The next one is the RDA Scoping Team, but as you know from previous call, this is held on until further notice.

Beyond that, there is the system for a standardized access and disclosure operational design assessment. This one also currently doesn't appear to have any updates, and so the next update that we have is the facilitated dialogue on closed generics with Greg Shatan and Alan Greenberg, there should be a short update on this.

GREG SHATAN: Hi, it's Greg Shatan for the record. The report today is a preview of our face-to-face meeting which is going to be starting this evening with a meet and greet in Washington DC with drinks and tapas, you're not invited. Tomorrow, the meeting starts in substance. We have a detailed agenda, but basically, the first day is going to be spent discussing largely the public interest issues, and particularly, whether a closed generic should be required to meet for global public interest ordinarily, differently rather, serve a public interest resolve.

So there's going to be probably a fair amount of debate about the terminology and meaning of those two concepts, looking at the global

---

public interest framework that the board has created using that tool, looking at previous work that we've done, and assessing how it looked through a public interest framework and filter discussing different types of benefits that could be associated with closed generics, both public and commercial benefits and looking at the threats and opportunities, including things like competition and consumer trust and safety and things that are of interest.

A lot of these ultimately come down to the end user interests since we are, if you will, the audience-- we represent, in essence, the audience here. That's day one. Day two, we'll be discussing more of evaluation criteria. How we would potentially deal with applications and what special criteria there might be. This is a topic that we really haven't discussed much in, they kind of have that level of order in that regenerated.

So we're going to have some smaller breakout groups to discuss these and brainstorm answers, and both make up questions and then make up answers to them over the course of the day, and then discuss potentially what contracting posts allegation, compliance and enforcement and review might look like as well down the road. That'll take us through the end of the second day, which is Friday, and then we'll wrap it up with a dinner at a Mexican restaurant nearby, which features primarily seafood and solution and the like.

Then we will all go off back to our various corners of the world. So that's basically what we're going to be covering, a lot of public interest discussion on day one and a lot of the session of other criteria and what the process might be looking like on day two. Any questions? I don't

---

see any questions, so. I have one last minute thing. There has now been a movement to put a high-level summary together after, I think it'll be after each meeting.

Certainly, there's one now, which I will circulate afterwards. It's fairly high level and a lot of it covers things that we've already discussed, but it's good to have it as an overall summary of where we stand. So I will send that around to staff who can then put it on the list or I'll put it on the list. Then there's another one that'll be a more interesting, which will summarize the work that we do tomorrow and Friday.

That hopefully will come out next week, hopefully, in advance of our meeting next week. I'll be able to use that to report back on everything that we have created in our two days of facilitated dialogue. Thanks, and back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Greg, and, of course, very important discussions taking place. So all the best for the good rolling out of these discussions in the next few days. We look forward, of course, to have some fantastic news next week. Now, I'm not seeing any hands up, so that means we can go to the next update, that's the applicant support our GNSO Guidance Process, the GGP, and for this, we have our representatives, Maureen Hilyard and Sarah Kiden.

So Maureen has a presentation that's here that you can actually see in the agenda, and you can click it and watch it, but of course, the presentation will be made on Zoom as well. So over to you, Maureen Hilyard.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Olivier. Maureen, for the record, just a very brief overview of what we did. I would also like to apologize, first of all, because Aaron's name was there, and I think somehow, I must have been thinking about Nigel at that particular point of time, so I do apologize for that, I will amend that and replace the slides.

He had a conversation with the group earlier, before I came on to it, and he was actually reflecting on some of their questions that they'd actually asked, and, of course, one of the topics that they discussed had been the pro bono resources that were provided and the fact that 24 entities, companies, individuals, offered their support in a range of topics.

So I think that it was the services that was well intended, but I think what came out of it was the fact that qualification criteria was really restrictive, and also there was very little awareness of the services anyway so that people didn't take advantage of it, and, of course, the fact that only three applicants qualified according to their criteria at the time was that they had to have a public interest objective and come from at least a developing country and financial need.

Only three applicants qualified, but then again, they were unsure of how applicants were informed about the services, and that the requirement was a public interest objective so that applicants obviously weren't aware of how they could actually be qualified for support.

Of course, I didn't mention that these conditions for qualification have now been [00:25:19 - inaudible] the restricted conditions, that's a lot

---

more flexible, and that it's sort of like do it to get not so much regions, but actually looking at struggling applicants across the board. So it's going to make it a lot easier for people to access the services that are available.

One of the things too, was the fact that they were very unsure about-- because they're unsure about how people were informed, and there was no MoU sign, so it's purely voluntary. So there was no obligation to report, and so there's no record of how the services were actually used and what value the services may have offered the applicant that were successful, and the others who weren't in like, did they learn anything new that they didn't know before [00:26:23 - inaudible] qualified.

It was very specific about the fact that we do need to track the usage of the services, and I think that that's really important. If we're going to be measuring any type of success of any resources that become available as part of applicant support that we actually do keep tabs on those. So that was a summary of the discussion that we actually had around that particular topic. Exciting.

Yes, so then we went on to just basically the financial support. It was really select quite interesting that the recommendation, of course, was that the scope for financial support, of course, went beyond the application fees, which was the objective last time, and recommended that that might cover such costs as writing fees, application writing fees, and legal fees. However, the board noted that those fees were not charged by ICANN, so therefore may not be appropriate to use ICANN support for those particular activities.

---

So the ODA suggested that, in keeping with the intent of expanding the scope of the financial support, that that scope could go beyond probably-- for a successful applicant, it could actually go towards reduction of other kinds of fees that an applicant may need to pay over the few years of creating a more viable company that they're actually sort of like they're registry services or something.

So the whole intent of this too is that Org work with the implementation review team to explore ways in which too, and that's like researching other organizations that are providing these similar service or similar financial support service like what it is that they're doing. I think this is where it's become its own staff role to look for experts that can actually advise the GGP on better guidance.

Again, just tracking any data that we can actually collect, to select measure how we can gauge success in the area of financial support. [00:29:42 - inaudible] has had that, but if I can just finish this off because it's quite short. Can I have the next slide, please. Yes, so the final slide that we-

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's not me.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Not me. Okay. Thank you. So then gave a sort of like a summary with regards to the application support and that whole, sort of like the communication side of things. I think I mentioned that last time is that it should be, and it's mentioned here. I think, originally, it was six

---

months, and I think it was the communication side that said six months, but they're actually recommending it should be open at least 18 months before the opening of the new round for the reasons of just making sure that there's more people are aware of what the services are, especially pro bono providers, whether they qualify or not, and they don't have to work towards qualifying.

Just making [00:31:10 - inaudible] public, I'm not quite sure yet, public interesting is still there, but all those sorts of items should actually be just giving them an opportunity to, to actually apply, and that's the whole intent of the program itself. One of the things that I think it was [00:31:34 - inaudible] that actually wanted to know about was once the GGP has actually completed its work, will the ODA be updated as a result of it. And Aaron said, no.

Although the ODA was produced before the GGP had actually commenced its work. It died at the moment, and it won't actually be updated unless the board directs them to do so. Although, the whole point of the draft report is going to be to inform the implementation of the applicants portion of the implementation review with the PDP. I don't think that it actually matters too much about updating the ODA, because the three processes are going to be firstly, that we will produce a draft that is going to go to public comment around about June, it's supposed to be before I think the second meeting.

Then the second part is after we've actually reviewed that the public comment and the final recommendations of the GFP, we'll go to the council. Then the third part of it is, of course, is that the Council and Org will actually develop the final recommendations report, which will

---

go to the Board. So the ODA, I think is sort of like becomes a little bit irrelevant. It's actually guiding us, but it's done and dusted.

Okay. So that there was an interesting discussion that actually came out of it, and the rest of the meeting, which was sort of like we had about three minutes left or so, we actually started looking at some of the questions that were posed on the framework document. This is the GNSO framework document. Interestingly, although we had a discussion, it wasn't actually too profound, because really, only about three of us of the team had actually made any comments. So, it was a general discussion, but nothing resulted from it of any substance.

I feel sorry for Julie and Steven and supported by Mike, the chair who is trying to encourage people to comment on those agenda items because it's really important that we actually do make comments. Even though I was going to ask to discuss the CPWG comments, but it didn't seem very relevant when other people hadn't been given them a chance. We'll send that to them at the next meeting. I think that I did find that the ODA update was really helpful, and yes, so more after the next meeting. So perhaps we'll take Christopher's comments.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hello, thank you, Maureen. This is extremely interesting, and of course, having participated in the SubPro on this topic years ago, I would very much welcome the enlargement of the applicant support concept. In this context, I would just make two comments, Maureen, for your committees for future consideration. One is that it will be important to ensure that pro bono assistance, which is welcomed, also has no conflict



---

of interest, some sort of check will be required. The other point, which is more substantive is continuity.

I know from personal experience that once you get involved with organizing joint financing of complex project with different categories of expenditure under different schedules, it doesn't happen overnight and it doesn't happen all at once. So pro bono input must come with a reassurance that they will stay with the game from the beginning to the end. Otherwise, applicants could be left hanging in midstream. Just two points of warning in this complex field. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Maureen for the record. Yes, definitely. we'll take that to the meeting. Thank you. That's all for me.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thanks so much, Maureen, for this update. So Olivier has dropped up, so I'm continuing with you on the call until he's back. So I see Justine. This is a new hand, Justine. If it is, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, it is.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Go ahead, please.

---

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Hadia. Yes, this is Justine. I had a question regarding, or a comment and a question regarding Maureen's report on the GGP. Just in relation to your talking about how do we measure success for the pro bono program? One of the comments or feedback that we received some time ago regarding the ESP itself was that, and it's related to how much awareness was given to the pro bono program.

ICANN Org took a very hands-off approach with the pro bono program. What they essentially did was they just collected entities who are prepared to do this on a voluntary basis, and they just put up a list somewhere on the website, and they basically allowed applicants to try and find the information and then try and figure out which support services they might be inclined to go and obtain. Then they were supposed to follow up with the entity that's volunteering the services themselves.

So one of the comments that was made in response to what happened was that ICANN Org should really try to play a more facilitative role, put more effort into actual matchmaking. I don't know whether the GGP actually considered that.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

So sorry, Justine, I was writing all this down, but I'm taking notes because this is really, really, really important. Thank you. And we hadn't yet.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So in terms of a measure of success, you could probably we use some kind of metrics into what I was trying to put forward. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Perfect. Thank you. Thank you so much. Okay, I'm done.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Maureen. Any more questions or comments to Maureen? I see none. Thank you so much, Maureen and Sarah, for your work on this group. We conclude now the work group and small team updates. I would just like to tell you that there is additional resources on the agenda, if you want to know more about all the PDPs and policy work that is going on. So, take a look if you would like to contribute or know more about the policies that are going on.

Now, we move to the policy comment updates. So, recently ratified by the ALAC is the initial report on the ccNSO PDP review mechanism, and the public comment proceeding closed yesterday. Currently, we actually have four open public comments. So, the first is the FY 24/28 operating and financial plan and draft, FY 24 operating plan and budget, and this closes on the 13th of February. If you want to contribute to this, please go to the OFB Working Group page and attend the OFB Working Group calls.

Also, we have the second open public comment is the proposed procedure for selecting a top-level domain strength for private use. This is about how ICANN will choose a string for private use. This string should never be delegated by ICANN. So, the issue with using ad hoc

---

TLDs for private use is that if the string selected is delegated by ICANN and it leaks to the public. This could lead to name collisions. Also, as a private, TLD is resolved externally, this might lead to breach of confidentiality.

There are also some security issues with that. So, this proceeding is about the procedure itself. So IANA is opposed to-- the procedure for selecting the string, because the SSAC had a recommendation for a criteria for selection, it did not specify specific strength. So IANA supposed to select a private TLD based on SSAC recommendation, and then publish a document explaining the selection of the string, and then a public comment proceeding will follow after which ICANN Org will prepare a recommendation for the board.

There is a wiki space for this public comment. So, if you have any ideas or thoughts that you would like the ALAC to share with the Board, with ICANN Org, please go to the wiki page. The other open public comment proceeding is the additional script-based reference label generation of rules and related updates. This opened on the 19th of January, and it will close in March, early March. This is about some normative changes to 15 already existing rules, existing scripts, or languages.

So those include the Belo-Russian language, the Bosnian seret language, Bulgarian language, the English language, French language, German language, Hebrew language and Hebrew script, and [00:44:58 - inaudible] script, Macedonian language, Ukrainian language, Montenegrin language, Russian language, Serbian language, Sinhala script, and Ukrainian language.

---

The other proceeding that is also open, it's about seven new scripts, and I guess this is put down in the, yes, it says the second level of reference label generation rules, but this also is open now.

In the agenda, it's under the upcoming public comment, but actually, I think it's already open. It's about seven new scripts, the Armenian, Cyrillic, Greek, Latin, Japanese, Korean, and Myanmar. So again, if you would like to. So we are still I think to create a space also for that public comments. Upcoming, we have the improved GNSO stakeholder group and consistency charter amendment process, and that's with the EOC Working Group and the technical check with you. That one will be discussed with this group. So I'll stop here. Chantelle, would you like to provide any further updates? Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Hi, Hadia. Thank you. This is Chantelle for the record. So as Hadia mentioned, there are four, reopen public comments, we'll post the link in the chat. A decision left be made by this group on the two new open comments that are listed in the current statements tab.

The first being, as Heidi mentioned, the proposed procedure for selecting a top-level domain stream for private use. We discussed that a little bit last week, and then the second one is the additional script-based reference label generation rules as related updates. So if there are volunteers that are interested in working on either of them, please speak up or let Heidi and myself know. Thank you.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Chantelle. So any questions comments to us in relation to the already open-- Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks. Just a quick question. Under the current statements where you have the table and third one that says new additional script base reference LGR and related updates. Is that the same thing as upcoming public comment proceeding second level reverence?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, they are.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. Okay. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Those are two different, I would say. Yes, two different, they opened I think on the same say and closes on the same day as well. Thank you. Okay, so seeing no more hands up, let's go back to our agenda. Now with Jonathan Zuck. He will update us in relation about the subsequent procedures, ODA and ALAC correspondence to the ICANN Board. Jonathan, the floor is yours.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. There's not much of an update here, but what we did was go through a process of going through the ODA, looking for

---

disconnects between our previous advice and public comments on subsequent procedures and what came out of the ODA trying to look specifically at new issues that were created by the ODA in terms of assumptions that were made, leaps of logic, or things that we thought weren't in keeping with the intent of the original subsequent procedures working group report.

So we generated this letter and re-emphasize some of the points that we had been making. We had Leon Sanchez on the ALAC call yesterday, who confirmed that the letter was received and taken into consideration. One of the things we talked about was option one versus option two, and it does seem as though the board is leaning toward option two.

I think the GNSO is well suggested possibly that this is a false dichotomy between option one and option two. The answer is probably going to be a hybrid. So I think that's probably more likely the case, then straight up option two. But there's a lot to be worked out in terms of the details of option two and where we really focus on making sure that option two, which is this accelerated version, accelerated rollout of a new round, doesn't leave behind the types of applicants about which were most concerned, those in need of support, communities and IDNs.

And so that's where we took a stand was that we like a lot of the things that are in option two, but that we wanted to make sure that the types of applicants about which we are concerned don't end up in the state postponed as a result. So he said we'd hear more and ICANN76 about it, so it wasn't a lot of details, but the letter was well received, and

---

we've gone over by the board. The next step is to take this same letter and turn it into advice.

So I suspect this small team will re-coalesce around this draft and expand on it a little bit and turn it into official advice to the board for submission prior to ICANN76. Justine, I don't know if there's anything you want to add to that, but that's my understanding of the next step.

JUSTINE CHEW: Not particularly, except that it'd be useful to understand the timeline for this generation of advice. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know, we'll have to have to work that out. So we'll come back to the timeline question I suppose. I don't have that off the top of my head. All right. Christopher Wilkinson, I see you've got your hand up.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi, thanks, Jonathan. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. A couple of small points. The most important one is to welcome and to trench the position of At-Large regarding geographical lens. Five years ago, At-Large meetings did not even have geographical lens on the agenda, and although in some details, I think we need to go a little further, but for present purposes, I wish to just record that it is a major achievement of consensus building among At-Large that we have a policy on geographical lens now.



---

We'll have to stick to it because it with this issue will go on for several years, shortly or even longer with option one. If option two is adopted, the obvious way of making sure that newcomers get a priority is to exclude from the first phases existing portfolios of registrars of the TLDs, make quite sure that the first phase is oriented in priority to new applicants.

As you know, for competition reasons, I already have strong reservations about the extent of portfolio investments in registries, but for these purposes, if you want to give the newcomers a leg up without favoring them unduly, give them the first try. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Christopher. That's certainly an interesting concept. Obviously, I don't think it will go over well with the GNSO, but we can certainly raise that prioritization as a possibility. I think that it would be an accomplishment to get them to hold off on applications until, for example, IDN variance work is done. That to me will feel like a major victory, but we should definitely take your thoughts on prioritization under consideration. Michael, go ahead.

MICHAEL PLAGE:

Thank you, Jonathan. Michael Plage for the record. With regard to next steps, one of the things that I was thinking about and perhaps would like to hear from the rest of the community, I agree with your statement about the false dichotomy of option one or option two. If we look back at what happened with the SSAD ODA, where the Board gave it back to the GNSO Council, instead of hoping that the ICANN Board does the

---

right thing, would it not be perhaps appropriate to have the board say, can you give it back to the GNSO?

Thank you, for your input, allow us to come up with option three, and then give it back to the board? It seems like if given between the two choices, shouldn't we the community trying to be refined option three instead of leaving it up to the board? Does that sound appropriate? Good idea, bad idea. I just feel like waiting till Cancun, waiting a couple of months just doesn't seem like a good option.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Michael. Certainly, we have been proponents of pushing things back to the community when it came to applicant support and closed generic, and I've had obviously I've made some headway along those lines. So I suspect, and again, Justine might be able to elaborate on this, I also said that the GNSO is already busy working on option three and option three proposal based on their correspondence to the board before their most recent retreat, but making official advice to do so will be interesting. Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Jonathan. This is Justine. Actually, GNSO hasn't done what you said. In fact, I was a member of the GNSO Council small team on the ODA that reviewed the ODA and was part of the team that drafted the substance of that letter that went from GNSO chair to the board.

Interestingly enough, I was the one who kind of suggested if we wanted to look into the option of or look into the possibility of coming up with

---

an option three, or four, or five, or whatever, but the decision wasn't taken up. I think also because we were trying to turn around a letter pretty quickly in time for the board workshop.

So I guess the members there didn't think that we had enough time to properly flesh out an option three, or four or five or whatever. So that's not to say that GNSO wouldn't take it further, I just haven't heard anything since the letter went from the GNSO chair to the ICANN Board. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Well, that just means Jeff Newman hasn't worked his magic yet over there, but thanks for that update. Michael asked in the chat, whether we ought to be trying to come up with something ourselves. I guess that's a possibility. I just feel like we are the way more peripheral to this process and are pretty focused on a particular set of interests when it comes to subsequent procedures.

So I think that with all the aspects of the subsequent procedures process in which we are not involved, that the ALAC coming up with an option three feels foolish to me, but I don't know. Justine, were you responding to that.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes, if I may just jump the queue, Hadia. Sorry. I was also going to say that I think GNSO's position is that they prefer to compel or persuade the board to just approve the GNSO SubPro outputs, and proceed with implementation. So just to move it towards IRT, and that's the

---

Implementation Review Team, the IRT sort of or this is things that are still up in the air rather than-- So I think that may be the path that they are preferring to take rather than doing some work on an option three. That is my best guess. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, and I guess it's not a horrible outcome. Thanks, Justine. Hadia, go ahead, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. So I raised my hand, actually, to ask about option three. So the difference to me, of course, the timeline is it's a big difference between both options, but the technical differences between both, is that in the second option, you don't pay upfront for the whole system, and also, implementation is cheaper because part of the processes are done manually.

If you take that part and incorporate it into option number one, I don't know that it will work, because if you actually are not processing the-- in option two, you are processing the application in batches. If you start doing most of the processes manually in option one, I don't think this will would really work because you're not processing the application in batches.

Unless, of course, you decide to take option one, while also processing the application in batches them then also you could do some of the processes manually maybe. So Justine, yes, if you can tell us more about this option three. Thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Christopher, if you can hold for a second, and I'm going to skip you in the queue back to Justine so she has an opportunity respond to Hadia, if that's okay. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, the response is very quick. There is no option three as it stands, so I'm not quite sure what I'm supposed to respond to. So, there you go.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So Hadia, it's not clear what options really look like and what parts. One of the things when we have our session at ICANN76 about the ODP process might be that there's a question of expertise in this ODP that we need to address, because we've now had two situations where the result of an ODP has been an outlandish estimate, followed by let's throw it all out and throw somebody together, alternative.

So there's a little bit of a pattern developing with these ODPs, and there may be something at the core that we need to address as we really discuss how they've gone and who's involved in developing these initial implementation plans, but that's a broader question. Christopher, back to you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Christopher Wilkinson the record. I think we should not sound the fittest about finding a good solution. So the benefit of

---

diversification and the benefit of users in underserved sections of the market. In my written contributions to the little study groups that we set up, I've made some suggestions as to how option two could be developed, and if you want to cost the development of the option two and option three, that's a matter of semantics.

I also think, and I need to repeat in this context, some of the things I've written previously, I experienced the SubPro in detail over a period of years, my conclusion was that GNSO incumbents in the SubPro were functioning as, pardon the expression, a cartel of incumbents. If we just throw our hands up and say GNSO is going to decide, let's stop wasting our time.

This is a serious problem where the policies that were written into the SubPro's report are antagonistic to the interests of anybody who's not already an incumbent. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Christopher. Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you. This is Justine again. I don't know about ALAC or At-Large wanting to develop option three. I'm not sure that's actually the best use of our resources. But having said that, if we could take the approach within our ALAC advice to reinforce things that we think need to happen or need to be completed before the next round begins, then, presumably, the option three might reveal itself in that exercise. So I will put emphasis on making sure that we state clearly what we think

---

should happen, should be completed as the way forward for our advice as well. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's certainly been our position as far as to protect our own ground. Okay, so yes, so next steps will be to turn those into advice, and we'll take the comments from this call and put something together and start running it by this group again. We'll put some points together and run it by this group. Thanks. Hadia, I pass the microphone back to you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Jonathan, for this update. I see no more hands up. So I guess no further comments to Jonathan or Justine. So if not, we go to any other business. So is there any other business for today?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Christopher, go ahead, please.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm sorry, I seem to be speaking rather a lot today, but makes up for the most lazy silence in recent meetings. This is about Google. Yesterday, I heard reports that the American administration has initiated a substantial antitrust case against Google. I speak from the limited experience from the 1980s when I was associated very closely with the

---

European Union's monitoring of the then divestment of AT&T, where a monopoly telecommunications operator was obliged to divest substantial parts of its business.

I just want to be on record. First of all, US competition cases take a long time and they involve ramifications which cannot be foreseen entirely at the beginning. This particular case is addressing mainly Google's dominance of the online advertising market, but there are others. At this stage, and this is a message not so much for ALAC, but from the ICANN Staff, that I can need to set up a small taskforce to follow the Google case in US competition law very closely indeed.

Because my experience was that in the telecommunications case, the US case had massive international repercussions and influenced competition policy worldwide. Just a word to the wise is enough. Set up a little group, including an economist and a lawyer to make sure that over the coming years, the board and the community is carefully and accurately briefed about the effects of this case on Google, and particularly, of course, on Google's role within and around ICANN, which as we all know, is very expensive. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Christopher. So may you please point out how this relates to ICANN's mission? So I read, also, in the Washington Post yesterday that the Justice Department sued Google over dominance in online advertising? So if you could explain more or elaborate on how this actually relates to ICANN mission. Thank you.



---

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm speaking mainly from fairly old memories, which marked me for life. So I'd rather not do that immediately over the conference call right now. But if you send me the question in an email, I'll work on it in the next few days. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Christopher. So any questions or comments to Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: That's not to find a point on it. This is a main example of the attempt by Google to occupy a very substantial place in the domain name system, notably through the portfolio, their portfolio of top-level domains. There are other features, nearly everything we write through Google Docs, goes through the service and technical services of Google. I rest my case. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Christopher. Let's think about it, and maybe we could discuss this topic over email if anyone wants to discuss further with you, or if you would like also to discuss it in this group, but, yes, we need to hear from others as well. Thank you. So any comments, questions to Christopher? Okay, so I see none. Any other business? Okay, so I don't see any hands up. So we go to our next agenda item, which is our next meeting. So when is our next meeting?

---

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thanks so much, Hadia. This is Yeşim speaking. So I'm looking at the calendar, and normally, we're supposed to go with 19:00 UTC. However, next week, we have the AFRALO monthly calls, so it could be a clash. What we can do is we can go with 21:00 UTC if that would suit the participants instead of 19:00 UTC.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Yeşim. So any objections to 20:00 UTC?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: No, no, 21.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: 21:00 UTC? So I don't see any objections. So we go with 21:00 UTC on Wednesday, 1st of February. Thank you, Yeşim. Thank you all for attending this call, and it's a productive one for sure. Thank you to our interpreters. Thank you to staff. I turn it back to you to adjourn the call. Thank you.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**