
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday 1st of March 2023 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both in the Zoom room and on the comm bridge will be recorded after the call. And just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, and Claire Craig. From Staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Chantelle Doerksen, and myself, Yesim Saglam, present on today's call and I will also be doing call management.

Special for today's call, we do not have interpretation provided as it's the ICANN76 prep week, however, we do have real-time transcription service provided, and I'm going to share the link with you here on Zoom Chat. Please check the service. And with this, just one final reminder for everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And with this, I would like to leave the floor. Back over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yesim, and welcome everyone to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which is likely to be a bit shorter than usual. First, because it is during the ICANN prep week, there are already a lot of other calls happening today so we don't want to crowd your day with another long call in addition to all the other ones. But also, because the agenda is light. So we'll see how we can get on with things, and let's hope we can go swiftly through the agenda.

Firstly, the Work Group and Small Team updates. I only have a couple of updates, one from the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process and one from the Facilitated Dialogue on Closed Generics. So that's a quick update. Then after that, we'll have the policy updates with Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia Elminiawi. There's a bit of work there to do as the statement is under consideration at the moment. And then we will have some time, and it doesn't actually mention his name but I have seen that he is on the call with Jonathan Zuck.

Planning for ICANN76. Yes, that big meeting coming in two weeks' time, it needs a few more things, dots on the I's and crosses on the T's, and you have to prepare for this. So we'll spend most of the time, I guess, on today's call. And that's it for the call today. Is there anything else that we need to add to this agenda?

I'm not seeing any hands up so the agenda is adopted as it is on your screen. And our action items from last week all pertain to this week's call or preparation of some of the processes in the run-up to the ICANN meeting. So the scheduling of the CPWG, things like that, they're all complete. There's no comment on these so that means we can go swiftly to agenda item three. And the first one of our Work Group updates comes from the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process with Steinar Grotterod and Daniel Nanghaka.

STEINAR GROTTEROD:

Good evening and good morning. First of all, I apologize for crying out loud with an email that I sent off last Saturday because I misunderstood some deadlines that were internally set by the Transfer Working Group

for early input to the shorter question for Phase 2 this Monday. But that was, as I said, an input and request to the Working Group members and not to At-Large, etc. But it is still being distributed and I have a copy from the same email that was sent to Jonathan asking for input on the shorter questions.

In my opinion, the shorter questions for Phase 2 are okay. There is only one element that should be of particular interest to the At-Large and that is the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, which means the process that should solve any transfer dispute that has occurred. Having said that, I think that the shorter questions will create the necessary discussion and deliberations, and I don't see any need to emphasize or add more to that. So I think that is okay.

But if the CPWG Working Group members don't agree with me on that one, I think we can set a deadline of something like the 22nd of March for an input meeting, if possible, for us to make our comment with the final deadline on the 4th of April. That is after the ICANN76 meetings. So I think that's an action point. If anybody thinks that we should elaborate a little bit more about the shorter questions for Phase 2, then we should do that by the 22nd of March.

The meeting yesterday in the Working Group was more or less for the Transfer Emergency Contact. And that is contact between the registry operators and the registrars, and this is something that the end user, the registrant, doesn't have any access to and can't trigger. In my opinion, the best alternative is to have this sorted out between the registry operators and the registrars and find a good way to use the Transfer Emergency Contact (TEAC) in the upcoming policy. Some stats indicate it

is not known at all and it's very seldom used. So it is a question about whether there should be some sort of centralized system for doing this because as of today it is phone calls only.

To my knowledge, the TEAC will be mostly discussed during the ICANN76 two meetings, and I'm, unfortunately, not able to participate in that in person. I hope to have a proxy for the two meetings because it's very inconvenient for me in my time zone, but I will listen to the recordings afterward. So, my summary here, please read the question about early input to shorter questions for Phase 2 that was disputed by me on Saturday, and give your feedback on this by March 22nd if needed. That's it, thank you very much. Questions? I don't see any hands, so back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, and what a marvelous thing to have more acronyms. It's always amazing. How marvelous to make this even longer and longer. Yeah, it's an evolving document. Let's come up with some more acronyms and then we'll be able to make it look like we did a lot of work. Anyway, well done. I'm just kidding here. I'm not seeing any hands so let's then move to another of our updates. That's going to be Closed Generics, the facilitated dialogue on Closed Generics -- OFDCG -- and for this, we have AG, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. There's not really a lot to report at this point. We may be regressing and we're spending a fair amount of time right now on definitions. It became obvious as we proceeded, that, in some cases, we

were using words that seemed to be standard English words but not necessarily in the same way. Closed Generics is one of them.

There are also references to things like affiliates in the various contracts, and we were using similar terms but not necessarily in the same way. So we're spending some time on that right now. Not a lot of others to report, there will be a Closed Working Meeting in Cancun on Saturday. We are meeting again next Monday prior to that, so work is proceeding. The intent is to have something out in the relatively near future, and I believe by before the June meeting, but at this point, not a lot of substance to talk about. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. The floor is open for comments and questions. I should just tell you in the meantime that you have failed to produce acronyms this week, but definitions are definitely a good thing to do. So, well done. There'll be plenty of time for definitions. Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, just a quick question, any progress on the global public interests question?

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, never mind.

ALAN GREENBERG: We started talking about things like that and got bogged down by recognizing that we were trying just to jump the gun to some extent, and have moved back. But clearly, it's something that's still on the table with great disagreement. It's going to be one of the real stumbling blocks. The bottom line is no.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Alan, I do have a question on this. Based on the premise that the definitions for the global public interest appear to be a key component of any kind of solution or proposal for Closed Generics, is there not some kind of a blockage here?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I guess to start off, even mentioning the concept of a definition of global public interest is a non-starter. We've never been able to do that. The Board is using a framework to determine whether something is in ICANN's public interest, according to ICANN's bylaws. Like everywhere at ICANN, we use the same term to have many meanings. Within ICANN, the global public interest is a very internal thing. Does it meet the bylaws? Should ICANN do this?

And that's not necessarily the same as whether some registry somewhere in the world is doing something in the global public interest. The Beijing advice, 10 or 11 years ago now, did not use the term global public interest. That term has become common in the period since then. And it is very clear that there may be multiple competing public interests. And the question is, is that a bad thing?

There are some people in the group who believe that we should be looking for a public interest, period. There are others who believe that since we have a global resource, should we be satisfied that a public interest is enough to use a specific word? And that's what the discussion will be when we get to it. We're not at that point at this point.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: But, Alan, just as a follow-up, I seem to recall from your previous explanations that the actual applied-for strings were determined not to be part of ICANN's remit. Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we have to say that because, you know, Apple computers are not part of ICANN's remit. So clearly, the string is outside of ICANN's remit. I don't have any good answers for you right now. I can tell you what Alan Greenberg believes. What the group will come up with remains to be seen.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much. Gopal Tadepalli?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you very much, Dr. Alan Greenberg, for the nice first discussions. What is the 'closed', that's always the question. If at all we get a --

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, are you talking about how closed is the generic, or the meeting?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Both words, closed, tomorrow, closed is the generic -- the word "closed". Not in any context -- C-L-O-S-E-D -- like, apple. An English word, closed.

GREG SHATAN: The questions is, using "closed" as a hypothetical string?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Yes.

GREG SHATAN: That's actually up for discussion, whether we are governing only generic terms. In other words, terms that describe a place or a thing that is used as an identifier for a class of things or of intangibles or whether we are governing all non-brand closed TLDs, is under discussion. If we say that it's only generic terms, which is a subset of all non-brand dictionary words, then there's nothing stopping somebody from getting dot-closed

and calling it closed and saying that, because it's not generic, it doesn't have to respond to any of the restrictions that we want for generic.

Again, this is up for discussion. I would say some people think that the intent was to govern all closed TLDs and that it would essentially be to keep semantic distinction to say that it only applies to terms that can be defined as generic, as opposed to the rest of the non-brand English language. And that doesn't even get to issues of geographic terms and the like.

But I would say that both of the issues that came up as I was getting on the call, relating to the public interest, we're very much embroiled in those discussions. I wouldn't say we're close to an answer or even close to the latter part of the discussion. I would say, to some extent, we've gotten a little less ambitious in our timing, where we thought we might have a preliminary report by Cancun.

Now, these are topics that are very much front of mind. But first, we're trying to work on, at this point, what we're calling framework questions, which somehow came out of a suggestion of mine. So we'll see how that goes. But it's never a dull moment, and I think that by and large, there is a spirit of cooperation and a desire to come up with an answer, a recommendation, as opposed to just furthering a stalemate and allowing the lack of a status quo to go forward. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Thank you for this explanation, Greg. I'm not seeing anyone else in the queue, so thanks to both of you, Alan and Greg, and keep up the good work on this. It certainly seems to be challenging. That pretty much

closes our updates for our Work Groups and Small Teams and it takes us to the policy comment updates with Chantelle and Hadia.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you, Olivier. We have no new public comments that are coming up. The only one that we need to draw attention to -- and I'll turn it over to Hadia in a second to walk us through -- is the additional script-based reference label generation rules and related updates. That public comment proceeding closes on the 3rd of March. The CPWG wants to recommend that the ALAC move forward with the draft statement. That means we have maybe 48 hours to turn it around, including either a consensus call by the ALAC to ratify the statement or if we do that after the fact. I'll need to check on that. But with that, I will turn it over to Hadia to walk us through the statement.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Let's look at the Google Doc, and let me tell you what I propose in relation to this statement. First, the public comment is in relation to the second label generation and it is not about the root zone label generation rules. As I see it, we could still also put a comment in relation to the root zone label generation rules. However, I think we should note that we are talking about the root zone label generation rule and not about the second label. That's one point.

The other point, the statement mainly is about words or labels that include, for example, A and A-grave or A-acute or E and E-grave, and that those labels are sometimes required to be seen as variants, however, according to the root zone label generation rules, those are not variants.

So, the fact of the matter is that those labels are not considered a variant. In some cases, and in reality, users see the strings with diacritics as the same version of the string without a diacritic.

An example of that is the French version and the English version. We find that communities would like to register both as variants but they're not able to do that because the root zone label generation rules do not allow that. So the question here is what would be our ask? One possible ask is to allow for exceptions in certain cases, not as a rule that labels with diacritics should be treated as labels without diacritics, but to have some exceptions.

And then the question also comes to mind is, should this exception happen at the root zone label generation rules level or at a lower level? So, would the panel say, well, those are the rules with the exception of some labels like such and such, or should we keep the root zone label generation rules as is and have this exception done at some other lower level? As we know now, we have the EPDP on variant IDNs going on and the PDP IDN variants for ccTLDs also going on. And both PDPs are considering the root zone label generation rule as the sole reference for calculation of variance, whether blocked or allocated. So self-identification is not possible.

We could comment when those PDPs come out and say, well, let's make some exceptions, but also, here's another opportunity to put a comment at another upper level at the root zone label generation rules level saying, well, average DNS users regard many strings with diacritics the same as strings without diacritics. This is the reality, this is how users see it. And

it's not only how users see it, but also this is also what some communities need as TLDs.

My proposal would be to (1) mention clearly that we are mainly referring to the root zone label generation rules and (2) propose an exception to the rules in relation to some strings or some labels. I wouldn't recommend much. Users do see them as variants, but I wouldn't say that we can go ahead and say those are variants. Because again, self-determination is not allowed. So we can't actually say those are variants but we can say this is how users see them.

I'll stop here. I would like to give the floor to Bill to hear his view, and then I open the floor for discussion. If you agree with going forward with a statement and if you agree with the points that I put forward, then I'll go ahead and reflect them in the document. Bill, please go ahead.

BILL JOURIS:

Basically, I think we have two sets of issues with the document. The first is that it takes the root zone rules and simply applies them to the second level, which is rather in conflict with the mandate that the IDN [inaudible - 00:28:28] gave to the various script generation panels, which said, "You are absolutely not to think about second level, you are doing this strictly for the first level." And the first level has a provision that if someone wants a new TLD then it will get a manual review as well as variants getting rejected automatically. Where the second level, there is no manual review and realistically cannot be. So that's a problem.

The second problem is reflected in the fact that all of the issues we're talking about involve the Latin script. And when the ALAC commented

on the Latin script root zone LGR originally, the Latin generation panel chose to -- to be blunt -- just blow us off and say, "Well, obviously, you didn't read the document," which, in fact, we had.

So we have those two sets of issues and I don't know if we want to combine them in a single comment or if we want to split them into separate comments. But, time being short as it is, I would be inclined to go with what we've got here. But I absolutely do think we should seize the opportunity to comment here. And as Hadia mentioned, there will be future documents that we will want to comment on as well. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Bill. So let's open the floor for discussion. Satish? I didn't see you on the call, please go ahead. You lead the discussion.

SATISH BABU:

I think we have an issue here that leads to end-user expectations. So I have basically reached out to someone to clarify the issue of whether this is only about the second level or if it's about the top level. We should hear from him shortly. But the core issue is what was raised in the previous meeting. And it is well documented that the dot-Quebec issue has been kind of up in the air for quite some time now, it is not new.

And we do have a problem with the way the [inaudible - 00:31:13] generational panel has treated the issue in a way that is completely inconsistent with the best of the other script communities. So if Quebec, with and without an accent, is equivalent for the end user communities,

it should be the same way for the generational panel as well. But that is not the way the GP has got to see the issue. So there is clearly an issue. Whether it's a second level or a top level, in both cases, the same principle would apply.

But it is possible that this particular comment opportunity is only for the second level, in which case, we may not be able to raise the general issue. But we still can raise the specific issue at the second level and wait for an opportunity when it comes up to push the issue at the top level as well. So therefore, I would suggest that we go ahead and put up the point that the variance should be applied to the Latin script in the same way as it applies to all other scripts under consideration. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Satish. Any other comments or discussions? So I guess we all agree here, that we go ahead with the public comment. Because we need to provide this by the 3rd of March, I would say we will clean it up and post it via email as well as also put it on the Wiki page. If we don't receive any additional comments, then we go ahead with it. Satish, what do you think?

SATISH BABU:

I agree with that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much. So we are done with this policy statement. Again, I don't see any more hands up so we are ready to move. This is the only current statement. I guess Chantelle mentioned the upcoming public

comment proceedings, the initial report on the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee Charter Review, the Technical Check Review, and the improved GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charter Amendment Process. And this is with the OFB Working Group. Thank you so much. I'll stop here and give the floor back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. I actually have a question regarding the upcoming public comment proceedings. Because two out of the three that are mentioned for February -- the initial report on the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee and the Technical Check Review, we're now in March, so are these likely to be released soon or is it just sliding over? Are we basically expecting anything before the ICANN meeting takes place? Maybe Chantelle might know.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: My apologies. I realized I failed to move them from February to March. We're not expecting any new public comments to open between now and ICANN76, so stay tuned for what will come after.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: All right. Thank you very much. I wanted to make sure that was clear, because, of course, I thought that a few years ago there was a consensus within the community that the ICANN meeting would not see the opening and closing of public comments and there was a moratorium before and after of at least one week. I'm not seeing any other hands up so we can move to the next agenda item. And thank you for this policy update.

Thank you very much for taking us through the statement, Hadia. And we now go to Agenda Item 5, and Jonathan Zuck is going to take us through the ICANN76 At-Large planning.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks a lot, Olivier, for the slot on the agenda. I just wanted to use the opportunity of the CPWG meeting to make people aware of some of the sessions that we'll be doing and what we'll be discussing so that people have a chance to think about things and raise issues if they come to mind. So that's what I thought I would go through.

On Saturday, the weekend before the ICANN meeting begins, which is mostly devoted to internal conversations -- although there are a few community-wide conversations happening over the weekend as well, including one that Staff generated on subsequent procedures. But to my knowledge, we don't yet know what that subsequent procedures discussion is going to be. We have scheduled our own internal subsequent procedures discussion with an eye toward looking at all the recommendations we've made with respect to subsequent procedures and identify what our key priorities are.

In journalism, in newspaper journalism in particular, because the size of a newspaper was limited, they used to make reporters write their articles in what they call an inverted pyramid format, where the article was written so that the most important stuff was at the top of the article. So if an editor needed to just chop the article from the bottom for space, they could. And that's a little bit of the exercise that we have going on now.

With the regime change, so to speak, with respect to the Board and the CEO, there's definitely a renewed concentration and effort on subsequent procedures, and we need to really prioritize our recommendations and determine what it is we think is absolutely essential to happen prior to a new round because I don't think that we're going to get everything that we've recommended.

There are some things that don't affect the timeline but there are also things that take time and they could affect that conversation. Some of the things that we've been after, having a more broad discussion on it, have taken place. And that includes applicant support and Closed Generics. So I think that we were successful in both those cases in making a case for the Board to push those conversations back to the community.

So that is the session that we're going to have on Saturday to discuss subsequent procedures. I hope as many people as possible can participate in that. I don't think we will finish our work by any means. Instead, I think that session will be to look at coming up with some principles that we might apply to some of our recommendations to determine whether or not they're critical and maybe have a couple of sample conversations that will lead to some small group work, both of the CPWG and the [ODP - 00:39:52] Working Group to come up with a refined list of recommendations for the Board. So that's the session that's going to be happening on Saturday.

Then, another session that we have at the other end of the week, is sort of our own plenary discussion. What we submitted as a possible plenary discussion is looking at the ODP process. Now that we've had two of them, one for SSAD and one for subsequent procedures, we have a little

bit of data as far as how that process goes. And some patterns have begun to arise and suggest some questions be asked.

So again, that's going to be a community-wide discussion that we hope will be interesting and exciting, and probably just the start of this debate. But it's just a question of whether or not the ODP is fit for purpose, or what we could do to make it more efficient. Is there a change we can make to the PDP process to make the ODP process or implementation generally more efficient?

Are there instances in which the separation of church and state between policy and implementation -- because those lines become blurred as a result of things being left undone in the PDP process, such as auctions, and what position does that put Staff in terms of ODPs? So that's the conversation we'll be having about that. That'll be a community-wide discussion on the panel, and then hopefully, a lively conversation. Any questions about either of those? Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Jonathan. Very interesting topic. I just have two points. The first one is that the border between policy and implementation was always a topic of discussion. Since the beginning when I started with ICANN, I always heard discussions on that and [inaudible - 00:42:31]. We evolve by having people who have done the policy or the first committee Working Group proposal be participating, at least at the discussion level of what could happen in the implementation. My main point here is that I have the impression that you say that we will have a discussion, but it's just 10 minutes. It's a bit short for a discussion with the participant, but

maybe the way we are doing the meeting is because it's a short slot.
Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sebastien, what do you mean by that? We have a 60-minute conversation on --

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can we see the program for this meeting? It will be easier for me to tell you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of the ODP session?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The unfinished business, yes. General discussion, 10 minutes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, at the bottom. Yeah, so I don't know, these times are just estimates. I'm moderating this conversation and so --

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You will do well. That's okay. It was just to --

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I see what you're saying there, and I'm not even sure I noticed that before. I'm definitely going to try to drive it to a conversation as soon as possible. But I think the fact that we might only have an hour is certainly going to limit things. So, good catch. I didn't even realize it myself. I'll be happy to give up my wrap-up time to facilitate internal conversation. Thanks, Sebastien. Other questions or comments about those two? Okay. What else do I have to cover, Chantelle?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yesim, could we please go back to the CPWG agenda? Thank you. Jonathan. I think the next part is to talk briefly about the ALAC topics to the ICANN Board. And I'm just noting quickly that they have been submitted, so now we have to work through the timing. Staff has proposed timing here just as a discussion point. And obviously, they aren't fixed. But that's something that we might want to talk about. And then also specifically, not to put Justine on the spot, but under the ALAC topic 2.B, sub-pro is listed and we have Justine as the main speaker for that. And Jonathan, I don't know if there's anything you want to add further to that point, or to use the CPWG time to flesh out what some of those questions or statements should be.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think the Board has recently come back to us and asked us to flesh out our questions and make them a little bit more specific. I see Alan has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a quick comment. In looking at items 2A and B -- A being the joint ALAC statement and our advice, rather, and B being sub-pro -- the priority of those two should be focusing on B. We have A on the agenda because ICANN Org happened to come back to us and say, we've completed it and we're disagreeing. But between those two, there's far more substance and importance in sub-pro than in the advice one. So let's make sure we allocate the time reasonably. We don't have much of it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I think you're right about that, Alan. And I think probably A is just going to be a pain. The irony about sub-pro is that it's so vague, it behooves us to try and figure out what exchange it is we want to have with the Board on sub-pro. So yeah, so you're absolutely right. Keep your comments pithy on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, it's sometimes hard to control what other people say, especially if a board member decides you're going to start expounding or gives the mic to a staff member. We may want to flip the order is what I'm saying. If we ran out of time and didn't get to the advice statement, nothing would really be lost. If we run out of time and don't get to sub-pro, we've lost an opportunity.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, Alan, I'll take it under advisement. Justine, just to put you on the spot for fun, what is your sense of what we might want to focus on in what will be a fairly brief conversation with the Board in terms of

subsequent procedures? Where would feedback benefit us the most? Is there a specific part of our advice that you think we want to cover? Is it where they're thinking is going in terms of a revised version of option two, in terms of timing so that we have a better sense of what the time constraints are on our recommendations? Give us your thoughts, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I don't really have any clear thoughts at the moment so I can't answer your question. I suppose the basis is the advice that we've given, and also the letter and the supplementary advice that we were preparing but haven't submitted, it's the question of picking and choosing out of all of those things what we want to put forward. I don't have a proper answer for you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, it's going to require more thought. I have this vague recollection that when we first put this on the agenda it was to see if the Board had questions or additional comments on the advice or recommendations that we've made thus far. I guess we could potentially look at that. We could go back to our correspondence. Because we did receive a response to our correspondence but it was fairly generic. And so it may be that we want to pierce a little bit more deeply into that -- the topics we raised in our correspondents that, as you say, could evolve into being more advice.

I think our whole objective with the Board in the near term here has got to be to reduce, reduce, reduce, and revise, to try and crystallize what's most important to us. Because we've got a lot out of them now and I

think there's a new level of urgency around public and procedures and we need to refine our positions. Go ahead, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I'm still trying to digest the first part of the conversation that has happened between the Board and GNSO Council, where the Board actually tables not in a very detailed form, but enough for folks to understand where they're coming from, in my opinion anyway. And they mentioned things that they have concerns about. They have said that they're going to defer deciding on ICANN76.

So my understanding is a lot of the recommendations or the sub-pro outputs are going to be voted on by the Board. And we don't know whether they're going to vote yea or nay, but presumably, they're going to vote yea because the Board has also talked about wanting to push along the recommendations toward implementation. So they have said that once they approve certain things at Cancun, then the IRT will be set up expeditiously to start looking at implementation.

But in terms of the list of things that they have different decisions on -- because they still have things that they want to talk to the council about -- the list is not very long but it's extensive enough for me not to be able to regurgitate it to you right now. But it will include issues that are on our advice, which are auctions, picks, and dependencies like name collisions, applicant support, Closed Generics, those are a given.

I have a question in my mind as to whether the Board appreciates the nuances in our previous advice and against the ODP process or the ODA, and by virtue of that, ICANN Org has explained to the board. So we might

want to think about trying to explain some of the things to the Board in this conversation that we're having, that are not necessarily hard to do but people are just looking past them, really. Things like CPE, things like objections. I think those things we might want to try and talk to the Board about again. We need to think about this a bit more to optimize the time that we have.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, those seem like good suggestions, Justine, so thank you for that. The RBC question, I think, is central to a lot of other questions, and so we've had some brief discussions with the Board on RBCs. It might be worth seeing how their thoughts on that are evolving as well because I think that's something that we find very important. It's critical to a lot of other types of conversations that are going on because it will be the means by which those conversations have teeth.

And so I think RBCs are potentially an interesting topic for our discussion with the Board. I think we're going to continue to have that conversation. So I ask the folks on this call to think about the things that they think are most important for the ALAC to discuss with the Board and we will continue to evolve this agenda, for sure.

The Board has come to us with specific questions. I think one of the things that the Board is doing that's a little bit different is not asking the same questions of every group. So it didn't make sense to ask the same questions to each group rather than just having a group discussion, and so the questions are more specific. We have received questions about the appreciation of volunteers or facilitation of volunteers, and what are

the most pressing issues for end users. So that's, again, something that might be reflected in our conversation on the Saturday before.

And I see Avri's comment on the GSO doc so let's go through that exercise as well. So, those are some of the questions that we'll be having from the Board and having conversations about that as well. Put your thinking caps on. I think we need to have a fairly succinct conversation with the Board, not a free for all. So we need to see how specific we can make our questions and how specific we can make our answers to make that meeting as effective as possible. With that, I guess what I would do is hand the mic back over to Chantelle to talk to us a little bit about the ICANN76 talking points.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Jonathan, thank you. The shepherds have been very busy the past few weeks updating the talking points for ICANN76. Some of the slides look a little text heavy and we might want to consider breaking them up. As you can see on the slide in front of you, there are five policy topics. There are two topics under governance and operations, neither of which have a session per se at ICANN76, but the OFB wanted to make sure that you are aware, and Cheryl helped draft those so thank you to her. And then finally, you have the At-Large resources, as usual. At this point, I think we should go through the individual slides quickly, we'll note the talking points, and then we'll note the sessions for each one of these topics that will be happening.

Now, one thing we are working on with Jonathan is to see about assigning or looking for a volunteer to attend these sessions and report back. Some

of them are fairly easy. For example, under session bullet point 2 is our own ALAC internal session and subsequent procedures. So for completeness, just talking maybe a little bit about what happened.

And so on the screen in front of you is the session report document that we would like to try to use. There'll be three sections, to make it standardized: what happened, what are the At-Large-specific takeaways from the session, and then what does At-Large need to do next. So again, this isn't necessarily about what happened in the session overall, per se, but very intentionally specific to A-Large and At-Large's interests.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Just to re-emphasize that, we've had experiments on and off, apparently, in the history of At-Large, including my time here and doing this. And I think we continue to try to refine how to do this. But ideally, particularly at this meeting, we're trying to minimize the number of sessions where we're just talking to ourselves, and encourage folks in the community to get out and be active participants in the conversations that are happening around the meeting. And so we're hoping to, in the early sessions, identify folks that are interested in these various sessions.

As we're talking about the talking points, we'll talk about the sessions that are relevant to that and get folks to volunteer to be at those sessions and be a kind of rapporteur for them so that at the end of the week, we can say, "Well, here's the state of play on this, here's what the contracting party is currently saying about DNS abuse."

And, what about this as relevant to end users? Is there a next step? Is there a question that we ought to try to get the answer to, etc., and come

away with a list of action items from the meeting based on our participation in conversations around the community.

So that's the overall objective. For those that are going to be there, those that are going to be online, we're trying to get folks to commit to being in these sessions. And while in those sessions, think about what specifically is relevant for end users and what if any questions or action items come out of those sessions so that we come away from the meeting with an agenda for ourselves. So that's the overall objective of that idea. This document is meant to capture those reports.

So it's not just a general report of, "Well, this happened and people talked about this," but trying to see a couple of bullets that say, "Here's what was discussed that we think of particular interest to us and here's what we think we ought to be focused on for the next couple of months, particularly before the next meeting, which is quite soon, that we ought to get a handle on based on what you heard." Hopefully, that makes sense to everyone, but that's what we're going to try to do. All right, Chantelle, back to you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you, Jonathan. Just to build on what Jonathan was saying about the objective of the session reports, during the ICANN76 At-Large welcome session, we will be asking for volunteers to attend, participate in these sessions, and then report back. So please consider volunteering, and then we can finalize that during the session. Jonathan, looking at the clock, we still have about 20 or so minutes. Did you want to go through these slides individually to look at them? How would you like to proceed?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know the answer. I guess, possibly. I mean, it's a lot. As I said, I think that the subsequent procedures talking points probably need to stop being subsequent procedures talking points and instead be applicant support talking points or something like that. It's a lot under subsequent procedures and that's a conversation that's going to be so multifaceted. But maybe we could ask the shepherds on each of these to talk about what they think is going to be most important. I don't know. But besides that, I think just sending people to this document to read it is probably the best idea because I think it's too much to just cover this way.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Okay, thank you, Jonathan. So I will post the document link in the chat. It's also on the agenda. So feel free to take a look at it. In the notes section on the slides, we do have background information so please make sure to check that out as well. And we look forward to hearing about your willingness to volunteer during the welcome session that ICANN76.

JONATHAN ZUCK: In the agenda here, you'll see there's also a link to the overall At-Large workspace for ICANN76. You can always come back to this agenda to find all the documents and things like that for ICANN76. So just remember that in this agenda of every recent meeting is this ICANN76 At-Large workspace where there are links to all of these different documents and conversations. All right, any other questions or comments about ICANN76? Sebastian, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Just to say that we are still working on the plenary session. I hope that [inaudible - 01:05:48] can join online during the session to be the voice of end users. In case she's not able to do it, I may come back to you and ask for somebody else to take the floor during this session. But we have a meeting later this afternoon and I hope to know better about what she can do during the session. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thanks, Sebastian. I think that's it, for ICANN 76, Olivier, so I will pass the mic back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jonathan, and thanks for taking us through this whole thing. It certainly looks like a lot of work. And now, we're going into any other business. I'm not seeing anyone's hand up at the moment. The next question, I guess, is when will our next meeting be? And the proposal is for a meeting to take place after the ICANN meeting because next week, Staff are traveling. The question is, do we need a meeting next week or can we do everything online?

The next meeting would be on either the 22nd or the 29th of March. I would aim maybe towards the 22nd of March for the simple reason that giving it one to three weeks without any work, we might miss some deadlines. And I certainly noticed that there was a deadline, wasn't there, on the -- oh, no, there was no deadline, sorry. There is nothing in the pipeline that warrants a meeting at that time. Any thoughts on this?

Since there's absolute silence at the moment, I would be inclined to make it on the 22nd of March. Pencil it in. If everything is being discussed in the face-to-face meetings and we don't need a call, then we can always then move it to the 29th. We can cancel the 22nd and go for the 29th. And I am also aware that staff usually is on holiday the week after the ICANN meeting, or at least takes a break because they need it. So it would be a skeleton staff that could run the call.

And I see Sebastian says, "No meeting usually during the week after an ICANN meeting." You're correct as well. Any other thoughts, then? If that's the only input we have, then I'm okay with doing it on the 29th of March and doing everything else by email in the meantime.

All right, seeing that there's no one jumping up and down for either the [inaudible - 01:09:55], let's go for the 29th of March. Next week, anyway, Staff is traveling and the week after, everyone's going to meet face-to-face. If there is something that's important that needs to be done quickly, no doubt Jonathan will drop a note to Hadia, myself, and Staff, and we can always schedule a call on the 22nd.

Bear in mind, many people will be absolutely exhausted after the ICANN meeting. So, the next call is on the 29th of March. I'll see you at 19:00 UTC. And that's it for today. I'd like to thank everyone who has participated in this call. It's been very interesting. I hope that you've all enjoyed the call as well. Thanks for the updates and for the preparation for this ICANN meeting.

This week, as I mentioned earlier, is the ICANN prep week. So please have a look at the agendas and participate. Get ready for the travel next week

and then I'll see you all in Cancun, whether face-to-face or virtually. Unfortunately, I shall probably see you virtually. But if you are traveling, safe travels. And for everyone else, have a very good time until then. No interpreters for this call today but thanks to the real-time text transcription service today, they've been really helpful.

Remember, when you leave the Zoom call, you will have a set of multiple-choice questions, just take two minutes to answer them. It's always good to have some feedback on this. And that's it. Thank you, everyone. Hadia, anything else that I've missed today?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No. Thank you. Nothing to add from my side. Bye.

OLIVIER CREPIN LEBLOND: Excellent. Bye, everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are. Goodbye.

YESIM SAGLAM: This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]