
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call, taking place on Wednesday, 5th of April, 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 type of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge, will be recorded after the call.

And to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Judith Hellerstein, Steinar Grotterod, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Bill Jouris, Justine Chew, Christopher Wilkinson, Alberto Soto, and Greg Shatan.

On the staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Chantelle Doerksen, and myself, Yesim Saglam, present on today's call, and I will be doing call management.

As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretations provided, and our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Claudia and Lilia, and on the French channel, we have Aurelie and Jacques.

And before we get started, as usual, we do have real-time transcription service provided for today's call, and I'm now sharing the link with you here on the Zoom chat. Please do check the service, and another reminder is to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well.

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.

And with this, I see that Olivier has joined us on Zoom, so I'm going to hand the floor over to him. Thank you very much, and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim, and welcome, everyone, to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which is likely to be somehow shorter than usual. Let's see how it goes. We have very few updates from our work group and small teams. We have just a quick rundown on policy comment updates with no statements currently in the pipeline and decisions which have been made, so we'll have some general discussion on that. Then Jonathan Zuck will be spending about 10 minutes speaking to us or with us, animating a debate about the subsequent procedures. There's certainly the SubPro-IRT planning that's coming up, and then there is, after that, a discussion on preparations for ICANN 77, with Jonathan and Hadia taking us through this, and that's, of course, the preparation for the different sessions that we will be holding in the next ICANN meeting, and that will take place in Washington, D.C.

Now, at this point in time, that's all there is, so if you have other suggestions for topics or any other business to add to this agenda, please suggest these now. You may suggest these now. I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. So, the agenda is adopted as it currently is listed on your screen.

That takes us to our action items, of which there are two from last week's call, and those relate to the holding of today's call, the first one, and the second one is for input to be provided to Steinar regarding the

comments on the transfer policy review input. By the 3rd of April—and, of course, that was two days ago, and I gather that the statements or the responses were helpful for Steinar to go and take these to the working group. Unfortunately, he has an apology today, so we won't be able to find out. Maybe if one of his colleagues will be available at that point, we will certainly see.

But action items are—since I don't see any hands up—are completed, and since I've just alluded to the transfer policy review policy development process, I believe we're probably—is it Daniel Nanghaka providing us with an update today? The problem is I don't see Daniel. Then it's sometimes the case.

So, we have 10 minutes for the TPR PDP, but I'm not quite sure who will be providing this, because I know that Steinar is not with us. I'm going to turn to Chantelle, because Chantelle was supposed to be speaking on this, and so, Chantelle, do you have an answer for that?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Olivier. This is Chantelle. We do not have any updates on transfer policy for this week. We will be back next week with an update, so stay tuned. The only one we have is from Alan on the RDRS, formerly known as the SSAD ODA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, sorry. For some reason, it wasn't—I had to reload my agenda, and now, of course, it says N/A. So, no update on the transfer policy review, no update on the expedited policy development

process on the internationalized domain name, no update on the registration data accuracy scoping team, but there is a short update on the registration data request service, the RDRS, which used to be called the SSAD ODA, and Alan Greenberg is going to provide us with an update on that. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and there also will be a very brief update on closed generics. In terms of RDRS, we are meeting regularly right now. There was a meeting at the beginning of this week. The main discussion this week was quite—I thought was quite interesting. The proposal from staff identified a number of reports that would be generated. It did not, however, identify what data was being collected. Now, normally, you collect data and then decide which to publish, and of course, there could be data collected that is not published but is used for future purposes.

The rationale was that this originally—this system was requested by the board to some extent, perhaps to a large extent, but certainly to some extent, to identify what the demand was. Things like the number of requests and related things were clearly within the report structure. The point that a number of us have been making is this is a very changing dynamic we're in, although this is what the board asked for today. When they have to make a decision on the outcome of this experiment, so to speak, almost three years from now, it's not clear what the questions are going to be. It's not clear what the environment is going to be, and it's not at all clear that the question they will be asking is

simply, do we implement SSAD as designed or not? Yes, no. Chances are it will be far more nuanced than that.

So, we're trying to make the case to collect as much data as possible and make sure it's preserved, even if we don't have reports on it right now, even if some of it may have to be redacted because it has confidential information in it.

The downside, of course, is with privacy issues and data minimization issues, you have to justify why you are collecting data and what it's going to be used for and how long you keep it. So, it's somewhat more complicated, but we feel that the world is unclear enough. We're going into this process. We better not lose information that we might need going forward a year or so from now, and I think we are making some headway. That's really the only report I have at this point. That was the main topic of discussion at the last meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Alan. Let's see if there are any questions or comments on this. I note that in the agenda, there is a blog post from the 1st of March where the ICANN Board greenlight implementation of the Registration Data Request Service. That's what launched it as such. It was a resolution of a special meeting of the ICANN Board earlier this year, and that's moving forward. Is there any sense as to whether this is taking us closer to a replacement to the WHOIS service?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the WHOIS service still exists. It's not going to change. As noted before, for at least several registrars, the WHOIS information has become almost totally useless because it simply points to their proxy servers, to their proxy provider. But nevertheless, the concept still exists, and in theory, due to GDPR, there is still redacted data. Remember, this system is not replacing WHOIS. It's to access information that is redacted from WHOIS. Depending on the registrar, that may be virtually nothing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I am not seeing anyone here putting their hand up, so that means we are going to be going to the next one, which is on closed generics.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just a very brief report, and despite Jonathan's request, this is not on substance, but on process. But it's, I think, an important one that I'd like to mention. As Greg mentioned last time, the process proposed by staff was to review an executive summary, which had been drafted, even though many of the substantive points under it had not been decided. There was an attempt to try to address the substantive points as sub-items within the executive summary.

That position has been reversed. We are now going back to the original document and working our way through it and trying to address the issues, and then we'll draft an executive summary once we know what we're summarizing. That's a very positive step. That being said, we still have a huge number of items to address and a very tight timeline. The timeline has been adjusted somewhat in that we still have to have a

report ready well before the June meeting, but it doesn't have to be finalized as was originally planned. We're making progress, but we still have a tremendous challenge ahead of us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. On this dialogue on closed interacts, is [inaudible] still likely to become public after everything is finished, after the work of the group is completed, as it says there? Or is there not very much [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: Once we have a draft, it will be made public. Whether there'll be interim reports along the way as we make progress through it, I can't speak to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's open the floor for comments and questions on this topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will be leaving the meeting, unfortunately, right after my presentation. If there's questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, let me then ask everyone, are we going to be releasing Alan from his chair after the closed generics? If you want Alan to be released, then you can put a green tick. If you would rather keep him on the call, then put a red cross. I don't see any—in the absence of red crosses—

ALAN GREENBERG: You'll have to disable my leaving button.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the absence of red crosses, Alan, thank you very much for attending and for providing us with an update on these two topics.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for letting me leave.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think it's any of my resolve to let you or not let you. You're free to do as you wish. Let's continue. In the meantime, I've actually received a note from Satish Babu, who suggested he could provide a quick update on the EPDP on internationalized domain names. Just a three-minute quick thing. So, let's revert back to that and hand the floor to Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Olivier. So, this is also a process update rather than a substantive update. The big news, the good news that is, is that the EPDP team has completed the phase one charter question. We normally have a meeting on Thursday, but this Thursday being a holiday, we had the meeting last Monday, and that was the last meeting for the phase one question. And now it's been handed over to, it shortly will be handed over to ICANN Org, which will do the subsequent processing,

and it will be available for public comment, most likely by the end of April.

The not so good news is that for ALAC to respond to some of these points, since the finalization of the recommendations and the implementation guidance and the rationale took so long to finalize, we were not able to bring it to CPWG as often as we would have liked to do like to bring it.

So, we will have to then, once the public comments start getting open, we will have to discuss some of those—not all issues are contentious. There are a few perhaps that are of importance to At-Large, and which may be a little bit controversial. So, we will have to start with those discussions once the report is out for the public comment.

There are about 50 different recommendations, and it's a pretty substantial report. So, this is just an early notice that this is going to be in our plate sometime soon now. Thank you very much, and back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Satish. Let's see if there are any questions or comments regarding your intervention. Certainly, 60 recommendations sounds like an enormous amount of work, so that's one thing I should do is to congratulate your team and your colleagues for having been through this. And I mean, I know the work is not finished, far from it, but certainly this number of recommendations sounds like a great set of steps forward. I wasn't aware that so much had to be done.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. Well, the AILAC team was pretty active in the whole thing, and Justine can give you the formal feedback on that. But we also note that there is a phase two part of it. Phase one was all the gTLD kind of questions at the top level. And phase two, which will start now, is on the second level, and that is expected to continue until 2025 or so. So, thanks again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Satish. I'm not seeing any hands up, so that means we have pretty much finished with our work group and small team updates. And that means we can then go to our next section, and that's the policy comment updates with Chantelle Dawson and Hadia Elminiawi.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Olivier. This is Chantelle. I will just do the high-level overview and then pass it over to Hadia, as usual, for the substance. No new comments have been posted. The ALAC and the CPWG have decided not to make the comment on the initial report on the RZERC Charter Review. We discussed that last week. And then, looking ahead to public comment proceedings, just building on what Satish had just reported on IDNs, that one is coming up and is scheduled to open, I think, at the end of April, early May. We have it as April for now. So, if there's some discussion that, Hadia, you'd like to give on that, I will turn it over to you now for that deep dive. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Chantelle. So, actually, I don't have much more to add, but just to note that upcoming, we have two actually internationalized domain names related PDPs. One is the gTLD one, and the other one is the ccNSO IDN ccTLD, and they're both supposed to be in May. I'm not sure that the ccNSO, the gTLD one, is supposed to come out by end of April, as mentioned. The ccNSO one, I'm not sure that it will make it in April, for April. But those are two that are different in nature, but need to be consistent. And that's it for me. Thank you. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's really, really fast. Thank you very much for this, Hadia. Let's see if there are any comments or questions on these topics. Just opening the floor to see if anyone wanted to discuss. And I'm not seeing any hands up, so that's fine. And that means we can now go to the SubPro update, SubPro being the subsequent procedures. And for this, we have Jonathan Zuck taking us through that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. So, we had a session at, I guess this is a combination of things, a discussion of ICANN 76 and also subsequent procedures. We had a session in ICANN 76 that was about the ODP process and kind of explored whether or not staff were forced to sort of bridge some gaps in the report and make some assumptions about policy, about things that weren't clear and whether there was enough kind of community input into that process.

And I think the net net of that session was that perhaps there was not enough community input into that process, and so that assumptions got made, both in the case of the SSAD ODP and the subsequent procedures ODP. And that's something they're already addressing going forward.

But I think also as a result of that session, when staff are looking to design the IRT for subsequent procedures to look at what the implementation of those recommendations would look like, it's a little bit more expansive. So, we're going to have a representative and an alternate, which is Justine and Cheryl, for that IRT, but the number of participants that can participate in all the conversations, raise issues of concern, etc., is unlimited.

And so, I think it behooves us to identify who's interested in being a part of that IRT, and perhaps if there's a particular issue on which you're interested in participating, rather than having to commit to the whole IRT, we could determine that as well. And then as the schedule evolves for the IRT, involve additional participants beyond our main two as those particular issues heat up.

So, for example, at the point at which the IRT is discussing the applicant support program, Maureen and Sarah may want to become more involved in the IRT, but they may not want to be on every meeting. And so, I think the way that we're going to try to handle this is to figure out how to plan people's time and maximize the utility of that time by aligning with the schedule for folks that are interested in participating beyond the two main folks.

So, that's how Lars has proposed the IRT to go. So, I wanted to just put that out there so that people are aware of that structure, and so you could speak up and identify as a particular interest in being a participant in the IRT, but also if there's a particular issue on which you want to participate to make that known as well. We don't need to know today, but I'm happy to discuss it with folks if people have questions about that.

So, yeah, to Chantelle's description, it's essentially an open group, but again, I don't think we're not trying to encourage lots of people being on all the time, but maybe try to make this sort of periodic participation thing work if we can. The only real difference between the representatives and the participants has to do with voting to pose a question back to the GNSO. So, participants are free to speak up, express their opinion, etc., but if something raises to the level of needing feedback from the GNSO, then that will be a result of the vote of the representatives. Any questions about that?

All right. Well, that's basically the subsequent procedures update, the most important part of the IRT. Beyond that, what we're also going to try and do is form a couple of small teams, one from this group, from the CPWG, to look at the recommendations that we've made with respect to subsequent procedures and really drill down into which of those recommendations need to be implemented, completed, measured, etc., prior to the start of a new round. And so, we've done some basic prioritization exercises, like this one is more important than this one, sort of relative evaluation, but what we haven't done is really determine which ones are essential to be finished prior to a new round beginning. And that's the discussion that I think we need to have.

So, again, if you're interested in that, please make that interest known here and staff will record it and we will get a conversation going on that prioritization or critical path, I guess, is a better way to think about it than prioritization, critical path analysis of the recommendations we've made with respect to a new round. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. On the forming of the implementation review team, if members of our community or anybody on this call are interested in taking part, what's the procedure? Do they have to file an application? Will there be a call for candidates? Will the call be publicized with a Zoom and then you just turn up on the Zoom or any idea of this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not positive about that. Chantelle, I don't know if you have more details. You pulled up this blog from Lars that I hadn't seen before. I'm reporting on a conversation I had with Lars, but I suspect that there will be a call for mailing list participation and that's how it'll begin. But Chantelle, you may know more than me. I don't know if you care to be put on the spot.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jonathan. Sure. So, the blog was published yesterday and there is going to be an official email going out to the leaders later today. So, look forward to more information on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Well, there you go. We're discussing it one day too early or something like that for that level of detail, Olivier. But so, I'll keep people informed about that when I receive that official email. But there'll just be a call for volunteers that I think will result in people joining a listserv. And so, if separately, if you're interested in being on the small team to determine the critical path issues among our recommendations, then please, you can either put something in chat or let staff know and we'll put together a little small subcommittee and then kind of report back to the CPWG for a final discussion on that. But we just got to kind of hash out what we're going to where we're going to draw the line. So, probably need to make a distinction between those recommendations that have timeline impact and those that don't. And those that don't have timeline impact, I think we can press forward on.

You know, like an example is that we probably believe that more than \$2 million is necessary for the applicant support program. So, making that determination is not going to change the date of the launch of the new applications, whereas setting some expectation of looking at the results of the DNS abuse mitigation activities may in fact have an impact on the start date. So, we need to make that distinction. And those that affect that start date, we're going to have to be really selective with to figure out which are most important. All right. And I see Carlos has volunteered, and Satish and Bill. So, hopefully you're seeing, you're seeing those, Chantelle, in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's correct, Jonathan. Chantelle is, or Yesim is taking notes. And so if anybody is interested, let them please put the notes in the chat and then staff will be recording this and following up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, perfect. I guess I'm next. So, I can just keep going. So, ICANN 77, this is the one that comes up the quickest between the spring and summer here, it comes around pretty quickly. ICANN 77 is coming up in June in Washington, D.C. I'll have to put some creative thoughts into this time's promo video since the 2,000 views on the other one has set a pretty high bar for me. So, we'll see what we do in D.C.

But more importantly, what we have to figure out is, because it's a policy meeting, what are we most interested in seeing discussed at that meeting? Are there particular policy sessions and discussions we want to hold ourselves? There's not that distinction between the weekend and the weekdays. It's a shorter meeting. It just goes Monday through Thursday. It's just a four-day meeting. So, just about anything we schedule is going to be open to the community. So, it's about looking at what kind of cross-community discussions we might be interested in leading. And so, I'd be interested in opening up the conversation here if folks think that something should be discussed at that meeting. If something should be discussed at the meeting and we should try to hold a session on it. That's really the first topic of conversation. I realize I'm sort of putting everybody on the spot here, but if you've got some ideas, Hadia and Olivier as the CPWG chairs, if you think there's something that we should broaden the conversation on that we've been discussing on CPWG calls, now's a good time to speak up so that we can

try to get that into the planning process sooner rather than later. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. So, the introduction of the new generic top-level domains is a big step that's going to be happening soon. It will expand the online space, impact the industry, have an impact on registrants and Internet users, and I guess as the representatives of the interests of Internet users, developing sessions around this would make sense.

So, by the last day of ICANN 77, ICANN Org is supposed to present—we are supposed to be done with dependencies, items on which the implementation of SubPro relies on, and the implementation plan is supposed to be in place by the end of August. So, those dependencies include applicant guidebook, closed generics, IDNs, and definitely also—well, this is not the dependency, the security and resiliency of the Internet, but definitely the introduction of a new gTLD also has an impact on the security and safety of Internet users.

So, I guess we could start thinking of topics that have an impact on Internet users and that are related to the launch of the process or application for new gTLDs. So, in our last meeting, we did start discussing Internet users' online safety, and in doing that, we started looking at already approved policies that could actually have—that implementation is necessary before the next round.

So, we could look into all the relevant topics and look at it from an Internet user perspective and see what we would like to see

implemented before the new program is launched. So, those are just some thoughts, but I think we could work around—

JONATHAN ZUCK:

What do you think a session might look like? Boil that down for me a little bit. It feels like you're circling a topic potentially there, but what do you think a potential hour, hour and a half session might look like that we might want to get onto the calendar?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

A 90-minute session. I think we don't really need to focus on one topic, but maybe to bring different topics. So, I don't have a look for the session yet, but maybe we could, like, take each of the topics and look at it from an Internet user perspective and see the impact of that topic on—the implementation of that topic on Internet users in relation to the launch of the new program. And maybe in the end, we could come up with some recommendations. So, yes, I think not less than 90 minutes for sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. I guess I'm going to ask you to think that through more and try to boil that down to—I mean, like, what you think that session might look like and how you want to lead that discussion and what list you're working from when you say you want to go through the list of topics, I don't know what list that is necessarily. So, just spend some time percolating on that, Hadia, and come back with a little bit of a proposal. And think about a session you might want to lead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, sure. And I invite everyone also to think about it also and share their thoughts in that regard. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, for sure. Thanks, Hadia. Sebastien, go ahead, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. First, I apologize. I don't have any more Internet at home. Therefore, I am just on my phone and late. We had already one meeting, a prep meeting with the leadership of the community to discuss about ICANN 77. And, yes, there were some ideas put on the table about celebration of the 20th anniversary, but it seems that the GNSO is reluctant to do anything. Therefore, we will have to check what we want to do and how we want to do something on the interim ALAC was born, set up by the board 20 years ago.

Regarding the topic, maybe it's just a crazy idea, but let's try to be ready before the meeting. And we don't organize any—not such, but we organize very few At-Large sessions, and we go into all the sessions organized by others. As it's a policy session, it's a policy done by the SOs. Therefore, let's go to their meetings and bring the perspective of end user in those meetings and not trying to have our own things where nobody will be coming because they are really busy with their own stuff.

There is no plenary session. For some topics, we may wish to try to organize something with the other, not a plenary session, but cross-community session, I would say. But let's try not too much to be inside

ourselves, but let's go to the other and bring the message we want to bring about end users. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sebastien. I agree completely. I mean, I think if the topic's already being discussed, then we want to go be part of that conversation. So, it's really about whether or not we think there's a topic that isn't likely to get discussed by others that we might want to raise and certainly make it a cross-community discussion. I agree completely that particularly in a policy forum, we shouldn't spend our time just talking to ourselves. I think that's definitely the case. So, I think it's just looking for anything that looks like it's falling off the radar because it's more important to us than it is to everyone else. And I mean, there are certainly topics like that, like applicant support, where I think we need to keep a vigilant eye on it because probably between us and the GAC are the ones most interested in a successful program there. Eduardo, go ahead. Oh, and Sebastien, on your first point, there was a discussion with the GNSOs, ccNSO and me on this topic of the anniversaries. And we just came to a rough agreement that there's more time and more people at the AGM in Hamburg and that made a better sense of a time to have those 20th anniversary celebrations. So, that's what happened to those. It wasn't anyone in particular. It was just sort of a general agreement of let's focus on policy at the policy forum and then spend some real-time planning some interesting activities in Hamburg.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, just to think about that, we are in Washington where ICANN was born with the decision of NTIA. Maybe it's something we need to take into account even if we don't want to. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. I don't want to put you on the spot, Jonathan, but if you have to select a specific item that you would like to discuss in a plenary, which one will you suggest?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which one would I suggest? I guess I don't know the answer. Sometimes, when the deadline approaches, I become inspired with something. It was when I came up with the ODP session last time. I feel like auctions is still something that we're concerned about sort of from a process level. I don't know the extent to which auctions, private auctions, have a big impact on individuals and users, but I think in terms of our sense of fairness and not seeing the ground become kind of a joke, I think we feel strongly that private auctions are a bad idea and that Vickrey auctions and perhaps some sort of multiplier for communities or underserved regions that allows them to better compete in Vickrey auctions would be an outcome that makes it more likely that non-standard applicants have a chance, right, at the strings that they want. So auctions is still something that's swirling around in

my head and I think in the head of the board as being an important topic that still needs addressing. So that's one thing that occurs to me.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I do have another one. It's this thing about the fact that the board has a deadline for to start getting this new round going. And one of the things that I think we all know or we probably perceive that it will not happen is that the thing with the closed generics, I don't think it will be resolved by that time. So I don't know if that will be a good thing to bring to everyone just to chat about that. Just throwing it out there.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, thanks, Eduardo. I mean, closed generics is an interesting topic because, as you know, I've been whining a lot about the lack of substantive discussion of that topic within the At-Large community, right? We sent very able representatives to the group and Alan and Greg and I'm sure they're doing their best. I just wish that we had had more of an opportunity as a community to discuss how we really feel about that. I think we've attached ourselves to the GAC for a perspective on that and I don't know if that's the right answer or not. I just don't feel like we've discussed it enough, but some kind of substantive discussion on closed generics would be a good idea and maybe we should see if Greg and Alan think that would be a productive session. I mean, it's a strange problem of them doing their work in confidence and I understand the reasons for that, but I still feel like, as a community, we could be having more of a conversation about what our

priorities are there. So yeah, I think that's a reasonable topic, but thank you. Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Jonathan. In terms of topics, I do agree if we can collaborate or kind of get into some other GNSO or CCNSO sessions, that may be good, but building on what Javier was saying at that point of time, I was thinking perhaps something like the next round of gTLD auction. How can we create a win-win situation and what we want to discuss is what policies need to be there in place to ensure consumer trust and safety, encourage small businesses or entities, something in those lines, because applicant support, again, builds on to supporting underserved countries or people with smaller pockets and not too deep pockets, and having new gTLDs coming on, which kind of are about the DNS abuse aspects also comes into the trust and safety part.

So if we can build something in those lines, attracting also business so that we can have different SOs or people also speaking from their perspective, but all building to create an ecosystem which is win-win for all, not zero-one game.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Amrita. Yeah, I guess there is some sort of abstraction that once again, we're kind of circling, which is just sort of how to change the map a little bit on applications in a new round. I mean, when we did our applicant support session a few meetings ago, I was able to go through and create a map of where all the new registries were, and none of them were in any of the target regions for the applicant support

program. And so it's sort of an embarrassing map to look at. And I think we ought to look at underserved regions. We need to look at communities. And this idea of generic names, this idea of geographic names, all that's tied together into this idea of getting others than just portfolio applicants and brands into a new round. And what does that look like, and how do we make sure that actually happens?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Yeah, and I was thinking of more communities. I used the word underserved regions, but I was thinking more on communities like small-medium enterprises, anywhere for that matter. They also need support, or even local communities, NGOs wanting to do something in those lines. Perhaps we can build a case around those while pushing for applicants.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. The more that we understand, like, how the Catalan community is succeeding with their domain and how to replicate that success, I think that's worth looking into. I mean, part of a successful round will be an educational effort where we try to figure out what worked and didn't work. And then we may even have a role as the At-Large community in getting word out to people and encouraging people and communities and non-profits and others to apply for new strings. So, we should definitely keep that concept open. Thanks, Amrita. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I know that it's a policy forum, but there are two topics who is not belonging to the CPWG, but maybe still be of interest. The first one is CEO search. I don't know what will be the next organization meetings, but maybe something will happen and it will be good to have an exchange amongst us about this specific topic.

And the second, I am very concerned on what is happening or not happening on the holistic review. I will know a little bit better tomorrow evening, but I feel very bad with what is happening now. And as we don't have any OFB meetings since a long time, I wanted to raise that here. And I think it could be one of the topics, even if it's policy, is it a policy with a little P or with a big P? I think it could be included as a discussion for us. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. I remember at the last meeting, you were talking about having an internal discussion, starting with an internal discussion on CEO. We can think about—maybe it's an OFB call or something like that, but having a call prior to ICANN 77 to have an internal conversation about CEO candidates and what that criteria should look like and things like that. So maybe that's an action item for staff to figure out where we might fit that kind of a conversation in so that as those conversations develop—and they will, right? I mean, my guess is there will be some kind of conversation at 77 about the CEO search. It would be great if we were able to speak from a consensus position on what the At-Large community is looking for in a CEO. So maybe we try to get that conversation going even before the meeting, as you suggest.

And yeah, as for the holistic review, I don't know where that stands, to be honest. I feel like it's, as you say, it's dissipated a little bit, the discussion of the pilot, because there didn't seem to be a lot of consensus around it. But let's keep that in our radar as well. And if you've got an idea for a session, then maybe put together some kind of proposal, Sebastien.

Well, I think we have the beginnings of some ideas here. So I really appreciate the conversation. And part of it is we'll keep an eye out on what other people are talking about discussing and what the Org is talking about discussing, and we'll supplement those issues. But it sounds like we have some good things to discuss. So thank you for that.

The next part of the conversation is what bilaterals we might want to have. We didn't have a GNSO bilateral at the last one because the schedule ended up too tight. So I think, I don't know, Chantelle or Heidi, is somebody able to speak up on whether or not we're still planning to do an offline or online—an out of meeting bilateral with GNSO?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, there is a plan to hold an intersessional, and we're just waiting to hear some details on that, and then we will be able to move forward on that one. And also on the GAC, we've reached out to Joanna, and we're aware that there's going to be—well, we're thinking that there will likely be one planning session and also the regular public service working group call as well. So there'll be a couple of calls with GAC members prior to 77.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. That's great. So I think we'll continue to have conversations about what bilaterals we might want to have at this meeting. But as Sebastien suggested, I think we'll try very hard to put the group out into the field in some of the other sessions that are taking place, and so limit some of the things that we're trying to schedule ourselves. Olivier had an idea in the chat about having like a daily gathering first thing in the morning to kind of figure out the agenda for the day, and that's intriguing to me. I don't know if that's what you were thinking about elaborating on, Olivier, but I see your hand up, so go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thanks, Jonathan. I was not going to elaborate on that, although it's just a brainstorming idea here. Of course, we would all know in advance what the sessions are going to be for the other participants in this meeting, but effectively having a morning discussion as to who is going to go where and report on what. So the ALAC members and the At-Large community being out there in force in other meetings.

The question that I had, which was slightly unrelated to this, was with regards to bilaterals. Have you considered just leadership bilaterals, just to use that meeting to have a quick sync with the other communities? Like, for example, if there's no time or space for a one-hour bilateral between the GNSO and the ALAC, then maybe the leadership can meet just for the half an hour or something, or even on a more informal basis, so as to maybe touch on specific points that might need to be touched on.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, that's an interesting idea, Olivier. I think that's an interesting thought, and some of that takes place via the SO/AC leadership meetings. There's usually a dinner, and there's usually a meeting, and I don't know how that's going to happen in the policy forum. So, some of that sort of high-level bilaterals take place already, but we can give some thought to smaller meetings as well.

I guess I wanted to circle back, since I think we have time. Michael, if you have session ideas for the policy forum, then I'm happy to have you air them in a pithy fashion if you're ready to. I pithy did so via the chat.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

The one thing—I raised this during the public forum in ICANN 76. I really believe, in light of ICANN's next upcoming five-year strategic review, I do not believe ICANN fully appreciates the economic dynamics that are currently undergoing in the marketplace, and I really think they need to take a look at that, because unless you understand all the players, it's really kind of hard to undertake a holistic review and make sure that all the impacted parties have, in fact, a seat at the table. The issue of closed generics, price controls, you name it. There's so much stuff that I think tends to get swept under the rug on a one-off, and I think an economic survey of the entire marketplace would be incredibly important, particularly as there, I would say, is ongoing changes. The price of domain names continue to increase, and what happens? The volume begins to go down. Right now, ICANN's fees have traditionally been locked into a per-transaction basis. So, if there is a continued slide in the number of domain names under management, that will have a direct impact on ICANN's budget.

And ICANN has been incredibly fortunate for the last 20 years because the numbers have only gone up. ICANN has never had to manage an organization where the number of domain names under management has either stayed the same or potentially declined. So, I think it's really important for the community to take a look at that. So, that's my pithy intervention for today.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right, and I'd be interested in seeing what that looks like as a session proposal. I mean, as I'm sure you're aware, there are some recommendations that came out of the CCT review that had to do with economic analysis that has yet to take place, and ICANN now has an economist, and so I wonder if we should try to get a session going with that person and just a Q&A with the economist or something like that to get a sense of what that position looks like and what the projects are on the horizon and things like that for the ICANN economist. That's potentially intriguing as well.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, Jonathan, if I could jump in here. So, A, I have noticed the economist. I have actually in the past asked ICANN what the economist is doing. Surprise, surprise, that has fallen on deaf ears. So, here's an idea. How about we invite the economist to our next call or one of our next upcoming calls, ask him the questions, and then that will inform us on whether that should be a topic for ICANN 77. Is that something we can reach out? Can we reach out to ICANN Org to see what his availability would be, if that makes sense to the rest of the group?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I'll talk to staff about that. I think that's interesting. Once I learned that there was one, I became very intrigued, as you have. So, let's see if we can get him on a call. I think that's a good idea. And you asked some interesting questions about all the seats at the table, because one of the things that I hear coming up over and over again is this idea of the distinction between registrars and hosting providers, even though there's an enormous overlap between the two, and whether or not resellers and hosts, and what is the extent to which they're adequately represented in the ICANN community, and whether or not we have a good enough understanding of what that marketplace looks like as well. Okay, was there anything else, Michael?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yeah, just one final point on that, about having seats at the table. I would encourage everyone to read the OECD security report on DNS security, which ICANN was a major contributor. And in that OECD report, the report specifically called out how resellers are an important part of the ecosystem, and they largely have no direct contractual relationship with ICANN. And I think even John has shared some statistics before in the past regarding what a large percentage of overall domain name registrations are done through resellers.

So I think, again, this is something that we could potentially want to look at from that holistic view, and understanding the economics, I think, is one of the best places to start. So thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks, Michael. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Just a wild question, talking about an economist. In the previous, or prior to the previous round of new gTLDs, ICANN had commandeered some kind of an economic study that was less than stellar in its contents, and that was recognized much later. I completely lost track of that. Is there one for this round, or is the answer at this time of saying, well, let's not have a study that doesn't mean anything, let's have an economist that we can blame later? Did I say that? Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know the answer to that question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But there is no economy status reports for this round, is there? Has there been any research done for this round?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't believe so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. The reason why I ask is because I thought that one of the conditions, one of the many conditions for the next round, was that one needed to do another study and continue to find out whether it makes sense to have more gTLDs, et cetera.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe some of the questions we'll be able to ask.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sebastien [inaudible] something here on Boston Consulting Group reports or something like that. But yeah. So, yeah, let's perhaps get the economist on a call and get an understanding of what's planned and what would be helpful and things like that. I think that's a good idea. So, Chantelle, I'm going to leave it to you to try and make that happen. And I think that is it for me for this topic. So, that's back to you, Olivier, for any other business.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. And the floor is now open, therefore, yes, indeed, for any other business. I note that there was a suggestion earlier, and I have to find it somewhere in the chat. A question from John McCormack regarding—and that's when looking at the policy comment pipeline, there was going to be a public consultation on the .net renewal agreement. And the question was whether there was any discussion on removing the price cap.

Now, I'll probably let Jonathan answer that or whoever has been following this. But I do note that, in general, the AILAC has not in the past commented on individual—here we go. Yeah, John has put the

question again in the chat. On individual renewals, gTLD renewals, except in some cases. So, I guess—Yeah, go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

In one case, [inaudible] renewal, there was some money that was set aside that VeriSign was donating to ICANN for some economic analysis, actually. And I don't actually—I haven't really tracked exactly where all that went, and it was \$20 million or something like that. So, we should look at that as well. But yeah, John, I don't know the answer on the .net contract. It's out for public comment now. So, we'll have to take a look and see.

I mean, one of the things that came out of the CCT review was the possible sort of unintentional predation of those price caps that—because the economies of scale that VeriSign enjoys means that they can make money at those prices, whereas some of the newcomers can't. And then it might make sense to allow some more price freedom, but I don't know specifically what's going on with the .net contract. So, we'll look into that. Back to you, Olivier. Oh, Michael, you've got your hand up.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Yeah, just to follow up on .net and potentially .com. So, one of the things that is interesting is if you look at the baseline contract, which almost every registry operator has signed to, there is a provision in there, Jonathan, you might be aware, that requires the registry operator to participate in any economic survey or—I'm very aware of that. Yep, you're aware. Except I believe that that provision does not apply to .com

or .net. I could be wrong, but the last time I checked, I was not able to find any requirement by Verisign to participate. So, I think that's noteworthy.

The other thing that I think is also noteworthy, and I think you referenced this as well with regard to the recent .com approval, Verisign is voluntarily contributing \$20 million to ICANN over a five-year period. I believe the .net agreement also deviates by—I think Verisign charges or pays \$0.75 per domain name as opposed to \$0.25. So, what's interesting from a holistic standpoint is Verisign is paying an extra \$6 million for .net, theoretically contributing an extra \$4 million for .com, and it's just interesting why that voluntary, if you will, voluntary contribution is there in and above it, and that to me goes to the overall economic picture. And I think if we are going to do an economic survey, ensuring that Verisign with regard to .com and .net participate—because I question how good this survey will be if you're missing com and net from the overall market analysis.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

You know, it's interesting you say that because the irony is that when we went out with an economic analysis firm during the CCT review, we got good cooperation from Verisign and miserable cooperation from the registrars, who in fact had that provision in their contract. So, I don't know whether it's in the registry agreements or not or in the .net or .com agreements, but they actually supplied a lot of data to the economic research firm and the registrars supplied none. [inaudible] at the time.

So, the existence of a provision in the contract, as we've learned in many instances, does not mean it's enforced. And so, we definitely need to be on top of that with any economic research going forward. Back to you, Olivier, I think, to close the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. And I was just going to comment on your last point. Wasn't it Verisign or isn't it Verisign that publishes quarterly updates on the domain name markets as well?

JONATHAN ZUCK: They do, yeah, they do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think they do that. And there's also, of course, I think there are a number of processes within ICANN now that also look—there you go, the domain name industry brief. Thank you, John, for this. There are also, of course, within ICANN, there is also an Internet health, the health of the technical identifiers and a number of other processes that are supposed to be monitoring this, although I'm not sure to what extent it's being publicized. Sometimes, projects start, they are interesting, and everyone talks about them, and then afterwards, they slowly fade away in the background. One never really knows whether they're ongoing or not.

Right. I've rambled enough. Let's go—well, we are still into any other business, so are there any other topics that anybody would like to touch on? And no, I'm not seeing anyone else putting their hand up, so I just

wanted to thank everybody for taking part in today's call. When is our next meeting? And thank you, Hadia, for checking the outputs of the projects. That would be—it would be cool—well, not just cool. It would be interesting to perhaps find out how many of these projects are still alive. I remember at some point, there were some easy identifiers. ICANN has a set of graphics and so on, for example, in the compliance department, and then also in other departments, there was a set of graphics and financial graphics that were openly available for everyone to consult and that were supposed to be updated, and then they slowly faded away. Yeah, the open data project as well. There's a whole number of things which are [inaudible], and then either the person in charge of them moves on somewhere or the person in charge of them loses hope and disappears in oblivion. Who knows? We'll never find out.

Not seeing any hands up, let's find out when our next meeting is. That's one thing we can certainly find out about right now.

YESIM SAGLAM:

Thank you, Olivier. So, next Wednesday, it will be 12th of April, and we would like to propose 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

19:00 UTC. So, a strict rotation, and that looks fine, I guess. So, thank you very much. That will be next week. And seeing no hands up, that means it's the end of today's call. I'd like to thank our interpreters and the real-time text transcriber for a great job, as usual, and of course, our staff and Chantelle, in particular, who make these calls what they are. Chantelle, behind the scenes, by the way, gets in touch with every single

participant in those calls that has an active participation, such as the small group updates and also all the things that are taking place in the policy pipeline. And she doesn't do it just once. It's like two or three times. If you don't answer, Chantelle will be running after you and getting an answer. So, thank you, and well done on doing this. Really active, and it certainly helps the co-chairs of the group, Hadia and I, very much, so we don't have to do the running after people. And that really becomes, agenda building becomes a breeze. So, I wanted to prop her up on that.

And with this, I wanted to thank all of you also for being on the call. It's thanks to you that we have this interesting, very interesting discussion every week. And I hope it was as interesting to you as it was for me. I certainly, once again, learned quite a number of things. Hadia, anything else that I've forgotten today?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Olivier. Nothing from my side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Goodbye, everyone.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]