YESIM SAGLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to APRALO Policy Forum Call taking place on Thursday, 4th of May, 2023 at 6:00 UTC. On our call today, we have Amrita Choudhury, Jahangir Hossain, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Laxmi Prasad Yadav, Gopal Tadepalli, Priyatosh Jana, Suhaidi Hassan, Udeep Baral, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Naveed Bin Rais, Bibek Silwal, Satish Babu, Aris Ignacio, Gunela Astbrink, Samik Kharel, and Ali AlMeshal.

We have received apologies from Shreedeep Rayamajhi. And from Staff side, we have Gisella Gruber, Athena Foo, Nitin Wali, and myself, Yesim Saglam. And I'll also be doing call management for today's call. And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, for the transcription purposes, please. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Amrita. Thank you very much.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Yesim. And hello, everyone. Welcome to this call. Amrita here. Just a note that the APRALO policy forum was being chaired by [inaudible - 00:01:41]; unfortunately, he would not be to continue because of his professional engagement. So, till the time we find a way to manage it, the leadership team of Aris, me, and Gunela would be managing it for the time. We have a fairly action-packed discussion today. We have an overview on the NomCom Rebalancing being shared by Cheryl. There were a few questions asked by Tripti Sinha on this, and we would be discussing those questions too after we hear from her.

We also have updates coming in from our ALAC representatives. Satish would be giving an update on the EPDP on IDN Phase 1 report, which is out for public comments. Maureen would be updating on the GGP process, and Naveed would be covering other policies which are up for public comment. Each of them would have 7 minutes. I know that's not enough, but since we want to keep within our timeline, this is how we have planned it. And over to you, Cheryl, to begin. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I'm just going to organize a screen share here, which will be that. And hopefully, you can now all see something that says "NomCom Rebalancing Text".

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yes, we do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If so, my audio is okay. Let me start off by in giving you a little bit of context, and by also apologizing that I'll be only fixed imagery because my aging, if not ancient laptop is deciding to have driver issues and it's now no longer allowing any of my webcams to stay operational for more than a brief second. So, you could all imagine what I look like. That being said, I am delighted to talk to you about NomCom in general, of course, but the NomCom Rebalancing, which is currently part of not only the bylaws out for public comment, but also-- Sorry. Excuse me. One moment. I have a granddaughter descending upon me. Just bear

with me briefly for one second, please. Apologies. It is that time of day and her mother is in Germany.

Okay. Right. I am back. Thank you very much for your patience there. I just needed to get an older sister to get her younger sister organized. Right. Okay. NomCom Rebalancing, and I'm getting some audio across-sounds, so hopefully someone else can sort that out. In the text you'll see in front of you, you will find in reference to the ICANN correspondent, the questions raised by Tripti, that we want to get to the discussion part of after my background briefing.

But what I'd like to do first is recognize that I have wonderful number of extremely well-seasoned previous and even current NomCom members with me on today's call. And if you would like to have any depth and color bought into the conversation on the lived experience of being a NomCom member, I would be very happy to pass the talking stick over to anyone or all of them. My role in NomCom has been that of being part of a leadership team and not part of a voting delegate. So, it would behoove us to listen to all sides of the story as we look into this.

I'm just going to scroll up, however, away from this text, which I promise we will come back to. And we will look at these particular questions here, those six questions outlined, which is the ones that we are going to be discussing with a view to having some regional feedback to the chairman of the board. But I want to take you to the section which is off that hot link that you can see at the top of screen proposed ICANN bylaw amendments, which was in the correspondence that we're looking at.

What I've done is I've taken away, I've exerted the piece that is the bylaw, the proposed bylaw language that is the basis from which all the rebalancing conversation is going to start from. This bylaw language, which has no redlining, this is only the as it would be written without any edits as proposed to go into the bylaws as a new version as a result of all of this process. So, a new section 8. 2 which is a composition of the nominating committee. And I just want to spend a little tiny bit of my time helping you understand a little bit about this and a great deal of the context and history associated with it.

First of all, in the second and most recently completed review of the nominating committee. It's not a slide, Holly, it's a document, and I'm sure it'll be made available in the agenda. It won't be a problem. As I was trying to although it is literally what is available on the public comment section and in the correspondence sent and blog. There's nothing extra here. There's a lot taken away, but there's nothing extra. So, if we go back, the second nominating committee review process, which like all organizational reviews, then after recommendations has been made by a reviewer process, they are basically go through a whole process of rationalizing, running through public commentary, going into implementation, and finally being implemented, which is where we are now.

In this second review process, it was suggested, it was recommended, absolutely, that there was a need to rebalance the nominating committee. Now, the rebalancing of the nominating committee was proposed to be in two ways. By looking at the distribution of the seats across the component parts of ICANN to better reflect both fairness and the capacity of the AC/SOs or appointing bodies to actually fill those

seats. And I'll come back to that in a second. And secondly, to have allied recommendation coming into account, whereby with the exception of the non-voting leadership team. If you have the ability to hold a seat on the nominating committee, then that would be a voting delegate seat. So those two things are lockstep with each other.

In the review implementation process, an enormous amount of time, energy, and effort, which I won't go into but I can give you a little bit more information if you're interested later on, went into thinking of all sorts of options as radical as you would please, as extraordinary as you would please, write down to just one seat per AC/SO. That's it. So, we went from did a risk analysis and strengths and weakness and where the options were on just about every possibility from not changing anything through to just one seat each, or even less than one seat, just a point of four-person committee. So, all things were considered.

We came up with and many of you who paid some attention to earlier public comments and community briefing opportunities taken by the nominating committee review implementation working group, will also have heard earlier on that there was a suggestion that we do not change the total number of seats. And anybody who is a recent serving or currently serving member of the NomCom can very easily put in chat to help everyone else understand why it is important to have just from pure logistics point of view, a goodly number of people available to do the sheer amount of review and diligence and deep diving work that are nominating committee demands of its members. It is a hard and arduous task. And the seats are all well utilized.

So, the implementation review team said, right, we will not suggest we change the total number of seats but we will look at a rebalancing opportunity. We have one seat which has for tradition's sake to date, not actually being filled. And however, we believe that with our knowledge of activities within that advisory committee, the Government Advisory Committee to be specific, that they are in a position now to continue to consider how as they have changed, they may be able to put someone in that role as a delegate.

Now why that was complicated up until now is that the individual members of the Government Advisory Committee have always worked on absolute autonomy, and they only produce consensus agreed recommendations in their advice and associated documentation. So, no one GAC member could represent on behalf of other GAC members. So, this was a little wrinkle in the original design. The original design of all of these seats also took into account the need for the importance of geographic diversity and that there was a great benefit of in the early days of nominating committees, of having people sitting on the nominating committees who actually had their own networks that they could reach out to regionally and locally to increase the likelihood of getting valued and appropriate candidates to apply.

Now in times since this was originally designed and certainly up until the last, I guess, at least eight or so years, if not a little bit of longer, professional hub firms, less personal outreach and more advertising, and well-managed specific outreach has been undertaken. And so, the importance of having a really, really, really good personal network is less important now than it was when it was designed. But it was on that basis, of course, that the At-Large Advisory Committee was given five,

one for each geographic region, seats, to fill. And the At-Large Advisory Committee, the ALAC, only fills those seats considering the expertise and local, regional understanding and knowledge that the individual sitting in those seats can bring.

We certainly don't expect the representative of APRALO in the name or- - Sorry. They're not the representative of APRALO. Just remove all of that from your memory banks. The Asia-Pacific regional representative, not a RALO representative at all, the representative of the Asia-Pacific region in the delegations list does not have to have a personal contact and network with every one of our economies. That's ridiculous. But they do have to have a good understanding of what it means to be as diverse of region as we are. They do not have to be a member of the At-Large. They do not need to be endorsed or supported or proposed by the RALO.

I hope you all heard that because you're all going through an electoral place at the moment. What they do have to be doing is the ALAC does have to in conjunction with discussions with the RALO, seek out the best possible candidates. So, the RALO doesn't appoint these candidates. ALAC appoints these candidates. ALAC has appointed non-suggested candidates in the past, and they can certainly appoint well and truly out of the regional listing that you get from the RALO.

But when it came to the Generic Name Support Organization, seven seats were issued, not five. And the seven seats were issued to match the existing constituencies of the GNSO back then, which was before its last review, and it recognized that there was two very different types of business interests. There was small business interests and there was

large business interests And so there it lies the rub, ladies and gentlemen. We have proposed that we do not change the total number of seats. We have proposed that the fairness and relevance of the delegates sent by the ACs and the SOs, where it is seen to not be fair or fully across all of the possible constituencies as it no longer is in the GNSO, that that should be the business of that AC or SO to sort out.

And so that was the proposal that we made to implement. The GNSO was unable to agree to that as a possibility, and so you see the current bylaw language, which does not say you get seven seats GNSO and you sort it out. It just says you get seven seats GNSO, and Tripti's letter is a method of us trying to bring the wider ICANN community into how this rebalancing can be bought out. Why is this important? Because the business constituency wants to keep their two seats, and the number of people in representational roles for their constituencies within the GNSO, that say, "Well, NPOC does not have a seat. Well, that's not a problem. The GAC seat hasn't been used. We'll give them that one. " And I don't know about you, ladies and gentlemen, but I certainly don't think that's fair.

That's the background. Now, let's go back to the questions and why you're being asked to them. We are going to be changing it so it says, as the language is there, I'll just remind you what that language is. The ASO gets a seat, the ccNSO gets a seat, the GAC gets a seat, the SSAC gets a seat, the RSSAC, the IETF gets a seat, the At-Large Advisory Committee gets five seats, five voting delegates, and the GNSO gets seven. So that's what the new bylaw will say. But that's not rebalancing. That is just a cleansing of the details of how those seats are currently allocated.

Now I would like to suggest that I stop with this background and we should focus the following conversation now you've got that background on those six questions. And with that, Amrita, I'm perfectly happy to stop sharing if you like or leave it on screen, and you can run a queue.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Cheryl. Let the question be there for a few more minutes so that if people have any comments, they can see and even since you've been involved in this entire exercise, you would be able to give them background or even certain key pointers.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to help.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: So, given the question which has come in, in case you have been able to read them, it's great. What does it mean to have a balanced NomCom at the point in time? For example, what criteria would you apply to measure or assess whether the NomCom is balanced? And further, how can one test whether or not the NomCom is balanced? Do you support the view, the current composition of NomCom needs to be rebalanced? Please explain why or why not. How frequently does the balance need to be measured or assessed? How do you suggest that the NomCom composition be rebalanced? Who should conduct this work and how should it be conducted? How would your community group prioritize consideration of the issues within your planning efforts?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I get us kicked off here if you wouldn't mind?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, with the first one, we need to understand that when the report, the initial report called for rebalancing, it was trying to find a solution to a component part of the GNSO not having a seat. It was not trying to say if the ccNSO only has one seat, then the GNSO should only have one seat. It was not trying to say if the Government Advisory Committee and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee only have one seat, then ALAC should only have one seat. Although we did do that thought exercise to see if that would work. Sorry, I have calls coming in as well. But what it was meant to do was find a way for all of the component parts of the GNSO to have the option of having a delegate.

And let me share one problem with that. The GNSO is the only, I repeat only in the current design of ICANN, component part of ICANN, AC or SO, that can have an expansion of its constituencies. Everything else is tied to either geographic region, right, or is not structured in a way where we have things like specified seats beyond one. And for example, the SSAC can only, only just managed to keep one delegate because of the huge amount of work that's required as a delegate. So, if we gave the SSAC five seats to match ALAC's that would not be acceptable to the

SSAC. They will send one good person and that is it. The rebalancing is not quite as pure imbalance as you might think, but it was to stop a problem continuing.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Cheryl. Maureen had her hand up. So, Maureen, over to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Amrita. And thank you, Cheryl, for the background. It was really interesting. I just wanted to start the questions off. Not many answers here, but I just wondered whether, I mean, why this rebalancing need is being done now when we're also sort of-- you did say that this is based on the current structure of ICANN. And we've been asking for ICANN to undergo a holistic review so that we actually look at how ICANN is structured and whether it is actually fair and equitable and it's structured in a way that meaningfully engages the multistakeholder model and get a complete balance of inputs into public comments, etc. So, I mean, was it considered that perhaps we might be better to do this after we've actually had a holistic review? Just a query. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's actually a proposal from the proponents in the GNSO to maintain that it's all too difficult for them to get their own house in order. And that should they be forced to try and make the changes that something like a future holistic review 5 or 10 or more years down the track should

be the trigger point for it. That is simply smoke and mirrors and does not solve the problem at all on the fairness of representational rights.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Cheryl. And I think also to add to Cheryl. My limited understanding is the NomCom changes every year and till the time ICANN solicit review happens, the process has to continue. And if we can try to make it more equitable as much as possible, it may make sense to have a nuanced decisions and people selected. So, I guess it's also a matter of priority. And I see Satish and Gopal's hands. Satish, over to you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Amrita. Satish, for the record. These are my personal opinions. First of all, I think between the ACs and SOs, the current structure is fine. It works. I don't think we can really tamper with the total numbers of each AC/SO. Of course, in NPOC and NCUC, there is a little bit of they see that ALAC has got five seats and they have zero representation. So, there is that heartburn that is there, it's been there for some time. But I still think that between the AC/SO, the current balance is really okay, but within GNSO, there is a problem. And GNSO has to find out a solution without tampering with the overall number. This is my personal view. Thanks.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Gopal, over to you.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. Thank you so much. A nice, lucid presentation. I've just been watching the NomCom activities on May, it's very transparent. Only when the NomCom members can proactively solicit nominations, the fairness criteria may become a little more crucial. Am I right? Can the NomCom members proactively solicit nominations?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Yes. They can. When the nomination period is on, they can reach out to candidates and encourage them.   But it's just not encouraging applications. They also have to be fair when they are selecting, and when all the SOs/ACs together vote for candidates and select them. So, it's an entire process.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. Then these numbers make lot of sense. Because if they count as votes, if GNSO one person gets a candidate, all seven votes will go to that concerned person.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Not necessarily. There are different mechanisms which are involved. It's not because I bring a candidate, I vote for that person or something. That's not how it normally works. Naveed, over to you.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah. This is Naveed. Thank you, Cheryl, for the background and presentation. I was just wondering like these questions that were posed by the Board to the community. I want to see these questions how they

EN

like in the context of the public comment is already open, is it like two different ways we are going towards? Like some community want to make public comments, so these questions would be answered there as well. So why seeking these questions directly from the community? Or I'm missing something?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just briefly, if I may, Naveed, the public comment is specific to comments on the language for the proposed bylaw changes, right? Not on the views to rebalancing. Because rebalancing has, in fact, been placed apart and away from any bylaw change language. If I can just bring you to that paragraph in Centerstream now, most recently, the NomCom Review implementation working group concluded that with Recommendation 10, the one I was referring to etc., was not feasible and withdrew its initial proposal accordingly. That's the reason it was not feasible was the GNSO refused to cooperate and the very best they would do it was all going to be all too hard for them to come to any sort of agreement, so hold off until some future point in time when either ICANN no longer exists or a full holistic review proposed as a new structure. Not good enough, in my very biased view.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Cheryl. Since we are running out of time, we what we could do is perhaps I may ask Staff to share a link to these questions and also the documents which Cheryl has said, and we can leave the document open for your comments till perhaps next Monday or Tuesday, and then we kind of finalize draft and share it with ALAC. Does that make sense

for everyone? Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you for sharing it. If Staff could actually put it up in the agenda link it, it would be good. Okay. Thank you so much. So please, this would be shared with you. You can put in your comments on the questions, and we will try to summarize them from APRALO and share it with the At-Large.

So next. Thank you so much, Cheryl, for giving us the background, the insights and the site geopolitics between the different SOs and ACs. With that, we move to Satish for an update on the EPDP and on IDNs. And just to let you know, it's a detailed thing. Satish will just take us through a bit. CPWG is discussing this in details, and whoever is interested, please join the CPWG call for more details. If you want a separate session, Q&A on the questions, we could perhaps arrange for that later. So over to you, Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Amrita. Satish for the record. So, seven minutes is what I have and what I'll do is walk you through some parts of the report and then focus on slide number 13, which has got a particular question that we thought we should get some input from the community. Next slide, please. Yeah. So, this is the basic thing of the input. This EPDP is focused on variant management. Variant are the synced or the labels that are equivalent for the script communities. So, the most frequently used example is of HSBC which is the HSBC is a bank effort. That HSBC is represented in Chinese in two distinct fonts, the traditional Chinese and the modernized version.

EN

Although they look slightly different, they mean the same thing to the community, the Chinese community. And therefore, they should behave as a domain name. They should behave in a similar fashion. And they have to be tied together so that HSBC alone, the bank alone owns both. And the other one, one cannot be owned by one party and the other by another party because that will lead to enormous amount of user confusion. So, the challenge here is to-- Because the DNS system at the base of it at the infrastructure level, place every domain name as independent of every other domain name. There is no concept of a group of domain names that have to go together.

For the first time by bringing variant, we are imposing that constraint on the system, and that has got down some implications not only at the technology level, but also at the level of the contracts and various other operational. For example, you are transferring a particular TLD from one registry to another registry, then that transfer cannot be done in isolation of one particular label alone. The entire set of variants have to move lock step.

So that is the kind of challenge that the CPDP tries to address. We've got about 60+ recommendation in the final thing. Not all of them are important for the general end user. Most of them are more important for registries and registrars. And we don't have to really go through everyone, but we will go through some of them.

Next slide, please. So, there are 68 recommendations in this initial report. Recommendations and implementations and guidance. And over the next four CWGP meeting, we are planning to split it among the team. So, Justine and I would join the 13:00 UTC CPWG, and

Abdulkarim and Hadia will be in the other thing. We'll be splitting the work among all of us, and we'll be presenting to the CPWG for their input. But as we found in yesterday's CPWG, it takes a lot of time and we're not able to really get to discuss it fully to the extent that people want. So that's indeed a challenge. So, we are to see how best to address it.

Next slide, please. I would recommend that you take a look at the report just so that we can just go through it. There may be areas that say you may be interested in. Why did we want this variant? Basically, it is because the script community, the end user script community, they treat this as things. So, for example, these two Chinese scripts, they are both equivalent to the Chinese community, Chinese readers of the language. Similarly, the Arabic example.

Sometimes it's also a security problem. It's not just usability. The security problem is when there is possibility of misrepresentation. Now, these two look alike, but the underlying unique code points are very different. And that can lead to homograft attack. So, then what happens is we are identifying these as variants, and we are blocking some of them so that they don't get confused with the actual ones. So that is a precautionary kind of approach, whereas the left side is about usability. It is about enhancing the end user experience as in line with expectations of that community.

Next. I will not go through this. Next. So, these are some of the classifications of the recommendations. So, at the heart of this is the idea of a variant set, which means a primary label. When you apply for it, there is a tool called the Root Zone LGR tool, which will identify all its

variants and their status, whether they can be allocatable or they are blocked. The logic, the rationale for this blocking allocation comes from the language community's own rules. It is not imposed by ICANN. In fact, the whole language community, the generation panel of that language community, the integration panel, these three are technically speaking outside ICANN. And therefore, it's also outside the EPDP's limit. But their work actually goes into the Root Zone LGR, which is what ICANN in a sense control. And therefore, the tool will tell you given a particular string, what are its variants and what are their dispositions. Are they allocatable? Are they block?

Next. So, I will not go through this. These are the annexes of the report. Interestingly, we have things like the first one is actually very technical thing. It's very hard to wrap your head around it. There's optimization of the actual process. We have the EPDP team membership and attendant. It's a good metric for ALAC to look at how ALAC team is formed vis à vis the other team.

And the last one, I would recommend that you take a look at annex B which is a kind of a tribute to Ariel who was earlier At-Large Staff. Now she is part of ICANN org. So, she has actually created this big process flow diagram of the entire application process. It is actually quite daunting even to look at it. The idea was that we identify which is the step where the EPDP work has an impact.

Next. Can we now move to slide 13? I'm not going to go through all this. Okay. Here, there are actually about 20+ recommendations that we wanted to cover in yesterday's meeting, but we couldn't cover everything because there were questions and we've been going down

that rabbit hole, and we ran out of time. So, 3.5 and recommendation guide 3.6. The preliminary recommendation 3.5, both future IDN and gTLD and existing registry operators who want allocate variant labels must explain why they want this variant label.

Now what's happening is in the 2012 round, there was no possibility of variant. ICANN org decide not to have variant because the policy was not in place. The work that the EPDP is doing was not in place. So, people had interest in variant, but they couldn't get the variant. They had even indicated the variant that they were interested in in the application, but it made very clear that that had no value whatsoever because variants were not being given. So, some of the people from 2012 round will want the variant of the primary gTLD now when we open up. And new people, new applicants, also will want their variants.

The main point here is that people who want allocatable variant must explain why they seek those variant labels. There's overall a concern that adding more variants will kind of destabilize the DNS system if you go beyond a point. That's why the conservative approach has been used everywhere. So, this is a reflection of that, and the criteria for evaluating explanations provided by the applicant should be pre-identified and applied consistently by qualified evaluators. We are bringing in a new set of people and criteria.

So, we are saying document the criteria for evaluating those explanations from 3.5 because the applicant is saying why we want this, so their logic. And to evaluate this explanation, we want a group, a new group called what we have labeled here as qualified evaluators. So, we would welcome your inputs on this particular item because in the

current set that is presented yesterday, this is one thing that we can't have view on as ALAC community. So, I'll stop here. Unless there's any questions immediately, it's back to Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Satish. Does anyone have any questions for Satish at this point of time? Just in case you want to go through all these presentations and come back to Satish, please feel free to do so. Satish, Justine are from our region, so you can always write back to them. I think the presentation is linked to the agenda. So, we now move on to Maureen. Maureen, over to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Amrita, and thank you, everyone. Just checking to understand that the 3rd of May is today in my world, although it's the 4th of May in other parts of the world. Next slide. Okay. What I'm going to be going through is really what we've been doing in the GNSO guidance process working group, looking at preparing potential applicants in general for the next applicant, the next round of new gTLD applications. And one of the things that we're doing is we're making it general but been very specific in relation to people who will actually want to apply for support. Okay. So that's what the whole thing is about applicant support for making an application for this new round.

And we've probably spent the last four months on section on awareness and education because this is-- I mean, from our end user perspective, I think that this is actually really, really important because we will have a role in making sure that people are made aware of information that

they can get about the process if they're interested. So, what's happened is that we're actually working on this model of how-- There's a goal that's been set within the sub-pro document, which Cheryl had a very heavy hand in, but they set goals, specific goals that we need to focus on to ensure that the next round is more successful than the last round. And so, for each goal that was set, we're looking at, okay, what is the best approach to making sure that we actually have success and achieving that goal, so there's the approach and there are indicators of success and then there are metrics, and the metrics have to measure the actual success of the approach and indicators.

These first two actually set the scene for people who are interested and who would actually qualify for support. Anyone can look at all of the stuff, but whether they actually qualify for support, this is where the details are actually expressed. So, in this first goal, where it's actually saying that the potential applicants from underdeveloped and developing regions should be a priority target of event, communication channels, and publications. So that one sets the actual where the regions, the regions and the areas that are going to be looked at. And then the second goal looks at what sectors, so within the region and then delving down into the sectors. The targeted support applicants will come from not-for-profit sectors, social enterprises, and/or community organizations. Again, focusing on support.

Next slide, please. Okay. One of the things though that came that slide that I just showed you was from a meeting two weeks ago. At the last meeting that we had, we've been really focusing on how do people know whether they are actually eligible to be qualified? What is an underdeveloped or an underserved or developing underrepresented?

What do they mean? So, we're actually been looking at what definitions can we use.

So, I think at the last meeting that we actually agreed that for developing regions and countries, looking at the section below, we would use the UN standard model, which basically looks at measures of poverty, literacy, education, those human development index criteria. So, that's a UN model. And so, when we're looking at developing countries, it'll be very much better expressed, but they will be looking at that kind of criteria. And then for the underserved region, the GAC had a very good definition for the underserved and underdeveloped region. Because they just define it from a DNS viewpoint that that doesn't have a well-developed DNS or associated industry or economy, and that the government within the government may not have a very good awareness of ICANN's role and functions and policy processes, and all the expectations that go with having a business in the gTLD of the area.

That's an example of what of the things that we've had to do to make sure that it's very, very clear. Now I'm actually not so like going to go to through all these slides and things like diagnostics or something slides in any depth, but they're there for you to have a look at later. The next slide is probably more important for what I wanted to say.

In this particular slide, a lot of these suggestions and these points down here are actually been suggested by the CPWG. And for those of you who have been a part of that, I really do appreciate your input. But what we decided was that it couldn't be just a single approach. When we first looked at this thing, and the indicators of success, they were just going to measure the number of events and a quantitative view of

0.5% of applicants in the next round are supported. That would be their measure. And we're saying no, we've actually got to look at a broader range of indicators to ensure that we're actually capturing all the sorts of ways in which people want to apply.

But the really important one that I wanted to bring to your attention, and you may have heard me say it if you're at the CPWG meeting, but one of the really, really important things about this is, because it will be a recommendation we'll be pushing is that any public materials which the Staff actually produce for outreach activities, have to be carefully worded in a way that can be used and read and understood by anyone who doesn't work for ICANN.

And I think that this is really important because this is something that the GAC and the ALAC has certainly tried to push in all the work that we've actually been doing is that public material. The materials that ICANN work needs to be the expectations of an applicant paying $185,000 dollars to get a domain, domain name. There's a lot of commitment to that so they have to understand exactly what it is that they're getting themselves into.

Okay. So, I think that the other slides that I've got, the other two or three or something are explanations based on this too. I don't want to go into too much depth. You can read it at your leisure, and it's only in the agenda. Thanks, Amrita. I don't want to go over my time.

YESIM SAGLAM: Amrita, you are on mute.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:	So sorry, Yesim, sorry. I was speaking without realizing. Thank you, Maureen. Since we have scarcity time, I will jump over to Naveed at this point of time. Anyone, if you have any queries, please reach out to Maureen separately. Naveed, over to you.
NAVEED BIN RAIS:	Okay. So, thank you very much. Thank you, Maureen, for the presentation. I actually had a couple of questions, but we will defer to that. So actually, it is my hand to ask some questions, but I see that the time is short now, so I'll move to my part. And we have around five minutes left, so I'll try to be quicker. So here, my idea was to see what kind of public comments are open and what ALAC can do and how ALAC is involved to reach out to APRALO policy forum and then update about this.
	So, there are actually four comments that are open, public comments open for input. So, two of them already we discussed in this call so I will not discuss them anymore. One of them related to Root Zone, and ALAC has decided already that they are not going to comment on that. So, my presentation on my talk year will be focused on the screen one, which is the RA, recently signed RA .NET with ICANN, which is very strict.
	So next slide, please. So actually, there has been some discussion in CPWG about whether ALAC has a limit on it or not. And two weeks ago, we had a discussion and decided that we do have a limit on that, but we are yet to decide which aspects we are interested to comment on. So

right now, we are in the process of finding out actually how or in which aspects we are going to address in the public comment. So actually, an effort is going on, and recently, I have also joined that small team with Michael, and, well, to identify the features, issues, and deviations between the baseline RA that was there since 2017 and this recently signed .NET or what are the differences.

So, we have at the moment 1200+ gTLDs that follow the baseline RA since its inception. And recently the .org, .info and .Asia has renewed their contract on that baseline actually. But there is no consensus policy at the moment that enforce or force the registries to follow the baseline that has been there. So, it's up to them whether they would like to adapt or they can go ahead with what they have been doing before.

Next slide, please. So, actually, this slide contains a summary of what changes have been announced by ICANN in this .NET RA, which is registry agreement. So, one of them, they say that the new RA that we have signed comply with the gTLD RDAP profile. And it also includes the plan to say goodbye to WHOIS related matters and shift to the new one. So, they also have a compliance of SAC097 related to RDDS. And they also allow ICANN to use this Bulk Registration Data Access for research purposes actually. And there are some commitments not in the form of formal agreement, but commitments to combating DNS security threats such as DNS abuse and other things.

Next slide, please. So, this is what ICANN has announced. Now we are in the process of finding out the notable deviation from the baseline RA. And I just put them as numbers here. So, one of them is the violation of factual statements that they declare at the time of signing the contract.

Before in the baseline RA, if you deviate from the statements that you presented in the agreement, that leads to the termination the contract, but not anymore in this .NET RA. So, that you can have a penalty of violating those statements, but it does not lead to the termination.

Another interesting thing here, which is of debate in CPWG as well, that they specifically have used security and stability as proper nouns. They defined it for themselves and does not leave it open for the community to define it later, which is an ongoing debate. So, they fixed the definition of security and stability in the agreement and they say we will comply to these definitions of security and stability, which is not what is actual security and stability that we look for in the baseline RA.

Next slide, please. So, we have a question as well, but I would like to just finish next two slides. Another one is this baseline RA binds itself to this RSEP, which is Registration Services Evolution Policy, right, which is itself evolving in nature, but again, .NET agreement has fixed the definition and the scope of RSEP and say we are going to comply with that irrespective of the change that the community come up with in the future. Another one is this baseline RA requires registries to cooperate with the economic studies with a SHALL statement, but no supervision is there in the .NET RA. So, it means that if ICANN comes up with an economic study related to registry or domain names or whatever, .NET can refute that we don't cooperate.

And another one is the letter of intention to comply with the SSAC074, which is that we are going to report to ICANN related to any security related matter that come up or any security related issues that come up in future. The next slide, please, which is the last one, I suppose. And

EN

the contract is for six years as compared to normal 10-year contract of baseline. They also have a pricing cap in this .NET RA where they said that nothing will exceed, renewing registering, or transfer fee does not exceed $10.67.

So, the last one, next slide please. It's just summarizing where we are right now. So, our small team is looking into supporting the features, issues and deviations. We are still an ongoing process. So, presentation is expected next CPWG call where we are going to discuss the aspects that we are going to comment on and narrow the scope that we have. ICANN recently last week has issued a clarification regarding registrar agreement of .NET and registrars related to some geographical matters, which have been raising a lot of public comments. So recently, this is just one week ago. And currently, we are exploring different options, how to make a public comment, whether we seek explanation or more on the differences in the contract from ICANN or how to go about it. So, I stop here. We are threes minute overtime already. So--

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Naveed. Sorry, we are not able to take questions, Holly. You have put it in the chat and I would request Naveed to respond to it, share or over Meets. And I do see Cheryl's question that in case CPWG decides not to respond, would APRALO want to? This is up to all to discuss and come back. What we could do is if the next CPWG call discusses it, perhaps in our APRALO monthly call can have 10 minutes, and Naveed could share the presentation beforehand over email and people could go through it and there could be a question-answer

session during the call on 18th. This is something which we could perhaps look at so that the discussion continues.

I think we are three minutes overtime. So, may I request Yesim to state when we have the next call and perhaps whichever processes are open for public comments, we could discuss it further in those calls. And before I hand it over to Yesim, a request. The Staff has sent a survey to the primary member of each ALS. In case you are the primary member, please fill it up and submit it back before the deadline. In case you are not the primary member of your ALS, please request the person who is assigned to fill up the form and resubmit it back. And with that, Yesim, I hand it over to you.

YESIM SAGLAM: Thank you very much, Amrita. So, looking at the calendar, as we are holding the policy forum call on the first Thursday of the month, it will be 1st of June, again, Thursday at 6:00 UTC. However, there is something I would like to give a heads up. It's going to be the week of prep, prep week, so I'm not actually foreseeing any prep week calls, most probably at 6:00 UTC, but I just wanted to give a heads up about that one.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Yesim. Then we will decide upon it. Jahangir, it would be good that you send the mail to Staff with a copy to me so that they can resend you the survey form so that you can fill it up. I think that would-- In this, you are the primary contact and you've not received the survey, please write to Staff with a copy to me, and Aris, and Gunela, we will

look at it. And please do look at your spam. Some of them have got it in their spam folders also.

So, with that, I think we should end the call. Thank you so much to Cheryl, Satish -- I guess he's not here -- Maureen and Naveed for sharing your presentations. And all of you who have being here. If you are new to the call, Ashirwad and others, please don't feel daunted. Just go through them, come back to these people with your queries, I'm sure they will be able to help you out. And thank you so much, everyone. Bye then.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]