YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the first APRALO Policy Forum Webinar on the topic Next Round of New gTLDs and Overview taking place on Thursday 7th of September 2023 at 600 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. And just to cover the apologies. We currently do not have any apologies sent for today's call. And currently from staff side, we have Gisella Gruber, Athena Foo, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam present on today's call, and I'll also be doing call management. And before we get started, just a kind reminder please state your name before speaking for the transcription purposes, please. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Justine. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone here wherever you may be. I will first say that if you find it disturbing that I'm moving my head around too much, please forgive me because I have three screens, so that's why I shift left and right. But I'll try to look straight most of the time. So, thanks for signing up to this webinar. I have to indicate that this is the first of a series that we have planned.

So, to those in the participants who are from my region, APRALO, I'm speaking to you as the chair of the APRALO Policy Forum. And to everyone else who is not from the Asia Pacific region, then consider that

I speaking to you as the ALAC liaison to the GNSO. I hold those roles. Anyway.

So, the impetus for this webinar series was actually born out of the need to get people up to speed about what's happening with the next round. And it's kind of by way of an introduction that we are doing something at the APRALO GA, the general assembly next week. But, obviously, it serves a larger purpose, and I noted that we shouldn't keep anything to just AP. So, it's for the benefit of At-Large overall. So, that's where I'm coming from. I'm going to try and take you through a slide of about 15 slides, a deck about 15 slides. So, I'm hopefully not going to take more than 30 minutes.

I would ask if you could keep your questions to after the presentation. I'm going to try and have as ample time as possible for questions. But if you can't help it, then by all means, please, put something in the chat. I'm not going to stop on the account of seeing something in the chat. So, I'm just going to roll through my presentation. But when you're putting something in the chat, it would be useful if you could indicate the slide number, and the slide number will appear at the top right corner of what you see on the screen. That just helps us guide what is it that you're referring to specifically. Okay?

So, right. So, I'm going to just go through a little bit of what we intend or what I intend to cover. This is the broad strokes of the presentation today anyway. And I also note that sometimes the participants that we have may be obviously coming from a different level of knowledge. So, I need to be able to cater for newbies, totally newcomers, and also right up to possible experts like Cheryl. So, just bear with me if you have

seen or know some of these background information that I'm talking about. I think this this particular presentation, anyway, is an update of one that I gave I think about two years ago. So, you'll probably see some similar things that I'm going to talk about if you attended that particular webinar a few years ago.

And by the way, Cheryl, I've conscripted Cheryl to try and also answer any questions on the chat because she is former co-chair of the SubPro PDP working group. So, she's also a resource for all of us. Right. Okay. I have my virtual assistant on the screen as well. Dixie. Right. Let's get going. Okay.

So, just a little bit about the history before we came into the new gTLD program. So, I'm assuming that you all know what the anatomy of the domain name is in terms of the top level, second level, and so forth. So, I'm not going to go into specifics about that. But to note that before ICANN actually was constituted as ICANN, we already had a top-level domain. And as you see on the screen, there are a bunch of them predating ICANN. And then we had, in year 2000, what we call the trial round of gTLDs or TLDs. And you see them on the screen as well. And then after that in 2003, we had a round of what is called the sponsored TLDs, the top-level domains. And all these put together are considered what we call legacy TLDs and sponsored TLDs. To quite distinct from new gTLDs.

So, the new gTLD program is a fairly new construct. Yeah. Well, not so new now, I suppose. But it only came about starting in terms of the policy development in December 2005, and it went up to 2007. And the reason for the coming up with this program is for ICANN to introduce

unlimited generic top-level domain both in ASCII and IDNs. So, ASCII is basically Latin script domain names or TLDs. I should say TLDs. IDN is not in script, they're IDNs, TLDs, right, into the domain name space.

And so, what came about is actually the new gTLD program, what they call the 2012 realm. And the mandate for coming up with policy for the new gTLD program lies with the Generic Supporting Names Organization or GNSO that's in the bylaws. And, well, I noted before that there was a policy development process between December 2005 to September, I think it was 2007. The result of that is what we call the GNSO 2007 Consensus Policy. And you'll note this is the process by which ICANN go through between coming up with policy and before or right up to launching the program. So, you'll see here on the screen, what is in terms of the steps at a very, very high level. And, obviously, there's a lot of things that goes on in between.

The launch of what we now call round 1 or the first round happened in 12 Jan to 12th April 2012. It's guided by what we call the applicant guidebook. And the applicant guidebook in theory, captures all the expected implementation of the program, basically the rules and procedures for how to conduct a round of applications and evaluations as well. But what in practice happened is that there were gaps, there were quite a few gaps in the 2012 round AGB, which then certain things had to happen to stop gap to plug in those gaps.

The question always asked is how does the program actually impact end users? So, why are we doing this? Why are we concern concerning ourselves with the program? It is a fact that much use of the Internet still depends on the usage of domains. Obviously, that might change

over time because we're seeing the proliferation of things like Facebook, Insta, Twitter which have their own platform and apps as well, which may not utilize a domain name per se. But there are still millions and millions and millions of online websites, email applications that are still being used in the world.

It is a fact also that the core business of ICANN is to manage the domain name system or the unique identifiers, as we say. And as we noted before, the new gTLD program is aimed at enabling the expansion of the DNS, the Domain Name System. And I would highlight, it is to enhance, the expansion is intended enhance innovation, competition, and consumer choice, with safeguards in place to help support a secure, stable, resilient DNS. So, these are the things that we latch on to in terms of why end users need to know and need to somehow be involved in the policies that govern the DNS or the expansion of the DNS, anyway, in this case.

And just look upon the program as a framework for who gets what applied for string to operate as a TLD, or top-level domain. And included in that framework would be any applicable terms and conditions for such operation, including possibly at the second level. Say, for example, we're talking about community-based TLDs. And all these, in fact, impact end users in terms of access, trust of the domain names, the service providers who use them, and all sorts of other avenues that still rely on domains, obviously.

Okay. So, what are what are Subsequent Procedures or SubPro as we like to call them? As alluded earlier, they are basically rules and procedures governing the next round of new gTLD applications, which,

hence why we're migrating the usage of the term SubPro to the next round. As I said, it determines what strings can be applied for, who can apply, how do you go about applying, what fees are applicable, including refunds, the terms and conditions, and other unique additional requirements or certain types of TLDs.

SubPro is also about updating the rules that will govern the next round, addressing issues, also policy goal achievements, deficiencies, lacuna, because I mentioned a lot of gaps earlier, right, unintended consequences, which were quite a few as well that were identified from the 2012 round. So, you have a policy development process earlier, then you have a launch of the round. And then the round close, and then we go into another round of review, which is where the policy development comes into play. And ultimately, all these updates or corrections or improvements, if you want to call them, would be captured by way of a new applicant guidebook or what we call AGB.

And important to note is in general, Subsequent Procedures will not apply to legacy TLDs or the country code TLDs or any delegated new gTLDs or those which are still unresolved from the 2012 round. So, SubPro is meant to be proactive in terms of the effectiveness and not retrospective.

Right. So, this is what I was talking about, scaring people. So, I had a side conversation with Cheryl earlier about scaring people. So, the SubPro policy development process, the actual policy development process took close to five years or if not a little bit more than five years, if I remember. I'm not going to go through all of these. You can read it. We'll make the slides available when the wiki gets picks up again. But

suffice to say there is a process by which GNSO goes about in undertaking a policy development process.

So, this is part of the process. By the way, this is before the PDP working group actually started working. So, there are certain processes that are in place before the PDP actually starts working. These are the ones. And then we had this thing about, community comment which is kind of like a pre-public comment proceeding. And the PDP working group itself was chartered in early 2016, and it ran for, I said, a little bit more than five years, if I remember correctly. And it's under the auspices of GNSO because as I said, GNSO is by the ICANN bylaws mandated to be responsible for policy governing gTLDs.

ccNSO comes in, the Country Code Name Supporting Organization only comes in in respect country code TLDs. So, that's why you have the bifurcation of the G and the CCs. So G is under the GNSO, and the CCs are under the ccNSO. There was one special work track under the SubPro which had to do with geographic names or geo names for short. That particular one was a special PDP working group, I guess, because it was chartered by a cross-community basis, on a cross-community basis. So, it had colleagues from LAC, ccNSO, GAC as well as GNSO. But that's fine. Nothing too concerning there.

So, these are rest of the process by which the PDP took on and including things like initial report, and then the final report and all these went through public comment process. So, in addition to participating in the PDP working group itself, everyone, anyone in fact, had the opportunity to put inputs or provide comments through the public comment proceedings. And I would note that I think SubPro is probably the only

one, at least from my memory, anyway, that had the privilege of having three public command proceedings instead of the normal two. Right.

So, why did SubPro PDP working group take more than five years to complete its work? That's because we, the PDP, had to discuss more than 40 topics across 9 program areas. Ranging from what you see overarching, pre-application and then throughout the application process, going into evaluation, going into right through to contracting pre-delegation and post-delegation. So, this is the framework, diagrammatically anyway, for Subsequent Procedures. And if you go to the account, I think that's about 41 blocks there or polygons. And just keep this in mind. So, this is why we took so long to complete the work because it was a hell of a lot of work to do, really. And there were some instances where we couldn't do anymore. So, then we had sort of parallel process after the fact. Yeah. And I will come to that in a minute.

Okay. So again, why do Subsequent Procedures matter to end users? As I said, because they facilitate further expansion of the DNS by introducing more new gTLDs. So, that's the intention at least. And based on our experience from the legacy TLDs all the way up to the 2012 ground, we have a laundry list of want and don't want. I like to call them that, want and don't want. So, the want in terms of-- And this is coming from the At-Large perspective. Yeah? So, I'm not talking about the perspective for any of the other groups within ICANN community, just At-Large.

So, from the At-Large perspective, what we do want to see for the next round, and which is what we've been advocating through the entire

SubPro PDP process and onwards into ALAC advice and so forth, is we want to see competition, consumer choice by way of new entrants. We also want to be able to say that there will be new niche single community TLD applicants that are coming into the fray, not to mention many of them might probably meet applicant support. We also want trustworthy TLDs and operators and down the chain right down from registries to registrar and registrants. Because, as we know, DNS abuse, for example, is still happening. And in some respects, it's an up upward trend, especially with new gTLDs. So, there's something to be done in combating DNS abuse. So, if you're going to introduce more TLDs, then presumably that's going to have to introduce more sources of ways to perpetuate DNS abuse.

We also want more IDNs from a TLD perspective, in non-ST scripts, obviously, because we believe that IDNs is truly the way to make the internet multilingual. We also have an eye on registry commitments in terms of the contractual obligations. So, we need to be able to say or point to certain obligations that the registries have in the contracts to compel them to do something or not to do something and so forth. Protection for registrants is a minor aspect, but we did cover that as well. Strings with geographic meaning. We tried to push that forward, but it didn't take. So, we still have that sort of angling, but it's probably something that we need to keep for the next PDP that ever happens. And, obviously, we want to have metrics to be able to understand the impact of the program.

And what we don't want is a concentration of players. So, if you have competition, if we are going to be advocating for competition, then obviously we can't be also advocating for a concentration of players,

right, because that's the antithesis of competition. We certainly don't want TLDs that are against public interest or, as I said, facilitate abuse of any kind. We want to avoid having TLDs that are confusing similar that don't resolve in an expected manner, even highly sensitive TLDs without safeguards. So, for example, banks. Dot banks is a TLD that's been delegated, but that's considered a sensitive TLD. So, they have rules around who can get a second-level domain name under that TLV. So, that's a type of safeguard. We certainly don't want gaming of the system. And definitely not negative impact to the stability and security of the DNS. And finally, we don't want unfair and open-ended ways to resolve contention sets.

So, where did the laundry list of wants and don't want actually pop-up in the 41 topics of SubPro? These were the ones that were identified. We went through the process of considering the recommendations that were coming out from the SubPro PDP. So, as you see, this alone is quite a few. Not all 41, but still almost half, I think.

And did we consider all of these when we were deliberating on recommendations or the draft recommendations as they were when they were coming up? Yes, we did. And I remember the very painful process, I guess, or very stressful process of doing back-to-back consultations on CPW, the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group calls, from I think July. I kind of looked it up and thought it was like from July to 2019 to April 2021. So, I was basically continuously presenting on all these topics that you see on the screen, asking for comments, asking for input, asking for opinions on what At-Large think about these things. And the output of that exercise were a statement that went into the final report of the SubPro PDP, as well as two pieces of advice that

went to the Board. And if you Google these, you'll probably find them somewhere on the net. And I'm sure they turn up At-Large website also.

So, from here on, how does SubPro actually get to the next round of the new gTLD? So, I was talking before about SubPro, Subsequent Procedures, as kind of like the PDP process. So, once we have the PDP finished and we have the policies adopted, consensus policies, by the way, how do you move them towards the launch of the next round? So, this is what I'm going to talk to you about. So, this is the actual GNSO policy development process. They have a very nice graphic. And I told you before that they have a very long descriptive process, and this is it. And I was reading somewhere that someone said something that ICANN doesn't move at the speed of light, but if nothing else, they are very detailed in their actions. So, this by way of this diagram alone, kind of indicate that, supports that statement.

I will just draw your attention to two parts of this set diagram. The one that is in the yellow, which cuts across, is the PDP process. Generally speaking, it's the PDP process. But the one at the bottom is what I want to talk about now, which is post the SubPro PDP report having been finalized, it then gets submitted to GNSO Council because the GNSO Council as the manager of or PDPs and anything to do with gTLDs, they have to approve policy recommendations that come up on the PDP process. So, that's what happened February 2021. And then after Council approves that, whatever they approve, goes to the Board for adoption, so that it goes up the chain. And this is how consensus policies come, which are developed from grassroots level, bottom-up, goes to the top and gets implemented.

And then the Board, they have also a process that called for public comments, and that happened sometime in 2021 as well. And after that public comment proceeding for the ICANN Board, they instructed ICANN org to do what is or to conduct what is called the operation design phase. That is, simply put, the way that ICANN org take the recommendations, the final report away, and figures out how to actually implement all these recommendations. The instruction from the ICANN Board came in September 2021. And it's important to note all these chronological events because it explains why we are, where we are now.

So, the ICANN Board conduct that ODP, the Operational Design Process, and that took pretty much one year, the whole of 2022. And they came out with a report, which is called the Operational Design Assessment or the ODA, at year's end last year. And then the ICANN Board took that, then they took the final report and they looked at all the however, I think 138, if I remember correctly, recommendations. And they looked through them, they considered them, and they approved or they adopted as the proper word should be, 98 of those at ICANN76 in March this year.

So out of the all the ones that were submitted to the Board for approved or for adoption, they adopted only 98. There are still 38 that remains pending, and the Board has marked them as pending. If you want more information about what is pending and what has been approved, I will direct you to my summary reports that I put out for the GNSO Council meetings. Someone can remind me, I can stick the URL in the chat afterwards. Okay. And henceforth, once things are adopted by the Board, it then moves to implementation. And that is where the

Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team, or shortened as SubPro IRT, comes into the picture. Yeah. And that was constituted in only May of this year. And Cheryl and myself are the two, reps for the ALAC on the SubPro IRT for obvious reasons.

So, it's still quite a bit distanced to the launch. So, you see a little bit of winding go up still. What else needs to be done? So, I alluded to 38 recommendations as still pending. And here, I would make a distinction between policy work and implementation. So, it's important to understand where policy end and implementation starts. A lot of the work is already completed because we have policy recommendations that have been adopted by the Board. There are some, namely the 38 that I mentioned, they are still pending.

Although we expect the Board to adopt some of them already in I think within these few days. In fact, they're having a workshop. And anything that is adopted moves into implementation. So, there isn't going to be necessarily—and I said what necessarily indicatively for a reason—aren't necessarily going to undergo any more policy work. It's not meant to be anyway because policy is already made, it's been adopted by the board. So, it becomes consensus policy. So, there is no real impetus for us to change that policy unless we institute another PDP working group.

In short, anything that has been adopted by the Board is considered consensus policy that moves to implementation. Anything that's not been adopted by the Board yet, there is still room for policy development, but very, very narrow, I would say. And in terms of this this 38-- And policy development is driven by GNSO, remember. So, the 38 that's pending, the 38 recommendations are still pending are

because the Board has indicated some concerns about them. They are being addressed through GNSO, in particular by a small team of the GNSO council. We just call them SubPro small team. And we've been having a series of meetings with the Board SubPro caucus members to talk up those concerns and see how we can resolve them. As the ALAC liaison to GNSO, I have inserted myself into that small team to make sure that the ALAC perspective and the At-Large perspective don't get lost somehow.

So apart from the 38, there isn't much policy development work remaining. But parallel to these things that have been adopted, and the 38 is still pending, we do have other ongoing processes that contribute to the next round. They don't actually contribute to SubPro, but they contribute to the next round. And the examples of this is the Internationalized Domain Name Expedited Policy Development Process or the IDN EPDP for short. There the working group chartered separately out of SubPro, away from SubPro. So, they're not part of SubPro per se. But they're doing work that SubPro didn't do or that SubPro couldn't manage to cover in their five-year term. So, that particular PDP deals with policy recommendations for gTLDs at the top level and the second level in respect of variant management. Then we also have what's called the GNSO Guidance Process on Applicant Support, GGP on ASP.

Now I want to point out that this GGP is not policy development. Okay? They don't make policy. They are supposed to look at how to implement the policy. So, they're supposed to provide input in terms of implementation guidance So, they're not coming up with policy, but they're coming up with recommendations as to how to implement the

policy recommendations that have been adopted. So, that's the distinction between a PDP and the GGP in this instance.

There was also a tripod type closed generics facilitated dialogue which I will come back to in a little bit. And there is also the issue around names condition. So, the SSAC, it has a project going which is called the Name Collision Analysis Project, NCAP. The output of that will somehow contribute to the next round as well, implementation in next round.

Right. Moving on very quickly because I see that's already that's half an hour. Okay. Implementation. Now distinctly, as I said before, the 98 that have been approved goes to implementation. So, policy development is driven by GNSO, but implementation is actually driven by ICANN org. How the community participates is through the SubPro IRT. From best knowledge so far or best data so far, implementation is expected to take up to 24 months. I think they're trying to trim it down as far as possible, and target dates have been announced by the ICANN Board chair, which is that the next applicant guidebook is meant to be finalized by May 2025. And the target launch date for the next round of applications is packed at April 2026. And, obviously, this is subject to any dependencies that are listed out on the screen. So, I'm not going to go through that.

So, what do we have to do in terms of the next round, or what the community has to do? So, there's a whole bunch of things. So maybe I'll just let this run. Okay. So, I segregated them to three categories, which is completed or near completion, then the second category would be contemplating completion by the end of this year. And then the rest of it would be from next year up to 2026, which is when the target

launch date is pegged at. Okay. So, as you can see, there's still work to be done. And where do we feature as At-Large in these things? So, I've highlighted them for you in yellow.

Now in terms of the 38 that I mentioned that is still pending, 12 have been more or less resolved. We're just waiting for the Board to adopt them officially. Another 10 is expected to be resolved soon. And that also still has to go to by way of adoption by the Board. And that 22 went through the process of what we call the GNSO Council Clarification. So, that's the work that's being done by that particular small team. Closed generics, we know now that there isn't anything going to be coming out of the closed generics dialogue, as in there isn't going to be more policy work before the next round anyway. There isn't going to be any more policy work.

The GGP on applicant support is undergoing a public comment process at the moment. So, if you don't already know what that is about or if you want to have a look at that, then I suggest that you visit the CPWG agenda and participate there because that's where it's being discussed. Now in terms of the balance of the 16 of the 38 pending recommendations that have been tagged as having concerns by the Board, that will go through the motions of the GNSO small team because they will have to work it out. But in one particular one, which is recommendation 17.2 on applicant support, that one is in this group of 16. So, if you don't already know, I would just mention that we have had a series of consultations also through CPWG, and I actually did one for APRALO as well, asking for input as to how to improve or how to fix the concerns that the Board raised regarding 17.2, applicant support.

Now I'm not going to go into details because that's not the idea behind this overview webinar.

In terms of some of the other things. So, I've indicated how we can participate mostly through either-- it's always going to be either via a small team, in which case, probably me, or it's going to be through implementation via the IRT, which is going to be also me and Cheryl and the other At-Large members who have signed up to the IRT, or public comment proceeding.

Now in terms of what's going to happen up to 2026, these are some of the other things that we can do and we should be doing or we should be looking to do. Again, it's a question of public comments, or actually participating in the PDP process especially like, for example, in the IDN EPDP implementation of anything that is adopted by the Board from now on. The applicant guidebook, which is one of the key outputs of the SubPro IRT, and then, obviously where we can come in is the program communications. And I think a lot of you would have interest in that aspect of it.

And parallel to SubPro or parallel to the next round is the notion of the need to increase the adoption of Universal Acceptance and email address internationalization. Because that that comes under more the Universal Acceptance-- I forgot what S stands for. Steering Group, UASG. So, that's why it I highlighted in a different color because it's not really part of SubPro perse. I think I'm coming to the last one, so bear with me.

So, I think I've covered these already, just specs to reinforce. But what I would say is that there's ample opportunity for community participation in the IRT. I mean, we're still kind of nascent, so if you want to join, please do, because the work is going to take at least 12 to 18 months from now. And the IRT has an open and representative model, even though it's actually constituted by ICANN org. So, they've taken the step to make it an open representative model. So, that means that if you join as a participant there, you are free to feed your input, you're not going to be censored in any way.

But you would need to know or you would need to be familiar with the SubPro outputs and preferably all the deliberations that went into producing those outputs because the IRT is supposed to act as a resource for ICANN org in implementation to ensure that the implementation done by ICANN org conforms to the intent of the community develop policies. So, you need to know what's the intent in order to be able to monitor ICANN org to make sure they do things. And I alluded to the applicant guidebook as one of the key outputs of the IRT, the SubPro IRT. The other one would be or the other two would be applicant support program. I think that we would have a key interest in that. And the third one, not so much, which is the registry service provider pre-evaluation process. Okay. I think I've taken way too much time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And we do have some questions in fact. Holly has her hand up first in queue.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. I'm going to stop sharing my screen so that Yeşim can do stuff in the background. Okay. So, questions. I would encourage people to try and verbalize the questions rather than having me scroll through the chat to see what was the question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We've covered, anything that came in chat's been covered. That not a problem. So, you're just running with a queue. So, you've got Holly and then Gopal at this stage.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Perfect. Thank you so much, Cheryl. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. And it's a pretty fundamental question. I've put it in the chat as well. And it's basically, do we have any information about usage? First of all, do we have information about the names resolving? I can remember Jonathan complaining probably a year or so ago. He got a name, didn't resolve. ISPs aren't actually doing what stakes to resolve. So, are they resolving? And then are they being used? Because the idea is this is a-- the whole idea of this was consumer trust, consumer choice. Well, is it something that consumers are using or not?

And my second or part of that, and something that Satish can talk about. One of the particular issues was about Universal Acceptance, particularly the Internationalized Domain Names, which were seen as a

particular consumer benefit for all of those people for whom English is not the first language. I know that proceeding is a pace, but I think it's just generally, is this a process that that is useful, that is appreciated, or is it just a lot of money in ICANN's pocket? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. To be honest, I'm not sure whether I'm the best person to answer your question, Holly, but I will try. The first one is I think the answer is no because I don't think that was part of the charter of this Sup Pro PDP. So, again, I'll remind you that I'm just speaking about the SubPro working group and what happens with that going into the next round. So, I think y our question maybe something that we might want to take up separately. Okay? In terms of the IDNs, well, that's also another good question, but you'll note that ICANN is using IDNs as their tag line for promoting the next round. So, that question goes to ICANN, I would say.

And in terms of where At-Large is coming from. We do really, I mean, personally, I believe that IDNs and their variants are very important for bringing the next one billion people onto the internet because as you say, it's to cater for people who don't use English as a first language.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just one question, one further one. The link that Cheryl put in chat where the information was, I actually looked through that while the meeting was going on. The information's not there. We haven't asked the question, so I think we need to ask the question.

JUSTINE CHEW: I would strongly encourage you to bring that up through CPW.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Okay.

JUSTINE CHEW: Gopal, you're next.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Very nice. Thank you very much, Justine for a nice, easy pace. One of the best on the topics that I've heard in the recent times. The visuals on the slides are very nice. However, I missed one slide. I'm multitasking in my office. The earliest slide where one block was highlighted in the name, country name. There's several blocks in columns. One of the early slides. I am just making an observation for comments to content. Yeşim is probably moving it backward.

JUSTINE CHEW: Do you remember the slide number?

GOPAL TADEPALLE: No. My apologies. I was multitasking in my office. Please, I was listening, but kindly go back. Geographic name, application evaluation based on geographic names. This is slide number 10. I noticed this now. Thank you very much. You see there is an observation that we

have been making all along. There's a pattern in the country name, a directional description, a feature of the land, a tribe name, or an important person. And usually there are male. It's a pattern that has been emerging on how the country name happen.   Is there any prioritization based on these patterns that's being contemplated?

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, I mentioned in one of my slides, I can't remember which one now, that it's the list of wants and don't wants. So, I mentioned something along the lines of we want some attention put to strings with geographic meaning. So, that kind of ties in with geographic names. Because we're not talking about just country names. We're talking about also things like river names, mountain names, place names, basically.

There was a time where we said that we would really like some regard to the rights of people to strings with geographic names.   And geographic names was pretty much taken up under the work track 5. Okay. So, I mentioned that as a special work track. But we basically couldn't get a lot of the ideas that we had through for obvious reasons. So, there are set policies in place for geographic name, and they're very limiting, by the way. Okay. So, they only address country names, they address capital city names, and they address non-capital city names where the city name is being used as a reference, basically.

And, of course, there are certain other things which are a little bit more obscure like geographic areas like ASEAN and that sort of thing. But in terms of the policies that came out for geographic names, they are very,

very limited.   It could be that we will tackle geographic names as one of the other webinars in the series, but not today. Questions? Any more questions? Because I'm really sorry--

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We have we have a little bit happening in chat first of all, Justine. Oh, by the way, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I know Justin knows who I am, but the transcript probably needs to.   We did have a comment coming in from Steinar who also mentioned a number of the parallel activities that are going on, which complement in many ways the new round, that included things like the RIA amendment and they mentioned the sunset of who is moving into the RDAP and the RRDS.

But Juliana has asked me to read this to the record which is a question she has a slightly dodgy connection, which I'm sure we could all empathize with. This is from Juliana Harsianti. How this procedure would support one, internationalized or international domain names and two, applications from certain countries or institutions which have difficulties with the application procedure.   For examples, these complicated documents, etc.   I believe this is specific to, applicant support, of course, and some of the joy of the applicant support activity in the GGP.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, in terms of IDNs, and we're just talking about the top level, we're not talking about anything below the top level. IDNs are already available. They've been available since the last round, basically. So, they've been available for 10 years. So, it's not an issue of IDNs not

being available. It's the issue of the awareness of IDNs being available and registry of operators or applicants, potential applicants wanting to apply for and to operate IDN TLDs. Because I think in terms of to operate IDN TLD, you need certain skills and knowledge. It's kind of different to operating an ASCII TLD. So, you need to know how to operate IDN TLD.

In terms of the second part of your question is yes. Part of what we are still trying to put through or push through, I would say, is this thing about the recommendation 17.2. I would say first that applicant support, the topic applicant support is not just one recommendation. There's a series of recommendation. So, all the other recommendations have been adopted. So, it's going to stay whatever that's there is going to be an applicant support program. It's the question of what is going to look like in implementation. The only one that hasn't been adopted by the Board is the one that I mentioned, 17.2, and that has got to do with the pro bono non-financial resources that's available to applicants who qualify for applicant support. So, we're talking about things like lawyers, consultants, application writing professionals, people with business know how as to how to put together the business plan, the application itself and then navigate through the process.

So, Juliana, I would invite you to have a look at, and I can't obviously find that particular link at the moment, but have a look at what is called the ALAC proposal to amend recommendations 17.2, and I think you'll find some very interesting aspects in there. Steinar. How are you, my man?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Good morning.   And thank you very much, Justine, for a fantastic presentation.   It was a nice morning wake up for me in Norway.   So, thank you very much.   I have more like a question because one of the concerns is that in the new round, we will still see some sort of a consolidation of the registry operator and the backend providers based on the experience we'd have with the present round.   My question goes into is there any way by policy by the applicant guidebook that we can prevent this kind of consolidation about that?   And I think that is something that, if not, how can we bypass this in a way and make it make the new round also feasible and workable for end users and the choice of having a string in a new environment.   Thank you very much, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay.   I'm not sure about having a string in a new environment, unless you're talking about an alternate web, which I don't really want to go there.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: No.   It was not an old.   It's having a string in the new TLD that's come up some time.   Yeah.   Okay.   But the alternate to it.   Yeah.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay.   So, if I may suggest, one of the questions that was discussed in the SubPro PDP was whether there should be a limit to how many applications a particular applicant can put in.   So, that question was discussed, and the conclusion was no ceiling.   So, that means that we

can't prevent anyone from applying for multiple TLDs, or multiple strings, I should say, because the string only becomes the TLD when it was approved and delegated. So, that's where it comes to this thing about entrenched registry operators who are doing brisk business, they have the ability to apply for many, many, many, many streams to continue doing that. And we can't stop them because there's no policy to stop that.

The only way we are now promoting is that we say that we want things like applicant support program to help bring in new competitors and competitors who will use a particular string for community sake or public interest, whatever it is, that is not an entrenched player. So, that hopefully increases competition. We don't know how successful we will be. We know from the last round that there were only three applicants for applicant support and only one got through. So, this is a major push that we're making to tell ICANN to really, really concentrate on having an applicant support program that works. Which is why some of us are spending so much time speaking until we are blue in the face, trying to convince everyone that this is important.

And in terms of with the community that you want to see having a string, then if they are able to get themselves organized, they can apply for string, using a community-based TLD, and put it as a community-based application. Obviously, they'll need to have the resources and the know-how, and presumably, they can tap into this applicant support program that we're trying to formulate. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Thanks, Justine. And I do recognize time is ticking on as well. We've only got about another 10 or 15 minutes to go in today's session. I just wanted to make sure that we recognized the comment that Hong Xue put into chat, where she was talking regarding applicant support, saying how important it is, but stating in her view, that it's the lowering of the application costs that is critical here.

I guess at this point, it behooves was too mentioned to everyone, Justine, that the costs are based on a cost recovery so that in all in all, this is not lining ICANN's pocket. In fact, it should be a cost-neutral exercise, so that the funds that come into ICANN from the day-to-day operation of the names that are out there and resolving in terms of annual fees, etcetera, etcetera, is not going into a black hole of new gTLD operations and developments, but rather that the costs charged to applicants and during the processes are designed to including a contingency for legal, I will admit—and that can be hefty—have a cost-neutral or cost neutrality.

So, there's significant upfront costs that ICANN org needs to cover, it needs to recoup, and that it should not be digging into the other parts of their funding model. So, it's really easy to think, oh, just cut this and do that and make this less or make this more, but when you dig into it and you start taking those layers of onion off, it gets a little tiny bit more complicated. But in the particular point that that Hong was raising, that's something where the GGP is doing a lot of work, the GNSO Guidance Process, because they're looking at applicant support quite specifically. And what they're trying to do is ensure that the guidance, the recommendations that they're making regarding guidance of how to implement the applicant support program don't do things like have

insufficient funds or where a certain pot of money is spread so thinly, compensating for the amount and also fees that there's nobody gets any benefit at all. So, there's a whole lot of moving parts, but it is something that all of us working in the area are very aware of.

I just want to note Nitin Walia's comment in chat now. I've got microphone, and that is the availability of IDN is not a challenge. Adoption of IDN and Universal Acceptance-readiness of major software applications and website is to which ICANN motivate industry leaders, and he names a group of them to become UA-ready. And of course, that is very much the bread-and-butter work of the heavily supported by ICANN and sponsored by ICANN UASG, which Justine mentioned as well. And with that, I think we've got covered other than some general advertising that's going on in chat. Back to you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Thank you. This is Justine for the record. Sorry. I always forget to say that. So, if I can just add a couple of more things to Hong's comment. In terms of if you're talking about application costs, I see it as two parts of it, two parts of the equation. One is your application fee and the other part is whatever that's not in your application fee that you will incur in putting in an application and going through the evaluation and so forth.

So, looking at just the application fee side, that is going to be determined in implementation because ICANN org has to look at the cost of introducing and running the whole program in order to then work out what the fee, the application fee might be on a cost recovery

basis. So, for example, if ICANN org anticipate that that program is going to cost one million, of course, it's going to be more than that, but one million to do and they're going to anticipate a thousand applicants going in, then it's just basically one million divided by a thousand, and that's your application fee in a very high-level thing. That's what we mean by cost recovery.

But on the flip side, there's also your other costs which is like your legal costs, your consulting costs, and so forth and so forth and so on. So, that's where we are talking about applicant support coming in to foot that bill so that the applicant may not have to find money to pay for those kind of things if ICANN can make them available through whatever means. And back to the application fee of it, side of things, which I should mention before I forget is that ICANN org has already mentioned or indicated in the ODA, the Operational Design Assessment, that they're proposing that applicant support applicants or applicants who qualify for applicant support may enjoy up to a 75% discount on the application fee side. Okay? So, that's something to note and something to maybe hold them to if we can.

And so, Nitin's comment about UA. Absolutely, which is why I had that in my slide, although it's not part of SubPro and it's highlighted in blue. So, that's something definitely that At-Large and APRALO should champion and promote more heavily.

Okay. So, we are six minutes past the hour. I can probably take one more question. And if there are none, then we could possibly go to the poll. So, yeah, I mean, feel free to contact me if you have put in in questions or very specific questions. But I will remind you that this is a

series of webinar that we're putting together. So, this is just the first one, and it's just the overall view of things. We plan to go specifically into certain topics. And, Yeşim, if you can go to the next slide, I think, there. Yeah. Okay. So, the ones that are marked in red are Universal acceptance and IDNs, applicant support program, community applications. Those are the ones that I have identified as ones that we can probably work single webinars around. So, we're looking at probably another three webinars in the series already.

And now I want to know from folks here what other topics apart from the ones that have been marked in red that you would like to see covered in this webinar series, and they will try to work around those. So, Yeşim, I guess you can run the poll. And by the way, these are the ones that At-Large considered and had-- Some of them we had to say in terms of like the statement or the ALAC advice. But these are the ones that were identified as having some sort of end user angle to it. So, I have listed only five in the poll because Zoom only allows maximum of six answers options as options. So, I've created one that says others, and then you can tell me in the next question what others mean if you have indicated others. And at the moment, nobody has selected others.

So, basically, in addition to the three, I would put UA, Universal Acceptance and IDN together because they literally go together. So, I'm considering them as three topics that have already been identified. The ones that you see on the poll questions are potential ones that I thought might be interesting. But if you don't think or you don't agree with me, then by all means, make a suggestion, and I'm quite happy to consider and see how we can work around those. Okay. So, I only see 62%, 65%. Okay. So, it's going up. We might give that a few more minutes then.

Please do, please do put in your selections because it would help us, this would help me in the ETF plan. Our next cycle of webinars probably in 2024. Because we've already kind of lined up the next three webinars up to, I want to say, December 2023, although I don't remember exactly.

Okay. So, one person has indicated other. So, I'd be very happy to see what that other means. We're still at 65% participation in the poll. Okay. So right. It's just gone up to 67%. Can I get an indication of whether people have finalized their selection? Because I'm noting that it's 10 past the hour, and I don't really want to keep you beyond the 75 minutes that I had promised. Okay. It's gone up to 70%. So, people are still participating in the poll, which is good. I like to see poll participation rate that are high. So, 70% is high. And if we can get the higher rate, that will be even better.

Okay. I'm going to rely on Yeşim to tell me when she thinks that the rate is going to stabilize which is when we're going to stop the poll. It's just a quick question anyway.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Justine, I'm kind of also seeing we're at the 71%. And I'm not seeing any more progress and the poll has been open for almost four minutes. So, I think we're good to get this poll, this question closed, if you agree as well.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. And I as well. Sure. No worries. And I noted that two people selected others. So, I'm depending on these two people to tell me what others mean.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: I'm sharing the results by the way.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So, high numbers for registry commitments and geographic names. Okay. Geo names. All right. And next one would be communications. Okay. That's interesting. All right. Okay. And could take a snapshot of this, but Cheryl will give it to me.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: I got a snapshot, Justine, I will send you after the call. So, would you like me to move on to the next question?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, please. And then, if we do have time, we can fit in a picture because I'm always reminded that we need to take a picture of any activity that we run. Otherwise, no picture, no, it didn't happen. So, I want to make sure that this happened. Okay. So, those two people who selected other in the question 1, can you please pop your answers into the call question 2? And in the meantime, I wonder if I can get everyone to turn on their cameras, and then we can do the picture at the same time while our two colleagues sort out the answers to question 2. Obviously if you didn't select other in question 1, you can

still put an input. You're not prevented from doing that, by the way. Who can I get to take a picture?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: I can do that.

JUSTINE CHEW: Maybe a few more people just in case. Yeah. You might have to take two screens. Let me just see. 40 people online at the moment.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Yes. Well, not many people with cameras on, but I'm going to try it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. If you can manage, please, people just turn on your camera for like a minute so that we just take a photo and then you can turn it off again. I understand that if your net--

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Please smile. Ready? 1, 2,3. And I will need to take the picture for the second screen as well. So, again, 1, 2, 3. Okay. Got it. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW.   Thank you for that. Okay. So, I think we have some answers in the poll for question 2, three answers. Maybe we can show that.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Yes. Let me finish the poll.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And there was also some points made in chat. So, when you see the captured chat, you'll have a couple of extra things as well.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. We'll do. We'll do.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Just give me one second, please, because sharing the results is a bit trickier for such questions. Okay. I think you can see the answers now on the screen.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Security and stability is one. Universal Acceptance I'm already going to cover in the next, in one of three next ones. Right. Yeah. The UA and IDNs go together so that work out. So, GPI and security stability. Okay. I have to just warn you that I can only speak from the perspective of what happened in SubPro. So, I can't go into the technicalities of security stability. I can tell you what the issues were, what the deliberations were, and what are the recommendations that came out of SubPro. So, that is the extent of this webinar CE. Yeah. Because we're talking about SubPro and the next round.

Global public interest is an interesting one. I'm going to have to think about that really. It's more tied to, the way we look at global public

interest is more tied to registry commitments mostly. But now I'll have to think about that. Anyway. Okay. So, thank you very much for joining us today. It's 16 minutes past the hour, so I have taken one minute extra but thank you very much for participating. Thank you for all your inputs. Thank you for the chats. Thank you for the questions. And, hopefully, you will watch out for announcements on the Webinar number 2.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And thank you, Justin. Great job.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]