

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call taking place on Wednesday, 27th of September 2023. It's 1300 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom room and on the phone-bridge will be recorded at this call.

And just to cover our apologies. We have received apologies from Satish Babu, Marita Moll, Alan Greenberg and from Vanda Scartezini. From staff side, we currently have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yesim Sağlam, present on today's call. And I will be doing call management for this call. As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation. And our interpreters are Marina and David on the Spanish channel, and we have Claire and Dominique on the French channel.

And we do also have the real-time transcription service provided on today's call, and I am going to share the link with you here on the Zoom chat. Please do check the service. And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes, please. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond and welcome everyone to today's consolidated policy working group quote, which is going to be another busy one as you can speak from our agenda. We'll

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

start with our work group and small team updates, that includes a quick update on the transcript policy review policy development process, potentially a quick one on the EPDP on IDNs. And then we'll have, Hello? I think someone is on the wrong channel. And then 20 minutes on the facilitated startups on closed generic. And finally, just a quick update on the new gTLD next round. After this, our policy statement update will be carried through with Hadia Elminiawi and Claudia Ruiz.

And then we'll have the review of the airlock input on the At-Large, work based on ccNSO PDP for initial report on the selection and deselection of IDN ccTLDs. Hadia will take us through that. We'll then have a review of the pending recommendations of the consumer trust and security and submit to your view to recommendations with Jonathan Zuck, and then we'll have the after session, ICANN78. Now I know that there are parts of this and 7b, which has ALAC questions to the Board, GAC, etcetera. We might have to jig things around depending on timing, because my understanding is that Avri Doria is only here for the first hour of this call.

So, section 7 might jump forward if we lose a bit of time and we don't have enough time to have Avri on this. The 7 might come before 5. And then we'll have a discussion on the INR PIR relations with the 5 regional internet registries, Jonathan Zuck, and finally, any other business. A long agenda today. Hopefully, we can get through it quite swiftly. Let's open the floor for comments, questions, changes to the agenda. And Christopher Wilkinson has put his hand up. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you very much. I'm glad you put point 8 on the agenda, which I asked for last week. And with a view to saving time, I've posted to the list two specific questions to focus at least my interest and I hope others interest on this, this question. If they involve any research or additional work by staff. Of course, I'm quite prepared to take this up again on a in a future meeting. But for the time being, you've got my questions. Thank you. And thank you again for thanks very much for you on putting it on the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Christopher. So, the if people haven't read those emails yet, they can. It's in your mailbox. I'm not seeing any other hands up. So, the event the agenda is it as it is on your screen with the caveat that I've mentioned regarding moving one of the sections forward. And we can move to the action items now. From past weeks, there's still a number of them that remain to be fulfilled. Well, not many, actually. I've just recycled my screen.

So, there's just one with Jonathan Zuck and Jonah to work with GAC leadership and adapters on the ALAC to the ALAC. I think the topic of a joint ALAC-GAC statement and closed generics to the ALAC-GAC meeting. I guess this is all in hand or coming up. Any comments or questions on these action items? A lot of concluded action items. So, that's Yeşim. Yes. You have the floor.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Yes. I'm sorry for interrupting. It seems like we're now having a problem with your audio. It's not as loud as we would like it to be for

our interpreters. As well as for the real time transcription service. Would you be able to switch to zoom audio? And meanwhile, Adigo can try redialing back to you. I'm sorry for interrupting the call for this reason.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, let me try the Zoom audio for a moment. Is that working?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: I think it's much better.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, really?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Yeah. It's yes. And you just have the confirmation from the interpreters as well. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's stick to Zoom audio for the time being. Don't call me back on Adigo, and then we'll, if something does go wrong, then we'll get back on Adigo. Thank you.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I put the phone down on Adigo. Apologies for that. Technology sometimes is a bit challenging, but in the meantime, I'm not seeing any hands regarding the action items so thank you. Let's proceed forward. Let's get ready to rumble. Let's go with agenda item number 3, and that is our work group and small team updates. And we'll start with a quick update from Lutz Donnerhacke, about the transfer policy review policy development process over to you, Lutz.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Thank you very much. I hope you can hear me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very clear.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Okay. The update is very quick. We had yesterday a discussion about a questionnaire which was shared between the members of the group. And we are already discussing the issue how much bulk transfer which is approved by ICANN may cost and who has to pay for. It's the same discussion we had over the last month. And the current situation is that almost nobody does understand why we're still discussing this. Steinar, do we have anything to add?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. That that was a good one. No. I think it's I think that the history here is that the \$50,000 is some sort of a historic element and I do agree with you, Lutz, that nobody really wants to pay it. Nobody

actually think it's the is the correct amount in today's scenario. So, but on the flip side here, I was listening to the recording this morning, my time and now I see that at least the registry operators has been more vocal.

This has more or less they have been quite silent recently, but they are more or less vocal. Whether there is going to be some sort of a consensus on this, I'm not sure, honestly. Let's see it ends up in the final draft and the public comment and so on. So, that thank you very much, Chris, for being by proxy yesterday. That was a good work. Thank you. Over to you Lutz.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: So, back to Olivier. There's nothing more to say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lutz, and thank you, Steinar, for being on standby. And great to see progress still. Although, it's a long process, but there you go. Let's continue. Let's go now to the expedited PDP on internationalized domain names. For this, we've got 5 minutes with Justine Chu.

JUSTINE CHEW: All right. Oh, sorry. I didn't realize it's being full and told to do this. Okay. This is Justine from the record. So, a couple of weeks ago, I discussed with CPWG, something to do with conservatism principle and basically the background to it is that some of the draft recommendations that were coming out from the EPDP appeared to be

inconsistent to certain commenters from the from the public comment process. Inconsistent, meaning to say that on the one hand, we were advocating for conservatism principle. But on the other hand, some of our recommendations didn't seem to demonstrate that. And what conservatism principle basically means is that if, you're not sure about whether introducing a variant is going to cause more problems than not, then don't introduce it.

That's basically the conservatism principle in in in very straight for forward language. So, what has happened is we've tried to, and all this started from the fact that the EPDP didn't want to recommend a ceiling value for the toll number of allocatable variants that can be delegated for any particular gTLD. So, the upshot of that is that if you don't have a ceiling then you have to have a complimentary mechanism. To still control sources, we control the number of variants that are sought to be introduced to the root. And it's not a question of how many introduce in terms of being a problem in the root, it's more the problem of the fact that variants are meant to be same word of the variations of the same word.

So, in that sense, it might introduce confusion to users and we're not talking about just the top level because every variant that's introduced in the top level will have presumably second level domain names under those. So, you can imagine that if you have four variants at the top level, and each variance has got a number of permutations and that flows down into second level so that the number of permutations that can potentially be produced becomes exponential. And that's what we're trying to guard against. And at the end of the day, when we say

that we are want we are wanting parents to be introduced to meet language needs.

We are also trying to deter frivolous applications for variants. So, what we're trying to say is that if you want the variant, then you need to be able to justify why you need it and how you're going to manage it to address this permutation, the confusion that could arise from the permutation in the numbers of variants that we introduced. So, we try to advocate the ALAC position that was kind of agreed on from two weeks ago, and we have received pushback from the registry stakeholder group and as opposed to the registrar stakeholder group as well.

So, we're trying to talk to them about a compromise and I think we have been successful in advocating why we're asking for certain mechanisms to be in place to have this so-called GAC rails and I think they see it, but they want more details. So, we're trying to work out how best to compromise and sorry, we don't have, any text or so forth to show you because it's still unstable at this point. We're still discussing it. So, hopefully by next week, we can have something good to report on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are there any questions or comments? I'm not seeing any hands up. Thank you very much for this. Let's then move on. Thank you, Justine. Now our next update is going to be about the closed generics, the facilitated dialogue and closed generics. And for this, we have Greg

Shatan, I believe. Although I can't see him on the list of attendees at the moment, which is a bit of a concern.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Olivier, if I made the decision, I don't see Greg on the call. And Alan--

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is not on the call either.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Is on apology. Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, okay, let's pass this for the time being then. And then the interest of saving time. Let's move on to the next one, and that's the new gTLD next round subsequent procedures, five minutes, and we're back with Justin Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Just very quick updates from perspective of the pending recommendations from Sub-Pro, as well as the IRT, the implementation review team. I think Jonathan very ably channeled me at yesterday's ALAC call. So, I'm going to touch on some of the things that he mentioned.

I wasn't able to attend that call. In terms of the Sub-Pro recommendations or what they call the Sub-Pro outputs that are still

pending. So, there are a few categories. So, one group of them are not approved or not adopted, then there are some that are still pending, either clarification or something else. And then there's another group that has to be revised altogether because they have been not adopted. So, I'm just going to touch on two.

The first one is regards to the group of 10 outputs that is focused around the enforceability of PICs and RVCs. So, I've put down the recommendation numbers as you see in this, in the smaller form there. This one, I would just say that it's still being bended above by the small team, the Sub-Pro small team of GNSO Council, and the goal is for council to issue a second clarifying statement. So, that's why it's WIP work in progress. To address the what's concerned on these 10 outputs. And all I want to say at this point was there was confirmation that the ICANN Board will have a community wide conversation on this issue around and possibility of fixing overseas.

The second one, which is something that has not adopted, which is recommendation 17.2 on additional applicant support resources. I think I've spoken extensively on this. So, in this point, I'm repeating myself I guess. All I wanted to mention is that I have been approached by NCSG to explore the possibility of ALAC participating in a session that they are organizing at ICANN78 and it is because on based on what they said to me anyway, it's because that they think the proposal that NCSG has put forward to the small team in the large part mirrors the one that was put forward by ALAC.

So, they want to collaborate with the ALAC to viralize the commonalities between the proposals in order to advocate for what both groups are

trying to point out as need full aspects to get a better applicant support program. So, I don't have the details of when that session is going to be. But they're still talking to me anyway. So, as soon as I have details on that I will share those. And certainly, we would not turn away any possibility of exploring collaboration across groups across community white thing.

It's always a good thing like Johnson says. So, if they are Participants to this session, then that'll be great. But as I said, we can look at it as in when more details come to light. Next slide, please. Just moving on to very quickly the IRT, this is something that Cheryl and I are both on as the alternate and the rep respectively. And all I wanted to say was, we have started meeting since May 2023 and to date, we have reviewed six topics.

And other these six topics, I believe only Applicant Freedom of Expression and Universal Acceptance have more or less stable text. When I say text is because the output of the Sub-Pro IRT is basically, or one of the major outputs would be the next applicant guidebook. So, that's why we're reviewing the text that is going to go into the next a version of the applicant guidebook. In terms of the other ones, they are still work in progress.

Reserved names we started just yesterday. So, we typically take about two to three calls to get to a more or less stable position, but in this particular mechanism of the IRT has worked quite well in my opinion, because the community have been able to point out weaknesses or misunderstanding on the part of the ICANN or the people who are implementing the new gTLD program in terms of their understanding

the Sub-Pro recommendations. So, I think that's a good process and we would certainly be looking to monitor and provide inputs as in when that, and I will stop there. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for your updates, Justine. Let's see if there are any questions or comments on this topic. Very efficiently delivered, might I add? So, thank you. Right. No hands up. Let's then continue through our agenda, and now having finished our policy comment updates, I don't think that Greg is on the call. No. He's not. So, we will move to the policy statement updates and that's with Hadia Elminiawi and Claudia Ruiz. Over to you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. Olivier. And recently ratified by the ALAC, is the GNSO Guidance Process applicant support guidance recommendation initial report. And this was developed by Satish, Maureen, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And recently ratified also is the ccNSO-PDP 3 proposed policy for a specific ccTLD related review mechanism. And this was developed by Michael Palage and Alan Greenberg. So, currently open for public comment is the ccNSO PDP for initial report on the deselection of IDN ccTLDs.

Actually, the public comment closes today. And I do have a proposed statement. It's just like two paragraphs, one paragraph and also, still open for public comment is the proposed updates to existing right protection mechanisms documentation. And I don't think we actually need to comment on this from my point of view. So, this is basically just

updating the documentation in accordance with recommendations developed by the community. And the recommendations basically updates the URS procedures, the URS documents, the URS rules, technical requirements also documentation.

So, if you think otherwise, if you think that we need to comment on it, so please, share your thoughts now. If not, we can actually conclude that we don't need to comment on this. So, I will just stop if anyone has any other thoughts. If not, I think we conclude that we do not need to comment on it. And then I will go to C now which is the current statement. yes, Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Hadia. Just to mention that I had gone through these slides, which you had provided in one of the previous calls regarding this topic. And there had been no responses at the time and no suggestions for commenting on the proposed updates to the existing rights mechanisms documentation. So, you're quite correct. We can probably put this as no statement. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Olivier. And again, this is only an update to the documents based on community approved recommendations. Okay. Thank you. So, now we proceed to item C, which is the statement that is currently being drafted and I will present it in item number 5, but let's quickly go through the upcoming public command proceedings. So, we have the NCAP study to draft report. And the NCAP study to working group is actually having a face-to-face workshop next week on Monday.

And I will be joining this workshop. Also, we have upcoming. It will be the technical check review.

The pilot holistic review of revised terms of reference, and this will be dealt with during the OFB working group call. I think we have a call tomorrow and also there is the internet service providers and connectivity providers a charter amendment. And that's it for the upcoming Public Comment proceedings. If there are no hands up, no comments or thoughts, let's proceed to item number 5, which is the At-Large, we go to the At-Large workspace in order to read the draft statement for the ccNSO PDP4 initial report on the (de-)selection of IDN ccTLDs.

Again, this is the PDP which is like more or less equivalent to the GNSO IDN PDP. And in this statement, basically, we are in support of the recommendations. I had actually presented a brief about the recommendations two weeks ago. However, we supported, but we also drew attention to the importance of having a consistent solution for both PDPs, the IDN variant ccTLD, and the IDN variant gTLDs. Both recommendations need to be consistent and this is actually in accordance with Board resolution that stressed that both PDPs keep each other informed about their progress and recommendations in order to have a consistent solution.

And I think this is important from an end user point of view so that users could have consistent experiences. So, that's the reason I have actually put it and users seldom actually know the difference between a ccTLD and gTLD to them. They are all domain names and thus it is important to have a consistent solution. I stop here and I'm open to any

comments or thoughts. If you, agree we can move this draft we can adopt it as our final version and submit it. The statement is actually on the Wiki. so, if you want to make any changes or edits, please go ahead. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. And you might have seen on the chat, Justine, making points so indeed, yes, the updates have been made by Heidi. However, on the second one, the second potential amendment was one which I wasn't quite sure about. It says not only important for ensuring consistent implementation and rationale, but also for maintaining consistent user experiences, meaning consistent implementation and rationale with an e or consistent and rational implementation because rationale would be before implementation if it doesn't have an e

HADIA ELMINIAWI: What I meant, so consistent implementation, that's one thing and then also rationale, that's another thing and if you don't, agree actually to this rationale part, we could actually remove it. But my point is you cannot have two PDPs talking about the same topic, which is variance, IDN variants and then have contradicting, rationales. For example, it's okay in one PDP, you have this logic that says, as an example, there's no harm in having unlimited number of variants and then in the other PDP which is also about IDN variant, you say, well, it's okay. No, there is harm in having an unlimited number of variants, and we do want to limit them. So, this is what I meant by rationale. Like you cannot have

contradicting logics governing the PDPs. However, maybe this is too deep. We don't need to get that far.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks. So, Hadia, I don't disagree with where you're coming from in terms of inconsistency, but I think in so far as the EPDP is concerned, we have already settled on the position that there is no real major inconsistency between the CPDP and EPDP, anything that is not directly consistent, so as to speak, it's because there is good reason for it and typically, it's because cc's for more stringent set of rules around them and they are obviously controlled by the country code operators themselves as opposed to the GE site of things. So, don't disagree with you in terms of ideal ideally, but practically speaking, that may not initially always be the case. Thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: I agree with you. I do agree with you, Justine. However, I do think that we need to just put it out there in order to ensure that going on, we continue to guard, this latency. Again, I do think that this is a point that does relate to end users and that's like we at At-Large could point it out. Thank you. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So, since the deadline is today and the text isn't long, may I just suggest that we call this a consensus call on the group that is here and as a result, if there is no objection to this, then you can proceed forward with passing this on to the ALAC and the whole train for ratification can proceed forward.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. Thank you so much, Olivier. Any other, thoughts, suggestions? I see, Justin saying I would suggest deleting and rationale with an e. With an e, you mean rationale with an e or without an e?

JUSTINE CHEW: Without an e.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry. I'm reading the sentence because it kept changing. So, it's meant to be with the with the e. Because otherwise, it didn't make sense.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. I'll leave it up to ALAC. How's that?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. So, based on what Olivier just said, we could go ahead with the statement. Thank you. So, I see no more hands up. And so, I hand it back to you, Olivier, and thank you so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. Thanks for sharpening this process and for the record, you're basically part passing it on for the ALAC ratification process. Now we've got several sessions now, several items with Jonathan Zuck the first being the review of pending recommendations of CCT and SSR2 review recommendations. And the one after that being the At-Large sessions that ICANN78. Jonathan, since, I know that Avri is part of the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5 things down and it's all your topics, I might recommend that you swap 6 and 7 and start with the At-Large sessions so as to have Avri's participation without too much time constraints. But over to you, Jonathan Zuck. It's up to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. I'm flex and certainly the 6 doesn't have any kind of a deadline associated with it. The 6 is just a reference to some materials that came out of the Board workshop in Istanbul with regards to some pending recommendations of the CCT and SSR2. Just one from the CCT and several from SSR2. That came from the Board, and we just need to keep it in our radar in case we want to I don't know, as I said, refine or modernize or reestablish these as advice from the ALAC given the

concerns and issues raised by org and the Board in these recommendations.

They're related to DNS abuse. They are somewhat old now and the playing field has changed to some extent since these recommendations were made particularly the CCT recommendation. And so, like I said, there's no deadline on it. It's just something we may want to address as in our continuing efforts to figure out the best ways to be helpful with respect to DNS abuse. As far as the sessions and ICANN78 and the connection to Avri, that's down here the Board questions to ALAC.

I think that's what we were going to ask Avri to talk to us about a little bit the first question is our view on RVCs and their enforceability in line with ICANN's mission and I guess I wouldn't mind color commentary from you on this as well, Avri. But in particular, it was questions 2 and 3. That I was hoping to get some specificity from you and yet, I suspect that both questions 2 and 3 will have the majority of their discussion take place on a call that we call the OFB working group or the operations finance and budget a working group because that's the working group that primarily discusses the organization itself that makes sense as opposed to till the policy which is the focus of the CPWG call here. But, with that, I guess I would like to pass the microphone to you, Avri, and to share your thoughts on these questions. If that's all right?

AVRI DORIA:

Sure thing. Yeah. First of all, and we're going to have to work out something with that OFB one because as I mentioned, when I was asked

about it, there's only a 15-minute window between two meetings that that I am free for it, so I'm not sure how that's going to work out. I may just have to deal with one of my other meetings, take a breakout of it or whatever. I'm not sure how we'll handle it. So, that's not totally on you, but let me go on these. Let me start with the normal is I'm not here liaison dining.

I'm not here speaking for the Board, but I'll give you my impression of what we're talking about and so, take it with that huge grain of salt that always comes with something being said by a Board member that's not the Board chair because of the rules we've got within the Board on who speaks officially. So, on the RVCs, I mean, we're just getting ready to start that conversation. The Board has been, very definitive in it. If there's going to be RVCs, then they have to be enforceable and they have to be enforceable by ICANN within its mission. Oh, I've been spotlighted.

It has to be within its mission. It has to be within the bylaws and it has to work within the bylaws and it has to work in a way that doesn't destroy ICANN in the process of trying to do it and so, we're going to start to have community discussions on that. Because we're not sure. Now a lot of people got into this issue of oh, we're going to have to have, bylaws changes. Oh, we mustn't have bylaws changes and by large, I think most of us want to avoid bylaws changes if they're avoidable, but we've also heard from the PDP that, well, if you have to change the bylaws, change the bylaws. Well, of course, then that's up to the community whether we're going to do that or not. So, we want to get that conversation started.

The Board hasn't even gotten to the point yet of nailing down exactly. We're discussing that, I think, some this week, and then probably some going forward, exactly how we're going to do those community discussion. So, certainly some discussion on how you would expect such a process to work out. Sort of a new process. So, how would people expect a community discussion on something that's substantive before happening. Because it's a fairly big issue and as any of you that are that have gotten it and following Justine makes it easy to get into have followed these. You know how important the RVCs are to many of the other mechanisms in there. So, it's an important discussion. I don't know if you wanted to ask me more about that or whether I've hand waved enough on that one.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Avri. And I guess I don't know the answer to that. I guess we're trying to get to a place to where we're able to be prepared to come to the meeting with the Board with some thoughts on this. And this particular issue, I think would definitely fall squarely within the CPWGs remit to discuss. I mean, I think we come to this from a kind of a simplistic perspective which is if it's in the contract, it needs to be enforced and so, that's the bottom line.

I think from the standpoint the positions we've taken in the past that you can't put something in there that's somehow outside the remit of ICANN to enforce or you need to find a way to force it or whether it's internal or external. At one point, I'd I have some vague recollection. I haven't heard it repeated much recently that, Becky was proposing something along the lines of an audit process that sort of goes

alongside, the RVC that's actually conducted, arranged for and sort of conducted by the registry itself to provide sort of objective criteria for enforcement so that ICANN doesn't need to build domain expertise and things like that in order to do this enforcement.

I don't know if the Board has had further discussions about that, if that has some popularity with the Board or not, but it's sort of it made sense when she pitched it, but I don't know if there's been further discussion about it.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. I didn't raise my hand. Yeah, the discussion on that has continued and there's been various discussions about-- and these are things that if you go back in pre-history, some of them came out of Triple X discussions of that. If you could set up mechanisms that are totally controlled outside. In other words, it's the registry has contracted with some venerable organization to do the adjudication and oversight of these mechanisms and all it puts out for is basically you failed and you must fix this, or, yeah, you're doing good, and that the only thing ICANN might have to look at, is the you failed flag and deal with an enforcement at that point.

Now whether that satisfies all the conditions, whether that if you put it under stress test, is the kind of thing that doesn't have huge edge cases. Those are all the details that that people are getting into. So, there may indeed be some kind of proposal on that. It's not subtle, but it's certainly a topic that that's under this discussion. You had asked one

other thing there and I forgot while I was hand waving, but I see Justine has her hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. Yeah. So, trying to back up Avri here because both of us are on that small team and sometimes I scratch my head about what's going on there. So, just speaking on my own behalf, obviously, being on the small team sometimes is challenging because I don't actually understand the impetus or the motivation of some of the contracted parties' people there or people who support the contracted parties there.

From my perspective, what Jonathan said earlier is right that we've always talked about having a need for some kind of transparent and clear procedure as to how you would write up an RVC, to make it objective and measurable so that it can function the way it's supposed to function when it goes into a contract. There is no point, we've always argued that there's no point putting something into the contract that you cannot assess, therefore you cannot enforce.

So, what I always talk about is that we need some kind of mechanism in order to make sure that anything that is proposed as RVC should have objective criteria and is measurable, accessible, so that it can be enforceable. Then there's this issue about some people then have raised about, what if the RVCs touches upon content and that's outside

the remit of ICANN. So, I'm not going to go there. We we're supposed to have a discussion about that, but there are also other people who are saying that, well, we know the applicant or the registry might come up with some innovative model of business and what have you. And they may have very good intentions between behind what is being proposed as an RVC.

What I think the Board fears is that that's all well and good. But if you're going to expect ICANN to be able to assess or monitor RVCs that have complicated criteria that is that either is beyond the capability of the ICANN staff or that you require heaps of people to monitor just one particular RVC, then it's just going to be unreasonably burdensome on ICANN to be able to monitor and enforce those things. So, we're at that stage where we're still bending about what to do really to balance the difficulties. I'll stop there. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Can I jump back in again?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Please, it's your show, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: It's my show. I'm not sure how far you wanted to take the conversational mode. And thank you for remembering what the other topic was I had mentioned which is the contract. To drop back a second. There's even an uncertainty that we'll have to clear up with legal and such whether we can even negotiate a contract that touches

on any of the issues that aren't in the bylaws, and that would be in conflict. So, there's even a what can be negotiated question at the start of it all. But, yes, I think there's absolutely no doubt that that the Board seems, gee, no doubt that it seems, but anyhow. I've gotten really good at equivocating. I'll have to unlearn that habit soon. But basically, that there's a solid view that they have to be enforceable.

Now what enforceable means is probably then the next thing that'll fall into a discussion of does that mean specific steps? Does that mean that you have to actually include what the penalties would be when you're being precise in a contract? How far do you have to go when negotiating an RVC in a contract for it to be enforceable. Do you really have specific do you have to be?

And then the other issue you ought up, the practical matters, practicable matters discussion that's going on is indeed that if you're saying because then it falls into that uncertainty, well, we're giving the Board power again question of saying, it can say, no. That that would be too much. That would be too hard. That would be a fiduciary risk for ICANN to take on that kind of activity for the very innovative case. And that innovative case is always one of the edge conditions that we discussed that's very similar to the Here Be Monsters at the edge of a map.

So, those are the edge cases that do we have a way of handling the edge cases that we can't be specific about in contract? Or how much do we want to give the Board? Is the question that's being asked in the small team, is being asked among-- Power to say no. To say, no, we

can't enforce this. Well, no, it can be done. We showed you how. No. No. It's really we have to put in 20 extra people to do it.

So, those are the kinds of issues they're afraid of it going into. And I understand that concern because it's amazing how quickly ICANN always seems to get to the edge case in actuality. Did I make it more confusing? I see Siva has a hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Siva, please go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: One of the points that Avri mentioned is really good, that of the possibility of having an external body to oversee our registry voluntary commitments which will minimize the complications of ICANN devising a method of enforcing registry voluntary commitments. That is one of the points. And the other point is that is it possible that ICANN could clarify with the significant registry applicants, what they actually want to convey? Some of these commitments might not have been conveyed clearly. Is it possible that the legal department could sit with the registry applicants who seek to make significant registry voluntary commitments and ask them how they go about implementing and what is their idea of an enforcement? And that should give a lot of clarity to this enforceability question on registry voluntary commitments.

I think it's getting too complicated. The debate on the enforceability of RVC is too complicated. As long as the applicant that makes a

commitment that these are enforceable, then there must be a way.
Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Oh, yeah. And by the way, I am approaching time now. Unfortunately, I'm chairing the next meeting on that. Yes, I think clarification and partly why we want to have community discussions, I think partly it's one of the things we're looking at is can we build templates? Can we build things that that guide? I think it's yes, of course, it's possible for a legal to sit down and try to clarify. You say things get more complicated.

I think that's in the nature, and this is perhaps me straying from the question you asked me, I think that's in the nature of the ICANN enterprise. With every new set of conditions that we have to protect against or we have to guard against or we have to work towards, you build another set of guidelines, you build another set of guidances, you build another set of rules that require another set of principles, etc., that do complicate and we get to the gothic structure that we sometimes appear to have.

So yeah, it does get more complicated the more problems we have to make sure get dealt with. And of course, there's always going to be new problems. So how do you build a protection against the problems that you don't know yet, that you don't have yet? Realizing that ICANN has the most creative set of people for looking at any set of rules and finding the opportunity in it. So, how do you deal with that particular issue?

And I'm really sorry I have to talk and run. Usually, I'm here until the end and after. It's just I've got this other meeting this time.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So, no time left to talk about these other two.

AVRI DORIA:

Right. I'll say two words on them. t Three words. I already said four words. But anyway, on those, really don't want to limit it. It started from the Board only has a role in cancellations at this point, and it started to look at, are there things that really should be considered, a, when scheduling a meeting in a place and, b, when canceling a thing. And people have suggested political I have, and this is where I fell into it, I said, "We really shouldn't be going to countries where people will get arrested and put into jail just for being LGBTQVIA, etc." And then started to look at other things and conditions that might be. And so, how do we build a system perhaps that measures these things that takes them into account? What kind of things?

As I say, I don't want to limit the human rights respects that you all bring and say, yeah, yeah. That's something you really should consider when scheduling, something you should consider when canceling. The more sustainable and eco-friendly was sort of not but it's sort of everybody has been talking about it globally of travel less, fewer meeting. And any of those don't have hot coffee. I'm hand waving. This is not my subject, but I recognize it's as important is we have a big footprint. Is it stuff we should do to decrease our footprint? Is decreasing our footprint something that should be a priority for us, etc.?

Sorry. I got to talk and run, but that's-- And I really don't want to limit 2 and 3. It's what do you care about in terms of those two? Human rights and the sustainability of the planet.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right, Avri. Thank you very much. We always appreciate your presence here. So go to your next meeting and break a leg. So, I guess the question then becomes, we need to have a conversation ourselves about this topic. And I think this is an interesting part of what we do and whether or not it's the responsibility of the At-Large Community to come up with the technical means that something takes place, or stick to our guns in this sort of simple case that simply says that we recognize the importance of RVCs to contracted parties to address concerns raised by the community about their application and to adhere to upper particular aspect of the application.

One of the things related to closed generic, right, is this idea that, there has to be a public interest component to the application. And we saw that framework on closed generics that we were fairly uncomfortable with, but it had these commitments that would need to be part of registry's operation of a closed generic, and many of those commitments would be related to some public interest objective and activities that would fall outside of ICANN remit. And so, then the question then becomes we let you have this closed generic as it's speaking of edge cases, we let you have this close generic, but we don't think that you're upholding the public interest commitment that you made in conjunction with this closed generic, for example.

And so, it's a serious issue of course, for us. But whether or not a bylaw amendment is needed or not needed, I think is something for lawyers to decide, and it's a little ridiculous for us to be the ones to try and dictate one way or the other. I think it's fine for us to be simplistic in our demands, which is they are important, and once in the contract, they need to be enforced. I think it's really that simple, and our position should maintain that simplicity because these are problems for IRT or for legal to solve. Not for the At-Large Community to solve. Those are just my personal thoughts, but we need to discuss this further in the run up to ICANN78 because we'll be asked this question by the Board.

Judith, you've patiently had your hand open for some time. I just needed to vent there. So, Judith, please go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

No problem. So, I can't agree from your first point. So, the human rights, I mean, I see where they're coming from, and that's issue has be deviled many international organizations. Whether it's the UN and others. And maybe we should look at-- I know the IETF has cancelled some meetings in some places because of those issues, but the question is is, like, are there so many places that are raising their hands up that that we are going to not go to some parts of the world because of that, or maybe we could just say we can just work with them to try to get them to change some laws or all or even protect people while we're having our meeting. It's like, okay. We understand your concerns, but during our meeting, this cannot happen, and they'd be having some requirements on them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Judith, these are all good points. I'm really going to ask you to be on the OFB working group calls. I think that's really what we're going to focus on these issues and not the CPWG.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: But the problem is when I'm going to be in Kyoto, we'll all having the IGF. I think it's the week when people are traveling for the IGF.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yea. We just have limited bandwidth here, and we if we could find a way. Maybe it's a question of composing an email that can be read out in that meeting or something. Those are very important to discuss. And I don't have the answers. If we look back to the situation in South Africa, there was something called the Sullivan principles that had to do with businesses and how businesses did work in those places. And we do have some leverage over vendors, for example, and the policies that they put in place. So, there are opportunities, and we've talked about this idea of ICANN not using vendor, for example, that are not fully UA compliant, for example. And a greater exploration of the leverage that we do have over different institutions is worth discussing, but we're going to really move this discussion over to the--

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I agree with that. One other point. We are losing also in that discussion, I think, of making sure that we don't put our meetings on

religious holidays. And that seemed kind of lost. I know we were going to take it up in another area, but just putting that back on the agenda.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think the OFP would be a good place to discuss that as well. Thanks, Judith. Pari, please go ahead.

PARI ESFANDIARI: Hello. I think following what just Judith mentioned and on the issue of sustainability and footprint. Again, we cannot just take an issue and focus on that. There should be a cost-benefit analysis. For example, I hear a lot about traveling and the cost of traveling to the environment. However, there are a lot of benefits. And if we focus on sustainable development goals and do a cost-benefit analysis so we will have better understanding of the benefit received and the cost to the environment. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Pari. I hope that you're able to participate in the OFB discussion on this topic as well. So, those questions 2 and 3 are really under the purview of the OFB, it's on the agenda. And let's make sure and have a fulsome discussion about it. I think it's perfectly appropriate for the At-Large Community to form some distinct opinions on this and come to ICANN78 prepared to discuss it. And so, let's all do our best to get out of that OFB call and have this fulsome discussion on both the ecology issue and the human rights issue.

So, what I was trying to do is have a discussion, if any, if people wanted to raise points about the RVC issue on this call. And so, I feel like I might have missed a couple of things in chat, but if you have something, some thoughts on RVCs, and what the At-Large position should be on them, then I would ask you to raise your hand now and bring those to the foreground on the issue of RVCs. I don't see hands going up. Oh, Steinar. Go ahead, please.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Yeah. I posted that question in the chat because I personally have some sort of problem understanding why a registry operator can't put some sort of RVCs that can be seen as content oriented, and ICANN said we can't have that because content is not in the remit or ICANN. The way I see it is that this is something that the registry operator easily could monitor and be in compliance with by their own resources, so to speak, and ICANN Compliance can take all the other elements what is in the RA and monitor this whether to see whether their regulatory operator is in compliance or not.

Maybe it's a better way for the registry operator that really want to have this kind of element is that they put it in some sort of RAA or terms of condition for the use of that name space, but I have really personal problem seeing why it can't be some sort of content or element in the RVCs as well. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Steinar, that's right at the core of the issue. Many of these RVCs are content oriented or licensing oriented. So, there's a couple of different

types of RVCs. One is about the potential registrants of names and enforcement of things like for dot doctor, you have to be a licensed physician or something like that and not just a spin doctor. But the other piece is about content and, again, to address sometimes objections raised by the GAC and then maybe the next round by us.

And so, in RVC is going to contain things that would ordinarily be considered outside of the remit of ICANN. But I think as we delve into this, outside the remit of ICANN means that ICANN can't be the one to impose those things. But if they're voluntarily saying we're going to apply these restrictions in order to address concerns by the community and we're building them into our contract that once they're in the contract, they need to be enforced even if they have to do with content.

And so, as you say, yeah, there could be some self-enforcement as long as it's sufficiently objective, the contract compliance could make some assessment about whether they were in compliance with that RVC. I think that'd be critical. So, thanks, Steinar. Christopher, go ahead, please. Chris, we don't hear you. You didn't appear to be muted, but now you are muted.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Is that better?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Yes. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. I was just saying I don't want to take the meetings time. I agree with Steinar. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks. Anyone else with thoughts on this? I see something-- Oh, Sebastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Jonathan. I am in a train going to my airport for Japan. I just wanted to ask one question. Is it our point of view that we need to stick with the current Boarder of ICANN's if I can say it like that, as what are inside the remit of ICANN and what it's outside? I think maybe we don't have enough time for that, but it's something we need to think about, okay, content. But just maybe things could be outside. And for the rest, I also agree with Steinar, we need to find a way to have something who is in the contract but not controlled by ICANN. Or if it's not the contract, it's an addition, it's something. But as end user, we are happy to have a commitment for the registrant and registry. And it's not because ICANN can take care of that that we as user can't have that as a project. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. Again, I think what you and Chris and Steinar are saying is sort of in line with what Avri was discussing and as I said, I think might have been originally a proposal of Becky's, but I could be misremembering. That if the registry is capable sufficiently objectifying compliance through some sort of third-party audit or something like

that so that ICANN Compliance is handed a binary yes or no, they've done a good job, they haven't done a good job, or they've they were doing a good job, but they're not anymore or something like that, then ICANN contract compliance could take action, right, could enforce that provision of the contract.

And so, I feel like that's the proposal that's being most discussed. And as Avri said, and Justine has also put in the chat, the issue about content is interpretation of bylaw provision about ICANN's remit. And I think there's certainly a lot of strong voices that ICANN that don't want the PDP policy development, etc., inside the picket fences, we used to call it, to affect contracted party activities around content. But I think this is a different issue, and I think that's conflated.

Again, I think there's a difference between ICANN coming up with new content-related restrictions, which is a separate discussion, and we'll have to have the debate, and it will be ongoing. But this is more about just provisions in a contract that were made in most instances to get an application accepted by ICANN that otherwise wouldn't be, and make sure that those provisions that were put in for that purpose are, in fact, enforced. That's the objective here. Steinar, go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I also asked in the chat, maybe an example will give me some better understanding of this. But I was thinking about if registry operator put an RVC saying that we will not allow any hate speech connected to domain name within our namespace, within our TLD. That is something that is definitely content, and this is something that is not in the DNS

abuse discussion or whatsoever. And I do understand that ICANN Compliance, it will have big, big problems in monitoring whether the registry operator keep that promise to act on and mitigate if there is information within the namespace that has been described or can be seen or identified as hate speech. But it's definitely something that the user of that namespace or the audience of that namespace will benefit of.

And I do understand that kind of input from a registry operator. We've seen this in several ccTLDs that they trying to get into the content area because of the bad behavior like hate speech and fake news and whatever these things are. And I really don't understand that a registry operator can put this kind of parameters into the contract. But maybe it's better to put it in somewhere else that is not on the contract between the registry operator and ICANN but put it in the terms of condition or something like that. But it gives some sort of a signal that the registry operator takes this extremely seriously and want to have tools to reduce and mitigate hate speech as an example. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Steinar. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. So, I think what I'm going to say has already been said, but since I took the floor, I think three points here. The first that the application might be accepted only because it has those RVCs. So, it only makes sense that those RVCs need to be enforced. As for how are

those RVCs enforced, I don't think that we should be saying that. It's for, like, you mentioned, Jonathan, lawyers or ICANN org to say how they can actually enforce those RVCs. And if the RVC cannot be enforced, then it should not be there. Because, again, the applicant might be accepted only because there is this RVC in the contract. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Hadia. Good comments. I think that this issue of examples has come up in a number of different contexts. So, one of the things we may try to do is flesh this out. That is great that you came up with a hate speech example, Steinar, and we'll come up with some other examples that we can look at to have this discussion.

But I also see that folks here seem aligned with my position that it's not our job to figure out the how but the if, and that we remain convinced that RVC can't be added to a contract without a contractor compliance having the means and the willingness to enforce it. And obviously, ICANN legal might get involved in the front end to say, well, we can't accept this in the contract because we can't enforce it or something like that. And so, I think it's going to be a complicated issue, but I think frankly, we have the capacity to take a fairly uncomplicated position on it. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you. I was just going to mention that there were also questions asked about whether it is only going to be contractor compliance that monitors and enforces these RVCs, in the context of someone could

take the issue to court and get a court order telling instructing ICANN org to do something, something, something.

Or we also have the mechanism of the PICK DRP, where it is a third-party adjudicator that also comes out with a decision that instructs whoever to do something about something. So maybe we need to also consider supporting mechanisms that's complimentary to contractor compliance in helping monitor these things and having a dispute resolution mechanism if contract compliance were to somehow I wouldn't say fail, but be inundated, so to speak. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Justine. I think those are excellent points. I know that here in the United States, the Federal Trade Commission has as part of its remit to simply enforce the promises made by companies. In other words, if you say you're going to do something, then that becomes a legal obligation to do that thing and the FTC can enforce that promise on your behalf, and that's essentially what an RVC is. And there are obviously a similar consumer protecting agencies around the world, that can play a role in that. And as you said, the PIC DRP issue is possible. It can be an expensive proposition to go through a DRP process, I think, but yeah, we should make all of that part of our discussion as we go forward.

So, I think this topic is not done, but what we want to do is be as prepared as possible for the Board at ICANN78 to discuss our position on this. And so maybe it's some things on the periphery, like making sure we have standing to bring up PIC DRP on behalf of users as

opposed to it having to be an injured party or something like that. So maybe there's some opportunity to reiterate some of those things we've raised in the past. Any other questions, comments on this? And on the other two topics we'll really dive into them on the OFB call. All right?

So, then the next topic is what questions we want to get to the Board. We've got, basically, two weeks, I guess, to determine what questions we want to send back to the Board. We have these three from the Board as the ALAC. And so, we'll raise this issue on the OFB call as well. But I would love to open up the station to folks to address what questions we might want to bring to the Board. Justine, go ahead, please.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks. So, you had one that you mentioned in the ALAC call, which is to do with DNS abuse. I don't know whether that's something that we want to put officially to the Board, or you want to go via back channels. But I'm suggesting that we put it to the Board so that we get a proper answer.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, I think I know what you're talking about. I raised the issue of DAAR and its evolution and what appears to be a de-emphasis on its evolution. Is that what you're thinking of?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes. That's right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yeah. That's certainly one possibility. I don't know if everyone recalls, but at one point, there was a scheduled public comment on the next version of DAAR, and there's been a lot of discussion. There was a blog post back in 2021 about the future of DAAR, and John Crane mentioned in one of our calls that when we were talking about predictive analytics, that they were going to be part of the next version of DAAR. Justine even had a meeting with them about predictive analytics.

And so, there was this kind of vague discussions, and now we don't feel like we hear about it as much. Ironically, DAAR is mentioned in the Board's response to the CCT and SSR2 on DNS abuse, but the real plans for DAAR and the strategic objectives for it appear cloudy. So, it's possible that we need to ask the Board for some clarification on that, and to do so clearly, according to Heidi. I don't know why we can't ask open-ended questions if they ask them, but, yeah, so we need to come up with some clear questions for the Board and DAAR and the future of DAAR, and expectations around it is certainly a candidate. Thanks, Justine. Olivier, go ahead, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I'll just put a link over to that famous DAAR and noticing that there are monthly activity reports. My question was, what are they doing with them? They're published and then and then what?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

They're being used to justify not doing anything outside DNS abuse. I couldn't resist. So, yes. I think that's interesting. And the other thing that has evolved, obviously, is some fairly substantial reporting out of the DNS Abuse Institute, and what is the role of DAAR given the new tools that are being made available and reports that are coming out of the DNS Abuse Institute. And so, I think those are important questions as well. But, yeah, what actions are being taken, I think, is a solid question. I think that ICANN regards its role as providing information and tools, and not policy.

And so, I think one of the challenges we face, Olivier, is that is where that demarcation is. In other words, what additional things need to happen via PDP. So, for example, this issue of bulk registrations that we continue to talk about is something that if anything is going to be done, it won't be ICANN org taking that up. It'll probably have to be the GNSO that takes it up eventually to do something about it. So, that's the sufficiently complicated answer to your question. And so, Heidi, I don't know that we've even decided this is one of our questions. I just said it's a candidate as a question. I'll look at that question in detail for you after this call, and we'll note that down for further decision by this group. Steinar, go ahead, please.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Very, very short comment on the DAAR. Why is DAAR report, the monthly report important? I guess it's at least important for those stakeholder groups that are monitoring how this ecosystem handle DNS abuse. I guess it will be more important if the updated RA RAA amendments would be enforced, because then we will have more

details and so on. But it is kind of a picture about how things are going on in the g namespace with respect to DNS abuse situation. Thank you. I think it's very, very important, honestly. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Steinar. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. It's a follow-up question to the point regarding DAAR. The actual ICANN page that speaks about DAAR is quick to mention that DAAR data is neither intended to provide information about security threat mitigation, nor to account of how reliably and quickly security threats are mitigated by TLDs. It basically is there to-- It says here it's intended to inform its users about areas in which security threats are concentrated within the TLD space and how this concentration changes over time. Really just saying, oh, the boat is sinking, that's it. Take it for what it is. Provided no action is taken on this, it's not something that's particularly useful in my view.

And it's interesting because the DAAR reports themselves mention another reason, another purpose for DAAR, which is to give the ICANN community reliable and persistent data as well in insights that help inform policy discussions around security threat concentration patterns. So, it is meant to go into policy discussions. I'm not sure whether it is going into policy discussions and whether any of that is actually taken into account at the level at which it should be taken into account. Perhaps that's the kind of discussion we should have about DAAR and question as to whether it's taken seriously enough. And if there might

be further things that it should not do, but certainly have consequences on. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right, Olivier. Certainly. I think the DAAR to date has remained at a fairly high level and has been more along the ticker as well as more trend analysis and aggregate information that sometimes makes it difficult to take particular policy cues from that. And that could be part of this question and part of this discussion with the Board as well. I'm being told that we have a little bit of an extension, but we'll have to keep up on this topic, and I know that we have a couple of other discussions to bring up doing Chris's topic. So, I guess I'll end the queue here with Sébastien and we'll move on. Sébastien, please go ahead, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

It's just to suggest another topic, therefore when you want.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Oh, another topic for the Board. Yeah. Please go ahead. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I hope it's a question we will not need to ask, but if before the ICANN meeting we don't have the comment open for the holistic review, we may ask them where they are on that topic because it's in the hand of the Board now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. Yeah, that can be a question as well for sure. Okay. I'll hand the agenda back to you, Olivier, because I know we're running over on time, but this is an ongoing discussion with respect to the discussions we want to have with the Board, we'll look at how to have a more fulsome discussion on the RVCs, and we'll discuss these other two questions from the Board on OFB and also look for questions for the Board on OFB, which could include the policy review question as well. So, back to you, Olivier, to continue through the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And as it's a hot potato, I have to give it straight to you because you need to lead a discussion on the IANA/PIR relations with the five Regional Internet Registries.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. And I don't know that I'm prepared to lead that conversation. Is there somebody that's a more of a domain expert on this issue?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This was a topic that was suggested by Christopher Wilkinson, and perhaps we should hand the floor to Christopher to give us a quick maybe a one-minute intro on that because he's already mentioned it earlier last week. And then see if there is any feedback on this or what can be done or if anything can be done. Christopher, are you--? I can see him. Oh, he was there a moment ago.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Ah, okay. You've reappeared. You had disappeared off my screen. Over to you, Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Very quickly. We've had our 90 minutes. I've circulated two points to the list. The first point, I would say what we need and what certain ICANN definitely needs from a management point of view is an audit of what has happened between the RIR in Africa, Mauritius, and what is going on in the ISP community in South Africa. Just an audit, bearing in mind that we're supposed to be working with stability, security, and transparency. And this story so far, to my mind, does not fulfill any of those criteria.

The second point that I've raised in the email is political. We need some feedback from those in ICANN who are dealing with the fragmentation issue. Because if it gets about that an RIR can be bankrupted in the way that apparently happened in South Africa and Mauritius, some governments I think certainly not the European governments, but some governments will react. It's a sitting duck. We need some political initiative and at least preparation so that the issue can be dealt with when it comes up, and I'm sure it will in the IGF, and in due course in the ITU.

I leave it at that because I have no intention of attending either the IGF or the relevant ITU working parties, if they'd let me in again. But I just put this on the table in quite firm terms. We need an audit of what happened, and we need active political interests in the IGF context to make sure that this precedent is not allowed to get out of hand in terms of the discussions on fragmentation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Christopher. And there's a note in the chat regarding what happened with AFRINIC, whether it was bankrupted or not. I see Hadia Elminiawi has put her hand up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hi. So, I'm not sure if this has been mentioned or not, but you might know, Christopher, that last week on 22nd of September, ICANN put out a publication that said that ICANN has appointed John Crane as a resource available during this week in Mauritius and as necessary going forward, to support the official receiver. So, John has been offered as an expert observer to provide information and expertise if and where the official receiver requires related to AFRINIC requires that. So, I think this is something I would say positive that ICANN has done. Yeah. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Thank you. I know John Crane quite well because he was in RIPE when I was trying to persuade RIPE to join the ICANN community at all 25 years ago. Thank you. I look forward to his report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Christopher. I would suggest a couple of action items based on this discussion because it is an important one. The first one is there is the Address Supporting Organization in ICANN. We used to have good relationship with them. There are a couple of Board members that are on the ICAN Board as elected by the ASO. There's also an ASO address council chair. Perhaps the next step would be to get in touch with them and not start sending out some statements and so on that might cause more harm than good at this point in time. Clearly, it's an important political process that is taking place. And I'm saying political because there is some underlying part of politics behind it and things.

So, getting input or perhaps coordinating with the ASO, and with the NRO, the Number Resource Organization, is a first step in finding out what exactly is happening, what is ICANN's stake on it, and what can be done, what the ALAC can do to either ease the situation or to support action to be taken. So, let's get the facts first, please. Yeah. Thanks, Justine. And that would be our action item, and then depending on the response that we get-- And I would ask for Jonathan Zupp to get in touch with the other chairs, or suggest Jonathan. I can't ask anything of you. ICANN suggest things of you.

Okay. That's potentially the next step forward. And then, hopefully, by the ICANN meeting, there'll be some movement and a discussion can be followed through with that and perhaps even a quick sideline bilateral, on the side. But then it's all in Jonathan's hands. So maybe he doesn't

like those people, and maybe he doesn't want to talk to them. So, we'll just leave it to him.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks, Olivier. I'll look into that outreach. Thanks. I guess I'll put this back in your hands for the agenda and to close down the meeting, and I'll follow up on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Much appreciated. Okay. We're now in any other business. Not seeing any hands up. Could we check when our next meeting will take place, please?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thanks so much, Olivier. So, for next week for next Wednesday, 4th of October, I would like to suggest 2000 UTC in order to avoid to clash with the AFRALO monthly call. Would that work for everyone?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I am not seeing anyone object to this.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay then. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, 2000 UTC next week, one-hour later than our usual evening time. I know there's a lot of people that will be flying because the IGF in Kyoto is starting up. Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, you put your hands on.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Just a quick point about changing times between 19 hours and 20 hours. It might sometimes confuse some participants, and they might tend to miss the meetings.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Siva. We do try to avoid changing the times by one hour. The difficulty we have is if we stop the rotation, then it does affect some people even worse, and they then miss two meetings in a row because of the terrible time that the meeting is at. So, just moving it by one hour is something which we'll publicize, and we'll make sure everyone is aware of. Thank you. And I think that's it for today. Hadia, anything else?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Nothing from my side. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, thanks to everybody who has taken part in today's call, especially the interpreters and real-time text to transcriber who has stayed around to continue with their fantastic work. Thanks to all of the people who have provided updates. And of course, thanks to you for attending. See you next week and follow up on the mailing list. Goodbye.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]