
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday 14th of February 2024 at 14:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. And to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Fahim Soomro, Maureen Hilyard and from Laura Margolis. And from staff's side we have Heidi Ullrich, Andrew Chen, and myself, Yeshim Saglam and I will be on call management. And as usual, we do have Spanish and French interpretation. Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Claudia and Lilian and on the French channel we have Claire and Jacques. We also have real-time transcription service provided and let me just copy and paste the link for you here on the Zoom chat. Please do check the service provided. It's very useful. 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 as well, please. And I'm just reminded that Jonathan Zuck is also an apology for today's call. We would like to put that on the record as well. 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, Yesim. Welcome to everyone from around the world for this Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which is going to have a lot of policy discussions as you are expecting it to be. We'll start

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.

with our work group and small team updates with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, TPR/PDP with Steinar Grotterod. We haven't got any other updates apart from the new gTLD next round, the subsequent procedures with Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Justine Chew.

After that, we'll go through our policy comment pipeline. Now, on this occasion, there are a lot of comments in there. So, well, sorry, a lot of consultations taking place, a lot of public comments. So, we'll spend about 20 minutes on this. Hadia will take us through all of that work that is yet to be completed. And then we'll be going to the ICANN 79 preparation, CPWG preparation. That's it. Any other business at this point in time? I am not seeing any hands up. Okay. So, the agenda is adopted as it currently is on your screen. And as you can see, the action items are also all completed, most of them pertaining to today's call or preparation or in progress for the ICANN 79 talking points, as you know. So, some work has taken place. Thank you very much. Any comments or questions? I'm not seeing any hands up.

So, we can swiftly move on. And we'll be going to agenda item three. And for this, if you look at the bottom of the agenda, you will find the minutes from the GNSO transfer policy review meeting that took place yesterday on the 13th of February. They're quite long notes. And I believe Steinar is online to take us through these and more. Over to you, Steinar.

STEINAR GROTTROD:

Yeah. Hi, everybody. This is Steinar speaking. I'm not going to spend time reading these preliminary recommendations. I think my idea of

putting these on the agenda is that it's actually quite useful for those who want to participate in the session we have at ICANN 79 discussing the sunset of the change of registrant data, CORD, as we now call it.

There's a couple of things that I have highlighted in red, and you may put particular attention to that. I also want you to know that I invited all the workgroup members of the GNSO TPR to our session at ICANN 79. And my idea of doing that is that the different views we have on this challenge, may I call it that way, will actually be of the best. So, I hope for a fruitful discussion, my plan is to prepare some PowerPoints or some slides to kind of guide us into maybe a half an hour, something like that, half an hour plus discussion about whether we should propose to sunset the change of registrant data or leave it as, still have it in some sort of inter-registrar transfer policy stuff. That's my two minutes update. If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer that one. But I think we have plenty of time, we need plenty of time to discuss other topics. So, I don't see any hands, so I put it back to you, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar, for being very efficient indeed. Let's zoom straight through to the new gTLD next round, the subsequent procedures. And for this, we welcome both Justine Chew and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The matter of doing and what we need to do for the applicant support handbook public comment will be discussed later while we review

upcoming public comments and recently started public comments. So, I'm assuming we'll skip that until later. But in terms of an announcement for everyone's attention regarding the applicant support program, those of you who are familiar with the applicant support program back in the last round, or of course, as some of you were, involved in the development of that program in those dim, dark, distant days, will recognize that a very important part of that program is the ability to review applicants. So, there's a support application review panel that was part of the original applicant support program and is also part of the proposed program for this next round of new generic top-level names.

Now, that gets shortened, of course, to an acronym because it's ICANN, it's what we do. So, that's called a SARP, S-A-R-P. And in the program that is being developed now underneath the implementation review team that Justine and I and others serve on, that SARP is to be an external or third-party provided service. The rationale for that is, very rightly, to ensure that it's an unbiased and highly professionalized system, which is to ensure that the criteria that is set by us in the community and approved by ICANN-wide will be fairly and reasonably deployed and applied, and that there should be a pass or fail, a yes or no, a very dispassionate mechanism of choosing from the applicants who apply for the most fitting ones to receive the support.

So, the call for expressions of interest for the provider of this service, of this SARP service, has gone out before, but has been recently repeated on the 12th of February. And Justine and I wanted to draw everyone's attention, in case some of us know, people with organizations who might be able to provide these services, and also for your information,

that I think this is the third time that the request for proposal on ICANN Support Application Review Panel, in other words, the ICANN SARP, is out with a view still of the program, the Applicant Support Program, going live in the second quarter of 2026. With that, Justine, what did you want me to do next, seeing as I can't get into most of my computer?

JUSTINE CHEW: Do you want to mention about the awareness campaign?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd love to mention about the awareness campaign, if I could find, or remember at this ridiculous hour of the night, what's changed about the awareness campaign? Perhaps you can pick that up for me.

JUSTINE CHEW: Oh, sure. If you have a look at the second link on the agenda, where it says ICANN is building awareness, amongst all the information that's provided in that blog, there is a mention that the awareness campaign for the Applicant Support Program is targeted to start in May of this year, which is why we're trying to finish up the ASP handbook, so that the information can be concretized for socialization. That's it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And what it is we're asking this group to do about this is not very much. It is an awareness of the awareness, but it is something that when we do make, and I'm assuming we probably will be making, at least a

supportive comment regarding the Applicant Support Handbook, that we will be well and truly aware of the time crunch that all of this is in. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Olivier, did you want me to continue?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, you continue directly.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. All right. Thank you. Well, I mean, apart from that, in terms of the awareness program, when ICANN makes the program awareness for the ASP in a big fashion, in May, then we would have presumably all the materials that we At-Large can use, utilize to also do a big what's the word I'm looking for? Have our own campaigns to promote the ASP as well. We're always looking for that to get our hands on that, to talk more about the ASP in terms of like actual details of it, and how you apply, when you apply, what eligibility all that sort of thing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that work, just to embellish, though, sorry, and now you're at least helping me remember what it was that we agreed I would talk about, that work will also need to be worked through the regions, this is not just an individual effort, the work of the RALOs and the various members who might be able to work with GSE on those efforts should also be noted, because it will take a little while for the RALOs, I would

think, to organize that. Sorry about that, Justine, thank you for almost saving me.

JUSTINE CHEW:

No problem, no problem. You've saved me a bunch of time as well, so happy to return the favor. Okay. Let's move on to the PICs and RVCs discussion, shall we? Okay. Thank you, Yesim. I think you can go straight to slide number three, next slide. Just a recap on the timetable, I think we're doing well in terms of time, timing, and just earlier today I received advice that because this is not a regular public comment process, so whatever will be produced at the end of the day, there's no need to go through an ALAC vote and ALAC members are already participating in the CPWG call, so they should be up to speed about what's going on and what we're trying to say, and presumably have their inputs incorporated by way of these CPWG calls. So that gives us a few days extra for CPWG members to actually have a look at the draft responses and make comments. Originally I had taken, shortened that period so that ALAC could have a vote on that, but since ALAC doesn't need to have a vote on it now, so that brings up extra days for our comments, for the At-Large CPWG comments. Okay, so that's what it says on the slide number three. Okay, moving on to slide number four and slide number five.

Okay, so I propose to actually go through all the responses that I have collected and been able to formulate through all the inputs that I've received that's been discussed in the last three weeks of CPWG calls, and hopefully we can come to some kind of consensus position or loose consensus position in terms of drafting the actual responses. So I'm just

going to go through in bullet form what those responses are going to look like.

Slide number five is basically a summary of the key elements of interest of the proposed implementation framework for content-related registry commitments, that is the framework that has been proposed by the ICANN board. All right, I think I've gone through this a number of times, so I don't propose to go through it again, but this is basically telling you what is the key points that I picked up from the framework, the proposed framework. Next slide, please, if we can go to the actual positions that I've been trying to formulate.

So you remember, you recall that the two topics for consultation that the board put up. Topic one has about nine questions and topic two has seven questions. So topic one, this is under topic one, in terms of the questions themselves, so the first question and the second question is related with the second question, use of rationale. But the first question is basically saying, or the board is asking, if ICANN and applicant cannot agree on the final registry voluntary commitment language in terms of it being enforceable under the bylaws and also as a practicable matter, then should that application, and it's application, not RVC. So the application, should the application be allowed to move forward without that RVC, even though that RVC was proposed as a means to resolve objection, GAC early warning, etc., and included in the etc., we had discussed comments.

So there's a lot of things to unpack here, but I'm trying to simplify things so that we don't get confused and we don't get bogged down with unnecessary complications. And what I've done now is I've actually

swapped, last week I talked to, I think it was last week anyway, I talked to, or the week before, I talked about yes and a no position. So now swapped them because in the draft that I've proposed to have written up, I propose that we start with no first, but have a but suffix. The reason for that is I think it's easier to draw attention to something negative and then have a but positive side of it. And plus the question that the board put in question one, they mentioned objection first rather than comments or GAC early warning.

So our position so far that I've been able to formulate is that the answer to question one is no insofar as objections are concerned. So we're saying that the objection, sorry, the application should not be able to move forward unless the objection is satisfactorily addressed. So basically if an RVC does not satisfactorily address an objection by way of the language of the RVC, being, ICANN agreeing to it as being enforceable and as a practical matter, then the application should not move forward, full stop.

And why? We discussed the rationale being that the objection is a formal process. It requires substantiation, requires reasons to be filed together with the objection, the reasons why the objector is disapproving, whether it's the string, whether it's the use of the string or some other reason. So because there is this need for substantiation and reasons and rationale, it is unlikely to be menial, frivolous, and so forth. So there should be some substance to that objection.

And in the process of filing an objection, there is what we call a cooling off period. I can't remember exactly how many days it is, but once the objection is filed, there is a cooling off period by which the two parties

involved, basically the objector and the applicant, can try and resolve the objections or the subject matter behind the objection. And if that fails, then the objection will proceed to be heard and determined. So that the objection process becomes the final arbiter, so to speak. But if during the consultation period, the cooling off period where the two parties are consulting each other, they somehow come to an agreement or an understanding of something in terms of the RVC, then the objection possibly could be withdrawn. But ICANN would still have to agree to the language at the end of the day for the application to move forward. So that's the no side of things.

The yes side of things is we think that an application should not be stopped from proceeding if the RVC was proposed to address the GAC early warning or a comment. So we've got three categories of things now, objection, comments, and GAC early warning. So it's a no for objection, but it's a yes, the application can proceed if we're talking about a comment or a GAC early warning.

So why is that the case? So in terms of a comment, a comment does not have the weight of an objection. And we discussed the possibility of a comment being menial, frivolous, even malicious. And therefore we can't expect an applicant to deal with every single comment. And there could be many of them, and some of them don't even necessarily have any weight to it kind of thing. Or any substance to it kind of thing.

And the point is that if the comment is meritorious in some way, then there is still the possibility that an objection can be filed. So how it works would be like if someone puts in a, files a comment, a negative comment, for example, then someone like the, even At-Large, an ALAC

or the independent objector could look at it and could take it up and file an objection based on that. Right? So there is a back step or a way of moving forward if that comment is meritorious.

And in terms of the GAC early warning, a GAC early warning, we discussed this also that it is, it doesn't have the weight of GAC consensus advice, because GAC consensus advice is consensus advice, meaning that GAC is putting forward this advice, whereas GAC early warning is presumably submitted by one or a few members of GAC, so it doesn't have the consensus weight behind it. And it's meant to serve as a new warning. It can also be resolved inter partes, meaning between the GAC member that's putting in the early warning and the applicant. And again, if that falls through, if there is no resolution beforehand, then there could be an objection filed by GAC or some other party.

Okay. And the notes here being that ICANN we have agreed that ICANN must agree to the RVC language. And it's irrelevant whether the applicant has good intentions or not. Contract law dictates, or contract law practice dictates that both parties must, or any parties that to the agreement must agree to provisions or obligations being put into the contract. You can't have just one party saying, I want this and the other party saying no, then it doesn't go, it doesn't work that way. Both parties have to agree for anything to go into the contract. And on this basis, ICANN won't want to include anything it does not intend to enforce or put it in the position that someone says that you must enforce it. So ICANN wouldn't want that anyway.

And yeah, in terms of what is acceptable and what is practicable, we have said that we're happy for the board to be the final arbiter of that

with advice from legal and probably input from contractual compliance.
Siva, you have the hand up, please go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: You were talking about a comment or objection leading to a will not move forward status for which the applicant has to answer or do something to lift that status. But is there a provision anywhere in the ICANN process to mark an application arbitrarily as will not move forward or make the comment or objection not transparent and without assigning reasons or citing rules? Is it possible that there is a provision somewhere to mark an application as will not move forward? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: In short, there is no such provision for comment and GAC early warning, which is why we're saying here that it doesn't stop the application from going forward. Whether it gets resolved or not, or whether it gets addressed or not, it wouldn't stop the application from going forward. But from an objection point of view, an objection is a process, is a formal process. And if the objection prevails, then that would stop the application from going forward.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: You know, the question is that if the objection, there was indeed an objection, that objection is not transparent, or the objection is not conveyed to the applicant.

JUSTINE CHEW: The objection is conveyed to the applicant, the objection is participated by the applicant. So when you file an objection, there are papers that go or the information gets sent to the applicant is not intransparent. Because the applicant has to answer to those objections. So it can't be not transparent, it has to be transparent.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: No, no, still the question is, is there a provision to mark an application as will not move forward without an objection, without comments, without transparency, without assigning reasons, without citing a rule? That's the question. Thank you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, there could be other ways. If it doesn't meet a particular evaluation criteria, then yes, of course. Okay, but we're talking about RVCs to begin with here. So I'm trying to narrow down the conversation. There could be other ways of stopping an application. So if, for example, the applicant itself has got a problem in terms of not meeting a certain criteria, then yep, definitely that would stop the application from moving forward. Steinar, question?

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah, hi, Steinar for the record. I just need some clarity here. We are now talking about an RVC that has received an objection. And we propose that if so, and it's not being sorted out, the application cannot move forward. But couldn't there be a scenario where the RVC has been

removed from the application? Will that also make a full stop of the application? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, presumably yes. But in terms of how the process goes to deal with RVCs, that we don't really have clarity on. Okay, and I kind of allude to that in a later part of our replies. But I'm talking about here RVC being proposed to address an objection. So it's one causing the other, not the other way around. So it's the RVC that is proposed to address an objection, which is what the question is asking.

STEINAR GROTTROD: Do you have some sort of examples that kind of can follow this a little bit? Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm not quite sure what you mean by way of an example. Would you mind doing me a favor and put something in the chat and I'll come back to you?

STEINAR GROTTROD: Yeah, maybe I understand this better when we walk through the rest of this process. So thank you. Anyway, interesting. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So I'm happy to try and answer your question if I can think about it a little bit more, but I'm also wary of time. So I want to get through all

of this stuff. So that's question one and question two. Next slide, please. Moving on to question three and question four. So question three asks, should all applicants that propose RVCs and community gTLD commitments be required to designate a third party to monitor compliance regardless of whether the commitments relate to content or not? And question four is the rationale for the answer. And what I kind of gathered from all the discussions in the last three weeks is that the answers to question three should be yes, but there's also a but suffix. So it's yes, to have yes, having to—in support of a blanket practice, to have the applicant, any applicant that proposes an RVC or community gTLD commitment to also identify a third-party monitor to monitor the compliance of those commitments. Right. And it doesn't matter whether it's a commitment that relates to content or not. Right. It's probably the rationale being that it's too subjective in the first instance to determine whether something is content related or not. So hence, it's just easier to have the blanket practice of anyone that wants to propose a commitment of such case would have to also identify a third party compliance monitor. I have “designate” in inverted commas because I'm using the word identify, I will come to that reason for it in a bit. Right.

On the flip side, if I can go to—so I've just I've addressed point number one, and I'm going to go cross cutting here. Right. On the flip side, point number four, the subjectivity also plays a part in making it too general to conclude that every RVC would require a third-party monitor. And it could be viewed as possibly being unfair and too demanding to come up for to force them to force applicants to come up with a third-party monitor. Right. And on that basis, it's also probably too hard to establish

a community-wide standard to decide whether a third-party monitor is required or not, because then you have to have like a PDP or a CCWG to actually come up with the standard. And that will take time. And based on what's happened across those generics, it may not be a successful exercise to begin with.

And then going back to point number two, we know that in the 2012 round, these third party monitors were accepted for community gTLD commitments. Because we know the fact that community gTLDs will invariably have content use and restrictions as part of the application anyway. So it just makes sense to keep that practice for community gTLD commitments. Right.

And so what I'm proposing is there were in fact, there were two schools of thought or two positions, you could say contrasting positions. One is to have a blanket and one is to say maybe a blanket is too much to ask. So I'm proposing to meld the two together to say that we can have a blanket practice of identifying the third-party compliance, which is 6A. But we ask contractual compliance to look at it, and to tell us whether an RVC can be within their realms of monitoring, or whether it's beyond them. Right. And therefore, if it's beyond them, then we can use the third-party monitor that has been proposed by the applicant itself. And we allowed ICANN Board to determine that as a final arbiter. So it's melding the two together. So in the case that we, ICANN compliance say that we can monitor this non-issue, then we don't need the applicant to rely on the third party monitor. But if contractual compliance says that no, we can't, this is beyond us, then we just say that, well the applicant has already proposed a third-party monitor, so we can just use that. Of course, there is a selection process or assessment process that's to be

done by ICANN to determine whether the third-party monitor is actually a suitable entity or not. Somebody raised the concerns about the reliability and the credibility of this proposed third-party monitors. And then I believe Siva also proposed a possible alternative to have the considered appointment of well-regarded non-ICANN paid community members to fill the role of the third party monitor. Okay, so that's where we stand. And I'm hoping that I will get support for this position of melding the two opposing views together. Any objections?

Some of you who are putting stuff in the chat, did you want to verbalize any concerns or... I mean, if it's support, it's support. If you have concerns about the approach, then please, can you talk to it rather than just putting something in the chat? Okay, so if there's no one putting up their hands, then I'm proposing to move forward. Next slide, please.

Okay, the fifth question and the sixth question are a pair again. The fifth question says, "Are there any changes that should be made to the proposed implementation framework?" And I kind of picked up three possibilities. The first one is this approach of putting in flexibility in terms of the third party monitor. Right, so again, it's basically to require applicants to identify, not necessarily doesn't need, but identify as a must. And that is only if ICANN says that that is required. And because of the fact that contractual compliance can't do the job.

And then second, well and that's the point about the point two here. Retain flexibility for ICANN to determine whether a third-party monitor is required by examining the RVC, and then deciding whether contractual compliance is in a position to do the monitoring, and obviously the enforcement as well. And so long as, and we are leaving

this to the ICANN board to decide, and they will have to weigh the risk of this, well, they have to examine it to make sure that it's not something that requires ICANN to regulate content, and it would minimize any risk of litigation or IRPs or accountability mechanisms being invoked against the RVC.

Okay, the second point about it is the credibility point, which I talked about. There is no mention currently about how ICANN would assess a third-party monitor. They just said that ICANN will have to approve it, but there's no mention of how they would approve or disapprove it, a third-party monitor. So it goes to the issue of credibility and reliability, and bearing in mind that if an applicant is the one that's proposing the third party, then the cost of having that third party is borne by the applicant, so the applicant is actually paying for it. So hence the question of reliability and credibility. It's not like where you have auditors auditing accounts, because auditors are subject to regulation. We don't know whether this would be the case for third-party monitors.

And the third point, oops, it should be third and not second. So the third change would be preservation. There was an issue about, in terms of making it difficult for an RVC to be changed, down the line, especially if, say, for example, the registry operator has changed hands, has been bought over, and the new operator should still retain the RVC as much as possible, especially if the issue that the RVC purports to address is a live one. So there should be some kind of moratorium in place.

And in terms of the application change procedure, someone mentioned that that is typically very community resource intensive, so there should be a question about whether there's a better way of monitoring all

these changes, these RVC changes. And at the end of the day, the ability to change RVC should make sense in terms of balancing public interest versus commercial feasibility.

Okay, I'm being prompted that I'm using up a lot of time, so Siva and Olivier, please go ahead and make it quick, I guess.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yeah, and isn't there a conflict of interest if ICANN requires a third-party monitor and it expects the applicant to pay for the third-party monitor, and if the applicant or the registry pays for the third-party monitor, there's a clear conflict of interest. And besides the rationale of a third-party monitor is to find a way out of ICANN's difficulty in, with its remit, and so it's a way out. And why would the ICANN require the registry to pay for the third-party monitor? And there again, if it requires the registry to pay for a third-party monitor, does the registry have an option to choose a third-party monitor who will cost him \$1,000 a year, or would ICANN stipulate a third-party monitor who would bill him \$1,000 an hour for an indefinite period, for an indefinite number of persons? Could you go into all these?

JUSTINE CHEW: So, those goes into the weeds. So, as I said before, the ICANN in the proposed framework, it mentions that ICANN would approve whether to use a third-party monitor or not. So, and who proposes the third-party monitor? It's the applicant. Because the applicant is the one that's proposing the RVC. It depends on the nature of the RVC. So, you have an RVC, they would have an idea of who would be the best person to

monitor those RVCs. And you can't, well, somebody has to pay for those services. And it can't be ICANN paying for that services because that's where you cross the line and go into the weeds of regulating something that you wouldn't want to regulate. Which is why it has to be the applicant who folks the cost of the third-party monitor. And it's not, I don't believe that it's a conflict of interest.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: I'm sorry, I defer with you. I'll write in the chat. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Alan, quickly please.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, very quickly. I think the conflict Siva is referring to is the fact that if the applicant, the registry pays for the monitoring service, they have a contract with them and therefore, potentially they set terms. And those terms might well be, you don't particularly look very carefully or whatever. So, the credibility of the monitoring group is a critical issue. And ultimately, we will have to get down into the weeds to determine how ICANN satisfies itself that the monitoring organization is credible. Not easy to do, but that's clearly a requirement.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. So, I'm saying that, as I said, all it says in the proposed implementation framework is that ICANN will have to approve the third-party monitor. There's no mention about how they're going to do it,

which is what I'm saying in point number three here on this slide. But the issue of conflict of interest in terms of who pays for it. It has to be... Well, it must not be ICANN that pays for it because then that would cause a problem. So, insofar as somebody has to pay for it, it will have to be the third-party... Sorry, it will have to be the applicant that pays for the third-party monitor. But again, as I said before, because it's the applicant that's proposing the third-party monitor and paying for the third-party monitor, they have to be careful, and ICANN will have to assess whether this third-party monitor is a suitable party or not. But at the end of the day, ICANN cannot pay for the services of that third-party monitor because that would cause conflict of interest on ICANN's part. Okay, Siva, sorry, I need to move ahead because otherwise I won't be able to finish. So, let's move on.

Okay, so this is a question that we didn't discuss before, which is PIC DRP and RR DRP. I mentioned... I could have mentioned in passing, but we didn't actually discuss it, and I noted that there was one comment from Alan before, so I've already picked that up. But I just wanted to talk a little bit about the PIC DRP and the RR DRP, the fact that these two procedures, dispute resolution procedures, are in place already. But the issue here is with PIC DRP, at least, as you see, B.1.2, reporter must specifically identify which PIC and state grounds of alleged non-compliance and detail how it has been harmed. And Alan has already picked up on this, and the same point is in existing ALAC advice. That if you require the reporter to have experienced harm, and you can't show the harm, then effectively this PICS DRP is useless, is ineffective. So we have a problem with that, and that was what was in the advice. So what we're saying is that if we can consider, number one, not requiring the

reporter to explain how it has been harmed, but instead maybe detail how it could potentially be harmed. So it's a question of prevention rather than just cure. Okay, and the fact that there's only been two PIC DRPs filed to date. Who is the enforcer? The enforcer is ICANN Contractual Compliance. It's just that it's using the procedure as a means of educating whether a PIC has been violated or not. Michael, very quickly.

MIKE PALAGE:

I would just echo your concerns about the harm being problematic, and one of the recent reconsideration requests that I submitted, part of the denial was about harm and standing. So I totally agree with you that that ambiguous language is incredibly problematic, and I could dig through the stuff, and I'll share it with you, private, well, I'll share it with you to highlight that point. So that's it. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, thank you, Michael. Next slide, please. Now, you'll see that there are similarities with the RR DRP, the Registry Restriction Dispute Resolution Procedure. This is the one that applies to the community gTLD commitments, whereas DRP applies to PICS and RVCs, but this particular one applies strictly to the community commitments. Again, the process has been in place since 2012, and this one, I had a look at it, and I've highlighted some bits where I think could be problematic, so it says limited to harmed established institution, and ICANN is not a party to this RR DRP, it's, well, it's not a party to the PIC DRP either, but there are mentions of established institutions, and then there's a little blurb

about what that established institution actually means. There's also a mention about defined community, and then it tries to explain what it is, but all these are actually part of the community application process, the questions being sought to be answered by the applicant.

And I just think that the way that this RR DRP document has been set out is a bit too scant, and if you had no idea whatsoever about community TLDs, I think you would probably get lost about how to file a RR DRP if you wanted to, so I'm suggesting that that something needs to be done about expanding this document a little bit more, the explanation of this DRP a little bit more.

And the other thing about it is also, as you see at the bottom, measurable harm to complainant and community name objector, so again, there's this notion of having to explain or show harm incurred or experienced to the party concerned, the complainant and the community that's involved. So again, it's the same with the PIC DRP, the having had harm experience would be a criteria, and we're saying that that is not good enough, so try to prevent, look at prevention rather than cure, to have, say, again, possibility of potential harm rather than actual harm being required as part of the RR DRP being filed, and to note that no RR DRP has been filed to date. Next slide, please.

Sorry, I'm trying to press on. Okay, let's skip this one. Let's skip this one. Next slide, please. Right, so in terms of a position or response to question seven and question eight, question seven is about are there any specific improvements to be made to the PIC DRP and the RR DRP, and why, if you say yes. We're saying yes, clearly Alan's talked about it, Michael's now talked about it, so we're saying that, we're going to

suggest that we move towards foreseeable harm rather than actual harm being a criteria for filing the PICS DRP, and then potentially the same could be said about the RR DRP in point four, and I've talked about this obscure use of language and terms in the RR DRP, so I'm suggesting that more clarity be introduced under point three.

Okay, and then there were two questions I wanted to maybe gauge some feedback on is in terms of awareness, I don't believe there has been enough awareness on these two procedures being in place, so potentially we might want to ask for more efforts to create awareness on these. And then in terms of reviews, the SubPro PDP actually looked at the question of reviewing PICS DRPs and came to the conclusion that because there's only been two filed, that was too few cases to actually do a proper review, and because RR DRPs has been none filed to date, so how, on what basis would we do a review. So I don't know whether we want to mention anything about forcing a review and in what circumstances do we demand a review. Any thoughts on those two points?

Okay, I'm being prompted, I have two minutes left, so not doing well today on time. Okay, so no comments, moving on. Question nine is a catch-all question, so unless anyone else has got problems with the framework, then we may have to leave question nine unanswered. Moving on to question two, topic two, question one is, would there be any types of content restrictions that ICANN must accept, and if so, why, and can we identify with any specificity such types of commitments? So based on the conversations from the last week, here are some points for consideration. So where the applicable content registration are formulated to implement category one safeguards, which is for strings

deemed to be applicable to highly sensitive or regulated industries, then that those kind of content restrictions should be accepted because it's a safeguard.

Number two is any RVCs, any content restrictions that the applicant proposes and agrees together with ICANN in terms of language of that commitment as being enforceable and as a practicable matter should be accepted, provided that ICANN is not required to adjudicate whether the applicant or the registered operator is in compliance or not.

Third one is that community commitments would naturally involve having restrictions on use and content anyway, as an inherent nature of the way that they manage the community. So again, the practice of having a third-party monitor for compliance should continue and therefore these kinds of commitments or content restrictions should be accepted, again with provisos about the third party being acceptable, the language of the commitment being acceptable.

I think Avri made this point about the fact that ICANN doesn't exist in vacuum, it is still subject to US laws, extraterritorial laws, court orders, so all these things would trump bylaws anyway, so the notion of hanging on to the bylaws is a little bit extreme, I guess. And then at the end day, as long as the content restrictions do not require ICANN to adjudicate compliance and ICANN is in the position to enforce the outcomes of those adjudications using third-party monitors and dispute resolution providers, then that's fine, we should be able to accept those content restrictions. Okay, moving on, next slide please.

So the question three is are there any types of content restrictions that ICANN should not accept, and I would have said here that anything that the ICANN board deems requiring ICANN to adjudicate whether the applicant or the registry is in compliance or not should not be accepted, should not be entered into, so that's quite straightforward. Next slide please.

All right, do you agree that ICANN must move forward with a fundamental bylaw change? And I think I kind of heard that majority of us were leaning towards B, no, that ICANN must accept, agree to enter into, enforce content-related RVCs and gTLD community commitments and that no clarification of the bylaw is required because our position is so long as we don't require or those commitments aren't putting ICANN in the position of adjudicating whether the applicant or the registry operator is in compliance or not, then we're fine, we're not running afoul of the ICANN bylaws and hence there is no need to clarify the fundamental bylaws. And we've already given examples of those commitments which would necessitate the acceptance and enforcement by ICANN. Okay, I see two hands, Alan and then Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, I don't really feel comfortable with that answer, and I'll tell you why. Our position is as long as ICANN is not judging the content, then we're okay. I believe there are other entities, people that do not agree, that would say that any content-related stipulation in a contract is in violation of the agreement, of the bylaws. If ICANN and its legal counsel believe that our position is ironclad and there's no chance it could lose in a court, then fine. But if that is not that clear, then I think

we need to make it clear because our position is not the one that's going to be taken if this ends up going to court or going to somewhere or other where a judgment has to be made. So I think we have to be very careful about this. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: What are you suggesting that we pick as an option?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm suggesting that we are not the ones who can judge this. That the answer I think is yes, a bylaw is required unless it can be demonstrated that there is no potential for someone arguing the other case.

JUSTINE CHEW: The funny thing is this is a multiple choice question. So we've been given the question, we've been given the set of answers to choose from. So I'm in a position to only choose A, B or C. There is nothing to say that "We don't choose any of the above or none of the above, this is why." So if you can help me out in terms of what we should be saying about this, that would be quite useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would say C and somewhere there has to be a place where we could put a qualifier. It may not be in direct answer to this question, it may be in the cover letter.

JUSTINE CHEW: Well, you can provide the rationale for that under question six. Because question six asks for why you choose A, B or C.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that one can, you can there provide the flexibility to say yes presumes we do not have ironclad proof. If we have ironclad whatever demonstration that there's no way it could be interpreted as ICANN judging the content, even if it's someone else doing it, then we're fine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, point noted. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Justine. And I'll try and be brief because we're way over time on this topic, unfortunately. But I had exactly the same feeling as what Alan had. And you can see also in the chat, Hadia. This is not a thing where, what do you prefer? This is the case of we know what the purpose is. Now we need the legal advice to tell us how to reach that purpose, whether it's a bylaw change, whether the bylaws already have the things inside it to be able to achieve that purpose. But it's not a case of, well are you going to say yes, are you going to say no? For that very reason, I would definitely go for the yes as in C, because it would have to be for the lawyers to look at this and say, how do we achieve what we want to achieve, rather than say, what is the safest option for ICANN to stay out of all of this? Because that's what I'm usually a bit concerned about, the ICANN lawyer saying, oh, let's go for the safest option for ICANN. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, Hadia? You'd be quick.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, thank you. This is Hadia for the record. So I agree to what Olivier said and Alan said, that the final word needs to be by the lawyers. However, I do see that if we choose yes, this is actually very dangerous, because ICANN would be regarded as changing its mission to start getting involved into content. And like, people will not say it's about PICs and RVCs, but it will be regarded as a huge step that—So we know that we are talking about RVCs and PICs, but if it's in there in the bylaws, I don't know, maybe we can be specific and say it's only about the RVCs and PICs, I don't know. But again, making such a change could have huge impact. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, so I'm going to respond by saying that I seriously doubt that ICANN Board or ICANN legal would want to change the bylaws in such a way as to say that content regulation is allowed. They would just want to say that ICANN has the ability, legal ability or whatever, to handle commitments that relate to content in a way that doesn't require ICANN to adjudicate. I think that's where we're trying to get at. Greg.

GREG SHATAN: I feel that the bylaws are clear enough on this point. The issue is that some, that people continually try to muddy the waters often by not actually looking at the relevant bylaw point, which says that ICANN shall

not regulate content, should not regulate services that use the internet unique identifiers or the content that such services carry or provide. And regulate is defined as imposing rules and restrictions on that content or on those services. And so the definition of regulate is really what's important here.

I think that what I would say is that I would not concede, and I guess maybe goes to the answer for the next one, which is that I would not concede that there is a lack of clarity. But if we want to try to get a further clarity on it, I think it needs an opinion, maybe a legal opinion on what this bylaw means. I think my concern is similar to what was said before, which is that if we reopen the forces that tried to make this an even broader restriction against essentially—doing anything that has any consequences related to content, we'll try to reopen the whole point, not for clarification purposes, but for relitigation purposes. So I would rather, in a sense, answer that no, it's clear enough, which is B, and that there is adequate room for ICANN to engage in dealing with RVCs in this manner, without it being considered, quote unquote, the regulation of content or the regulation of a registry.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, thank you, Greg. In fact, I would say that I'm with you on that, and my answer would have been B as well. But now we have this problem about some people wanting B and some people wanting C. So I have to figure out what to do on this. Alan, you had the last word, and then I have to hand it back to Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'll be very brief. Two points. Number one, there have been sessions at recent ICANN meetings with people making the statement that the current bylaws do not allow content to be mentioned in a contract. So there are those who believe that. So although we may think the current bylaws are good enough, not everyone does. So that's point number one.

The other point is, yes, the powers that caused the current bylaws to be written are still around, clearly. However, the process by which a fundamental bylaw is changed is very, very different from the process under which the current bylaws were written under the CCWG accountability. So one does have to factor that in. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Olivier, back to you. Thank you, everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Justine, for taking us to this very, very interesting discussion again. Unfortunately, we have to move on. And now we're off to the policy statement updates with Hadia Elminiawi and Andrew Chen.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, thank you, Olivier. This is Hadia for the record. So I will start and then give the floor to Andrew. We have the NCAP Study 2 Draft Report. And we don't yet have some—I don't know if we will be having a call next week. But if we have a call next week, we might have someone to present this. In all cases, on the 20th of February, during the prep week,

there is a webinar about the NCAP Study 2 Draft Report. And I'm not sure that currently we do have time actually for someone to present this at the Consolidated Policy Working Group call. So maybe we can just rely on the webinar, which is going to happen on the 20th of February during prep week.

Then we have Phase 1 Final Report of the EPDP on Internationalized Domain Names. And Justine has provided, has proposed some language for us to adopt. I have also proposed some language. I don't know if we—Can we maybe look at it now? We can click on the proposed language for the Final Report of the EPDP on Internationalized Domain Names. IT'S on the wiki page. If you scroll down, it's in the table. Yes. And here you have the Phase 1 Final Report of the EPDP.

So if we scroll down, we will find Justine's comment. I've also put a comment. Justine, if you want to speak to it. And I would also speak to the comment that I have put. Justine, would you like to start or would I go with my comment first? Okay, so maybe Justine. Okay, so basically on the wiki page, Justine is referring to two points. I have commented on the second one, which speaks about a contradiction between a recommendation provided by SubPro and another recommendation provided by the EPDP. And the contradiction is about whether an applicant can apply for a string that its script is not included in the root zone label generation rules. So the SubPro recommendation says that the applicant can actually apply for a string that its script is not included in the root zone label generation rules. However, this string will not be delegated. Like it can apply, but it will not be delegated. The IDN EPDP for gTLDs says that the applicant cannot apply for a string that its script is not included in the root zone label generation rules. And this is the

contradiction that Justine highlighted. However, I don't see it really the way that has been said by Justine. So I'm saying that in my comment that recommendation 25.3 of the subsequent procedures PDP report pertains to all scripts including but not limited to IDNs, while recommendation 3.22 of the IDN EPDP for gTLDs specifically targets IDN TLDs as well as variants. It also targets variants.

So we could regard 3.22, the recommendation three, it's an implementation guideline, 3.22 of the IDN EPDP as a subset of guideline 25.3 with more stringent criteria. Also, the determination of variants according to the IDN EPDP recommendation 1.1 is determined only through the root zone label generation rules. That is, there is no self-determination for variants. Accordingly, it would be totally impractical to apply for a variant while its script is not available in the root zone label generation rules because there is no self-determination there.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Could I interject? Thank you. Number one, we're not really concerned about variants at this point in time. We're just talking about the string itself, the main string. And I want to point out that this issue was discussed in the IRT together with Sarmad, and Sarmad is the one that actually put forward this contradiction. And the IRT looked at it, and then even the former co-chair of SubPro PDP says that, yes, it's a contradiction. But he conceded that a recommendation would trump an implementation guidance, which is what I'm suggesting that we support here. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Justine. But then I have another view. I'm looking at it from a different angle. So I'm saying there is no contradiction. We can regard the IDN EPDP recommend guideline as a subset of the overarching guideline with more stringent requirements. So rather than viewing it as a contradiction, let's view it as that we have a general guideline, and then inside this general guideline, we have some specifics related to variants and related to IDN TLDs, which will mean that both guidelines are implementable. At the end of the day, the IDN EPDP speaks to variants and speaks to IDNs. So if you want to apply this recommendation or this implementation guide on variants and IDNs only, that's fine. And still allow others not applying for variants or IDNs to apply for a string whose script is not included in the original label generation rules. However, the applicant will be fully aware that that string will never be delegated unless the script will be -- so I'm thinking there could be a way forward –

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sorry. I think we're taking too much time. And I agree with Satish to say that we can resolve this. I disagree with you. So I'm going to propose that if you disagree with me, then we just take the second portion out altogether.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

It's okay. I agree, let's discuss it offline in order not to take too much time from this call. If any of the participants or attendees of this call have a view, we are welcome to any other thoughts or views, what we

have put, and anything else. So please go ahead. You can add or add to the Wiki page as you wish.

If we don't have any other thoughts or ideas in that regard, we can move on to the next item, which is the proposed top-level domain string for private use. And we do not actually have a pen holder or someone to present this to the group. I could present it to the group if no one else wants. Again, it's about the IANA picked private string, which is .internal, and that string would never be delegated in the root zone. And the public comment is about if IANA actually followed the criteria specified by SSAC in order to come up with this string. So basically, this is what it is.

We can go to the next open public comment is the proposed language for draft sections of the next round applicant guidebook. And definitely, this is with Justine and Cheryl. Justine, would you like -- or Cheryl, would you like to make any comments here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Sure, I can have a go. Cheryl, for the record. Obviously, the various sections of the applicant guidebook, considering the ridiculously huge amount of work that many of us in the community here in At-Large and active in the CPWG, not just myself and Justine, but many of you, have put into everything from the beginnings of subsequent procedure and now continue through the implementation review team activities, which have gone into great detail on dotting the i's, crossing the t's, and making sure the words all work, that we did undertake in a previous call to do some brief notes so that a comment goes in, but also ensure that

members of this group have the opportunity to make some comments and suggestions if there's anything that is obvious to them and they're fresh eyes. So that's a work in progress, and I'm assuming it will be done on time. But please also remember, I'm in another meeting, and I'd like to get on to the rest of what you need from me. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Cheryl, for remaining with us. And Justine, do you want to add anything?

JUSTINE CHEW: No time.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. So I move to the string similarity review guidelines, and we have Alan Greenberg, he actually volunteered to be the pen holder for that public comment. Alan, would you like to add a few words?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not really. As I said last week, I think the onus is on us to review the document prior to the ICANN meeting, see what ICANN has to say, and then react to it. And I'll probably be ready next week to present something.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Alan. And so upcoming public comment procedures, we have the phase two initial report of the EPDP on

internationalized domain names, and that should be out maybe beginning of March. And then also we have the review of the draft applicant support program handbook, and Justine, I believe, talked to us about this on our last call. Justine, would you like to say a few words here?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Cheryl and I have to get together and work out how best to handle this. But I did mention last week that potentially we could run a webinar on it, and I think that is the plan. I'm still working on the details of it because I've been busy with the RVC consultation and IDNs comment. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And if I can just reinforce what Justine just said, we need to do something. We don't necessarily need to do something terribly expensive. Again, it's been well developed from our own people's thinking, but to that end, it's really important that there are a couple of sections in the public comment on the applicant support handbook that do need particular input. There are very specific questions being asked about, in particular, small businesses, tribal lands, all those sorts of things, and it really is an opportunity for our community to make some comment on that. So that's the nature of certainly what I'd be proposing we highlight in a webinar, and then use that webinar to poll and get the temperature of the room and put that into a not terribly expensive, but nevertheless effective comment. Should we comment? Absolutely. Thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Cheryl, and looking forward to the webinar. And with that, we finished this section. I hand it over to Andrew if he wants to add anything.

ANDREW CHEN: So just a reminder to please complete your review of the PICs and RVC consultation form by next week's meeting, and for the IDN EPDP Shepherds to review the draft statement in order to submit this before March or by mid-March. With that, I wanted to hand the floor back over to Olivier or Hadia or anyone else who may have updates regarding the current statements.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Andrew. So I don't see any more hands up, so let's hand it to Olivier for the next part, which is about ICANN's 79 Consolidated Policy Working Group Preparation. Olivier, would you like to go through that, or would you like me to start?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much, Hadia. We haven't got so much time on our hands. Just one point regarding closing off the policy work. There was a big discussion today on the PICs and RVCs. I think Justine is still somewhere in the middle of not knowing what she's going to answer in a few of the topics here. If I could ask Justine to follow up, and actually everyone to follow up on the mailing list, because the deadline for the final form will be the 21st of February. So it won't be possible for us to

have an extensive discussion during next week's call, which is likely to be a shorter call as well. So the most we can do would be that.

Now on the next topic, the ICANN 79 CPWG preparation, the topics were already discussed last week. Andrew has a quick update for us on the talking points. Andrew Chen.

ANDREW CHEN:

Thank you, Olivier. So this is just a reminder, everyone, for all the subject matter experts to please provide your input to the talking points document by 26th of February. That way we can review it by the February 28th call. As we can see that there has been some input already, but more input from our policy shepherds would be great. Thank you, Olivier. I pass the floor back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Andrew. I'm not sure that we have time to actually go through the suggested topics for a discussion on this call. Perhaps we'll have a quick review of these during next call, if I may propose this. And unless anybody has an update on these, a quick update on these, then we can move on to any other business. And thank you for putting the points in the chat. Indeed, prep week will begin next week. So there'll be a number of very interesting sessions that we invite everyone to participate in. And over to Hadia Elminiawi. You have your hand up. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. I just want to highlight that on Wednesday, 21st of February at 16:30 UTC, there was the board session during the prep week, which will include three topics. The first is the FY 26-30 strategic planning. And the second is the board's role and responsibilities when board adopted policies do not address the problems they were developed to solve. And the third one is environmental sustainability at ICANN. And there is a link to all of this on the agenda under item five. With that, I stop and hand it back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Hadia, whilst you're there, could you just take us for those people who do not have access to their screen, the board questions to the ALAC and the ALAC question to the board, please. They're on that same page. If you have them. I can just take it quickly. There's a first question regarding what does the ALAC regard the success with respect to contention resolution? The second board question is what are the top three topics that are essential to be addressed before going to the next round of new gTLDs? And if there is time, the third question will be, what would you like to know on the ombudsperson selection process? So that's the third. And then the two questions from the ALAC, the ALAC seeks clarification on the prohibition of CCWG auction proceeds members from applying to the first call for applications on the ICANN grant program. And the second one is this year, there are a lot of key activities happening around internet governance like NetMundial, Global Digital Compact, Summit of the Future, etc. How can ICANN support real multi-stakeholder participation for these topics? Thank you. Sorry, just because of time, we just plowed straight through.

I think we're over in any other business now. Not seeing any hands up. That's pretty good. We're managing to finish just on time. There was a point that Sébastien Bachollet wanted to ask regarding NetMundial. I don't know whether Sebastian is on the call. I know he was on another call earlier. Do you just want to say a couple of points on this topic?

In the meantime, while Sébastien is getting on the call, the next meeting next week, we usually have a rotation. Unfortunately, our next meeting time will actually clash with an ICANN prep week call, which means that we should be looking at a 14:00 UTC meeting. Is that correct, Yesim?

YESIM SAGLAM:

Thank you, Olivier. Yes, exactly. That's correct in order to avoid the clash. And also, I would like to underline that we are not going to have interpretation provided next week because it's prep week. And regarding the time, yes, it will need to be at 14:00 UTC, but we will also need to limit the duration of the call to 60 minutes because otherwise, we will again clash with a prep session starting at 15:00 UTC. So 14:00 UTC for 60 minutes. Yes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

And without interpretation. Thank you. Over to Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I am really sorry. I am not very good at multi-tasking. Fortunately, Cheryl was here to help me. I wish I could have done the pitch, but I just wanted to be sure that you are aware that there is a tentative organization of a NetMundial meeting in Brazil, the 29th and the 13th of

April. So for it's a short time, how and why At-Large could be interested. I think as NetMundial 10 years ago, we were participating and it was a real multi-stakeholder organization. At that moment, ICANN was on the front seat of the truck and including people in the truck. I don't know this time how it will be. We had this discussion with the interim CEO and she says that ICANN will not be driving the car or the truck, but will be participating.

And the other point, I would like to say that we as the chair of the various RALOs, we are working together to organize the 23rd of April roundtable, cross-RALO roundtable on the anniversary of 10 years of NetMundial. If you have idea of people to talk or topics, please come back to me and I will try to gather all those information and set up the program with my chair colleagues. And thank you for giving me two minutes on your meeting, Olivier. Thank you very much. T

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: On the meeting, staff, could you confirm we should still have the RTT scheduled even though we don't have language interpretation? Can you confirm that?

YESIM SAGLAM: Hi, Judith. I think that will be the case, but we will need to double check. But as usual, we will be requesting the real-time transcription. I don't

think we should have any problems, but we will need to still double check.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. And please note also in the chat that Amrita has added a few more points regarding the community members have been confirmed at NetMundial+10 and the subcommittees will be formed now. And the discussions will be open but restricted, but more information and clarity will be received soon. Anyway, we'll be able to follow that up in future calls.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, just one second. I think to answer Avri's question, it's exactly why I think it's important to discuss that in such arenas, this working group and other working groups. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. And the point that Avri is making in the chat is the closed way in which the prep is being done and a number of points on how this is rolling out. We'll have ample time to discuss this during future calls and also in the face-to-face meeting in Puerto Rico.

In the meantime, since we know when we're meeting next week, I'd like to thank everyone for having been on this call, including those people, and in particular, those people that have produced updates. Please follow up with the topic that Justine took us through, the voluntary commitments, which are particularly important as the deadline is approaching. Thanks to our interpreters and to the real-time text

transcriber and to our staff for doing a great job in putting this together.
Hadia, anything else to add?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Nothing to add from my side. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Goodbye, everyone. And have a please don't forget next week's prep week calls, which have some very, very interesting topics in there. That's all. Thanks.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]