YEŞIM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call taking place on Wednesday, 21st of February 2024 at 1400 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 just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Alfredo Calderon, Adrian Schmitz, Pari Esfandiari and from Mouloud Khelif. From staff side, we currently have Andrew Chen and myself Yeşim Salam and I will also be doing call management for today's call.

A couple of reminders. Unfortunately, due to the ICANN79 Prep week, we do not have interpretation provided for today's call. However, we still have the real-time transcription service provided as usual. Let me copy and paste the link here for you so you can check the service from the link I've provided. And my final reminder will be to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes, please. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim, Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking and welcome to this week's consolidated policy working group call, a shorter one than usual because we are right in the middle of the ICANN PREP week. And I'm sure you've all been on some of the other calls. We have one that is immediately after this one. So, we need to be very strict today in timekeeping. And we have an agenda that is only one hour in

---

length. And we will start, of course, with our workgroup and small team updates, just a shortened set of updates with Justin Chew that will take us through the new gTLD next round of subsequent procedures. But then the bulk of today's call is going to be dealing with the drafts that are being created at the moment for the policy statement update.

I know that it only shows 10 minutes, but there's quite a few in there in the pipeline. And you'll see that there are quite a few in draft mode at the moment. And we will be focusing specifically on one regarding the top-level domain strings for private use with Satish Babu and Eduardo Diaz taking us through that. And also, with a public comment consideration for phase one final report on the expedited PDP on internationalized domain names. So, after that, we'll quickly review the ICANN79 policy session. And that's pretty much today's call. 60 minutes, that will go very fast indeed. At this point in time, are there any amendments, additions, deletions, changes to be made to this agenda? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just to note that I had planned to have something on this in similarity for this meeting, but unfortunately, I didn't make it. So, it'll be deferred until whenever the next meeting is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. It'll be deferred until later with a capital L. We will see. Thank you. I'm not seeing any other hands up. So, I know that I am actually seeing, I'm seeing Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. Hi, this is Steiner speaking. I just want to add that we were asked in the GNSO TPR working group to comment the proposed recommendation. And I put the link into this agenda with my proposed input to whatever the ICANN staff has put forward. So, we don't have to spend time on this, on this meeting, but please check out the information that I've submitted and post on the mailing list or on this wiki. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Steiner. And sorry, the deadline for that, if I understand correctly, is the 27th of February, isn't it?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: That's correct. That's correct. So, the next meeting will be the upcoming Tuesday and then we will go through this. But then the essence here is that we will actually discuss this in more details at ICANN79. So, but this is my proposed input to the preliminary recommendation set by ICANN staff. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steiner. Thank you. So, that's at the bottom of the agenda, underneath the agenda in the comments section. Not seeing any other hands, we are therefore agreeing to the agenda as it currently is on the screen and we can move to the action items. And you'll see that those action items are all relating to the current processes and everything is, it looks as though everything is on track. So, as we prepare for this

forthcoming ICANN meeting, we have all action items complete for the time being. Maybe more today. Any comments or questions on these? Not seeing any hands up. Okay. So, that's for our action items. And we've already had in the next agenda item, we've already had the update from the transfer policy review policy development process.

There is also a written, a quick written update in the IANA naming function review, which Carlton Samuels is following closely. My understanding is Carlton is not with us today, but he did submit at the bottom of the agenda, his update, which speaks about the meeting number six that took place on the 21st of February at 0100 UTC. So, just a few hours ago, I invite you to have a look at that and perhaps we'll be able to discuss it either in a future call or when we meet face-to-face in Puerto Rico.

Okay. And with this, I can then transfer the floor to Justin Chew, who will, in the absence of any other updates from the other work groups, like the EPDP on IDNs, which we will speak about in a moment, the RDA scoping team, the RDRS, the applicant support group. We're down now with the next round, SubPro, and Justin Chew is going to take us through some of the work, pressing work that is taking place there.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Olivier. So, if you see the agenda wiki, I actually have two or three documents really on the agenda wiki, but I'm only proposing to deal with one of them, which is the draft ALAC responses to the Board consultation on RVC's registry voluntary commitments. In terms of the third one, where it says GNSO small team SubPro supplemental

recommendations. It's the same deck that I circulated to the CPWG mailing list.

Just reminding folks that there is a prep week session on Thursday the 22nd at 2030 UTC. I believe it is where there will be a couple of small team members who will take you through the supplemental recommendations for the 10 SubPro recommendations that were rejected by the Board or were not adopted by the Board. And the presentation will be on a proposition by the Small Team+ on how we fix those recommendations based on the Board's concerns.

So, if you're interested in following that particular piece of work, then please attend the prep week session on 22nd of February, 2030 UTC. That particular session is more or less just informative more than anything. It's just to give people a firsthand view of what are the supplemental recommendations that have been worked on. There is going to be a follow-up session during ICANN79. I can't remember when that is, but you'll see I think the dates and the links in the ICANN79 talking points document.

Okay. So, moving on, I'm just going to deal with the--, as I said, just the draft ALAC responses and very quickly. Yeah. Can we go to the Google Doc? Yeah. Thank you. So, I'm just going to go through the comments that's left on the document. So, in terms of the first one where Steiner had a comment on objections, I believe I've already addressed it. And I think at the end of the day, Olivier has also indicated support in that particular comment. So, I'm going to propose to resolve that. I'm not going to do anything right now. So, if Andrew could just make a note of what are the conclusions so that he can help me clean up the document

at the end of the day, because we want to finalize this and submit it soon. Okay. So, unless there is objection, I'm going to keep moving because I only have 10 minutes.

Next page, page two, that's just Andrew asking for some confirmation, which I've given him now. And you can add some text if it's not clear what I've written up before. Oh, by the way, this blue text is what I've drafted based on the number of the four calls in the last four weeks where we have formulated the positions. And based on the last week's call, the amendments from the last week's call is highlighted in yellow. So, if you don't see any yellow highlight, that means that the text or the intent of the text was as per previous week. Okay. So, page two, it's fine. Page three is fine. So, I just changed the words a little bit. Page four. Okay.

So, this is the Question 6, answer the Question 6, propose change number two. Olivier had some comments, which I don't object to. So, I think this is a question of cleaning up. I did have a question for Olivier, which is to the point about the second paragraph where he says this could lead to a conflict of interest. And I propose some new text to replace that short sentence just to make it clear. So, I'm going to ask if Olivier has any objections to the new sentence that's in green under the yellow highlights.

I think it's showing up as red on the screen. But rather than say this could constitute a conflict of interest, I'm saying that this could lead to an actual or an appearance of conflict of interest as between the applicant or registry operator and its third-party monitor, which will need to be addressed. So, it's just making clear what we're referring to

in terms of conflict interest is the conflict interest between the applicant registry operator and the third-party monitor. Nothing to do with ICANN. Okay. Olivier, if I don't hear anything from you, I'm assuming that's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Justine. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I would just say that you're being extremely polite and writing things in a very nice, kind way. Well, I've spent too much time last week in the battles of the UK Parliament and being more direct, even though politeness is, of course, still—

JUSTINE CHEW: Take a breath, Olivier. Take a breath. I'm going to have to give you a Diplomacy 101 update.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All good, Justine. No, but thanks for this text. It conveys what I wanted to say. So, that's absolutely fine. Yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Good. Yeah, I just wanted to clarify when we say conflict of interest, it's between who and who, because if you don't have that, then you could also imply that ICANN is affected in terms of conflict interest. And also, the reason why we keep saying—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, between the regulations and the regulations. But of course, we're not speaking of regulation here, so--

JUSTINE CHEW: Correct. Yeah. And also, because it is quite clear that we cannot have ICANN paying for the third-party monitor, because then that creates a conflict of interest for ICANN as well with the bylaws and stuff, which is what we're trying to get away from. Okay. And then the last one would be the question eight, answer to question eight on the PIC DRP. And I don't know whether Calvin's on the call. I had asked him to propose some text to address his point, because it's very long, and it's pretty hard to digest, in my opinion.

So, unless he's got something-- Oh, okay. So, what we can do, Andrew, is we can just reach out to Calvin and see if he's going to try and propose some text to cover his point into the blue text. If he's not, then we'll just give him a cut off, and then if he doesn't respond, then we'll just finalize it ourselves. Cheryl, you have your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I'm glad you said, let's just tighten this up and give a cut off. But as best as one can, I don't see that what is written is in any way a problem text. So, I'm just a little bit concerned that we've got a tail wagging a dog here instead of a dog wagging a tail. So, I just want it on the record that I'm perfectly comfortable with, as she is rich. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:	Okay. Thank you. But yeah, I mean, for administrative and fairness, I'll give Calvin a chance to respond. But as you said, we give him a cut off, because we want to get this in. And that's pretty much it then. So, the rest of the document, nobody else had any issues with. And thanks to Andrew for doing some grammatical checks for me, and spelling checks. But that's pretty much it. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much for this. And thank you for your work. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Cheryl Langdon-Orr was just typing. And of course, when you type, you forget to put your hand down. Sorry, darling.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	That must be magic being able to have a hand up and type at the same time. Very, very good. Multiple hands. Thank you. Thanks very much, Justine. And we look forward to the follow up in the future calls, and of course, in our forthcoming meetings. Now, let us continue in our long agenda. And the next part of the agenda is the policy comment update with Hadia Elminiawi and Andrew Chen.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:	Okay. Thank you, Olivier. This is Hadia for the record. And let's go quickly through the public comment part. So, recently ratified by the ALAC are the ICANN FY25 plans and draft PTI FY25 operating plan

budget, as well as the 2023 African domain name system market study report. And currently open for public comment is the NCAP study 2 draft report. And today we have an item for this on the agenda. I'm not sure if anything has been drafted in that regard, though. Carlton and Greg are supposed to provide an update. And we have also faced one final report of the EPDP on internationalized domain names. And Justine, Satish and myself are going to provide an update today on that. Also, we have the proposed top-level domain string for private use, and Satish Babu and Eduardo Diaz provided a draft comment. I also suggested a few lines.

There is also the proposed language for draft sections of the next round applicant guidebook. For that, we have Justine Chew and Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And then there's policy review guideline, and for that, we have Alan Greenberg. And then we have the review of the draft applicant support handbook new gTLD. And also, for that, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Justine Chew. So, going to the updates part, let's check first if Carlton and Greg, I'm not sure if they are with us today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, it's Olivier speaking. So, Greg is on the call. Carlton is not. Greg is able to provide an update now, Elminiawi.

GREG SHATAN: Hadia, can you hear me?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, we hear you, Greg. Go ahead, please.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. So, we've had some emails back and forth. And both Carlton and I, I think, have reviewed the NCAP study. We think that it just requires a short statement of support. There's really nothing in there that's controversial. It all seems to be consistent with what we would like the group to be doing.

The only point of particular interest, I think, is that they've recommended that the NCAP study number three be canceled, or at the very least postponed, in order to have a new round of defining named coalitions, feeling that the definition has gotten kind of stale, as we've been working on this quite a long time and more information has come out. So, that's the one interesting thing. And I do think that's an appropriate move to be taken. I agree that the definition is kind of fading as fit prefers. So, I will prepare a short and pithy statement that we can circulate around. Thank you so much.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. This is Hadia for the record. Thank you so much, Greg. And also, I've been part of this working group. And also, another reason or two, among the reasons of not going ahead with studies three, is that every string will need to have its own assessments at the time it is submitted. And so, reviewers will need to make decisions on a string-by-string basis, based on the best available data and analysis that the review team, the technical review team, that the NCAP study is suggesting to have, is available to that team. Again, the review needs to

be done on a string-by-string basis, and also at the time the string is applied for. So, the timing also matters. NCAP study 2 provides actually 11 recommendations. Among those, I think the most significant, you've pointed one of them. And another one is the creation of the technical review team, which will be responsible for assessing strings for name collision. And then, another also new thing that NCAP study 2 report provides is the establishment of a workflow designed to assess applied for TLDs for potential name collision, and also allowing the applicants to submit mitigation plans. So, I stop here. And then, again, of course, the public comment also, the report provides two things, the recommendations, the 11 recommendations, which stem from the study 2 report and also it provides responses to the Board questions. I stop here, and I see two hands up. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to note that there was a prep week session yesterday on string collision, and it was really, really good. So, anyone who's interested in the topic that doesn't have the resources to read all of the reports, watching that session from yesterday, it was really, really beneficial. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll just follow on from Alan. Thank you. Thank you, Hadia. Thank you, Alan. Cheryl Langdon, all for the record. Couldn't agree with you more,

Alan. It was excellent. It should be actually linked as a resource to the drafting space for our NCAP work, because we really do need to be able to grab that as a ready resource to upskill our members. Just on the NCAP three study, I just wanted to double check that my belief is correct, Greg, as I see it and as Hadia re-reviewed it, because that study and putting it off won't have an effect, because it really needs to come into focus when a string is applied for.

It should have no chilling effect on the progress of the next round of gTLDs. It is work that can go on and should not be a blockage to the progress of implementation work in IRT for the next round. Unless everyone else thinks differently, I would make sure that Greg's picky comments on our behalf that we will all be reviewing. Just note that we no longer see this as a roadblock at this point in time. Thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Cheryl. Alan, if you have your hand up again, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just following up on Cheryl, I would word it slightly different. There's no need to delay things because of what the report says. There are, however, a bunch of things they say must be done. If we don't do them, that could delay the round. There's work to be done. It's not as if we're home scot-free with this report, but the work is reasonably doable in the timeframe we're looking at.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Alan. Again, on that topic, every string brings a unique set of challenges that are associated with name collision. Given the understanding of the group, currently the available data and sources and measurement methods are insufficient for understanding or designing mitigation and remediation plans for all possible name collisions. Again, it should be on a string by string basis. Greg, please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. I just want to say I'll make sure to reflect the points just made in my 50 statements. Thanks, Hadia, for detailing some of the additional points, and thanks to Cheryl and Alan for their comments. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Greg, and much appreciated, of course, your effort on this, you and Carlton. Let's go ahead to our next public comment presentation. That would be Satish and Eduardo on the proposed top-level domain string for private use. I'm not sure who's going to start. I guess, Satish, please go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Hadia. I'll start off and then Ed can join me. This is about reserving the domain name dot internal for private use. The background to this is that whether you have a small network or a home network or a very big network, these networks require a private domain or a domain name for private use, which should not today or in the

future collide with an ICANN public domain name, which means if I start using random domain names as private use for my network, there is no guarantee that tomorrow ICANN will not delegate the same string, in which case you have a collision and you're no longer private. So, the idea is that ICANN should reserve a name, and this recommendation starts off with SAC113, which provides a set of criteria for such a name.

So, the criteria, I'm not going to get into the SAC113 document, but basically it says that this should be a valid domain name. It should not be delegated, and it should be short and meaningful so that people can remember it, et cetera. So, the question for us is whether we need to kind of respond to the statement. There was a question as if whether this is only for very large networks, but actually it is not for large networks. It is in our opinion, Eduardo and I, it is a matter that concerns end users, and it's a matter of great relief for the end user that ICANN is supposing to reserve dot internal for this purpose.

So, there have been various attempts to kind of reserve some name spaces. For example, we have dot testing, dot example, dot invalid, dot localhost. These have been reserved by RFC260. Localhost, these have been reserved by RFC 2606, but this does not provide anything for a private network. Later on, there was something called dot local, which Microsoft had proposed as a valid private use top-level domain. But a little later, RFC 6762 came out with multicast DNS standards, and this started reserving dot local for that purpose. So, therefore, there's a problem with people who are following dot local.

Again, there were other RFCs, RFC 6762 recommended that they acknowledge, they said that pragmatic use. So, they did not kind of

make a single recommendation. They offered things like dot internet, dot internal, dot private, dot corps, dot home, dot LAN, etcetera. But there was no single recommendation. So, all things considered, we believe that dot internal for private use, that I can guarantee that it will never ever delegate, is an extremely useful kind of a thing for not just big networks, but also for smaller networks and home users also. I will stop here. And Eduardo, are you online? Do you want to add on something to this?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. I think the response and the recommendation that we're putting in is that, yes, we strongly support to have ICANN delegate, I mean, reserve the dot internal. I mean, in the end, people will use whatever they want to use, but those are responsible that are working with networks. They have at least one name reserved that can be used by internal networks. And in fact, we quote Google and Amazon, they're using dot internal inside their network as examples of what they're doing and supporting dot internal. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Eduardo. I see that Judith has supported the move in chat. As Eduardo said, Google and Amazon are already using dot internal as their private use. And as Cheryl points out, it provides a safe space so that nobody will have a future problem. So, Hadia, back to you. We are done with this. If anyone has any comments, you can--. I don't know the deadline for this. And Hadia has also suggested referring to dot, I

mean, the RFC113. So, we have incorporated that as well. So, we will leave it open for maybe a week or so for any further comments. And then we'll pass it on to Andrew for further action. Thank you. And back to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Satish. And thank you so much, Eduardo, for all your work on that. And basically, the few lines that I have put is in relation to RFC113 and that dot internal is the second highest queried private domain name that goes to them. They actually made like an analysis or a study on queries to two servers and the A and the J and dot internal came one of the highest queried. Also, there were previously some proposals put forward to reserve top-level domains for internal use. Dot internal also was among those.

I think it was proposed in 2017. So, the document is open for anyone who wants to comment on it. There is a link on the wiki page to the Google Doc. So, I don't see any hands up. So, let's go back to the main page, to the agenda. And I think we move now to the phase one final report of the EPDP on internationalized domain names, the comment provided by Satish, Justine, and I had a few comments as well. So, I don't know who wants to take it from here, Justine or Satish. The floor is yours.

SATISH BABU: Yeah, I'll take it on from here. Thanks, Hadia. This is Satish for the record. So, before we get into the actual statement, we need to realize that this particular phase one report had full consensus, all the 69

recommendations in the EPDP team. It was later approved by the GNSO Council, and then it went to the Board, and the Board has actually put out the call for public comments once again, as the last kind of opportunity for anyone to respond. Since it has come through this pipeline, we don't really expect any major comments at this stage. But what we are trying to do, the team of Hadia, Justine, and I, what we're trying to do is one is to kind of highlight some of the complexities that have been managed, given the significant challenges in this particular EPDP, just to highlight some of the things. And there is one thing that is, we had a discussion in the APRALO Policy Forum, again, on this phase one report.

There was a suggestion that came up from there, but we find that it is not within the scope. It is related, but not within the scope of the EPDP. So, we are taking it offline. And here in the statement, we are just looking at one particular, what looks like a conflict, but which eventually turns out not to be a real conflict, because it's not practically possible. And this has to do with the SubPro implementation guidance 25.3, in respect of scripts, which are not yet integrated onto the Root Zone LGR.

Now, in practice, this particular recommendation, the EPDP recommendation 3.22 kind of overrides, because 3.22 says you cannot make an application if the script of your particular label is not there in the Root Zone LGR already. But the implementation guidance of SubPro says that if someone wants to apply for a label in a script that is not yet part of SubPro, sorry, not a part of Root Zone LGR, they could do so, but that wouldn't be processed. And it will just be pending, will be kept pending until eventually that particular script is integrated into Root Zone LGR.

Now, practically, it would appear very strange why anyone should, knowing that, that particular script is not in the Root Zone LGR, try to apply, but that is where SubPro left it. But when the EPDP discussed this particular problem, they realized that 100% of the labels have to be conformant with the Root Zone LGR. So, in practice, it is not possible to kind of have a situation where someone can apply with a script that is not included in the Root Zone LGR.

So, in practice, it is not possible. So, although it looks to be an apparent contradiction, it is not. Today only I got the call notes of the last EPDP meeting where we discussed this issue also. And the chair, Dona's final statement was that it is not really a conflict. It is not the EPDP recommendation will override. And also, the statement points out that it's also wasteful to kind of accept an application which is not, which everybody is clear that it's not going to be processed because the script is not yet in the Root Zone LGR. So, that is what we were trying to bring up. I will stop at this point and pass on to Justine and Hadia for their additions.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Satish, for that. And Justine, do you want to add a few words to what Satish has just said?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Before we get to Cheryl, I just want to mention that at the last IRT call, the implementation review team, subsequent procedures call, and mind you, this issue of a potential conflict was actually brought up in a previous call of the IRT, which is why I picked it up and decided to put it

into the statement right now. But in the last SubPro IRT call this week, Lars mentioned that the ICANN org, GDS team is going to present something at ICANN79 on why IG25.3 or SubPro is not going to be implemented. Okay. So, there is a recognition, there is a clear conflict, regardless of what other people say.

My position is there is a conflict and it's fine. I mean, we are supporting recommendation 3.22 with the EPDP on IDN. So, I don't think there's any problem there. And the SubPro implementation guidance is an implementation guidance. So, the recommendation always trumps implementation guidance. And Lars' team has now recognized that 25.3 is not implementable in consideration of 3.22. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Justine, for this. I'll go to Cheryl, and then I will also mention the discussion that happened during the EPDP IDN call. Last call, but Cheryl, you first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Hadia. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I sincerely hope what you're going to add isn't going to suggest we do other than recognize that, thank heavens, we have a way out now of what would have been classically called a catch 22. It is absolutely clear in most people's minds that the guidance coming out of the EPDP, a recommendation 3.22, is absolutely able to get us out of what is a circular exercise, because it simply, to quote Justine, trumps the recommendation guidance that the subsequent procedure work put forward on that. We tossed, SubPro tossed, these issues to the IDN

EPDP. They've done their work. We support it, and thank heavens we've got a clear and less ambiguous thing for it to be obviously well and predictably advertised in the applicant guidebook so that poor dear applicants may not be confused, but I'm glad to see the back of this one. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Cheryl, and I must say here that, of course, the IDN EPDP recommendation is the way forward, and no one ever said otherwise. However, I was of the view, but it doesn't matter anymore, that generally speaking recommendations need to cover all use cases and the recommendation provided by the IDN EPDP only covered IDNs and variants. Having said so, the sub pro recommendation did cover labels that use ASCII characters and that are not included in the root zone label generation rules.

Having said so, again, currently there are no known labels with ASCII characters not integrated into the root zone label generation rules, and that would have been the only case that implementation guideline would have applied. So, again, for sure the IDN EPDP implementation guideline is the way forward. So, I never said otherwise. I was just saying that they complement and they do not contradict, and I know others have another view.

Okay. So, thank you so much, Justine and Satish for this comprehensive comment, and I think we will need to go forward with it because it is already due. So, unless anyone has any other thoughts, I guess it should be marked as complete. Thank you so much, and I don't see any hands

up. Thank you again, Satish and Justine, and let's go back to the agenda. And now it's, we are at Olivier and Jonathan and ICANN79 Policy Session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. I don't know if Jonathan is on the call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I am.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was checking. You are. Fantastic. Yeah, we didn't have you last week on the call, so we thought we'd pass and let you take us through this week, the few remaining points.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, that sounds good. I'm sorry I missed last week's call. I came down with strep, unfortunately, so it was not a fun week. So, we're talking about having a policy discussion at ICANN79, we're not really calling it a CPWG meeting because that has its own implications associated with it, but our sort of internal policy discussion. And Steiner recommended a small discussion on the sunset of the change of registrant policy.

And then the other sort of big thing that's in front of us is the new handbook for applicants for applicant support. And so, those are going to be our topics of discussion in that policy discussion. And then, yeah.

And so, the screen is going wild in front of me here, so I don't know if I'm supposed to be following. And so, there's also a Talking Points document that has been evolving and that should be a resource for everybody.

And we hope to circulate this document to everybody early next week so that you really sort of get yourself up to speed on positions we've taken and issues of importance to the At-Large community so that if you find yourself in a session or in the hallways or whatever in a discussion about these topics, you kind of know where we stand as a group and can kind of sing from the same hymnal as everyone else because we have a lot more influence when we're saying the same thing every time we're asked and when anyone is asked. So, that's the Talking Point documents. Andrew, I don't know if you want to take a quick stroll through them to talk to people about the structure or anything like that.

ANDREW CHEN: I can do that. Thanks, Jonathan. And this is Andrew for the record. So, this is also a reminder to please submit your talking points by no later than Monday, but earlier would be great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible - 00:46:46] and separate, yeah.

ANDREW CHEN: Yes. Thanks, Jonathan. So, yeah, the way it's structured is we have the CPWG policy issues that we have been keeping track of. These have been updated by different checkers. It looks like we still have to clean

this up before it is finally circulated amongst the CPWG. I will be sharing this on our list before we all arrive in San Juan. So, the next portion is on the Operation Finance and Budget Working Group and their Talking Points on issues concerning the Continuous Improvement Program.

So, when you have a moment, please take a moment to review this. And then the last portion is on the ICANN Board Engagement Session, which is taking place later today at, I believe, 1630 UTC. So, Talking Points have been provided here for these different breakout sessions. So, if you are attending a breakout session today, please take a look at this document for the Talking Points that we will be supporting. Thank you, and I pass this back on to Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, thanks, Andrew. And did you post the link to this document somewhere?

ANDREW CHEN: It's posted in the agenda. It's linked in the agenda.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, and thank you for your work on that. You're finding your way into the At-Large community. Very nice thing, Andrew. Thank you. And then there's policy questions to and from the ICANN Board. So, I guess it's down here where it says ICANN79 at the bottom. Yeah, there you go. So, we have been noodling this idea of contention resolution for some time and whether or not to make our own statement, continue to negotiate with the GAC, or what the best path forward is,

because I think this is an issue that matters to us, but it's largely one of optics. But there's also this issue of too many millionaires playing games sort of makes something unapproachable by the kinds of folks we want to apply for names.

And so, that's why these private auctions and things like that sort of give us pause. And that's true for the GAC as well. And so, the question for the Board is, what would represent success around this issue? And that's something I think we can answer. What the best way is to get there is something that there's some contention about. But what we want out of it, I think, is fairly clear. Then the other one is, what are the top three topics that ASCII sees as essential to be addressed before going into the next round? And so, Justine will be handling that part of the conversation and trying to just sort of boil down to what our top priorities are there.

And then also, time permitting, what do we want to know about the ombudsman selection process? And Sebastian will be helping manage that part of the conversation. And then in terms of our questions to the Board, we wanted to pursue this issue of the prohibition of the auction proceeds members from participating in the program that came out of it, the grant program. And so, Alan's going to be leading that part of the conversation, because that was a surprise to many that spent a lot of time working on what to do with the proceeds.

And then finally, there's this question about all these other topics, all these other activities going on around Internet governance and deliberations about Net1DL and WSIS+20, et cetera. And so, the question kind of is, how can ICANN support real multi-stakeholder

participation, particularly with the end-user voice in some of these different fora? And so, that's providing materials and briefing and things like that, and trying to figure out where we can be most helpful and effective in these conversations that are taking place around the world. So, those were our questions to the Board. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I didn't realize I was the shepherd on the auction proceeds one, but I'm happy to do it. I really do need some guidance on this though, because ALAC people have taken, or At-Large people have taken, two different positions. One, everyone agrees they can't remember putting this rule in the recommendations, but we did. So, are we asking that they sadly follow the rule, but don't expand it wider, or are we looking for a mechanism by which we can ignore the recommendation that was actually made? Because those are two very different things.

Essentially, the difference is, the recommendation said you can't own the group if you participated in the PDP. You can't own a group that's making an application, but you could be an advisor, you can be someone who's involved peripherally, as long as it's not yours and the money doesn't come to you. So, I'm not really sure which position the ALAC wants to take. My personal one is, I can't see a way that we can undo the recommendation, no matter how unfortunate it is. But that's livable in my mind, whereas the can't-be-involved is not livable.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right. I think that's where we settled. You're right to say that in the previous conversations, we brought up both, but I feel like where we settled, and we might not have done a formal vote on it, but was on that second option of not expanding the recommendation that got made by the original PDP. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, it's Judith Hellerstein for the record. So, I was on the committee. I know we had a conflict of interest forms, and we said that we would benefit or not benefit, but there was a very difference for saying your organization is going to submit a grant to being an advisor or advising other groups that this grant exists and this is the way of doing it, and advising them what's to be included, what's not to be included, what do the words mean, what not. And we certainly never said we can't be an advisor. The advisor thing was never listed. It just said that we are not representing any groups as sole representatives.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And that's what we agreed to, but we also agreed that there would be a panel set up of ICANN volunteers to review these in addition to the professional grant, but it will be a separate panel of other people. And I don't see that happening either, and so that was a second point, but I do think we need to come down hard in saying there's a very difference

in ownership and advising, and they seem to think that advising is included and is not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I think that's where we are.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And I'm happy to help out on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. At this point, I think we're all violently agreeing with each other. I'll be honest. The issue of ICANN volunteers reviewing applications is something that was tossed out. I don't think it was in the final report. I may be wrong, but I don't believe it was there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, and it's certainly not something that we've had reached any consensus on internally as a point for this discussion, so I think the only one is really about the advisory role is the point that we're trying to make. Let's be as precise and specific as we can in this discussion. So, with that, I guess it's back to you, Olivier and Hadia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and just as well, because we have two minutes until the end of today's call, we're now going into any other business. I am not seeing any hands up. Okay. So, that pretty much takes us then to when will our next call take place, and as you know, this week is the week where we have our prep week, and there are quite a few calls on prep week. Next week is the week before travel. I'm really sorry. We haven't really discussed on whether we want to have a call that close to the face-to-face meeting. In theory, we could meet on Wednesday the 28th of February. Any objections to this? Okay.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Today is the 21st of February.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, that's right, and 28th is next week.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, yeah, some of us are traveling or at nothing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I would tend to say let's have a meeting, but it's going to be a light one, but if anything has changed that we want to get out, it's there and people can listen to the afterwards. It probably won't be a very long

one, but I would suggest it's probably worth happening for those who are not yet traveling. Just my opinion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Point taken, Alan. Yeah, thank you. Point taken. Okay. So, that's our next call, and in strict rotation. So, I believe, and that's going to be confirmed by staff, it will be 1400 or is it going to be the 1900? I'm not sure on this one because I see it written as 1400.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I hated that just by the way. I'm feeling particularly overwhelmed with the consistent night-time business that ICANN's pressing on volunteers at the moment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you, Cheryl. I'm not quite sure why we are on 1400. Yeşim, may I turn to you please?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Olivier. So, the reason for this week to have it at 1400 UTC, another 1400 UTC was because of the past week actually to avoid the clash. And for next week, I would like to underline that we are not going to have interpretation provided for next week either because staff is traveling. So, no interpretation again, unfortunately, next week. And I will actually ask Andrew, sorry, Andrew, for putting you on the spot. But maybe there was a specific reason for 1400 UTC, it might be

because of staff traveling, so am I supposed to offer 1400 UTC again, or are we good to do 1900 UTC?

ANDREW CHEN: We're good to do 1900 UTC, I was just trying to keep to the original rotation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Andrew, let's then in light of the fact that we've now had two calls at 1400, let's have next week at 1900 UTC.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Okay. Well noted. And are we going with 60 minutes or 90 minutes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As short as possible please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, exactly. I think we'll have a 60 minute, we've dealt with perhaps 60 minutes this week, we can do a 60 minute in any way, if we have more things to discuss than the time allocated, a few days later everyone will have the joy of seeing each other and discussing this face-to-face, so perfect. 1900 UTC it is.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Okay. So, 1900 UTC, 60 minutes without interpretation, however we will, as usual, request real-time transcription service.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you very much, thanks to everyone who has participated in today's call and have done all the updates, of course, to a transcriber as well and please don't forget there are, I'm not going to go through the whole list, but there are a lot of very interesting prep week calls and so I hope to be able to see you on those and we'll all be ready. Thank you and have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, wherever you are.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you all for joining today's meeting, this meeting is now adjourned, have a great rest of the day, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]