
ICANN77 | Prep Week – Policy Update
Thursday, June 1 2023 – 14:00 to 15:30 DCA

ANDREA GLANDON:

Hello and welcome to the ICANN77 Prep Week Policy Update webinar. My name is Andrea Glandon and I am the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I will note in the chat shortly. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

Interpretation for this session will include Spanish, French, Arabic, Russian, Chinese, and Portuguese. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. If you would like to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom Room. And once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, please be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time

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.

transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN’s multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to David Olive. You may begin.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you very much, Andrea. Welcome, everyone, to the Policy webinar. I am very pleased to have my team and here they are recently gathered together to prepare and present to you this Policy webinar in preparation for ICANN77, the Policy Forum. The webinar will provide a high-level overview of the planned working activities of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees during ICANN77. The Policy Forum, surprise, is my favorite of the ICANN three meetings. It, of course, is the eighth Policy Forum. The first time we’re having a Policy Forum in North America and the first time we’re having a Policy Forum in an ICANN meeting in Washington, D.C. where I am now speaking to you from the ICANN office here.

So with that, I want to note that my colleagues will be talking to you about the various themes and highlights and priorities for the meeting. And with that, I will thank them for their efforts and turn it over to Dan who will go through as our moderator and emcee on the program today. Dan, please. The floor is yours.

DANIEL GLUCK:

Thank you, David. And thanks, everyone, for joining us today for the ICANN77 Policy Update. I'm Dan Gluck reporting and based out a mile away from our home for the upcoming Policy Forum in D.C. I'll be your host for the next 90 minutes or so. Today we'll have three panels highlighting some of the sessions of ICANN77 and the hot button issues for the ICANN community. After each topic, we'll have a brief Q&A. In between our panels, we'll spotlight additional information relevant to ICANN77. We're in a regular Zoom Room so you'll be able to ask questions in two ways. You may place your question in the chat by using the format Andrea will share shortly in the chat. You can also raise your hand using the reactions feature in Zoom. Any questions that we do not get to, please make sure to add to the chat and we'll be sure to follow up after the session. We're very happy to provide a resource document for the participants. Andrea will place this link into the chat as well. This document contains links and information that will follow the flow of our session. Please take a look at the document and refer to it throughout the presentations.

We're going to start with a heavy hitter in the policy world, the New gTLD Program next round, then an update from the technical realm and see how things are going with the Security and Stability and Root Server System Advisory Committees. Finally, we'll touch on some important PDPs of note from the GNSO and ccNSO and hot topics from the GAC and At-Large.

Before we begin, though, in my opinion, the finest band ever to come out of the home of our Policy Forum in D.C. was a hardcore band called Fugazi who said and probably their biggest song—and I'm

guessing most people here have never heard of the band but I'll keep going with it anyway—their big song Waiting Room, the quote is “Function is the key.” And the Policy Development Support function at ICANN is the team that I'm on and I'd like to give you a bit of a brief background on how we fit into the key structure of ICANN.

ICANN's policymaking is based off the multistakeholder model. It's a decentralized governance model and allows for community-based, consensus-driven policymaking. ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees participate in this policymaking work. And the fantastic Org Policy Team, some of whom you'll meet on this very webinar work, support the work of these constituencies. As has been our role with previous meetings, the Policy Team will be supporting 81 community-led sessions out of the total 120 sessions during ICANN77.

Something I realized during my first few months here at ICANN is that no one really wants a mystery novel. They want to cut right to the chase, get to the meat of the sandwich. And that's what we're going to do. First, we're going to start off with the New gTLD Program next round. I'm going to hand it off to Steve Chan to get us started. Steve, how's it going?

STEVE CHAN:

Hi, Dan. Hi, everyone. It's going well here. For the record, I have heard of Fugazi. I didn't know you're going to say that. I'm not sure if I agree with of the best band to come out of D.C., but I have heard of them. That means something, I think.

Greetings. I am reporting live from Los Angeles, it's a little gloomy here. I think most people would expect to be sunny in Southern California. That has not really been the case for a while now. So as Dan noted, we're going to start off with SubPro or new gTLD Subject Procedures. We have a pretty big block of time dedicated to this single topic. So the question that some of you might be asking is why we're spending so much time on this topic, given the broad remit of the policy support function and all the various things that we support. So what I wanted to do is try to provide a little bit of background and context about why we're devoting a big block of time to this topic.

So for those that are familiar with it, there was a Board resolution at ICANN76 in Cancún. That is where the Board approved a majority of the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures. I'll call it SubPro from this point forward. So the SubPro Recs. But 38 of those recommendations were placed in a pending status.

In that same resolution, the Board resolved that ICANN Org would deliver an implementation plan no later than 1 August. In that implementation plan, there are a number of community inputs that feed into that overall plan. So those inputs that overall plan are required by the 15th of June. So this is maybe not a shock, but 15 June is the last day of the ICANN meeting. That is the primary reason why we want to spend so much time on this topic because SubPro is going to figure heavily into the deliberations at ICANN77 and in the run up to ICANN77 as well.

So what I want to start off with is a high-level overview of the community deliverables that I had mentioned and just reference.

There are four of them. Three of them are squarely on the shoulders of the policy support function but I'll run through all of them very quickly. So the first was a planning timeline in respect of the outputs that were marked as pending by the Board. So I mentioned there's 38 of those pending recommendations. So in this case, it's a plan and timeline for resolution of those 38 pending recommendations.

The second deliverable is a working methodology and that's the primary thing that the GNSO Council need to work on. But this is also in reference to the Implementation Review Team or IRT. So that reference is a work plan and timeline as agreed by ICANN Org and the GNSO Council. But the primary output for the Council is a working methodology.

The third output or deliverable is again a project plan and work plan and timeline for the policy work or potentially an alternate path on how to handle closed generics for the next round of new gTLDs.

Then the last deliverable is yet another project plan. But in this case, it's for the IDNs or Internationalized Domain Names Expedited Policy Development Process—that's a mouthful—otherwise known as the IDNs EPDP. In that case, the requirement is to identify all the charter questions that will have an impact on the next Applicant Guidebook.

There's a second part of this which is it taking into consideration the consistent solution for IDN variant TLDs between the IDNs EPDP I just mentioned but also the country code PDP 4 that's going on within the ccNSO. The intention is trying to make sure that there's a consistent solution for IDNs ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs. That part is captured actually,

for the most part, in the IDNs EPDP Phase 1 Initial Report which is actually out for Public Comment right now.

So those are the four deliverables. That was my attempt at trying to provide us some context for why we're talking about this topic, giving you a preview of the things we're going to go into more detail. That said, there are other elements of SubPro that this team covers. There's the GNSO Guidance Process on Applicant Support. And there's also activities in the Advisory Committees. Those are not directly implicated in that Board resolution I mentioned when I first started speaking, but we're going to cover all things SubPro in this update. So be prepared. Hopefully, that gives you a good roadmap of where we're going, that hopefully helped set things up.

What I would want to cover first is the one of the four things which is the implementation routine. So I think this is probably the simplest of the four deliverables that the Board requested by ICANN77. So what I'm going to speak to is just really about the responsibilities of the GNSO Council and not what is more broadly implicated by the IRT or the Implementation Review Team.

So I had mentioned that in the Board resolution, it just talks about a working methodology to be agreed upon by the Council and Org. That was actually something that was agreed upon on the ground at ICANN76. It was actually a pretty quick discussion. So what was agreed upon it at ICANN76 was that because there is such a large number of output, there are over 300 recommendations, affirmations, implementation guidance, the timeline for the IRT to be able to get through all of those recommendations in a timely manner. Given how

long it usually takes for implementation, there is a broad agreement and mutual understanding that some different structure might need to be pursued for the IRT to be able to get through that work in a timely manner. So what the GNSO Council and ICANN Org agreed to was to pursue something known as an open and representative model. This is something that is common in GNSO PDPs. For the sake of everyone's understanding, the idea here is to bridge the gap between a fully open participation model, which is how IRTs usually operate, versus the need to be nimble and to be adaptable when circumstances arise. So for all intents and purposes, the SubPro IRT is going to operate like any other open IRT. So this representative structure comes into play when essentially issues arise or when the IRT believes that the proposed implementation that Org is presenting is not consistent with the intent of the working group's recommendations. And that is pretty much actually the only time when the representatives truly have a different role than the open members. And in that case, they need to go to their appointing organizations, get an understanding if they believe that the issue that is being discussed needs to be elevated to the attention of the GNSO Council. So they need to provide that official opinion. The GNSO Council's liaison to the IRT assesses whether or not there's consensus to raise the issue and that is primarily the extent of the role of the representatives. But otherwise, the IRT operates like an open model. So like I said, the only deliverable for the Council is really that work in methodology that I hopefully described in an okay manner. But everything else related to the IRT is really the realm of my good friends and colleagues in the Global Domains and Strategy or GDS group. So for those that got an opportunity to catch their webinar

yesterday, they also had a Prep Week session. They also have a session, if I'm not mistaken, on Monday. So if you're interested in the details of the IRT itself, they are the ones to go to.

So that was probably a lot to go over quickly but that was one of the four covered so far. Dan, did you have anything you want to add at this point? Any questions? Any other comments?

DANIEL GLUCK:

I was pinging you about this earlier because this is something that the Non-Commercials, which I mostly work with, there's something they're focusing on and something they're very interested in. And a small team looking at the recommendations to the Board that are still pending after the Board resolution is published at ICANN76. I know they made ground on some of the specific recommendations but do you think you can go in more depth here for their progress, for the people that are watching at home?

STEVE CHAN:

Thanks, Dan. I'm glad you were able to provide a little bit of breaking my monologue here. So thanks for breaking things up. I look forward to any other music recommendations you have.

So the next one, Dan mentioned the small team. It's a GNSO Council Small Team and this is in reference to the 38 pending recommendations I mentioned at the very start of my comments. The small team was agreed upon actually at ICANN76. The intention was for the small team to review all these 38 recommendations and

basically perform a Triage process to determine, make sure that the Council fully understood the issue, determine what they thought about the issue, and then also try to plot a path forward so that the issues could be resolved. Like I said, the Council dove in head first, and this was something that was initiated at ICANN76. So that first step of the small team of performing that Triage, that is already completed. I'm going to run through very quickly a bunch of other activities and I'll explain why I do so afterwards in a moment, but it's probably given me quite a bit of information in a short period of time.

So like I said, that small team completed its Triage review of all those 38 recommendations, it was done over just a handful of meetings. The next step was for the Council to consider the output. The primary thing they were looking at out of that Triage exercise was the proposed next step. That was actually reviewed by the Council at an extraordinary Council meeting, so a special meeting that's not part of their normal schedule. That was in early May. In that case, the Council generally agreed with the Triage exercise of the small team. They actually tasked the small team with further work, which was really about digging into each of those recommendations and try to uncover and document existing discussions, relevant recommendations that might help address the concerns of the Board, additional rationale, and even the deliberations that might all of which help alleviate the concerns of the Board. So the small team quickly completed that task and shared it with the Board.

So that document that I just described, that served as the basis for a Joint Council and Board session. That was on the 22nd of May. What

occurred there is that the two respective bodies gained a much better mutual understanding of the issues at hand, and then also got a sense of what the Council in the small team thought was a potential path forward to resolve the issues.

So all those steps I just described, that takes us to today. What I want to remind everyone is that the deliverable for the Council is a plan and timeline to resolve all the pending recs. So there is actually still work that needs to be done. The Board itself, they need to explore where it thinks the landing spot or the path forward is for each of those recommendations and it needs to share that with the Council. Why that is so important is because the Council needs to have a sense of what the path is to be able to resolve the issues. That path is going to be able to provide the Council with the ability to develop the work plan and timeline. So that's a really critical step.

So the intention is for the Board to deliver that guidance or as much of it as possible in advance of ICANN77. Then that will also be the basis of the Council's full-day pre ICANN77 working session which is really dedicated to all these SubPro deliverables of which there are four. And hopefully what will come out of that is agreement on all of these different work plans and timelines.

So like I said, that was a lot of information and you might not have caught all of it. But what I really wanted to show is that there was a lot of work done in a very short period of time and there was a shared will between the Council and the Board to work through these issues in a really collaborative and efficient manner. So I know that was maybe a lot of different steps that you might not have all caught every one of

them. But like I said, I just really wanted to show the path and demonstrate the path that was followed by the Council and supported by select Board members.

So with that, that's two out of four done. I will pass it over to my colleague, Ariel Liang, who will speak about the work plan and timeline for the IDNs EPDP Phase 2 work, which again is one of the Board's deliverables or requested deliverables for ICANN77. Thanks.

ARIEL LIANG:

Thanks, Steve. This is Ariel Liang reporting from Washington, D.C. My home is literally 20 minutes away from Marriott. So it feels pretty great to have a meeting right in my hometown here. So before I talk about the actual deliverables, I just want to provide you a general update or information about the EPDP on IDNs effort.

So the GNSO Council approved the launch of this EPDP in May 2021. This group is tasked to develop a consistent definition of all gTLDs and also develop policy recommendations that will eventually allow for the introduction of variant gTLDs at the top level. So currently there are variant ccTLDs but no gTLDs yet. So this group is tasked to do that work for the last mile we're introducing variants at the top level for the gTLD space. The work of the group is not really only focusing on the top level, it also focused on second level related to variant management mechanisms.

In November 2022, the group decided to split its work in two phases. Phase 1 is focused on top level, and then Phase 2 is focusing on second level. This split is to basically prioritize on the top-level

recommendations because they are identified as a clear dependency for the next round of the New gTLD Program. Ending April 2023, just the past April, the group successfully published its Phase 1 Initial Report for Public Comment which is scheduled to close on June 19. It actually just got extended for two additional weeks because of a community request. So if you're interested in submitting public comment, please put your input and then you will still have time to do that. What the group is looking forward to is to finalizing its recommendations based on the community input received. And if no surprises, it should be on track of delivering the Final Report to the GNSO Council by November this year.

So that's a general overview of the group's effort. And now I will talk about the Board resolutions specifically regarding the EPDP on IDNs deliverables. So it actually has the two aspects. One aspect is that the Board asked the GNSO to take into consideration and to ensure that a consistent solution is developed for variant management of both gTLDs and ccTLDs. This analysis is actually already conducted by the IDN EPDP team. They have included their analysis regarding recommendations that under similar topics that's covered by both the GNSO and ccNSO PDP on IDNs. You can see that analysis in the Phase 1 Initial Report that's published for Public Comment.

Now I will talk about the primary aspect of the Board resolution, which is asking the GNSO Council to deliver a project plan and timeline that will identify all of the charter questions in IDN EPDP that will impact the next Applicant Guidebook. So that's the key for resolution. So what this group has done is analyzing all of its charter questions and also

have consultations with ICANN's Global Domain Name and Strategy function, the GDS function, to understand what the impact may be. And through this consultation, they learn something new, which is that the next version of the Registry Agreement should also be considered part of the Applicant Guidebook because they're going to be published for Public Comment together in the future. That's the expectation. With that understanding, what the group concluded is that essentially almost all of its Phase 2 charter questions will have an impact on the next Applicant Guidebook and it makes sense to tackle Phase 2 in one go instead of further triaging its work. And also what the group did is to review their timeline and on the stand that the conservative estimation of completing Phase 2 remains the same, which is then November 2025. You didn't hear wrong. It's actually 2025. That's based on a lot of assumptions. But most importantly, it's a conservative estimation. Also, EPDP team realized delivering November 2025 the Final Report for Phase 2 would most definitely delay the launch of the next round. So it is already in process exploring mechanisms to speed up its work.

So for example, the project plan actually only have the group starting its Phase 2 deliberation after the finalization of Final Report for Phase 1. But in reality, the EPDP team has already started its Phase 2 deliberation and made significant progress on 6 out of the 19 questions already.

Then another example is that the group has requested more frequent meetings during ICANN77. So it will actually have one meeting per day and four working sessions total during 77, and all of which were

focused on Phase 2 charter questions. In addition, in the May GNSO Council meeting, the EPDP team requested at least one dedicated face-to-face workshop that will all focus on making substantive progress of Phase 2 deliberation.

So to recap, in the ICANN77 meeting, the GNSO Council will respond to the ICANN Board's request and provides the deliverables regarding the IDN EPDP. And the in the deliverable, it will state that the EPDP team will not make change to its project plan. So basically tackling Phase 2 in one go. And the conservative estimation of the end date for Phase 2 will remain the same, which is November 2025. But the group will aim to underpromise but overdeliver by exploring different mechanisms to speed up its deliberation. So one is already starting Phase 2, a discussion way ahead of schedule, having more frequent meetings, doing ICANN public meetings, and then finally requesting dedicated face-to-face workshop. So that's a general summary of the IDN EPDP effort. I guess I will turn over the floor to Dan if you have any further questions on the EPDP and I can further elaborate.

DANIEL GLUCK:

Yeah, I actually do so. Steve mentioned, when he was talking, shared will. I think that's a really good term for this because this is going to be such a big lift from all of our stakeholders and constituencies here over the next few years. The shared will to work together. And one of the other resolutions from the other aspect of that resolution, I should better say, is that the GNSO has to consider and almost harmonize their solution with what the ccNSO is doing for IDNs as well. Can you expand on that?

ARIEL LIANG:

Sure. So for the audience who may not be familiar, the ccNSO also has an ongoing PDP on IDNs. The full name is ccPDP4 on the selection or deselection of IDN ccTLD strings. So that's an ongoing PDP. The scope of that PDP is different from the GNSO's IDN EPDP because their focus is basically developing recommendations that will eventually replace the Fast Track process for ccTLD IDNs. What they cover is different but they also will cover areas that's related to variant management mechanisms issues, and those are the areas that those group have to focus on and coordinate so that inconsistent solutions will be avoided but doesn't necessarily mean every single recommendation have to be exactly the same because the nature or the foundation of ccTLD and gTLD management are different. So there will be differences. But as long as there's rationale and reason behind it, it should be acceptable.

So just to let you know, we'll give you a heads up and I will recommend all the audience to read Section 5 of the Phase 1 Initial Report of the IDN EPDP because the EPDP team has already conducted its analysis on the recommendations that are developed under the same topics that are covered by both groups. So basically, the IDN EPDP identified four specific recommendations that differences exist but they're basically related to the foundational differences between ccTLDs and gTLDs. So for example, for ccTLD you have to be a meaningful representation of a country or territory that that string refers to. But this type of requirement doesn't exist for gTLDs. So I will not belabor this point and then I'll just ask folks to read Section 5, and you can learn more detail about that. What I believe is that in Phase 2

of the IDN EPDP similar analysis may be conducted as well if they're applicable. So that's both c space and g space will be coordinated on their development of these policy recommendations. Did I answer your question, Dan? Is anything else you'd like to ask?

DANIEL GLUCK: No, not at this time. We're going to move on now to Benedetta, right?

ARIEL LIANG: Sounds good.

BENEDETTA ROSSI: Thanks, Dan and Ariel. My name is Benedetta Rossi and I'm based in France. I'm going to be talking to you about closed generics. As you may know, "closed generics" was one of the topics within the SubPro PDP charter but the working group was unable to come to agreement on recommendations. As a result, the Board currently does not have policy recommendations to consider on this topic.

In March 2022, the Board therefore proposed a Board facilitated process for a GAC and GNSO Council dialogue on closed generics. Then the GAC and GNSO jointly invited participation from the ALAC in the dialogue. Dialogue participants have been meeting regularly since ICANN75 and held a two-day workshop in Washington, D.C. in January 2023. The group is currently working on an initial draft framework for community review and input prior to ICANN77. While the work is ongoing and isn't finalized by the group, this framework is expected to include elements focused on the following steps associated with the

New gTLD Program, the application process evaluation and post delegation.

In parallel to the work conducted by the facilitated dialogue group, the GNSO Council has been working on a draft timeline and project plan for policy work to occur after the delivery of the closed generics framework—I believe that Steve touched on this a little bit earlier—should a framework be agreed upon by the group. This timeline and project plan is being delivered as specified in the ICANN Board version in ICANN76, which again Steve has referred to earlier. And the Board asked for this timeline and project plan to be delivered no later than the 15th of June to align with the broader implementation deadline of the 1st of August. The GNSO Council in delivering this timeline and project plan acknowledges that there is some uncertainty stemming from not having drafted a charter for this work yet, which establishes the scope of the work. Uncertainty stems from the fact that the drafting of the charter is pending the finalization of the draft framework from the facilitated dialogue.

At ICANN77 dialogue, participants are holding two open sessions to further progress their work and gather input from attendees on which interested community members are welcome to join. This is the last project that is referenced in the Board’s resolution from ICANN76. I’ll now turn to my colleague Julie Hedlund for an update on the GNSO Guidance Process and Applicant Support. While this project is not actually directly tied to the ICANN76 Board resolution and deliverables, it’s nevertheless an important part of the Council’s work related to SubPro and will impact the implementation of the next

round. From here on out, this portion of the webinar, we'll look at the broader work within the SO/AC that is connected to SubPro. Over to you, Julie.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you, Benedetta. And thanks for that bit of background on the GNSO Guidance Process. I'm located in Sunny, Arlington, Virginia. This is sunny today in the United States. So this is going to be a very brief update on the GNSO Guidance Process for Applicant Support, also known as the GGP. And for those of you who might be interested, this is the first GGP that the GNSO Council has undertaken. It's a fairly new process. It was established a few years ago and this is the first time it's being used. So we're breaking new ground with this activity. One of the things I'll touch on briefly is the activities at ICANN77. But first, let me give you a little bit of background about the GGP.

It all stemmed from the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures or SubPro Final Report that have envisaged some levels of substantive work taking place during the Implementation Review Team or IRT phase the work but after ICANN Board adoption of the recommendations. For instance, in topic 17, Applicant Support Implementation Guidance 17.5, the report suggests the creation of a dedicated IRT and it should be charged with developing implementation elements of the Applicant Support Program. The GNSO Council subsequently determined that the provision of this IRT guidance relating to Applicant Support is best accomplished by the GGP. In 2022, the GNSO Council approved the GGP and the working group began its work in November of 2022.

So what's happening at ICANN77? Well, there the working group will hold a working session, and in that session, it will continue to draft its Recommendations Guidance Report. Recently, the group has started finalizing the text for this Recommendation Guidance Report and it's expected to finalize that work at ICANN77. Those recommendations, the Guidance Recommendations in the report, are relating to the identification and prioritization of metrics, including indicators of success, as well as those relating to financing the program when qualified applicants exceed allocated funds.

So what happens next? Once the Recommendations Guidance Report is agreed upon, it will be published for Public Comment, and that's likely to happen in July of 2023. So just next month. The GGP Working Group will then review the public comments and adjust this report as necessary. It's anticipated that the GGP Working Group will provide its final GNSO Recommendations Guidance Report to the Council by December of 2023, if not sooner.

So that is my brief update. I'll be brief. This is actually a very important activity and one that is moving on according to its schedule to be completed at the end of this year, again, as we've said, if not sooner. So at this point, I'd like to turn it back to my colleague, Benedetta, for an update on GAC activities relating to SubPro. Over to you, Benedetta.

BENEDETTA ROSSI:

Thank you very much, Julie. I'm back now to speak about the Governmental Advisory Committee or the GAC's engagement on the

next round of new gTLDs. The GAC has been closely involved in every step of the policy development process and its subsequent steps, as the topic has been a priority for governments and observers in the GAC for the last several years. The GAC's focus on matters pertaining to the next round of new gTLDs continues to increase, notably due to the recent Board resolution, which we touched on earlier, published at ICANN76 where most of the SubPro PDP recommendations were approved.

So why is this topic important to the GAC and to governments more broadly? First of all, the new gTLDs raise public safety and rights protection concerns, for example, relative to DNS abuse and to IGO protection. Secondly, the GNSO SubPro effort will determine the application rules for the next round of new gTLDs. And finally, participation in ICANN by governments is important to develop mechanisms that preserve or protect important public policy interests, including GAC early warnings and GAC consensus advice.

So how has the GAC engaged in this effort? In order to actively engage internally, so within the committee, the GAC formed a focal group which evolved into a small group of interests of GAC members and observers. The purpose of this group is to follow matters pertaining to new gTLDs and flagging areas where GAC input or advice may be required. GAC members also participated in the SubPro PDP Working Group effort directly and provided feedback throughout the PDP process, including via Public Comments. The most recent consensus input was provided by the GAC in June 2021, and it was the GAC comment on the Final Report for Board consideration.

Currently, the GAC continues to work within the committee via the small group on issues on the next round of new gTLDs and is reviewing potential advice to submit to the ICANN Board on issues of interest to the GAC, specifically on topics that are marked as pending by the Board. There are also three processes in which the GAC is actively participating in at the moment, which we touched on collectively earlier, the GNSO Guidance Process and Applicant Support, the GAC and GNSO and At-Large facilitated dialogue on closed generics, and the SubPro Implementation Review Team or IRT. For each of these efforts, the GAC has dedicated member representatives taking part in the discussion.

So why are these three specific areas important to governments? For Applicant Support, GAC members note the importance of fostering gTLD applications from diverse applicants and increasing the number of applications from underrepresented region. Governments also wish to reduce or eliminate ongoing ICANN registry fees, find financial support. On the other hand, for closed generics, GAC members are working closely with the GNSO representatives and At-Large to finalize a framework for closed generics, taking into account the GAC advice from the Beijing communiqué. In the Beijing communiqué from 2013, the GAC had noted that exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal. It's important to note, however, that only six GAC participants are assigned to this effort and that input from the wider committee is required in order to assess whether the result is acceptable to the committee as a whole in preparation for the next round of new gTLDs. The GAC is planning on reviewing the proposed framework in detail at ICANN77 and beyond to provide input to the

facilitating group with the aim of noting whether the result is something that the GAC can officially endorse as a committee in preparation for the next round of new gTLDs. The GAC understands that if the facilitated group does not achieve an agreed framework on closed generics, this issue will be submitted to the ICANN Board for a decision similarly to what occurred in the 2012 round.

Finally, the GAC looks forward to participating in any future policy work pertaining to closed generic. Regarding the Implementation Review Team or the IRT, the GAC is looking forward to providing input in preparation for the development of the next Applicant Guidebook.

At ICANN77, the GAC will hold two GAC plenary sessions on the next round of new gTLDs to collectively discuss the draft framework on closed generics and potential input from the GAC then the potential need for GAC advice to the Board on issues of importance to the GAC, specifically on the items marked as pending by the Board. Finally, the GAC is I'm looking forward to engaging with the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board at ICANN77 on new gTLDs during the bilaterals with them, both of these groups.

With that, I'd like to turn over to my colleague, Chantelle Doerksen, who will present At-Large perspectives on this topic. Thank you. Over to you, Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you Benedetta. That was a great presentation. Very interesting. Hi, everyone. My name is Chantelle Doerksen. I'm speaking to you from Los Angeles. As Benedetta mentioned, I will be updating you on the

policy development work discussions at the At-Large community and the At-Large Advisory Committee, also known as the ALAC, continue to participate in. Then I'll tell you a little bit about the policy sessions that the At-Large will be hosting during ICANN77.

So first, in terms of ongoing work, the At-Large community continues to identify end user interests related to the New gTLD Program next round. Between now and through ICANN77, the ALAC and the At-Large community are reviewing and updating their priorities as they relate to the interests of end users. This includes looking at previous advice as well as some of the outstanding review recommendations.

As the voice of individual end users, the At-Large community is focused on distinct areas of DNS expansion, particularly in relation to the next round. As you can tell from this [inaudible], a little bit of now a couple of the areas related to SubPro that we are closely following. As you heard from my colleague, Ariel, work on the Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names is ongoing. And it's something that the At-Large is very active in and the At-Large identifies Internationalized Domain Names as a priority topic ahead of the next round.

For example, the ALAC is in support of the call for Internationalized Domain Names is one of the primary reasons for actually proceeding with the new round in the first place. Relatedly, the ALAC continues to advise ICANN to advance Universal Acceptance as part of preparations for the next round. This includes the development and monitoring of metrics on the adoption of Universal Acceptance by third parties.

Similarly, the ALAC believes that further advances in Universal Acceptance are still necessary as part of ensuring success.

Moving on to a second topic, closed generics. As my colleague Benedetta previously mentioned, this is coming. It is starting to evolve and it's moving forward. And the ALAC is considering under what public interests or consensus might closed generics be acceptable.

Then finally on Applicant Support. The ALAC continues participation in ongoing discussions related to the implementation aspects for Applicant Support via the GNSO Guidance Process, which my colleague Julie Hedlund discussed. This is also a very important topic for At-Large and the ALAC is focused on the design of metrics to define and measure what success will actually mean.

So now let's look a little bit at what the ALAC has planned for ICANN77. We're going to be hosting two sessions. The first policy session is on Monday which looks at the end user perspective on the next gTLD application window. This session will gather input from the RALOs on the New gTLD Program and allow for input from the broader At-Large and ICANN community on what the end user perspective looks like. By the end of the session, participants will have identified advantages to the New gTLD Program and possible concerns related to end users.

A second session is scheduled for Wednesday, which will be a community discussion related to the challenges of auctions during the next round. Participants will include representatives from the ICANN community, the ICANN Board, and ICANN Org. The objective of this session is to discuss possible processes that minimize gaming and to

understand, for example, how to allow smaller entities to participate in contention resolution. At-Large of interest do lie in minimizing gaming of auctions and maximizing participation, most importantly, for applicants from underserved regions. An outcome of this session is to identify one or two ideas or processes on how to minimize gaming. As I mentioned, this session is designed as a community-led panel discussion, so please come ready to participate and engage with us.

With this, I'd like to hand it over to my colleague, Danielle Rutherford to talk about the SSAC.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Thanks so much, Chantelle. Hi, everyone. This is Danielle Rutherford, and I'm coming to y'all live from Los Angeles, California as well. One of the groups I support is the Security and Stability Advisory Committee or the SSAC. As it relates to SubPro, the biggest priority for SSAC is finishing the work of the Name Collision Analysis Project or NCAP. One of the pending recommendations that my colleagues Steve mentioned earlier is recommendation 29.1 from the SubPro Final Report that was marked as pending because it was recognized but the results of NCAP may result in changes in how name collisions are managed and mitigated in the next round.

So NCAP is currently in the second study of three potential studies. NCAP Study 2 further commissioned three separate studies. The first is a case study of collision strings. So this study looked at .corp, .home, .mail, .internal, .lan, and .local using DNS query data from the A and J root servers. This case study highlights changes over time of the

properties of DNS queries and traffic alterations as a result of DNS evolution. This case study went out for Public Comment in January of 2022. The NCAP Discussion Group has finalized this case study.

The second study commissioned by NCAP is a prospective study of DNS queries for nonexistent top-level domains. So this study is aiming to understand the distribution of DNS name collision traffic throughout the DNS hierarchy. It goes into provide insights into where and how DNS data can be collected and assessed. This study also went out for Public Comment in January 2022 and has also been finalized by the discussion group.

The third study commissioned by NCAP for the Study 2 work is a root cause analysis. So this is a study that's looking to analyze various aspects of name collisions from the previous round of new gTLDs. This study uses data from controlled interruption to identify the root cause of reported name collisions. So the study is analyzing reports received by ICANN around the delegation of strings that resulted in actual name collision problems and tries to qualitatively describe the underlying root causes of those name collision reports.

The discussion group has reached consensus on this study. So now NCAP Study 2 has two outstanding work items on top of these three studies. The first is to finalize responses to the ICANN Board's initial 10 questions. The Board initially asked the SSAC 10 questions related to the topic of name collisions, and that's what kind of predicated the NCAP project to begin with. The NCAP Discussion Group is also completing the Study 2 report working on that in the discussion group actively and finalizing the findings and recommendations of Study 2.

If you're interested to learn more about NCAP, yesterday the NCAP co-chairs Matt Thomas and Suzanne Wolf provided a really detailed Study 2 update as part of Prep Week. I really recommend you check that out if you want to learn more. Matt and Suzanne are always available to answer questions and encourage community-wide engagement in the NCAP Discussion Group. At ICANN77, there will be an open NCAP Discussion Group work session. With that, I believe I turn it back over to Dan.

DANIEL GLUCK:

That's right. Great job. Everyone on this panel here, we have some time now for any questions from the chat and wants to raise their hand. Thank you, Andrea, for posting that format in there. We'll give it a few seconds here and I'll keep an eye out for any hands in the present list. All right, I'm not seeing any.

So, I'll ask a question on my own. I'm an inquisitive guy, and this question is going to go to Chantelle. We heard a lot about the plan for the At-Large, in the ALAC, and something that I just wanted to clarify, if you could, how does the ALAC make sure that end user interests are accounted for and taken into account recognized for the work that's currently ongoing for the New gTLD Program next round?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thanks, Dan. That's a really good question. It's something that the At-Large and the ALAC are working on is an internal ongoing project specifically to prioritize its own recommendations and policy work, as well as some of the review recommendations that they still consider

relevant and important. This relates to data collection metrics, as we touched on a little bit, as well as EPDP on IDNs and Applicant Support to name a few. This exercise, more importantly, which is internal to At-Large, involves both of At-Large's working groups, the Consolidated Party Working Group or CPWG, which looks at DNS policy topics such as those related to the new round, and the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group that looks at operational and governance matters. Both of these groups advise the ALAC. So a lot of the internal work goes on between those two related to this prioritization effort.

Overall, my last comment just on this is that this prioritization work is actually helping the ALAC articulate how end user interests are taken into account and how they should participate in its work related to a new round, such as with the Implementation Review Team that kicked off a few weeks ago. I hope that answers your question. Thanks.

DANIEL GLUCK:

Absolutely important stuff. It seems like it's in good hands. We're going to move on now to our first spotlight of the day. We're going to hear from my colleague Devan on how to stay informed with everything that's going on on the Policy Team. We have some publications to talk about. Devan, are you ready to explain them to us?

DEVAN REED:

Thanks, Dan. I am. Hi, everyone. I'm Devan and I am based in the Quad City area in Illinois. We communicate weekly on a regular basis. The first way is by regional monthly newsletters. These newsletters contain updates on ICANN policy, public comment, regional events, and other

ICANN related news. The regional newsletters are currently available in the following languages. Asia Pacific is available in English. The Europe, Middle East, and Africa region is available in Arabic, English, French, Russian, and Turkish. The Latin America and Caribbean region is available in English, Portuguese, and Spanish. The North American regional newsletter is available in English. Please follow the link in the chat to sign up for the regional newsletters.

The second way we communicate regularly is with the Community Digest. It's a twice weekly newsletter that aggregates ICANN announcements, news, blog posts, webinars, public comments, and other ICANN and community publications. It is available in only English and it's published on Mondays and Thursdays throughout the year, excluding ICANN weeks. You can find previous editions of the Community Digest on Archives page which will be shared in chat. Please use the Google form to sign up and receive the ICANN Community Digest today. I will pass the floor back over to Dan.

DANIEL GLUCK:

Thank you, Devan. As a committed subscriber to all those publications, I want to thank you for that and the content you send out. As a new person, being able to go through some of those old digests were really helpful. The links are all there. It's all well-formatted. So I thank you for that.

But I also want to thank you for your work with COM. COM is our Community Operations Management. That's something that launched formally a little over a year ago. Its main aims are to provide

experience and development to SO/AC support, recognize efforts already being made and assist policy and other departments with short to mid-term staffing needs. To date, over 20 COM assignments have been received with six currently ongoing. Devan has worked on the Work Stream 2 CCG, Terri with the closed generics, Brenda with advice improvements at IFRT, Julie and Natalie with the ccNSO IGLC, and Kim with the SubPro IRT. Recent adjustments have included COM feedback from requesters in addition to SO/AC support feedback already in place, and discussing with Policy Team leads on how to best move this forward. Really good stuff and I'm happy to be on a team with them. They're doing a great job.

Next, we're going to move on to another really good team, it's our technical team. Daniel shared a bit in the last session about NCAP. But now we get to hear more about the RSSAC, SSAC, and RSSGWG. Our first speaker is going to be Andrew. Andrew, how's it going?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Thanks, Dan. My name is Andrew McConachie. I'm coming from you live from Rotterdam in the Netherlands. I support the Root Server System Advisory Committee, and I'll be giving a quick update on a couple of their documents and how they're progressing.

The first document that the RSSAC is currently working on is RSSAC001 v2, which is the Advisory on Service Expectations of Root Servers version 2. This document describes many service expectations of root server operators and requires or recommends that RSS publish certain information. The first version of this document was published in 2015.

After eight years, the RSSAC felt it was necessary to update it. This document is still being worked on, it's almost finished, and the RSSAC expects to publish it before ICANN78.

The second document that the RSSAC is working on is RSSAC 002 v5. This is the RSSAC Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System. RSSAC002 specifies a series of measurements that RSOs or root server operators gather and then report back to the community. It was last updated in 2020 with version 4. And this document is actually finalized and will be voted on by the RSSAC at ICANN77.

That's been my quick update on the RSSAC. I will now hand it over to my colleague Daniel Rutherford to tell you about the SSAC. Take it away, Daniel.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD:

Thanks, Andrew. So as it is a Policy Forum, the SSAC will not be hosting a public info session for the community. Instead, the SSAC is going to be focusing primarily on advancing internal work for its ongoing work parties of which there are three. The first is studying of the evolution of the DNS resolution and how different technologies and things have changed over time. The second is looking at operational practices and registrar name server management. Then the third is looking at studying the possibilities and implications of DNSSEC DS record automation.

The SSAC also co-sponsors the DNSSEC and Security Workshop at every ICANN meeting. For ICANN77, the workshop is actually going to be solely focusing on the topic of DNSSEC DS record automation. So

the SSAC highly encourages anyone interested in DNSSEC adoption and security to attend this workshop. With that, I will turn it over to Carlos.

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks, Danielle. I get to build on some of the work that Andrew helped facilitate a few years ago with an update on the Root Server System Governance Working Group. So this is not necessarily a technical group per se but it is a community led process to develop a final model for root server system governance. This was advice from the Root Server System Advisory Committee in 2018. As a result of the broad implications of this work, the ICANN Board convened the Root Server System Governance Working Group to develop a final model based on that RSSAC advice.

The Governance Working Group has been in place since 2020 and it's been working on developing governance principles that will describe the values that the final governance model is intended to preserve. The Governance Working Group will hold four work sessions during ICANN77. It's essentially a one-day workshop for those members. And the goal was to have final principles after ICANN77 so that the GWG can start developing that final model, and eventually governance processes to implement those principles.

So if you're available on Wednesday, I recommend stepping into that room to observe those sessions. The work involves several communities and it's something that is a priority for ICANN to support,

given the broad implications of the root server system. That is my update. Dan, over to you. Are there any questions for us?

DANIEL GLUCK:

Thank you, Carlos. All three of those, very informative subjects. They might be a bit under the radar with this being a Policy Forum, so very important nonetheless. And we'll give a check out now, if we do have any questions with that one. Thank you, [inaudible], for being here. We appreciate that. But I don't see any questions. I'll ask one. Carlos, can you tell us a bit more on the RSSGWG? It's unique, it's really interesting. Who's a part of the GWG? And can you tell us a little bit more about it?

CARLOS REYES:

Can I sell you on it? Well, apart from it potentially being one of the more consequential governance decisions within ICANN since the IANA stewardship transition, I think it's just important to think about a particular element of ICANN's mission. Obviously, ICANN helps coordinate the development and implementation of global policies related to generic top-level domains. We explored that earlier with, for example, the SubPro and PDP that resulted in all these preparations for the next round of the New gTLD Program. We also talked a little bit about the policy development processes that the Country Code Name Supporting Organization develops. But another element that ICANN's mission is to coordinate the operation and evolution of the Root Server System. So if you go look at the Bylaws, there is a provision for that. It's in the public interest that ICANN supports the enhancement

of the Domain Name System, which, of course, the Root Server System supports. So this is new work for the ICANN community. It's never been done before. And the Root Server System Advisory Committee recognizes that.

As part of its 2018 advice, the Root Server System Advisory Committee identified stakeholders of the Root Server System. It includes the root server operators themselves, the ICANN community, and the Internet Architecture Board. But these stakeholders all come together within the Governance Working Group. There are members within the Governance Working Group from the gTLD and ccTLD Registry communities. We have members from the Internet Architecture Board, as I mentioned, as well as the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. There are a lot of different voices and stakeholders at the table, partly because of the importance of the Root Server System and ICANN's role in facilitating its evolution.

DANIEL GLUCK: I guess sticking with the Root Server System, Andrew, can you give us a little bit of an update on what difference or the changes that are going to be in place for RSSAC002 v5 compared to v4?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks, Dan. I mentioned that the RSSAC will be voting on RSSAC002 v5 at ICANN77 and this is, of course, version 5 of RSSAC002 with version 4 being published in 2020. There are a lot of small-ish changes. But I'd say probably the most significant change in this version is

there's now a specification and a standard way for RSOs to add their own metrics that were otherwise not part of the 002 specification.

So there were some RSOs—excuse me. There were some root server operators. I shouldn't use acronyms so flagrantly. There were some root server operators publishing some of their own statistics and their own metrics, but there was no standard way to do it. With this version of RSSAC002, they've published a more standard way to do it. I'd say that's the most significant change with this version. Thanks.

DANIEL GLUCK:

All right. Thank you to everyone here. Carlos, I'll think about that for when we start thinking about our Shark Tank theme ICANN78 update. Now we get to move back a bit. We get to speak to our ICANN76 update MVP, Ozan, to tell us a little bit about our Community Excellence Award. Ozan, how are you? Where are you based today? Are you in Istanbul? Izmir? Where are you at?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Dan. All good here. Hello, everyone. This is Ozan Sahin joining today from Istanbul, Turkey. At ICANN77, the Selection Panel will announce the recipient of 2023 ICANN Community Excellence Award. As Dan noted, I would like to give you some information about this recognition.

The award was launched in 2014 at ICANN50 in London, and ICANN77 marks the 10th presentation of the ICANN Community Excellence Award. In this year's selection process, ICANN community members

submitted their nominations from December 2022 through March 2023. Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees appoint 11 ICANN community members to form the Selection Panel. And the panel met five times with all nominees from late March through the end of May.

Selection Panel evaluated the candidates against three award criteria. The first one is demonstrated ability to work across community lines with both familiar and unfamiliar ICANN stakeholders to build consensus. The second one is being a facilitator of dialogue and open discussion in a fair and collegial manner, in a spirit of collaboration shown through empathy and a sincere desire to engage with people from other backgrounds, cultures and interests. And the third one is demonstrated additional support for the ICANN multistakeholder model and its overall effectiveness through volunteer service via working groups and committees.

The Selection Panel recently concluded this review and this year's recipient will be announced at ICANN77 on Wednesday, during the Networking Cocktail. We invite you all to the ceremony to find out who this year's recipient is and celebrate ICANN community's contributions. With that, I will now give the floor back to my colleague, Dan. Thank you.

DANIEL GLUCK:

Great to hear, Ozan. Have that marked on my calendar. Looking forward to it. But just right now, I have countries on the mind. Benedetta did such a great job in our first session talking about the

GAC. There's something that's stuck in my head. I think it's because I live pretty close to our colleague, Rob, and then I think there might be something in our municipal water that's got—it's got a lot of GAC questions going on upstairs now. As we move over to our next PDP and advice panel—it's a good thing Fabien is here because I think he'll be able to answer some of the questions I have. How are you doing, Fabien?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: I'm doing very well. Thank you.

DANIEL GLUCK: Something I've been thinking of and something I've seen through correspondence through different groups are the highly anticipated amendments to the Registry and Registrar Agreements regarding DNS abuse mitigation. That looks like that was just published. Has there been any reaction in the GAC already or do you expect any GAC input down the road regarding this?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: Yes, absolutely, Dan. Actually, the GAC has been quite busy working to prepare for those amendments and be ready to build a GAC comment that we expect would be submitted in a Public Comment process that just started. Particularly, there was a focus on capacity development. Actually, the GAC went through two webinars they organized. A number of community participants come and brief the GAC on that issue, including ICANN Org. We expect a final event for that process, a

workshop, to be organized right before ICANN77 which will focus on ensuring that GAC members are prepared for the Public Comment process and particularly new comers and members from underserved regions.

More widely as it relates DNS abuse, there's certainly been a noteworthy announcement that's been looked at from a GAC perspective, which is the informal project that our OCTO Team has started, the inferential analysis of maliciously registered domains which we'll look at drivers of malicious registrations in TLDs.

When we talk about DNS abuse, also, I want to mention that WHOIS is never too far, because it is either a tool that can help with mitigating DNS abuse or preventing DNS abuse or is critical for parties that seek to deal with DNS abuse. But that would take me to the ICANN76 Cancún communiqué. But I'm sure you've read all that.

DANIEL GLUCK: Absolutely. It mentioned advice for WHOIS to the Board, correct?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX: That's absolutely right. It sounds like you do read the communiqué because the GAC did advise the Board during ICANN76 on the RDRS and the particular issue of confidentiality of law enforcement requests. That's a piece of advice that in the meantime the Board has accepted. Work has actually been going on between the GAC representatives, ICANN Org representatives, and GNSO representatives as part of the GNSO Small Team on EPDP Phase 2.

The other piece of advice that connects the two topics of DNS abuse and WHOIS is the advice on privacy and proxy services where the GAC is seeking prioritization of that work following previous advice on that matter, as well as updates from ICANN Org on that. The GAC will certainly be looking forward to opportunities to resume that implementation, especially in the context of RDRS where privacy/proxy services have been discussed as a potential challenge to the success of RDRS. So it will certainly be a topic of the high interest.

DANIEL GLUCK:

Three high interest topics there. We have new gTLDs that was up top, DNS abuse, WHOIS. Any other topics of interest that we should be looking forward to from the GAC?

FABIEN BETREMIEUX:

There are a few indeed, and I see that you're on top of things. That's quite impressive, Dan. As part of the other topics that are not worth, I'll mention a few. One is the fact that we've talked about in this webinar quite a bit about the GNSO IDN EPDP. And the GAC right now has been working on submitting a comment that we expect will be supportive of the Phase 1 Initial Report. That's one important topic. A second one is some in the community may remember the joint GAC-ALAC advice statement, and I will quote here, on enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation at ICANN. This was in 2017, ICANN60, Abu Dhabi. I think this is one statement that led to the ITI, Information Transparency Initiative, which both the GAC and the ALAC recognize as beneficial to some extent. But both committees are

looking at things that ITI may not have achieved from the perspective of that advice, in particular, ensuring that the documentation is uniquely identified and easily accessible. Another aspect also is ensuring that any documentation has an executive summary, a synopsis, and a non-jargonesque explanation to it. We'll probably hear more about that.

Finally, I'll mention in passing a short session that will the GAC will hold on emerging technologies. The GAC is not going to engage substantively. We don't expect substantive discussion of the issues but we do expect that the GAC will plan further work and sort of agree on a framework to discuss those technologies such as blockchains, alternative routes, and artificial intelligence and their impact on the Internet and the DNS in the future. That's it for me, Dan.

DANIEL GLUCK:

Thank you so much for answering all those questions. We definitely bugged you enough. So we're going to pass it off now to Silvia for an update on the ALAC. How are you?

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Good. Thank you very much, Dan. Hello, everyone. My name is Silvia Vivanco and I am speaking to you from Lima, Peru. I will be speaking about the Regional At-Large Organizations or RALOs and At-Large activities at ICANN77. The North American Regional At-Large Organization or NARALO, as RALO lead of this meeting will hold several events. The NARALO roundtable will focus on the topic "Government activity to expand broadband access in the U.S. and Canada." The

roundtable will consider various government efforts to expand broadband access in the U.S. and Canada. Panelists will include government and private sector speakers who will explore and critique federal, state, and local initiatives to make broadband more available, affordable, and usable. NARALO will also hold its monthly meeting in a town hall format to enable debate and exchange of ideas. And NARALO will also hold a networking event for NARALO members and Next Gen participants from the North American region.

AFRALO, the African Regional At-Large Organization will hold the traditional AFRALO African meeting with which will discuss and approve the latest statement on the topic improvement of African participation in ICANN. The AFRALO community will present an overview of the topic and will make recommendations. The statement will also address one of the pillars of the African regional plan for Fiscal Year 2021-2025.

RALO leaders will all to hold a RALO Coordination Session during ICANN77. The focus will be on issues which will benefit from coordinated action among all the RALOs as well as issues of mutual interest. Topics to be addressed include the first discussions on developing a unified digital onboarding process for new At-Large structures, representative and individual members, plans for the RALO General Assemblies and an initial discussion of the role of Fiscal Year 2024 Strategic Plans. ICANN's interim CEO Sally Costerton will attend this meeting as well to have a conversation with RALO leaders.

The At-Large sessions are focused primarily on policy as noted by my colleague Chantelle earlier. However, At-Large will also hold a joint

session with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee or SSAC to discuss issues of mutual importance. In terms of operational issues, At-Large record a welcome session that will provide an overview of the nine At-Large sessions and a review of At-Large talking points. At-Large will conclude with a wrap-up session that will provide an opportunity for At-Large members to reflect on their achievements during ICANN77. And with this, I finished my remarks and I hand over the floor to you, Dan. Thank you.

DANIEL GLUCK: Thank you so much. And I'm actually going to hand it right back over to Caitlin for an update from the GNSO. Correct?

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Dan, and hello, everyone. My name is Caitlin Tubergen and I am recording live from Nashville, Tennessee in the United States, home of country music. You heard it from several of my wonderful colleagues earlier in this presentation about some of the GNSO's work related to SubPro. But I wanted to quickly touch on a couple of the other policy efforts that are not related to SubPro. First, I'll touch on the Transfer Policy PDP Working Group. This is a working group that began meeting early in 2021. Their role is to review the current ICANN Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy and determine if any changes are needed to that policy. And that's the policy that governs transfers when a registrant wants to transfer its name from one registrar to another.

During its session at ICANN77, this working group plans to discuss its preliminary agreements and recommendations related to reversing inter-registrar transfers, disputes related to inter-registrar transfers, as well as the Transfer Emergency Action Contact. The group would like to invite the public to that session to hear their thoughts on some of the group's preliminary agreements.

You heard my colleague, Fabien, touched briefly on the Registration Data Request Service and how that's a topic of interest to the GAC. It's obviously also a topic of interest to the GNSO. And the small team for the Registration Data Request Service or RDRS will be meeting ICANN77. That small team has three tasks ahead of it. In short, it's supposed to be providing the Board with draft success criteria for the system. The success criteria that the group came up with was recently reviewed by the GNSO Council and that will be transmitted to the Board shortly. The group will also importantly be discussing how best to promote and secure a comprehensive use of that system by both potential requesters as well as ICANN accredited registrars. And there's also a couple of topics in the group's addendum that the small team wasn't able to comprehensively go over yet, but plans to have further discussions with ICANN Org, including during the session at ICANN77.

Lastly, before I turn the mic back over to Dan, I wanted to note that the GNSO Council will be having its standard open meeting during the ICANN meeting at ICANN77. There's usually a small time allotted for comments from the public. However, this time, the GNSO Council has

decided to take advantage of the face-to-face time and have an extended time for open mic or a town hall type session.

In terms of topic prompts, the Council will be providing those in advance of the session. We just wanted to let everyone know that there will be a time to bring your comments directly to the Council and we invite you to do so at that session. With that, I'm going to turn the floor back over to Dan who I believe will be discussing some updates in the ccNSO.

DANIEL GLUCK:

That's right. Thank you so much. A bit of a plug for the ccNSO here. Link in chat now. We should be posting our recent ccNSO monthly update. Really helpful document or correspondence that lets you see how things are going with different policy development processes. Quickly, I'm going to highlight now ccPDP3 and PDP4. PDP3 is the Policy Development Process in the ccNSO with the goal to report on and recommend a policy for review mechanism. And that's about decisions pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation, and retirement of the delegated top-level domains associated with the country codes assigned to the countries and territories listed in the international standard. A lot of words there. Read the update. It's a lot better than I can say.

PDP4, that's with internationalized domains. As we discussed earlier, Ariel talked about the need to harmonize together with the GNSO standard. But for ccPDP4, eventually that is going to replace their Fast Track process.

On the same subject, we're really happy to announce a new ICANN Learn course. The course is called Onboarding: Country Code Names Supporting Organization. It's currently available in English with more languages coming shortly. It provides an in-depth look at the ccNSO's role in supporting ccTLDs. And it's placed within the ICANN ecosystem. This course also introduces key contributors within the ccNSO as well as the ccNSO ICANN support staff. Now we have some time for any questions for this panel here.

We'll take a look. We're doing well on time. So if anyone's got anything, please raise a hand, put a question in the chat. But I'm not seeing any. I don't see anything. I don't believe so. Thank you, Joke, for posting that. Really good there. I guess we'll open up the floor to any questions from any of the other panels today. Anything from the first two that we missed out on? Anything from there. Again, I'm not seeing any hands. Not happy about it. I want to hear some participation. We'd love that. But we're the Policy and we're always available if anyone has any questions via e-mail or anything like that.

Absolutely, languages will be updated soon for the ICANN Learn course. Thank you, everyone, for joining us today. Going in the chat now, we are going to post a link to a survey for you to let us know how we did or if you understood the band reference I had in my opening. I appreciate everyone that participated today from the Policy Team, everyone watching at home. A major thanks to Andrew Glandon for doing a great job wrangling us together for another policy update. Finally, major thanks going to David for the Leadership and Policy Team and for putting a bow on our ICANN77 Policy update.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Dan. And I want to thank everyone for giving us time to go over the various activities and policy and advice work and the priorities expected ICANN77. To that extent, you got to meet some of our team members and you'll be able to see them soon as they begin traveling to Washington, D.C. for the in-person meeting. With that, I want to thank everyone for being on this call. I look forward to working with you in Washington, either in person or online. With that, allow me to wish you a good evening, good afternoon or good morning, wherever you may be. Thank you very much for all your help and participation.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Thank you so much, everyone. This concludes today's Policy Update Webinar. We look forward to seeing everyone in Washington, D.C. or online. Have a great day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]