
ICANN81 | AGM – At-Large Leadership Wrap Up
Thursday, November 14, 2024 – 15:00 to 16:00 TRT

YESIM SAGLAM:

Hello, and welcome to the At-Large Leadership Wrap Up. My name is Yesim Saglam, and I'm 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 and ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom.

When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom, onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC chair. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Yesim, and thank all of you. We got a full house here, it's always great to see. We made it. We made it to the end of the meeting. We had a great intervention from Tijani at the public forum on behalf of underserved communities, so thank you for that. And the purpose of this session is just kind of to wrap up as the name implies, and get

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.

people's reactions and action items from the meetings they attended, kind of hear what's going on and think about what's next.

And then we also, because it's an AGM, have some folks who are leaving their positions and people that are coming in. So we'll address that a little bit as well. So that's the aim of the meeting. So what I thought I would do is go right into the highlights and start with the leaves and reports. So I'm gonna start with Justine Chew, tell us a little bit about what's going on in the GNSO.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Jonathan. This is Justine for the record. So, just touching upon some things that GNSO Council have decided on or in the midst of deciding. We had a council meeting yesterday and two things. One is the EPDP on IDNs Phase Two report was adopted unanimously.

So well done to our team and to that PDP who has basically finished that work now. So that report goes to the Board for consideration and hopefully adoption, and then through to implementation if it's approved. We don't know at this stage, actually, I pretty much know that if it is adopted by the Board, then technically speaking, there should be an implementation team that does the implementation.

But I suspect that it will come back to the SubPro IRT IDN track to look at for implementation. The second thing is the motion that Council put up for initiating the PDP, and it's a PDP, not EPDP, PDP on diacritics, Latin diacritics, that was also unanimously adopted. So the decision

basically is to initiate a PDP on Latin diacritics. That is the good news about that portion.

The not so good news at this point in time is the charter for that PDP has not been decided upon yet. Council had decided to split the motion, usually it's a motion to initiate the PDP together with the charter.

But in this instance, council decided to split that motion because I think there was no quarrel about the fact that we need a PDP to do that policy work. But there is still some questions as to what the scope of that PDP should be, which is why they had two elements.

One of the questions about why the initiation and the scope was split into two motions is because in terms of the scope, there's a question that was raised at the 11th hour, and it kind of attempted to, if I may put it very simplistically, it kind of attempted to change the scope. So I think council is taking action to not let that happen and to make sure that the charter is clear to disallow that from happening, not gonna go to mechanics or what is being attempted to be changed.

The second thing in terms of the charter was the nature of the PDP, whether it was going to be open plus rep model or just open. And I just want to mention that I think some counselors prefer the open method because number one, I think generally speaking, the community is in favor of this PDP or everyone acknowledges that there is a problem to be fixed.

So I don't think there's gonna be any contention, which is why some councilors said, it should just be open and you don't need reps really.

There is a little bit about why a rep is intended or needed in this case, maybe not. But the point is that staff and councils have sort of fallen into a default that every PDP tends to be an open plus rep model.

And that shouldn't be the case. Even I have advocated that the default should be open model, and if there is a need, then you move towards an open rep model. So that's that. But I believe that the charter of this PDP will be decided upon in the next meeting, the December meeting.

The other couple things. One is the decision to defer the RPMs, the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group to review the UDRP, that motion has also been passed, so it's been deferred for another six months. But there is some issues about the policy status report that councilors think that should be a little bit more accurate. But that's nothing for us to get into really.

But I just want to mention that some of the councilors also indicate that councilors shouldn't just by default keep pushing this back because it's been pushed back a number of times. And the reason for that is the UDRP is very much in the domain of WIPO as one of the largest service providers for the UDRP service. And the UDRP, sorry, the WIPO and ICA, the Internet Commerce Association, have now gone and started their own kind of policy working group to review the UDRP, which is what the RPM working group is meant to do.

So the point being that because council keeps delaying the work, someone else outside the GNSO mechanism is now attempting to expedite that work. I'm not gonna get into that. There is a disagreement on council whether that is, they think that is a good idea

or that's a bad thing, and they don't want council to be pushed in that way. But let's leave it aside. But just an update.

The other thing was, yeah, there was a mention of whether there was a need to have a GNSO liaison to the ALAC as a reciprocal kind of thing. And I was asked to comment on that, and I said basically, GNSO Council has their own right or decision that they want to make if they want to appoint someone from GNSO to the ALAC. But I said, in so far as my role has been, it is very much a GNSO liaison role to the ALAC as much as it is an ALAC role to GNSO. So I personally didn't think there was a need to have a second person coming here. And I think I'll stop there if there's any questions

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Any questions, quick, for Justine? Satish, go ahead, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Justine. This is really good news for ALAC, both the resolutions. I have a clarification question regarding the diacritic resolutions. The third resolution says the completion of this PDP is not a dependency for the launch of the application process for new gTLDs. Now, there is an obvious surface meaning to this, but is there anything deeper than that, or just that it is not a kind of roadblock?

JUSTINE CHEW:

You're right. This is Justine. This is not a roadblock, it's not meant to stop the next round from launching. So it's not meant to delay anything

about the next round. They just wanted to make it clear to everybody that that is the case. And it's not inconsistent with policy, even SubPro says nothing at this point in time will stop the next round. If new policy comes into place, then they will just take effect as in when they are implemented.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just on the matter of timings then, considering this PDP would start now, how long do you expect it to last until it actually has its solutions or its results, and could these actually be integrated in the current round that will start? Or are these definitely out of scope now?

JUSTINE CHEW: My answer to the question is, I don't know, because, the charter hasn't been decided yet, and it's usually a staff mix and a session assessment, a general assessment of how long that PDP might take. But we also have gone into a practice of the PDP members, whoever they are, once that PDP is constituted, to have input in terms of how long the work might take.

Having said that, I think because this is a very, very focused narrow PDP, I don't think it will take as long as some of the other PDPs have taken. But in so far as meeting the timeline for 2026 in the next round, I also don't have an answer to that question because it depends on like as it is, Council keeps delaying the voting of that charter. So hopefully,

nothing else delays it and it will get approved in December, and then we can start the PDP early next year.

But as I said before, at this point in time, nothing else would stop the next round. If the PDP finishes its work, and mind you, it is not just about the PDP finishing its work, it's also about Council considering and approving, and then it has to go to the Board for approval before it gets implemented. So those also incur time lag, which we don't necessarily have control of. So I can't answer the timing question really.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. We've got a little bit of a queue. Let's end the queue here because we've got to move on. So Tijani, had to be crisp.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. I am concerned about the postponement of the UDRP decision. You said that it is now delayed for six months. Will it be a hard stop? Will it be the final delay?

JUSTINE CHEW:

I don't know.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks. Avri speaking. I would not expect it to finish-- the new PDP to finish in time to be useful on this round, unless the round slips. I mean, when you can't even decide on the charter at the time of setting up the PDP, but you have to have a delay, and then, as you said, all the end game stuff, including the comment periods and all that wonderful stuff, unless the round slips it won't make. It is my prediction. I know I shouldn't know, but I don't believe it would happen.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Obviously, in the same vein, the INFERMAL report finally came out while during the meeting and said exactly what we thought it would about pricing and bulk registrations having a high correlation to malicious registrations. And Justine has secured a guarantee that they'll reopen the DNS Abuse small team, but it'll be an interesting question whether or not we can get a timely focused PDP going on bulk registrations in time for the new round or not too. Okay, moving on. Laura. We closed the queue, Satish. Sorry.

LAURA MARGOLIS:

Good afternoon. This is Laura Margolis for the records. Well, I will give you a very brief report because the ccNSO council meeting has just ended half an hour ago. So I didn't have the time to prepare the written report, but I will just highlight some things that went on during this week. For example, the results of the survey of the DNS Abuse committee were presented during this week to ALAC just in a brief version. And during that presentation, some questions were raised to the chair of the working group, to Nick Wenban.

And also someone asked, I don't remember who, about making public their repository of information regarding the DNS abuse for ccTLDs. So I spoke with Nick and told him if it was possible to work on opening that repository to all the ALAC community. So he said he will work on that and let us know, because I think it'll be something very useful for all the community despite it's supposed to be only for ccTLDs, but of course we can always get some information on that. So I will keep you updated on this.

And another interesting thing, it's the PGA working group, which is the Policy Gap Analysis Working Group. This working group has completed part of the work, but still needs to explore some gaps that have not emerged in practical terms. So the working group is seeking to extend its mandate until ICANN83 allowing it to present its results maybe in ICANN82 and present its recommendations during ICANN83. So I will be following on this and I will send you a more detailed report on these topics.

Then, also ccNSO was discussing on the financial contributions guideline. According to the ccNSO financial guideline that was adopted in November, 2013, the guideline needs to be reviewed every five years. So the first review was undertaking in November, 2018, resulting in an improvement of the invoices process. But the second review was introduced during ICANN81. So the chair of the former finance group, sorry, focused on the historical background and the core principles of its guideline.

Also, based on this introduction, the ccTLD manager with the largest annual contribution to ICANN, which is .nl, the Netherlands, raised the topic of the discrepancy between the level of financial contributions of all the ccTLDs and the total amount of the ccTLD community considered reasonable to contribute. So they are discussing on that and they decided to make a draft charter for a new working group to review these issues. What else? Also, there is a new version of the ccNSO repository for the bylaw changes that I will also send you by email. And I will finish now with this very brief report and work on the written version. I will send you shortly. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's great, Laura. Any quick questions for Laura? Yeah, the DNS abuse report, I think was very telling, so I think it's a good-

LAURA MARGOLIS:

Yes, it was a very brief version, but the final version, they didn't launch it yet, so that's why we were presenting a very brief one. But I have that presentation, I will share it with you. And also the final one, when it's available to publish, I will also share it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sounds good. We don't have Joanna, she headed back. So Amrita, do you want to share a little bit about the beginning of the meeting with the GAC. I've just seen her at the back.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Jonathan. Amrita for the record. So we did have a discussion on WSIS+20 and a bit of brainstorming on how the GAC and the At-Large community can possibly look at working. Certain examples were shared on how certain countries have been working with the community there to develop their position, or at least to inform and to educate and also get feedback. What was felt is this is one of the topics in which GAC and At-Large can work together.

And since the WSIS+20 is something which is round the corner, I would say I think there were no places where there were any divergent views. Everyone I think agreed that both the advisory committees should be working together on it, and there needs to be more discussion on it.

JUSTINE CHEW:

This is Justine. So I gave the-- oh, sorry. I was talking to GAC about the DNS abuse stuff because that's the other agenda item on the GAC/ALAC bilateral. So I basically raised the fact that the INFERMAL report is out, and in the ALAC we have always been talking about or since 2022, I don't remember when exactly, but we have always been asking GNSO if they would look at bulk registrations as an avenue for reducing malicious actors, because we always believe that belt registration is a way for bad actors to easily get more domain names to do bad activities.

Added to the bulk registration is the element of know your customer. And we've been advocating for a baseline standard that all registries and registrars, in fact, to have some kind of baseline standards to look at these two things. And we at the GNSO, it was always said that, you know, some registries in some registrars said we don't have evidence of

this being a problem. And they wanted, and we said, well, okay, OCTO ICANN Org has commissioned this report, so everybody decided that, okay, fine, we want to wait for this report. So this report is out.

And I think Jonathan just mentioned that it actually substantiates what we've been saying. So now we're reopening it the discussion at the GNSO, but also trying to bring GAC into the picture. So I just noted that this INFERMAL report is out. I just mentioned a couple of the conclusions in the report. And my co-speaker from the GAC side also reinforced the fact that I know he actually mentioned some of the statistics in the report. And I believe we have raised certain interest in the GAC to look at this. And hopefully this is another avenue where the ALAC and the GAC can work together and possibly, maybe even ccNSO. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Yeah, just after the ALAC session with the GAC, I stuck around in the GAC room for their next session, which was about DNS abuse. And the ALAC was quoted on several occasions in regards to this report. And it just appeared as though the GAC members had received that report, INFERMAL report in their mailbox just a couple of hours earlier. So we're quite likely to see some movement in there because as usual, I guess, many countries express their real concerns with regards to DNS abuse and I think we should consider them as potential allies for the future work that we do. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. And we'll get the CPWG up and running on what we want to propose with the respect to bulk registration. So the SSAC is left. I don't see our liaison. Did anything come up in the SAC meetings that other than what we saw in our face to face with them?

It's okay to say no. So just let me know. I'm just saying. Oh, okay. Alright. We had a great face-to-face with them, they're excited to do the safe cyber campaign. They're interested, very interested now in DNS SEC automation and how it can be good for registrants. We're gonna be working on this whole, what's an end user question, again, with the SSAC. But we'll get that figured out and I think we'll be good allies on a number of things. All right. We've got some-- I'll start, I'm just gonna go geographically since I don't know who was first. So, Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Jonathan. So, one difference that we found with SSAC reporting this time and followed by another session from OCTO was the difference in the attitude towards the alternate roots. So far, there's been a kind of pushback, but this time we find that there is a tendency to cooperate and see how we can integrate with these alternative roots. For an end user, that's a significant change. And we should probably note it somewhere so that we can discuss this later. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Justine, you mentioned the GAC and the ccNSO for the DNS abuse. I think that we have to work with the SSAC mostly because they have a very good approach on that, and they are also working on the future using AI, et cetera.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Two things which I felt with regards to the SSAC. Number one, the SSAC has for some reason defined or appear to be defining domain names as being the names that are in the ICANN root. And things like blockchain domain names are not domain names, they shouldn't be called domain names. I thought that was a shift. Never heard that one before, but okay.

And the second one was the attitude of the GAC with regards to the pushing of policies and SSAC recommendations. In the past, they used to just publish and then go, there you go. Good luck. I'm glad to hear that they're now also ready to push for their recommendations to be heard. And I think that's a significant shift in the way that they operate.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I think we're partly responsible for that shift because We were the first ones to actually push one of the recommendations, so. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, thank you. Hadia, for the record. I would just note that the SSAC liked very much the video that the DNS abuse video that the ALAC did.

And they are actually looking of more like this or maybe improving that video. But this is actually what they would like to build on. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Any other liaisons? Okay. that's it for liaison reports. So I'm gonna just go over to Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Avri to talk a little bit about any session reports that were any action items or things propped up that we should know about.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. So the session reports actually are at the end, so we've got hopefully 30, well, 15, 20 minutes. We'll go through the CPWG things first, and there are some session reports relating to this. So the transfer policy review, policy development process, we had Steinar Grøtterød provide us with an update at the beginning of this meeting. And I've just spoken to Steinar and not much appears to have happened, but what he has done was to take his reports, his slides, and he's shared them over on the session reports.

On the PDP on IDNs, we've already heard from Satish and others, and of course, our friend Justine has provided with much updates. Latin diacritics, we've all heard of. The others, it appears RDRS, IANA function review, and RDA scoping team, I am not sure we've seen anything happen in this specific meeting. Certainly, what Justine has mentioned is we're not on the GNSO Council agenda as such.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So there could be a movement to discontinue RDRS. Does anybody have a sense that that's getting any traction or not?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's an open question to everyone around the table and outside.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay,

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I certainly don't have any definitive information, but there's certainly been a lot of negative reviews for RDRS and a feeling that there's really no pathway to success. Certainly, that's what I hear out of my old friends in the intellectual property constituency, but also, hear from others.

Once again, it's something that seems to be a useful tool to protect the registrars. But it was not useful for its purpose, and I've heard similar things in the Public Safety Working Group from the government representatives who were participating there as well. And I think those are being heard. There haven't been any customers, so to speak, of RDRS that I think have given it positive reviews, which in a normal market economy would mean that it was going down in flames. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I raised it because in the CPWG, we may want to make note of that feeling, the buzz that's here because some believe that if we let the RDRS thing fall to the wayside, that some of the other things like Steve Crocker's working on as outside ICANN alternatives to it that might be better, might get more attention. So maybe it's something to revisit what our position, because our position right now is fight to preserve it, and so we might want to revisit that given the general malaise surrounding it.

NATALIA FILINA:

Natalia Filina speaking. Just two words to our RDRS topic. For us, as you know, that we within EURALO hold a very great webinar about RDRS in January of 2024, and we just discussed recently with colleagues here that we might do that again one year after, and just gather speakers from European region for this discussion, not just from ICANN Org, but maybe we may do that on the high level for all regions. And we will look at the dynamic and how is going on with this pilot, and maybe it'll be not a pilot in the future. And so as ICANN Org told, that's very useful to have a feedback from our community. So let's do that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier speaking. And maybe since Greg is here were there any updates on the privacy proxy services accreditation issues?

GREG SHATAN: No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this compact report. Let's continue. Avri, I'm going to turn to you if there's any other policy discussions that we need to mention.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. Avri speaking. I don't think so. The only thing I wanted to mention about the meeting, and I wanted to find out to some degree whether it was useful is the whole thing in the CPWG we did of sort of annotating the meeting and talking about what was being done and why. And we sort of did a little bit more and as we did a regular meeting, but also annotated it that way and just curious to see whether it was at all felt to be useful to treat it that way, especially to folks that were just coming in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that was my thought. It's Olivier speaking. How'd you get the feedback? You'd sort of carrier pigeon?

AVRI DORIA: If you've got any carrier pigeons, sure.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The cats have eaten them.

AVRI DORIA: People who are there could actually speak up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The AGM in particular is a great time to be doing things like that to help people acclimate to how those meetings run. And so I certainly think it was a good idea to do it that way, and we can do a survey or something to see if the incoming leadership felt that too. But I thought that it was good. And then I know the CPWG is discussing doing some single-issue calls or something as well to kind of mix up the format a little bit. I think for some of the more complex issues, that's probably a good idea also.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. Indeed, we will have some single-issue calls, but in the meantime, we'll still have weekly calls every Wednesday at 13:00 UTC and 19:00 UTC. I love advertising. Good. I think that's all for the CPWG. We can go over to the OFB-WG, please.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Sure, thank you. Claire Craig, for the transcript record. So while there were no specific discussions to the OFB, I just want to remind you of the open public comments and let you know the deadlines and that persons can still volunteer to contribute. So the first one that will be closing is the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct on SOIs and General Ethics, and that closes on the 2nd of December. Then we

have the proposed Internet Coordination Policy Two, ICP-2 V2 principles, which there has been an extension on that, and it closes on December sixth.

Then we have the anti-harassment as well, that closes later in December. I don't have the date for that. What we need to keep our eyes open for also in December would be the Board's report on the comments, the public comments for the draft strategic plan and operations framework, as well as the draft PTI FY26 operating plan and budget, and the ICANN FY26 operating plan and budget and draft IANA FY26 operating plan and budget. So those are some of the things that we need to pay attention to. Our next meeting is, I think it's December 6th, it's the first Thursday in December, and our meetings continue to run 18:00 UTC and I think 14:00 UTC every Thursday. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Any questions for Claire? Marita, is there anything you wanted to add?

MARITA MOLL:

No, I think that was pretty good, Claire. Thanks for doing that. We basically had a report from finance, so that's what took up our sessions.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Marita. Yeah, go ahead.

-
- JUSTINE CHEW:** Just a comment to Claire and the OFB Working Group. So there was a question of the floor during the ALAC/Board bilateral. Edmon basically stood up and said, you know, can we get some feedback from the ALAC, the At-Large on the SOI and ethics policy? I think that's something that we should pay attention to as well. Thank you.
- CLAIRE CRAIG:** That's one of the ones that closes, I think it's December. Sorry, I don't have the date for it, but yes, we are aware of that one. Thanks.
- MARITA MOLL:** Marita speaking here. On that one, I was just looking at it, we're quite well on the way with people having contributed to the document on the ethics policy. Thank you. And that's December the second, I think, is the deadline.
- JONATHAN ZUCK:** All right. That's excellent. We also got good feedback from the Board on our participation on the prep Week session. That was sort of future looking about and we were well prepared for that and I think well represented. So thanks to all of you for your rigor on that. So I think we came off very well. So for session reports, I'm gonna go ahead and let Olivier manage that part.
- OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And just to close off on the two working groups consolidated policy and

OFB, if you're not aware of when they are, you can go on the alac.icann.org website. You go into the calendar and they will all appear there magically, so you can just click on them and you can keep track of these. I think it's worth mentioning that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

It's probably also worth mentioning again, that if you are on the ALAC, you're expected to be on both of those calls. So please make a point to be on them and make it the exception when you're not, and to listen to the recording when you can't be on the call because your purpose here at these ICANN meetings is to be evangelists for the positions we take, and you gotta understand them in order to play that role. So please make sure that you're on both the CBWG and OFB Working Group calls. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier speaking. So one of the things that our community was encouraged to do over the week since Sunday, actually since Saturday, was to submit some session reports. There's a page, I don't know if we can turn to it. I think magically we'll see it on the screen. There's a page with the session reports, and unfortunately, I'm not seeing so many of them filled up. And it's really easy, you just have to look at the session and next to it you've got what happened, what are the At-Large specific takeaways from this session, what are the At-Large specific action items and next steps.

That being said, that being said, on a positive note, there are some good reports in there as well. One of course, as I mentioned earlier, was the one from Steinar Grøtterød who came up with an actual PowerPoint presentation on Sunday. The session on the GAC discussion on the new gTLD program next round was filled in by Joanna Kulesza, who's of course our ALAC liaison to the GAC. On further down, I think on Monday, there was one about the geopolitical legislative and regulatory developments update.

Harold Arcos did an excellent report on this as well, which I encourage everyone to read through. Then the Universal Acceptance Strategy Capacity Building Initiative, Satish Babu. Thank you, excellent report here again. And then another one from Satish Babu, the GDS SubPro IRT IDN Sub-track work session. I don't think you can have more acronyms than in this title. And he also uses some acronyms in there, but hopefully they-- it's a good short report. Reports can be as short as they can be as long as it tells us what's happened there. On Tuesday, we only have one from Bill Juris, the SSAC discussion on Name Collision Analysis Group and new gTLDs.

And then on Wednesday, there is one from Satish Babu, again, Emerging Identifier Technologies, very complete report. And then there are a number of reports from Jasmine Cole progress on IDN related projects for the new gTLD program next round. And then GNSO RDRS, so registration directory request service committee work session from Jasmine, and then one from Amrita Choudhury, Continuous Improvement Program, CCG meeting.

And then I think for today, we haven't got the session reports yet, but hopefully they will appear. But if you did go to any other meetings, then the ones that have listed, then please, please put in your session report, just a few lines, so then we have a better idea of what happened in those sessions. I see Laura.

LAURA MARGOLIS: Thank you, Olivier. This is Laura for the records. I confess I forgot about this and I wasn't assigned like before with Andrew that he reassigned us at the beginning of each meeting, all the reports. So I think that it should be good to do that maybe for next meetings in order to have all the reports done. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any other comments? Any other suggestions? Oh, please. In Spanish. Ah, si.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LUQUE BRUGES: This is Lilian for the records. I would like to mention this because I think it's important for end users, especially for Columbia. Yesterday I participated in the delegation of the country in the ccNSO for the launch of the next bid for the .co domain.

Some years ago, it was declared a public utility, so the control was assumed by the ICT ministry, and there was a first speed for an operator. They demanded between 24 and 40% of the income, and the operator offered 80%. And this profit, this is important because the

ministry is reinvesting this in end users throughout free internet programs, wifi, laptops for schools, and so on. So this is something that is very important for my country, for Colombia, and it's important that .co is for the benefit of the whole population. And the bid started in November, and I think this should be awarded in March or April. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lillian. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And great to hear finally some good news as well. We're not all gloom and doom and it's great to see that .co, which has a lot of registrations due to its use by some non-Colombian organizations as well as an alternative to .com is now in plain sailing with a lot of money that will go to the community. I think we can stop with this positive note and go to something even more positive. So let's go over to our positive Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. I always try to be more positive than negative, so thanks for those reports and thanks everyone for your participation. Do you have something you're trying to add?

ALI ALMESHAL: Yes, some positive news as well. Yeah. Bahrain have decided to start the first pilot Universal Acceptance integration curriculum program with the universities, and now it is being implemented, and it is with four universities in Bahrain, working with Sarmad and the working

group team to launch this, which will start in December. So all the Universal Acceptance curriculums are part of those four universities officially now. And the universities plus the faculty as well have been trained by, again, Sarmad team and the working group. So they have done trained the trainer. So this is the first pilot program in this curriculum, and I think they will be rolling out very soon with other regions. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. More good news. Greg, do you want to take two minutes to tell us a little bit about your plans for ICANN82?

MARITA MOLL: Jonathan, it's Marita. I've had my hand up for a bit.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay.

MARITA MOLL: Sorry. It's on the session reports. So before you move on, I just wanted to ask what happens to these reports and how are they gonna be used to benefit the entire community in the end? Because I'm really unclear about that, they just report it here and then they go off into a deep hole or what.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The short answer is that any action item should be taken up by the corresponding work group, OFB or CPWG. That's the idea behind them, is that when there's an action item that comes out of it, that we act upon it.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Hadia for the record. It's just a quick question. Do we add the spaces as well to the session reports? Like for example, the Middle East space the Africa space the APAC? Do we add spaces as well?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Again, the issue here is not really just to create a report like a newspaper. The idea is, is there a takeaway, something our community should do something about? And if the answer to that is yes, please do a report on it so that we then ingest that into the CPWG or OFB working group. That is the intention. That's the idea of doing these section reports, is for us to take something away that we should act on, okay? Satisfy.

SATISH BABU: A quick addition. This is Satish for the record. Addition to what Ali just mentioned. For our speakers of Spanish and French and other languages, the UASG is translating these course content, the syllabus into those languages so that they also can use it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Okay, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. As you all know, the next ICANN meeting will be in March in Seattle, Washington, which is, of course, part of NARALO, and we're excited to have you all join us in our geographic region. We're planning three events similar to previous meetings in North America where we will have a town hall version of a NARALO monthly meeting.

We will have some sort of a round table on a policy or operational hot topic of interest to ICANN, and possibly may get some special guests from the Pacific Northwest where there is quite a bit of major software and hardware companies involved. I won't name names especially because we have no commitments or even any idea of what will happen.

But we may try to take advantage of where we're at. And last but not least, we're planning to have a social networking event for NARALO members along with next gen and fellows from North America. It'll be very exciting, very exclusive, you'll all be very jealous. We might go to the top of the space needle, we might go to a brewery tour, we might go

on a boat, we might take a boat from the top of the space needle while drinking beer. All of these are on the table. And so that's our three headed plan for fun in in Seattle when it's not raining, which is never.

CLAIRE CRAIG: I guess we wouldn't be sleepless.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thank you. That's very exciting. We're all looking forward to Seattle and the boat off the top of the needle. Excellent. All right. So last but not least because it's an AGM, we have some folks that are leaving our ranks and others who are incoming. And we have some parting gifts, although nobody's ever really leaving all entirely. But we have some parting gifts for our outgoing members. So let's go through them. And they're on the screen. So we have Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong from AFRALO secretary. So let's give him a round of applause. And I guess the gifts are happening over here by the translation booth.

All right. And Joanna Kulesza, let's give her a round of applause. Tommi Karttaavi, Marcelo Rodriguez, Eduardo Diaz. Go get your gift, Eduardo. And Bill Jouris. Thank you very much for your service, and I'm sure we'll be seeing more of you, but thank you for your work on the ALAC.

JUSTINE CHEW: Let him finish the incoming.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What are you trying to do?

JUSTINE CHEW: She wants you to give the gifts

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, you want me to give the gifts? Okay. All right.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Maureen, we also thank you and others who served on NomCom. So we thank you for your service.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Some incoming members of the ALAC as well. And your gift is getting to go to the CPWG and OFB working calls every week. Yeah. Hervé, Hounzandji, Emilia. Oh, my Lord.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Aren't you glad this new intake has got some amazing names?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, these are some names.

JUSTINE CHEW: Zalewska-Czajczyńska.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Zalewska-Czajczyńska. Excellent. Natálie Terčová. Eunice. There's something covering the name now. Perez, Kathleen Scoggin and Judith Hellerstein. So we're very excited to get the new year started. We've got a lot happening this spring, we're gonna be doing the safe cyber campaign with the SSAC. What are we doing now? A picture. Okay. Why don't we just do that after we close the meeting. Otherwise, it's a little bit of a-- so everybody, thank you so much for work at this meeting. Let's look forward to another great year. Thank you. This meeting is adjourned. Oh, one last thing. I'm so bad at this job.

All right. So thanks again to all of our staff who've done a wonderful job this year. Thanks in particular for Yesim, for all the work that she did on this particular trip and finding us everything and restaurants and everything like that. Thank you so much. Thank you for our fearless interpreters who always keep us going, so thank you. And the tech crew. And the tech crew.

SATISH BABU: Mr. Chair, I have a request for you. You have been absent for some weeks finishing your film, so I think that the community deserves to have this film, or at least a link to it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I promise to do a screening in the spring, maybe in Seattle. We'll figure it out.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]