
ICANN82 | CF – At-Large Hot Topics
Saturday, March 08, 2025 – 10:30 to 12:00 PST

MICHELLE DESMYTER

Hello and welcome to the At-Large Hot Topics Session. My name is Michelle DeSmyter. 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 today will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. And please speak at a reasonable pace. And with this, I will now hand the floor over to Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Avri Doria, CPWG co-chairs.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and welcome everyone to this session of policy work and the At-Large Hot Topics. We've got a whole group of activities for the next hour and a half or so. The first thing I need to ask is for the people who

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.

want to speak and so on to be in the room as well, the virtual room as well. It is very hard to coordinate the cards that are put up and the hands that are put up in the room. So that's why I've been asked by staff to try and get people to put their hand up in the room so they know who does what and have an order to the speaking order.

JONATHAN ZUCK

By in the room, he means the Zoom room.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

The Zoom room, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, so raise your hand in Zoom is the point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Raise your hand in Zoom, not in the room. Okay, so the Zoom room, that was one thing. The other thing is what we're going to be talking about today. So, first, we'll be looking at a few of the topics in the Consolidated Policy Working Group, the CPWG. And I should also ask colleagues to try and avoid using acronyms as we do have some newcomers in the room as well that might not be very versed with our lingo, as one would call it.

Then after that, we'll be having Avri speaking to us about the implementation review team activities. So once policy is put together, then there's implementation that has to happen. And

then we'll be looking at the fourth proceeding for the proposed language for draft sections of the, I love the thing, AGB, Applicant Guidebook. Thank you for not using acronyms on the agenda. The Applicant Guidebook, the big, big topic, that's of course for the Next Round of new generic top-level domains.

And finally, Avri will be speaking to us about the topic dive process discussion, some specific discussions that we have every now and then I think once a month that change the order in which we discuss things on the weekly Consolidated Policy Working Group calls and looks at single topics for deep discussion, hence called a deep dive process.

So, let's start with the CPWG, the Consolidated Policy Working Group activities. And effectively what we have is a meeting that takes place every week. It's rotating time. Thank you. I think there's still somebody that's got a loop. It's being rotated every week and we discuss a number of topics. We, the At-Large community has two main policy pieces of work. The first one is to take part in generic name support organization, GNSO Policy Development Processes. And for this, we actually have colleagues that sit in those working groups and that I guess relay the At-Large position into those working groups. That's when the policy gets made.

There is also a process in ICANN which is the public consultation process where ICANN asks questions about processes that have been finished or that are in development and asks for wider public input. And the ALAC and the At-Large community channel the input

of, I guess, represents the interests of the end users out there. So, it looks at things with an end user perspective and tries to provide the best input through those public consultations. And that also requires a significant amount of work. But we do that by discussing these openly on those weekly meetings.

We have in the policy work group and small team updates, the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, the Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names, the Registration Data Request Service, RDRS, which was formerly called formerly called the SSAD, System for Standardized Access and Disclosure, Operational Design Assessment, just a crazy alphabet suit.

We've got the IANA Function Review discussions. We've got the Registration Data Accuracy scoping team, all to do with when you register a domain name, the actual details of the registrant, how it's stored, how accurate is it, who can have access to it, et cetera. And we've also got a discussion on a Policy Development Process focusing on the Latin diacritics, otherwise known to normal people as being the accents on Latin characters and Latin character sets.

Each one of these gets discussed, maybe not every week when there's no update. I wonder whether we have anyone who can take us through a couple of minutes on each one of these. Andrew, I'm going to ask, do we have, for example, the first one, which is the transfer policy review Policy Development Process. Is Steinar with us? And Steinar Grøtterød is the person who has been providing us with the regular updates weekly on this topic.

AVRI DORIA

While we're looking for that, this is Avri, can I interject something? One of the things, and you just got to it, is one of the things that keeps all these things going is that there is at least one person if not perhaps more. It's good when there's two, especially if they're geographically separated, but there's at least one person that tracks it very carefully.

So I want to just point out that it's a great opportunity for someone that wants to get in a subject, that wants to get more active, that's willing to listen in on meetings every week or every two weeks to get involved in these because these are really the chance that people have to jump into what's going on and to get to know the people that are working on these topics otherwise. So, as he goes through looking for the person who's here and just to say a couple words, it really is a lot of critical roles and probably next time we do this, we should list the name of the liaison to the group because it really is very important. Thank you for letting me put in that advertisement.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you, Avri. It's Olivier speaking. So, I'm going to hand the floor over to Andrew to just take us through this list. And I know that some people are present among us. So, the people that are following these topics are present among us. And then in this case, they'll be able to say a few words. Otherwise, we'll just quickly describe what the process is.

The first one is the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. And I was asking for Steinar Grøtterød, I can't see him online. And that's to do when a domain name gets transferred. It's the work on when a domain name gets transferred from one registrar to another registrar. So, you're the owner, you might want to change providers and so on. And there's a process by which the domains can get transferred from one to the other. It wasn't a perfect process. And so, there was some work done to improve the way that it was done.

And that's still, I think we're pretty much reaching the end of this Policy Development Process. We've reached it. And handed in and the ALAC was very, very active and At-Large community was very active in providing input on some topics that were not originally included in the whole work stream. But we managed to push those topics on.

The next one is the Registration Data Request Service. Maybe Alan wants to say a couple of words on this.

ALAN GREENBERG

And if I can figure out how to get a microphone. The RDRS is the son of SSAD. The SSAD was, if you go back when European Union instituted the GDPR to essentially make personal data private, an awful lot of information that was in WHOIS disappeared. And SSAD was the, the solution that came out of a PDP to allow people to get the information who had a right to the information.

The ALAC among others said, that's a horrible solution. Don't implement it. And implement just a simple ticketing system, so we can track when people make requests. Ultimately, and perhaps not for those reasons, that is what the Board did and created the Registration Data Request Service, RDRS, as a two-year pilot project to try to find out how much demand there was or what people really wanted or something. It's not clear. That process is halfway through. We have another year to go. We are currently, the group is currently writing a report to the GNSO and to the Board on what we think should be done. Not at all clear what that report will say.

The Board is also deliberating on it though. And recently the Board, we had a presentation from a Board member, which was very encouraging. It said among other things that even though it's a two-year project, we don't plan to stop RDRS once the two years is over. There may be a replacement for it or something to enhance it. They said a number of interesting things that threw me for a loop because I wasn't expecting them.

One of them was that now information is pretty well hidden behind proxy services for many domains. They said that has to be included. That was something that was never ever said before and is a marvelous result. The other thing they said is even though ccTLDs are not subject to rules by ICANN, if we build a request system, we should allow them to participate. Can't require them to, but we should allow them to. And of course, in up until now, all these actions have been GNSO actions where the GNSO cannot talk about ccTLDs. And the Board is saying fine, but if we have a

product, it should work with them. So, some positive things coming out of it. Not clear how it's going to proceed or what the timeline is, but it's looking more interesting than it was for a very long time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thanks very much, Alan. Andrew, for the IANA Naming Function Review.

ANDREW CHEN

Thanks, Olivier. Andrew for the record. So, the IANA Naming Function Review is an accountability mechanism created as part of the IANA stewardship transition to ensure that ICANN's IANA work through the public technical identifiers meet the needs of the naming customers. There is a session at this ICANN meeting to talk about the IANA Naming Function Review, and they will be spending time discussing whether to pass the revised draft for publication and comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thanks for this. Then Alan Greenberg for the Registration Data Accuracy.

ALAN GREENBERG

Thank you. I've been working with ICANN for 19 years now. For much of that time, there have been discussions about the accuracy of WHOIS information or what it was then called now Registration Data Accuracy. In general, the discussions have been people like us

and users of the data say we have accuracy problems. The Contracted Party said no accuracy problems here, and the discussion would go on.

We have had a number of groups formed to talk about it, a number of studies done. It's not clear where we're going. There is now yet another something undergoing activity of the GNSO which will look at accuracy again. Not clear where that's going. We keep on participating because it's really important from our point of view, but this may well be the subject that never dies.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thanks for this, Alan. So, we mentioned the Implementation Recommendation Teams, the IRTs. So, I'll hand over to Avri Doria to run this part, Next Round IRT and PPSAI IRT.

AVRI DORIA

Thanks. I thought the IRTs were actually coming in on a slide of their own, but okay. So, the Next Round, and if I can I see the next slide just to be certain? No, okay. It's just part of the statistics. Okay.

So, the Next Round IRT has been going on for a bit now. The IRTs, for those of you, the Implementation Review Teams, it's a process run by the staff, by the implementation staff with participation, full participation from community members, especially community members that were part of the PDP, part of the Policy Development Process, so that-- Because just historically found that the things that people had understood when they were creating the policy are

not necessarily understood in the same way by those people implementing the policy. And so therefore it was good while the implementation was being designed and put together to do that.

So for the Next Round, what is being worked on is the AGB, the application guidebook, and each of those chapters has been discussed in great detail and moved forward. That process is one that continues moving on. We'll come back to this topic again when we're talking about review comments that are coming in because one of those sections of that is in there. Justine, do you want to add anything? Or Cheryl, do you want to add anything? Or did you, Andrew, want to add something?

ANDREW CHEN

Andrew for the record, I just wanted to point out that Michael Palage has a hand up.

AVRI DORIA

Michael Palage has a hand up. Okay. First, Justine, did you want to add anything? Okay. Michael Palage, please.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Hi, Avri. Mike Palage for the record. I could just wait till we get done all the sessions. I just have some questions and I just wanted to know when I could ask. Maybe after we get to number seven. Thank you.

many definitions. Some of them don't seem to be appropriate anymore. Some are missing. Are we allowed to change them? Or is what is in the policy immutable and cannot change? So, there's questions to ask the GNSO. We have spent the last, I guess, several weeks or months trying to phrase those questions, and we're still in that process right now. So, the answer is this was foreseen, I think, as a one or two-year effort. Good luck with that.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And one of the things, it's policy and proxy. I always fail the test on-- I know what PPSAI is, but I always fail the test on translating all the words in the acronym. So someone can do that. But one of the things--

GREG SHATAN

It's Privacy and Proxy.

AVRI DORIA

Right, but then there's the SAI stuff.

GREG SHATAN

Services. And then Accreditation. Accreditation, yeah.

AVRI DORIA

See, see. But whereas we all know what the PPSAI is. So, I'm one of those that loves the acronyms, and I think the words are superfluous, but anyway. One of the things that Alan said there is crucial for all this is that an IRT is not supposed to make policy, is

forbidden from making policy. It is the biggest sin to make policy, and therefore that's why it comes up with questions to send on. Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG

I realize I should have given a bit of a prefix for new people. Round about 2011, it was recognized that there are privacy proxy providers, that those people who essentially take over control of a domain for you and hide your information. It was decided that we really, we probably should accredit these people so we know who they are and we can identify domains that have this kind of service invoked for them.

A PDP was convened. The PDP completed somewhere around 2013. It still isn't implemented for a whole bunch of reasons I won't bother going into. So right now, we have a PDP which resulted in something 10, 12 years, 10 years ago or so, maybe 12, based on a requirement a few years earlier than that. And the question is, should we implement it? And that's basically where we are right now.

The world regarding registration data has changed radically since then. The concept of privacy proxy services has changed radically. We're in the interesting environment right now where there are several services offered by registrars that are called proxy services but they're privacy services and privacy services that are proxy services. They don't even have the right name. And there are many registrars now or several registrars that offer proxy services for free and simply give them to everyone and there's not even a way to

stop them. So, the world has changed radically since this PDP was conceived of and recommended to the Board. That's where we are.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Yes, Greg.

GREG SHATAN

Just to follow on that, I think the bigger lesson or there's a pulling back a little bit. I checked and the Board adopted the PPSAI recommendations in August, 2016 after the working group sent them to the GNSO Council December, 2015. It's very difficult to run an IRT 10 years or 9 years after the recommendations were completed. There's just too much time.

And as Alan said, there's been huge intervening and I would say superseding facts on the ground and external to us, the biggest change which changed the whole landscape of this issue was GDPR which was not in place or had just been adopted but nobody was paying attention yet to it because it didn't come into effect until 2018. And so now you basically have a massively out of date project that was designed for a different time period. It's like trying to ride a horse on the highway. So not going to work.

AVRI DORIA

Okay. Having been a member of that original PDP group, I'm not surprised to see this as its current state. But then again, I wasn't one of the proponents of it. So, I pass it back to you now for DNS Abuse.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And you do realize, Alan, when you start speaking of the early 2000s with potentially some gen alpha people that will soon join us, that is like prehistoric times before they were born. So, a bit scary.

Now, DNS Abuse is another one of these prehistoric discussions that we've had that has gone on for so long. And it is nevertheless extremely important. And I think that maybe Jonathan can take us through what we've been working on as a community.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks. Yes, DNS Abuse is definitely one of those umbrella issues and an evergreen issue. And we really dug in deep right around ICANN67, actually, and started trying to control the agenda and push both Contract Compliance and the Contracted Party House to commit to more activity in this area.

A lot of the pushback at the time is, well, it's such a small percentage of registrations, we shouldn't be so worried about it. But again, the statistics show that it's on the rise. It's increasing, in particular, phishing is on the rise. And so, it's still an issue. It's one that it's a battle that will never be completely won. It'll be a constant tug of war, if you will, between efforts to combat malicious registrations and efforts to use artificial intelligence and other tools to facilitate it. And so, it's all about trying to find a balance and find the balance between what's a reasonable

expectation to put on the Contracted Party House and where there's most bang for the buck, if that makes sense, right?

Back then, the first thing that happened is the Contracted Party House started or many in it created something called the DNS Abuse Framework and they signed on to it. And it was a voluntary framework that many people signed on to, but then didn't necessarily adhere to. And then the PIR started something called the DNS Abuse Institute, which has now been renamed the NetBeacon Institute. But that was an outside of ICANN organization looking at issues of DNS Abuse and potential mitigation of it.

It was designed to be separate from ICANN itself because there's a lot of caution around what falls inside and outside of ICANN's remit and the ICANN community's remit with respect to DNS Abuse because of the concerns over bleeding into content regulation, right? And that's at the epicenter of some of the disputes around DNS Abuse. We saw a plenary back then about how expensive it was to revisit how narrow the margins were in the contracted parties and how expensive it was to revisit a domain that basically if they had to look at it after it was registered, they made no money on it. It was just literally that quick.

And so, it really moves in a direction of what can be done in a more predictive environment around it. And at the time, we made some suggestions that had come out of the European Union about predictive analytics where they start looking at a registration and the patterns that it fits in with respect to other registrations that

have been shown to be malicious and can you kind of predict whether or not the use of this domain will be malicious. And part of the problem again with GDPR is that to do those kind of predictive analytics really requires access to a lot of registrant data that's now more difficult to see. And so that made things somewhat more complicated.

The other issue is what should happen inside of ICANN versus outside? And so, there've been some pilots, for example, Verisign did a pilot with the FDA and trying to look at drug-related issues. And that's definitely, again, a content issue and one that I think they deemed best handled outside of the ICANN remit. There's been some talk about trusted notifiers by some in the Contracted Party House so that they could develop relationships. And in fact, Donuts, when it first came into being, had some public interest commitments around the creation of trusted notifiers on the area of trademark abuse and things like that.

So, there've been a lot of conversations back and forth about what's in and what's outside of the ICANN basket on this. But as we talked about before, if we're willing to talk about the definition as it currently sits, which is phishing and malware and botnets and spam when spam is used to deliver the other things, there are many of us that think the definition should be broader. But even if we stick to that definition, there's more that can be done.

And so, when we look at the latest research that came out of the office of the CTO, that this informal report was looking at indicators and things that tend to be correlate with malicious registrations.

And so, we're hoping to pursue some of those things in conjunction with the GNSO and in balance with the Contracted Party House. So, it's an evergreen issue on which there's sort of many points of discussion that are happening. And we're trying to focus on the things that can happen within the ICANN community.

It's within the remit of ICANN and we think bug registrations will be perhaps the most productive use of our time, the most productive reform from the standpoint of the contract to party house to where the whatever the cost is to them is most productively used in DNS Abuse medication.

So, I'm happy to answer more questions about it. I talked about it a little bit earlier, but if people want to discuss it further, I'm happy to. But it's a little bit of an evergreen issue because when you think about it, what issues actually affect individual end users, DNS Abuse is going to be a perennial one. It's one that's direct contact with end users performing the tasks they want to be able to perform online. And that's why it's such an important one to us amongst the many other issues that we pursue. But hopefully that's helpful as background, but I'm happy to discuss it further or answer any questions about it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thanks very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So, we've opened the queue. We've got Greg. Sorry, we've got Michael Palage first and then Joanna Kulesza. So over to you, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Please allow Joanna to go first. I'll stay in the queue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Okay. So, Joanna Kulesza.

JOANNA KULESZA

There we go. Thank you so much. This is Joanna Kulesza for transcription purposes. Just to add on top of Jonathan's intervention for the newcomers in the room, DNS Abuse sounds technical, but it is cybercrime and cybersecurity. So, if you're working on cybercrime and cybersecurity, this is the theme to follow. I have the pleasure of acting as our liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee. And I'm certain, Jonathan, we will agree we are fully aligned with the GAC on how to proceed with DNS Abuse.

This is me trying to highlight two things. First, DNS Abuse will come up during our bilateral with the ALAC. So, if you're interested in how DNS Abuse is being approached by governments from that cybersecurity and cybercrime perspective, that's the perfect session to attend. Second, Jonathan mentioned briefly the geopolitical issues. This is one of the breaking points, if you will.

Cybersecurity and cybercrime is so high up on governmental agendas that we would struggle to convey the message that DNS Abuse targets the DNS because we have one world, one Internet.

So, this is something that needs to be tackled at the international level because DNS in its design is international.

And this brings me to a third point. We have been hosting sessions with the governmental engagement group here within ICANN org. Veni, Elena, Alexei have been very helpful. We hosted one of these sessions, the most recent one, that focused on international work on cybercrime and cybersecurity. We've looked at the Budapest Convention again. We've looked at the work within the UN on cybercrime this time, not so much cybersecurity. These two themes are very closely aligned. They built on the geopolitical tensions. We are open for suggestions on next calls, on the regulatory updates, working meetings, online working meetings.

The plan at this point is to invite the Council of Europe representative within the GAC to speak on these two acts of law in more detail than we discussed during the last session. But that is still up for debate. And this is a good opportunity for us to hear back how we might wish to better coordinate, more intensely coordinate with the Governmental Advisory Committee on DNS Abuse issues. So, the bilateral is one opportunity.

And then we have this new standing format of monthly working meetings, not capacity building, working meetings, where we try to align the positions on DNS Abuse. That is very high up on our agenda. We are looking at WSIS+20 during this bilateral and the first meeting focused on that. So, this is just for me to compliment maybe the little bit broader aspect of DNS Abuse that is geopolitical because we have one world, one internet. Thank you so much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much, Joanna. Closing the queue and handing the floor over to Michael Palage.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Thank you. Michael Palage for the record. So, my comment here actually touches upon three of the topics. Number two, the Registration Data Request Service. Number four, Registration Data Accuracy. And number seven, DNS Abuse. I participated in the previous session, which was a joint session between the contracting parties and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group.

And with regard to data accuracy, a disturbing and concerning theme or trend that I heard discussed that I would like to bring to ALAC's attention was the topic that accuracy is merely limited to just contactability. That is the narrow definition that the contracting parties and non-commercial group appears to want to be advocating. And of concern was the point that there should be a respect of anonymity on the internet. And I actually pushed back hard on that.

I respect privacy. I think that's important. But looking at where national laws are going, recognizing that the DNS is national critical infrastructure, I do not see a scenario in which anonymity can coexist with security and stability. To me, anonymity means non-accountability. So, I would just like to kind of put that pin there, seeing how this is going to be a reoccurring thread, and hopefully, maybe this is a topic for another deep dive, but I really think we

need to look at this issue of anonymity because I think it really is consistent with not only ICANN's bylaws, but also its articles of incorporation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thanks very much for this, Michael. It's Olivier speaking. So, we're a little tough on time at the moment. I just wanted, before handing the floor over to Avri for the next part of this session, go through the statistics. If we can go forward a couple of slides, please. I don't know who's in charge.

First, the number of public comments that the community responded to, you can see they're not huge numbers, but there have also not been so many consultations that happened that we could be involved with directly. But as you can see, we've been busy still. So that's one. And then I think I can hand the floor over to Avri after that. I don't know where the next slide is. I think that's all there is. Yeah, so we had just topic dives, which we'll be talking about a bit later. Over to you, Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Let's go back to that previous slide. And yeah, just to go through the statistics on it is, yes, so anytime that there's a public comment called, we have the opportunity to respond to it. Now, Jonathan's been working very hard and a lot of others on what is our methodology for deciding when and how to respond. And basically, a sort of a composite of what is the end user impact. Is there an end user impact?

A lot of these that you'll look at, and you have to stretch to put the impact of what's going on in end user terms. And then the other thing is, how does it affect the ability of At-Large and such to do its work within the coherence of the organization? So out of the five opportunities that we had, two of them were commented on. That was the GNSO Council Assignment on Data Accuracy and the third proceeding for proposed language for draft sections of the Next Round Application Guidebook, AGB.

There's one that is currently under review, but has not been submitted yet, and hopefully we'll get to talking about that real soon now. And there's the fourth proceeding for proposed language for the draft sections. So, it's the fourth and last chunk, I believe, of the Application Guidebook that we're going to get to review before we get to review the whole thing. Then there's been a number of correspondence.

The other thing that CPWG can do is to initiate a letter, a correspondence, to either the Board or one of the other ACs or to one of the supporting organizations on an issue. And then that's passed on to ALAC to approve and send. We don't actually send the correspondence. It's sent from at ALAC. So that's the ALAC-SSAC joint correspondence regarding delegation signer DS Automation.

This one is the big bullet for me. 15 of you, 15 At-Large community members have volunteered to review public comments. That's good. It's intense work. Some of us are worse at it than others. Some are really good at it. I don't volunteer to be one of them. But there are others that really put in time. It is a good way to really get

into what's happening with stuff. So very much thanks to those people that volunteer and actually follow through and do it. So, thank you. They're essential to the function.

Next slide, please. Okay. Just other statistics. We're not going to talk about the topic dives right now. We've got that later because something more important first, but we did one on, this is basically where we spend an hour as one of our weekly meetings talking about an issue. We've done two, DNS Abuse, multi-stakeholder model and the legacy of the picket fence. We're going to talk more about in a bit, whether these are a good idea, whether they should continue because this has been an experiment. And so, I wanted to bring it back to you and I will. And then there's been 10 calls. We do our weekly call.

Next slide, please. Okay, this is the review of the fourth proceeding of the proposed language for draft sections of the application guidebook. And with this, I'd like to pass it on to Justine, who's going to tell us about the version of it. And it's important to pay attention to this because those of you that are ALAC are going to be asked to act on this a little later. So please, Justine, it's yours.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thank you, Avery. This is Justine Chew for the record. Well, I think we're jumping the gun a little bit because we haven't even got endorsement for our points before we go to ALAC, but I'm pretty confident.

AVRI DORIA

I didn't say it was going to them. I said soon, something.

JUSTINE CHEW

But I'm pretty confident that it will get there anyway. Okay. I'm one of the co-leads for this effort. That's why I'm speaking, really. But I'm also the ALAC rep on the Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team that's doing the work in helping ICANN draft the Next Round Applicant Guidebook or AGB. And for this particular fourth public comment, you see that there is a group, a team of reviewers. So, I'm just going to call them out now because I want to thank them for the work.

Seth, Eunice, Mangwala, Avri, and I did a little bit of work myself, but Cheryl also pitched in and she's the co-lead on this. So, what we did was I basically opened a call for this team to submit bullets or comments. And then we tried to narrow it down to become bullets because that's the process that we're adopting now, going by bullets, explaining the bullets before we decide whether we want to draft something or not. So, I'm not sure whether Seth and Mangwala are on the call. I don't think they are, but I know Eunice is here. So, Eunice, please feel free to jump in if I'm not covering everything.

So, this particular fourth public comment proceeding is quite extensive. As you can see, on the left side are the topics from the subsequent procedures PDP that's been covered by this fourth proceeding. And on the right side, you see there are 15 documents up for review. So, I apologize that we couldn't make the 26th

February CPWG call because it's just too much work there. But we're on target now.

So next slide, please. And basically, a team of reviewers looked at a series of, I believe it was nine that we called out as important to At-Large in one way or another. And then the rest of the six were, if we had time, we would look at it. And we did actually, I think Eunice did a lot of that as well. And this is what we came up with basically. So, the recommendation that the review team has for the At-Large and the ALAC is that an ALAC comment is warranted, should be drafted and submitted. And we are proposing these points to be included in that comment.

It goes by the order of the documents that have been listed for public comment. It doesn't go in order of importance or anything like that in terms of the topic for this community.

So the first one covers the community applications, in particular, the community priority evaluation. So, if I can just say a little bit about this for those who are not familiar, and I want to repeat also the point that Avri made earlier, is that the Implementation Review Team does not make policy. We are just there to provide guidance to ICANN org to make sure that they are implementing the policy recommendations that have been adopted correctly. That is the general rule. So, we do not make policy.

I will put a caveat on this, is that there are certain topics which were sort of farmed out, if I could put the word, to other groups, name collisions is one of them. So name collisions is in SubPro, we just had a general recommendation that said that if the previous

round's name collision framework were not replaced by a new framework, then we would keep the one that we adopted in 2012.

But the actual new framework now is done by the name collisions analysis project, the discussion group, which I was part of for some time. So that is under SSAC. And they came up with a recommendation and the Board adopted it. So in that situation, SubPro didn't deal, subsequent procedures PDP working group didn't deal extensively with name collisions, but someone else did. And because it was adopted by the Board, so the IRT has to look at it. And if there were gaps, then we could say something.

But the ones, the topics that subsequent procedures talked to that about and came up with recommendations, which were approved by the Board, we can't change them. We can't add to them and we should definitely not remove anything from them. It's just a question of whether the interpretation or the intention of those recommendations have been correctly taken up by ICANN org, which is the body that's actually implementing these. So I want to make that clear.

The community priority evaluations come back to topic one is about, is a contention resolution mechanism strictly for community TLDs. So going into the next round, there are basically two major types of applicants. You can be a standard applicant or you can be a community TLD applicant. And the reason for that is because community TLD applicants will have additional questions to answer in the applicant form and they would have to provide things like community registration policies and justify why they're

going to use this TLD to service a particular community. And ALAC and At-Large have been a very strong proponent of community TLDs, one of our ask, one of our hopes is to see more community TLDs in the next round. And because of that, community priority evaluation is like a get out of jail free card kind of thing if you can pass the evaluation. So that's important for community TLDs.

Now, the thing is, the community priority evaluation from the last round was put out very late. It was actually introduced after the application window had closed. So if you're trying to get to the points of winning this evaluation, but you didn't know what it was at the time and you put in the application, you have one hand tied behind your back. And that's what happened. So this time around, we said that everything that the applicant needs to know has to be in the application guidebook or has to have at least some reasonable notice, otherwise it's unfair to the applicant.

So community priority evaluation in particular last round had a very, very difficult target to meet. So you had to basically be perfect in order to pass the evaluation, which we thought was unreasonable. So we asked to review the CPE framework, the community priority evaluation framework. And we did that. ICANN org came up with stuff. But I'm still not sure whether it's going to work, but we are at this stage where I'm not really particularly confident in moving the needle anymore. So I think we'll just have to see what happens. To be honest, I'm quite honest.

So the comment here is that despite the efforts to improve the CPE for the next round concerns still remain. One of the concerns is that

the CPE is highly subjective. The evaluation process or whoever who does evaluation, the way they go about it is quite subjective. So they have guidelines. Yes, but that's still at the end of the day is still at discretion of the evaluator.

And the last round, for the last round, the people that they chose to be evaluated were completely unsuitable for that job, in my honest opinion. So that's why we always talk about, and we're still talking about the fact that it is important for us to be able to input into who gets picked as the evaluator. We can't necessarily do much about changing the way the thing is being evaluated, but we certainly should still put our finger on who is the evaluator. And that's the whole point of the first bullet.

And this is something that-- B is something that Avri brought up. So I don't know whether you want to speak to this, Avri? No? But essentially there are some terms in this CPE guidelines that are still not really defined. Or it's very highly left up to the evaluator to decide. Things like relevant minority opposition. There is no real definition of what relevant means, what minority means. So it's left up to the discretion of the evaluator.

The second one is financial and operational evaluation. So there is something in the financial statements that talk about the fact that you need to provide audited financial statements as part of the application process. Now, with the applicant support applicants, there could be new entities that are trying to get into the market. So they may be a startup for all we know. So with a startup, you

don't necessarily have audited accounts in at least the first year, really.

So we're just going to check whether something like that is going to impact the ability for this particular applicant to submit an application for the TLD stream. So that's the gist of it. And if there's any points that I'm not making you understand about it, please feel free to put up your hand and ask at the end of my presentation. So I'm trying to go very quickly.

Name collisions. I talked about the name collisions earlier. This is one of the areas where we can still try to fix things in a more constructive manner. And this was discussed a little bit in the NCAP as well. And just now in the previous session of the IRT when they talk about the registry agreement, there is nothing in the chapter under name collisions that talk about the fact that reporting should be available for end users that are facing or that experience name collisions.

But it is in the contract. It's in the base registry agreement that the registry agreement, the registry operator has to have reports from ICANN org, from reporters of people who are experiencing name collisions, and they are supposed to do something. The registry operator is supposed to do something about it. So we're just looking at the front end of it. So I just wanted to raise the fact that there's nothing in the name collisions chapter in the current draft AGP that talks about this reporting mechanism. Okay, next slide, please.

Application fees. So I think most of you know that the application fee for the next round is quite an exorbitant amount. It's standing at \$227, and that's just the base fee, yeah? It doesn't include any conditional evaluation that you may--

GREG SHATAN

That's in thousands.

JUSTINE CHEW

Two hundred and twenty-hundred thousand.

GREG SHATAN

\$227,000. Yeah, you said \$227, which would be a--

JUSTINE CHEW

No, I said thousand, but I didn't-- You heard as a-- Well, I'll correct myself. \$227,000 per application. That's significantly higher than what was in the last round. And as I said, that's just the base fee. Doesn't include any conditional evaluations. But that is the fee that ICANN org came up with based on the fact that they're saying that certain things have to be in place.

So there's some costs, and they have to cater for things like legal contingency if they have to fight a legal, what do you call it, a case that's filed against an application, for example. So they have this internal formula that we've been asking a lot of questions about how they came up with the figure. And they just basically arrived at \$227,000 per application.

The way I see it from the chapter is that, they have provided certain windows by which applicants can decide to pull out and get some kind of refund. But the base amount of refund that they can get or the highest amount at the moment is, I believe, 65%. So we're trying to ask whether there's any possibility of increasing that.

Because if you're talking about an applicant who's new, for example, an ASP applicant or a community applicant that's not well-resourced, they have to put up \$227,000 just to put in an application. And if they find that they can't deal with all this or they can't navigate this complicated application process and they decide to pull out at some stage, the maximum that they can get is 65% of that \$227,000. So we're just asking for the possibility of increasing that 65% higher to a higher amount.

And that is the part A. Part B is about whether there's a possibility of having more windows by which applicants can decide that they can withdraw. And then the amount of refund will cascade depending on when you decide to pull out. And the last one is about-- yeah. So this is, again, the name collisions thing. The name collisions they have to put in a mitigation plan of some sort if ICANN org determines that the string that they've chosen falls in the high-risk category of causing collision. So if that happens, then the mitigation is that the applicant has to put in something called a mitigation plan.

And we do not know what this mitigation plan looks like at the moment. It's just skeletal at the moment. We're still trying to navigate a way around this. And we don't know how onerous it is

actually. So the point here is that if one of the things that the applicant can't get through is this mitigation plan, then please also consider having a higher percentage of refunds for this because it's onerous. So that's it.

Next slide, please. I'll just keep going until I'm told to stop. And Eunice, again, please feel free to raise your hand or whatever you want to interject.

Applicant journey. So this is another topic. What we would say is that it would be useful to identify which of these evaluation process may be subject to challenge and to provide a hyperlink to that relevant section. I remember this. So the applicant journey chapter is basically an attempt to guide the applicant. It's one of the chapters. The application process is actually, and the evaluation process is actually quite complicated. It could be a subject of a master's thesis, in fact. And so you're making applicants go through this jump through hoops and hoops and hoops and hoops.

And so one of these chapters, which is called the applicant journey, is just basically like a like a step-by-step. You go through this and then you do this and you do this and that. It's not exhaustive, obviously. It's just a high-level guide. And one of the things that I thought was missing is the fact that there are challenge and appeal mechanisms that are going to be in place for the next round. But this particular chapter only talked about the appeals for objection. It didn't talk about challenges to all the evaluations for which

applicants are eligible to put in a challenge. So that's the only point I'm asking for this.

Topic 20, application change requests. So there is a section in this chapter which is the overview section, section one. As I said before, what application change request means that is that once an applicant submits an application, and if they are requested or they wanted to do something to change the application, then they have to submit what is called an application change request. And some of the changes, depending on what the change is, may have to go through evaluation again.

So there's this thing about materiality. So if it's not a material change, then it may not have to go through evaluation again. If it's a material change, then they would have to go through the specific evaluation. Like for example, if they resubmitted their financial statements and it would have to go through a financial evaluation again. Or if they submitted a Registry Voluntary Commitment, then that has to be evaluated. And what is not clear here, is that many of these evaluations incur additional fees. So that's not clearly stated in the applicant change request section.

So that's what we're asking for, to make sure that there is a reference to the fact that if you're going to make an applicant change, application change on something, whether a conditional evaluation would apply and therefore what is the fee that is tied to this evaluation.

Application questions. And I'm going to ask Eunice if she wants to take this on, if she can. I'll talk about the first one. Which is my

point anyway. So in the application form, they ask a whole bunch of questions. I can't remember how many this, I think it's 70 something questions. And the state in the form is some parts are private, some parts are public.

So what it means is, when someone submits an application, it goes into the system, the application system. And then when they are finally revealed for public comment, not the entire application will be revealed. Only the public comment, the public sections will be revealed. Private sections will be kept and they will only be retained by ICANN org and shared with the evaluators that would do evaluations on those sections.

Now, one of the sections talk about the applicant, obviously the details of the applicant. Another section talks about subsidiary and a parent of the applicant, if they had one. Or one or the other. But interestingly enough, the applicant's direct parent company and the ultimate parent company is marked as private at the moment.

And I'm going to ask the question, why is it private? Because we want to know who owns this applicant in order to determine whether they meet certain conditions like you're not supposed to be owned by a wealthy company and try to apply for ASP, certain things like that. And if say they were a part of a group that is already a major player in the market, then we want to know about things like that as well. Eunice, you want to-- Karen?

EUNICE ALEJANDRA

This is Eunice speaking. I am going to speak in Spanish. Thank you. Thank you. What we are suggesting regarding this point is as follows. We would like the applicant to provide details on the TLD community's governance to confirm that they have permanent support within that TLD community to inform how they deal with claims within that community, including different relevant procedures and including policies to make sure that the community will trust that TLD. If the applicant considers that these policies should be considered in the community priority evaluation, then we would recommend that they be included under specification 12 as well, which is part of the registry agreement. And I think that's about it. Thank you.

Oh, no. Let me go on, please. So, this is all under the community section. And it goes from questions 137 to 134. Okay. Thank you. Excellent.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks, Eunice. I needed a drink of water, so thanks. Part C is about the fact that we were told that an applicant can submit a registry voluntary commitment together with the application and not necessarily as an application change process. But we do not see in the form where this is possible. So we're just asking that question. Next slide, please.

Oh, public interest. Public interest commitments and registry voluntary commitments. There's a whole list of things here that we identified. So if I can just go through them very quickly. There is a note in the chapter that talks about safeguards. So the next round,

these safeguard public interest commitments are going to be mandatory. They were mandatory last time too, but that came in late because it was a result of a GAC advice. So it came in after the application window closed. This time around, it's going to go in as part of the program itself. So there's not going to be contention about what safeguard picks would apply or not. It is going to apply. And it's dependent on the string that you select.

So I'm not going to go into details, but just to say that the safeguard picks are already detailed. In the chapter based on GAC advice from previous meetings. And it clearly states out that the type of strings, there are four category of strings which would attract safeguard mechanisms. And the category strings are very specific. Things like one is that if the string has got very strong indication or ties to, what do you call it? High risk industry or regulated industry, then you have to have a safety pick in your registry agreement. So that's how the safety pick works.

Another one's for cyber bullying. Another one is if it's some kind of relation to military, for example, then you have to have safety picks. But the issue here now is that in the guidebook itself, the draft guidebook under chapter, whatever this is. Section 2.2. It talks about the full list of strings that would attract safety picks is per whatever, and then they put an appendix. But if you go back and look at the GAC communique or the GAC advice that produced this framework of safety picks, it is not, it's not an exhaustive list. So I'm questioning why they use the word full list because that implies

it's exhaustive. So I'm going to ask for that to be changed. And tell applicants that this is just an example of a list, not the full list.

Section 3, they talk about, they have this phrase called limited unique circumstances by which an RVC would apply if a safety pick didn't apply or a mandatory pick didn't apply. So I'm asking why the use of this phrase limited unique circumstances? Because you're being presumptive. There could be many situations that we have not foreseen that would warrant an RVC even if you didn't put in this or even if your string didn't attract a safety pick or a mandatory pick. So they bring presumptive here and it's unnecessary. It's a superfluous.

Third one is-- So there is no time limit by which an applicant can put in an applicant change request. Right up to contracting, they can put in an application request. And it's not clear to us how the impact of that happens because technically speaking, if it's a material change, it has to go through a public comment process. And they talk about the application comment process. So it implies there's only one. But the understanding is that every time someone puts in an application change request and it's a material change, then it would have to go through public comment. So that's just a clarification there. 3.2, that's just a mechanical thing.

The next two points that I want to raise is the fact that we should express strong support of what is already included in the applicant guidebook. At the moment, the draft AGB, is the fact that an RVC, a Registry Voluntary Commitment that is proposed to resolve an objection or to address advice, if that is not approved, then the

application does not proceed. So these are the two instances where it will stop the application. And it's a policy advice and it's in there. I just want to say that we should express strong support for this.

And the next one is that for all Registry Voluntary Commitments and change after, regardless of when the changes were applied for, then it should go through a public comment process to inform ICANN decision on the RVCs. So at the end of the day, when someone proposes an RVC, we have the chance to comment on it through a public comment process proceeding. But at the end of the day, ICANN org has to look at it and they have to be satisfied that it is implementable or it's enforceable before they put it into the contract. And I'm just suggesting that the ICANN org should also listen to what the community has to say about it before they make that decision. Next slide, please. Continuation. There's a-- yeah, right.

ANDREW CHEN

Andrew, for the record, apologies for the interruption. Just mindful of time, that there's 15 minutes left in this session and there are hands up from Hadia, Sergio, and Kathleen and Avri.

JUSTINE CHEW

Sure, no problem. I can stop here. I don't know whether we have time for questions because Avri also has another section to go through.

AVRI DORIA The other item can be caught in a couple of minutes. I've already mentioned it a couple of times. It's not critical, like getting through these is for continuation of processes.

JUSTINE CHEW Well, I mean, this has gone through, we shared this to the CPWG mailing list, so everyone should have a copy of this anyway. If you want to comment, please do it on the mailing list. I will stop the presentation and take the questions.

AVRI DORIA Can you, without going into details, just show the last slide and the heading just so people have, because there's one more slide, right?

JUSTINE CHEW I think there's more than one more slide, but if you can just scroll through just to see what are the topics. And the bullets, we made it such that it should be easy enough to comprehend.

AVRI DORIA Basically, the RVCs had three pages worth of bullets.

JUSTINE CHEW So this is the last page and then the next page is just a timeline.

AVRI DORIA

So on questions, we had three people and the first was Hadia, then Sergio, then Kathrine. Kathleen, not Kathrine. Yes.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you, Justine, for the presentation. And thank you also for the entire team for putting this together. And my question was with regard to the recommendation, with regard to the name collision part. So I was part of the Name Collision Study Group and I don't really get the recommendation that you're putting forward. So what happens is the recommendation basically, it describes the framework that's in place, according which applicants submissions will be assessed.

And the applicant, if the domain applied for is indicated as risky, then the applicant has the opportunity to provide a mitigation plan. And that mitigation plan would be assessed. And according to that, the domain name may proceed with some further technical recommendations. So if you could explain more of the comment that you put, thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW

Sure. So we also discussed in the NCAP DG group, and this could be before you joined it. That one of the things that needed to be included is the fact that anyone who is affected by a name collision should be able to report it to someone. That name collision is happening, do something about it. Let me finish. And it's already reflected in the base registry agreement. So there is an obligation

there. All I'm asking for is the fact that it's not mentioned in the AGB chapter. And that's all we're asking to put in.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

We're asking again for what, for mentioning what in the AGB?

JUSTINE CHEW

The fact that there is this notification by public. There's this ability for--

HADIA ELMINIAWI

But that won't happen, the public won't be able to actually give any--

JUSTINE CHEW

It is for the applicant to know that users, end users have the ability to notify of a name collision, that they're experiencing a name collision.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

But end users won't be able to notify because that part is happening before it's actually an operational--

AVRI DORIA

Can I interrupt? It looks like if you look at the schedule, we've got a ways to go. It looks like we've got a point here where we need to

have some more discussion, but three minutes here won't solve it.
Okay. Sergio, please.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO

Sergio Salinas Porto for the record, and I will speak in Spanish.
Please wear your headsets. Thank you.

Okay, first of all, happy International Women's Day to all the women in this room. We must acknowledge your fight to become empowered and gain more leadership positions everywhere you work.

Secondly, Justine, I am concerned about the following. I am concerned about the possibility of those willing to access auctions to participate in an auction, in a new gTLD auction, and those in underserved regions may have a grant. But this means that you need to have over \$5 million of revenue in order to access that benefit. In some countries, like Argentina and in many others, you will see that these stakeholders will not reach that revenue level. So that is a concern to me because this means that this is kind of tricky. On the one hand, you're telling them that they can apply and they can access this benefit. But then, on the other hand, if their revenue does not reach \$5 million, then they cannot access this benefit.

So could we add this to our hot topics so that we can, let's say, spread the message and include more people? But, let's say, unless I deal with Coca-Cola in Argentina, I will not find anyone who has a \$5 million revenue. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks for the point, Sergio. We did as much as we could in terms of trying to support applicants support applicants. If you are applicant support applicant, and you find yourself when you apply for the gTLD string, you find yourself in a contention set and that goes to an auction. Because remember, auction is the last resort. You will be eligible for a bid credit. We are still debating what that bid credit level is going to be. I think it was something at 35% or something like that. I can't remember. We were trying to get it up to 50.

So how it works is if you bid \$10, for example, then you only have to pay 65 if you win. So that's how the bid credit works. And it's only available for applicant support, applicants if you're qualified. And that's to the extent that we managed to get this through. We tried our best to change it, but it is what it is. And it's policy. We can't do very much about that. But we can still try and ask for it to be higher than bid credit amount.

AVRI DORIA

And if I can interject, and I know I'm doing that quickly, is you asked for it to be a hot topic as opposed to necessary. So it may be, and we should talk about that at some other point, a larger topic to talk about financial fairness in this whole thing, which is not a specific comment on the AGB.

JUSTINE CHEW

Sure. I think you should raise it at Avri's plenary.

AVRI DORIA

It is an Applicant Support issue, so it could be quite easily fit in there. But yes, please. And Kathleen, you are there.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

I had a financing question too, so I can wait.

AVRI DORIA

Might as well say it.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Oh, it was just it was about the credit issue. Then you just answered it basically.

JUSTINE CHEW

So yeah, we can't actually do much about this. The way it's framed now, but it can certainly be part of the next policy development process.

AVRI DORIA

And it can be a large issue as we're careening towards. Remember, the AGB is not approved yet. We've got what Jonathan said earlier is we're rushing headlong to get this done. Everybody wants to get this done. But if there are critical issues, then we should bring them

up and see where they go. That they're not necessarily AGB issues. They're larger. Oh, we we've got a whole four minutes left.

JUSTINE CHEW

I'm done.

AVRI DORIA

So you're done. Okay, but I wanted the people to look-- So what we have there is I have the impression now that except for a couple of places where we need to do some more discussion, that we've got what we want to write about, and we'll go through and make sure we've got the penholders and so on. And to meet that schedule.

JUSTINE CHEW

Yeah, thanks for the reminder, Avri. So I was going to suggest that we do a call for penholders and then keep that open until the end of ICANN82. And then I'm happy to work with whoever volunteers to write these up, assuming that we have consensus on most of these things anyway. I'll come back to the name collisions with Hadia.

AVRI DORIA

Am I wrong in thinking that we do have a general approval of going forward with these subjects, barring the ones where there are open questions? Yes. Yeah, I see heads nodding. I see no head shaking. Somebody shout if you're against it. Yes.

HADIA ELMINAWI

No, I raise my hand. I'm not definitely against it. And I think Justine is talking the part you're referring to. It's after the temporary delegation.

GISELLA GRUBER

Excuse me. Sorry to interrupt. It's Gisella at the back. Sorry, I just had to. Can you please state your names every time you speak? The interpreters have no idea who's speaking when you take the floor. And I understand even if you're doing it quickly, we're not able to hear on the other channels. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Yes, ma'am. Thank you. This is Avri speaking.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO

Sergio, for the record, is speaking. Generally, the document is fine. But I insist, I feel that it's still important to include in the document something that has to do with lowering the requirements of \$5 million in revenue so that a company who's in unfavorable situations can be placed in a way that they can ask for subsidies. That's it.

AVRI DORIA

So that can be a topic we'll talk about more after this as part of writing and such. Okay. So then we'll proceed on that. So that finishes that topic. The topic that we didn't get to and I'll come up,

but I will cover it. Oh, this is Avery speaking again. Sorry. Is that we've been doing those topical dives. We've done two of them. We did them in response to a request at the last meeting that we take some time and do some, and this is the adaption.

So what I'd like to ask is come talk about, do these work for you? Should they change? I'll bring up the topic again. I may not bring it up again until the next Consolidated Policy Working Group CPWG meeting to ask it, but please talk about it. Come and tell me whether it's working for you, whether it's not working for you. Do we want to continue doing it? Do we want to stop, etc.?

And so that was what I was going to spend more time talking about. But please, we're here for a week. Talk to me about it. And if we fit it in somewhere else, we can. Is that, yes, please, Emilia, with this last minute.

EMILIA
CZAJCZYŃSKA

ZALEWSKA- Yes, thank you very much. I just wanted to respond to your question about feedback to the deep dive. So from my perspective, I think this is a wonderful idea. Definitely, I really liked it. And I think especially for people who are newer to the environment, this is very, very helpful.

What I may suggest is not only to continue this, maybe also to take some more umbrella topics and doing the one deep dive on that, and then even deeper dives on the particular issues. So maybe it is something to consider. Like, for example, there was a topic of the DNS abuse. So it is a very large topic with different smaller pieces.

So maybe firstly, having this bigger deep dive and then the smaller deep dives on the particular issues in this area.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I very much appreciate that comment. And can I reach out to you to help me as we go along further with this, draft you into helping with this all. Thank you.

EMILIA
CZAJCZYŃSKA

ZALEWSKA- Sorry, it was Emilia for the record. I'm so sorry.

AVRI DORIA

Yes. That's it. We're past time by a minute. This is Avri again. Adjourning. Oh, oh, yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thank you very much, Avri. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And we have next steps. And next steps is just to review what we still have today. There is the ALAC Community Engagement Subcommittee, which I think everyone is really invited to take part in. That's at 13:15 local time. And then after that, there is an important discussion, the At-Large Continuous Improvement Process Initiative. That's also taking part here at 15:00 local time. This is, we briefly discussed this morning, the community improvement process. And it's very, very important that we all take part in this.

And then if you're still alive after that, there is Get to Know the ICANN Community. And that's a session with, I think it's with the fellowship, isn't it, Jonathan? Yeah, and NextGen. That's really important that you be here because you are going to be able to find people who can actually do the work for you, rather than having to do the work for yourself. Finding new people to take your place and help you out and let you retire at some point or leave the building, hopefully. But it's really important. It's really great as a newcomer coming into the community and having a welcoming community there. It's really, really good for them. Many of them, it's the first ICANN meeting. So be nice to these people.

And then after that, there's actually an ICANN82 fellowship social networking event, which I understand we are all not only invited, but encouraged to attend. That will be at 5:30 p.m. local time.

Thanking our interpreters for our lack of saying our own names. This is Olivier Crepin-Leblond closing. Avri, finished? Great.

AVRI DORIA

If I speak, I have to give my name again. It's Avri. I got nothing to say.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you. Have a good break. Have a good lunch, everyone. And to those people around the world, have a good break. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]