
ICANN83 | PF – At-Large Policy Session
Monday, June 09, 2025 – 13:45 to 15:00 CEST

YESIM SAGLAM

Hello and welcome to the At-Large Policy Session. 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 and 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. Thank you all for joining and I will now hand the floor over to Olivier Crepin-Leblond, CPWG Co-Chair.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Yesim. I hope you can all hear me in the room. If anybody can give me a thumbs up from a distance, then I can see Jonathan putting his hand up. Thank you so much. Welcome everyone to this CPWG meeting. Today we're going to have some reviews of the working group activities, the

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.

implementation review team activities, the work of the CPWG and of its representatives, of the At-Large representatives in the various policy development processes that we see across ICANN. We'll also have a review of the new gTLD, New Generic Top-Level Domain Applicant Guidebook, with Avri taking us through this, and then a discussion on the internationalized domain names and the goal of the universal acceptance process with Sarmad Hussain, the Senior Director on IDNs and Universal Acceptance Programs that will come and see us. After that, we'll have a discussion based on the checkerboard of topics that Avri has shared earlier. So it'll be interesting to see what we go for. And then the time will be up by then.

So I hope that everyone will be able to take part in this meeting. As usual, because we're now co-chairing things, Avri is on-site and I'm remote. We'll be taking both questions and comments online by putting your hand up or also using the flag, your name card, which you should have in the room. And I guess Avri will probably have to look at the name cards because I can't see anything from here. Just a couple of faces very far away in the distance. So that's the thing today. Anything that I've forgotten, Avri, on what we have today?

AVRI DORIA

Not that you've forgotten, but a couple of things we wanted to slip in so that we make the time even more pressured. And so two of the things that I wanted to slip in, and I think it's actually a good place to do them between the welcome and going through the review of

policies. And that's one, to introduce people to what you call the checkerboard, because I'm going to ask them to do something with it during the course of this meeting. And then also there was one thing that we did not get to in this morning's session, which had to do with the sessions that people would attend and who was going to volunteer to report on what, etc. So if it's okay with you, I'd like to get those two in between one and two, and then we go into things as predetermined. So if somebody can bring up that matrix, as it were. Okay, that's the discussion grid. We have a short discussion period in here. It's only a 15-minute period, and we'll probably spend more time talking about it and picking, but it was really something to try. We have a period of about 15 minutes. Hopefully, we'll have the full 15 minutes. And we didn't know what topic to put in it, and we didn't know what topic to put in it. And there were so many possible topics. So, we collected in the CPWG, the Consolidated Policy Working Group, a set of topics. And what we're going to ask is each of you that are here to go and, I guess someone will tell you where to go, to pick one, so that, and just now, to pick a topic that we will talk about when we get to that. We're not going to discuss them all now, discuss what they mean, discuss how it could be better worded. We can discuss all that later. For now, just look at these, read them, pick the one you want. The one called Topics Collection is the only one. That's a wild card. That's when you want to talk about topics as opposed to talking about a topic. And so, if you really want to do the meta thing that we do so well of talking about the topics as opposed to talking the topics, pick that one. Otherwise, pick one of these others. They're

all things that we've talked about a bunch. And there's a poll. So, everybody can go to the poll, can pick and go. You should be able to see this within the slide deck. I assume the slide deck is available to everyone. So, if you haven't finished it by the time I finish talking, you can go back to it.

I'll mention the other thing now and we can just show that. In the last session, we were supposed to have time, but then some of us talked about the review stuff way too much. We were supposed to have time to go through the agenda and talk about people going and reporting back on the action items that came up for At-Large and ALAC in those sessions. So, what we've done now is there is a list, took through, took my list and added, you know, can add to it. And I'm asking people to go to that list, and I'm sure that we'll be able to give you the URL for it. And the URL is in the chat. So, find one, put your name next to it, please. It's not asking you to write up front like in the past. You can, if you're a happy writer, please do. But just when it comes time to do the reporting back at the end, we'll ask everyone, did anything come up that we need to take action on, that we need to pay attention to, that we need to come back to? So, those are the two things. One was left over, and this one is something that's, you know, slightly different. Trying to find ways of getting more topics discussed other than the ones that people that plan meetings think of. So, please, okay to move on now? Has everybody seen this, knows where to find it? Everybody's seen the other table? We can leave the voting open until the end.

So, the voting gives you a good idea of what the topics are, even if you can't see the table.

I'll talk about, oh, let me just talk about that now. We'll have 15 minutes. I want to give people as much time to speak as possible. Each person will get two minutes maximum. I'll be playing timekeeper unless someone can help me. Make a point, the point you think important about whatever the topic is. Make one point, not your whole litany of points. Use it to speak for a minute, speak for two minutes, make a point. Obviously, respond to the comments that others have made, that's fine. And as I said, I recommend picking one point that you can really zero into in a very short amount of time to make sure that your point is heard and understood. So, that's what we'll try to do during that 15-minute period. I'll repeat this again later. Let's move on to the agenda.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much, Avri. You also have a link with the policy table in the chat, so if you haven't had a chance to make a choice yet, quickly have a look at it. And we'll start then with our reviews of what's going on. There is implementation that takes place afterwards once policy has gone through, and what basically happens is the implementation is effectively taking what's been done in the policy and making sure that it really is what is going to be implemented afterwards. I'm trying to make a sort of quick background around this, but on the policy activities, we have been following a number of policy development processes in the Generic

Name Supporting Organization, the GNSO. And regularly every week, we had an update on the transfer policy review policy development process, the expedited policy development process on IDNs, one on the registration data request service. We had one on the IR naming function review that is ongoing on. And there was one on the registration data accuracy scoping team. And there is one about the Latin diacritics, Latin diacritics being the Latin characters with accents, et cetera. And I think I might be getting some feedback very soon coming to me. Anyway, so that's what we have as far as policy development processes are concerned.

And because I don't know who is in the room, I'm going to ask anyone who is able to provide an update on their little bit, just a snapshot of where their group is now, knowing full well that some groups have actually finished their work and are now entering a process by which there is either a public consultation or it's been sent to the generic name support organization and there is a follow-up on these. I'd like those volunteers to please put their hand up and bring us an update if that is possible. And I can see Cheryl Langdon-Orr having put her hand up. So Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR

Thank you very much, Olivier, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, and both Justine and I and others who are observers who have obviously been doing a little bit of [inaudible]. And we've already held one of the two meetings that is planned for this week at ICANN

83 and I managed to scrape into almost all of it and listen to some of it this morning. Whilst we are out for public comment and you all know you're going to get pretty much a whirlwind tour of the applicant guidebook later on in the session, I won't mention that. But what I did want to mention is that we are continuing our work doing refinement of text. Today's thrill-packed an exciting venture, had us still in the RIA land, which is sort of eye-watering at times, but all worthy work. And we will be continuing to do some further refinement of text, which may not have been seen in red lines up until now, and decide whether or not some of these clarifying comments will or won't make a version that will be post-public comment guidebook. But that will be annotated and called out at the time, so worthy work we're continuing on with. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG

Thank you, Alan Greenberg. I'm reporting on RDRS, the Registration Data Request Service, which is the, I guess it's the poor stepdaughter of the evil grandmother, or evil mother, SSAD. We are at the point where we're trying to formulate what we have learned, if anything, from the RDRS. It's about a year and a half into a two-year program at this point. And what wisdom we can convey to the GNSO and to the board on what to do with SSAD, and whether it should be implemented, what parts of it should be implemented, how what we've learned has affected that. In theory, we will have a

public comment out by the end of July, inputs received sometime in September, since August is essentially dead in Europe for getting comments. And in theory, sometime later, we'll have a final report ready to be discussed at the next ICANN meeting. My personal opinion is there's no way we can possibly make that schedule, but we probably will. And that's all I have to report.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Caphan-Belon speaking. So that's some of the policy work that is taking place. I can let you...

AVRI DORIA

May I ask a question? Did I understand correctly, it's a schedule we can't meet that we probably will—If that's what you said, Alan, how do we do that? I mean, how is it that we do what's impossible? Do we short shrift something? Do we ignore issues? Or does some miracle come by that we find we can do what we said we couldn't do?

ALAN GREENBERG

I have worked on innumerable projects within ICANN where we had a schedule which was impossible but we met it. I guess there are different opinions as to how we did that in that case. The cynic in me says in many cases we simply ignored some things and went ahead and pressed on anyway. Occasionally there's a miracle, but

usually it's not a miracle. Usually it's expediency. The word short shrift does ring a bell though.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. For some reason that's become my word this meeting. I don't know why it has occurred to me. Does everybody know what short shrift is? Especially those who aren't native slang speakers of it. Short shrift is what happens when you're making somebody's bed and instead of giving them the full sheet, you bend it over halfway so that when they get in the bed, there's not enough room for their feet. That's short shuffling a bed. It basically is a way to make one sheet have the function of two visually, apparently, but not in reality. That was everybody's lesson on short shuffling.

JONATHAN ZUCK

It could have to do with getting cold feet on an issue probably too. What do we want out of those discussions with RDRS? And do you imagine that the things that are priorities for us will be the likely victims of the short shuffling, or do you think there's some hope of our own objectives from that discussion to see the light of day?

ALAN GREENBERG

I guess the easy answer is I don't know. If you remember correctly, when the RDRS recommendations came out, we recommended don't do them, build a ticketing system, which is what they did. That's what RDRS is. Unfortunately, it's a ticketing system which is not mandatory for use. One of the larger registrars who was using

it decided we've learned enough from it, we're going to stop now. It's in even less use than it was before. The RDRS was not implemented largely not because of our advice, but because of an analysis that was done by staff on what it would cost and how to build it. And in my mind, that had some failings, one of which was the way the price was described was enough to kill it. How we fix it now, I don't see anything other than a policy process which will take another N years and I have no personal belief that this policy discussion will end up with a much better solution than the previous policy discussion, simply because of the way policy discussions go in ICANN. So will we get anything out of it? I don't know. Will it end up with an abomination? Maybe. Sorry if I'm not a lot more rosy at this point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Okay. Thank you very much, Alan. It's Olivier speaking. There is a question in the chat, actually, from Siva, and he asks, has ICANN reached a consensus on whether RDRS is to be voluntary or mandatory for registrar and registries and also for ccTLDs?

ALAN GREENBERG

The answer is no. We have no consensus. There is no way we can make RDRS mandatory without all the registrars and registries, if they were to be included, voluntarily agreeing to and putting it into the contract or holding a PDP. As I see it. I don't see any way of finessing it other than that. ccTLDs, there's no way we can make them do anything, so they're definitely not going to be all included.

That being said, representatives of the board have said that in their informal discussions, they believe that any follow-on system must be mandatory and should be available for ccTLDs to participate should they choose. That's as far as I can say it's gone. So there's an indication from the board that they understand the need for mandatory use of it and for the ability of ccTLDs to participate should they choose. How that will play out in reality, I have no idea.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Thanks very much, Alain. It's Olivier speaking. Thank you. I'm not seeing any other hands up in the chat. I guess we've kind of moved also. Avri, I guess you can run through the review of implementation review team activities. We've pretty much gone through any updates that could be there at the moment for us on the policy development process. Over to you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you very much. And yes, you're right. At the moment, we've got 60 minutes left in a 45-minute package. So we'll try to move on here. But we're talking about good stuff. So the next thing we have is review of the implementation review team activities. I'm told that PPSAI has nothing to report. I won't even ask them if they do. And I'll turn to Cheryl and say, is there anything more that you wanted to say about the IRT activities? No. Great. So moving on. We're going to the review of the new gTLD application guidebook. I'd like to ask if somebody could actually put that up, a version of it. I don't know how many of you have actually downloaded it, looked at it at

all. It's a really quite good. If you could go through a couple of the pages here. Let me see where I want to get to. I'd like to get to the table of contents, which is really one of the easiest ways to walk through it. I do recommend that people read it if they can. I recommend most that they read the applicant journey. In other words, if you get to document overview, which we just go back a page, please. It's page, yeah, that one. You'll see that the first module there is the applicant journey. Now, that is a very fine descriptive narrative of what somebody will go through as an applicant. And it goes through all the steps. It goes into detail on the steps, you know, about being eligible, requirements, fees, strings, everything, every topic there is.

One caution I want to give you, nobody's application will be that simple. Nobody's application will be that straightforward through. If you really want to understand any particular topic that you're in here, you'll find references throughout it. And here I'm getting more into the meta of the document than any of the rules itself. Like I said, meta is one of the favorite things. But you'll find that there is probably something in the appendix, in the notes at the end, that goes into the gory details, and sometimes they really are quite detailed, quite gory, of the thing that's being spoken of. So if you're looking at general information requiring application eligibility, if you're reading and you say, but what do they mean by this word? What do they mean by an applicant? What is an applicant? What is an applicant's corporation? Who does the applicant work for? To understand any question like that, there will

be references to later in the document that explain to you what that means. And that's where they get very specific into the kind of wording things that, for example, the implementation review team have spent a year or more arguing over, what does the word applicant mean? Who does it refer to, et cetera? What are the restrictions? What are those? So I recommend that if you read nothing but, you read the applicant journey, just so you have an idea of what kind of steps, even if you have no intention of applying for one of these or no intention of talking your mother-in-law out of applying for one of these. Your mother-in-law can't apply unless she's actually a member of a corporation because individuals and sole proprietorships may not apply. I figured I'd say that while we're at it since I made a reference.

So you'll go through it and you'll see that it really gives you an idea of what the applicants go through. So I really do recommend it. Oh, no, it was just something crashing, not somebody speaking. So I really recommend that you go through that. And it really is quite good in terms of giving you the initial reference. So if you find something that you don't understand but you want to understand better, it'll at least give you the first breadcrumb, the first note in a trail that you can then follow to get as deeply into one of these issues as you could ever possibly want. This is one of the reasons why there'll be lots of consultants out there making money helping applicants because understanding this is really quite a chore. It is quite, for any complaints or any nasty remarks I may ever make, it really is quite a piece of work, quite a piece of the amount of effort,

and some of my favorite people on the staff, other than the ones that sit around and help us, are indeed the crowd. I had to say that. Are indeed the people that have been working on this to such a degree of devotion and detail to make sure they get it right. Now, every once in a while they go away, they have a discussion among themselves and the legal folk and come back and say, we've decided otherwise. You've heard that a couple times. And that happens. But by and large, it is a very good effort and an incredibly well-intentioned and practiced effort of taking every single little issue, the representatives and even people like me, who are just observers, I wasn't even part of this, but I observed and I had comments, strangely speaking. Who would expect me to have a comment? But anyhow, who took those things very seriously, dug into them, came back with detailed interests. So the reading is good, even if you don't intend to ever apply for one. If you want to understand the fever that ICANN will go through once application period starts and once people start writing applications and asking questions. It's something that if you weren't here for the last round, you won't have experienced how it becomes an overriding concern. I just really wanted to give a plug to that, and it is good reading.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I don't mean this speciously, even though it's coming out of my mouth, but on whose behalf or from which perspective are we reading this? Are we thinking about this in terms of the kinds of applicants we've been advocating for in underserved regions that would be through the ASP program and looking for undue

complexity? Because I don't think the majority of the At-Large community are looking to be applicants. Are we thinking of applicants as end-users until they apply for something, and therefore that's a constituency of ours?

AVRI DORIA

Why would I recommend somebody read it? Yeah, I guess that's what I'm trying to say. No, I don't think it's facetious at all. One of those words you shouldn't try to say too quickly. I think it is a good question. I think, yes, if you want to be a consultant, you should read it. And just because we're all At-Large here doesn't mean that none of us are consultants. You know, that could actually happen. Sure. I personally think people should read it in the same way you'd read a so-called illustrated novel, in the same way you would read a storybook if you have no intention. And that's, does it make sense to you? You yourself, a user, you're reading about this. You're reading about what I call a fever that will overtake ICANN for a certain number of years, and you want to understand what's going on around you. You want to understand the comments. I would read it for alarm bells ringing in your head. I don't know if this is just something that happens to me, but certainly when I'm reading something, especially something I'm not necessarily too bound up in, I'll be reading it, and then all of a sudden, these alarm bells will go off in my head. Something's not right here. I don't understand this. Why is this this way? Why is this that way? That's a good thing, reason to read it, and then to come and bring it up and ask. I think as a user, if you're reading this and say, but if they do that, what

does that mean for me? What does that mean for us? What does that mean for... What are the implications of following this? Just to understand, to ask the questions, to go through. I think that's why, but I think the first reason is if you're going to be doing stuff at ICANN for the next couple years, and you want to understand what's going on around you, then these are... I forget how many pages it is. They're not hard to read. They're easy pages. I think they're easy pages. I think it's a good thing to have as a background so you understand what this organization, what this group has been working on for all these years, what everybody that does have a coin in interest or has a political reason for having a domain name, has a cause for which they're getting a domain, a top-level domain, has a national interest. It'll give you an understanding of why do we keep pushing for... Are there going to be enough IDNs? Is this really serving the IDN purpose? What about applicant support? Are they doing enough things so that communities that normally can't participate can participate? Those are all questions. We've had opinions about most of these issues. Not most of these issues. About many of these issues along the way. So how do they resolve your issues? You may not know the question you had four months ago. Nobody may have come with the feedback and saying, they listened, they half-listened, they told me to forget about it, they've done this, they've done that. I've seen times when both Justine and Cheryl have come with an issue, have tried to explain an issue, why people cared, and haven't necessarily gotten the feedback one would hope they'd get. So to understand that, to sort of be able to tie together, it kind of is almost like the midpoint in

this effort. We've spent however many years getting to an application guidebook. An application guidebook is more than an application guidebook. It is the definition. Whatever policy went before has been resolved, in a certain manner of speaking, in that application guidebook. It has become the de facto policy. Sure, some of it may be able to appeal at some point, et cetera. There may be corner cases. But that is the policy. Going forward, the application guidebook becomes the de facto policy of what we're doing with new gTLDs. So I think that makes it worth reading. Does that answer the question in a non-facetious manner?

ALAN GREENBERG

Avri said everything I was going to say 12 times over and three times more eloquently. But I'll summarize very quickly. This is going to be what ICANN is focusing on for the next 10 years, like it or not. You might as well have some idea of what's going on. And if you didn't participate all the way through the 2012 round, then you really need to get a brief summary of what's going on this time around. For better or worse, it's going to be our life.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Sorry. I haven't completely gathered my thoughts on this. But given its importance, is it something that we want to ask the entire community to read, or is it something that we want to ask a few people to read with a little more rigor and present, to raise some of the alarm bells that have come up, et cetera, so they can...we can... It's sort of like sometimes big reports come with a... I forget what

it's called, like a reader's guide or something like that. Is there a way, a path through the document that is more accessible to the majority of people rather than just having this be a, hey, if you feel like reading this, read it. Should we assign some people to read it and come back and say, here's five things that we saw and that the group should communicate about?

AVRI DORIA

My answer to you is both. In other words, I'm asking everybody to read it. I can't tell anybody to read it. I can't force anybody to read it. You know, I think it is worth your while to read it, to have a good understanding, a good feel. I think having people... And I think that that will happen between Cheryl, Justine, me, and other people that will get into it, that we'll go through sections. I think by reading it, you'll know questions that we won't figure out. Remember, any of the three that I just mentioned and many of the rest of you won't even see the questions that a person reading it... And I'll use the word... A naive reader, you know, and I don't mean that in a pejorative sense of naive, but a reader who hasn't been steeped in this as, you know, the be-all and end-all of the I can't experience, you'll have questions that would never occur to me, would never occur to Cheryl. So it's both, that there may be times when, yes, having... You know, for example, in this whole thing, I'm not going to get beyond my plea to read the application... Notice, I haven't told you to read the rest of it. You know, I'm not going to get beyond that. Every single one of these modules could have an interesting hour lecture. Now, perhaps interesting from my perspective,

perhaps not interesting from yours, but could have an hour lecture, which I'm not going to be able to do now, and such. But you're going to read the application journey there, you're going to come up with a question that never crossed my mind. I've been doing this for how many years? What, 20 years I've been playing with new applicant, you know, gTLDs in one way or another? There's questions that don't occur to me. You know, I've become blinded to them, you know? It's sort of like a smell in the room you don't smell anymore because you've been in it for so long. Well, I'm one of them. And Cheryl and Justine, forgive me, but they're probably among them. We've become smell... You know, we've lost our smell sensitivity. So that's why we need you to read it. That's why we need the community at large to have read it. If one or two of you don't, it doesn't matter. But, you know, and that's why I make my plea to the community. I'm going to stop on this now. I've noticed that... Oh, you've got... Of course, I'll answer the questions, but I'm not going to go through any more sections.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Hi, thanks, Avri. I agree 100% with what Jonathan just proposed. For a small group to... No, for everyone to read it, but for a small group to come together and... I'm going to be talking about the importance of the document. And if possible, that we can have maybe a CPWG meeting time scheduled when that can happen. What I think that does to some extent is that it gives us, you know, sometimes we need a timeframe to do certain things in because with everything that you're doing, you don't normally take the time

to do what you need to do. But if you know that you have to do this by a particular time, that's fine. But if you know that you have to do it as a goal, as something that needs to get done, you do it, and then we get together and have a discussion on it. That's just what I wanted to add to what Jonathan just said.

JONATHAN ZUCK

My first question is on whose behalf, in a way, are we reading it? In other words, are we keeping out an eye for implications for end users or are we just looking for logic problems that don't have anything to do with the fact that we're part of At-Large, a small group of people that we're trying to describe or something like that? And are those separate efforts or are they the same effort? Are we concerned about the applicants in this case? Are we more concerned about the downstream implications for end users? Whose flag should we be bearing as we try to read through this?

AVRI DORIA

I bet you can guess. I bet you can guess at what my answer is.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Everybody.

AVRI DORIA

Exactly. You'll read it for what you get from it. But Clair did remind me of something. At the moment, we're going through the review of it. I'll get to your question. We're going to the review of it and

we're asking people to review certain sections and sign up to read certain sections, and that's because this is the last chance to get it changed. Please.

MAUREEN HILYARD

I guess sort of like having been left until last, you know, everyone else has sort of, like, said what I was going to say. But I've actually been through some of the questions, the questionnaire things. Even I was confused about what was being asked. So who are we addressing this application for? Because I found that it was probably very American-focused. And yet we're giving it out to underserved regions who have no idea. We're looking at non-ICANN people. But at the same time, they obviously still want to have a domain. But I think what you're saying is very true. If we're going to be focusing it on people who are new to the whole process, they've got to understand the actual language. And, in fact, I was having, as someone who's been working in ICANN for so long, I was having problems about what were they specifically asking for, and I think a small team working on that would be really good.

AVRI DORIA

You reminded me of something else I should say. It's not just the people that live in the USA. I was helping a friend of mine try to work her way through the applicant support application, both of us from the U.S. having trouble parsing out some of the questions. So it isn't

even that we have a natural advantage being from the U.S. The questions are tough.

AZIZ HILALI

I'm going to go with what Jonathan said, but going back to the first round in 2012, I know Avri, you worked on that project. You worked on the project in 2012 on this one. You know that the program was not used very much. There were not too many delegations that came out of it. I think the enhancements were pretty good. I did not read the whole guide, but I saw that there was a lot more support. It was easier for the candidates to obtain support. The calendar is a little bit clearer. And I would like to know, Avri, since you read the document and you worked on it, what are the guarantees? What are the mechanisms that were implemented in order to have or to obtain a better support, to have better candidates that would come from underserved regions? Because I imagine that the ASP was put together for certain countries, for NGOs, for universities, for all that is for everything, for organizations, charity organizations? What are therefore the guarantees for us to have a better success with this support plan? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

I'm going to put your question, if you'll forgive me, on the table for a longer conversation at another point, because we'll never get to our next agenda item if I do. But I will take it and I'll put it in there. And at the moment, I'm not sure that we've necessarily covered the answer to all of your questions. A lot of efforts have been made. I'm

not sure that there's guarantees. Anytime I hear the word guarantee, I've got to say I don't know from guarantee. But certainly many efforts have been made. But if it's okay with you, I won't go into the details now, but I will put a promissory note that I will come back to you with an answer at another time. And with that, I want to stop so that I can let our guests have the floor to talk about IDN and UA. IDN is a really big part of this new gTLD. It's bigger than the new gTLD, but it's critical, because one of the reasons we said we're doing this is so that we can have IDN TLDs. So are we going to get there? And please, I'll give you the floor. Thank you.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

Thank you, Avri. My name is Sarmad Hussain from ICANN. So I am here to give you a quick overview of some of the work which is being done in the areas of IDNs and universal acceptance. The slide deck is going to be online. We're going to touch on many different topics, and there are detailed slides for each of those topics in the annex of this presentation in case you want to look at more detail. But this just gives you an overview of the work which is going on in the IDNs and universal acceptance space. And then we'll also discuss some of the ways we are moving forward.

In the context of IDNs, one of the most fundamental work which has been actually achieved through the input of the community has been to develop the root zone label generation rules. These are the rules which define what is a valid top-level domain in a particular

language or script, as well as what are its variant labels. We identified 28 scripts for which these need to be prepared. We've already completed work on 26 scripts in the root zone of GR5 version. We've added Thaana script. We just concluded its public comment process, and the integration panel is now considering integration of that proposal. So that will be 27 scripts. And the only one left right now is the [inaudible] script from the original list.

We also continue to develop second-level reference LGRs. These are referenced because the registries may consult with them as they design their own IDN tables for the second level. What these reference LGRs provide are secure solutions which have been discussed with the community which uses that script. We've also recently implemented the IDN implementation guidelines 4.1. Initially, earlier in 2011, IDN guidelines 3.0 were implemented. They were revised after some time, and these have come into effect since 30th of April. We also did an interesting study on how much IDN registrations contribute to the reputation block list. This was in the context of, of course, DNS abuse. And we actually published a detailed report on how much RBL or reputation block list, which report some of these different kinds of views come from IDNs versus ASCII domain names. There is going to be a link available in the presentation in case you want to read more about it. We actually published a report on it. There's obviously ongoing policy development and implementation effort with the SubPro applicant guidebook, its implementation, IDN EPDP phase 1 which is also under implementation, IDN EPDP phase 2 which is currently under

analysis and then the Latin diacritic PDP which is of course started and ongoing.

In addition to that, we are actively involved in supporting the new gTLD next round program. A couple of significant projects include support for IDN variant gTLDs in the registry service provider evaluation program as well as the string similarity evaluation for the next round and you can find many more details on the work and the status of IDNs in this report which is linked here. Next slide please.

On the UA side, our efforts are focused in three areas, outreach and training on UA for the community, updating the technology and then supporting of course the community efforts which are ongoing. Outreach, you may have heard about the UA day efforts. In 2025 we hosted 59 different events in more than 50 countries. We are also doing outreach to public sector organizations in this context. We've recently signed an MOU with UNESCO to work together to reach out to their member states. We've also starting a UA curriculum program where we're working with universities to integrate UA into their actual degree programs so that we can have a sustainable capacity development effort and of course we have courses which are available at ICANN Learn and also do trainings at other venues like NOG meetings so that's a continued work.

In addition to that, we've actually started implementation work on UA. We have now team members who are fixing open source tools. We've obviously got input from the good work done by UASG on

what are the gaps and we are now actually focusing on fixing the gaps so we are working on open source tools like WordPress content management systems and many other tools. We provide a regular update on this during the UA update session and during the prep week so please attend those if you need more information. There's additional information in the slides as well later. We also do outreach to big tech organizations so we are talking to large organizations. If you attended a session at ICANN 82, we'd invited Meta to share their updates based on the work we've been doing together for almost one year together and we're also working with other organizations and we are of course making ICANN's internal systems UA ready as well. There was a blog published by ICANN which shared that 91% of ICANN's public facing systems are now UA ready. We also continue to support the community groups. There are multiple community groups, Universal Acceptance Steering Group, UA Committee of ccNSO, UA Working Group of GAC, and based on more recent discussions we are now formulating a new expert working group which will come into place in July. Next slide please.

And so these are a few more details about the community groups we support. I guess we've been supporting UASG for last 10 years based on the ask which was part of the UASG charter. We are actually going to be celebrating 10 years of UASG on Wednesday in the last session so please come join us to listen more about their achievements. And I guess there was also a UA committee of ccNSO

which we continue to support. We also continue to support the GAC's UA Working Group. Next slide please.

As we move forward, there was a blog by Kurtis about our direction on how we are taking the UA work forward. As I shared based on the good work which has already been achieved by UASG and other community efforts, it is now documented what are the gaps, what are the possible solutions and we are now I guess focusing more on implementation or implementing these solutions. As I shared, talking to big tech organizations, fixing the open source tools. We also obviously want to focus on tech developers and system administrators. So as the focus now moves more on implementation, I think the announced way forward was that we set up a new expert working group which of course guides ICANN's work into how we can take this implementation work forward more effectively. This call is still open. We were requesting people who have expertise in UA and IDNs and also of course in internet governance and policy work around multilingual internet to be part of this group. There are going to be 12 members. We requested one nominee each from ALAC, ccNSO, GAG, GNSO and SSAC. There's a link for call for nominations. In addition, there were going to be six members and one chair which is going to be appointed by the ICANN's CEO. The plan for this group is that they will come together in July and they will look at the focus areas, the stakeholders which are listed above and based on those stakeholders provide guidelines to how ICANN can effectively reach out to those stakeholders so that ICANN can take on those guidelines as part of

its implementation work to address and UA adoption work. So let me stop here. Those are all the slides I have and I'm happy to go in more detail on any of the topics which we covered. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Do we have any questions? I don't see any. I don't see any hands. I see no questions. So thank you very much. I'm sure we'll think of a question. Ah, a question. Please come up to the microphone, introduce yourself and ask the question.

BARNABAS PETER

Hello. My name is Barnabas [inaudible]. I'm a NextGen. I'm from Warsaw University of Technology. My question is, I heard Hussain talk about integrating Internet governance into universities and that was one of the topics I was going to cover. So I was asking him how they're going to make this possible. Thank you.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

Thank you. I can talk more specifically about the UA curriculum integration program. Your questions are more broadly about Internet governance but let me just very quickly respond and I also see there's a hand up there. So basically we've set up a program where we've developed with the community, UASG, we've developed 12 modules which cover different topics which are needed to implement universal acceptance and IDNs and we are talking with the universities across different regions from APAC region, Africa, LAC, where we are talking to the university to see

whether they can integrate these 12 modules in their existing coursework or alternatively offer this as a new course. Both options are available to the universities based on whatever their preference is. And we will work with each of those universities which are interested to provide them faculty training, as well as support, technical support as needed, while they integrate the program into their curriculum. And then they roll it out, and we eventually get a sustainable mechanism for students to learn about how to implement internationalized domain names and universal acceptance. Thank you. Thank you.

EUNICE PEREZ

It really isn't a question. I wanted to share the experience. Because in Mexico, we have just had a course, and we also have a university that is already seeing this implementation. We have received this course. Gerardo Ferreira was the one who created the course. And I think something very important about this is at the university, it's not only the professors who are teaching, but we are also having some technicians who operate email servers, or they just operate their own technologies. And so it was, for us, very interesting and very important, because we work together to be able to translate these curriculum into our language. And there were many ideas that kind of emerged in terms of creating a space to be able to then implement the codes. I mean, implementing them in the servers. That was my comment. Thank you very much.

HAROLD ARCOS

I just wanted to thank Sarmad and the whole steering group in the UA. Because in the past four years, we have gone, in our LACRALO region, we have initially had two projects, then four, then six, then 10. And this year, we have executed 14 activities. And this has been precisely because since ICANN has put the UA in the focus of its agenda, the work has been intensified in our region. As you know, we have two ambassadors. One of them is in the Caribbean, Luis, in Bolivia. And so I would like to thank you for the continuous support that you have given us, and it has allowed us to grow. We have a group headed by Sylvia Herlein in Brazil. And we would like to be able to put this next stage, because of course, we have ended the stage in UA. And then fortunately, we have a very good experience that we would like to share. We have shared it at the RALO Chair Community. And this is the case that in Bolivia, as a result of the coordination with all the stakeholders, we have managed to sign a document that is similar to an MOU, that is the Expression of Interest by all of the stakeholders, institutions, governments, academia. And this was called the Universal Acceptance Agreement for Bolivia. And two universities are already working on this so that there is a national line. So in this sense, I would like to ask that the agenda has all this university integration more present. We have already had a meeting with Rodrigo de la Parra, our GSE for Latin America. But this issue was not in our agenda. And I think it is important, because there is the experience that Eunice has just mentioned. And I think we need to multiply this and reproduce this in all of the universities. I think this is viable. This was included in the LACRALO fiscal year two years ago. And it was also mentioned

at the Cancun General Assembly. And we have not been able to materialize this. So we've only had these two experiences of universities that are involved and that are opening the door to a chair. So this was included in our LACRALO meetings. And we believe it is very important for us to have it more quickly, for us to have the modules, and to coordinate this with the academia network. Thank you very much.

SARMAD HUSSAIN

Thank you for your comments. And so we do plan to continue supporting the UA Day, which allows for us to work with the community globally to support and create awareness, but also capacity for implementing UA. We are also, as I said, we are supporting the UA curriculum program. So if you have universities which are interested, please come reach out to us. You can email us at uaprogram@ICANN.org. And we will work with you to make sure that we take those universities through the program. And we would be very interested in extending that collaboration. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

And thank you. I've gotten one quick request for last word. And then Heidi, you had wanted me to announce something, and I never picked up what it was. So if you could just announce it.

HEIDI ULLRICH

Yes, thank you, Avri. For the Universal Acceptance Expert Working Group, there's currently a call for expressions of interest that is open until this Friday the 13th. So if you're interested, please do submit your EOI to At-Large staff. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, and my apologies. Your last word.

HANNAH FRANK

Thank you so much for your presentation. I want to highlight the success case of Nepal. I saw the tremendous job they made, and they launched the first webpage. And that is a milestone, I can say. That was the only thing I want to say. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And now I need to apologize to you all. Through horrible time management on my part, but really good conversations on your part, we didn't get to have the discussion. But I've asked to put up the results, and then we will get to those in our upcoming CPWG meetings. And I want to make sure you all know that those meetings are open to everybody. And they're recorded, so even if you miss one. So we will go through these topics. But let me see, what did we get? Okay, the winner was with 26%, have I got that right? With 26%, we got on policy, does ICANN listen to or care about end users? And that's not negative. It just says people want

to talk about it. Maybe they want to talk about how much they care. It's possible. Could happen.

The next big one, as far as I could tell, is governance and oversight of the RIRs. Do we understand it as a conversation? So that's a really good conversation. Then at two, at 15, what can At-Large and ALAC really do about it, for any of it? Does ICANN listen or care about end-users? So we got that question twice. And we got DNS abuse mitigation, effective policy tools, and supporting contractual compliance obligations beyond contracted parties. So we really have some fodder for some good conversations coming up. Again, I apologize for my time management, but I really thank you all for the content of the conversations. And we are adjourned on this one. Thank you

ALAN GREENBERG

I'll note, does ICANN care about end-user opinions is 41% if you merge those two together.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

And just closing off, thank you for joining this. Just also to say that these topics will probably be the topics that we'll then have in future CPWG calls. Thank you, and join us in a future call online. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]