ICANN74 | Prep Week – GNSO Policy Update
Tuesday, May 31, 2022 – 20:00 to 21:30 AMS

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the GNSO Policy webinar on Tuesday, 31st of May 2022.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. During the Q&A session at the end of the webinar, if you'd like to speak at that time, please raise your hand in Zoom and you'll be placed in the Q&A queue. For the benefit of other participants and our interpreters, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. All participants are welcome to access the interpretation as well as all available features by the Zoom toolbar. With that, I'll hand over the floor to Philippe Fouquart, GNSO chair. Over to you Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Merci, Nathalie. Thank you very much, Nathalie. Hello, everyone. This is Philippe Fouquart, I am chair of the GNSO. Hello, everyone, and good luck to everyone, including the interpreters.

I'm very glad to welcome you to this webinar about GNSO policies.

So this seminar is going to explain to you how we move forward towards ICANN74. We're going to talk about what we are doing at GNSO currently. Just like Nathalie said for this seminar, we have to respect the rules and standards of behaviors. So this is the program. We're going to have it on the screen, please. We're going to put our slide there.

We're going to listen to the different working group chairs of the PDPs. We're going to hear from the Scoping Teams that are going to meet during ICANN74. We're going to have some advisors that are going to talk to us as well. If you want to participate to a session in ICANN74, please do register right now. It's going to be of course limited as far as attendance on location. So we're going to look at those Scoping Teams. You do have them on the screen—there you go—quickly.

The EPDP on Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs did conclude with its final report, and we're going to vote on this report during ICANN74. During the seminar, we will have a summary of our progress regarding this PDP on Transfer Policies. Roger Carney will talk about that. We'll have also a PDP regarding Internationalized Domain Names. We'll have the Accuracy Scoping Team with Michael Palage, who's going to talk

to us later on. We'll talk about the SSAD ODA with Sebastien Ducos. We'll also talk about DNS abuse with Paul McGrady. And I'll come back with you to talk about the small team that is not going to meet during ICANN74 regarding small generics. This is the summary of what we're going to hear now. I hope this is going to enable you to get ready for ICANN74. But we're going to move to the next slide, please. Next slide.

Let's talk about the PDP and do this overview of PDPs. We have the Z diagram. Let's please move to the next slide. This is taking a little while to go to the next slide. But we are on slide five, and we're talking about the work we've been doing and all the initiatives I talked about. We have a PDP on Specific Curative Rights. Thank you very much for showing us this slide, this visual overview. We're going to work on it during the meeting. We have two PDPs and EPDP. We are working on a first report. We're drafting it. And regarding transfer, we're nearly finished with the work on transfers, and we're going to go to our public comment period regarding the transfer.

Before giving the floor to the facilitator, I wanted to let you know that we're going to have questions and answers at the end of the seminar. You will have two opportunities to ask questions. You can put them in the chat by using questions in capital letters. Make sure it's very clear that it is a question. Or you raise your hand, and at the end of the webinar, we'll be able to give you the

ICANN PREP WEEK 74

opportunity to speak. I'm going to give the floor for the first topic to Greg regarding Transfer Policy. Greg, go ahead.

GREG DIBIASE: Thanks, Philippe. Hey, Roger. How are you? Can you tell us a bit about what your group has been working on since your last update before ICANN73?

ROGER CARNEY: Hey, Greg. Thanks. Yeah, we've been actually pretty busy since, I guess, March. We've concluded some big discussions over I guess the lock-in period of transfers, some bulk discussions and some of the NACKing reasons. Actually, for the past month, we've spent working through all the details of the last minute edits on our initial report. So we made really good progress and actually the whole time. I mean, since we started last year, we've made really good progress. But then the last few months, we've made great progress.

GREG DIBIASE: That's great. I see that the working group is aiming to publish its initial report for Phase 1A shortly after ICANN74. Is the group on track to do that?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. Actually, the good news is we're well on track. Staff has actually got it in their hands now and cleaning it up and actually getting the questionnaires ready for it. So we're in good shape. Actually, on Thursday this week, maybe staff can help me, I will have time. I don't remember. We'll be going over, a chat on the initial report itself. So everybody that's interested can get a nice preview before the initial report is released.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Are there any new or recurring challenges that have emerged since your last update to the community?

ROGER CARNEY: I don't think so. I think that, again, the group's been working really well. We've had maybe one thing that we've stumbled on, and again, staff will put the questionnaire out in the initial report. And it has to do with not the idea but where the enforcement happens on time to live for transfer codes. Right now, it's being discussed if it's the registry that can enforce that or the registrar. And now we posted it again, initial report, asking for input on that.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. Can you tell us a little bit about what the working group will be discussing during its session that ICANN74?

ROGER CARNEY: Yeah. Actually, fortunately, our normal meeting day is today and we were able to give the working group time off today again because we're right on schedule with what we wanted to get done. But starting next week, actually, the working group is going to get an introduction to the Phase 1B work which is the change of registrant. Next week will be really just an introduction and the plan is that at ICANN74 to really jump into it and get work done starting on that change of registrant.

GREG DIBIASE: Okay. Is there anything else you would like to update us on?

ROGER CARNEY: No. Again, I think that the big thing on this is the working group has been working really well. Obviously, transfer is more focused on registrars and registries. But we've had really good input from the other groups. And maybe more input from the other groups is better than registries and registrars get focused in on their operational knowledge and it helps to have that aspect from the other group. So I just encourage that to continue.

GREG DIBIASE: Great. So last, a more fun question, apart from being reunited with colleagues and friends, what are you most looking forward to at ICANN74 or your visit to The Hague?

ROGER CARNEY: Well, the good thing for me, I guess, is I've never been to the Netherlands. So that'll be a new place for me. But outside of that, yeah, it seems a little weird. I think we're over 30 months from the last face to face that we've had. So it'll be fun to get back with everybody. But personally, being in the Netherlands will be new for me so that'll be something fun.

GREG DIBIASE: Awesome. You and me both. Thanks, Roger.

ROGER CARNEY: Thanks, Greg. I think I'll pass back to Philippe now.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you, Greg. Hi, everybody. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening for some. Hi, Donna. Donna, can you tell us a bit about what your working group has been working on since your last update before ICANN73?

DONNA AUSTIN: Sure. Thanks, Flip. With the IDN EPDPs getting into some very detailed discussions about how to account for IDN variants primarily in future new gTLD processes, but also addressing how existing IDN gTLD registry operators can apply for variants, given that it wasn't possible in 2012. So we're not assuming that it will be the same process. So we're just giving some thought to that.

For example, what should be the process for existing and future registry operators to apply for a variant or variants of their existing IDN gTLDs? What should be the associated application or/and annual registration fees? This is something that we're very cognizant of recommendations from the SubPro Working Group. So with application fee, we're adopting the cost neutral element that SubPro did, but we're giving some thought to whether there should be more fees, given there may be different evaluation processes. So that's something we've been discussing, and do restrictions that apply to like community .brands or geoTLDs, should that also apply to variants.

But one question that we've spent quite a lot of time discussing in the last few weeks, and we've actually assigned a small group of volunteers to look at this a little bit closer to come up with some practical examples that we hope will help us navigate and hopefully reach consensus on, and that relates to the string similarity review process. One of the challenges with the IDN variants is the multiplier or compounding effect, which can

mean that a primary IDN gTLD string, which would be the mainstream that the applicant would apply for, it varies, it can be a few variants, it could be a few hundred, it could be a few thousand variants. So we have this multiplier dynamic that creates some challenges as we work through some of our charter questions.

So most, if not all, IDN TLDs will have an associated allocatable variant, as well as blocked variants. Allocatable means a variant that can be delegated, whereas a blocked variant can't be, but a blocked variant is still set aside. So while we've agreed in principle that an applicant for IDN gTLD can apply for as many allocatable variants as they wish, we do think it's unlikely that they will apply for all of the possible allocatable variants.

So the challenge for us in this discussion in string similarity review process is whether the process should include the primary IDN gTLD plus only the requested allocatable variants, whether it should include the primary IDN gTLD plus all of the allocatable variants. So the Root Zone LGR actually identifies the allocatable variants and the blocked variants. So you can see there is a way to get some estimate of what that would be.

Then the third one is the primary IDN gTLD plus all the allocatable variants and the blocked variants. So thinking about this from an implementation perspective—

ICANN PREP WEEK 74

FLIP PETILLION: I think we have a small issue. I don't hear Donna. I do see the others but I see the screen of Donna has been frozen. Donna, do you hear us?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: I'll try and reach out on the side, Flip. Just a second.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Flip, I see that Donna, I think that she's dropped. What we can do is maybe move to Greg and Michael. And then when Donna rejoins, we can catch up then. How does that sound?

FLIP PETILLION: Okay. Thank you. Greg, please.

GREG DIBIASE: Sure. Thanks, Flip. Michael is here as well. There you are, Michael. Hey, Michael, so can you tell us a bit about what the Scoping Team has been working on since your last update before ICANN74?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Sure. Thank you, Greg. There's really I guess two primary things that we have been working on in parallel. The first is we are trying to finish our write-up to the Council on Assignment 1 and 2. For the reminder of those who may not be familiar, Assignment 1 deals with the enforcement and reporting questions that were posed by the GNSO Council in the charter, and the second assignment is the measurement of accuracy.

We've had a draft report, and we have been slowly moving forward towards finalizing that. We were hopeful that we would have it done by ICANN74, but it looks like we will not be achieving that finalization until perhaps slightly after ICANN74. So that is probably one of the main objectives that we have been focused on.

The second thing that has consumed a significant amount of bandwidth within the group over the last couple of weeks has been a request by ICANN Org. For those who may have participated in the ICANN73 meeting, one of the interesting outputs of that meeting was the ICANN Board directing the ICANN Org to engage with the Commission to reach out to the European Data Protection Board to get some clarity regarding access and accuracy. What has been reported to us by ICANN Org is ICANN Org right now is looking at a number of scenarios

that they are looking to propose to either European Data Protection Board or the Belgian DPA to seek this clarity. At least one of those scenarios, ICANN has indicated that their intention is to actually do a data privacy impact assessment. A number of the members within the Accuracy Scoping Team have been very supportive of this, they think that doing this extra homework and due diligence to flesh out these questions to a greater degree of specificity will help ICANN perhaps achieve the actionable guidance that it has been seeking since the GDPR kind of complicated things a little bit for the broader community.

So those are the two major objective and deliverables that the group has been working on. The other administrative action that we're doing right now is we are behind schedule. So we're in the process of putting forth a change request, the GNSO Council, regarding this change in processing. This actually dovetails nicely into the remainder of our work because Assignment 3 and 4 regarding future work are probably going to take a little time before we get some of the feedback that we need for the group to move forward. So that I would say are there are the three main things that we have been focused on.

GREG DIBIASE:	Got it. So, a lot on your plate. What are some of the challenges that the group is encountering?
MICHAEL PALAGE:	I guess the best thing to say is, I would say Zoom burnout. It has been increasingly difficult to get all of the parties to do their homework and to get forward. So not to jump ahead, but what am I most looking forward to about getting back to a face to face at ICANN74 is that camaraderie that is often missing and the spontaneous conversations that happen in the hallway. I think that is probably part of the missing magic that has probably made the ICANN multistakeholder model go forward. This week, I'm in Prague at the Central Jamboree, seeing colleagues for the first time in over two years. It's those really side hallway conversations that you had no intention of, that was not on your list, but those are probably some of the most valuable conversations that I've had over the last 48 hours here in Prague.
GREG DIBIASE:	Got it. At this time, is there anything the Council or community could do to assist the work of this group?
MICHAEL PALAGE:	Not at this time. As I said, we will be preparing our Assignment 1 and 2, giving that to the Council and seeking a change request to

allow for the longer runway regarding the work in Assignment 3 and 4. Regarding the outreach to the Commission at the Belgian DPA and European Data Protection Board, we are trying to timely move forward in getting that feedback to ICANN Org to help move forward with that. So I think that is really, really important and hopefully getting actionable guidance or some type of clarity that has not yet previously been reached in previous attempts by ICANN.

GREG DIBIASE: What is the Scoping Team planning to discuss at ICANN74?

MICHAEL PALAGE: We're probably going to be treating ICANN74 as a normal work meeting. Our objective, as I said, is to wrap up that Assignment 1 and 2, to wrap that up and get that off to Council. So, delivering on the assignment. We've had a draft for a number of weeks. We've been dealing with some struggles to get feedback from all the different stakeholder groups. But I think we're nearing that completion. We've set an internal sort of if you will drop-dead date for our call this week. So I think we're on target to make that deliverable. So, nothing that this time.

GREG DIBIASE:	Great. Lastly, the question you alluded to, so aside from the productive hallway conversations that you plan on having, what are you looking forward to most at ICANN74 or your visit to The Hague?
MICHAEL PALAGE:	Well, I already kind of cheated there, Greg. As I said, the spontaneous conversations and dialogues, it literally is probably the secret sauce that makes the ICANN multistakeholder model really happen. It has been incredibly challenging through two plus years of remote Zoom meetings. And while I think everybody has done well, given the circumstances, yeah, really looking forward to the face to face.
GREG DIBIASE:	Well, that sounds great. Thanks, Michael. I think I'll pass back to Flip now to see if Donna is able to join us.
FLIP PETILLION:	Yeah, checking with Nathalie if Donna is there.
NATHALIE PEREGRINE:	So we do have Donna on the phone but we don't have her on video. So all yours, Flip.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you. Hi, Donna. Hi, again. Do you hear me?

DONNA AUSTIN: I do, Flip. I'm very sorry about that.

FLIP PETILLION: No problem. Let's continue. Actually, we all know that that you were very, very focused with your team. That actually may be making people think of another challenge which is timing. Do you think that the team is still on target to publish its initial report by December of this year?

DONNA AUSTIN: Flip, we're cautiously optimistic. I think on my last update, I was reasonably confident that we wouldn't be able to publish in accordance with the timeline, but we've made some good progress since ICANN—whatever that number was before—73. So cautiously optimistic, can't guarantee it. But we're closer than I thought we were at ICANN73.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you. Is there anything that the Council or the ICANN community could do to assist the work of your group?

DONNA AUSTIN:	Yes. The EPDP team is launching a survey that's targeting Arabic and Chinese TLD registry operators, that's registry operators from 2012 that have an IDN gTLD, to gauge their potential interest in activating the allocatable variants of their TLDs in a future process. So we would really like to hear back from those IDN gTLD registry operators when we send out that survey. So that will only go to existing IDN registry operators. When they receive that, it would be great if they could respond, because their responses are going to be a key data point for us in considering solutions for existing registry operators. I'm pleased that you're out there and you're on this call. Look out for the survey. And if you have any questions that you don't understand the purpose or whatever, we'd be more than happy to respond to those.
FLIP PETILLION:	Well, you've heard this, people. If you have any question, please send them to Donna. Donna, can you tell us something about what the working group will be discussing during its sessions at ICANN74 in The Hague?
DONNA AUSTIN:	We've got two working sessions planned for ICANN74. One is on Monday, the 13th of June, and the other one is on the Wednesday, the 15th of June. We'll get an update on the ccPDP

ICANN 74
PREP WEEK

on IDNs. This is important for our work because the Board has asked the two efforts to attempt to have similar or consistent approaches with similar issues. So it's important that we keep up to date with what's going on with the ccPDP.

We'll have a report from the String Similarity small group. That was the issue I was trying to explain before my Internet froze on me. Then we'll proceed with group for charter questions regarding the same entity principle at the second level. What we mean by same entity is that the registry operators apply for the IDN gTLD, any variant of that string has to be from the same entity. So somebody different can't apply for the variant of that string. So we'll get into second level questions starting in The Hague.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you. Is there anything else you would like to share with respect to the work you're doing?

DONNA AUSTIN: It's complicated. the challenge that I'm explaining before about the multiplier effect or compound effect of variants is really tricky in our discussions because we're not just dealing with one or two strings when we have these conversations, we have to take into account, in some cases, the implication of thousands

of strings. So it really is challenging. But I'm really confident with the EPDP team, including our ICANN support. Ariel, Steve, and Emily do a great job in preparing information for us before we get into discussion. So they provide great context. And then we've got Pitinan and Sarmad, who are actually IDN experts, they have been tremendous in helping us navigate through some of these charter questions. I really think the representative from the IDN EPDP team have got the skills and knowledge that will help us get to the bottom of some of the tricky questions we have.

FLIP PETILLION: Thanks, Donna. I do recall, I've been at a couple of meetings in the Netherlands, but are there any highlights or memories from the last time or times that ICANN had a conference or meeting in the Netherlands that you would like to share?

DONNA AUSTIN: Flip, unfortunately, I won't be in The Hague. So I'll be doing the sessions remotely. But I was thinking back, I think the last time I was in the Netherlands for an ICANN meeting was for a GDD Summit. I think the memory for me is that Kurt and I used to go to little cafes for breakfast in the morning called [inaudible]. If anyone comes across it, I would recommend it. They had very good breakfast. So I would recommend [inaudible].

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you very much, Donna. Well, I personally can share with everybody that there are great Indonesian and Indian restaurants at the place. And please keep in mind on Monday evenings, a lot of these are closed, so make your plans well and ahead. Nathalie, with your agreement, I would propose to pass to the presenters, Paul and Mark.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Flip. You're correct, over to Mark, Paul, and you as moderator.

FLIP PETILLION: Thank you. Hi, Mark and Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Hello.

MARK DATYSGELD: Hello.

FLIP PETILLION: Hi. The usual suspects. Hi, guys. Can you tell us a bit about what the Scoping Team has been working on since your last update before ICANN74?

MARK DATYSGELD: Yes, definitely. We have chosen a very aggressive timeline for this project, and I actually think this was a good thing. Initially, it seemed a little ambitious to go over as much as we have been. But I do believe we have been rather successful in doing so. Would you agree, Paul, that we have been making very steady progress?

PAUL MCGRADY: Yes, I think so. We've had really good feedback from the community, which is super helpful. We've had some fresh ideas, which again is very exciting because this is an area where we've been trying to solve some of these problems for years. They have fresh ideas and new ways of looking at things was kind of a surprise and a welcome one.

MARK DATYSGELD: Definitely. I think that something very important is that so many members of the ICANN community contributed to our outreach effort. We made the call for inputs and people were very forthcoming. Publicly, we also got some private feedback from people. And overall, this has given us so much material to work with in a way that I think has never happened before in the team of DNS abuse. It's always there's very specific sessions, there's

things that are very tailored or we have an hour to do it, and now we've gotten a few months to do it. This has really shed some light on what's missing there, what are our expectations, what the different actors actually want to bring to the table. We are starting to find out that we may have more points of agreement than we thought that we did before, and that has been, in my view, incredibly positive.

PAUL MCGRADY: I also think it's been really interesting to see what the community is up to. This is turned into a bit of—I shudder to use the word clearinghouse because ICANN already has—that already means something. But it basically has become a way to take a look into not just what the Council might do or what PDPs, and those kinds of things, but also what is the community doing organically and being able to get a handle on those and to report about them. Not everything that comes out of this is necessarily going to be some sort of formal recommended action, I think. It's early days. Some of it could be just making the Council aware of what other people are doing and finding ways to encourage it. I don't want to be a spoiler, though, and I could be wrong.

FLIP PETILLION: It looks like you guys are very happy with the input you get from the community. But if councilors could help you, please let us all know so we can act. But what I would be interested in is, at this time, what is your small team planning to discuss at ICANN74? Can you share that with us?

MARK DATYSGELD: Definitely, Flip. We don't have conclusions. We don't have anything. We don't have a delivery per se yet. But we have a lot of very interesting impressions and directions that we would like to discuss with the community. We have been very glad that ICANN Compliance has taken the time to talk to us very extensively as well, which has been incredibly helpful in shedding light into questions that maybe even some of our members from the Contracted Party House didn't have the clearest insight into.

So we are bringing a lot of different pieces of knowledge that we would definitely like to bring to the community and talk to them. We have seen some gaps or some ideas that might be actionable from our side as a community. We would like to bring at least some of those and ask the community, "How would you expect us to act upon this? Do you have ideas? Do you see another way forward to enrich even more a conversation?" That's the kind of meeting that I think we're going to try to have, one in which we

present a little bit, but in which hopefully the community can bring more to the group and that we can continue this discussion in a very productive way.

FLIP PETILLION: Anything else, Mark, that you would like to share with respect to the small team's work, its plans, its activities, its views, its agenda?

PAUL MCGRADY: Well, I'll just say this, and this is soft information so you can do with it what you'd like. But I've really enjoyed the tone of the small group. It has been cooperative from the beginning. People have showed up to try to solve problems and engage in dialogue. Nobody's entrenched. Nobody's dug in. It has been a joy.

MARK DATYSGELD: Definitely big shout out to the small team. Everybody has been awesome. This is a really, really, really good effort from the community.

EN

FLIP PETILLION:	So I think you really, really are looking forward to see people live in person. What else do you expect from ICANN74 in The Hague? What do you expect to do there, to see?

PAUL MCGRADY: I'll say something that I'm not going to do. Last time I was at an ICANN meeting in the Netherlands, it was in Amsterdam, and Brian Beckham got me on a bicycle because that's how you get around town. But the people in Amsterdam are expert bicyclists and apparently the people in Chicago were not. I almost got run over two or three times. So I don't think I'm going to be trying that again. I think I might just stick to taxis.

MARK DATYSGELD: Yeah. From my point of view, I would like to think that before the pandemic, we were hallway conversation ninjas. We had it down to this fine art where we could really fit in those six words, seven words. Now I'm afraid we might have lost some of that skill, and I would really like to try to bring it back up to speed and go like, "Hey, this, this, and that," get a full message across. So those are my current goals for ICANN74.

FLIP PETILLION: Super. Well, I'm personally looking forward to meeting with you guys again, of course. I pass to Philippe. Thank you. Thanks, Paul. Thanks, Mark. Thanks, Donna.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Flip. Thanks. Thanks, everyone. I'll second that. To the SSAD ODA small team, we have Sebastien with us. I always have to look up the acronym, I have to say, the System for Standard Access and Disclosure small team from Council. So could you tell us about that small team and provide us an update with your progress?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sure, absolutely. Briefly, the ICANN staff worked last year in ODP in order to sort of evaluate the risk and financial consequences of an SSAD and deliver the results in January in the form of an ODA. These results came a bit early and with a warning, a warning that this project was going to be extremely costly. Again, the policy recommendation had recommendations over a description of a system to allow that standardized access that was meant to cover a number of functions between all the accreditation of the requester. That was meant to be self sustaining financially. ICANN would develop it, but then it would run its own course and financially pay its own fees. It appeared very quickly that we were running into a problem, which was

that the cost of running such a project was absolutely enormous. And even before the ODA was published, we had conversation towards that with the Board with Göran warning the community on that.

Now, we started the small team immediately when we received the ODA. We looked at it in details. We had questions, went into iterations of questions with staff. And very quickly, it appeared that we may have to pare down with the SSAD initially intended to do, not so much in terms of policy. The small team is not here to redevelop policy, but in terms of developing a proof of concept that could at least sustain and demonstrate the use of a tool even if in a simplified lighter version.

So we've been working on this. We engage ICANN staff to sort of give us more information on how much would this new proof of concept cost. Now, this work in itself is not the entirety of the ODA that has to be written but significant portions of it. Technical description and costing has to be reviewed, and that requires resources. So staff came back to us with an estimation of how much time they would need to do this work, but also warning on the fact that that would imply pausing other important work.

So we are right now in discussion with staff. I have a meeting with them later this week to discuss exactly the consequences of

this. We've allowed for a bit more time initially. We were thinking about having answers for ICANN74 and decided to postpone that until ICANN75 in order to give a bit more time, but I think that in itself might not be enough to be able to fit it all. So without preempting possibly the next question, the intention is to have before ICANN74 the elements of discussion in order to be able to discuss what we do with this, how we move forward impacting the rest of the great work in the ICANN community as little as possible. But yes, also prioritizing this important task.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Sebastien. I'll assume that's the plan, but you have a session during ICANN74. So what's the plan there? What will you be discussing during that session?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Again, it greatly depends on what we will find out until then, and what news I can bring back from discussions with staff and members of the Board like Becky Burr, who we've been liaising on this. But essentially, it'll be a discussion by priority and how to move forward with the small team. Let's not forget that the aim of the small team was to try to review this ODA quickly, help the Board take a decision, help them move forward. If our work at cells is sort of delaying things too much, we probably need to look at transit ways to operate. We don't want to be a hindrance

here. We do want to be a facilitator, and all things that we will have to discuss during that session. But again, it's very difficult for me to preempt here, it's not a set schedule. It really, really depends on what we are going to find in the coming days and week ahead of ICANN.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Certainly, sure. Thanks. Thanks for that. Anything else you'd like to share on this SSAD ODA small team?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: No. There's definitely something to be watching. This is the first ODA that we're going through, and so there's a learning curve for everybody here. There's another one coming right behind us with the SubPro ODA, which will have its own intricacies and complications. Interesting it's a new form of operating, something I very personally believe in and like the intent of. But we need to make sure that we're not overcomplicating things and not delaying things. The idea of the ODA was to be able to plan ahead and make sure that we don't have future surprises. So we just need to use that efficiently and make sure that we arrived to our target before and in a better position rather than the more complicated world and with much delay.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Sebastien. Certainly, to second that, as you say, that's the first one. There's a learning curve for everybody, for Council, for the GNSO community at large, for staff, and for the Board as well, given that ODA is intended to inform them. What you're doing within that small team is certainly something that we could capitalize on in terms of working methods that say in terms of how the various stakeholders' small assets there get involved in that process. So I think we're learning a lot with what this small team is doing at the moment. That's why it's important beyond the question and the scope of that small team. Apart from that, maybe the jury stood out as to whether you will attend 74 in person, but I'll leave it to you how you would like to address that question.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Sadly not.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: What is it that you're looking to that meeting?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: The jury is no longer out. The jury came back in and decided that I was not going to come to The Hague, which is very sad because they don't know the fact here that my very Dutch mother comes actually from The Hague. So it's a city that I know well, not

perfectly, but I've been there very often and I was looking forward to sharing it with you all.

More importantly, but this is a bit of an acquired taste and will take connoisseurs to go for it. But you're going to The Hague right in the middle of herring season of [inaudible] of a very fresh herring just off the boat that you eat basically with your head up and entering the fish directly in your mouth. An acquired taste, it's not for everybody. But I was absolutely looking forward to feasting and feeding on that for the whole week, and I won't be able to.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Indeed too bad, and that's really unfair. So we'll be using your advice, both in terms of trying to acquire that taste. Hopefully, we'll see.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: You try it.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: But also on the choice of restaurants that you recommended for councilors that are in the audience will be using that. So thanks again, Sebastien. We're looking forward to the next steps for this small team.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you. Thank you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: So with this, I think we can move on to the next and last updates of the small team on the closed generics framing paper. As some of you would know, the ICANN Board invited the GAC and the GNSO to come together and discuss further the issue of closed generics, providing a framework for that discussion and suggestions on how we could approach this, both on substance and also on working methods. And determine for this team—team being a team of GAC members and GNSO members—to determine the next steps in terms of policy development.

So on our end of things, Council established a small team, as noted on this on the slide, to consider not only the question but also how we will approach that dialogue with our GAC colleagues. So we've been tasked by Council with essentially three tasks, three items, the criteria to determine the facilitator, which is suggested in the Board's letter, the potential participation from ALAC in the discussion along with the parameters of that discussion, the boundaries of the discussion, and how we will approach the question of the definition, etc. So, all of this is input to the small team. We're coming to pretty much the end, certainly the end on A and B, as noted on the

screen, and hopefully we'll close off and wrap up shortly on the last night, and for us to start our discussion with our GAC colleagues. Actually, I started by saying that we accepted the invitation from the Board to undertake that effort.

So this is for the updates on the small team on closed generics. So I think we're now at the Q&A. So we'll probably maybe first turn to Nathalie to see whether—I think there was one question in the chat so far, unless I'm mistaken. And if not, we'll take questions by the audience with the usual accustom using hands. Nathalie, were there any questions in the chat?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sorry, Philippe. I'll be able to know through Caitlin for the questions. Caitlin, over to you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Philippe. We received one question from Werner Staub, and this question is for Donna. "What about ASCII TLDs that are, in effect, misspellings of a string that would be an IDN TLD? Examples are .quebec (correct spelling .québec), .zuerich (correct spelling .zürich)."

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Donna, did you hear this?

DONNA AUSTIN: Yeah, I did. I did. Can you hear me?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, we can.

DONNA AUSTIN: Okay, great. When I said that what we're doing is complicated, it's really complicated. I've been chatting with Steve and Emily. Steve and Ariel in the background here are trying to unpack your question. I'm not going to be able to provide you an accurate answer, but what I will say is that we will be consistent with any recommendations that came out of SubPro. String similarity and confusingly similar, those processes are still going to be involved. So if somebody applies for the correct spelling of .quebec in the future, then that will be something that comes into play.

It is possible, but I don't know 100%, that the original applicant or the registry for .quebec may be able to apply for the correct spelling as a variant. But again, I'm not 100% sure on that. Actually, the guiding document that wasn't around in 2012 is the Root Zone LGR that is developed by the Generation Panels, who are linguistic experts. So that's another document that is pretty much we've agreed that that is one that we will uphold.

I'm not really sure what context you're asking the question either. But if you want to take it offline, we can look into it a little bit further. But as I said, this is complicated when we're talking about variants. So I'm sorry, I can't give you a straightforward answer. But there are a number of things you need to unpack and understand where there could be possible implications in relation to the current registry for .quebec and . zuerich and how it might be possible to apply for the correct spelling in .quebec and . zuerich in future application rounds. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Donna. So please feel free to reach out to Donna for follow up. Thanks, Donna. We all appreciate, given the complexity of the topic and the issue of variants and confusing similarities with IDNs. That is already a quite thorough answer. So thanks.

Any other questions? I understand that there was only one in the chat. Any other questions? Please feel free to use your hand. Anything you'd like to raise? Okay. I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. Would you like to raise your hand? Okay. Well, seeing no hand. Hopefully, that was very clear to all participants.

I just want to thank everyone here for taking the time. Thanks to the audience. We wish you all a very pleasant and efficient ICANN74 meeting, whether you have the pleasure because that's

going to be a pleasure to do it face to face, or whether you do it remotely. I think we're all looking forward to meeting you. Fingers crossed. But until then, have a good rest of your day. I'll speak to you soon. Bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]