

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 1<sup>st</sup> of December 2021 at 21:00 UTC.

We will not be doing the roll call tonight to save time. Attendance will be taken from the Zoom Room. I would, however, like to note the apologies we have received from Priyatosh Jana, Alfredo Calderon, Lianna Galstyan, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Steinar Grøtterød, Alberto Soto, and K. Mohan Raidu. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, Liz Le, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management. We have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and Veronica, and our French interpreters are Claire and Jacques.

I would also like to remind everyone that we have real-time transcribing on today's call. I will put the link in the chat so everyone can follow along. Thank you all very much. And I now turn the call over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Welcome to today's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. We are going to go through the agenda at the moment. First, we'll have the proposed revisions to the ICANN DIDP, the Documentary Information—my screen is going wrong—Disclosure Policy with Liz Le who is the Associate General Counsel for ICANN Org. So she is joining us today. Welcome, Liz. Then we'll have the follow-up presentation on the Expedited PDP on the Internationalized Domain Names. There's a

---

*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.*

---

follow-up presentation and you'll see also on your agenda a slightly smaller presentation which is the one from last week due to the fact that it has some interesting graphics in there that might be referred to. After that, we'll have follow-up on the Board advice. First, Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi will take us through the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the EPDP Phase 2. And then Justine Chew will take us through the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures. So that's the part of the interaction that's taking place between the Board and the ALAC. After this, hopefully we'll still have time, we'll have the workgroup updates, our usual updates from our various policy development processes. And then the policy comments updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğan looking at what's coming up since there is nothing that is there, strangely enough, at this very moment in time. And then Any Other Business. At this point in time, may I ask if anybody wishes to make amendments to the agenda or have any points that they wish to add? I'm not seeing anyone put their hand up. So the agenda is adopted as it currently is listed on your screen.

Then we have to jump smoothly to the action items. And you'll see there are quite a few of them and they're all completed, most of them relating to today's call. So I should just ask whether there are any comments or questions relating to these action items. Again, I am not seeing any hands. So that looks like we can move smoothly forward and go to the next agenda item. And that's going to be the presentation and Q&A on the ICANN public comment proposed revisions to the ICANN documentary information disclosure policy. Welcome, Liz. I guess the slides will come up. The floor is yours.

---

LIZ LE: Thank you, Olivier. Can everyone hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

LIZ LE: Oh, great. Thank you so much. My name is Liz Le. I am an Associate General Counsel at ICANN Org. I think that the committee has asked to have an overview of the ICANN Documentary Information Disclosure Policy or DIDP as we refer to it, and the public comment that is currently open right now for proposed revisions to the DIDP. So next slide, please.

So just a quick overview on the DIDP for those who may not be familiar with it, what the DIDP is it's a mechanism that was developed to allow members of the public to request information that's contained in documents concerning ICANN operational activities that are in the possession or custody and control of ICANN that be made public unless there's a compelling reason for confidentiality. Now, I want to note that these are documents that would be requested to be made public, in addition to the documents that ICANN makes public in the normal course of business. There are a number of those documents that we make public from our financial documents to documents relating to our Board meeting minutes and our Board materials, and those are all published on ICANN's website. If you go to the DIDP page itself, you'll see that we provided a number of documents and links to the categories of documents that we make public as a matter of course. But

---

in addition to that, what the DIDP allows a person to do is to submit these requests that ask for documents that are not in the public sphere and that are be appropriate for disclosure to be disclosed. When a person submits a DIDP request, it gets responded to by ICANN Org within 30 days. As part of the response, what ICANN Org does is we assess and evaluate the request at issue and the information that's being requested and we assess the appropriateness of disclosing the information.

The DIDP itself has a number of conditions that are defined for non-disclosure such as certain Trademark Information or privileged documents that are not appropriate for disclosures. So if those conditions are applicable to the documents that are being requested and there isn't a compelling reason for public disclosure outweighing the harm of disclosing the document, ICANN will provide in its responses identify the conditions that are applicable to the categories of documents. If there are documents whereby none of the conditions apply and it's appropriate to disclose, ICANN will disclose the document with the response. So that's just a quick overview of the DIDP itself. Next slide, please.

The DIDP was a mechanism that was developed in 2009 after community consultation, and then it was updated again in 2012 at the community consultation. In its Work Stream 2 effort, the Cross-Community Working Group on enhancing ICANN's accountability produced a number of recommendations in improvements to the DIDP as well as they proposed responsibility for the Ombudsman or the Complaints Office relating to the DIDP. And in response to that, ICANN Org prepared proposed revisions to the DIDP to address the Work

---

Stream 2 recommendation. We opened the public comment proceeding to see community input on the proposed revisions through DIDP, as well as the Work Stream 2's proposed responsibility for the Ombudsman or the Complaints Office relating to the DIDP. The initial deadline to submit comment was this December 6, when we have since extended it, the request the ALAC to December 13 to submit comments to the proposed revision to the DIDP. Next slide, please. Sorry, next slide.

So I think when you go to the DIDP, the public comment page itself, in the materials that we have explained, it's obvious what the revisions are. We've also provided links to the Work Stream 2 recommendations and we've also created redlines of the current DIDP versus the proposed revision. But just to put it here and highlight for the group, what we're seeking input from the community on as one input on our proposed revisions to the DIDP itself to address Work Stream 2's recommendation. Two, we're seeking input on the five criteria that the Work Stream 2 defined as part of the analysis for the expansion of the Ombudsman's role in the DIDP process. And the criteria are laid out here and they're also laid out in the DIDP public comment document itself. Then the third thing that we're seeking input in is the proposed expansion on the wall to Complaint Office in the DIDP process. And again, you can find that on the public comment page.

So with that, I do want to yield the floor to my colleague, Sam Eisner who is ICANN's Deputy General Counsel and is working in overseeing this process as well to see if she has anything to add. If not, then I do want to give the floor to any questions that you may have relating to the DIDP and the public comment.

---

SAM EISNER: Thanks, Liz. This is Sam Eisner from ICANN Legal. I don't have anything else to add. I know I'm interested in hearing the group's questions for us. I say let's move to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So I guess we can therefore open the floor right away. And if that's the case, I see a hand up already from Gopal Tadepalli.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. Thank you very much for nice presentation. Access to information, whether it is confidential or otherwise, should not have too many bottlenecks. There must be a procedure. Ombudsman office cannot become one more bottleneck. There may be a number of reasons in a global context where certain documents which are not classified public may need to be accessed. So there cannot be too many bottlenecks. So how is that ensured is the question, that the top cannot become a big bottleneck for accessing information?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Liz, Sam, I'm not sure who will comment on this.

SAM EISNER: Sure. Thanks for the question. So we agreed that there shouldn't be a bottleneck, right? That's one of the reasons that we have this process in place. Of course, ICANN already makes a wealth of information available

---

on its website proactively and without people having to ask for it. And so this is for that separate category of information that's not yet available or possibly needs to be redacted before it goes out.

So we have the DIDP process. It's something that's been in process and working since 2009. As was mentioned, we have a place on the ICANN website where you can access all of the prior DIDP requests and responses. The Work Stream 2 team took a look at the questions, the process, and made some recommendations, and so we're trying to enhance that. One of the things is they're trying to make sure that one of the recommendations, which has been incorporated into the revisions includes a bit more shorty on that 30-day limit and to make sure that things can't get pushed out to too much further. So we encourage you to take a look at the process itself. And if you have further recommendations or comments on the process that we think has been drafted to incorporate those Work Stream 2 recommendations, we would definitely be interested to hear those.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sam. Next is Michael Palage.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Hello. Sam, I guess having been an individual that has submitted many DIDPs over the years, I was a little disappointed in the proposed revisions. I think the proposed revisions actually make getting access to information more difficult. I think the bar was raised, not lowered. What I will do is I and a number of attorneys who have filed DIDPs, the document disclosure request over the years, will actually be filing some

---

written comments. So we will give ICANN the ability to respond in course with the rest of the public comments received.

The one thing that I struggle with and that I'm concerned about is the redline to the last enumeration. And if it's possible, can we pull up the redline with the last enumeration of what is out scope on the DIDP? It deals with materials including but not limited to trade secrets? Is it possible to pull that up on the screen? Maybe not. Okay.

SAM EISNER: I just put the link into the chat. Maybe someone can pull that up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The link is on the chat, yes. So perhaps whoever is in charge of the screen can try and—

MICHAEL PALAGE: There we go. I think it's at the bottom of page three or four. If we can go down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Magic happens.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Indeed, the beauty. A little further. Okay. So what happens is we start off—this is one of the enumerations of what will not be disclosed. I am fine with ICANN trade secrets, but what gives me pause—and perhaps if



---

you can give any insight—Is the fact where it talks about material harm to ICANN’s financial—if we could scroll down to the next page—material harm to financial or business interest. And then probably even more concerning, or the commercial interests of stakeholders who have those interests. There’s obviously been sensitivities to ICANN having oversight of the contracting parties. And the fact that ICANN would disclose information that would be detrimental to the financial interest of its stakeholders, that just seems problematic. Could you perhaps give any insight to what ICANN was thinking about that?

SAM EISNER:

Sure. Mike, it’s helpful to remember, too, that these aren’t just ICANN’s revisions, right? This is part of the Work Stream 2 recommendation. So it might be helpful as you’re developing the comments that you’d like to put forth, that you weigh them against the Work Stream 2 recommendations as well. So within the Transparency subteam, as they were looking at the existing defined conditions for non-disclosure, they went through them pretty carefully and had conversations and ICANN was participating in many of those conversations as well and providing input. We first were not part of any proper consensus on a recommendation or anything. It was a very lively group with a lot of conversation.

To your first point, we’d be interested to hear how you think this is actually more restrictive information, because from our standpoint, it really is providing some broader aspects of information. It’s reducing some of the areas where we previously had to find conditions for non-disclosure. So we really would be interested to hear that. But I think it’s

---

also important to weigh this against the Work Stream 2 recommendation. But as they were discussing this trade secret portion, there are times when ICANN is in receipt of third party information and we don't want to be the place where people won't do business with us because they think that if we get their information, we will automatically disclose it. We do want to make sure that we have the right parameters in making the appropriate level of information available to the public, but we do get business concerns from our contracted parties or from other vendors that we're not really at liberty to just disclose, and so we do you need to ask for permission if that's something we're going to make available. We don't want to set a bar that anyone who comes to ICANN automatically agrees to make everything that they do public just because ICANN has it. But we also ask the people who come into the ICANN system to understand that ICANN values transparency, and there might be additional requests for making things available. So I think that the trade secret portion was a way that Work Stream 2 was attempting to balance that. So I encourage you to look at that report and how they describe how they came to some of the changes on these defined conditions for non-disclosure.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Put it this way, we did. As I said, it's amazing what happens when you get a bunch of ICANN attorneys together. So we will give you a very detailed response in the public comment that will be coming forth in the next couple of days. But I guess what happens here is, look, I know we people don't like to talk in hypotheticals. But let me give you a specific example of how I see this particular wording being inconsistent with open transparency and all the other good stuff.

---

So one of the things Göran talked about was how registries have now granted additional access to the processing of their zone file and other information so that the abuse can start being tracked at a registrar level. He made that announcement at ICANN72. Now, one of the things that ICANN has disclosed as part of its restrictions via commercial relationships is that it is not able to disclose certain reputational blacklisting and other things, which I totally agree. If ICANN is licensing the product then that vendor will not allow you to disclose that. Totally 100% agree and understand. The problem, however, is as ICANN now begins to have access to start tracking DNS abuse by registrar level, historically, ICANN has only disclosed that information at a hierarchical level. If in fact there is someone who believes they have a reasonable belief that a registrar is engaged in questionable business practices or is causing the abuse, you're basically saying that they're not going to be able to get access to. The way I read this is they will not be able to get access to that because disclosing that a registrar was number one and DNS abuse would somehow be detrimental to their business or financial interest. Is that a fair reading of how ICANN would deny access to that request?

SAM EISNER:

We surely haven't looked at this in terms of the application any particular program or collection of research data. So we're not really able to answer that right now.

---

MICHAEL PALAGE: I understand. I guess that's part of it. As I'm reading this document, as someone who has filed multiple document disclosure requests over the years, it's just incredibly frustrating when you're trying to get data and on the 30<sup>th</sup> day, the e-mail comes, "Sorry, not available." So as I said, I'm not going to dwell on this. As I said, myself and a number of other attorneys will be using the public comment. We'll be submitting something, we'll not only be documenting the Work Stream 2 work. Yes, we will do that. So thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Michael. Thanks for this very interesting discussion here. Now I'm a bit concerned of the time. I was going to close the queue after Christopher Wilkinson. Gopal, if you could put your comments in the chat, please, because you've already had the chance to speak earlier. I'm going to take Siva, Alan, and then Christopher. Thank you for this, Gopal, and over to Sivasubramanian Muthsuamy.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHSUAMY: This is on the previous slide on the role of Ombudsman. I'm a little surprised that there is even a thought of discussing the role of the Ombudsman with regard to this process. Shouldn't the Ombudsman's office be seen as a point of redressal or appeal for directors when the regular processes fail? The regular processes of applying for information and appealing for the information, when all that fails, then one goes to the Ombudsman for a director. So why is that role a little redefined here?

---

SAM EISNER: Thank you, Siva. The Work Stream 2 team actually recommended that the Ombudsman have some level of a role in here, but then the Work Stream 2 team also had their companion work on the Ombudsman where they identified, just as you said, this is a process that appears to be out of scope for the normal Ombudsman role. And so in the communities considering whether to add a new task to the Ombudsman that they should follow these five questions that are laid out here. And so we encourage you, individually or collectively as ALAC, to consider how you would respond to these questions including some of the concerns that you raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Two questions. Actually, a follow-on to each of the previous two speakers. In terms of the issues that Mike was raising on confidentiality, it's completely standard in all sorts of agreements and certainly ones related to confidentiality to say you cannot reveal things that have been given to you subject to non-disclosure or subject to the requirement that you not further disseminate it, and that's quite reasonable. The way that clauses were written here, however, it almost implies it's ICANN's decision, whether you think, "This may harm them so I better not do that," and "Well, if I do that, I may end up with a lawsuit because I've harmed them, and therefore, I better not do it." So it's a very different thing, in my mind anyway, not disclosing something

---

because it's subject to confidentiality and it was disclosed to you under appropriate terms. Simply having the clause saying, "Well, someone may hurt someone, therefore..." I'm reminded a number of years ago in Montreal, they would not disclose information publicly that restaurants had been found to have health problems and rats and things like that. Why? Because it might harm their business. I swear that was the case. And now, hopefully, that's no longer the case. But yes, it made harm of the business and maybe that's good sometimes.

On the second issue of the Ombudsman, I understand the two conflicting Ombudsman aspects of the Work Stream 2 work. We have been advised a number of times over the years that if someone has a recourse, it has to be mentioned. So if we take an ALS application and reject it, in the rejection, we say, "And you have the following recourses if you don't like our decision." Under that kind of thing, I would hope that when the dust clears, if the Ombudsman does have a role to play, or the Complaints Office has a role to play in this process, that'd be mentioned explicitly in the policy. And it's not something subject to a side decision or you happen to have inside knowledge about it. If there is a recourse then that has to be presented as part of the policy. I understand that maybe it's still under discussion. But ultimately, if there is a role for anyone else to play Ombudsman or the Complaint Office, it really needs to be mentioned as part of the policy. So it can't be changed on whim or not known to someone simply because they hadn't read all the ancillary documents. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Sam, did you wish to comment on this so we can go to the next person, and then you can close off if you want.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't really need an answer.

SAM EISNER: Thanks. Just to note on the Ombudsman thing, I think that it would be a really helpful portion of the comments that we're seeking to get back on that Ombudsman portion to include those concerns, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Christopher Wilkinson is next. Hello. Good evening. Olivier, apologies for joining a little late but I had to enter the pass code six times before the system would accept it. Copy-paste.

Look, I have very strong sympathies with Mike Palage. So question on reservations. I don't want to take your time more than that. But bear in mind that this issue does extend beyond the attorneys in Washington that I hope them goodwill, but it's a broader concern and a broader interest globally about the transparency of the organization.

Specifically, I'm aware of certain documents which have been submitted to ICANN, which are released currently or in the past, I believe, on their websites, which certainly and in the interest of the public interest and competition and transparency do affect the commercial interests of certain stakeholders. That is what we are here for. So I have very strong reservations just under drafting of this clause that we have been looking

---

at almost irrespectively of Mike Palage's considered and legal reservations and problems arising.

ICANN staff, you are involved in servicing the interests of the public interest globally. And when you get documents and data that service that purpose, it should be transparency available. I think you should be very, very cautious. Speaking to the ICANN staff, you should be very, very cautious about accepting any reservations or qualification about the availability of the information that you receive. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. And, Sam, I'll let you close off on this, if you wish.

SAM EISNER: We appreciate the concerns that are raised here. We're always trying to improve our transparency practices within ICANN. I really encourage the group to look at the Work Stream 2 recommendations and to see the views that we were bringing into this revision. Clearly, if there's more that the ICANN community, in particular the ALAC, wishes to identify as other changes that they hope to see. Please bring those forward within the public comment, but this is part of the implementation, the Work Stream 2, and we're really trying our best to bring those into practice and to achieve those improvements. So we look forward to your input.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Well, thank you very much, Sam Eisner and Liz Le, for coming to explain this DIDP to us. And it looks as though there is likely to be



---

some commenting coming from the ALAC, judging from this. Unfortunately, we have to move on. We could have probably spent another 30 minutes on this topic but we have other topics to deal with today. So thank you.

We're going to move swiftly now to the next agenda item. That's the EPDP on the Internationalized Domain Name. And there's going to be a follow up on last week's discussion. Last week, there was a full presentation by Satish Babu. This week there are members of his team that are here. I'm not sure who will present today. Is it Lianna?

JUSTINE CHEW: No, it's Justine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Justine. Of course. Why didn't they put your name first? I have no idea. I'm just reading the names as they come through. Justin Chew, welcome. You have the floor now to take us through the second presentation on the EPDP on IDNs.

JUSTINE CHEW: Great. Thank you, Olivier. Yes, Satish and Lianna sent their apologies. Lianna's traveling. And Satish, time zone is just ridiculous for him. Anyway, the team—and when I say the team, I'm talking about the ALAC team, the five of us—just by way of opening remarks, I take full responsibility for the fact that the last week's slide deck was very dense. But we really wanted the CPWG to appreciate the amount of information and data that the team actually has to scrutinize in order to

---

work out the positions that we might want to propose to CPWG to take on in terms of answering the charter questions. So I hope you will give us a break in terms of the density of our slide decks. Having said that, we also agreed that we would try to simplify what we presented last week. And the result of that is this particular slide that you see presented now. Okay. So we'll actually go to slide number 2 already.

We have had close to about 14 working group meetings, EPDP meetings, up to 18<sup>th</sup> of November. And so far, we've covered charter questions a1, a2, a3. And just to note that some people might think that we're moving at a rather slow pace. I'm putting on my hat as the vice chair of this EPDP. I would have to say that we had several, quite a few working group calls dedicated to capacity building, and we thought it was necessary and it proves to be very useful, which basically took up quite a few calls. Now we are moving swiftly on to getting through the topics A in terms of the charter questions. Okay. So this particular presentation itself, we're just going to be dealing with the first three charter questions a1 to a3, because those are the ones that we have managed to cover so far. Okay. Next slide, please.

I will go through in very brief details in terms of each charter questions. Okay. So charter question a1, if I could just simplify it, it refers to existing delegated gTLD labels. And the question basically is should we use the Root Zone Label Generation Rule as the sole source to calculate variant labels and disposition values? Now, before you ask me what variant labels and disposition values mean, if we can just pop over to the next slide, and we'll come back to this later. Yes. Okay.

---

So this table shows you what variants are and what disposition values are. So in simple terms, a label can have many variants. And what you see as the original label here is also considered as a variant. So in this particular example of Arabic label, you'll see the new label. So that is the actual IDN. And then the A labels are obviously the representation of the new label in Unicode. Rows 1 to 24 will tell you what the variants are for this particular label. The disposition value determines whether each label is blocked or allocatable. That's the meaning of the terms that we use when we talk about disposition value labels and code point sequence. So you see the code point sequence, that is how you represent the label itself in terms of computer display, I suppose. Okay. So going back to the earlier slide.

All right. So in order to answer this question a1, we have to set a few contexts in place. The first one being that the Root Zone Label Generation Rule did not exist for the point of the 2012 round because it only came into being since 2013. That's also a couple of recommendations from the Subsequent Procedures PDP as well as the TSG or Technical Study Group. They have both recommended that compliance with the Root Zone Label Generation Rule is a must in terms of validation of future applications, and also to support the calculation of variant labels.

Now, the question that we are posed in this EPDP is whether we should impose that recommendation on to existing delegated gTLDs. So what we did was we requested ICANN Org to do a data analysis of all the existing delegated TLDs and analyze that using the Root Zone Label Generation Rule version 4.0, which is the current authoritative version, and see what the result is in terms of any discrepancies. So they did that

---

and what we found was basically only three applied for labels, which were self-identified by the applicant itself as being variant labels of their TLDs or their labels. Only three instances, so three cases, where they did not conform to the Root Zone LGR. And we're talking about close to 2000 over TLDs. So three out of 2000 plus isn't very significant at all. So basically, because we didn't think that these three cases pose a threat, we happily said that the answer is yes to the question on a1, that there shouldn't be any issues in applying Root Zone LGR as sole source for a distinct delegated gTLD label.

So moving on to question a2 which is on slide five. I'm just going to run through the slide deck and if people have questions, they can bridge it at the end. Okay? With question a2, it talks about—in terms of what happened in the 2012 round is variants to TLDs weren't allowed. But notwithstanding that, applicants were encouraged. It wasn't mandatory but they were invited or encouraged to provide their own calculation of what variant they had for their TLD labels, the ones that they applied for. And this question basically says that we had applicants actually self-identifying variants in the last round. And in such event that they were used to contribute it to any calculation that was undertaken in terms of evaluation, for example, to determine string contention sets, then should we take into consideration these self-identified variants from the last round? The thing that we want to point out here is it was made very clear during the application process in the 2012 round was that any and all self-identified variant TLD labels have no legal standing. So they don't count for anything. It was just a matter of interest that they were invited to be submitted. We've already mentioned before that a significant portion of this self-identified variant labels already

---

conformed RZ-LGR. But because they do not have any legal standing, then we took the position that it doesn't matter whether the variant labels that were identified were used for any purpose or not. If they carry no legal standing and we do not carry any legal standing, then we're not obligated to consider them in any way. So the answer to this charter question a2 would be no. There is no further action needed.

Yes, I want to thank Hadia for intervening and answering questions in the chat as much as possible so that we can save time.

Coming to charter question a3, this is the one that was a bit more complicated. It's interesting because when we asked for data analysis, the interesting bit I wanted to know was in terms of the charter itself, it was question a2 that asked for data analysis. All right. But because we took a1 and a2 together, the data analysis results turned out to be more useful for a1 and a2. So there you go.

Moving on to charter question a3. Next slide, please. Okay. So a3 has a bit more complexity, as I alluded to earlier, it has a number of parts. But if we could just address the first bullet point, which is to say that—okay, so we're now we're talking about scripts that are already covered in the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. Okay. So we know that there are—I forget the number. I think it was 11 that have already been incorporated into the RZ-LGR and we have a handful of proposals that are pending in integration. A number of proposals have just gone through public comments, including the one on the Latin script, which ALAC has a comment on.

---

Okay. So we're talking about scripts that are covered by the Root Zone Label Generation Rule. The question basically says that if an applicant has applied for TLD label of which the script is covered in the RZ-LGR and that label is found to be invalid, then is there any reason not to use the evaluation challenge process that has been recommended by SubPro to allow an applicant to challenge this determination of invalidity? And the context that we want to raise for your attention is the fact that there are six evaluations that each applicant has to go through in the initial evaluation phase that happened in 2012 round, and we don't foresee that's going to change for the next round. So, I want to point out that in coming to the conclusion of this question a3, we have had to adopt quite a few assumptions in terms of the process of how the applications are going to move forward in the next round.

Okay. So this is this is one of the assumptions. The fact that the six evaluations will remain for the next round, the fact that all the six evaluations are actually undertaken by third party evaluation panel, so not undertaken by ICANN Org, but ICANN Org actually appoints third parties to do the evaluations and come up with the determinations. And the fact that each label or applicant must pass all six evaluations before anything, any of the applications can proceed. When I say applicant, at least one of the evaluations has got to do with the applicant itself rather than the label such as financial and technical stability.

Also to note that in the 2012 round, one of the six evaluation panels is the DNS stability panel. What we're told is they actually did a review of all the applied for labels for ASCII and IDN requirements conformity, and what those conformity requirements are is actually in the Applicant Guidebook of the 2012 round. So I'm not going to go into that.

---

Remember that the RZ-LGR didn't exist before the 2012 round. If I could put it just very simply, it was manually checked by the DNS stability panel for the 2012 rounds.

In terms of challenges, there was no challenge mechanism for the 2012 round. So what happened was applicants who had grievances about the evaluation determinations by the panel, they ended up going the route of ICANN accountability mechanisms to ventilate their grievances. So an example of an accountability mechanism would be the request for reconsideration. And if you understand our RFR, the Request for Reconsiderations, and similar accountability mechanisms, they are not designed to handle challenges at a third party or application of new gTLD level. I'd like to say all but I'm going to qualify that by saying that most of the accountability mechanisms have got to do with asking for review based on action or inaction by ICANN Org or ICANN Board. In totality, ICANN. So because the evaluations are done by third party, they're not covered because they're not done by ICANN. So that's why I said that the accountability mechanisms are not designed to handle challenges to determinations of third parties. That is why the SubPro PDP recommended a limited challenge process be created for the next round. That process that the framework that challenge mechanism has got included elements which I put in the slide. I'm not proposing to go into that in detail. Next slide, please.

So after deliberations over a number of working group calls, what the EPDP concluded is three high level points. First point—and I'm going to take the time to read this out because this is important—is that an applicant can challenge an evaluation determination by the DSP that an applicant applied for TLD label whose script is supported by the RZ-LGR is invalid.

---

So basically, we are allowing for the possibility of a challenge by an applicant where the application for label is determined as invalid by the DSP, provided that the script of the label is already incorporated in the RZ-LGR. So, in essence, we've adopted the RZ-LGR as authoritative. So we have to apply it, basically. If the RZ-LGR says that the label is invalid because the DSP says so then it's invalid. But the applicant has the ability to challenge and that's going to be qualifying. Because the point number two says that the eligibility for filing such a challenge is limited to, if the assessment of the label being invalid was done incorrectly. All right. I'll come back to do that in a little bit.

The third point is that the evaluation challenge processes and the criteria applicable to this challenge process will be similar, if not mirroring what the SubPro PDP has already proposed in terms of a challenge mechanism.

So our proposed answer of the group, the ALAC EPDP, is we agree with these three high level points. But we will also ensure that point number two will include clearly an explanation that the eligibility is limited to an incorrect assessment of the RZ-LGR as it applies to the label being applied for. What we mean there is that it applies only insofar as errors to technical implementation of the RZ-LGR. I'm going to go a little bit, if you just allow me to explain and give you an analogy. All right.

So, when we say technical implementation, the RZ-LGR, remember we said last week that this implementation is going to take the form of some kind of algorithm built into the application submission system. So, we acknowledge that there could be possibility of errors in the programming when this implementation is done. Come up with a



---

positive error in terms of if something that should have been a label that should have been valid is invalidated due to a programming error, then the DSP has the opportunity to intervene and correct that error. We are saying that the challenge mechanism is only applicable to such cases of error. And it's the implementation of the tool rather than the rule itself. So we're not going to allow any challenges to the rule itself, just the application of the rule resulting in an error.

So the analogy I like to use is, if you take, for example, the GeoNames policy. One of the other six panels is the Geographic Names Panel, right? What their role is to take the GeoNames policy, basically, whatever the GNSO has come up in terms of GeoName's policy and apply it to each application to see if the criteria for GeoNames has been met or not met. So I'm not going to go into details of that because it's out of scope for this conversation. But what I wanted to allude to is the fact that the policy itself is not determined by the panel, the policy is determined by GNSO and the community. It's only the panel that applies the policy in assessing a particular label that's applied for.

So in the same way, if you're challenging the rule, basically, in the GeoName context, you're challenging the policy. So we can't allow the applicant to challenge the policy because the policy is not, as I said, it's not established by the panel, it's established by the PDP in the ICANN Org. So if you want to challenge the policy, you have to go through the PDP process in order to amend the policy. So in the same way, any challenges to the RZ-LGR, some of the content of the rule cannot be considered or entertained by the DSP. It has to go back to the creator of the RZ-LGR, which is the Generation Panel and the Integration Panel, and the whole RZ-LGR procedure.

---

Moving on to the next slide, just very quickly, the rationale for why we have agreed to this subject to the clarification is that through the capacity building sessions that we've had in the EPDP calls, we've understood the principles and workings of the RZ-LGR. I would invite you to have a look at those webinars or the calls, which we've posted there, covering the presentation by Sarmad and demo of the tool by Pitinan. So that gives you a clearer picture of the amount of information that we had had to sift through.

The second rationale is that the understanding that various assumptions that we adopted would apply, vis-à-vis the RZ-LGR used within the DSP. So we've said that there's going to be an initial algorithmic check incorporated into the application submission system which checks for validity. But the DSP will continue to perform manual review for conformity. And the DSP evaluation is authoritative, meaning to say that if the DSP figures out that the label is invalid, then the application for that label will be disqualified. That is the trigger that allows for a limited challenge process for the SubPro proposed mechanism.

Rationale number C is that we understand the SubPro's challenge process to be quite well thought out and there isn't anything that we would want to change specifically, and we thought that it was suited for the challenge process in context of the IDN labels being applied for.

Moving on, rationale number D. This one is an important one. The fact that we believe the RZ-LGR should be authoritative and should always prevail. So, again, this goes back to the fact that we are not going to allow for challenges to the rule itself, just the application of the rule. This is very important because we need to protect the integrity, the

---

security, the stability of the RZ-LGR and the DNS, which is all, as far as we're concerned, contained within the LGR procedure process.

So, any applicant's grievances which suggest that the content of the rule is wrong, incomplete or incomplete, is outside the scope of the DSP. So again, I said, if you want to challenge the content of the rule, you go to the GP, the Generation Panel. You don't come to the DSP, the DNS Stability Panel. And such grievances should be handled by way over request for change to the RZ-LGR. And that whole procedure itself, as I said, is part of the RZ-LGR procedure and it's not really within the gTLD program or the application for new gTLDs.

Rationale E, the tool itself, we keep talking about the tool. The tool itself is actually already available because, as I said, the RZ-LGR has been instituted since 2013 so that there is a tool for it. So, there is already availability for any potential applicants to use the tool to make sure that their label that they are interested in applying is valid. It's actually in their interest also that if they find that the label that they want to apply for is invalid, then they should go straight away to the GP and request for change or request for consideration of a change to the RZ-LGR before the next window opens. Because if the label is invalid then chances are that the application probably won't proceed to the end anyway.

The Rationale F, I just like to point out that even though the label is determined as invalid by the tool, the LGR tool, the algorithmic check within the application submission system, even if it comes out as invalid, remember we said that the DSP is still going to do a manual check. So we kind of agreed that there should be allowance for invalid

---

applications to proceed. Invalid, meaning found invalid by the initial algorithmic check. So those invalid applications should still go through but they go through to the DSP. So the DSP has an opportunity to check whether the determination was actually correct or not. We said that this was allowable because we recognize that there could be edge cases where the tool is wrong because of programming complications or programming errors. Yeah, it's got to do with the complexity of the code points and the fact that the tool actually generates thousands of possible variants. But the allowance of label having been determined invalid by the algorithmic check to go through, to proceed to DSP, that is still subject to the label having met other mandatory string requirements and the IDN in 2008 requirements. Okay. So that's the end of our recap. Questions, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Justine. I was going to say you need to wrap up as time is ticking. We have Hadia Elminiawi in the queue, and we'll probably have to move on immediately after that. And if there are more questions then perhaps can we have another session next week on this? Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. Thank you so much, Justine, for this presentation. I want to just quickly mention that, personally, I don't think that manual calculations will do a better job than an algorithm, especially when you're dealing with complex code points or whatever. But I would say the point that Cheryl put in the chat and that's the SubPro

---

recommendation, which is to address concerns or grievance by applicants. I think this is very important.

That's why I think that the main reason, to me at least, for allowing such a challenge is to address concerns raised by applicants in relation to the implementation. As for the content of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules, theoretically speaking, anyone could challenge the contents of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules by addressing the Generation Panels, and this could happen any time. The applicant does not need to wait for a new round for applications. The tool is available online. If anyone tries the tool and thinks it's not doing a good job or the Root Zone Label Generation Rules are wrong, theoretically speaking, this can happen any time. It does not need to be [spread] to any application process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. I just want to say thanks, Hadia. Look, we were hoping that the recap and our explanation of the rationales and how we arrived at certain conclusions would have answered questions from last week. But by all means, if anyone believes that they have further questions, sure, we'll be happy to take this over to next week, if need be. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Justine. If anybody has questions, could I just have a show of hands, please, if you have, so we can evaluate whether

---

we'll need another session next week, maybe another 10-15 minutes next week for just questions and a recap on this. No. It looks like maybe everything that needed to be asked has been asked and every answer has been given. Well, look, we'll just give it a chance next week in case. Thank you very much, again, Justine, for this excellent presentation and taking us through the points. I guess maybe people might have to digest both this presentation and the previous one. We'll open up a window next week again. If I understand correctly, there is no deadline as such so far, is there?

JUSTINE CHEW:

No. Because the PDP is ongoing, and we're just tackling batches of questions as we go along. So this is part of our update, the ALAC team's update to CPWG on what's happening with the EPDP. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Fantastic. Thank you very much. The next item is going to be a status update about the back and forth discussions between the Board and the ALAC, a follow-up from the meetings that took place during the ICANN Week a few weeks ago. And for this, we have first the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board of the EPDP Phase 2. Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi will take us through a Google Doc for a comment. Is it Hadia? Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Okay. Thank you. If we could please go to the Google Doc. So basically, we're saying the same things we said last week but we put more details

---

in there. The first issue, the Board is asking can the ALAC please clarify what GDPR related regulations in Europe it is referencing. We are saying the ALAC is referencing the European Commission legislation in progress, NIS2. The legislation revised discussions about access to WHOIS data. Article 23 of NIS2 imposes obligations on registries and registrars. It requires them to maintain accurate data, published data related to legal entities, and to provide timely access to legitimate requesters for non-public data. So that's the response to the first part.

Then the second part is saying what issue is it recommending that the Board should request the GNSO Council to reconsider? Obviously, we are recommending that the Board requests the GNSO Council to reconsider the SSAD policy recommendations. They're asking about the expectations regarding potential impacts to the recommended SSAD that would support such Board actions. So we're saying that the upcoming EU regulation has a direct impact on the domain name registration data in relation to its accuracy, access and timely disclosure to legitimate requesters. The current SSAD policies as proposed do not meet those requirements. And as the main purpose of the EPDP on domain name registration data was actually to comply with the GDPR and NIS2. It's a subsequent regulation or law that's actually complementing the GDPR. So if we're not complying with what the NIS2 is actually saying, we have not actually done what we were supposed to do. Because the purpose of the EPDP to start with was to comply with GDPR and relevant laws and regulation. If we could scroll down a little bit, please.

We are saying that the current SSAD policies as proposed did not meet those requirements. As the main purpose of the EPDP on domain name

---

registration data was to comply with related laws and regulations that ALAC is of the view of the firm, the adoption of the SSAD recommendations until we have a clearer view of what would comply. Because they're asking about the impact and they're saying this is instead of wasting time and resources from adopting and implementing policies that will need to be reviewed maybe before they're even put into operation. Alternatively, NIS2 requirements as they become law could apply only to EU registries and registrars. But this will certainly impede competition and introduce fragmentation to the DNS ecosystem. And the segmentation here, it's not only about competition between registries and registrars that exists in Europe and those outside of the GDPR jurisdiction, but also it will relate to registrants going to—picking registries and registrars based on who offers more flexibility and maybe also those who impose threat, those carrying actions that lead to DNS abuse would go to certain registries and registrars that are outside of this jurisdiction. So in all cases, it's not correct to have registries and registrars following different rules and regulations globally. For that, we think we need to wait and see what NIS2 comes up with in order to adopt and implement an SSAD that actually complies with NIS2. If we could scroll down a little bit, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, it's Olivier. I'm a little concerned of time.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: The document is there, and you can go ahead and read it. Please put your comments and suggestions. Please do.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, Hadia, if there are any points that you need highlighted, that would be maybe the thing. Is there anything else that needs to be highlighted further down? I guess if everyone could—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: The question here would be, first, are we really recommending deferring the SSAD policy—do we want to tell the Board, “Do not accept it” or do we want to say like, “Delay it until we know more”? That’s the question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Hadia. This document is available for comments. You see there’s a link in the agenda to the Google Doc. I guess you’re inviting everyone to comment on this document, then.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thank you very much for this. We are a little bit behind time and we need to continue. The next people in our agenda—well, people no, the next person—is regarding the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the Subsequent Procedures. For this, we have Justine Chew again. Welcome back, Justine.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I'll take 10 seconds. Just to update the group that the small team for this particular piece of work has convened and work is progressing. I'm hoping that we could present something more substantive in two weeks, if not next week. Thank you. Olivier, back to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Too quick for Olivier to manage, I suspect.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Not quite.

JUSTINE CHEW: You take over, Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm showing so much enthusiasm at the moment. And I'm muted, of course, and only my neighbors will ever know how happy I was. But there you go. I'm sorry for this. Thank you very much for this, Justine. I guess we can now move into the next agenda item. That's the workgroup updates. We have first the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. Steinar wasn't able to make it, but Daniel Nanghaka who is on the road at the moment is able to provide us with a swift and quick update. Daniel, you have the floor.

---

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I hope my network is very stable and okay. Just to review what the meeting had, is that we had at least an update from the Registrar Stakeholder Group which also happen to make a call on the domain lock period that we had earlier on discussed from At-Large. The input from At-Large was taken so much into consideration, and the Registries Stakeholder Group, majority of them mentioned that the 30-day plus the 60-day lock would be more appropriate upon the domain creation. Then once the domain transfer has taken place, then at least also this domain lock period can be enabled respectively, which is either a 30-day or 60-day lock. But it was taken note in the TPR Working Group that these days can be reviewed at a later point as we continue the deliberations into the losing FOA recommendations that we were earlier on discussing.

We continue to review the recommendations that we were deliberating upon in the previous meetings and quite a number of things came up into these recommendations. First and foremost, every time the losing FOA is done or any changes is being done to a respective domain, the registered name holder that has to be notified about the change that has been made into their account and also whether a transfer has been requested or not. This is to keep just the registrant updated of what is taking place into the domain and also to help resolve some of the critical security issues.

In cases where the party requesting the transfer authorization code is different from the registered name holder, then obviously losing FOA has to provide that extra layer of security in the form of a second factor authentication to make sure that the transfer is taking place and is a valid transfer taking place. This brings to my attention that the CPWG

---

has to take note that the TPR Working Group is taking note of all the respective security concerns in respect to the domain transfer at any given respective point.

Also to note that the working group also recommended that there was need to eliminate the Transfer Policy requirement of the registrar of records to send the losing Form of Authorization. This form of notifications have been reduced the number of communications or notifications that have to be sent. Because in many times, once there is constant communication, sometimes it becomes an issue of spam. But then also the various notifications have got to be taken into consideration. What would be the time that would be required that a registrant provides the TAC or the Transfer Authorization Code? In the working group, it was mentioned that at least 10 minutes would be a good time that the authorization code is sent and also the validity period is discussed in the working group. The domain name transfer is very important. And then also the time that the TAC has been provided and also the instructions detailing how the registered name holder can take action in case the request is invalid has been also put into consideration. That is in the recommendations from the working group.

Also to take note that an issue of the resellers came up because the resellers have to get information from the registrant because the registrant is the main holder or bookkeeper of this domain. But the scope of the discussions with the reference to the resellers was put on hold and the discussions will be coming in at a later point. So that is just a brief of what has been transpiring in the Transfer Policy. So probably in the next meeting, in respect of time, we shall be discussing more on the various recommendations that the working group came up in

---

reference to that losing FOA. So probably a presentation will be worth it such that the CPWG knows or is aware of all the respective recommendation that is coming from the TPR in reference to the Transfer Policy. Thank you. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Daniel. Thanks for this update. And as you mentioned, in the interest of time, we can probably go to the next update and we'll have a full discussion next week, have a bit more time to spend on this. But it's good to hear that the At-Large participants are being an integral part of this group and are able to influence the direction that this is taking. Now, the next one is the Expedited PDP on the Intergovernmental Organizations. For this, we will have Yrjo Lansipuro, I believe. Yrjo, you have the floor.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. First of all, I'd like to note that on our At-Large team to the IGO EPDP, now Justine and Carlos have traded places. So now, Justine is a representative, like myself, and Carlos is an alternate. Perhaps in the future, we can start rotating with Justine as far as these reports are concerned.

On Monday, we continued reviewing public comments to our provisional Recommendation 3. It's a recommendation that the IGO complainants be exempt from the requirement to submit to the jurisdiction of the courts, at least, in one mutual jurisdiction, in case the losing registrant challenges the URS decision and wants to go to court.

---

In other words, we suggested that the IGO doesn't need to waive its immunity in order to participate in the UDRP or URS.

Now, there were many critical comments to this point, including from Business Community, Registrars community, and many businesses and individuals who argue that the losing resistance should be able to appeal in a judicial process.

We discussed a couple of comments that claimed to have new ideas and compromises to the effect that the IGO would not need to give up its immunity at the outset as a prerequisite for entering the UDRP process. But in essence, they would just postpone the moment when an IGO has to decide whether to waive its immunity in order to proceed. That was a non-starter. The IGOs turned these ideas down. But the search for possible compromise continues. The next meeting will be on the 14<sup>th</sup> of December. As I said last week, our expedited work will be extended a couple of months, at least into the new year. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thanks very much for this, Yrjo. Thank you for this update. We can now move to the next one. And the next one is the EPDP on the Temp Spec. It's now got a name to it. It's not just EPDP anymore. That's the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi have the floor for a quick update on this.

**ALAN GREENBERG:** I don't think we have any update. The only thing ongoing is the Board questions. And at that point, Hadia's already reviewed it. We'll be

---

continuing on that. I don't think there's anything else that we need to report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this, Alan. Of course, the next one is the EPDP on IDNs. We've just had a feature presentation a moment ago. So the last one is back to Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi we for the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team.

ALAN GREENBERG: That one, I'll have a final draft of our items on the gap analysis that were talked about last meeting. It'll be out in the next day or so. And we'll finalize it at the next meeting. We will need some significant time in the next week because it's due the day afterwards. Thank you. But nothing more right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. We can move to the next item then on our agenda. Thanking, of course, all of our representatives in those work groups. It's just one thing to present an update but it's also another thing to be part of the group, and I know how many calls there are. There are a lot of them out there. Now, policy comment updates. Jonathan Zuck, Evin Erdogan, you have the floor.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. I'll just be super brief. Recently ratified by the ALAC same as last week actually is the proposal for Latin Script Root Zone

---

Label Generation Rules. There are a few upcoming public comment proceedings. November has officially closed as of today. But the Myanmar Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules one may open soon. Beyond that, stay tuned for a few more coming in the new year.

There will be one public comment opening in December, but this is likely related to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group, and that would be on the ICANN Draft Fiscal Year '23 to '27 Operating and Financial Plan and Budget. So currently, there are two public comments open for decision for consideration for the CPWG. One was presented on earlier in the meeting. That's the proposed revisions to the ICANN Documentary Information Disclosure Policy or DIDP. We had noted that Hadia had expressed interest in reviewing this public comment.

Then we also have the ccNSO proposed policy on the retirement of ccTLDs. We have reached out to Barrack, who is the ALAC liaison to the ccNSO, and not yet scheduled a presentation. But if anyone's interested in either one of these public comments, please do note your interest and we will note you on the drafting team. Otherwise, over to you Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evin. I don't think that I have anything to add. That was a good summary. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's Alan. I do.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see your hand is up, Alan. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On the document disclosure one, I think we need something more specific as an action item and who's going to be responsible. We'd have an extension, but we have an extension only effective until next week. So we need something done relatively quickly on that. I'd like something a little bit more specific than Hadia's had prepared a presentation for today. If you're speaking, I can't hear you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was coughing. I don't have a more specific answer so I think we're going to take that offline.

ALAN GREENBERG: As long as we do it quickly. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. I was going to actually jump in just on this topic to suggest that we ask if there are volunteers to pick up the pen on this. Jonathan, I realized you missed the early part of this call where we had that presentation on DIDP. It was certainly one of the reasons

---

why we're a little late now is because there was plenty of discussion on that, and certainly some points that were raised that got quite a few people to get involved in the discussion. So perhaps capturing the opinions that were shared today, as Cheryl mentioned, and creating a page—well, the page is already there, actually. But putting those points over on that page and identifying someone who is happy to shepherd the process to have something drafted is one way forward. I know that Alan has put his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I've got enough on my plate. I'm not sure I want to take full responsibility. But I was asked to make sure at least one part of it was included and I will certainly actively participate. Maybe I'll have time to actually draft something. I'm just not sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this. Of course, the other thing, I don't want to lose Hadia's presentation. Unfortunately, we didn't have time today for her to present, but we'll have that next week. That will be significantly closer to the deadline which we've already asked to be extended. There's unlikely to be a further extension beyond the 13<sup>th</sup> of this month. I guess this is the big focus at the moment. So if until next week, someone wishes to step forward and take the lead of this, then please do this on a mailing list. Evin will, of course, follow up on the mailing list as well with relevant information. Hadia Elminiawi?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a volunteer from Jonathan on the chat.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. I was wondering. No one actually raised a question in relation to the timing of the responses. So the responses are due in 30 days. If ICANN is not able to provide the responses in 30 days, it will notify the requester with the reason for a delay and then a response needs to be provided within 60 days. I don't know. Is this an issue? I just wanted to ask. Or it's not?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for pointing this out, Hadia. I guess as you see in the chat, Jonathan has volunteered to listen to the conversation again and to shepherd the process. I therefore invite you and Alan to contribute to it. Let's move forward. I'm concerned about the time yet again. Your hand is up, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I thought I put it down. I was just going to react to Hadia and say I don't think that 30-day plus extension is unreasonable. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Thank you, Evin. Thank you, Jonathan, for going swiftly to this section, which means that we can go to—just pointing out that the ccNSO proposed policy on the retirement of ccTLDs has a deadline next year. So we still have plenty of time to ask Barrack to provide us with some background to this public consultation.

---

We now are going into Any Other Business. Whilst you all recover your thoughts about what other business you'd like to bring forth, I should remind you that the ICANN73 plenary topic proposals are due on the 13<sup>th</sup> of December. Yes, very soon. If you want to get in the mood for this, join the ICANN73 Planning Committee meeting tomorrow, Thursday at 18:00 UTC, and get to work to prepare for the next ICANN meeting, which is very likely to be ... which actually is confirmed to be another meeting that will take place for the online, unfortunately. But of course, the topics will be particularly important since, as you know, the break between the third meeting of the year and the first meeting of the next year is quite a number of months. So think quite carefully. Any comments or any other points that anybody would like to raise in Any Other Business?

There's a question from Holly, "Is that meeting on the calendar for ALAC?" I am not sure. If staff can check. Because obviously, there would need to be a link to that meeting for those people that are interested in attending.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: We will check into that and I'll touch base with you, Holly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: There was a call for people to put themselves forward to be in that group. So I'm sure those who put themselves forward have actual calendar invitations. But it is important to transparency. So more things should be on the calendar, I think.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Cheryl. I should add that there is a link from our agenda that goes to the agenda of tomorrow's meeting. If you're a bit lost, just go on to today's agenda and click on that. Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment apart from mine. I don't know what it's doing up there. Put the hand down. I am not seeing anyone else. So thank you very much to everyone who has provided updates today. We have to check when our next meeting will take place.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Hello, Olivier. It's Michelle. Following rotation, it will be next Wednesday, the 8<sup>th</sup> of December at 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 13:00 UTC. Are we clashing with anything?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Not as of right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fantastic. I'm well aware that next Wednesday is also the global IGF. So to those people that are traveling there, take a great care of yourselves. Be careful. Wear your masks, etc. We hope that we'll be able to see you also online on that day, although you might be very busy in person there. Apart from this, I'm not seeing any other hands up. Jonathan, is there anything else to add?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nothing for me. Thanks, everyone.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Olivier, just looking at the calendar, I know we went to 21:00 UTC today. We were 13:00 on the 24<sup>th</sup>. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're in rotation. Unfortunately, it's clashing with Cheryl's night, which is pretty terrible and it's tough. But we have to do that rotation and then we'll do the rotation week after at 21:00 again.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Okay. Actually, next week is 19:00. I do apologize.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is next week 19:00?

MICHELLE DESMYTER: I'm looking at the calendar here.

JUSTINE CHEW: I thought it was 13:00.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It should 13:00. The meeting is supposed to be 20:00 today but it was delayed by two hours due to the clash with APRALO monthly call. It's 13:00. Okay.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: All right. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I'd like thank our interpreters and the person dealing with the real-time text transcription. Very helpful service as well. The captioner, [Carrabelle]. There we go. Thanks to you all for having lasted the full length of this call. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, wherever you are. Take good care of yourself with those uncertain pandemic times that we're going through at the moment yet again. Goodbye.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you all. See you next week.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thanks, everyone. Meeting adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**