

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 5th of January, 2022, at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. And just to record the apologies, we have received apologies from Evin Erdoğan from staff, Alfredo Calderon, Justine Chew, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Bill Jouris, Vanda Scartezini, and from Alberto Soto.

As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation for today's call. Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Claudia and Paula and our interpreters on the French channel are Claire and Jacques. Just a kind reminder before we get started to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

And one final reminder is, as usual, for the real-time transcription service that is provided on today's call. I'll just share the link here with you. Please do check the service. With this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim. Welcome, everyone, to this year's first call, 2022, the new year. Happy new year to everyone. I hope you've all managed to take a little break between our last call and now and been able to spend some time with family, friends, and so on, even though

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.

we know that we're under another wave of variant—not the IDN variants but something more important health-wise than the IDN variants. Of course, I'm speaking about the Omicron variant.

So wherever you are, I hope that it's been an uneventful Christmas and new year, uneventful holiday time for everyone. We're now ready for another year of policy work here in At-Large. Jonathan, did you want to say a few words or shall we just plow forward?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey. Welcome back, everybody. Let's dive in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Let's go, then. Let's start. Today's agenda is going to have, first, a status update on the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on EPDP Phase 2 and the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures. It's this dialog that is taking place between the Board and the ALAC. I'd say the first of its kind in some way. There has been some dialog in the past. But this one, because the two pieces of advice were so extensive, the Board has come back with some questions and the ALAC has responded or is in the process of responding with some answers. So we'll first go through this.

Then, after that, we'll have our work group updates—various work groups, which I gather might be a bit quick because I can't imagine there's been too much going on during the holiday period. There were a few calls that were due to take place after our last call. So it will be worth finding out what the plans are for this year. And then the policy

comment update at the end, where there are public comments for decision but none currently under development.

That's today's agenda. Are there any amendments, additions, deletions, etc.? I am not seeing any hands up so the agenda is adopted as it currently is listed on your screen. That means we can move on. And with an adopted agenda, we can go straight to the action items from our last call, the 15th of December—quite a number of weeks ago. They mostly pertain to either today's call or to the things that had to be prepared in advance of today's call.

Could I just check regarding the correspondence with Barrack Otieno regarding the public consultation on the ccNSO Proposed Policy on the Retirement of ccTLDs? I see that this has been ticked. Does anyone know the response that we have received from Barrack? Because I don't see this as being on today's call. Would anyone know? No? It doesn't look like it.

Okay. We'll maybe have to follow up on this. I guess it might be Evin that might know but I can't recall being copied on this. Let's find out since the 12th of January is approaching. It's, in fact, next Wednesday. So between here and next Wednesday, we'll have to check on that. But I'm not seeing any hands for any of the other action items. If that's the case, let's move on, then.

We go to agenda item three, the status update on the ALAC/At-Large processes, the first one being the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the EPDP Phase 2. For this, we have Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. There is not really a lot to report. The response to the Board's questions has been posted for quite a long time. There were very, very few substantive comments. There were a number of editorial ones. And Hadia has made a number of further suggestions, just this morning. Almost all of them are purely editorial. One is a minor clarification—at least, I think one.

But in any case, essentially, there has been very little of any substance commented. There were a number of changes made in response to the comments. That will be coming up immediately after this meeting and forwarded to the ALAC for its action on it. So essentially, our job is done at this point. Nothing has changed sufficiently to warrant another review in this meeting, given we have other things to discuss. So unless there are any questions, there's not really a lot to talk about right now. I thank those who did make some comments, though. I appreciate it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you. What's the next steps on this?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The next step is it goes to the ALAC. The ALAC, hopefully, will approve it quickly and pass it back to the Board. The Board does have a meeting with the GNSO to talk about the SSAD recommendations, along with publication of the results of the study that has been done on behalf of the Board. That, I believe, is taking place—I'm not sure the date—I think the 15th of January. So it's certainly important that we get our

comments to the Board prior to that meeting. But at this point, it will be out of our hands once the ALAC approves.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. I gather this is ready to go, then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Pretty much. There's some accepting comments and things like that. But essentially, I don't think there's anything of any great substance. It's a little bit later than we had planned. Both Hadia and I actually decided to take a break, as you just noted.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for that update, Alan. Are there any comments or questions from anyone? We appear to have a very silent 2022 so far. Either that or people are just logged in, now thinking and reading and trying to get back into it. No comments so far. Oh, I see Hadia has put her hand up. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier, and thank you, Alan. Happy new year to all. Because you're saying it's a silent 2022, I decided just to refresh our minds about NIS2. Let's remember that the aim of NIS2 was to achieve a high common level of cybersecurity across the EU member states. If the NIS2 regulation is to apply only to registries and registrars which fall under the EU jurisdiction, that will mean that Contracted Parties not within the

jurisdiction could easily become DNS abuse havens. In addition, also, that will mean fragmentation at the Contracted Parties level.

So our responses to the Board questions mainly focus on this issue and how the SSAD recommendations do not comply with the proposed NIS2 proposal. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this, Hadia. It will be an interesting exchange once this gets sent over. Right. I think we've exhausted every question or comment on this. Thank you very much. You know how to proceed forward now. Let's continue now with the second one of the subtopics. That's ALAC advice to the Board on the Subsequent Procedures. Justine is unable to join us for this time. But Jonathan Zuck will be able to provide us with an update on this process.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, everyone, and happy new year. Similarly to Alan and Hadia, the group has mostly taken the intervening time off. I personally did everything I could to forget that ICANN existed for the past couple of weeks. But we're back in the soup. There are actually two things that are going on, that relate to recommendations that involve the CCT Review Team Recommendations. This is my personal cross to bear as the former chair of the CCT Review Team and I guess the current chair of the Implementation Advisory Group for the CCT Review Team.

We're doing a recommendation prioritization exercise that we described a little bit on the last call. And we made some broad strokes

recommendations related to the CCT in the Subsequent Procedures comment period and advice to the Board. There's also CCT Recommendations that are embedded in the SSR2 recommendations.

So in a way, they've taken on a life of their own. The Board has endeavored to take on some of the recommendations. Some were passed on to Subsequent Procedures at the behest of the CCTRT. But the outcome was hazy.

So I think there's a fairly large effort ahead to sort back through the actual state of the CCTRT recommendations, and as the Board has proposed for this effort, restate them, essentially, as new recommendations in the context of Subsequent Procedures. In other words, it's now become too abstract to simply specify, implement the CCTRT recommendations. So one of the big requests from the Board in this list of questions from the Subsequent Procedures is just make new recommendations that incorporate the intentions of the recommendations that we want to emphasize from the CCTRT.

So check this space. I will be trying to reframe the CCT recommendations that I believe are the highest priority for the At-Large community and present them as, essentially, new recommendations to this group and then ultimately make that part of the response to the Board on Subsequent Procedures. So that will be coming up, if not in this next CPWG meeting, the one after that.

But beyond that, we've put a good dent in the questions that have been asked, the clarifications that have been asked for by the Board. We should have a more detailed presentation to give next week. I think

that's really the triage report from the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures. Happy to take questions or anything like that. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. I note that whilst there is a Google Doc that was created for the ALAC advice on EPDP Phase 2, there doesn't appear to be a home for the work in building the response. I note that during our last call on the 15th of December, there was a slide deck that Justine Chew had put together with the ALAC advice, replies to the ICANN Board's questions, and I'm a bit concerned that this gets lost. So perhaps one of the AIs would be to create a home for this response process and collect all of the relevant data, including the questions from the Board and this PDF that we see from the 15th of December.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right, Olivier. There is a document that just isn't public yet because we're homing in on its organization. But we'll make that document commentable very shortly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Of course, an announcement will be shared with the mailing list on this. Any comments or questions, anyone? I am not seeing any hands up so that process is ongoing. We'll look forward to next week.

We can now go to agenda item four. That's our work group updates. This is the first call of the year. What we usually have is a few days

before the call, Yeşim, or indeed Evin, actually, e-mails everyone and asks them in advance, “Will you have anything to show, anything to provide?” Of course, this is so early on in the year that we haven’t had the chance to do that. So I’ll quickly cycle through. If your group hasn’t got any updates for the time being, then you can just say so and we can save time on it. But I will be cycling through all of them.

We’ll start first with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, the TPR PDP that also works with the GNSO workspace on the Policy Review PDP. Our ALAC members on this group are Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka. I’m sorry. I haven’t even checked if they’re online with us.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hello.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I see Steinar is there so I’ll hand the floor over to you. Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hello. Happy new year to everybody. There was a meeting yesterday in the working group. We continue to work on the phrasing of the answer to the recommendation and the charter questions. I will post in the chat here the link to the document. If you start on page 15 for your readings, you will see the outcome of this. It’s going very, very technical details about security phrases, particularly connected to the TAC, the transfer authorization code.

There is also a new RFC that has been published recently that the group is looking for whether that is the tool that we're looking for because they want to synchronize that all the registrars are using the same technique so it will be more easy to registry operators and the registrars to actually do this in a safe and secure way.

From my point of view, I don't see the effect of this from At-Large standpoint. Whether the TAC is 16 characters or 20 characters, it doesn't really matter for the end users because the end users should not set that by themselves.

So that's a very short report from the group. Thank you. Any questions?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. I can certainly see calling it transfer authorization code, TAC, is probably better than AuthInfo Code, which is less of a descriptive way of calling the ... That's maybe a small comment on that. The floor is open for comments and questions from anyone. There are no hands up today. So thank you for this update and congratulations on the group meeting very early on in the year. That's a very eager group and I guess you still have plenty of work ahead of you on this.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: It's a lot of work but it's progress. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's progress. Yes. It's good to see the progress. I see Sivasubramanian Muthusamy has put his hand up.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Thank you. On the Transfer Policy's work, still the focus seems to be on the technical details of transfer, that Auth-Code, nothing more than that. There were some comments in the CPWG Working Group, one of which was that the history of transfer of a domain name, that is not ... Is that maintained by the registries, registrars, let's say, over a period of five years or 10 years? So if a domain name changes hands, transfers to somebody, and retransfers to someone else, are those details maintained? Is there any scope for this working group or any other working group to pay attention to those aspects? Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: If I understand you correctly, are you questioning whether there are some shorter questions that set criteria for historical transfer and logs about historical transfers?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes, logs of transfers, all times.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I can't recall any charter questions connected to that and I don't think that's a policy issue, in my mind.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: You mean it's not a policy question of this working group or that it's not at all a policy question?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I have some problems seeing it as a transfer policy issue. The registries will, of course, have records—all the records for a successful transfer—because there's a change of sponsoring registrar. Whether that is being stored for eternity, I don't think so. But maybe I'm wrong on this one.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yeah. And there's no clarity. Maybe some information on that would be helpful. If there is some way by which this could be clarified, whether the transfer records are synthesized or archived somewhere, just to see, for example, ICANN.org. How many times has it been transferred from one registrant to another or what were the changes on the registrant's status, registrant's records, and so on.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Okay. I'll try to find it. And if anybody has some point to direct me, I'm willing to spend some time on this. But the policy is connected to the inter-registrar transfer for one domain name at the certain point of the transfer and not the historical stuff. But if anyone has some information where I can start looking, I can spend some time on it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Steinar, I was going to put my hand up. In fact, I have, strangely enough. My hand goes up without me touching the ... Okay. It goes down. There

you go. I was going to mention, mentioned in the chat by Jeff Neuman is that this is a data retention issue in general, not a transfer policy issue when you look at the actual policy. There are some requirements in the Registry Agreement that pertain to this but that's not part of the discussions taken on in this group.

If you are interested in this, I see that John McCormack has got 23 years of transfer records. That's DNS-based. So just a little plug. E-mail John if you want to have that. I don't know whether he gives this for free. Maybe he does. Maybe he doesn't. But that's between you and him.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Steinar. Thank you for the question and for the comment, Siva.

Let's move on. Let's go to our next PDP. That's the expedited PDP on the Intergovernmental, IGO, Specific Curative Rights Protections. For this we have, I hope, Yrjo Lansipuro, since Justine isn't with us. Is Yrjo with us?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. Happy new year to all. The first meeting of this EPDP is on the 10th of January. So at this stage I don't really have anything to report except that our work plan for the spring has been nailed down. It extends until the 4th of April. Weekly meetings every week before that. So let's hope we get this thing ready by the time.

When that change of the work plan or change of the schedule—whatever it's called—was approved at the GNSO Council, there were some concerns expressed by the Registrars group on whether our group, the EPDP, is possibly straying from the narrow path defined by the charter. That just shows that we have a lot of work to do to get a result which I hope will be acceptable to all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Yrjo. Let's open the floor for comments or questions. Siva, I believe that's a hand for the previous topic or the IGO.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Sorry. It's old.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: With no new developments, I guess you have plenty of work coming up. So the 10th is the next call for this group.

That means we can move to the next one on the list. The next one on the list is the one on the Internationalized Domain Names, the EPDP on IDNs. For this, we will have Satish Babu, who can provide us with a quick update.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. First, I'd like to wish a happy new year to everybody. We really don't have an update at this point except to say that our first meeting of the year is tomorrow. And we'll be continuing our work with

the charter questions and also preparing for a session with the SSAC members—a joint session. It's not going to be tomorrow. It's probably at the next meeting.

But the EPDP on IDNs had requested all AC/SOs, if they had any written submission to make. We had the ccNSO and SSAC coming up with written submissions. The SSAC submission was sufficiently important. Then the group felt that we had to invite them for a meeting. So we'll be preparing for the meeting tomorrow with our regular charter questions. Once that happens, we will get back and provide an update on what has exactly transpired during that joint meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish, for the update. Let's open the floor for questions and comments. While people are gathering their thoughts, I have a question. Has the ALAC made a submission in that process or made any requests in that process?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. The ALAC has not made any comments because that was circulated to all the AC/SOs. The EPDP Team felt that it is somewhat premature and probably early on to give our written submission because the real issues were not yet opened up. We have had only, I think, two presentations to CPWG. We felt it is not yet time and we have informed Maureen, also. So ALAC has not made any written submission so far. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. The second question I have is whether the SSAC input is worth sharing in this group here or it will just be better for you to provide us with a summary during the next call.

SATISH BABU: I can share the link to the document in chat. I'll do it shortly—right now, actually.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. I am not seeing any other hands or anything so far. So thank you for all the work and looking forward to hearing—first, seeing the SSAC input and of course hearing the outcome of that meeting with the SSAC and with the teams that have submitted points.

Let's move to the next one. That's the RDA Scoping Team. That's the Registration Data Accuracy scoping team. For this, Alan Greenberg will be able to provide us an update.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is nothing to update at this point because we haven't had a meeting yet since the last time we talked.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: A perfectly fine response. I guess, automatically, I should say are there any questions or comments on this? Of course, there aren't any. So thank you very much for that. So we've gone through our work group

updates for today—very quick today, actually. The next thing is our policy comment update with Jonathan Zuck. I believe Evin isn't with us today so it's going to have to be Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes. It's never quite the same without Evin at the helm of this particular discussion piece here. The ALAC has recently ratified our advice to the Board on the revisions to ICANN's Documentary Information Disclosure Policy. There are some upcoming public comment proceedings, a proposal for Myanmar script Root Zone Label Generation Rules, update to the GNSO statement of Internet procedures and requirements. I wonder if that should be an operations and budget working group thing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

I thought that, too.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. The NCAP study, impact on data sensitivity analysis. That's something that Justine is working on. And supported scripts for IDNs. We'll get the date on that to you on the mailing list as well. There's something on the ccNSO Proposed Policy for the Retirement of ccTLDs. I want to say that we had somebody that had expressed interest in that comment but I'm not remembering who that is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Jonathan, was it Hadia, perhaps?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's what I was thinking, too, but I didn't want to put her on the spot. I wanted to remain vague and have her raise her hand if, in fact, she was the one who had volunteered.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Jon, could you say this again, please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, the public comment for decision. We were trying to make a decision about whether or not we wanted to comment on the ccNSO Proposed Policy on the Retirement of ccTLDs. Were you going to take a crack at helping us decide whether or not we wanted to take a position on that?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Exactly. But I thought that Barrack, actually, was going—that we decided, in the end, to have Barrack do that. That's why I did not prepare anything. However, I did look through it and I did text back. If you want me to do this, I can send you something over e-mail. But the reason I actually didn't is that I thought that Barrack took over this. So I didn't want to do something that he was supposed to do. It's not like I don't want to do it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. I don't think we're going to resolve this on this call. So let's take this offline and we'll resolve this on the mailing list.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Just to note, Barrack just answered me and he said that we can work on a Google document together.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Excellent. All right. There we have our resolution on that. I'm finding my way back into these issues after the long break. Thanks, Hadia, for speaking up on it. And Holly, you mentioned, "Should we make a formal ...?" I assume you mean a referral as opposed to a reference. Is that what you're suggesting, that we somehow formally refer something to you on the topic of the statement of interest?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. That's what I was thinking, Jonathan or Olivier—just a note that says, "This is an issue that I think is something that you should be looking at." It just means that at the next meeting that's exactly what we'll look at and decide how to deal with it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. That sounds good, Holly. We'll do that—refer it over to you. Then I think that that may be it for this update this week, Olivier. We're cranking back in here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. I just put my hand up, actually. On the topic of the SOI, statement of interest, procedures and requirements, if the GNSO is updating those ... I must admit, I haven't looked at what this is pertaining to. But of course, it seems like the Operational, Finance, and Budget Working Group is the right group to work on this. Maybe there might be, also, a requirement for the ALAC's SOIs to also be updated. I really don't know, at the moment, what this is about. But if there is, then perhaps what will be also something for the OFB to consider further.

On the topic of supported scripts for IDNs, it does say here, "At-Large IDN mailing list." The same thing could also be said about the proposal for Myanmar script Root Zone Label Generation Rules, also. So fire off an e-mail to the IDN mailing list for both the supported scripts for IDNs and the proposal for Myanmar script.

On the ccNSO Proposed Policy on the Retirement of ccTLDs, as I mentioned earlier, somebody ticked the box that Barrack was asked to present something. It seems to have been ticked so it probably was done. But I haven't seen Barrack's response, unfortunately. So that needs to be done ASAP. It needs to be worked on ASAP since the deadline for this is the 12th and that's next Wednesday. So we wouldn't want to miss out on that.

If I could ask that staff creates an actual ... Is there actually a space for this? I don't even know if there's a working space for this since it wasn't formally allocated. Oh, there is. Yes. There is an At-Large workspace for this. Okay. That's cool. That's already there. And everything that's

needed for this is there. So Hadia can follow up with us and with everyone. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thanks, Olivier. I just want to note that, most probably, tomorrow we shall be sharing the link with you on the group for the Google Document.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. I guess I'm not seeing any other hands up so that's done for this section and the next section, strangely enough, jumping from five to six. That's good. It's any other business already.

HOLLY RAICHE: Uh-oh.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And Holly has put her hand up. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, Olivier. You just whipped over the public comment for decision. I just wanted to remind people that within a day or two, depending on where you are in the world, there will be a meeting of the OFB Working Group. We will be discussing the Operating and Financial Plan and Draft FY23 Operating Budget. We had an initial briefing from ICANN Planning and there were two webinars held on that. They are both on the website for the OFB Working Group. Just by way of background for

people who want to get up to speed on the documents, I suggest you read the meeting notes for the December 16.

Then we will be having a presentation by Ricardo tomorrow and a discussion on what we, as ALAC, should be saying in terms of the budget. So everybody is invited to attend that discussion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Could you please share the details of when that call is tomorrow? You can share that in the chat for people to be able to see.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's on the calendar. I'll tell you what. Yeşim, would you put in the link in the chat? But on the ALAC calendar, it's already listed. So people, there's a link right there on the calendar. It's already there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And everyone is welcome to that.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sorry. If I may, the OFB Working Group will meet tomorrow at 19:00 UTC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. In fact, why don't you just send an e-mail around to ALAC, just with that link. Could you include in that link a link to the December 16 meeting of the OFB Working Group? Because that's got all the

background for people who weren't at that December meeting. That would be great. Thank you, Yeşim.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Holly, sorry. Just to double check. I'm having some issues here. You wanted me to send out a reminder for tomorrow's call with the link of last—

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, a link that takes people directly to the December 16 meeting of the OFB Working Group. It's on the workspace for the group. But if you have that direct link there, then people who want to actually catch up with the briefing that ICANN Planning gave us, as well as the webinar that they gave, it's really good background for tomorrow's meeting.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay. Sure. I will.

HOLLY RAICHE: Siva's asking, "To all CPWG [meetings]?" Yes. CPWG, ALAC. Okay? That would be great. Thank you.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sure. You're welcome.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. Just worth mentioning that the Operational Working Group calls are also open for everyone to attend. So you are very much encouraged to attend that. I am not seeing any other hands up. So that's the end of any other business and we can look at when our next meeting will take place.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Olivier. As we are rotating, next week's call will be at 19:00 UTC on Wednesday, 12th of January.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: 19:00 UTC next Wednesday? That looks absolutely fine. I'm currently not seeing any conflicts with anyone. No. Sorry. Did you say 19:00? At the moment, I see an OFB Working Group Recommendation Prioritization Subgroup on that. So maybe that has to be changed or something. Maybe that's an old entry that is in my calendar. Oh, no. It's 18:00. I'm getting completely confused. Sorry. That's fine.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. It's the first one of the year so we're a little bit rusty. Not seeing any further hands up. Thank you to everyone. We've got our next meeting set up. And particular congratulations to Yeşim for having been able to run the call today, pretty much as a one-person operator, I think. Flying the plane, serving the customers, doing the check-ins and the

luggage all at the same time is no small feat. So well done. And thanks to our interpreters, of course, and to the transcriber. Always very interesting, the transcription. If you've missed any of the points, then you can read back what's been said today.

Thank you very much. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening. And Jonathan, anything else that you want to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. That's it. Welcome back, everyone. We'll hit the ground running.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Great. Have a very good day.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks. Bye.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]