

## **Analysis of responses to the public comment on the Initial Report on the ccNSO PDP Review Mechanism**

- **Brown, Fannette-Marie.**

Analysis: A computer-generated response that makes no sense and should not be considered as a valid comment.

- **ALAC**

Submission: The ALAC commends the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) Policy Development Process Review Mechanism Working Group on completing the initial report and would like to offer its support to the included recommendations. The ALAC would like to stress the importance of ensuring that any review mechanism process does not result in end user confusion or inconvenience. Country Code Top-Level Domain (ccTLD) end users must be prioritized when performing any review mechanism. Commitment to due process and policies such as these will help ensure the consideration of end users. The attached statement includes the above mentioned ALAC comments as well as the ratification process.

Analysis: Consideration of ccTLD users is part of the IFO processes, which look at Significantly Interested Parties as per RFC 1591 and its FOI. Any review performed by the proposed policy would automatically include a review of the IFO's responsibility to consider Significantly Interested Parties. As such, the comment is mostly beyond the scope of this PDP.

- **Saad, Nojus**

Summary of Submission - The community needs more transparency, diversity, and multi-stakeholder management of the operations of the ccTLD PDPs and specifically the operators - especially prioritizing the integration of a Digital rights strategy and principle that ensures the privacy, security and inclusivity of ccTLD end-users.

Analysis: Many if not most, of the points are beyond the scope of this PDP, such as "What does the IFO structure look like? How diverse and inclusive it is? How can we ensure transparency, democracy, multistakeholderism and avoidance of conflicts of interest within the IFO?"

- **Hossain, Md Jahangir**

Complete submission: We appreciated the initiative of ccNSO PDP Review Mechanism but need to ensure that the current delegation or assignment ccTLDs should not be Transfer, Retirement, Revocation until ccTLDs delegator/manager requested for Transfer, Retirement, Revocation based on policy developed by the ccNSO."

Analysis: This is what the policy states.

- **NIC United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UKGBNI)**

Submission: “The ccNSO needs to be more concerned about transparent, democratic and multistakeholder operations of its ccTLD operators. We must remember problems, such as the DNS.PT Association fraud that reported that an ICANN member was one of the founders of this association, or operational problems, such as technical help, as in cases of ccTLDs such as .ua in Ukraine, which has been suffering from Russian attacks. And speaking of Russia, the ccNSO should come up with a faster plan for the demise of the .SU ccTLD which does not represent any country and has become the ccTLD of choice for criminals.”

Analysis: A Google search of “NIC United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” did not turn up anything, and we should probably confirm that this is an actual organization. Beyond this the comments are beyond the scope of this PDP.