

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call taking place on Wednesday 16th of November 2022 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing the 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 to go over our apologies, we have received apologies from Sebastien Bachollet, Lutz Donnerhacke, Satish Babu, Steinar Grøtterød, Marita Moll, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alberto Soto, Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet, and from Justine Chew. From staff side, we have Chantelle Doerksen, and myself Yeşim Sağlam, and I'll be doing call management for today's call.

As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation, and our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Paula and Veronica. And our interpreters on the French channel are Camila and Isabelle. Just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for interpretation purposes as well, please.

And my final reminder will be for the real-time transcription service provided on today's call. I'm going to share the link with you here right now. Please do check the service. And with that, I would like to leave the floor back over to Hadia Elminiawi. Thank you very much.

---

*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.*

---

HADIA ELMINIAMI:

Thank you so much. This is Hadia Elminiaw, for the record. Welcome all to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call. So let's take a look at the agenda. If you approve it then we go ahead and adopt it. So I will give you a couple of seconds. Please take a look at the agenda. We can scroll a little bit down. So hearing no voice. And, Christopher, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Thank you. This is Christopher Wilkinson, for the record. I've just posted to the chat right at the top of the screen the link to a very recent article from Dot Org, the Public Interest Registry about transparency in ICANN of -- first of all, I must say it's a relief to discover that somebody else is also feeling a bit itchy about GNSO and related matters. But the specific problem that is described is -- the specific problem is the number of participants who, according to the author, do not transparently record their affiliations.

I know this is bouncing around between Chantelle and Olivier but I haven't seen their respective chats. But all I would say that I would, Olivier, I would like this question to be not dealt with in AOB but that the staff and the ALAC Leadership retain the question specifically as an agenda point for a future meeting.

I think it's fair to let all our colleagues have a chance to read the article and to form their own views before we have a substantive discussion in CPWG. A slight interest in this because I may have to leave the call before the end of the call. Olivier?

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So thank you, Christopher. So you don't want it in the AOB. So, Olivier, do you want to have the floor? Or Jonathan has his hand up. Do you want to give the floor first to Jonathan?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Give the floor to Jonathan, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Jonathan, go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. Jonathan Zuck here, for the record. Thanks, Christopher, for bringing this to everyone's attention. Just as a nit, it feels like something that ought to be taken up by the overhead finance and budget, a committee that deals with sort of like intra ICANN kinds of issues more so than the policy committee. I know you're more used to participating in this one but I think we should talk to Holly and get it on the agenda for the next OFB call, which is coming up shortly, and she can circulate it and take the discussion there. That's just my impression of the issue. That's probably where it should live.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan, for your comment. Christopher, do you want to respond? So I have Alan's hand up. Alan, please go ahead.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I just wanted to mention that there are very significant implications to the policy process in this. So although I don't necessarily disagree, it is perhaps akin to the current changes to the GNSO procedures which -- it's a blurry area, but I would not want to shuffle it there completely. So just keep that in mind. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. Christopher, do you want to respond? Okay. So we are not having this item on the AOB for today. And if there is no significant objection, we will ask Holly to kindly put it on the agenda of the OFB-Working Group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia, it's Alan. I thought Christopher was asking to move it to the regular agenda, but not take it off this agenda altogether.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. But not for today because Christopher said let's give an opportunity for people actually to read the article and this side in order to be able to discuss it. So in all cases, we won't have it on today's agenda. But I will give the floor to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. Yes. So let's have it as an item for next week and just share the article for now. And we'll see in between this call and next week's call. We'll be able to find out whether we should have it in the Consolidated Policy Working Group, or whether this is

---

more of an organizational item with regards to ICANN transparency and the whole process that is currently taking place in the OFB-Working Group. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Olivier. So that's the action item. We put it tentatively on next week's agenda. Olivier, this is an old hand. Okay, so seeing no more hands up and hearing no voice, we adopt the agenda as is and move to the action items.

So the only action item we had was in relation to the registration data consensus policy for gTLD public comment proceedings. I have put some comments and Alan also has put his comments but we have not received any further comments on the wiki page or through the email. Anyway, this item is already done. We can check it and go back to the main agenda.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Hadia, this is Chantelle. If I may interrupt one moment.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, please. Go ahead.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you, Hadia. So for this action item, it's still unclear whether the CPWG is moving forward with a formal statement or if we can consider this closed. I think that's one thing we need to decide on this call, as the

---

comment will close on the 21st, which means there's little time for the ratification process to proceed. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Chantelle. And we will discuss it during like when it comes up. We have this item on the agenda, so we will have time to discuss it. So let's go back to the agenda. Now we go to the Workgroup and Small Team Updates. So we have no updates today from the transfer policy review PDP. We also have no updates from the EPDP on gTLD-IDNs, the RDA scoping team we also have no updates for today. The SSAD, we do have Alan. Would you like to give us an update today?

ALAN GREENBERG: I could. It will take 30 seconds, but yes.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I didn't realize we're at that point yet. The update is basically following what I said last week. A report is going to the GNSO Council. It is recommending that the WHOIS Disclosure system, albeit suggested with a different name, go forward. And it'll go to the GNSO Council, I believe, in their December meeting. I don't think there's anything further to report other than that.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. So nothing until the meeting in December, right? So let's go to the closed generics. And, Alan and Greg, any updates? Do we? Alan, you want to –

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't see Greg on the call. There was another procedural meeting this last Monday, I think? Yes, on Monday, and we are still talking. Again, we ran over agenda. But the discussions are still proceeding. The issue of travel funds for the alternate were discussed; there was no resolution.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So nothing yet in relation to travel. And the actual work will start actually in January when you meet face-to-face, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's not clear when the actual work will start. Presumably, it will start before, because just having a face-to-face as the first meeting is not likely to be fully productive. But there is no schedule announced at this point.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you so much, Alan. Any questions to Alan? So I see no hands up. So let's go to our next agenda item, Policy Comment Updates, and I leave the floor to Chantelle. Chantelle, please go ahead.

---

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

Thank you, Hadia. This is Chantelle, for the record. There are no new open public comments at this time. There are still six that are scheduled to open in the month of November. Two of -- no, sorry, four of which I think are of importance to the CPWG. And, Hadia, I'll let you go into detail more on those.

I also want to draw your attention to the upcoming public comment proceedings in December, which has one that I think we should start talking about because it'll come up quite quickly. It's the initial report of EPDP on internationalized domain names. So that could be a discussion topic for our future call between now and when it opens. And then moving on to January, which will come faster than we think, is when the NCAP Study 2 draft report is now slated to open. And you might recall that a few months ago, we had some guest speakers on, the two co-chairs, to give us an update on their work.

And just moving back, I realized I skipped over this: recently ratified by the ALAC was the ALAC statement on the proposed update to the GNSO operating procedures, which touches on the article that Christopher Wilkinson raised for discussion. So that statement has been submitted and that public comment proceeding closed on the 14th.

Now, I know Hadia you're going to speak a little bit more on the registration data consensus policy for gTLDs, but as a reminder, that closes on Monday the 21st, and so we'll have to make a decision because that needs to move through the ratification process for the ALAC if a formal statement will be announced.



---

And then finally, just one quick procedural note is that the GNSO Council meeting is actually tomorrow on Thursday, and not in December. And I'll stop there, Hadia, for you to do the deep dive on the comments. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Chantelle. We can discuss now the registration data. So let's take the open public comments. So the first is the proposed amendments to the base gTLD, RA, and RAA to add RDAP contract obligations. And as mentioned last time, we have actually decided not to proceed with a comment in that regard. And basically, the WHOIS Protocol that has been the standard to access domain name registration data for 30-plus years, but the WHOIS Protocol had limitations and those limitations were in relation to internationalization.

So the WHOIS Protocol did not support internationalization. It did not include authentication; it only supported lookup, but no search. It had no encryption abilities. So the RDAP actually came in in order to address WHOIS limitations. So it allows for authentication. It allows a differentiated access, which means that if you could have limited access to anonymous users and, for example, full access to authenticated users. If we were to have a standardized element to differentiate between legal and natural persons, then RDAP could actually support this.

So basically this about -- and also I would note that registries and registrars were actually supposed to be implementing already RDAP in addition to WHOIS, but now this public comment is about incorporating

---

RDAP in the contracts of registries and registrars because before, of course, it was the WHOIS Protocol that was put in the contracts. So as we can see, RDAP has already been in use and the only comment here could be in relation to the lookup.

So according to section 3.3.9, interactive webpage, RDS lookup service now is not like an obligation for registries and registrars to have it on their website while before, it was an obligation. We must remember that the lookup will always remain there on ICANN website. There is also -- maybe a comment in relation to the full explanation of the RAA agreements and policies in simple plain language so that consumers could actually understand their rights. And that's in 3.16.

Apart from that, the proposed amendments are fine. And, again, I think those are minor issues and I personally do not think it's worth a comment, however, and the comment period actually closes today. And the comment period closes today. So I stop here and if you have any questions -- so we have Alan and then Jeff. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. We discussed this last week to some extent. The suggestion has been made that perhaps a comment would have been warranted on keeping the registrars' requirement to have a WHOIS. Despite the lackings of the WHOIS, it is a well-understood procedure, and there is no other well-understood procedure for web access to published WHOIS information.

Now, the fact that there's not very much published information at all right now, it may be moot, but with new European legislation that in

---

fact could change. However, time has gone past us and we haven't done it. So I think we're going to have to let it stand. My personal feeling is that perhaps a comment would've been warranted should it have come to our attention soon enough. But so be it. Sometimes it doesn't work out as well as it should. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Alan. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yep. Thanks. This is Jeff Neuman. So, yeah, as Alan said, it's kind of late but I can address Alan's comment in a second here. But I think a supportive comment also could have been made. There was a change in these amendments made to the registry agreement which allows ICANN to take the registrar data and put it into the BR, essentially into the DAAR. And so basically it gives ICANN bulk registration data access to the registrars' information. So I think that's a good thing that certainly will help with the DAAR report, Domain Name Abuse Report -- sorry -- that ICANN puts out. So I think that could have been a supportive comment there.

On Alan's point, Alan, the language, the protocol that RDAP is in, is in JSON, which means that anyone can build an interface. I can even build an interface in a day. The browsers have interfaces for it. So you'll see as soon as RDAP is used more or now becomes the standard, you'll see lookup tools provided by a number of different entities because it's based on JSON. So it's really easy to put together.

---

That's the whole reason why the registrars don't have that requirement anymore. It's not to make it harder to get data, and it won't, it'll actually be very easy to get the data not just from ICANN lookup, but anybody can build a quick client for it, so thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Jeff. Yes, I do definitely agree with you that by implementing RDAP, now access to registration data would not be limited to registries and registrars. And I think I do know a couple of examples. And also, I do agree with you that ICANN Org will be able to use registry, bulk registration data, access information to study, and report on domain name registrations and security threats as part of DAAR, OCTO's effort. And this is something that's worth supporting. But so as many other elements of RDAP implementation that are also worth the support. So I guess unless we did object or do something in there, we do support definitely RDAP. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

To note, we had an extensive discussion on this last week, and it was clear that, yes, other people will develop interfaces, but it's a process which kills what people have been used to, and there's some negatives to that. However, we're not submitting a comment, so let's not spend a lot more time on this.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Alan. So seeing no more hands up. And if you would like, we proceed to the next item, which is the proposed amendments to SLA for

---

the IANA Numbering Services. And we have agreed to not comment on that. If there is a different opinion? Nothing. Okay. Thank you so much. Let's go to the registration data consensus policy for gTLDs. And if we can go to the wiki page, please. And, Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. As Hadia noted earlier in the call, there have been no further comments on the wiki page. Accordingly, I will take the data and translate it into the requested form because, you know, as is normally the case these days, the GNSO has requested input in a standardized format to make it easier to summarize and process. And we will do that and I'll note it's standard practice that if we don't have enough time to ratify prior to the comment close, that the ALAC will ratify after the fact. And it's a long-established process that it's the ALAC chair who will make the call on whether that's acceptable in this case or not. So I think we're on track for that. I'll send a note out when the revised form is ready. But I don't think there's anything more to discuss on this one.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Alan. And our comment will be in relation -- we do support the whole document. Our comments will be in relation to section 4 and section 10. Section 10 speaks to the disclosure requests. And we are commenting mainly on the response time for urgent lawful requests. And for that, we think that two business days is too long.

And another comment could be also in relation to the importance of still having a standardized system for access and disclosure. And then section number 4 speaks about the timeline for implementation. And

---

we think that the timeline is -- the policy according to the plan would be implemented in 2024. And we do think that implementation could be expedited. So basically two comments; one in relation to the implementation timeline, and the other in relation to disclosure requests. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, there's also a comment on the thick WHOIS implementation.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Which is section 7. Although I think there is nothing much to do there. Like we will -- correct, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I strongly disagree.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Really? Yeah, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Phase 1 made it really difficult to implement thick WHOIS. But it did not invalidate the whole policy, which is what the recommendation is here. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. So thank you for clarifying this part. So any questions to me or Alan? Seeing no hands up, we will --

---

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Hadia, Hadia, Jonathan's hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan has his hand up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Oh, I'm sorry. I did not see it. Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, thanks. Jonathan Zuck here, for the record. My question to the two of you, I guess, is: how does a currently non-thick WHOIS registry justify the need for the data under GDPR?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if that is possible, and as it said, it requires agreements which are not in place and honestly are not likely to be in place. However, there were other aspects to the policy. And on top of that, factually, it did not invalidate the policy. It may make it moot, but it didn't invalidate it. And for the implementation review team to say that the whole policy disappears because it may be difficult or close to impossible to implement, I don't believe is right. That's not within their jurisdiction.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So you're raising more –

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm giving you my opinion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're raising it more as a bad precedent rather than really championing thick WHOIS.

ALAN GREENBERG: It certainly sets a very bad precedent.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: But remember, there are also other aspects to the thick WHOIS policy that have already been implemented, which this essentially cancels out. So I think a comment is warranted.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. Thank you, Alan. So putting the comment out there. And definitely yes, we need to voice this out as you mentioned. But how would this really affect what's in place? Or do you see a possible change in the thick WHOIS policy implementation? Alan?



---

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, whether this has a measurable effect on reality is not the issue. They have translated words into something that means completely different. And as the board noted, when they approved the policy, they did not believe that the thick WHOIS policy has been invalidated, the thick WHOIS part of it. I remember there were other aspects to the policy; there were several sections to it of which the actual implementation of thick WHOIS was only one. But I just believe it's outstepping their bounds. So, you know, to –

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: You know, I could live with pointing out -- adding a policy noting that new agreements will be necessary to implement it, which is what the actual phase 1 said, but that's not what they did. They basically said the whole thing is moot, cancel it out. That I don't believe is appropriate.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Noted. Thank you, Alan. Thank you for explaining this to us. And seeing no more hands up, let's go to the current statements. So we have the Registration Data Consensus Policy for gTLDs, which we have just discussed. And we have the Initial Report on the Second CSC Effectiveness Review. This is with the OFB-Working Group. So please check it and join the OFB-Working Group if you would like to comment on this. Now we go to -- seeing no more hands up, we go to any other business. And I give the floor to Jonathan. Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just looked away for a second. Sorry, what's the topic I'm speaking on?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It's the ICANN76 Planning.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, yeah. Okay, great. Thank you. Yes. Sorry, I was asked to speak on that. We had our first meeting of the ICANN76 Planning Committee, and just began to talk about some sort of goals and objectives for that community forum. And because it's the community forum, we're hoping to not overdo it with our own sessions where we're just talking to ourselves and really make a point to get folks to go out and attend some of the other sessions that are going to be taking place that are of a particular interest to the At-Large Community. That includes sessions related to DNS abuse, applicant support, potentially closed generics, et cetera, where sort of observing the processes, finding opportunities for intervention would come play.

---

And so we're looking at maybe having three of our own sessions and no more in order to really take advantage of. And this is in addition to a bunch of face-to-faces, which we also have. So it's not just three sessions, but three potentially policy-related sessions. We'll do face-to-faces with about six other constituencies within ICANN. But we're trying to keep our own little sessions to a minimum so that we're participating in more of the community-wide sessions.

So, I mean, it is possible that for us to do a few though, and so if folks had something in particular they wanted to propose, this would be a good time to begin the kind of brainstorming process on what you'd like to see as a policy-related session at ICANN 76. So I'm happy to take questions or comments on that topic or topics that you think might be good to have at At-Large sessions at -- in Cancun. Siva, please go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: I think one of the topics that is being discussed in [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, Siva. Could you say that again? It sounded like you dropped off in the middle of your sentence.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Siva, you are muted. Please kindly unmute your line.

---

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: But there are the technical fragmentation of the Internet, and that it happens on the technical layers. That was something that we should discuss in Mexico.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Siva, you were muted in the middle. Can you start over your intervention? Sorry.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Okay. One of the important topics of relevance and pertinence to ICANN is the topic of Internet fragmentation. And some of the points that came up in the discussions at IGF is that most fragmentation happens at the technical layers, and it also has something to do with names and numbers. I think that is a very pertinent topic that we could take up for Mexico and even discuss that ahead of Mexico. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thank you. Chantelle, if you would please make a note of that and let's continue on. Gopal, please go ahead.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you very much. You see, the concern is at the technical layer we simply refer to the terms "heterogeneity" and "interoperability," rather than telling that it's fragmented or showing a lot of differences. Heterogeneity is the strength of the Internet, so is interoperability.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: So what are you recommending, Gopal?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Yeah, I would just try to position it a bit more positively saying that the heterogeneous nature of the Internet and the reason for interoperability will make it united.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Okay. So reference model everything keeps the heterogeneity and interoperability the pillars of strength for a unified Internet. It makes it positive for ICANN.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. So I have two questions for you: one is in relation to the deadline, and also, and the number of sessions. So what are the number of sessions you think we could go ahead with? And also, like when is the deadline for the submission of ideas for our sessions? And then also, I was thinking if a session about the impact of NIS2 on the DNS would be something we would like to discuss. Definitely, NIS2 has many sections that refer to the DNS and refer to the registration data and it does have an impact for sure. I don't know the final -- what the final version looks

---

like right now, but I think soon we will know like what the final version looks like. So thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Oh, thanks, Hadia. I thought we had actually seen the final version of NIS2. I guess I'll go back and check on that, but I feel like it's -- I think the final version is out for inspection at this point. So potentially, I was certainly hoping that that would come up here on one of the CPWG calls that perhaps you and Alan could take it on to discuss the implications of that in this group. And then maybe we can see if we should try to get a broader discussion going at the ICANN meeting. But I think you're right that it's definitely a relevant topic. And I think it is final at this point. There's all kinds of implementation details, obviously. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I just want to note that aside from the fact that ICANN announced following the cancellation of the 2020 Cancun meeting, that the 2023 meeting would be held there, the ICANN website is devoid of any mention of ICANN 76. Is there something going on that says it may not happen or something? Because I've never seen a case where ICANN literally does not mention the next meeting it's having at least, you know, right after the previous one. So I just find it rather curious. On the plus side, the Cancun Convention Center, and I quote, "Guarantees a COVID-19-free stay for all of its events."

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Wow. That is interesting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not quite sure how they do that, but I'm delighted.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe they're going to just load some sort of something in there, you know, fire extinguishing, fire suppression system. Yeah. I certainly have not heard of any backroom talk about this not happening. Everything's forging ahead. I think it's just far enough off that the meetings team just hasn't gotten their act together to update the website. As you can see from the slide here, Tanzania has already begun her magic of trying to fit all these different sessions into place. And so definitely, work is preceding apace on this. So I imagine that they just haven't gotten to it yet to update the website.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, I'm just noting that. I wasn't predicting it would be canceled. I just find it rather unusual.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've never seen a case in all my years with ICANN where the whole concept of an upcoming conference isn't mentioned.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, [I didn't know that was the case.] It surprises me too. Yeah, for sure. And, I mean, it's also the time of the LACRALO general assembly as well, so that'll be –

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'm sorry –

JONATHAN ZUCK: -come as a surprise to them as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I wasn't trying to raise alarms that it's being canceled. I'm just noting the curiosity of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, right. Of course. Thanks, Alan. Any other thoughts? As far as a date, we've got a little bit of time for our own internal sessions. The 23rd is the deadline for plenary sessions that we want to recommend, and I guess it's possible that NIS2 is justifiable as a plenary session proposal as well.

So I don't know if you want to put together a few lines of justification and what you think something would look like, Hadia, I can also potentially make that a recommendation for the after-the-plenaries. I'm thinking of a plenary topic that ostensibly is about how auctions are being handled and how some decisions, default decisions are being



---

made by the ODP process and what that looks like as a public process. So I think it's a session that might evolve into -- because the ODP will be formally completed, the board will be addressing it immediately after this meeting. It seems worthwhile to discuss once we've gone through it, whether or not there's changes we want to see in terms of public participation, public comment, et cetera, because there's some decisions that are getting made that might otherwise be community decisions as part of the ODP.

So that was something that I have rattling in my head as a possible plenary topic as well. But I think we should definitely discuss NIS2 as a possibility also. Gopal, I'm assuming that's an old hand. Is that a new one? Okay. I'm assuming that's an old hand. So that's what's going on. We'll get back to you with a deadline. I don't know, Chantelle, if you know it off the top of your head, but I haven't heard a specific deadline for our internal topics. So we'll keep that conversation open, and I'll put something on the list when I hear back from -- I think Gisella would be the one to tell us. So thanks, everyone. And I will pass the microphone back to you Hadia.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Oh, Jonathan, this is Chantelle. Can I just jump in really quick?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, yeah, please, please.

---

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Okay, thank you. So first, I posted the link to the NIS2 document that Olivier has circulated in the chat. And then to your point on ICANN76 planning, I know the plenary session topics are due -- are to be submitted to ICANN by the 23rd, which is next week. So I don't know what the internal deadline is, but that sounds like we might have to turn anything around really quick for plenary sessions at least. I'll stop there. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's right, plenary. But I think Hadia's question was about policy sessions. And like I said, I'd like to hold our internal navel gazing sessions to three but I look forward to proposals for them and we'll get back to you on a deadline. Thanks. And back to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan, for this update. All you can take a look at the slides. Chantelle posted the link. And now a CircleID article on ICANN policy and transparency. I guess we decided not to do this; to have this today on our agenda. So I do not see any hands up. So anything further you would like to discuss on today's call? Any of you? Okay. Again, seeing no hands up, we go to our next meeting. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I have to find the unmuting button. So yes, next week. When is our next meeting?

---

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Olivier. If I may, this is Yeşim speaking. So for our next meeting, it will be on Wednesday 23rd of November at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 19:00 UTC. So thank you very much for this, a good rotation time. Thanks for this call today, Hadia. I've thoroughly enjoyed watching and taking part as a participant. And, again, we are ahead of our advertised end time. So with no further business, it's time to thank our interpreters and thank our staff and the person in charge of the transcripts, online transcription, and, of course, all of you who have taken part on today's call. Is there anything else to add, Hadia, today?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. Nothing from my side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much. Have a very good morning, [afternoon, evening, wherever you are]. Take care and goodbye.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**