
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to APRALO monthly teleconference taking place on Thursday 15th of December 2022 at 07:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English Channel we Amrita Choudhury, Justine Chew, Aris Ignacio, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Maureen Hilyard, Pavel Farhan, Priyatosh Jana, Holly Raiche, Satish Babu, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eranga Samarathna, Gunela Astbrink, Bikram Shrestha, Samik Kharel, Letitia Masaea, Jahangir Hossain, Shah Rahman.

We currently don't have anyone listed on the Chinese channel and currently no observers for today's call.

From staff, we have Gisella Gruber and myself, Yesim Saglam, and I'll be doing call management for today's call. And just to go over the interpretation, we have Chinese interpretation provided and our interpreters are Ray and Sandy.

And one final reminder will be to please state your names before speaking not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes in case someone joins the Chinese channel. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Amrita. Thank you very much.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you. Yesim, and welcome everyone to the last call of this year. This call is relatively quite light because we just have a few updates. And if anyone wants to chip in and share some more updates apart from

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.

what is shared in the agenda, please feel free to put it on the chat and we'd be happy to take it.

So we will have Satish sharing a bit upon what the EPDP discussions on IDMs is going about. Shreedeeep will update on the call which he had with everyone from the APRALO Policy Forum. I'll share a brief overview on a plan which we have shared for APRALO and GSE team to work together. Do note this is still work in progress. And Cheryl will be speaking a bit more on the rules of procedures activity which was supposed to be [inaudible] done and what we are at.

And I am not seeing Ali, but if he's not there—and we were thinking we'll have some NomCom update, but I can see Justine in the call in case she wants to share something or anyone else, they can always state the same.

And before I pass it on to Satish, we had a regional leaders call yesterday wherein there was a discussion of having a regional call each month to discuss what each regions are doing. We had to give an overview on what is being done for the individual members. I did mention that this is still work in progress, but whatever we have, I did share.

And they did ask about the plans to work with the GSE team and the application for the ABR. There was a suggestion that it could be cross-RALO ABR proposal but I personally feel that time is so less, even coordinating within a RALO is at times difficult, but a cross-RALO ABR may be difficult to pull off within the timelines which we have.

So that with that, I will just pass it on to Satish. But as I mentioned in the chat, we would like to congratulate Cheryl that she's been chosen from the Asia Pacific region as the Chapter Advisory Council of Internet Society. We need voices who can actually speak out because we all have our issues. I am bringing it here because many of our ALSes are ISOC chapters, so that's the correlation here, but without talking too much, let me pass it on to Satish for the updates he wants to share.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks. So this is a very high-level overview of the expedited policy development process—EPDP—on internationalized domain names—IDNs. I know that several relatively new people are here on the call. And this is a complex topic. And I'm one of the three members. And we also, I mean, as we'll see later, the EPDP is a very specific model, which is an innovation on the PDP, which is the traditional or the legacy policy development process. The EPDP has members and participants. There are three members from ALAC: Abdulkarim, Lianna and I. And there are two participants, Justine and Hadia. And Justine also has been elected as the vice chair of the EPDP. Next slide, please.

So what is an EPDP? Like I said, it is an improvement over the traditional PDP for efficiency and speed reasons. It's based on a very well documented manual and the consensus playbook and called a representational model.

Then the next question is, what are IDNs? These are domain names in non-Latin scripts. And these have been available since 2012 for gTLDs, and even earlier for ccTLDs.

So you might want to know, what are we doing now if it's already been available since the last round. The point is that in the last round, explicitly, something called variants were not available. And this EPDP is to look at the issue of variants. And there is no consistent definition of variants either in the last round. We will see later what these are.

And there was also the second-level guidelines, there was a working group from 2015 to 2018 which produced a document, IDN implementation guideline 4.0. But the Board said we're not ready for this yet. So that was also deferred. And that is also coming under this EPDP kind of mandate.

And why is the EPDP on IDNs important for ICANN? The reason is that a next round is coming up and the ICANN community would like to put in place a comprehensive IDN policy for top-level before the next round of gTLDs. Next.

So somebody please interrupt me if I'm running out of time. So what are the core topics that we're covering under the EPDP? Now, this EPDP, as mentioned earlier, has representation from different parts, ACs, SOs of ICANN.

So the basic concept here is about IDN variants. What are the variants? Two labels that mean the same things to the language community. And these don't exist in all languages but only in some languages. For example, in English, we have color and colour, both are equivalent, or that—I don't know how you pronounce it in German, but these are equivalent to the German speaking community.

Now, therefore, since they are equivalent, end users expect that they behave identically. But for the DNS system, for the actual infrastructure, these are completely independent labels. The problem is for the language communities, they're the same. For the technology, for DNS, these are completely different.

How do you kind of bridge this gap? Also, a label may have multiple variants. So what is called the source label is the primary label that is being applied for, but that label might have a number of—in some cases, very large numbers—of variants.

Now, the entire process from application to delegation and beyond, so post delegation, so for instance, the transfer policy, in all these steps, we have to treat the entire group of variants as a set.

This is a new thing. So far, we've been handling independent labels, but here we have a set of labels which have to be handled together. One of the early questions was how do you define variants without any ambiguity? The last round, we did not have any consistent system, but now we have.

And this is called the root zone label generation rules. It's actually a bunch of data, which allows us to determine what IDN TLDs—the variants of a given label and what is the disposition, meaning are they allocatable, are they blocked?

So some of these variants are blocked for linguistic reasons. And also later on, we will see that the SSAC has given a warning that we have to be as conservative as possible, because these variants can have combinatorial effects meaning there can be large numbers are variants.

So SSAC says, be very conservative, have the least number, do not destabilize the root zone.

So the way this works is that each language community, called the generation panel, they are separate, although some of these panels handle a variety of languages together. For example, Neo-Brahmi panel, which covers a number of Indic languages or the Latin panel which covers several languages again.

So these are language-specific groups, they say what is blocked, what is allocatable, etc. And there's a single panel called integration panel which combines all different languages into a single root zone LGR. And we have now automated tools that if you give a source label, the tool will tell you what are the variants and what are the dispositions.

Now, the EPDP, the question to EPDP team was, should we have a single authoritative source of variants? Because in the last round, people were computing it in different ways. So the EPDP has more or less decided that the root zone LGR will be the sole source for variants.

Now, if you look at the languages, four scripts have no variant labels, 14 have no allocatable variant labels, seven have allocatable variant labels, and these are the ones that we are going to look at for the EPDP's work, and SSAC strongly recommends a conservative approach where variants must be only permitted if the TLD applicant clearly demonstrates the necessity for activating these strings. Variants that are not necessary but are desired must not be allocated [inaudible].

And the script communities, the GPs, generation panels have been asked to minimize the number of variants so that we don't have too many combinations. Next.

What is the work of the EPDP? The EPDP is to design policy on seven major things. Of this, item C and item G do not relate to the top level, all the rest relate to the top level. Item C and G refer to the second level. This is IDN implementation guidelines.

So what basically we're saying here is A is about root zone LGR. B is about same entity at the top level. Same entity simply means that this entire set has to move together. So if you're giving the set to a particular entity, applicant, then the entire set has got to be given. You cannot give a part of that set. This is called same entity and it can apply at the top level for gTLDs or second level.

Now the item D is about the adjustments required when you have this new system where you have not just one label but a bunch of labels. What changes are required in various agreements, the legal kind of stuff?

E talks about what are the adjustments or changes required to the process of the whole application process. We'll see a little later how that works. And F is about dispute resolution procedures and trademark protection.

So all these changes are because of the fact that from one label in the last round, we are actually going to a set of labeled moving together in every step. Next.

So a little bit about that timeline. EPDP started in July 2021. We have 90-minute calls on Thursdays. Today's call is the 62nd call. Most likely, since there is a lot of work to be done yet, it will go up 120 minutes from Jan.

Originally the EPDP had to submit one report. But after deliberations it is decided to split the work into two so that all the charter questions relating to the top level is phase one. We are getting it out of the way because the rest of the new round can work with the phase one report. Phase two is not required.

And phase two, with all the remaining charter questions basically relating to the second level may take longer, may take up to 2025. Justine, correct me if that's wrong. Yeah, so I think the slides end here, but we will open the other document.

So this document is one of the several very complex charts that the EPDP staff team, especially Ariel has prepared. This is not the most complex, this is relatively—what I'm showing you here is what are the steps in the whole application process and what charter questions apply to which of these steps? Is there a specific impact or is it just that you have to treat the entire set of variants together?

So I'm not going to get into the details of this. But you can scroll down and see that every step—some steps are complex, like parallelly, these are the seven kinds parallel steps happening. You can look at the chart in the—you can click the link. And if you want to just run through it to see what things are like further down.

Yeah, so. So the EPDP is looking at what are the changes required in each of these boxes? And the team, of course, as usual in ICANN, we have these different registries, registrars, end users, like we are the end users. So there are lots of perspectives. And there are also liaisons from different parts of ICANN, including GAC.

And the EPDP, every weekly call, we take the charter questions one by one. Some of them, we park because they're not relevant right now, or they may have some other impact based on other decisions taken so we park them. Others, we define the draft language, we give an opportunity for the participants to take it back to their home constituencies like we have done with CPWG for key decisions.

So now we are approaching the finalization of the phase one report, which is due in April. So we will be now sharing with CPWG some of the major findings of the phase one report, and we'll be kind of taking their inputs and using those inputs to kind of inform our participation in the EPDP.

So this is the last step, you can take a look. And you can see the charter questions that are attached to each of these boxes. And this is what we discuss in our call. I will stop here. This is a very high-level view, it is not of any detail, because some of the steps are very complex. For instance, the string comparisons, we have had to work in small groups and the small group that Justine and Hadia worked had produced something called the hybrid model.

Some of the kind of discussion topics are fairly hard to wrap our heads around. So it does take some time. And I would say it's one of the more

complex policy making processes that I've been through. So that's it. So any questions, I'll be happy to take. If not, back to Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks, Satish. Are there any questions for Satish? Shah has a question. Can you share or suggest a handy document or link on adjustments in registry agreement, registry service, registry transition process and other process or procedures related to domain name lifecycle? I think it's not related to what you have been discussing, Satish. So perhaps staff can—

SATISH BABU: I can respond to this. So from an EPDP perspective, there are certain charter questions that touch upon some of these things that because of IDNs, we will have to change the policy, and consequently, some of the existing agreement. So what I would recommend is that the best source, the most authoritative source is a report of phase one [inaudible] that will come out in April, and when you see that report, that will have the most authoritative information. There's also public comment on that. So if you want to raise questions, you will get an opportunity to do that also. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Satish, thank you for all this and I would recommend people going and looking at the documents which he had shared and perhaps if you have queries, you can mail it to him. And I'm sure Satish or Justine, Lianna would be happy to take it. And next I pass on to Shreedeeep.

SHREDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Yes, thank you Amrita. So we had our first meeting. And in the meeting, we talked about the current situation [on engagement] and we had a discussion about what can be done, a lot of [inaudible] suggestions and recommendations were forwarded, which is penned down into a working document.

And we are further planning to collaborate with different groups, especially with CPWG and have a clear position of APRALO about the various issues and challenges in discussion.

And we are also planning for engagement process. So the document is in the process. And that's about it. And our next meeting is scheduled for January 8th. So that is update. Thank you, Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Shreedeep, for the update and we look forward to more details. If you could share the link. If you cannot do it now, since you're on the road, if you can share the link to the working document, I think people will start sharing their comments, etc. on it. I think that would be helpful. The plan which you have prepared.

I think the next point in our agenda is about the APRALO and GSE plans, right? Can we have the document? Okay, just to give a brief overview to people who—and there were quite a few who were involved, there were quite a few who were not involved.

So since summer—our summer, not Australian summer, summer for the northern hemisphere, there was a discussion which Satish had initiated

with the GSE team about areas where APRALO and the GSE team of ICANN can work together for common objectives, because they also have certain mandates, and if we have similar mandates, they can support us and we can support them likewise.

So after several calls, communications, etc. There were certain areas which were identified with the GSE team and APRALO team can work together and they were primarily on reengaging some of our members, it is not possible to take up all the members so we were trying to identify who were the members with whom we could work and they would also be able to support.

There were also areas to see how we could make APRALO more relevant in various places. And also, what activities we could do in terms of with end users or bringing in information from the community. Certain topics were identified, common topics which could be worked on, and this is something which we had shared as suggestions based upon our discussions, but it is still being discussed with the GSE team, but I thought we would share.

In terms of revival of potential ALSes, we were thinking of ISOC Jakarta and having more work done with the PICISOC chapter and obviously, we were trying to—in this, there are various ways in which to approach it, is perhaps look at the ALS ICANN fellow, the NextGens from that region. Also see who were the Atlas fellows or ambassadors from the region and try to find out what would interest those chapters where all we can work together, etc. for both the places. And obviously, we have to look at what would interest these chapters and be within ICANN's remit.

So, there was a discussion that perhaps DNS abuse or DNSSEC, etc. based upon certain communities or people within the ALS could be looked at, perhaps creating board games or material which can help to engage people [with something which was being part of.]

And then in terms of trying to get new ALSes in countries where we are not present, such as Myanmar, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Bhutan, etc., to see how we can work on those countries if not all together, but at least to where we can get some ALSes. It could be individual members or ALSes.

We thought that IDNs and universal acceptance is something which is quite standard over the region and most people have some kind of interest in it, perhaps we may have local, national or regional initiatives planned with the GSE team. And we had the UA Day also being planned. So perhaps we could look at doing certain things at the regional, national and even local level.

And then DNSSEC was thought to be something of importance. Now we do understand that all ALS members may not have technical understanding, but there are members who have technical understanding, so perhaps building capacity, the ALSes could work as liaisons with local registries, registrars and ccTLDs to promote importance of DNSSEC.

What they could also be doing is, if there is an interest, they can bring in the GSE team and the GSE team takes it forward, or even organize trainings, etc. in those spaces.

DNS abuse is another topic which is very pertinent in this region. So perhaps with the support of GSE team, we can organize some initiatives or capacity building on DNS abuse initiatives. Can we scroll down a bit?

So obviously, ICANN policy is something, there was a discussion that there was an IDM survey which was done, perhaps those could be replicated. But we've not looked at it so much at this point.

Gunela raised a very important point that perhaps the APRALO team can work with the IKSOC org to actually increase and build the culture of accessibility in the diversity documents, etc. And then can we go down a bit?

And then we were thinking that there are various activities or initiatives which are planned within the region, perhaps our ALSes or even local ALSes can be participating in that. It could be APTLD 83, APRICOT is in Philippines, perhaps Aris can lead the initiative out there. And he is actually speaking.

UA Day is another initiative which is actually being spoken about. Then we have the SANOG where technical sessions could actually be held. We have Shah in Bangladesh and we have Jahangir, etc. And also from the leadership team, we could support and perhaps have some discussion on UA, IDN, DNS abuse, could be something, or even having DNSSEC. TWNIC Thai operators. You know, there are various things.

And there was also a discussion that perhaps the APRALO team could lead in creating some easy infographics on DNS abuse or ideas with the support of the ICANN GSE team. Perhaps for that, we can request for an ABR, we can make it in English and then look at having it in multiple

languages, etc. But we would obviously need support or graphic designers etc. For that, we need money.

So these are some of the thoughts which was shared, we have still to hear from the GSE team to take it more forward. But we thought we should share it with you just in case you have some ideas. You also can keep thinking that perhaps you may want to do something in your ALS, in your region, etc. And perhaps in the next call, we may kind of want to ask the ALSes or individual members if you want to do something—your plan for next year. Cheryl, I see your hand up. Over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks very much, Amrita. Just struck me as you were taking us through that document—an excellent document that it is—it's an awful lot to do. We do half of it, we'll be doing all right.

With the accessibility and diversity aspects, by early next calendar year, the toolkit and the survey template that ICANN is working with third-party providers to create for more general use across ICANN, is probably going to be available. And so we might be able to do something in that first three months within our region. But using those very new tools. Just a thought. I don't have time to put it in the document. I am a little bit busy. But I just wanted to get it out of my brain and onto the consideration space. Thanks.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Cheryl. That's very important. And perhaps Gunela who's leading this part would be interested to kind of look at it because we all

want it and Gunela is very passionate about it. So I think Gunela, you may want to check on this.

So this is what we wanted to share. Open to questions, comments, just food for thought, what we would want in our next call which is in January to hear from you. Because we always keep on speaking, but to hear from you even one particular thing you want to do next year which aligns to the ICANN mandate, etc. what help you would require etc. would be helpful. Any questions, any comments from anyone? Please feel free. Else it becomes a monologue. Yes, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a reminder, the ICANN budget is about to be released. The second webinar is for Asia Pacific region about 4:00 in the morning tomorrow. But keep your eye out because what we try to do, not only comment on the budget but relate the budget to the operating initiatives of ICANN itself, including the multistakeholder model.

We've tried to tie figures to the things that are important for ALAC. And for people who would like to contribute—you were talking about money. Well, the budget's there and there'll be ABRs as well. Just keep an eye on that aspect of it as well. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Holly. Very relevant and we do need to look at—the initial funding which is being allotted, so that [future, if there is no issue, it's always better to speak then.]

And another thing is, if we—and this is a question to most of the people who were involved in helping to draft this, is if we want to apply for the ABR, I know we have to kind of pass it on with GSE also, we need to work on it right now. We don't have time. So if we decide that we want to go for an ABR for one of these things, we need to think of it now and work on that proposal. Food for thought, but I will leave it at that.

Yeah, I will send a reminder, Shah, today. I was thinking [they] were following up with me, now I need to follow up with them. So that's from me. What is next in our agenda?

Okay, we will go to Cheryl for an overview. But before that, a homework for all ALSes and individual members. Next call, please come up with something which you would want to do next year which is aligned to ICANN and APRALO. That would be helpful. We will put it into the calendar of APRALO. Cheryl, over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. I appreciate taking a little bit of everybody's time today. It's a bit of a follow-up on what the small team that you created in your last meeting may have done with regards to our review of not only the APRALO rules of procedure, which is timely in itself, but also the specific parts—and some of them are new parts that need to be incorporated so that our mobilization of our structures and our unaffiliated individual members—some of which you've heard about today—and some of that outreach that Amrita just spoken about, will be hopefully generating more input, will be in a good place and properly framed.

So I'm sharing at the moment the scratchpad document, which yes, I know, I introduced to you in last month's call. Fear not, I'm not going to take you from the top. But as I scroll down to around page six or so, if memory serves, a little bit past this, we discussed areas of work in our last call, we discussed the mechanisms of how we were going to do it all in our scratchpad.

We created our small team for the purpose of doing this work. And I just wanted to bring you up to speed with what little—and it is, I'm afraid, little, not all—of the work that needs to be done that's happened between now and then.

So what we've started to do is dig into the actual drafting space. So you'll see here various highlighted text, this is verbatim copy of the existing rules of procedure that we have. And in this case, I have highlighted that we need to do some discussion, extend and further define that terminology.

And that's basically where we are, where we're putting actual text and edits of text, you'll see here there's green, this is new proposed text that after discussion has been accepted and gone in. All of that is being reflected in a markup copy. Then you'll be all getting access to the official clean version later on. But just to give you an idea that we've rolled our way through most of section A, which includes various rules and guidelines for what it is to be APRALO. Some of our terminology, interestingly enough, needed updating and modifying. Been a while, like I said.

And we're going to start digging into this section B, which is what you'll see on screen at the moment, which is—and there's only really four sections we're going to dig into, A, B, C, and D.

The APRALO and APRALO associated responsibilities. That's not a big section, but it's an important section, especially when we look at things like how the unaffiliated individual members aggregate their thoughts and utilize their representative—bringing their voice forward, all that sort of thing.

Little later on in C and D, there's more about expectations and metrics as well. And you should see, in a perfect world, ladies and gentlemen—not sure if I live in one, but [inaudible] going to try—B, C, D and any adjunct documentation completed in a near final draft, good enough to be looked at by the wider audience, by the small team, by this time in January. So hopefully, can be in your to-read-before list in advance of the next APRALO meeting. That's about as far as I can take it, Amrita. But I'm certainly happy to have questions.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Cheryl. A lot of work you have been doing. I'm sure we all know the amount of work which have gone into kind of—it's not cleaning up, many things to be added more into the document, which wasn't there. But thank you so much. And if you need another helping hand, I'm happy to—getting now slightly less busy, having slightly more time so I can get into it also to assist you. But thank you. And anyone who has any questions, etc., can ask.

And just on another note, as I was mentioning the regional call yesterday, we did discuss something which I forgot to mention is we are thinking that for every new individual member or ALS who comes in, there should be a toolkit or/and an orientation.

So it could be a common toolkit that was what was discussed. APRALO was doing a lot of work around this, an introductory program. So what I did suggest is perhaps each month or a quarter, any new ALSes or individuals who are coming in, they should be taken through an orientation curriculum, because you may give as many materials as you want, but people don't read them as much as when you take them through something. So this is still in a suggestion phase. Yes, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

[inaudible] since I've been in command and control of anything in this area, but we certainly used to have a staff-led and leadership-included orientation opportunity. It may not have been one to one for every ALS that joined or individual member that signed up, but sort of in groups or bunches. It did work fairly successfully way back when in the Mesolithic period of APRALO. It might be worth considering again. Thanks.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Yes, thank you. That's what someone mentioned in the call yesterday, there used to be something. I think those good practices need to be brought back. [inaudible] great to see you here. We were discussing how we can reengage the PICISOC chapter into the APRALO thing, and I think what you mentioned to me separately is you need capacity building with your members.

Perhaps next year, we can have a specific session for the Pacific region where we introduce APRALO what we do etc. And ABC, general thing for the Australasia part of the region. We can also, if required, do it for the other regions specifically. But hope that helps. Yes. Jahangir and Satish.

JAHANGIR HOSSAIN: [inaudible] I want to put one comment regarding the involvement about ALS member. It would be a great idea if we bring one ALS member showcase in every APRALO meeting for five minutes. That could be a good interaction between the APRALO and chapter and they feel more comfortable and more interaction and [inaudible] more contribution in the APRALO community. So if we make five minutes slot within APRALO meeting every month for one ALS member or multiple ALS member, it will be a great idea to bring more input from [inaudible] level.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Jahangir. That's a great point. In fact, we did initiate it at one point of time, about one and a half, two years earlier, we did have that. But after that it was many times the ALSes don't have time. We could possibly do something in terms of—

JAHANGIR HOSSAIN: Exactly, Amrita. You have another APRALO leader also take this type of initiative, but somehow is becoming slower, but we should continue this type of initiative upcoming days, it would make more comfortable and encouragement.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: No, absolutely. So what I would also encourage the ALSes, and perhaps we will put in a mail—many ALSes did mention they are not getting the mails—is send the mail, if they want to showcase what they have been doing this year, we can add it into our newsletter also. Perhaps we have a discussion between two to four ALSes on a particular topic in our APRALO calls. I think that could also help. Let's think. Any suggestions are welcome. Satish, over to you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Amrita. Two quick points. One is about EPDP, I forgot to mention that EPDP is run in a very orderly manner, there are these written rules on how people should interact. In fact, if you look at my name on the Zoom Room, there is always this thing, member, ALAC against the name. This is a mandatory thing in the EPDP.

And of course, in this meeting, it is not relevant, but it just is part of Zoom. So now I have to, in any other meeting, have to go in and change that and just make it Satish Babu. But this member, ALAC is what every participant has to put in that particular meeting, EPDP meeting.

The second point I want to raise is that it's time for us to push for our GA in 2023. We have already initiated the process with Heidi asking her whether we can think of having the GA together with the IGF which is in Japan end of the year.

We haven't heard from Heidi yet, but I think amrita, you have to start pushing for it now so that we can—there are many impediments, the availability of funding and whether in principle, it is okay to collocate with IGF, then Japan is an expensive place. There are all kinds of

considerations. But if IGF is not going to work out, we have to think of some alternative. Thanks.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thanks Satish. I think we did speak about it. IGF may be difficult, Japan being expensive. IGF has their own set of protocols, etc. We would follow up with her. Perhaps we may still look APRIGF, if it is colocated or else we may think of colocating with one of the [NOGs] perhaps or any other national IGFs, etc. in some place which is more convenient for everyone to go.

Perhaps we need to have more deliberation here. If Heidi did needs some help in speaking to Chengetai and others, happy to help her on that. But I think IGF may be difficult, because I know APRIGF also initially had been speaking but there were some challenges there.

But yes, that's in the option. I think we need to look at it and perhaps if we had any such big conference in the region wherein we already have people and someplace which is centralized, it may be good. Cheryl, do you want to add something?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I could, but I don't think I should. I think that I'm confident that Heidi and staff and Org is open and not only open but looking at options, they're taking our need for the general assembly absolutely and utterly seriously to the point where she was annoying me with concepts when I was far too busy to [inaudible] really trying to answer her.

So she certainly has not dropped the concept there. But I think we do need to, Amrita, ensure that you touch base and see what the thinking is there from Org's point of view. And now we have specific dates for the Japan IGF and as long as we've got them for NOGs, then we can perhaps have a conversation that will be more productive.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Yes, thank you, Maureen. The reason why I mentioned it is expense is also something which we need to look at. Even though it is not our responsibility, but it helps us to get more people in that budget or do more. And Japan will be great, I would have personally loved it. But if that doesn't happen, and we want to do it much more earlier [inaudible], if we can look at some other options, perhaps even ask if there is something—they have the DNS events also happening. I don't know what time they have it. Perhaps aligning to it or something may also be good.

I guess we have to keep our options open. And we need a GA. That is the bottom line out there.

So we have 11 more minutes. If anyone wants to speak up, wants to share something, please do so. Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Sorry to kind of speak too many times. This is an update on the UA Day. We have hit a kind of roadblock on the UA Day on the matter of the date in which you're going to celebrate.

So originally, the idea was 16th of February. And we had even announced in the last ICANN meeting that it's going to be 16. We had a session on that. We took community input.

But then we had a problem from Org because the meetings team said that that is too close to the Cancun meeting and they'd rather have the Cancun meeting all the way and then organize the—because there's one physical event associated with the UA Day. There could be many physical events which are local or national in nature, but there is one global event with participation from ICANN Board members and so on. So that requires a little bit of planning.

So the Org proposed the end of March 2023 for the UA Day. So there is a bit of back and forth happening now. I think the chances of it happening in February is kind of remote now. But the formal announcement has not come from ICANN Org. So we are still waiting for it.

For At-Large and for APRALO, it does provide opportunities kind of organizing some events in our ALSes and maybe national level and also one regional event also is possible. Thanks.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Satish. Gunela, over to you.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thank you, Amrita. Just a very brief update from the planning committee for ICANN 76 in Cancun. I can certainly do a more detailed update in January, but just to say we've been meeting weekly and the

schedule is coming together quite well. There are still a number of discussions to be had about the weekend At-Large sessions. We've talked about a plenary session that was recommended by the GAC on looking towards WSIS+20 in regard to the multi-stakeholder model and looking at some possible webinars before the event. So there's a lot of discussion and just wanted to briefly update you on that. Thanks.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Gunela. Thank you for sharing what is happening. Justine, I see you in the call. Do you want to add something? Any tidbits you want to add? I guess not. Maureen, you're there. Anything you want to add? Nope.

Okay. Thank you, everyone. So I guess, let's take back eight minutes of our lives and wish you a Merry Christmas well in advance and Happy New Year. Let's meet on 19th January at our usual time. And do remember your homework. Please think of something that you as an ALS or an individual member would want to do next year, and do share preferably, hopefully by the end of this year, something which your ALS has done or you have done as an individual member which we can highlight in our newsletter. So thank you, everyone. Bye.

YESIM SAGLAM:

Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day and see you all next year. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]