

YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 11<sup>th</sup> of January 2023 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 just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Bill Jouris, Alfredo Calderon, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Sebastien Bachollet, and Marie Joly-Bachollet, Dave Kissoondoyal, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi. And Marita Moll will be joining us slightly late.

We have Herb Waye, the ombuds, as the observer. And from staff side, we have Chantelle Doerksen and myself, Yesim Saglam, present. We are expecting Heidi Ullrich to join us as well.

As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation and our interpreters are Paula and Veronica on the Spanish channel, and Claire and Camila on the French channel.

We do have real-time transcription service provided for this call as well. I'm just going to share the link with you here on the Zoom chat, so please do check the service using the link.

And with this, the final reminder is to please state your names before speaking not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

---

*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.*

---

And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim, and welcome everyone to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking and I'll take you through the agenda today with my colleague, Hadia Elminiawi.

Now, we have a full agenda today. Quite busy. Starting with the review of all the work groups that we are involved in, focusing in particular on the transfer policy review policy development process and on the applicant support GNSO guidance process.

After that, we'll have our usual policy comment updates with a number of statements that are reaching completion and we will be focusing specifically on the draft ALAC statement on the initial report on the ccNSO policy development process review mechanism with Liana and Hadia leading the way on this.

Now, after that, we'll have the At-Large policy priorities for ICANN76 with Jonathan Zuck, and after that the subsequent procedures operational design assessment. We'll receive an update from Jonathan.

So that's the main parts, and any other business we'll just remind you of a few things that have happened. Recent GNSO, the DNS abuse letters.

That's a big agenda for today. Now, at this point in time, I ask if there are any commitments. Does anybody have to leave early in which case

---

we'll have to reshuffle their items before others? The floor is open for comments.

I am not seeing any hands up, so if you do turn up in a half-an-hour and say, "Actually, I have to leave in ten minutes," then I'm sorry, I'm not going to be able to do much about it. So thank you for adopting the agenda as it currently is on the screen. That means we can go to the action items right away, all of which are completed as you can see. I guess I can leave one moment for anybody who wishes to comment on any of these. Most of the action items related to this group, today's call, and in preparation of today's agenda.

Seeing no hands, that means we can swiftly go to our first item of substance and that's the work group and small team updates. And the first people to provide us with an update are Steinar Grotterod and Daniel Nanghaka for the transfer policy review policy development process. There's been a lot of movement on this. So we've got 20 minutes on this topic, and with a presentation about charter questions. Over to you, both Daniel and Steinar. I guess it's Steinar taking the lead. Go ahead, Steinar.

STEINAR GROTTROD:

Yeah. I'm taking the lead here. Actually, I don't think we need 20 minutes to discuss this. I found out some new updated information yesterday evening my time and the kind of important thing is that the deadline for comments to the initial report Phase 1A has been extended to January 23<sup>rd</sup> of this year. So we have another week to add other comments to the document that's being displayed on the screen here.

---

At the meeting yesterday in the working group, we spent some time on the recommendations 16 and 17 and I got the opportunity to kind of summarize in a very short way our previous discussion at the CPWG and I'm actually more waiting for some feedback from a small group that should make some sort of an updated input to the recommendation 16 and 17. This was kind of promised to have late evening my time yesterday or today, but unfortunately it's still not arrived. As soon as I receive this information, I will give it to the working group, to this group. We put that into the argument for if we should put anything on particular recommendation 16 and 17.

And if you recall correctly, the recommendations 16 and 17 is the discussion about the transfer lock after initial registration or successful transfer to another registrar and whether there should be an option for the registrars to enable an opt-out feature and it was voluntary based on what the registrar wanted to do.

It was actually a very good argument yesterday in the discussion and as well as came from one of the European registrars saying that he was kind of afraid that this kind of option could be more or less hidden and didn't really respect the basic idea of customer-friendly service and so on.

The rest of this meeting yesterday was focused on recommendation 13 and there comes another one that maybe is a little bit tricky and the question is here whether there should be possible for the registrar and the registered name holder to agree upon a short time to live for the transfer authorization code than the recommended 14 days.

---

One argument here is that some valued domain names would like to increase, maybe put that in bracket, their security level by having a short TTL for the TAC. But on the flipside here is that this is also something that easily can be adopted and incorporated in the terms and conditions for the registrars and certainly we have a scenario where the 14 days is not actually the standard but there is a [set range] time to live for the TAC depending on the sort of registrar you have. So this was also distributed yesterday and into a Google Doc, some arguments, pro and cons, and some elements based on the comments received.

Finally, the—how do I phrase that? The PDP will ask GNSO for a project change request. I think we have mentioned that sometimes previously that the idea was to have two phases. We already completed more or less the first phases—phase 1A—and the next phase will be the charter question for phase 1B and phase two which is the dispute resolution policy.

The way they are kind of proposing, though, is that we merge that into one file batch which makes sense in my mind and then maybe also hopefully squeeze the time we have lost because we're behind schedule.

So that was the minutes from the last meeting. I highly recommend everybody to access the Google Doc that's been displayed and put your comment into this because this is some sort of feedback I need, other members of the working group from At-Large need to signal whether we want to make some sort of comment in this phase or what sort of argument we want to put into the discussion into the upcoming meetings, finalizing the phase one report.

---

Thank you very much. Any questions I'm happy to answer, try to answer, willing to answer. So, we have the first one. Eduardo, come on.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Hello, Steinar. I read the presentation about this change in project and I noticed phase two is going to end—it's geared to end sometime in 2026 which is a few years from now and I read there that there is a concern about the current members being able to stay that long. Do you have any ideas on how that is going to be managed?

STEINAR GROTTEROD:

Yes. Thank you for reading the presentation, Eduardo, and it is very important. The PDP, I don't know whether it is a normal time, but I believe spending three or four years into a PDP may have some problems for members of the working group to actually be able to spend that much time on a PDP.

There was some concern about having a phase where we could reselect members of the working group. We didn't agree upon when that was in the timeframe but there is some concern that members are not paying—don't have the possibility to stay and focus that long. Thank you very much for the question. Anyone else? I don't see any hands. Okay, Olivier, back to you. And I'd really like to emphasize ... Oliver, do you want to talk to me or talk to yourself?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. I had a question myself, speaking on my behalf of course. A question regarding recommendation 16, removal of admin contact and

---

transfer contact, Admin-C and Transfer-C. This is all internal, isn't it?  
None of this is to be displayed publicly?

STEINAR GOTTEROD: Admin-C has been displayed publicly as far as I understand in the RDAP WHOIS information today but there is a proposal and I think there is agreement upon removing that. The Transfer Contact is something that has not been displayed in the WHOIS RDAP output but is very often being indicated in the control panel or the information set by the registrar of that you have successfully logged into your account.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So the GNSO Working Group recommendation is to replace the Admin Contact and Transfer Contact by registered name holder.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Does that have any privacy implications?

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Does that have any ...?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Privacy implications?

---

STEINAR GROTTOROD: Not the way I see it. Not the way I see. It still has to be in the line of the GDPR and the temp spec recommendations.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so it doesn't go any further then. Okay, that's all I needed to check because sometimes the thing with transfer contacts and admin contacts, often these are generic and often a registered name holder is non-generic. So you'd have admin contact would be, I don't know, admin@domainname.com but registered name holder is often a real name, a real detail. So this is why I ask the question.

STEINAR GROTTOROD: Just for clarification, the registered name holder is something that we also use the word registrant. So it is the domain ... If the intention here is to make an acronym for the registrant, registered name holder, yes. Alan, go on please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. My recollection is ... And this is going on so long that I'm not 100% sure is these recommendations are in line ... Essentially just following on to what was recommended in the temp spec EPDP Phase 1. But I will note that they seem to be in opposition to the regulations or the guidelines proposed during this, too. I'm not going to say we fight it at this point because EPDP is there and this, too, is going to have to be responded to. But it sounds like this PDP is rubberstamping what was



---

said in the EPDP, both of which seem to be in violation of this, too. We'll see where that goes. Thank you.

STEINAR GROTTROD:

Yeah. Thank you for the update, Alan. They ring some bells here in my mind as well. But what I understand is that when we have finalized both the older phase—phase 1A, 1B, and phase 2—there will be some sort of check out with the wording and the references to all of the policies as some sort of very, very final stage on that one.

So, I'm pretty sure that if there will be some further challenges, maybe not the right word to use, but hopefully it will be relieved and action taken in that respect. I will have that in mind. We should put some references into this. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry, if I can have a follow-on. The problem is by having the ICANN policy less specific--not less specific but far easier to satisfy removing all of these contacts, that means we may well end up with a very uneven playing field that is some registrars will have to have Admin Contacts back again and others will not have to because it's not in the ICANN policy.

But again, this is something we're going to have to hash out in a different forum. I'm not particularly surprised that this PDP is simply going along with what the EPDP said. That's certainly what the contracted parties want and we'll see how this plays out. Thank you.

---

STEINAR GOTTEROD: Thank you very much, Alan. Actually very interesting if you believe that there will be an opening—maybe I put that in brackets—that some registrars can continue with an Admin-C and what sort of use that Admin-C should have is also very interesting. But thank you. I put that in my memory bank. Hopefully it's stored and make that argument when these kinds of things will be discussed. Thank you very much.

There are some questions on the chat. If so, I will answer that in the chat. So, back to you, Olivier, and thank you for your time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. Thanks also for some of the answers to the point I was making also on the chat. I invite everyone to have a good read through that. And thanks of course to your usual and very helpful and very insightful reporting on the transfer policy review PDP. Certainly good work here.

Let's move on. The next one, the Expedited PDP on the internationalized domain names has had no update for this week, so we'll have to look at a future week for an update on this.

The Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team is currently held until further notice with no progress on that either. The System for Standardized Access Disclosure Operational Design Assessment, the SSAD ODA, has no update for this week and neither ... Well, there might be just a very quick update on the closed generic facilitated dialogue on closed generics. Let's see if we have Greg Shatan. I should have checked actually if Greg is on the call. I didn't see his name being mentioned in

---

the roll call or in the listing people. He isn't. Alan Greenberg, do you have an update on this by any chance?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not a lot. There was a discussion at the last meeting this Monday on the issue that was related to Greg distributing a list of the document from the facilitated dialogue, the one on the document on possible use cases which unfortunately did not have all of the named redacted. There will be further discussion on whether such a thing should be allowed in the future and a process for doing it. See where that plays out. Not a lot of other action at this point. Preparation for the face-to-face meeting at the end of the month.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you. Thanks for this quick update. We'll have that further update in a future call.

Now, we do have a significant 15 minutes for the Applicant Support GNSO Guidance Process, the GGP. Our representatives used to be Tijani Ben Jemaa and Sarah Kiden. Tijani has stepped down in one of our previous calls and the ALAC has appointed Maureen Hilyard to take his place, so welcome Maureen. So, Maureen, [inaudible] this is your first good update on this. And on the agenda you can see an additional resource with the GNSO workspace, guidance process initiation request for applicant support home. You've also got the At-Large workspace linked to this agenda item. Over to you, Maureen and Sarah.

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Olivier. Hi, everyone. Can I have my slides up? I've just got four slides. Very brief, hopefully a lightning talk as a recap. My role in our report today will be to give an overview of the decisions and developments of my first meeting with the group and Sarah will talk about our homework which we have to do in between our fortnightly meetings. It's quite comprehensive but it should hopefully we'll be able to give you a report after each meeting anyway. Have we got the slides?

YESIM SAGLAM: Sorry, I'm trying to find out where the slides are. I haven't seen them. Apologies if I missed it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Sorry. I sent them to Chantelle. I think that's who to send them to. Anyway, I can go through them. It would just save a lot of time to eventually have the slides and I'm not having to actually read through the stuff. But going forward.

The GNSO Guidance Process Applicant Support Group was, of course, just as a recap established in August last year and the group has had four meetings. I was going to hopefully show you and hope they find the slides. But there's a very tight timeframe that we're actually engaged in because we have to get everything done before September, before the last meeting. There's quite a lot of work. A lot of the work will actually be done as homework by the team in between the meetings that we have.

---

The SubPro report provided some very positive recommendations and implementation guidelines in topic 17 which is about the applicant support based on what happened, or didn't happen, in the last round.

What has been stressed to us on several occasions is that the role of the GGP is not to develop policy or even to make any changes to any of the recommendations or implementation guidelines as they are recorded in the SubPro final report. Our job is really to flesh out the details of the implementation guidance that has already been recommended in the SubPro report.

Our report, the final output that will come out mid-year actually, first of all for public comment, will hopefully provide an easily understood set of guidance that will successfully support applicants through the application process. So that's sort of an overview of the actual tasks that we've got to do.

There are actually five tasks. Two of the tasks were completed in the first three meetings, so that was quite good. They were sort of like a review of the 2011 and 2012 reports that were done about the initial round and task two was to look at ... It was basically a work in progress. It's sort of like down as completed but it's actually a work in progress as we work through our guidance tasks and apply to identify the experts with relevant knowledge about particular areas of concern during the last round.

Now, I understand that a letter was going to come to the SO/ACs, so At-Large ... Thank you very much, Yesim. We're actually onto the second slide now. Thank you.

---

So, task two was actually a work in progress because as we go through these tasks three, four and five, it's thought that we may apply to experts with expertise of the actual round and can actually help us and guide us in the guidance that we will actually provide within this final report.

It's the key elements of course that we want to get support for our guidance [inaudible] relate to outreach, education, business case development and application evaluation. So those seem to be key areas of concern during the last round.

In regard to this, we'll be seeking advice of the CPWG members when we come across any guidance topics that we know we can get appropriate and relevant input into these key areas especially and probably more so relating to outreach and education. But of course, like I think the others with the other topics as well. Especially as it was identified that the support for some deserving applicants was probably not as helpful as it could have been in the last round. Next slide, please, Yesim.

So this is a very abridged version of the other tasks that make up the rest of our work and it's very much based on implementation guidance 17.9 in the SubPro final report. And of course everything 17.whatever is to do with topic 17 in the SubPro report which was to do with applicant support.

So, the first ... Now, I'm not going to go into any great depth with these because this is what Sarah is probably going to explain to you because our homework tasks. These are basically our homework tasks. So we

---

were introduced to the framework. We were introduced to the framework and we've been asked now to start filling it in which is an interesting exercise because, as you will see, when Sarah provides her part of this report, there is some sort of sections that are interesting to say the least.

Anyway, so what the 17.9 implementation guidance states is looking at metrics. So the metrics we actually got to look at how can we collect the data, how can we measure the metrics, how can we—who collects it and what represents success? Those are the key areas that we'll be looking at, at the moment, because this is actually stated in the guidance and we have to follow the expectations of the SubPro as closely as possible. Unless we see any difficulties, we may be able to discuss that with the GNSO.

But the key areas of course are in task five, as I mentioned. Outreach, education, business case development, and application evaluation. So those are the areas, the main areas that we're going to be focusing on. Obviously, the areas of need.

My final slide, please, Yesim. So this is a timeline that we're going to be ... Now, January/February of course is when we'll be working on tasks three, four, and five hopefully getting it all done before ICANN76. So that's like pressure cooker stuff.

From March to May, we'll be looking at ... We'll be starting on the draft report. There's a task six, but that's a GNSO related task that's to do with financials.

---

May to June we'll be looking at publishing the report, so that's why I said mid-year and it goes out for public comment before ICANN77.

So July and August, which will be the end of the public comment, we will be developing a final report. Then in September the final report is finished and gets delivered to Council before ICANN78.

So Sarah and I are expecting a pretty busy time during this year getting this done. And I'll pass it over now to Sarah who can explain what our homework is in between meetings. Jonathan, I see you have a question.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. Just a quick note. In terms of the documents you're reviewing, I'm hoping that the CCT Review is one of them as well. I think that's where the recommendation for business case evaluation came from. There was a small study done by AM Global on cohorts that should have went out to various communities in underserved regions to try to ask similar companies the strange question of why they didn't register a domain name and I think that's where business case development came from. But I just wanted to make sure that you were aware of that study and that survey and also just the CCT work on this topic.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thanks, Jonathan. That wasn't one of the reports that was actually mentioned, but no doubt within the SubPro study itself, that would have come up. Jeffrey can probably tell us about that. Jeffrey?



---

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. That's what I was going to say, Maureen. The SubPro report considered the CCT Review and so what you'll see is that, although Maureen is talking about the SubPro report, that does contain the recommendations from the CCT report as well. I'm not 100% sure without going back as to whether that particular business study was mentioned. It may have been. Cheryl was a lot more involved in the applicant support section than I was. But certainly a lot of the—if not all—recommendations of the CCT Review Team report were incorporated into the SubPro report.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Jeff. I know that the business side of things already generated quite a lot of discussion amongst the other GNSO [guys] on the group and it sounds really interesting, so it would be good to be able to bring back those sorts of comments as they come through back to the CPWG. Thank you. Are there any other comments before Sarah starts? Thank you. Over to you, Sarah.

SARAH KIDEN: Thank you, Maureen. I'd like to request staff to display our Google Doc on page two. Thank you.

So, last week I think we introduced this document that we are using as our framework to go through tasks three and four, particularly. Maybe five a bit. And just as a reminder, task three is to sort of prioritize these

---

items and for each one of the metrics look at how we are going to collect the data, the measurement and techniques we shall use, if it's an indicator of success, what success looks like for that particular metric and approaches we shall use for impact of outreach and education.

So, the way it looks, actually, in the GGP this week, we talked about how it's not easy to prioritize, like you can't say this is priority number one or two. So we thought about ... I think that was a suggestion to send it out as a survey, so people can prioritize that way. But I think what may be useful for our team is to just look through each one of them and indicate if we think it's a priority for us and what success will look like for that particular metric. I don't know if that works for everyone and if, Maureen, you think that's a good use of our time.

So, otherwise, let's start with wareness and education. I've seen a few comments from Gopal. When I get to your comment, I'll respond to them.

So, the first one under one is education, the number of outreach events and follow-up communication with potential applicants. I'd like to note that it was already discussed within the CPWG and said that it's a bit vague to just say that we want to measure how many outreach events have been conducted without having attended. So, I think in one of the meetings we had recommended that we have a target and say maybe we are targeting ten or twenty and then see if we have achieved whatever we wanted to achieve.

So I don't know if anyone has comments about the number of outreach events. Is this a priority? How do we collect data and does it indicate

---

success for our group? So if there's anyone who has comments about this item ... Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes. I'm wondering ... I think they're also asking for not only how to collect to data but who is going to collect the data. I don't see that even in this table, what's being shown here.

SARAH KIDEN:

Yeah. I'll take note of that. Maureen, yeah?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I was just going to say that one of the things that we're discussing at the meeting was that the original document, the original questions at the top, there were people asking about whether they were appropriate and relevant and everything. So I think what they're doing now is they're actually looking at trying to modify it and make it a little bit simpler so that they've taken that out, although it is one of the stated ... In the SubPro, it actually does mention it. I think what we're doing at the moment is just trying to get any comments and the who and the how should really be together. But if we can have any comments from anyone—and I think Bill Powell has actually made a stab at it because there's awareness in education and Sarah will explain other sections. Questions? Sarah, they're probably thinking of inputs into the framework for us, so maybe not.

---

SARAH KIDEN: Yeah, maybe. If you have any questions or comments about any of these items, just let us know so that we have ... We will do our homework and take it back to the working group. Maybe we can go through some of the comments. I see a comment from Gopal about having historic data. I know staff mentioned wanting to give us an update about the last round that, basically, from what I gather is they feel that the data from the last round is really not enough to do detailed analysis. If you remember, there were only three applications and one was successful. So it's really had to have a lot of details about that but there were some lessons learned. For example, one of the things we want to do better this year is to do a better outreach and to make sure people really understand what the Applicant Support Program is and give them enough support so that their applications are successful. I don't know if that responds to Gopal's question about historic data. Maureen?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: All that we have is that much, we have to work on it. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think, too, that within the SubPro, there were some really positive statements about expanding the scope of the financial support, for example, to cover costs such as the application writing fees and legal fees. At the last one, it was really if they needed it for the actual application fee, there was a reduced fee. But they're opening it up to more opportunities. They had \$2 million in the last round and of course

---

they didn't use it, so what they're saying is that money was there for a purpose. So what they've got to do this time is actually make use of that, so that the final task actually that we all have to do is what is the criteria? And I think that was something that was really missing in the last round was what are the criteria for ... Like if we have too many people applying, what is the criteria that we actually use, going by the different sorts of opportunities that have been opened up now, that will be opened up now, for applicant support? And I think it's a very positive direction that we're moving down with regards to this.

SARAH KIDEN:

Thank you, Maureen. And the other thing that I think they said they would do better is opening the Applicant Support process before the regular round so that people have an opportunity to apply, and if they don't go through the process, they can still apply through the regular application process because what happened last time is they were both open at the same time, so if you didn't qualify for the Applicant Support Program then you could not apply through the regular round which I think is actually a good step in the right direction.

I see lots of comments in the chat. I don't know if anyone wants to raise them during the meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

I think that the chat has a life of its own as well. In addition to what's being discussed here, there are several threads that are discussed in parallel. No less exciting, though. I also need to be aware of the fact that

---

we do have a full agenda, so if you could please wrap up and then we can move on, please.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: You wrap up, Sarah.

SARAH KIDEN: I'll wrap up, then hand over to you. So, if you have any comments, please add them to the chat. We'll take time to respond to each one of them in the Google Doc. Back to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much. Thank you, everyone. As Gopal and Jahangir have actually made a start, it would be really good to get some more comments from people so that we can actually add them into the report. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Maureen, and thank you for this, Sarah. As you can see, there's more coming and more discussion into the chat. What I would say is just take note and then follow-up on the mailing list, please. It's really exciting to see this process underway as well.

---

Now let's go to the next agenda item. That's going to be our policy comment update. For this, we have Chantelle Doerksen and Hadia Elminiawi who will take us through where we are in that big, big, big pipeline that is in full swing now.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Olivier. Thank you so much. I'll give the brief overview as usual and then turn it over to Hadia for deeper discussion.

We revisited the format of this section and we're trying a different structure, so if the order of subtopics looks different, that's why. Recently ratified through the ALAC. We don't have any statements at this time. There are three open public comments. Nothing has changed since last week.

And the current statements, we have the initial report on the ccNSO PDP review mechanism that Leon and Heidi are working on with the CPWG.

We are going to set an internal deadline for community comments of this Friday the 13<sup>th</sup>, so that the ALAC ratification process has a full week to take place ahead of the 16<sup>th</sup> of January due date. Please let us know if you've got any questions on that in the chat.

The second statement that ALAC is currently working on is the draft FY24-28 Operating and Financial Plan and draft FY24 Operating Plan and Budget. That's with the OFB WG. Comments will close ... I'm sorry, the comment needs to be submitted by February 13<sup>th</sup>, so we will be working back from that deadline.

---

Upcoming public comment proceedings. Hadia, I will turn it over to you if you have any substance you'd like to discuss. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Chantelle. So, upcoming public procedures, we have two. One is the second level reference label generation rules and the other is technical check review. They're both technical comments. I can delve into the initial report on the ccNSO PDP review mechanism now. So, if we can have the comment, please, on the screen.

So, the initial report on the ccNSO PDP review mechanism. This comment is about the ccNSO policy development process review mechanism working group report of recommendations regarding a mechanism to review specific decisions pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs.

The policy offers ccTLD managers and applications of new ccTLDs and independent review mechanisms for IANA function operator decisions. The review mechanism will look if there were any significant issues with the IANA function operator following its procedures and applying it fairly in reaching its decisions. Or if there were significant issues in how the IFO complied with policies developed by the ccNSO in RFC 1591.

So, basically, the statement says that we are in full support to the policy recommendations but we would like to stress on the importance that any review mechanism process does not result in any kind of user confusion or inconvenience. We say that ccTLD end users need to be always prioritized when performing any review mechanism and we say



---

the way to this is full commitment to process and policy when undergoing any kind of review.

So, it's basically a support statement with what emphasizes the need to always prioritize end users. So, I don't know if you have any comments. The statement is still ... I think it closes on the 20<sup>th</sup> of January, maybe. So, if you have any comments, please go ahead and put them on the Wiki page. If you have any other thoughts or ideas, please share them. The statement is still open for comments and it's not due yet.

I don't see any hands up, so maybe we can go back to the agenda. Then we have the ... Okay, we have decided that there is no statement on the final report from the EPDP objection specific curative rights protection for IGOs. That's based on Yrjo and Justine's advice.

In progress is the FY24-28 Operating and Financial Plan and Draft, FY24 Operating Plan and Budget. If you want to take part in this, please join the OFB Working Group.

Second ... Yeah, that's it for me on this part, if we can go to the next agenda item please, if there are no more comments. I don't see any hands up.

So, we have discussed the draft ALAC statement and initial report on the ccNSO PDP review mechanism. I will give the floor now to Jonathan in order to walk us through the ICANN76 At-Large space and work plan. Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Hi. So, I guess I'm looking at number six here, this work space.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, Jonathan. Number six, correct. At-Large policy priorities for ICANN76. At-Large workspace.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. So, I'm not sure I know what this agenda item is, actually, or what this workspace is. I'm familiarizing myself with it. I thought I was giving an update on the meeting. As far as the ... Yeah, I don't know. Can somebody bail me out on what this workspace is for?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Jonathan. I can jump in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you. Then, Heidi, feel free to add anything in the chat that I might miss. Each ICANN public meeting has its own workspace. This is the workspace that the ICANN76 Planning Committee uses, and once the meeting begins, it will morph into where we can find the agendas and other presentation items related to those meetings published. So this will be a working area everyone should be aware of ahead of ICANN76.

Then there are a couple updates, Jonathan, that I'll turn it back over to you to talk about such as the plenary topic was chosen, what the At-Large will do. Then also possibly the discussion about the SubPro

---

conversation, if that should stay with ICANN76 or move to ICANN77. But I'll turn it over to you again for your input.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. Thanks, Chantelle. I guess I don't treat this as my portal and I need to start doing that. There's been some movement in the ICANN76 planning in that the vote results are in for the plenary topic and the one that was chosen was the GAC suggested topic, with the upcoming WSIS improvements to the multi-stakeholder model.

So we need to find out if there are folks on this call—and this is probably more of an OFB call question—that are interested in participating in the planning for that plenary. That's a cross-community planning committee that takes place for each plenary. So please do reach out if you have an interest in being a part of the design of that plenary session. I think it's got some work to do to fit within ICANN's remit, so there will probably be some fairly substantial changes to the recommendation as it currently stands.

A very close second, however, was the proposal that we made for a session on the ODPs generally and their efficacy and whether or not there needs to be more community input into them. I'm hoping that I can draft Alan and Justine to help brainstorm on who would be good to put on a panel for that discussion. One of the things we were thinking about using as an example is the auctions discussion whereby staff made some assumptions to fill in the holes of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group report that now have not been put in front of the community.

---

So, discussing the efficacy of the ODP process generally now that we've had two of them and whether there needs to be more points of entry for the community into those processes to make sure that implementation process doesn't dip into policy making.

So, we are going to do that as a session ourselves at ICANN76 and there appears to be broad community interest in that session. Like I said, it was sort of the runner-up to the plenary discussion.

Then what was the other thing, Chantelle? The ODA. We are also ongoing in trying to work our way through—just as the At-Large community, work through the subsequent procedures ODA to identify what areas of that document track to our areas of interest which is things like applicant support, auctions, community priority review, DNS abuse and some other areas and how those outputs compare to our inputs both in the public comment period and our advice to the board to find out if we need to comment on the ODA in areas where they're out of sync.

There are issue shepherds that are hopefully looking at their section of the ODA and comparing it to our previous advice and public commentary to see where those gaps are that we need to formulate into new communication with the board. Justine, go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

In answer to your question, may I suggest that you pose the question within the call for the ODA shepherds because I'll probably have some things to say about it. Thanks.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which question was that, Justine? Sorry.

JUSTIN CHEW: The one about who might be good for raising, being on your panel.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay. Definitely. I'll raise it there as well. Chantelle, help me to remember to raise it there as well. Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In terms of the panel or the discussion on the ODP, arguably the best one to talk about is the SSAD one, because effectively, it failed completely. We ended up in a situation where we're not going ahead with anything that was recommended and that there were several very major faults with the ODA.

Now, the counter to that is, well, it was the first one. We were just learning how to do it, so it's not surprising that it didn't work. But it's not clear that we've made any real changes that would have ... If we had made changes at this point or even are talking about making changes that would have done it better, that would be something else. But at this point we haven't made changes. We're not even talking about changes, so it's not clear that if it had been the third one it may have still failed in the same way because the underlying process has not changed.

---

Anyway, that's something to think about I think. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Alright. Thanks. Alan and Justine, I think I'm going to try to reach out to you directly. I didn't mean to start the whole conversation on this call necessarily but I'll be trying to reach out to you. I'm just giving you a head's up on what that session might look like. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. I just wanted to comment on what Alan was just saying because my initial feeling that the SSAD ODA did not succeed or did not achieve what it was required to do because it wasn't really an operational design assessment or operational design phase of the actual recommendations. My feeling is that they sort of tried to find alternative solution to the initial recommendations and then made an ODA for that. But then Alan would know more. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. It feels like it went down differently in a number of ways than the SubPro ODP. But yeah, we can discuss further. I didn't really reserve enough time on this call to have an in-depth conversation on this but I think a community-wide conversation on this will be useful and I'm looking for your help in what that might want to look like. Avri, I saw your hand up at one point but it went back down. I don't know if you wanted to speak.

---

AVRI DORIA: When you said you didn't want to spend time on discussing it, I put my hand down. I was going to make a quibble about what does success mean for an ODP but not the time for the discussion. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. But I don't know that you were going to necessarily be a part of the discussion. Are you interested in being a part of that discussion when it takes place?

AVRI DORIA: Not necessarily, but it'll be a general community discussion so I expect I'll be around.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I meant the planning port, but yes, okay.

AVRI DORIA: No, in the planning port, no I won't be.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Jeffrey, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN: Yes, thanks. As you can imagine, GNSO has a small team that's working on comments to this ODA which is interesting. Hadia points out some issues that we have problems with, too, in the sense that ICANN Org

---

seems to have in a couple places done an ODA on their alternate proposals which are questionable.

I think the biggest issue a lot of us have just personally with the ODA is that ICANN really, when it was looking at the system, kind of designed the Utopian of all systems—the Cadillac, if you will, some people say of systems. And rather than going out to third parties to solicit costs and realistic costs, it just kind of went to its own engineering team and said, “Hey, how much do you think this will cost?” or, “How much money do you need to do this Utopian type system?”

Anyone that’s ... Certainly I’ve run operations. Anyone who knows operations, if you go to your engineering teams and say, “How much money do you need?” they’re going to give you this hugely overinflated price and overinflated timelines which usually results in a business anyway of negotiation to figure out exactly what’s needed.

I think the ODA team here just took the numbers that they were given, put it in, and that’s why we have these exorbitant costs which are way beyond what the norm would be.

I did ask Karen Lentz, who lead the ODA team with ICANN, I asked if they had solicited third parties to help with the pricing of development and the answer was no. It was just all internal. And I think that’s what led a lot to the sticker shock.

Frankly, the overengineering of the system combined with the overinflated prices is what led ICANN to pursue an alternate in the first place.



---

So, it's their own ... To put it nicely, I guess, it's their own aggressive over-exacerbated system that's caused the need to seek an option two when really had they gone to development shops and to others to see what the real costs would be and to figure out what really needs to be automated and what doesn't, they would have had a much more realistic and presumably much lower pricing than what they came up with.

So, I think this is .... Sorry for a very long explanation but I thought it was important to share some of my views having done operations and systems, that this really wasn't ... And I was liaison for the GNSO. This was not—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, I don't mean to cut you off. I have a really small period of time just to talk about ICANN76.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're engaged in the conversation we want to have as part of a panel discussion and I have a feeling Alan, who has formulated some views on this as well, has some counterpoints on the cost issue and I want to steer the conversation off of the substance of this and talk about what kind of discussion we want to have. So this is not—

---

JEFF NEUMAN: So the long and the short is I'm willing to help out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. I'd be happy to have you on the planning team to figure out what a good panel discussion would be. I'm hoping to have Alan on that team as well. Alan, if you're reacting to Jeff's representation of the SSAD, then I'd ask you to hold your powder dry. But if it's something else, then go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I won't go into the details. I'll just say, for the benefit of this group who won't be listening to the other discussion we have, I'm obviously not a part of any GNSO analysis of how well or why it worked or how well it worked or why it didn't work, but I believe there are some other very major factors other than the ones that Jeff mentioned. Although I completely agree with Jeff. Having also done lots of implementation before, one can find fault with that part of the methodology. But there were other issues as well, which I find even more problematic than that one. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Just to say off the cuff of Jeff because detailed discussion of this issue is not really on this agenda, but off the cuff I do not share your pessimism. I think the ODA opens some options, which make it possible

---

to correct some of what I consider—I do know this very well—quite gross errors of PDP and GNSO position about the next round. So basically I welcome the options that are now available on the table. I do not share any information that I have, so I don't really have any information about how the costs are calculated. ICANN has a significant technical and economic staff and I rely on them to get it approximately right most of the time. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Christopher. So, just back on topic here with respect to ICANN76. That's going to be one of our policy sessions, community-wide sessions. As you heard me say before, our objective for ICANN76 is to have the large majority of our sort of internal face-to-face At-Large meetings take place on Saturday and Sunday and then on the Monday through Thursday of the meeting really focus on getting people engaged out in the other meetings and discussions that are taking place around ICANN.

So, we'll have some face-to-face meetings with other organizations during that time and we'll have cross-community discussions that are hosted by the At-Large really hopefully keep to a minimum the At-Large internal discussions on the Monday through Thursday part of the ICANN76.

So thanks for sharing this workspace, Chantelle. Perhaps the link can be shared with everybody to see as this progresses. Oh, Justine, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks. Just a quick mention. I'm not sure whether it should come under agenda item six or AOB, but I'd like to make a call for topics to discuss with the GNSO Council for the bilateral. I think we should start planning early, so perhaps I could coordinate with staff to do a call or something and start off a Wiki page like we did the last time on the call. Just to mention that, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good idea, Justine. Thank you. So give some thought to ... Well, all of our face-to-face meetings are going to require some discussion probably here and in the OFB Working Group on what would be good agenda topics for those face-to-faces with the GNSO, SSAC, and others. I think staff is now alerted to putting those things on the agenda.

All right. I think that's it. Thank you, Hadia. Back to you.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Sorry, Jonathan. I just wanted to make one quick comment about ICANN76 before we move on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead, please.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Great. Thank you. The SO/AC planning list. The leaders have been meeting and I know Jonathan and others have been involved in that and we just want to flag that there's been a discussion about postponing

---

community discussions regarding to SubPro at this stage. So that's something that I think the At-Large, especially the CPWG, will want to discuss to see if we'd like to postpone it to ICANN77 or if we would support keeping it for ICANN76. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Chantelle, just to clarify—and I guess I left this out of the conversation. There had been a discussion as part of the ICANN Planning Committee meetings that ICANN was proposing a kind of subsequent procedures track at ICANN76 and they were adding subsequent procedure sessions to the agenda. Is it that that they're talking about postponing or is it more abstract of let's not forget about it?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN:

That's a very good question. So, to clarify, they're talking about postponing the community discussions on the topic of SubPro for three months until ICANN77. So that was something some of the SOs and ACs were discussing and debating on the list. I don't know if At-Large would like to take a position on that, whether they'd like to keep the discussion to continue during ICANN76 or if we would be comfortable postponing it to ICANN77. But that seems like something our community would like to make a decision on.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Thanks, Chantelle, because I think it's a separate issue. One was to have these sessions added inorganically. So the question is I don't know that it's stifling discussion as a whole or just these track related

---

discussions that they were proposing. So I'll wait until there's more information on this and I'll bring this back to this group or put it on the list, depending on the timing. I think our session that we're planning is really more about the ODA and the ODP process and that fact that the board is actually discussing and potentially voting on the ODA just after ICANN76 was suggested that conversation should go forward. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. I wanted also to remind us of the small team that has been formed to continue review and comparison of the SubPro ODA to previous ALAC advice. So that's something also we've been working on. I guess we will continue because it is mainly related to our work in At-Large, right?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right. I mentioned that at the top.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yeah. And that's the next agenda item. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. And Jeff?

---

JEFF NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks. Chantelle, I think it was you that just talked about the SubPro track. Can you just say that again? Was it proposed by staff that the track should be delayed or was it proposed by the SO/ACs?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thanks, Jeff. It was proposed by one of the ACs to postpone community discussions. I'm looking for the original email. Then the GNSO replied earlier today that the idea of postponing community discussions on the topic of SubPro at this stage, even if for three months until the next ICANN meeting, has some concerns.

So I think this is something that, at the ALAC level, that we'll want to discuss, that there should be some sort of position on.

JEFF NEUMAN: When you said it was ... Sorry, just to ... You said it was an AC, so it wasn't the ALAC that raised it. Obviously it was a different AC and of course we would know who if there's only one other ... Oh no, actually, there's a couple others. But it wasn't the ALAC.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, thanks.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just for clarification, the postponement of discussion, does that imply that the window for an opportunity for affecting things through the discussion is being widened? Because otherwise it sounds like we'll miss the window to have any effect by delaying discussion until June or whenever the next meeting is. Can we have clarity? I thought the board will be taking action at some point before June or likely to and therefore potentially we miss a window. So I don't quite understand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Thanks, Alan. Heidi, did you want to speak to that?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I just wanted to say this is just really early days and we haven't heard from all of the SOs and ACs, so I think we need to just wait and see what's happening at that level and then we can go through you, Jonathan, if there's any more information.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Thanks. Again, I want to really make the distinction. There was a sort of out of the blue recommendation by staff that we add a track related to subsequent procedures as opposed to whatever organic discussions on subsequent procedures might be already taking place. So that's what the discussion about delaying is about adding this track



---

concept to an ICANN meeting is more about that than it is about stifling discussion of subsequent procedures.

Christopher, go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Very quickly. Sorry to take the floor again. But just to say that I'm not in favor of stifling discussion and I'm certainly not in favor of delaying it. I think, Jeff, we know very well what needs to be changed to have an efficient and fair second round. I'm against deferral. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. It's not a global deferral. But thanks everyone. I'll keep everyone informed as this is going on. Like I said, it literally just happened recently and it has more to do with the structure of the meeting than it does with the substance of discussions. All right, thanks. Let's get back to the agenda. Back to you, Hadia or Olivier.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan. So, I'm not sure, have we covered now agenda number seven like this or should we quickly give an overview? Maybe I can give a brief overview of what this is about.

In September 2021, the ICANN Board took action to initiate the operational design phase. Accordingly, the SubPro was launched in January 2022. ICANN Org started preparing an assessment of the operational requirements and impact of the subsequent procedures for gTLD final report recommendations.

---

Two options were presented for implementation. One of them is one big round and the other one is four annual rounds. There are some operational considerations and some overarching considerations associated with each one of them. The big round will take at least five years to implement. The total cost is \$457 million. The main financial risk is the amount of cost incurred prior to the application window, accompanied of course by uncertainty in relation to demand.

To mitigate the risk, there's a need to reduce the initial investment. The systems, 18 services will be implemented. The other alternative, which is option two for annual cycles, it will take 18 months for implementation. It has eight services or systems. It relies more on manual processing. It costs \$407 million is the total cost.

The first option gives us a longer waiting time to the start of the application window. Obviously the second option, it's a shorter waiting time.

Some assumptions in relation to the system include that the next round process needs to be predictable as possible. The board will determine issues that serve as dependencies or prerequisites. ICANN Org will determine the specific scheduling or rounds.

Some issues, also. ICANN Org identified seven issues that might need to be resolved before the implementation of a new program. Those include the Public Interest Commitments and the Registry Voluntary Commitments.

---

There was a concern that ICANN Org actually cannot enforce the PICs and RVCs. The suggestion is to amend the bylaws to allow ICANN Org to enforce RVCs and PICs.

Another concern were closed generics. A small team now is working on this from the GNSO—GAC and ALAC. We have Alan and Greg on that team.

Another was the Applicant Support Program and we have Maureen and Sarah on the group formed by the GNSO Council for the GNSO guidance process to provide additional guidance on the applicant support.

Finally, a small team has been formed that is going to be working to compare the ODA with the ALAC previous recommendations. The topics that are going to be discussed or compared are in relation to DNS abuse mitigation, closed generics, applicant support, community priority evaluations, geo-names, and new gTLD program objective and metrics. The first call for this group is happening tomorrow at 14:00 UTC. That's it for me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's pretty good, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. So now we go to agenda number nine. Olivier, would you like to walk us through this or Justine?

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's actually number eight, Hadia. It's number eight, any other business. And it is indeed about GNSO DNS abuse small team that has been busy and the GNSO itself has now written to both the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the Registries Stakeholder Group and also to the ICANN Compliance department regarding a couple of questions that they have.

I don't know whether it's Justine maybe the best person. I think probably Justine is the best person today to take us through this or Jonathan because I know Jonathan has kept his ear very close to the DNS abuse topic.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I vote for Justine because I've been following DNS abuse generally but not the DNS abuse working group.

JUSTINE CHEW: I don't really want to make a big deal of it because it's close to 25 minutes past the hour. It's just a note to say that the work of the GNSO Council small team on DNS abuse has come to a culmination with these letters going out to the relevant target audience. So it's a combination of the work that particular small team has been doing of which ALAC provided comments. So this is the next step. The letters are going to the relevant parties for more information in the case of bulk registrations which is where the ALAC provided a comment on. The intention of this letter is actually to seek more information about whether bulk registrations actually contribute to DNS abuse and how and whether certain contracted parties or even DNS Abuse Institute, for example,

---

have already things in place to monitor what they consider a bulk registration and whether it actually contributes to DNS abuse.

So, to cut the long story short, this is an ongoing process. It's something that the ALAC has participated in and we are now waiting for inputs from the target audience of these letters to take the work further. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Justine. It may not be directly related, but just a reminder that if you haven't seen it, there was an announcement that ICANN is engaging in bilateral discussions with both the registries and registrars to see some small updates to the contracts that require more specificity in terms of reactions to instances of DNS abuse in hopes of grabbing those bad actors that we've talked about for so long. So there's some movement there in the contract space but that's more bilateral than it is a community discussion. But it's still a good sign.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Jonathan. Indeed, I was going to personally mention that having looked at the process for such a long time, it appears to be a definite shift now in the Council. A few years ago this was one of the stinky topics that nobody really wanted to talk—

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Did we lose you, Olivier?

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I just got dropped. Am I back here?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. We can hear you now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry about that. I don't know where you lost me. I was just saying a few years ago this topic was really a part of a bunch of stinky topics that nobody really wanted to raise because it was really very controversial and so on and it's great to see that there is movement, there really is movement in there with everyone trying their best to mitigate DNS abuse in many different ways. I would personally say I'm really pleased to see that these letters are going forward, especially when it comes down to some of the more wooly language that is the registrar and registry agreements that seems to now be honed in.

I'll pass the floor to Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. My question is to Justine in relation to the target audience of both letters. The first letter is directed to the Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Groups and the second one is directed also to the Registry and Registrars but also includes the DNS Abuse Institutes and ICANN Org. So maybe if you can tell us how the target, how the recipients of those letters were determined? The second letter, especially. Thank you.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: It's based on the subject of the letters. So, in terms of the second letter, it's to do with bulk registration, so we took the position that there were several entities by which we could seek information from.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, the second one, the only other entity, apart from ICANN Org, was the DNS Abuse Institute.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: And Contractual Compliance., I believe.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for—

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. So, there were four targeted risk—yeah. Four targeted recipients for the second [letter.]

So, four targeted recipients for the second letter on bulk registration based on the topic, the content that we're trying to—or the information

---

that we're seeking. We thought it was appropriate to target the four recipients.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Justine. I give the floor to Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you so much. Any other other business than this? I'm not seeing any hands up, so we can go to our next agenda item. We're just on time, actually. The next meeting sometime next week.

YESIM SAGLAM: Olivier, if I may. So, as we are rotting, the next meeting will be next Wednesday on the 18<sup>th</sup> of January. It's 19:00 UTC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this and 19:00 UTC our next meeting and that's the 18<sup>th</sup> of January already. Wow. We've gone through January pretty quickly.

At this point in time, I'd like to thank everyone who has participated on the call, and in particular Hadia who has been a real trooper being a bit unwell. Anything else that you'd like to add, Hadia, before we close this off?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. Nothing to add from my side.



OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you. And thanks to our interpreters, the real-time text transcription. That's been very helpful to me again as I've been dropped from the call a number of times but didn't miss any of the discussions. Thanks. And of course to all of you who have participated in this I hope entertaining and interesting call. Let's continue on the mailing list and I look forward to seeing all of you next week at a different time but in the same place. Thanks. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**