
YESIM SAGLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 20 December 2023, at 14:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call.

And just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Justine Chew, Christopher Wilkinson, Laura Margolis, Raïhanath Gbadamassi, and from Andrew Chen from staff side. And on today's call from staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yesim Saglam. And I will also be doing call management for today's call.

And as usual we have French and Spanish interpretation. Our interpreters on the French channel are Aurelie and Dominique. And on the Spanish channel we have Veronica and David.

And another reminder is about the real time transcription service. I'm going to share the link here on Zoom chat. Please do check the service.

And finally my last reminder will be for everyone to please state your names before speaking not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. I hope you can all hear me well. I'm in transit today, so I will not be able to chair the whole length of the call but will be at least for the first part and then I'll hand the floor over to Hadia Elminiawi the co-chair. And I'll remain on the call, but she'll probably have a more stable connection than I do.

Today's call is a little shorter than the usual ones. We have a light agenda. After action items we'll go through our small team updates first with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. Just a few minutes on that topic. And then afterward on the Expedited Policy Development Process on Internationalized Domain Names (EPDP-IDNs), which will be the bulk of our small team update for this call.

No other updates in any of the other groups as ICANN is slowly winding down getting ready for the week of holidays. The only week where ICANN actually completely shuts down between Christmas and New Years. So that's the updates.

And then after that, we'll have the policy statement updates, of course, with Hadia Elminiawi, Andrew Chen, and Claudia Ruiz looking at our policy pipeline.

And after this, there will just be any other business. So a light agenda, indeed. Probably less than one hour in length. Let's open the floor if there are any additions or amendments to be made to the agenda. I'm not seeing any hands up, so that pretty much....

And I'm on Zoom now. I'm not sure. Yeah, of course, I dropped from the other side. I did tell you this was not going to be a reliable connection. Anyway briefly, yes, I'm not seeing any hands up, so that takes us over to our action items. The ones from last week are shown on your screen at the moment. You can see that there's just one remaining: The members of the CPWG supposed holding the CPWG meetings at each of the three ICANN public meetings.

I just wanted to ask Heidi, actually, regarding the process. Are we going to have a confirmation from the ALAC or from the meeting strategy group on this, or are we considering that we need to start preparing for the CPWG meeting at the next ICANN public meeting?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you for the question, Olivier. I am confirming that you are able to start planning the session. We are scheduling it, I believe, for the Sunday in Puerto Rico. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Oh, okay, that's helpful. Thank you very much for this. So that's one of the action items. And then the other action item was from a previous week, and that was for the next round Implementation Recommendation Team on what possible consequences exist for implementing the second-price sealed bid auction for contention set resolution in the future and how this may impact the opening and closing of community comments.

Justine isn't with us today. She has a conflicting other meeting going on at the moment, so we will no doubt learn about this in the new year since this is our last call of the year.

That's all the action items. Any comments or questions on any of these? John McCormac did mention here that the Africa DNS study won't be out until 2024. And it's showing that much of the hosting market in Africa is hosted outside of Africa as such.

Right, let's get to our agenda. I can start it all if I hear from Hadia that she's got a stable connection. So now I think we'll just go through the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. It's a very short update from Steinar Grotterod. I know he's on the call, but he's also as usual written the minutes from the GNSO TPR meeting that took place yesterday. If Steinar is able to take us briefly through this, that would be helpful. I can see him right here. Steinar, go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTEROD:

Yeah, hello, everybody. Yesterday's meeting was the last for this year also in the working group, and we discussed the potential security measures to be taken when there is a change to a registrant followed by an initiation of inter[-registrar] transfer policy.

There were different scenarios referred to as options in the minutes I added to the agenda. And there was, let me put it this way, I have kind of [advocated] that it should be possible to remove the section of the policy for change out of registrant out of the inter[-registrar] transfer policy. And that's been instructed to vote for Option 6. And you see that this is also something that the majority of the members in the working

group were in favor of, but not necessarily with the argument that I put forward.

So there is definitely some progress to kind of separate the change of registrant policy and the inter[-registrar] transfer policy. So that's it.

I also added to the agenda today my summary—and I emphasize my summary—of some data metrics that we received from ICANN Compliance two weeks ago. And this summary, intentionally, this summary is actually to give you some sort of a peek about the number of received [complaints] connected to the change of registrant by ICANN Compliance department.

What is interesting here is that in total there are very, very few numbers. And we're talking about the period in more than five that has been tracked in the Naming Services portal. This is something that I will add together with updated data from ICANN Compliance that [inaudible] in the January meetings. And hopefully, we will have a [inaudible] discussion about how to deal with the change of registrant policy in total.

This could be some sort of a nice Christmas or holiday reading for everybody. Take a look at it and comment on the wiki page or by the mailing list, and I will try to respond to that even though I do have some vacation time as well.

What is my final word is that I have the gut feeling that we cannot solve security issues with policy. And the reason for saying that, and it was also stated in the meeting yesterday, there are a set of upcoming registrations that will take place in the upcoming years that will

definitely make tougher requirements for any stakeholders within this industry. And we're talking about security measures that are like two-factor authentication and so on and so on. And my statement is that we cannot solve the lack of security by the policy. So that's my minutes for today, and hopefully we don't have to spend too much time on this today. But there will be stories to come in January. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. And I see Michael Palage has put his hand up.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Hi, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yep, we can.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Excellent. So, Steinar, I may not necessarily agree with your statement about, if you will, security and policy, one bootstrapping the other. And allow me to explain.

If you look at NIS2, there are specific references to the multistakeholder which is code speak for ICANN. And in there they talk about there being deference to the model. So I think we want to be careful. Obviously, we don't want a situation where legislation is dictating policy, but I would also not want a situation where inaction regarding ICANN policy somehow has an effect on enforcement of national law. I think that is

something that is to be determined. So I would agree with you, this is something that we want to look at. But taking definitive statements one way or the other I think perhaps may be premature.

The one question I would ask is regarding the number of domain name thefts. And I'll look at the statistics, but I have compiled a list of a number of high profile litigations that have been filed, and I'm just wondering if that kind of comports with what ICANN Compliance is seeing.

And then I guess the other question I have is, are people just going to courts and bypassing ICANN Compliance? So I would like to kind of see that kind of correlation to see what's going on here. There you go. So thank you.

And one final question. Yes, Jonathan, I don't think we want to inspire legislation, but the inability of the ICANN policy development process to finally deal with problems unfortunately may result in that as a factor. So back to you, Steinar. Thank you.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Yeah, thank you, Michael. Thank you for the questions. First of all, I think that your number, your stats about domain thefts don't necessarily reflect what is being tracked by ICANN Compliance. I think you have [correct] the assumption that majority of these go outside the ICANN Compliance ticketing, let me put it that way.

Having that said, the registrars attending at the working group, they have informed us that the number in total of domain thefts that are

caused by change of registrant policy is to the minimum. It is definitely to the minimum. There are cases of domain theft, but it is not necessarily, according to their information and stats, connected to the change of registrant policy. So that's the item that we're discussing for now.

Of course, I'm aware about that domain theft is going on, but the question here is, do we need a complex policy for the change of registrant in order to prevent domain theft? And the reason, my feeling and the majority of those who were vocal at the working group said, no, it won't help. Things will take place, domain theft will take place as [always]. And the key here is accomplished hackers, the specialists, the hackers, they will bypass whatever policy there is to hide their criminal actions.

And finally, also adding let's look at some of the ccTLDs, and the large ccTLDs. They have policies that put this responsibility into the hands of the registrars with good faith, and they are successful with that. And don't make things too complicated. That's what I say.

And we have Siva coming up. Thank you. Siva?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yeah, this is not only about transfer policy. It's about the comment on NIS and about the gaps that ICANN leaves for the time that it takes to make policy, so much so that governments step in and make policy. Is it by any chance desired by ICANN? This is a bit provocative. Is it desired that there is a gap so that governments could step in and make a policy?

And is the kind of policy that is proposed by governments desired by ICANN in any sense? Thank you.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Thank you for the question, Siva. To my understanding, the NIS2 as an example is not something that has to be approved by ICANN. It's something that the European Union defined for their own sake. Having said that, whatever European decide upon and a security instrument will reflect this industry in the generic [root] because the majority of the operators in the generic [root] also operate within Europe, hence has to be in compliance with the legislation. Michael, you may answer that more legal wise. Hope you can do it. Thank you. Michael, can you give a short comment on that one?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yes, and it's quite funny because literally in front of me right now I'm actually looking at the transposition of NIS2 into Belgian national law. The specific reference that you make is there is an extraterritorial provision in the NIS2 directive that applies to any entity providing services into the European Union.

Now one of the things that is actually interesting regarding NIS2 and how it will be transposed is registries that may not be established in the European Union, they need to designate a member state upon which they will be held accountable. They will need to register. So what will be really interesting here is to see as an NIS2 is transposed into individual member state law, is there uniformity regarding the registrant

verification and disclosure processes or is there perhaps a disparity in those requirements and could that potentially lead to forum shopping?

So again, this is something that I think needs to be closely looked at, and as individual member states over the upcoming months begin to transpose it into individual national law it's something that we and I think ICANN as a whole would want to take a look at.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Excellent. Thank you for that, Michael. I do hope that we on quite a regular basis put NIS2 and the European cybersecurity legislations on the agenda. I see Hadia coming up. Siva, did I answer your question?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes, except that the particular point that I was trying to make was that any of the gaps that ICANN leaves, is any of it an action deliberate and pro government policy? Is it deliberate to the extent that here is a gap for you to step in and enact? I'm sorry. It's very provocative.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: I think I will answer no to that, but I'm not sure. I'm not sure, Siva, honestly. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIABI: Thank you. This is a quick comment. As mentioned, as Amrita mentions and others mention in chat, that companies and organizations will have to adhere to national laws. However, the whole intention behind NIS2

was to actually have uniformity in relation to those, so to speak, individual national laws. So I guess what we expect from national laws is to reflect what NIS2 is saying.

And the way I currently see it is that our policies in some areas do not align with the requirements of NIS2, especially in relation to accuracy, in relation to publishing the data of legal entities. Those are two specifics where I don't see our ICANN policies aligning with NIS2. Thank you.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: I think you're correct in that, Hadia. My understanding is that the NIS2 is some sort of a minimum requirement for the member states to implement in their national legislation. And you cannot go lower in bracket than the NIS2. That's my understanding. But details about how this is being implemented in the European member states will be ongoing through the coming months. And I think if I recall correctly, it has to be implemented by October next year or something like that. And I do hope we will go into details about that many, many times.

Olivier, you're in, and then Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. Just to answer briefly the question that Siva was asking, I don't believe that ICANN wanted any of this to happen, at least not officially. But the point that I wanted to make is for many years I was the co-chair of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, and we did discuss these topics before they

were even on the agenda thanks to having people in the commission, people who were inside the processes.

And we did say in advance that ICANN had to be aware that these things were coming up, and the ICANN community had to be aware that these things were coming up. Especially when it came down the frustration from the commission and other government bodies that ICANN was not doing enough regarding DNS abuse, regarding transfer policy, regarding a number of things which did not appear to work in the public interest, at least in their own evaluation.

The late Marilyn Cade even said on several occasions that if things were not fixed here, they would be fixed by others and they would end up being fixed via legislation. And unfortunately, these warnings, these [inaudible] came onto deaf ears. And I recall several, and it's in the records, several that said, "Ah, we'll cross that bridge when we need to. This is never going to happen." Well there you go. We're where we are at today. That's it. Thank you.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Thank you for your comment, Olivier. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Again in response to Siva's question, during the EPDP on registration data where contracted parties were very reluctant to accept certain responsibilities because they felt they were liable to prosecution because of privacy issues, they actually went on...some contracted parties went on record as saying they would prefer

legislation because then it's crystal clear to them what they have to do. And they can't be prosecute for following the law. And if the law says you must release information under certain conditions, then that gives clarity to them and removes the uncertainty.

So when you say has ICANN deliberately wanted something, ICANN is an amorphous organization. It's not one single person calling the shots. So whether ICANN Org has done it deliberately, no, I don't think so. But there are certainly instances where policy is decided that almost begs there to be legislation like NIS2 which forces the issue and gives clarity at the same time. So it's a complex question, but there are certainly instances where legislation is preferable to a policy which might result in legal actions within the various member states. Thank you.

STEINAR GROTTEROD:

Thank you. I think we can set a [closure] on this one now, and there will be more to come on both the inter-[registrar] transfer policy and the NIS and European legislation in general. So back to you, Olivier. And thank you. Thank you all for your comments.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yeah, thank you very much, Steinar. And thanks for this very interesting discussion that we are having here. Looking forward to more developments next year.

Now I'm going to hand the floor over to Hadia Elminiawi because not only the next topic is the Expedited PDP on Internationalized Domain Names with Satish Babu and Hadia is also part of that group along with

Abdulkarim Oloyede but also because I'm going to be in transit now. So thank you to everyone. Have a great new year and a great holiday. And over to you, Hadia Elminiaawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Olivier. Safe travels. Now we are going to have an update from Satish Babu on the IDNs EPDP for gTLDs. Satish, the floor is yours.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Hadia. Can we go back to the first slide, please? I have a point here. In the last update, I had said that we facing attrition in the EPDP because Justine was leaving and Hadia also said she wanted to leave by the end of the year. But I have some good news. [inaudible] we persuaded Hadia to stay on, on the team, so she's not leaving. And the three of us will are going to continue until the end of the EPDP. Next slide, please.

So today, we're going to cover what happened in the face-to-face meeting at Kuala Lumpur. The next steps in the Phase 2 of the EPDP. Something about the IDN implementation guidelines 4.1 which is the current version. And a summary of the charter questions. We're not going to get into the substantive parts of the charter questions. Just to give you a glimpse of it because the substantive discussion will happen during the public comment phase that is going to open in February.

Next.

Just a little bit of background. The EPDP on IDNs was set up to develop policy for managing IDN variants at the top level and the second level. The top level was eventually spun off into Phase 1, and the second level was put into the Phase 2. The Phase 1 [inaudible].

During the initial work of the IDNs, this is actually a fairly new territory because we never had IDN variants at the top level before. So we evolved [inaudible] principles that throughout the Phase 1 and Phase 2 forms part of the foundation of what we've been trying to do.

The first is that root zone LGR is the sole source of variants. Then that whatever variants are enumerated by the root zone LGR is a set. And the set has to be joined to a single entity. The set cannot be split. It has to be allocated with a single entity. And finally, the principle of conservatism has said you cannot have too many variants because of the risk of [instability] and the [technical] issues that crop up.

So far what we have done is the Phase 1 final report was already published. There was a public comment process, then the EPDP team went through the public comment and incorporated the comments. And the voting yesterday, since Justine is not on the call I am not sure what happened, whether it was approved or not. All indications as of yesterday were that it would be approved.

And then in order to expedite the completion of the remaining charter questions, ICANN decided to organize a face-to-face meeting at Kuala Lumpur. The decision to have the meeting was actually taken several months back. The meeting actually happened two weeks back. Next slide, please.

So Phase 1 and Phase 2, a quick comparison so that we are aware of the big picture. The focus during Phase 1 has been top-level IDN variants, and Phase 2 is second-level IDN variants.

The current situation is that there is no policy for IDN variants at the top level. But at the second level there have been variants, and this is a registry-level issue. So for this we can and have [provided] variants in different scripts.

The Phase 1 is largely meant for but clearly for the next round of new gTLDs because some of the language communities like Chinese and Arabic have been waiting for variants since the last round which is more than ten years now. So they've been waiting a long time. But the Phase 2 work is mostly for the registries.

So who are impacted by the Phase 1 work? ICANN, applicants, registries. Phase 2, registries, registrars, resellers, registrants, end users. So there is an end user implication here I would say likely more than Phase 1.

Another difference is how the variants or the variant [sectors] are identified. In Phase 1 it is only through the root zone LGR. Now because Phase 2 is more concerned with registries, each registry could have its own way of identifying [things]. So this is done through the registry-level IDN tables.

And that this does create problems because [inaudible] the root zone LGR. Now the root zone LGR should not be underestimated. It is a monumental work because it covers so many scripts. Probably maybe about 80% of the world's population is covered [in what] script their

using. So it is a single centralized kind of a set of rules on how to allocate IDNs and IDN variants.

But when it comes to the Phase 2 work at the second level the registries have the authority and power to take decisions on policy. Therefore there's a need to ensure that there is no problem with [inaudible]. Because the root zone LGR solves the problem of having [inaudible] variant. But that is going to be ensured completely through policy at the second level.

And end user importance, Phase 1 it's lower, not zero. But Phase 2 is definitely higher as end users have to work with IDN variant domain names. Even [inaudible] the process [inaudible] itself might be affected when they [inaudible] so the number of steps involved may be higher. So overall there is going to be higher impact for end users in the Phase 2 work. Next slide, please.

So the Kuala Lumpur meeting, there were 18 participants—12 community members and 6 staff—and 1 person who from a very different and difficult time zone he did manage to join all the sessions.

The newly appointed vice chair of NCSG could not join the meeting. Now as you're aware, Justine vacated the vice chair position of the EPDP and the GNSO has appointed Farrel Folly as the new vice chair. But the vice chair could not join the meeting.

Most of the ACs and SOs were represented, including GAC which was interesting. Nigel is a very active participant. ALAC was represented by Abdulkarim, Hadia, and me.

The objective of the meeting was to complete the initial deliberations on the remaining charter questions. Next slide.

I'm not going to get into this in detail. Now generally speaking the principles from the Phase 1 carry over to Phase 2 but slightly differently. For example, in Phase 1 the top-level is root zone LGR. In Phase 2 it is IDN tables. And because of the fact that different registries have different policies perhaps, a further step called harmonization of the IDN tables would be required in order to ensure uniformity.

We had discussions, and this harmonization is a [inaudible] charter question that was not completely resolved in the face-to-face meeting. A small group has been set up with the registries and the ICANN technical staff to resolve the problem of how the harmonization should be done.

Same entity should work because we don't want user confusion, but it may work slightly differently. The variant set in this case has to look at the top level and the second level. So if the top level has variants and the second level has variants, then you have a kind of [inaudible] combination of a number of variants.

And transitional exceptions, otherwise called "grandfathering," would be required for some cases where the domains are already delegate. And if we're going to [contravene], then some of these principles are applied now in retrospect. So in those cases [we'll have to do] some special handling, so some exceptions until the time these exceptions are resolved.

We also looked at a lot of implications of the legal contractual terms, how will they change when you have variants. Next.

So discussions completed on all the charter questions. One charter question [inaudible] between the registries and technical staff, so we set up a small group. Hopefully, this will be resolved before the end of this year.

Some of the questions require language, some of the language already existing we discussed and some changes will be required. But we have generally consensus on all [aspects of this work].

The ALAC team has been very active throughout this EPDP and their inputs have been well received through the EPDP's work.

The Phase 2 initial report will be published for public comments in February. This will extend through the next ICANN meeting. And during the public comment period, the EPDP team will be presenting the substantive aspects of the charter questions at CPWG for inputs from CPWG in case CPWG has any additional inputs on the general consensus that is already existing. Next.

Now we come to a slightly different issue which was given to the EPDP later as a separate issue. This has to do with the IDN implementation guidelines. Now this document, the 4.0 version, there's an experts working group. This was set up in 2015. I was a part of that group. And the group delivered its report in 2018.

Now this particular group work is interesting because it is considered as somewhere between the technical standards of IETF and the consensus

policy of GNSO. In fact, this particular statement, the person who said this was Edmon who is a part of the IDN implementation working group.

So the problem with the output of that particular working group was that it spilled over into some aspects of consensus policy. It was a technical policy, basically. So when the report was submitted and the GNSO took a look at it, perhaps they felt that some of the recommendations were spilling over to the work of the EPDP on IDNs. So that is consensus policy, not technical policy.

So they had recommended to the Board to kind of defer those things, and the Board accordingly deferred those and published the 4.0 guidelines as 4.1.

So this EPDP was asked not on the substantive aspects of the guidelines but on the vehicle. What is the appropriate vehicle to revisit or review these guidelines from time to time? Next slide, please.

So the question that was asked of the EPDP was, what should be the proper vehicle to update the IDN implementation guidelines? And during the face-to-face meeting, we discussed multiple options. One was an EPDP, another a cross-community working group, and the third the same experts working group but with some improvements.

Now one of the comments that we heard during the meeting was that the charter of the experts working group was a little bit kind of fluid, so it went perhaps beyond the [inaudible] technical aspect into consensus policy aspect also which is the problem that happens [inaudible].

So now since this is a technical group, the CCWG was not considered appropriate. And given that at the level of IANA there was no difference between GNSO or ccNSO vis-à-vis security and stability issues, both groups had to be involved in this [inaudible] whatever [inaudible] proposing.

So if both GNSO and ccNSO have to work together, then that rules out the EPDP model. So the group veered toward a more regular version of the experts working group model itself but with a more rigorous charter and some more EPDP like provisions of working.

Because last time it took us from 2015 to 2018, about three years to come up with the recommendations. And also, the issue is that these recommendations are legally binding on the contracted parties, so we have to be very, very careful with these things and ensure that consensus policy is out of it and it's only technical policy that is discussed. Next.

This is just a kind of list. Now the last, Phase 1 [inaudible] had 68 recommendations. Now this one we find that—this is the first slide. Can you go to the second slide? Next slide, please.

So only seven recommendations are there, and many of the rest of the charter questions have been left without recommendations basically leaving it to the registries.

So the bulk of the responsibility of the second-level goes on to the registries, but there are some issues which are also important to...I mean [inaudible] ICANN policy. And some of them have high importance for end users, and we will [inaudible] these points when we

discuss...when we come back after the public comment period opens.
Next.

I think that's the end of it. Right, so if there are any questions, I'll be happy to take them. I also have a brief update on the UA Day progress, but I'll come to that after any questions are addressed. Hadia, do you want to add anything?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Satish. No, nothing to add from my side.

SATISH BABU: Right. So I don't see any hands, so perhaps you can revisit these things later. We can have a more substantive discussion at that point. Just a very brief update on the UA Day progress. The UA Day proposals, the deadline was 15 December. Last year, we had received about 54 proposals. This year we have 130. This is a remarkable jump, and it will be more difficult to [get a] shortlist of proposals out of it.

The UASG had actually invited At-Large to contribute three people for the [recording] of these proposals. I had forwarded that mail to Heidi and [Jonathan], and I don't know what happened to it. But tomorrow we're going to meet for deciding the criteria on how to [score it]. The actual [scoring] happens maybe later so by then if you can provide some names, it will be useful.

So that's it from my side. If there are any questions on any of these things, we can [inaudible]. Otherwise, it's back to Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Satisch. I don't see any hands up, so I guess we can go. So we don't have any more updates from the small teams. However, if Alan is with us, maybe he can take a few moments telling us about the RDRS, the launch.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's not a lot to tell right now. The system was launched. It's being used. At the launch time, about half of the domains were covered by it based on which registrars had volunteered. There's not a lot else to tell.

Leon did mention during the ALAC call yesterday that the Board will be looking at some of the currently unanswered recommendations for the SSAD. I'm not quite sure. I thought they were all effectively on hold, but Leon said there will be some discussion and perhaps voting on some of them. I'm not quite sure what that means, but we'll have to wait and see on that.

Other than that, it's business as usual at this point. The oversight committee that will be looking at RDRS operation and results will not meet until January. So at that point, we may have something new to talk about, but nothing active at this point.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Alan, for this update. Now we move to the policy statement updates.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just one moment. I do note that on closed generics the ALAC did issue advice to the Board. I haven't heard anything back from staff. Maybe I missed something. But have we had any response at all? I presume we've had an acknowledgement that it was received. I don't think we've had any substantive acknowledgement, but maybe Heidi has some input on that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. Heidi, do you have an answer to Alan and all of us.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Hi. Thank you, Hadia, and thank you for the question, Alan. As Jonathan notes, nothing substantive yet. I can follow up though. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Alan. And thank you, Heidi. I don't see any hands up, so let's move to the policy updates. So recently ratified is the GGP

for Applicant Support Guidance Recommendation final report. And I believe now it's in front of the GNSO to vote on and adopt.

Open for public comments we have the Draft ICANN FY25 Plans and Draft PTI FY25 Operating Plan and Budget. And those two are going to be discussed during the OFB working group meetings. I believe there is a meeting tomorrow. I don't know if Claire would like to give us a quick update. Okay, so let's move on. Okay, so Heidi is mentioning the OFB working group has already discussed the two budget items.

And we also have some deadlines on screen. So the Draft statement should be out Friday, 31 January, the final statement by 2 February, and it will be put for voting from 5-9 February. And we have the same deadline for the PTI FY25 Operating Plan and Budget. And Ricardo is the lead for the budget item, as Heidi mentions.

And the OFB working group will hold another meeting tomorrow including a discussion of these two public comments. So please if you want to take part in the discussions, join the OFB working group discussion tomorrow.

And still being reviewed is the Contention Resolution statement, and the penholder here is Jonathan Zuck. Jonathan, I don't know if you would like to provide a few words here. I guess there are no updates yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right. No updates.

HADIA ELMINIABI:

Great. Okay, thank you, Jonathan. And upcoming public comment proceedings is the Draft 2023 African Domain Name System Market Study Report. The 2023 African domain name industry study previously referred to as the African domain name system market study is meant to leverage the methodology and the results of the African DNS study to examine the current realities of the African DNS landscape in Africa and present a comprehensive report. The outcomes are expected to help the coalition of digital Africa for future growth opportunities and development. This is not out yet, but it is coming out soon.

So I'll stop here, and I don't see any hands up. So I guess we can just go ahead to any other business. And again, I don't see any hands up. So we go to the next meeting. So I'll stop here and ask staff about our next meeting.

YESIM SAGLAM:

Thanks system, Hadia. As we all know, next week ICANN offices will be close due to the Christmas break and we will be back by Tuesday, 2 January. So my question would be because it's right after the holiday break, do we want to hold our first call on the first week of January which is 3 January, or would you like to skip that week and hold the first call on 10 January?

HADIA ELMINIABI:

My inclination would be 3 January, however I don't know what others think. So again, it's up to the group. So it's either the 3rd or the 10th. What do you think? What's better for staff and...?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think the 10th. I think the 10th.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. I see Claire is saying the 10th, and Shah second week, John 10th.
Okay, so let it be 10 January. So is it 10 January, 19:00 UTC?

YESIM NAZLAR: Correct, Hadia. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Judith, also. So there is great agreement. Yeah, there is wide agreement on 10 January. So with that, I thank you all for participating in today's call. Season's greetings, happy holidays to all. Enjoy this. We have like 20 days now until our next call, so enjoy this break. Try to do some readings on our policies and also follow up the African Domain Name System Market Study report if it comes out. And with that, I hand it to staff and thank you all.

YESIM SAGLAM: Thank you very much, Hadia. And thank you all for joining today's meeting. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day, and happy holidays to everyone and Merry Christmas to those who celebrate. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
