
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – ccNSO: ccPDP3 Review Mechanism Work Group
Tuesday, June 14, 2022 – 15:00 to 16:00 AMS

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. Stephen Deerhake here, chair of the PDP3 working group on retirement and review mechanisms for ccTLDs. It's a great pleasure to see people in person as we meet here at the actual physical ICANN meeting for, what, the first time in like two years.

We have an agenda for today that can be displayed. There we go. We have a lot of this and that to tend to today. We have some administrative stuff which I'll turn over to Bart. What we really want to do today is 3, 4, 5, and 6, and then we can get to the usual AOB and next meeting stuff.

At this point, it's important I think now that we're meeting together for the first time in a long time to step back and really take a looksee as to where we are in the process. I want to review anything of substance that came out of the policy update session earlier today. I think that will go fairly quickly based on the lack of questions as to our work. I want to focus also on the work schedule until the next ICANN meeting and continue—if we have time today—continue a reading of the draft review mechanism on that.

So with that, I don't have anything further. Bart?

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.

BART BOSWINKEL: Shall we just run through it? And hopefully we can do it fairly quickly. Can you go to the next slide? Just so you know, it's always been or it is a point of discussion where the Board is with respect to the consideration of the retirement policy. At the upcoming council meeting Patricio Poblete will give an update to the council, most likely going forward as well on a regular basis if needed. So that's just one of the action items that's [gained] from meetings of this group. There are no other ones. So unless there are any questions, shall we go to the next item, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: At this point we'd like to step back and take a look and see where we are in the process. It's our thinking here that we really need to focus on completing the development of the review mechanism. As you know, we had a bit of a setback with regards to what we sought from ICANN Legal, and that's just the way it's going to be. So we can work around that and keep going.

And when we got to a point where we are pretty firm with our draft, we can start working on stress tests similar to what we did with the review mechanism when we got to a point where we thought we had something pretty firm.

We do need to talk about the bylaw carveout that was put in the transition, I guess ICANN 3.0 bylaws and then prepare for a public

consultation on the draft review mechanism. And based on that...and that is going to take some significant calendar time because that's just the way public reviews work.

And based on the feedback we get from the public consultation, we are most likely going to have to tweak the review mechanism text a bit. Hopefully, get that finalized. Depending on the extent of the tweaking, we would then have to put it out for a second consultation. And once we get that back in and finalize the language, then we can kick it over to the council. Next slide on that, I think.

And yes, finally then, take a look at what we might need to do there as...yeah. I really, based on what happened earlier today at the policy review session just concluded, I didn't see anybody jumping up and down thinking that what we've been doing is way off base. So if anybody has any thoughts to the contrary that maybe we're off course, feel free to raise your hand and let us know what you think.

Do we have anybody in the room that would like to comment? No. Do we have anybody remote, Bart, with a hand up? Yeah, my Mac has just died today. We apparently have no remote hands, no hands in the room. So I think we can close this particular agenda item. It looks like we have nothing to discuss with regards to what may have transpired in the policy update session. So next slide, please.

Next up is the work schedule going into getting ourselves to a point where we can actually enter into our first of probably two public consultations—I give up on this masking—with the goal of finalizing the review mechanism to the point where we can do a detailed presentation at ICANN75 in Kuala Lumpur.

We will also have to engage with the GAC. We have not in a while, obviously. We have continued to inquire as to getting active GAC participation in the working group, but that wasn't working before the pandemic and it certainly didn't work during the pandemic. So we, as I've done and as Eberhard and I have done in the past, will trundle on over to the GAC and give them an update on what we're doing.

It would be nice but probably not completely feasible to complete stress testing before Kuala Lumpur. I think we'll certainly have it partially complete. And if we find something really amiss early on in the stress testing process, we may have to go back and revisit some things which would completely do in our timetable. But it would be nice if we could work between now and then, now and KL, to get as much stress testing done as possible once we've got something that we're pretty happy with in terms of policy.

The thinking now is if we can do this shortly after the KL meeting which I believe is in late September, we can put out the public consultation—hopefully, we only have to do one, but we'll see—in the October/November timeframe. And as you can see on the

slide, there's nothing we can really do about the calendar. That's just the way these public consultations are set up. And that will take us out toward the end of November, possibly into early December. But hopefully, by year end we will have a pretty firm idea of what we think the policy should be. We think it passes the stress test. And we also should have a view of what the rest of the community thinks of the proposed policy. Next slide, please.

So we do have some open issues that we need to fiddle with and spend some time on.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bernie's available to run you through this.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bernie, do you want to take over, sir?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I always love open issues. All right.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Show my ugly mug on the screen. Hi, everyone. Miss you all. Don't miss wearing the mask.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We'll send you one.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Got plenty here, trust me. One of the big ticket items on our open issues list, what are the prerequisites before being able to request the review mechanism? We're not saying there has to be, but we know there are at least two mechanisms that are available now for reviewing IFO decisions. and that is an internal IFO review and mediation as everyone, including ICANN Legal, discovered with our questions is actually built into the bylaws. So for any IFO decision for anyone, there can be mediation which is paid for by ICANN.

Do we want to make those a prerequisite or not? The group hasn't sat down and talked about this, and we're going to have to figure that out. Are they optional? Are they required to clear up the issues? Make sure everyone understands exactly what they're getting into, etc. As has been pointed out, mediation doesn't look to address blame or change decisions, but it makes sure that both parties clearly understand each other. So that could be of use.

Our second one is a question of the timeframes for being able to request a review. We haven't done this in detail, and as I have said in the past, I'm building on my going on six years of playing with

the IRP IOT reviewing the IRP. And timeframes are really important things.

Let's give an example. If there is a decision by the IFO, up until when can you file for a review? Meaning let's say it's a delegation of a new ccTLD. There were contending parties. We have said that contending parties can apply for a review. But can they apply up until...can they apply after the Board has made a decision? Can they apply up until the point that the Board is going to consider the issue? Or are we limited until such time as the IFO has submitted something to the Board? All these things are important.

Similarly, although a truly exceptional case, as we know, if there is a transfer request and it is rejected by the IFO, again I state that would be like winning the lottery. We know that the IFO does not reject applications. They fade and die away in 99.9% of the cases. But should that happen, how long do you have after it's rejected that you can submit an application for a review? Obviously, it would not make sense for this to be in the years because everyone is going to have forgotten what happened, etc. So that's a small illustration of the timeframe issues.

Setting fees. We haven't discussed this. Personally, my view on this is that that's an operational issue once we finish the policy, and that's where that should be addressed and not here. But that is the working group's decision.

Finally, splitting of fees, meaning who pays for what? And I think that's rather important. Especially, as we have discussed earlier today in the policy update, it's one of our tenets that this is, this whole idea of costs, needs to be handled in a very serious way to make sure we're not excluding people. Because in our case as we know we have a lot of small ccTLDs, and we have always said that we want to make any mechanism that we come up with something that they can use effectively without having to go into serious debt or even being prevented from using it just by the costs. So looking at those kinds of things.

So those are the open issues. Do we have any questions? All right, not seeing anything, Stephen, back to you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Thank you, sir. Next slide, please. We've got meetings scheduled. We're taking a break as we usually do. A short break this time at the conclusion of this ICANN meeting. And we've got two on tap, the 13th and the 27th of July. And then the question for the group is, and anyone remotely participating can weigh in as well, what do we want to do about August? Europe seems to go away in August, and I can't say I blame them. It's a civilized idea. Do we want to break all the way to the 24th from the 27th of July? So that's almost a month off. And then resume on the 24th and then we can use the last meeting prior to Kuala Lumpur to prepare what we're going to present to the community there. Any thoughts on

scheduling a meeting mid-August or skipping that? Both from the group here and from remote participants, anybody have any thoughts or comments? Yes, sir.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Can we go back to the slide around what needs to happen next around...say between...? Can you go back one more? Yeah, go forward two slides. Forward please. So the one about between now and ICANN75, that's what we're talking about. As you saw the schedule, it means that we effectively have four or five meetings to do substantial work.

So the question is so we need to address some of the topics that Bernie raised already. We can start today, but we need to share or Bernie needs to share that document. It means that, say, hopefully by ICANN75 we have concluded, or just before ICANN75, we have concluded the full review mechanism in second readings and we need to prepare ourselves to present this to the whole community. So keep this in mind, and then look at the schedule. So that's why.

Now we can go to the next meetings. I think based on the number of meetings we have until 75, I think it's very optimistic to think that we can do stress testing, even complete it. So my advice to you is complete the review mechanism well before at least say by the Wednesday the 24th and then use the 7th to prep for a full discussion with the community around the review mechanism, so

looking into the details. So that means you have four meetings to do so. Brining in some realism. Back to you, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bart. This does suggest that perhaps we should have one in August between the July 27th and the planned August 24th meeting. My concern is that we may not have enough people to really make it worthwhile. So I would actually like to see a formal poll with the following question: would you be able or do you think you would be able to participate in a mid-August meeting? And if so, can I see a show of hands? Three. I think the answer is we will probably not have a mid-August meeting based on the show of hands I've seen. And I don't see anything remote.

So we will trundle along and really try to at least get the review mechanism pretty much nailed down from a tech standpoint and then use the 7th of September meeting, as Bart has suggested, to focus on presentation to the community. Because we have the policy update meeting for the ccNSO, and we will also of course have to go and visit with the GAC. So we're going to have to prepare for that as well. So I think what we'll do going forward is really focus on nailing down the open items with regards to contextual basis of the review mechanism, as Bernie suggested.

I think we'll defer discussing the fee issue, the splitting of the fees, etc., until after we have something out. I believe that that's something we can do concurrent with the first public comment

period, but I may be mistaken on that. Bernie, if you have any thoughts on that, feel free to speak up. Not hearing from you, I'm assuming not then. Next slide, please.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I was trying to unmute myself.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Oh, okay. Go ahead, sir.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I think on the actual fees, as I said, I think that's an implementation issue. And splitting the fees, I think it's going to be worth at least spending a little bit of time on that based on other models and what we can do. So that's what I think on that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, thank you, sir. A couple more slides down I think, Kim. Wherever we left off. Yeah, one more after that. That would be the next one.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: That's the last one.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yep, that’s it. We’re not really prepared to dive into review mechanism text today, Bernie, unless I’m mistaken. [Of course, if] you’ve got something queued up, we could take a look at it. Otherwise, I think we can move on to the rest of the agenda beginning with any other business. Bernie, do you have anything?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, there are some...Kimberly has the document, and I think it would be a waste of time not to actually use the group that has gathered.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Let’s take a stab at it then.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: So if you will. All right, let me tell you where we left off. In April was the last time we played with this document, and we had stopped at Line 326. Love the line numbers. Thank you, Eberhard, for insisting on these things.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: They are handy.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: All right, so we had completed all the other parts of dealing with the administrator and the arbitrators and the general process.

And now we were into details not included in the process overview for the IFO. So as per usual, we'll just walk through this. As you can see from the elevator bar on the righthand side, we're almost done on a review of what we had been looking at.

All right, so going into it, the IFO "will maintain a good working relationship with the administrator." That is the administrator of the review mechanism. "Must amend its procedures to allow concerned parties sufficient time to file for independent advice prior to the IFO implementing or making a recommendation to the ICANN Board regarding the decision which is being challenged. As such the IFO will advise all directly involved parties of any appealable decisions. Such decisions will be labelled preliminary decisions and will advise the concerned parties of their options for appealing such decisions."

So you'll remember one of our guiding principles here is fairness and making sure that everyone is aware of all their options. So we want to make sure by this that people have been notified of a decision, have been notified of the time they have and what their options are. So in keeping with that.

Next, "after reaching a decision on a ccTLD request which can be appealed, the IFO will advise those parties which could apply for a review of the decision and of their options for appealing the decision as well as the timeline for doing so." And as we mentioned earlier in this meeting, this timeline issue is something

that we have not yet delved into. I don't think it's super complicated, but we're going to have to clean up things. As ICANN has pointed out in a couple of other areas, repose is a very important issue.

I see a hand from Nick, please.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Oh, hi, Bernie. Just checking that you know there are remote participants, and I know you're obviously remote as well. Just I know the language here is the language here, but you talk about decisions being appealed. And I question really the use of the word appeal in the judicial sense because you're not really asking for a de novo review. What we're talking about is a review for procedural correctness, not an appeal in that judicial sense. Is that correct?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: You are absolutely right. As we have said, some of the terminology as we have never gone through this section of the document and, as such, I'm glad you're bringing that up. And, yes, it should be reviewed everywhere.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay, because I'm quite fussy about that because I think this is where a lot of the misunderstandings come from.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Well, you should be, and I appreciate the point.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: All right. Okay, I'll shut up. Thanks. Nice to see you. [Cheers.]

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, sir. “if a decision is being appealed to the administrator, the IFO cannot make a recommendation to the ICANN Board on the matter being reviewed prior to the administrator confirming it can do so.” This is one of the key elements of our review mechanism is, of course, you do not want the IFO to take a decision that it has taken which needs Board approval and sending it on if people are going through the process.

Now this whole question of timelines and prerequisite procedures before going for a review, as we're talking here, has a lot of implications about how the timelines fit together so that this makes sense. And making sure that similarly to what we are proposing here when you're applying for a review that if there are prerequisites procedures before going into a review application, that those other procedures also lock down the IFO versus taking any further action on any decision. So we're going to have to review that once we make the decision on other procedures that are prerequisites for applying for this kind of a review.

“Will make all relevant internal materials available to the arbitrator who will be under formal confidentiality agreement. These will include all internal emails on the matter and all communications from the relevant parties but does not include formal legal advice to the IFO.” So as we have said, the arbitrators will get a look at all the material. Except formal legal advice, and that’s fine. I think everyone understands that. And try to piece together what is at the heart of the issue and if the IFO did the right thing or if there were, as we have described earlier in this procedure, significant issues. Let’s go down to the next page, please.

“Will make itself available to the arbitrators to present details of the case and answer questions.” And “if the review finds there were significant issues and the IFO rejects the advice, the IFO will work with the administrator to include all review results in any recommendations on this matter to the ICANN Board.”

So again, this has been the crux of the matter. If the review finds there were significant issues, the IFO doesn’t want to change anything, then the results of the review will go with any IANA recommendation to the Board. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bernie. If we get to the point where we’re having to invoke the language at 347-349, it suggests to me that it’s going to be a rather contentious relationship at this point between the

IFO and the arbitrator. Do we want to flesh this out further, or are we happy with how it's currently phrased? In other words, I guess what I'm asking is do we want to put in a little more specific details as to what the level of cooperation has to be? Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

I think one of the issues that we don't yet have in here and that is another issue to confirm is the issue of what happens if the IFO does not follow the policy. And that will have to be included here. So I think that covers what you're talking about. I believe that where we will land on this, we've mentioned this in another format whereby not all decisions which can be reviewed necessary go to the Board.

As our example is a transfer request which is rejected by the IFO. Now as I have mentioned earlier, extremely rare as we have been told by the IFO they do not reject requests. But if people fail to make a convincing case or meet the requests of the IFO to confirm the transfer, these things eventually fall off the branch.

But if we're developing a policy as we say, we want to cover all angles. And so if something happens that is not going to go to the Board but is a decision that should be reviewed, and if there are significant issues that are found, what we are proposing is that the administrator can transmit that directly to the CEO of ICANN as this becomes an internal management issue which does not require Board approval.

Does that in part answer your question, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes, it does. Thank you.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Your hand is still up. All right, so that's the IFO section. Next, applicant and claimant details not included in the process overview. "Must be a ccTLD manager except in the case of the delegation of a new ccTLD where any applicant for that new ccTLD is eligible."

"To launch an independent advice review"—and we're using the review word here so, yes, we will adjust the language—"the claimant must submit an application via the website to the administrator in English within 30 days of the decision being made."

"30 days to be calculated as follows—the IFO publishing its initial decision will be deemed Day 0. Day 1 will begin 1 minute after 23:59 UTC of Day 0. The opportunity to submit an application for an independent advice review will expire on Day 30 at one minute past 23:59 UTC."

We're going into a heck of a lot of details here, but these things as far as timing and validity of things are really critical when people are trying to do things. So that's why we've done this, and it

doesn't leave any room for interpretation. These are the timeframes we're proposing, and this is what's happening.

“The evaluation criteria for an independent advice review application are: Be on the properly completed form/contract” (to be determined, of course). “Be received prior to the 30 day deadline. Clearly indicate which IFO preliminary decision is being appealed. An application for an independent advice cannot be approved for a decision which is currently the subject of an independent advice review or was the subject of a completed independent advice review.”

So we're just making sure here that we're not launching multiple cases on the same thing. It just would not make sense. If we're looking at something, we're going to look at it once. We're going to look at all aspects of it, and we will render an opinion on that. But we will not be running around doing three or four cases on the same decision.

“Have paid the required fees (fees and details to be determined). Be a party listed in the IFO decision that is a ccTLD manager listed in the IANA database or in cases related to the delegation of a new ccTLD any parties who applied to be the manager for that ccTLD.”

All right, why do we have that there? Well, we've said ccTLD managers can apply. But we don't necessarily want a ccTLD for .xy to apply if there's a problem with .zz. Obviously, we're looking at dealing with parties that are directly affected by these things.

“Clearly indicate the individual applicant has delegated to be responsible for the application including all relevant contact information. Clearly state why the claimant believes that the IFO did not properly follow its procedures or applied or applied these fairly in arriving at its preliminary decision. The IFO decision being reviewed is inconsistent with RFC 1591, the ccNSO FOI for RFC 1591 as approved by the ICANN Board as well as any other policies which apply to ccNSO members and is approved by the ICANN Board.”

I’ve run out of text, Kimberly. So basically, we’re asking people if you’re going to apply for a review, you’re going to tell us exactly which decision you’re applying for a review so there is no misunderstanding about what we’re talking about. And you will tell us why you think it has failed and it needs a review.

“For cases where there is a potential for more than one claimant. In all such cases where the administrator has approved an application for a review the arbitrator will consider all elements of the IFO decision for all potential claimants.”

All right, what happens here is, again, we want to avoid multiple cases coming from the same decision. So obviously the main case here we’re trying to deal with is the delegation of new ccTLDs. If, let’s say, there were three parties applying for that ccTLD and one has applied for a review, then the process is such that the review mechanism will look at everything for that case.

We do not need to have multiple cases, one for each of the two losing parties in the case where there were three submit a review request. The decision will come out. Because you will remember the only thing that the panel or arbitrator can do is say there were significant issues or not. So it doesn't matter if there were two or three or four parties involved in a decision. The case will be reviewed. There will be an opinion given. And then we will follow its course.

“By submitting an application the claimant will agree to the rules for the independent advice review which will include a clause preventing the applicant from taking the administrator, arbitrators, the ccNSO, or ICANN to court with respect to the independent advice review. However, this in no way prevents the claimant from taking the IFO or ICANN to a relevant court regarding the decision by the IFO and any approval of such recommendation by the ICANN Board.”

So we're just making sure here that we're saying the review process itself is out of bounds. If you're unhappy with the decision that came out of the review mechanism that we are building here, if you have agreed to the terms of the review mechanism, you cannot take the review mechanism to court. But in no way does this prevent you from taking ICANN or the IFO to court and even using the decision of the review mechanism as part of your court case.

“The administrator may interact with the claimant’s contact person to obtain clarifications on the application (and may allow the applicant to resubmit).” So what we’re saying here, again, in the concept of fairness and openness where we’re trying to ensure that you don’t need a legal team to submit an application here, when the administrator is going to look at this to see if it can be approved for a review, he or she can work with the claimant to fix things so that if there are administrative details, etc., that could cause problems on the application, we’re not—I guess the simple way of doing this—we’re not looking for nits to disallow cases. We’re trying to make it as simple as possible and we’re trying to provide the maximum amount of help to a potential claimant to submit an application while remaining neutral about the proceedings.

And finally, “if the administrator rejects the application for an independent advice review, the claimant’s payment will be refunded minus administrative costs.” And what we’ve been talking about is \$1,000-5,000 U.S. maximum but, again, fees to be determined at a later date.

“There is no mechanism to appeal the administrator’s decision to reject an application, however the administrator will be required to publish its reasons for rejecting the application.” Again, we don’t want to get into a case of, although in the previous point we had said we want to make it as simple as possible, we want to provide the maximum amount of assistance that is logical to

provide to a ccTLD, but if there is no case there, if it doesn't meet the clearly spelled out requirements for accepting a review request, then it's done.

We're not going to go through a superior court and a supreme court and blah, blah, blah. You have accepted the rules. The rules say the administrator will decide if the application is valid or not. The administrator can work with the claimant who is submitting the application to clear up any problems if possible. But if it's not possible and if the application does not meet the requirements, it's done. That's about it.

And folks, we're done. That's it. Be glad to take any questions.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Bernie. We've got a comment from Kim and also a question from Peter, if you can see them in the chat.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I see Nigel. I don't see Peter. But anyway, let's start with Nigel since I see him right now. Hi, Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, hi, Bernie. Would you mind just going back to the previous page, please, so I can refresh my mind on the...and you can carry on with Peter while I look at that, thanks.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Okay, Peter?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Bernie, Peter added a comment in the chat. Would you like me to read it out loud?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: I'll read it. It's okay.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay, go ahead, Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: “If there is one claimant and one potential claimant, can the latter provide their arguments? Do they need to join the claimant to become a party to the review?” is the question you want discussed. Basically, you'll remember as we ran through the process, we're not going into a system where there is representation. It actually will not matter, the scenario you're bringing up, Peter, whether there's one, two, or three. There are no arguments to be made because the only thing that the arbitrators are supposed to look at is were there significant issues from the IFO side in the way the process was followed, was it fair, and did it arrive at the right decision without any significant

issues. If there were significant issues, there were and that will be the decision of the panel. So it doesn't matter, or at least that's what we're proposing, whether there are multiple parties.

And again, let's be honest with the statistics here. The only major case where we should see that as far as I am concerned, and I'm willing to be corrected on that, is for the application of a new ccTLD. And I think the cases where there are more than two applicants for any given ccTLD are extremely rare. But this is why the language is there. It's covered as long as someone asks for a review and is qualified to ask for a review and the review request is accepted, the arbitrators will look at everything for that review. Will not limit themselves for this. And I think that we, as we say, there can be a decision but that decision will cover all aspects. Well, a decision...there will be an opinion which will cover all aspects of the decision. I hope that answers your question, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Yes, thanks, Bernie. It's a corner case anyway.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: It's very much a corner case, but this is what we're here to do is to avoid the messy parts of the corner cases. Thank you, Peter. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks, Bernie. I'm looking at Line 371 and 372 and 373. I'm not going to try and rewrite this on the fly.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Oh, thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: But I think we need some work on this. And I'm particularly interested in the fact that you might have two potential claimants but only one of them has paid the fees. I think that you could align this language a bit more closely to the reconsideration request language that's already in existence. That's just a comment on that. Obviously, we can talk about that offline.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: That would be good. Possibly a good suggestion. As we said, we're trying to map out the main ideas here. Are there improvements to the language? Sure. As we have said earlier in the meeting, the idea that it's a review and not an appeal has to be normalized throughout the document.

As far as the fee issue is concerned, yes, more than willing to discuss that. We have said that cost allocation is an issue for us to go through. But also, I think the system that we're proposing here is KISS. We're keeping it simple. Someone has a will to go and appeal this, and there is nothing in the rules per se that says that

if there were three parties applying for a new ccTLD, two of them are rejected, there's nothing to prevent them coming together and sharing the fees for requesting a review. That would be fine. As we explain about how the review is going to work and the process we're going to go through, that's fine. It will actually change nothing for us, but we want to keep things simple.

The idea that when you get involved in side branches of very complicated procedures—and I could talk for days about that relative to the IRP—you're just stretching things out. And that is another one of our key tenets is we don't want to stretch things out. We want to have a look. We want to look at all the information that is available. We want to see if the process was followed. If it was followed fairly. If there were any significant issues. Yes or no. That's it. That's where we're going.

All right, I'm done.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No more questions in the room, and I don't see any hands. So thank you, Bernie. Appreciate it.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thanks. Can I have the agenda up again? Yes, there we go. Thank you. Any other business from anybody? Either remote or in the room. I'm not seeing a waggle of hands, to use my usual expression, either on Zoom or in the room.

So with that, I would say we can just make note of our next meeting which is scheduled for Wednesday the 29th at 19:00 UTC as per what we usually do on Zoom. It's a pity we won't be seeing each other in 3D, but it's the best we can do at the time. So make a note of that. I hope you can all attend. It would be nice. And we will dive further into our work.

And with that, I believe unless there is one last anybody has anything, and I don't see, so I will pronounce this meeting adjourned. I thank everyone for pitching up. I hope you have a rest of a good ICANN meeting and safe travels home. It's nice to be able to say that finally. And with that, I'll close the meeting and the recording can be stopped. Thanks, guys. Thank you, staff as well.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]