YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, the 11th of November, 2020 at 20:00 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 in the Zoom room and on the phone bridge, will be recorded after the call. We have received apologies from Priyatosh Jana and Lilian Ivette De Luque. From staff side, we have Evin Erdogdu, Herb Waye, and myself, Yesim Nazlar. I'll also be doing call management for today's call. We have Spanish and French interpretation for this call, and our interpreters are Lilian and Paula on the Spanish channel, and Claire and Jacques on the French channel.

Before we get started, just a final reminder to please state your names before speaking not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

With that, I now would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. Just to make sure, I don't think that we have captioning today, so apologies for that. But we certainly have our interpreters. Is that correct?

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.

YESIM NAZLAR:	Sorry, Olivier. Yes, that is correct, due to the [inaudible] [holiday] [Anyway,] we don't have real-time transcription provided for today's call.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. There we are. So apologies for this, but that's not something that will last. Next week we'll be back to our usual progress. So welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call on a holiday in many countries around the world, or at least some countries around the world. But we're working.
	Today we have some … Well, to be confirmed. I'm going to check with Justine. We should have some updates if Justine Chew is on the call. I'm not seeing her right now. But, otherwise, we will go into the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu, and we'll have a focus on early warning for the root zone scaling and a focus also on the preliminary issue report on the policy development process to review the transfer policy. Of course, that's the inter-registrar transfer policy. And then we'll have Any Other Business immediately after that.
	I note that the page has been edited again. I hope that I've got the latest agenda. But I'll open the floor if there are any amendments, additions, or changes to the agenda that is currently proposed on your screen.
	I am not seeing any hands up, so the agenda is adopted as it currently is displayed. We can therefore move to our second item, and that's the action items from our last call. There were quite a few action items. A number of them are in progress. The first one is for Joanna Kulesza, who suggested inviting Alexander—maybe we should have full names;

Alexander Something from the Council of Europe—to present to the At-Large community regarding the treaty of a potential single-issue call. That's still in the works. Things are getting coordinated, so this will be done in the near future.

Also, related to this, I guess, is Yrjo will suggest to the Public Safety Working Group that this topic be [added] to the agenda of the next PSWG meeting. That's, I think, in progress as well. I wonder, because I didn't see Yrjo's topic listed on today's call, is this still in progress, Yrjo?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes. Thank you. It is, yes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. So that will have some future updates.

Jonathan Zuck and Sebastien Bachollet to reach out to [Bertan]—I believe there is only one [Bertan]; that is [Bertan Alachapelle]—to present to the Consolidated Policy Working Group. That's also in progress, I gather.

And Hadia Elminiawi noted an AI for ALSes to think about how to collaborate and engage on unique identifiers. I'm not sure there's an update on this yet. I have seen some e-mails going to the Outreach and Engagement Committee. So is there an update on this, perhaps? Hadia Elminiawi, if she's on the call? Yes, you are.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:	I did send an e-mail to Daniel in order to put this possibly on their agenda, but we haven't agreed on anything yet.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. No worries as long as there's progress, and there certainly is. So that's great to hear.
	Next, Gregory Shatan to consider whether [to] actually create an At-Large charter for human rights so that it is not exclusive to the NCSG. Potentially nominate a co-chair. I'm not sure if Greg is on the call. I guess this is also in progress mostly. I'm not seeing Greg Shatan. I know it's in progress.
	The last three action items have been effected.
	So I think we should just roll this over and then see, next week, how this is coming along. But certainly a lot of things in progress.
	Are there are any comments or questions? I'm closely checking the participants list and not seeing any hands up.
	So we can probably move on then. Thank you. Let's go to Agenda Item #3. That's the work group update. We had penciled in Justine Chew because she was not able to make it to last week's call. Is Justine on today's call as well. I know this is a particularly terrible time for her.
YESIM NAZLAR:	Olivier, this is Yesim, if I may. I don't see Justine on the call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Yesim. I'm not seeing her. So I would guess that I could just ask if there are any other work group updates or if anybody wishes to add anything they've gleaned from the SubPro Working Group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, Cheryl here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It sounds like one of the Co-Chairs is on the call. Yes, please, Cheryl Langdon-Orr. You have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I actually do spend a little bit of time playing in the Subsequent Procedures field. That said, I can certainly report to the group that what the Subsequent Procedures Working Group has been doing … ugh. Sorry, guys. My … I just … I just disconnected from another call and, once I turned off my headset, my phone decided I needed it to go on speaker. Right. Now, without the echo, what the SubPro Working Group has been doing in its calls that have been still running twice weekly for 90 minutes is going over the public comments in a great deal of detail. You'll be pleased to know that your ALAC comments, or the comments that the ALAC put forward, very much are borne out of the work that this excellent working group did for it—kudos to Justine and the small team that has done that—and continue to be detailed and considered. I'm not suggested that everything you've said is going to prevail on the

day in terms of changes to recommendations, but what I can assure you is that it's being fully and frankly looked at.

We've got a workplan that I might suggest you ask Justine to publish to your document file so you can all know what we're up to in coming weeks. We are going pretty quickly through the topics. Fortunately, we have gone through a couple of topics already or are about to in this coming meeting. So I trust Justine and some others will be in the meetings for that, where we're looking at CPE and other aspects as well. But a number of the areas that we have particular interest in from an At-Large and end-user perspective have been covered off already. On some of those, you will indeed be seeing some modifications to the recommendations that were made in the draft report.

So I think that's about as much as I should say because, as Christopher will point out, of course, if you [inaudible], I am highly compromised [inaudible] as the Co-Chair. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I'll open the floor if there are any questions on points that you've raised and the updates that you've provided.

I see Christopher has put his hand up. Christopher Wilkinson?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Good evening. On a technical point, staff may note that something has changed, and there's far more [blather] involved in logging on to

these Zoom meetings than even a couple of weeks ago. So I don't quite understand what has been changed technically, but it's a bit awkward.

Cheryl, why are we having two meetings a week? What is the urgency that seems to be driving the PDP and resulting in certain reluctance to make any serious changes to their recommendations? I ask because, frankly, we're heading, both in Europe and the United States, into national and regional medical crises. I cannot imagine that ICANN will go ahead with opening a new round under these circumstances as if nothing is happening in the rest of the world. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, Christopher. Happy to respond to that. A couple of things. First of all, once the final report is sent to the GNSO Council, which will be happening before the end of this calendar year, based on our extended and modified committed-to timeline … That of course is why we're still doing (and we have been doing for more than half or nearly two-thirds of the year now) two meetings a week, so this is not some sudden newness to our workload. Our workload has been intense, and it has been intense because it's a huge amount of work to do. But there is a great deal of time and a great deal of opportunity even for more influence to be brought to bear by various opinions from the SOs and the ACs once it goes through, if it does indeed even go through, the GNSO Council and eventually gets to the Board. Then it is after a number of other activities that the Board will undertake that things like the new guidebook will be developed, and a new round may or may not continue.

So there's no "Oh, dear. We have to have a new round started by the following date" pressure. There is, however, pressure to complete a PDP process that has been going on coming up for five years now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Cheryl. I certainly understand the eagerness that some might have to want to finish this because five years is a very long time indeed. But I think that we should welcome also the fact that all the comments—if I hear correctly, all of the comments that were sent—are being analyzed and are being tabulated, etc., etc. So I can certainly imagine the huge [fast] that this entices. So, really, good luck for the whole group into moving forward on this.

Christopher, your hand is still up. Do you wish to follow up or is that a new hand?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Thanks. Since my hand is still up, thank you, Cheryl. I just feel that there is an enormous amount of time being spent on really quite marginal changes to the recommendations. I was just beginning to wonder for how much longer is this going to go on for. But I take note of your response. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Thanks for the update, Cheryl.

Unless we have other work group updates, we can move on to our next agenda item. I gather the other work group that we've had regular updates about was the EPDP. I know it's got another name to it now.

I've seen on the website some question about Phase 2A. I'm not quite sure whether there really is some movement or whether this is just wishful thinking. Would Alan or Hadia be able to advise?

Hadia Elminiawi?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: There is [inaudible] to report. So, yes, there is going to be an EPDP Phase 2. That basically will tackle the distinction between legal and natural persons in order to issue a recommendation in that regard, and also, the feasibility of unique contacts to have uniform anonymized e-mail addresses. I guess there might be a 2B later. That was never said, though. But saying there is a 2A, you assume there's a 2B. I don't know.

Then the other pending thing is the scoping team in order to tackle the accuracy [match].

So that's it for me. I leave the floor to Alan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Hadia. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I think you must have been asleep because I'm sure we talked about this last week. Why it's called 2A as opposed to 2B, since there's

already been a "2"—I'll leave the nomenclature up to the GNSO experts in this group—is there was a determination that it would not be called Phase 3, so we're calling to 2A. Go explain. But there's no doubt it is going to come to pass. I'm not sure what else there is to say at this point. There is discussion going on among the various groups within the EPDP on how to approach this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this, Alan, and thank you for this update, Hadia. On that note regarding sleeping during calls, yes, I have been known to chair calls while sleeping, but I just woke up.

So let's go and hear from Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. The concept of us not noticing that you were chairing a call while you're asleep is just too gorgeous for me not to be laughing when I came off mute. My apologies. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, not still giggling. All right, that just tickled my fancy.

The thing I wanted to mention while we've got both Hadia and Alan on the call is I note, from the GNSO Council perspective at least, that there is component parts of the EPDP. In other words, those of you at the table have been calling for confirmation of continuation or replacement of representatives to move into this Phase 2A. I was just wanting to put on the record that I sincerely hope that both Alan and Hadia will be endorsed by the ALAC to continue in their incredibly valuable role but, more importantly, [now] have the capability and intestinal fortitude to

continue in the fantastic way that they have done, providing they're willing to do so. So imagine me down on bended knee, begging them at this point in time to seriously consider continuing on the role because their influence has been significant and we owe them a great debt for what they have done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. I gather, by 2A—let's hope we don't reach 2Z at some point … I see things are moving forward on this.

Alan, your hand is still up?

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand is up again, actually, but I didn't bother putting it down in the interim.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Over to you, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to note that, although not done in a public forum, Maureen has canvassed the current membership of the EPDP, and both Hadia and I have volunteered—foolishly, I think, or perhaps it's a measure of insanity—to continue. Holly has said she would continue as an alternate. And Bastiaan, for reasons related to his job, is resigning, so we'll need to find another alternate for that. But, other than that, we will continue in some form or another for at least another little while.

Now, the GNSO Council has said, if we don't make progress soon, they're going to kill the whole thing or something. I could make the same statement about my resignation, so let's see where it goes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan.

Let's therefore move on, maybe, to the next part of our agenda, unless there are any other work group updates. I haven't seen any other hands going up, so let's move. The next agenda item is the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu. Over to you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. For the policy comments updates, there are currently no recently ratified statements by the ALAC but several upcoming comment proceedings. You'll note on the tabs there that October has, of course, past, but those public comment proceedings are still pending and may come before the end of this year (2020).

There's one public comment currently open for decision for the group, and that is the proposed Amendment 1 to the .job registry agreement. This closes very soon, on the 16th of November. It was noted on the agenda last week, actually, but I don't think there was a confirmed decision on it.

Beyond this, there are two currently statements being developed by the ALAC. We may have two presentations today, but we'll definitely have at least one. The first is the recommendations for early warning for root zone scaling. This is being led by Abdulkarim. I think he is on the call, but

I'm not sure if there will be a presentation or a comment today. But there is another confirmed presentation for the preliminary issues report on a policy development process to review the transfer policy. Alan, Holly, and Hadia have created a presentation for this for about 15 minutes, so I'll turn it over to Jonathan or the group for the presentation. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. Abdulkarim, are you ready to go today?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes, I am.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, great. You sound great.

                         So go ahead, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Oh, okay. Thank you. [I was actually reviewing] the document on the recommendations for early warning for root zone scaling, and I … First of all, I will give a brief summary of the document, then my own … some of the recommendations.

                         The root zone server is growing significantly as a result of more gTLDs. The community had discussions about some issues. Number one is the risk of not being able to handle the root zone growth. Also, the second issue is IANA becoming [inaudible] request for additional changes to the

root zone. Then the third issue is about that a recursive resolver would run out of cache space. And number four is that the anti-abuse community and law enforcement agencies would have trouble dealing with the increased number of new gTLDs. And the fifth one is ICANN's process severely impacted. So these are issues that the community discussed about regarding what could happen or the impact of the root zone growing significantly.

Because of these issues that were raised, there was an agreement within the community. There's a need to carry out some measurements to be able to report the potential impacts. However, the feeling is that there was an agreement that should be some measurements. However, the general lack of agreement on which parameters to be measured is one of the problems that could not be resolved.

So the document is on the rate of the scaling of the root zone, not to maximize the size of the root zone. It's not able to … the maximum size of the root zone. This is to enable an early warning system in place in case the root zone is going too fast. So this document does not really discuss about the maximum size of the root zone. It's just about the rate of scaling.

There have been previous steps in place to put an early warning system in place, but the steps were not yielding desired results. Therefore, it is recommended that most of the reliable paths forward is for [inaudible] that discussion with the groups and also the groups that could be affected by the root zone scaling issues. So, because of lack of agreement, especially due to the measurements, the suggested way

forward is to have [inaudible] with the groups that could be affected by the root zone scaling.

So that's the summary about the document.

In terms of what the document has also described, one of the groups that could be affected by root zone scaling is the At-Large because At-Large is one that could be affected, especially when it comes to the anti-abuse community. It could also be affected if ICANN's process are severely impacted.

So, based on these two issues, I felt that there's a need for us to comment on this document. My suggestion is that we have a comment along the lines of that, first of all, number one, [inaudible] and there has been no tangible outcome on measurements for early warning systems, the recommendation is the right way to go, that the recommendation, which is to have periodic discussion with each group. And early warnings for anti-abuse communities should be taken seriously. Proper consultation channels should be put in place. There should also be a clear mechanism in place for feedback in case the ICANN system is overwhelmed. The early consultation process can also include helping end users identify TLDs to reduce confusion. In the event that ICANN processes are severely impacted, there should be a mechanism in place to [pause] the process.

So those are my recommendation. I think I would probably share these with the community. It's something we can probably expand and review, depending on what we feel as a community. But I think there's a need for us to comment on this document, especially given the two

reasons—that we would also be affected one way or the other and also the fact that whatever happens in terms of ICANN itself being impacted is also going to affect us. So that is why my suggestion is that we look at this document and see if we can raise more issues than the ones I've raised and submit a comment on this. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Abdulkarim, thank you very much. Just at a high level, would our comment basically just endorse the recommendations made in the paper, or are there things in the paper with which we would be disagreeing?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Based on my understanding of the document, there's nothing for us to [dis]agree with [in] the recommendations in the paper, which majorly says there is no agreed measurement that can be used to determine those issues, that communities should be consulted [inaudible] [as time goes on]. So I think, yes, [we] would agree with that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. And the recommendations that you outlined are all contained in the paper, or some of them are original to you?

ABDULARIM OLOYEDE: Some of them are original to me, which is just to encourage or to say just to make sure that some of the concerns, especially regarding the anti-abuse community, is taken into consideration. And, in case the

ICANN process is severely impacted, there should be a way to pause the scaling of the root zone server.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So those are new. I just wanted to make sure everybody was clear on that.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you very much. Holly Raiche, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. My memory says that SSAC came up with some papers back in, I think—I'm not sure how long ago—about the expansion of the root zone. In it, they had some precautions that should be taken. I'm just wondering. I imagine those are still relevant. Are we looking at those as well? Because they were quite concerned at the expansion of the root zone and its management, such that the operation zone continued. So are we also looking at that? Because that was relevant at the time.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much, Holly. I'm not aware of the document you are talking about, but I think, yes, [there will be a need for us …] I've also been trying to look for previous comments related to this document. If you know of any, I would be glad if you can share that with me.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I'm happy to. I'll find it. It's just in the SSAC documents, but it was their cautionary tale as to, if the root zone is expanded without proper controls, then it certainly represents danger to us all—well, danger to the root zone. So, in our recommendations, I think, at the very least, we should refer back to the SSAC paper—I'm happy to find it—and say, "Look, we still support the fact that these issues have been raised by SSAC and, for the safety of the continued operation of the new gTLD environment, we should be mindful of those recommendations as well. So I'm happy to send off to you or the policy thing just a reference to that SSAC paper. I think it's a couple of years ago. I'll check. Happy to. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That'd be great, Holly. Thank you. Maybe, Abdulkarim, you can see if there are any specific recommendations in that paper either are not recommendations of the current paper or ones that you've thought of that might be worth including.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I think we're kind of rehashing something that we've hashed up before. So the story here goes that this is a paper that was published by the Office of the CTO—so I believe it comes from David Conrad's office—and it's recommendations for early warning for root zone scaling. This paper was published in response or

as a follow-up to the recommendations that were made by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee by the At-Large Advisory Committee and by the Government Advisory Committee for designing a warning system to alert the community that the growth of the root zone was growing too quickly. That's in response.

So I gather that probably what we have to do as one of the originators to this whole thread is to check that, based on the recommendation that we've made in the past, the recommendations that are now in the Office of the CTO paper agree with what we've mentioned. To me, it looks like this is the case. So I think we definitely need to comment on it. The way that Abdulkarim has laid forward is, I would say, the right way forward. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess Olivier said a lot of what I was going to say, but this is a longstanding issue. It's fine if we do come up with new ideas that we didn't have before or not else has had before, but we have to look at this in the context of history of how we got here. Certainly, any SSAC paper that was published is implicitly going to be incorporated. If not, then the whole thing has a major fault in it, but I'm pretty sure that, as Olivier said, it was a cornerstone of the document that's currently being published and looking for comment. So we just do need to look at it in the context of where it came from. And, as Olivier pointed out, we have been involved before, and those need to be looked at. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. So, Abdulkarim, I guess, please take a look at the OCTO report and the SSAC report. They're both in the chat now. Just do a quick search to see what our previous comments on this have been, in case there was any disagreement with the SSAC report, although it sounds like it's something we were pretty much in agreement with. So, if you would take a look at those as you're drafting comments. I'm assuming you're up for doing a draft as well, Abdulkarim?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes. I'll be happy to do that, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thank you. Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It is a new hand, yes. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Actually, the paper itself—the OCTO paper—has all of the references there. So it talks of SAC 046 and SAC 100, as Cheryl mentioned. It also has got a link to all of the other points that were made, including, I believe, some sessions and points that we made as a

community. So I think it's well-drafted, and it's going to be easy to look back at what we said and to say, "Great." Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Excellent. Any other questions or comments about that? It sounds like, Abdulkarim, this is a great framework and you've just got a couple more things to check. But thanks a lot for your work on this.

I don't see any other hands up. Olivier, that's probably an old hand— yeah. So, Alan and Hadia, do you want to talk about registrar transfer? I guess it's just Alan. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. It's Alan, and I do have a presentation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. You'll note just my name is on it. There was a discussion on e-mail involving the three of us. The report I drafted last night, and I did send copies to Holly and Hadia. I hadn't received any response back by an hour or so ago, so I just left my name on it. They can comment later on whether they agree or disagree with anything that's in it.

First slide, please. All right. The transfer policy is the policy governing moving a gTLD from one registrar to another. So, if you are with some registrar and, for one reason or another, you choose to move to a

different registrar, that's the transfer policy that governs how that should happen.

The current policy has several mechanisms which were designed to ensure that a transfer is done with the full knowledge and at the request of the registrant, not, to use their common term, being "hijacked" by someone else. Unfortunately, those processes to some extent relied on the public WHOIS. Without information in the WHOIS, the gaining registrar cannot necessarily be sure that the request is being made by the real registrant. You can contact your original registrar because they know who you are, but that doesn't give any information to the gaining registrar. So the processes have been a little bit weaker since the temporary specification came in, and that didn't change with the policy developed by the EPDP. There are some people who say, "Yes, but since there is no public WHOIS, no one knows who you are, and no one knows who it is or what the domains are, so they're not as attractive." I'm not quite sure I put a lot of faith in that statement, but, nevertheless.

But, for whatever it's worth, the process that we were using before doesn't work anymore. The question is, what do we do about it? There was something called a [form of] authorization, which essentially gives the registrar the permission to do the transfer.

There was a felling in one of the PDPs that the FOA was not needed anymore because it was sort of redundant, but the PDP nevertheless came out with a strong statement saying, "Keep it anyway. A level of redundancy is a good thing in this particular case."

Next slide, please. Now, there are a number of related issues over and above the formal transfer policy. I'll note the transfer policy was created by a PDP and has been updated by, I believe, four or possibly five different other PDPs. It probably is the single policy that has had the most PDPs on it. That's not surprising. As a result of the original policy, there were a lot of issues that were raised. The PDP was sufficiently complex that it was broken into four different PDPs. Today we would probably do four phases of a single PDP. The world changes a little bit.

Nevertheless, this is going to be yet another PDP to both fix the problems associated that were caused by GDPR, but there were a number of other issues that were also raised. The concept of transferring registrants … If you want to take your registered domain name and transfer it, sell it, or given it somebody else (so there's a different registrar), even if you're not changing the registrar, that is not subject to the transfer policy because it's not a transfer between registrars. But it is a transfer between people. That one has become somewhat problematic.

One of the common issues—it's a little bit laughable, but it's not laughable if you're the person who's involved in it—is, to transfer a domain, you have to have communication with your registrar. That means your e-mail address has to be updated, has to be correct. If you look at your registration information and say, "Oh, gee. I don't use that address anymore. I have to change my address," once you change that address, ICANN policy says that domain is locked for a certain period time—60 days, I believe—and you can't do anything with it. So, if you want to change your registrar or change your registrant, and you have

to update your contact information because you realize it's out of date, that implicitly [locks in] to say you can't do what you want it to do.

Not surprisingly, for a whole bunch of reasons, if my memory is correct, the transfer policy is the single largest complaint that GDD gets, that ICANN Compliance gets, and that registrars get. So it's a big issue, and that's why we've been looking at it again.

There are a number of other issues not directly related to the GDPR that are being looked at at the same time. There's the concept of an emergency action contact. That is, if there's a transfer that has been done or going on, and we need immediate action/involvement of a registrar, this is a contact that, I think, has to respond within four hours or something like that. There's a dispute policy that has some issues related to it. There are a number of other issues related to EPDP policy. Lastly, there's a concept of ICANN-approved transfers. These are generally transfers when a registrar goes out of business or something and all of their domains have to be transferred somewhere else. So this PDP will be looking at a number of different things.

Next slide, please. There was a scoping document done (a small document done) a while ago by a group of GNSO people. That's pointed to, and now we have the preliminary issue report. The issue report is the staff document that goes into great detail on what is the thing to be looked at and essentially scopes out the original problem, gives the history, and gives a staff recommendation on how to approach it.

The issue report in this case is detailed and is, I think, typical of GNSO technical staff in that it's a really good review of everything that has

gone before, describing the problem and trying to put it all into perspective.

The concept of a preliminary issue report is that we used to have just an issue report, and occasionally there were things in it that people objected to that we thought staff didn't get right. So we now have a concept of a preliminary issue report and a comment period on it. In this case, from my perspective, I can't see anything that requires change. I think staff did a good job. Registrars may well look at it and say there are some details that need adjustment or things that were omitted. This is a highly technical issue. But, from our point of view, from an At-Large point of view, I think it's a good document.

There's a staff recommendation in, in which, if we can go to the next slide, they are recommending a single PDP but multiple phases. Now, the concept of a phase was first introduced in the EPDP. The concept of a phase says, although there is one charter for the group, the PDP will have multiple reports—multiple preliminary reports and multiple final reports. In this case, they're recommending two phases. So there will be two final reports.

The difference in Phase A and B—why it's not Phase 1 and 2 but instead is A and B—is they are recommending that, first, the issues in Phase 1A be addressed and a preliminary report issued for public comment, the Phase 2 have a preliminary report but a single final report that should be issued on both subjects. I think, in this case, that's reasonable.

The Phase 1 issues are the issues that are really important. They have to do with day-to-day things that are not working today or need

improvement today and need to be addressed first. They're broken up into two issues because they're really two completely different things. So I think the recommendation is reasonable. Phase 2 includes all the other items that need to be addressed that were identified in the scoping report. Grouping them together, I think, is reasonable. Some of them are less complex. The scoping report not only prioritized the issues but also assessed the complexity of the issue. So I believe the staff recommendation is a reasonable one.

Next slide, please. And that's basically what I just said. The issue report is comprehensive. It's exhaustive. The staff recommendation seems to address the needs, and I see no issues that are identified that we really need to bring to point. I apologize for a lowercase "I" in "At-Large."

Next slide. As far as ALAC action, I see no need for any action at this point. The preliminary issue report is in good shape, and I'm not expecting it to be, "No, no …" One of the reasons [not] to comment on something if we like it is we're afraid other people are going to say, "No, don't do it." I don't foresee that at all. So I think it's a reasonable thing that we don't issue a comment on this. We should be prepared to work on the PDP when it's approved, and I have no doubt it will be approved. The work is highly technical, so we need someone who's willing to get into the guts of it. There's not a lot that they have to watch out for on behalf of users, and we're not the only group looking at from a user point of view for registrants. But I think it's important that At-Large does keep their hand in it and make sure that we get regular reports back as to what's going on and raise red flags if there is anything that we'll need to comment on as we go forward.

And that is it from me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Great presentation on that. Hadia, you had a hand up. Go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. Thank you, Alan, for this comprehensive presentation. I totally agree with everything you said.

I would just like to quickly point that the report assesses the effectiveness of the inter-registrar transfer policy in terms of three main or three key elements. First is the portability. Like, can registrants easily transfer their names? And is the process well-standardized and effective for registrars? Second is preventing abuse. Like, does the policy include effective protection against abuse, such as fraud or domain name hijacking? Third is information. Like, are there are ready available educational resources about the transfer policy [inaudible]? So it is really comprehensive. I think one of the elements that we particularly as ALAC now like to focus on is preventing abuse. But, again, it tackles all three elements. Again, I do agree with Alan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia.

Any other questions or comments on this?

I think we may have a volunteer [inaudible] Cheryl, once the PDP is approved [inaudible]. So let's keep an eye on this. It sounds like we don't need to comment on it directly unless we see some controversy popping up. We will select folks to participate on the group going forward.

Alan, my question for you in the near term is that, because we're now endeavoring to assess our position on things prior to entering into PDPs, do you believe that there are key issues on which we need to be vigilant or aware of that are likely to be a source of controversy once the PDP is empaneled?

Alan, my question was aimed at you. Are you on mute?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was on mute, and I was expounding brilliantly on the issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry I missed it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not expecting a lot of controversy. Holly can confirm or not as she wishes. She's been involved in a number of the transfer PDPs, as have I. In general, they work better than most PDPs because there is a general interest from all parties to have this work smoothly. It's in the interest of registrars, it's in the interest of registrants, and it's in the interest of registries to make sure these processes work because every transfer or attempted transfer that doesn't work smoothly and satisfy everyone

causes real manual intervention and labor. So there is a general belief that this is something that should work.

Now, we may have difference over the details. And registrars are certainly going to look for ways to minimize their effort, but at the same time, they don't want failed transfers or things like that because that causes more intervention.

So I'm not expecting controversy. Will there be issues that will be hotly debated? Probably. As I said, I don't think there's going to be a lot in this that we say, "If you do this, then our user community, especially the registrants in our user community, are going to curse you to something," about. I don't think it's going to go down like that, but I do think we need to be involved and watch it so our community can be informed if something really needs our involvement.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So there's less of a "We're going in with these particular three things we want to see in it" and more about just keeping an eye out for things that come up during those discussions. I didn't know if they had liability issues, again, like they do with the PDP for illegal transfers of if there was a DNS abuse tie-in to fraudulent transfers.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is certainly DNS abuse because hijacking and stealing domains is big business. some of that is related to DNS abuse. Some of it is just related to fraud. There's an awful lot of issues that drive these things. I don't see specific things that are controversy. We should certainly fight

for ensuring that, even without the information from WHOIS, we can make double and triple sure that registr[ars'] transfers are authenticate and they don't cause problems. How that's going to be done and whether that'll be a controversial issue or controversial mechanism or not, I don't know. It could conceivably come down to a discussion on, "We could do this, but there are privacy implications in it, should we." So there may well be privacy implications in it. But we're putting the cart before the horse. I definitely thing we need to be involved, but I don't have any red flags to wave, saying, if we're not involved, this is the horrible thing that's going to happen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess the context from which I'm asking that question is whether we should start within the CPWG to discuss some of the issues in the issue report prior to the empanelment of the PDP.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, many of the issues in the issue report are not going to be of great interest.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: They have to do with the mechanics of under what conditions can a registrar refuse? Are they allowed to refuse a transfer? Or under what conditions does a registrar have to do certain things? I don't think

they're going to be controversial. Other things may well be more controversial. Certainly those things involved in 1A and IB, for that matter, are likely to trigger more registrant interest than some of the things in Phase 2.

I see Holly has her hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Totally agree with what Alan has had to say. I'm sure that privacy policy is going to be an issue. Certainly, when I was involved in the IRTPD, we wound up having a great deal of discussion with the privacy proxy and how to deal with that in the context of the then-policy, which has since had to be adapted to accommodate the EPDP. I agree with Alan that 1A has got the main issues. The change of registrar within [inaudible] registrant is perhaps less controversial. I don't see a lot of issues in that. So there may be some issues in [Item 2] that Alan talked about, but the main issue, as I see it, is going to be authentication that complies with the GDPR. But I also agree with Alan that I don't think it's too contentious. I think everybody wants processes that ensure that there isn't fraud and that there isn't DNS abuse. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thanks, Holly. Alan, is that a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, it is a new hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me elaborate for a moment on the change or registrant issue and why it is a complex one and is of interest to us. The reason why there is a lock put on a domain if you change your contact information is to prevent hijacking. If someone breaks into your registrar account, changes the contact information to them, and it is not locked, what they can do is immediately transfer the domain away. At that point, your registrar is lost. You don't have no contact with whoever it's gone to. They can change the contact information to a completely different name. So putting the lock on gives a breathing time to say, "Don't let someone steal it just because the figured out how to change your contact information and change the e-mail or the name, for that matter, on the registration."

On the other hand, if it is you, the real domain owner, who's changing it because you realize the information is out of date and since you now want to sell the domain, you need to get it correct. That same protection mechanism is now a catch-22 saying you can't do what you want with your own domain.

So how to bridge those two things and get the protection when it's someone naughty doing something but gives you freedom when it's you doing something without, of course, the registrar being able to detect

whether you are you or you are somewhat naughty makes that a really complex issue. So that's why it's likely to be interesting—how you bridge those two problems. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Holly, is that an old hand?

Okay. Great. Thanks, Alan. Thanks for bringing this to our attention and going through the issue report. It's very useful, and it sounds like we'll take a watch-and-see approach to this as it unfolds.

I think—oh. Olivier, did you want to speak a little bit to the .jobs amendment?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Jonathan. Indeed, yes, this is one which the ALAC, or rather this group, hasn't really looked at or established whether we want to submit a statement or not. This topic is to do with the amendments to a gTLD registry agreement. We as a community don't usually look at individual gTLD agreements, but we have in at least one case. That was the one about PIR—the sale of PIR—which was for .org. Dot-org was a special type of TLD due to its history in how it was allocated to the registry that is running it. T

he .jobs one is also a special one. It's not a new gTLD as such. It's called a legacy-sponsored TLD—the same sort of thing as .asia, .arrow, .xxx, .coop. It was created in 2005. So, at the time, a handful of new top-level domains that were created that, I guess, were testing the waters. Dot-jobs had been a top-level domain that was under this discussion since

even before ICANN was created. There were some people that said there was a huge demand for this. So they launched this. Their registry was Employ Media, the registry operator, that delegated the duties of .jobs sponsor to an organization called the Society for Human Resource Management. In this role, the sponsor established its HR—not "human rights" on this occasion; this is the Human Resource—council that functioned independently as required in the agreement itself.

Now, what Employ Media is looking at doing is not to actually disband this HR council as such. They want to retain this, but they want to change the SHRM (Society for Human Resource Management) with another organization—with a company, basically. So this is where there is a question because, under the agreement, they need to obtain authorization to do something like this. This is where we need to, I guess, make a choice as to whether this community wants to comment on this or not.

There are a handful of other changes and so on, but I guess the biggest one really is whether this SHRM should be changed to the actual registry operator themselves, Employ Media.

I think that's all I need to say about it. We just need to think now whether this community would want to comment on this. If so, then of course we have to find a penholder and then someone who's ready to take the time to read through it. It's not huge. These are straightforward changes.

I see Greg Shatan has put his hand up. Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. My tendency is to think that this is one that we would want to comment on since jobs are …

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Did we lose Greg?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg, you're going in and out.

GREG SHATAN: No, I had a problem. Siri decided to interfere for a second. Hopefully I'm back now.

In case, jobs are of are interest to end users—places where one could go look for jobs. But how well it works? I do not know. I think, or that reason, it's of interest. Also, given that there are these councils—we may want to look at whether these councils have appropriate end user concerns—concerns for employees and future employees, job seekers, as well as employers and others—it may be worth taking a look at that, too, from our standpoint. I think this is one, especially given the job market in the world, it's worth looking at. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. Do you have bandwidth to take a look at it?

GREG SHATAN: I could ask Siri to take a look at it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Given your passion for the topic?

GREG SHATAN: Oh, my passion is just endless and boundless.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, you've done some job-hunting.

GREG SHATAN: No, I've had the same job since I was a small child, working as a boot black in Penn Station.

In any case, yeah, I'm happy to take a look at it. I did participate in the .org registry and, with other hats on, I've looked at all of the prior registry agreements that went to the 2013 model from the legacy model. So I may as well pick this one up. If anybody who wants to join me, that's fine. If not, I will just produce something for us all to consider and then take it from there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, just start with some talking points first to see if we can get some consensus on it, right?

GREG SHATAN: Yeah. Consensus sounds like a good idea. I'm all in favor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Consensus prior to drafting I think is the way to go.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah. No, I don't think I'm going to propose anything shocking to the conscience, but I do want to take a look at it from the end-user point of view because it's entirely possible it has not … I've noticed, doing a little nosing around, that, back a few years ago, ICANN was looking at taking it away from them because it was basically underperforming.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

GREG SHATAN: So it's also worth looking at if—

JONATHAN ZUCK: While they were looking to get rid of the equivalent of PICs at the time, too.

GREG SHATAN: Everything old is new again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, exactly. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. You know there are two things in there. I was just looking at their registry accreditation agreement and the redline changes they were proposing. There is of course this thing where they would like to [steer] out of this "subcontractor" and run the thing themselves. So we're looking at something which moves from a not-for-profit to a for-profit.

But then there are also, as I think you might have led to with this whole thing about underperforming, that the sponsored top-level domains are generally linked to some restrictions as to who can register a domain. And what they are looking at here—it's quite clear in the removing of some paragraphs—is they would be removing some requirements for registering domains under .jobs. That, of course, opens their market up. That, at the same time, is something which our community might not be aligned with. But it needs to be studied. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Olivier.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sebastien, you're next.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Just to be sure that we are careful on what we ask for because, if we start with this one, we may wish to do all the sponsored TLDs one day or we have to be really [explaining] why we are taking this one and not the other. Even if it's this one, it's of course important, but it's important because of the content of the end user. I'm not sure that it is a TLD itself, but it's something we need to be aware of—if we start with this one, the other sponsored one will come one day. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: If I could just respond.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: I think we can make a case for this one that won't drag us into looking at every one, I think, for two reasons, both of which I touched in briefly. One is given that it has a governance model that involves multi-stakeholder participation or at least stakeholder participation and that that's up for grabs now and ascertaining whether there's end user participation and whether that's changing, especially in way that would be detrimental to end users.

Secondly, given that this is a business to consume or really a business-to-job-seeker sites, as end users, not as registrants but as end users, this is one that's of particular interest to the individual Internet user in a way that .coop, for instance, might not be. Certainly, they'd have a much more broad application. And I would seek to distinguish it that

way and as to why we have an interest and not that we're just now in the business of commenting on every registry agreement that goes past.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess I would add to that it's well within our power to simply be capricious and decide not to comment on future ones, even if they're identical. So we can decide later that we made a mistake to dip our toe in this pond.

Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. I'm not sure it's a good way to go if we decide to do a comment for this one and not for the future one. Yes, we can take scope, but I am not sure that it's not affecting the end user also. We can take some other … I think what we need to look at is a change of management. It's important for end users in the way they will run the TLD. But let's see what Greg comes with. We'll be able to discuss that at that time. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sounds good. Thanks, Greg. Thanks, Marita, for volunteering on this. I think, Olivier, it's back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. We are now reaching Any Other Business. And whilst people collect themselves—oh, I see a hand from Sebastien Bachollet, so let's start with Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was an old hand, but in fact I was asking myself if I will raise my hand. Just to inform you that—it's not directly linked with CPWG—there will be an ICANN69 readout in French on Friday the 17th at, I guess, 17:00 hours. I don't remember if it's [inaudible] or if it's UTC. But therefore, if people want to follow and come to this, it will be great and we'll try to have others. It's a little different than something done by other places, where it's staff organizing. Here it's EURALO. [It's] France with the help of ICANN. We're organizing this readout. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sebastien. It's going to be on Friday, the 13th of November, at 16:00 UTC.

Could I ask staff, is this is in the At-Large calendar, or is that not in there?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Olivier. If you could please give me on second, please. I'm not sure if it's already [edited].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:　　In the meantime, while you check for this, I have to let everyone know about the ICANN69 policy outcomes report, which is formerly known as the post-ICANN69 policy report. That is available. That has now been published. So you'll be able to read everything that has happened. You can download it from the website and you can read everything that has happened in the At-Large world during ICANN69. It's very nicely put together, effectively. That will have links to all of the different sessions as well, to the different workspaces, etc. So it's an interesting read for those people that have missed ICANN69 or that would like to see what came out of it. You can directly then, from there, go to some of the sessions.

Back to you, Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR:　　Thank you, Olivier. I don't see it on the At-Large calendar yet. You said it's the 13th of November, right? This Friday?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:　　It's Friday the 13th, yes.

YESIM NAZLAR:　　I don't see it, but I'm going to liaise with Gisella and make sure we add it to the relevant calendars.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just to make sure, yeah. Thank you. So people who are not … Well, we have to publicize it, basically, so this needs to be on a calendar somewhere.

I note Carlos Gutierrez has put his hand up. Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just as staff, please remember that, after a long effort, LACRALO has been able to incorporate French-speaking countries in Latin America. We even have a member from a French-speaking country now in the RALO from Haiti. So please include us in this distribution of the November 13th readout in French. Thank you very much, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for pointing this out, Carlos. Very good points, indeed. And it's great to see that ICANN has agreed to expand the number of languages in the LACRALO region. It's always good for better outreach to our language communities. I'm sure Sebastien is delighted about that, too.

I'm not seeing any other hands up in the meantime, so what we need to do, I guess, is to look at the … Well, I just have one question, actually regarding the ICANN69 policy outcomes report. Will that be translated into other languages? It's a question to staff. Because I think it's important, for the support of our community, that these reports are in French and Spanish as well. So I'm not sure whether you can answer that

[YESIM NAZLAR]: I'll check on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So that was one thing. Finally, we need to go into Agenda Item 6, our next meeting, now, bearing in mind, next week the Internet Governance Forum will have entered its third week but—oh, miracle!— there are no IGF sessions on the 18th of November. So I guess, unless we hear to the contrary, we can probably now start rotating again.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Olivier. Yes, that's what I was actually going to offer. I believe we are good to rotate and go back to our 13:00 UTC time for next Wednesday, the 18th.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thank you. 13:00 UTC on Wednesday, the 18th of November.

Carlos Gutierrez, you still have your hand up.

CARLOS GUTTIEREZ: Sorry. I'm on the phone. I don't know how to bring it down. It's an old hand. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No worries. Thank you. Yes, I hear Maureen is going to suffer on the 13:00 UTC.

Well, thank you very much for this. I'm not seeing any other hands up or further announcements, which means that we are closing in a few minutes earlier. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening. And, of course, thanks to our interpreters for having worked today. We'll all speak next week. So have a good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, wherever you are. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]