YEŞIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call, taking place on Wednesday 26th of May, 2021 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing the roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. We have received apologies from Bill Jouris, Christopher Wilkinson, Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Glenn McKnight, and from Maureen Hilyard.

From staff side, we have Evin Erdoğdu and myself Yeşim Nazlar stationed on today's call and Heidi Ullrich is expected to join us shortly. As you know, as usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation and our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Marina & Paula and on the French channel, Aurélie & Camila.

And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And the one final reminder is for the real-time transcription service provided and I'm just going to share the link with you here. Please do check the service. And with this, I would like to turn the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim. And looking at the real-time text transcription, I can see it works extremely well. So, I recommend everyone for using this as it really captures the discussion rather well.

And sometimes it's helpful to be able to look back a couple of paragraphs as something that somebody has said, and you don't quite believe they have said that. Anyway, let's hope we don't have such a situation today.

We've got an interesting agenda starting with the At-Large policy sessions and talking points with Jonathan Zuck and he'll be taking us through the different plenary topics and the policy sessions. After that, we'll have the work group updates, starting with the transfer policy, review policy development process with Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka. And the alternates also, they're all listed on your agenda.

We'll have an update on the Intergovernmental Organization Curative Rights Work Track, otherwise known as IGO Work Track. And then an update as usual on the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. Usual update but unusual update should we say because there could be a potential ALAC minority statement to the EPDP final report. And having monitored the final discussions on the EPDP mailing list, I have certainly seen some matters of concern.

After that, we'll have the policy comment update with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu taking us through some of the forthcoming policy consultations and potentially a discussion on the EPDP Phase 2 policy recommendations for Board consideration. I gather maybe that discussion could be batched with the discussion on the work group updates in agenda item two. And then finally a few announcements and any other business. So, that's our agenda for today, quite a busy day

indeed. But if there are any changes, amendments, additions to the agenda now is the time for you to ask for the floor. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to note that under the EPDP, what we're talking about right now is not the final report, but the initial report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's the initial final or just the initial report?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's called the initial report. It's the first report that goes out for comment for the extensive public comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Maybe that needs to be—yeah, that could have been a typo on the agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: There will, at some later point, be a draft final report and a final report. This is not it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. So, staff will have to change this. They'll update the agenda on the fly and they'll call it Potential ALAC Minority Statement to the EPDP Initial Report. It does feel like quite final, the EPDP, but I guess it's the Phase 2A, initial report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of us would love it to be final at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I don't notice any other hands, but that's one amendment to be made to the agenda. And now I could ask if Jonathan has made it to the call yet. It looks like he might have not, in which case we can go—unless he shouts his name out.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: No. Not yet, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND   Okay. Right. So, there was one more thing that I needed to do, which of course I skipped and that's the action items—review of the action items. But those are quite a straightforward. They are all completed and there was just—and some of them of course relate to today's call. So, I invite you to have a quick browse of these action items. One of them is to do with the ICANN68 workspace. Reference back to the ICANN68 workspace about the At-Large ccTLD policy session. And the other one is to do with the GNSO Review on Rights Protection Mechanisms. And the others are going to be treated today.

I'm not seeing any hands up, so let's proceed forward. And in the current absence of Jonathan, let's go to agenda item number 4, and that's the work group updates. And we'll start with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process with Steinar, Daniel, Raymond and

Lutz. And perhaps even the ALAC observers as well, who are invited to take the floor. Now, I'm not sure who is going to be leading on this. I see Steinar has put his hand up. So, Steinar, you have the floor. Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hello. Daniel Nanghaka, and whoever attended the PDP working groups, please add to my updates. I have done some comments on the Wikispace here. And for me, it looks like that we are kind of switching a little bit of focus. We are discussing more and more of the use of the auth-code and the auth-info. And that is to my understanding taking more priority than the discussion about the form of identification from the losing and gaining a registrar.

In my opinion, I think this is a good switch. I think the key to have a safe and secured transfer, seen from the registrant point of view, is depending and can be handled by the auth-code. As I understand, I need to have some sort of consensus from this group, whether we should accept that kind of workflow or in particular also, if there are anything that could be improving the auth-code management. There's a set of questions in the charter that goes into the details of the auth-code management. But there are maybe hopefully more input from this group. So, that's my initial comment and if Daniel, Lutz or anyone else has some extra, I'm happy to hear that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. Holly Raiche. And Holly, of course, yeah you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd be interested to know why you're saying that the Auth discussion is more productive. It's a question to Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: The Auth-Code discussion is … The auth-code is a way to … It's kind of a password that the registrant has to initiate when you transfer a domain name from the losing register to the gaining registrar. It is this data that you've put into the process that's set by the gaining a registrar. So, I think that as long as you have as a registrant, as long as you have a valid auth-code, you have some way to prove that you have the authorization to do so.

The form of authentification is kind of averting paperwork that was used and it was a communication of emailing both from the gaining and the losing registrar in the old days when WHOIS data was more available. But I think that well, in my opinion if the registrars do have in the policy defined a decent way of handling the auth-code, both the time to live and the cleverness of creating an auth-code, I think that is feasible and doable and, in my opinion, a secure way. Hopefully that answers your questions and I hope to—

HOLLY RAICHE: No, it does. And recalling your presentation last week that actually makes a lot of sense. So, thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for the question, Holly. And thanks for the response, Steinar. Are any of Steinar's colleagues wishing to add to the points that Steinar has made? At the moment, I only see Holly's hand up. I'm not seeing anyone else. Oh okay. Sébastien Bachollet has joined the queue.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. But I am not one of the members of this panel. I just wanted to know if it's the right place or maybe I need to explain to the members of this working group. But I am stuck with impossibility to transfer a domain name from one registrar to another registrar. And just to know, I have one minute to explain if you give me one minute, if not, I will defer that to another place.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Sébastien. I think that because we're going quite fast and we had allocated 20 minutes to this topic, if you can summarize the problem, we can take this as a case scenario. I don't think that they're going to address the specific problem, but certainly it would be interesting as a backdrop for the participants in the group to see what kind of problem an end user might have in transferring a domain name. So, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. And not at all, I am asking for you to, or for anyone here to solve the problem. I will try to manage. But just to summarize, I had since long time a domain name and it's a .com and it's a reseller who take care of all that with an address in U.S. But the mailing address is my professional address from 2004. And therefore, if I ask for an auth-code, I can't. The registrar, or the reseller is not any more available. I can't reach him and I tried to reach the registrar. And if you don't have a code to answer to the customer service, you can't. You can send a letter. I sent a letter, I sent with all the information and I don't have any feedback. Therefore, I am completely stuck because there is no possibility either to get an auth-code or to find another way to have the registrar transferring my domain name to another registrar. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Sébastien. Lutz Donnerhacke is next.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Sébastien. One of the points and I had made during the call yesterday, there are only a few points we can add to the discussion because most of the discussion is dominated by intra-registrar issues and the whole organization of the group is organized in a way that these issues have priority, and will be discussed, and have a pull on the desired outcomes within the group very quickly. So, we have to keep focused on the development there.

But the registrant issues are really underrepresented and I'm very glad that Steinar had added some comments like this one you have described here. It's impossible to get an auth-info code to the group. But more

than that's an interesting question you will not hear there because most of the parties involved in the group are not interested in solving such an issue. They are interested in solving the issues which have friction during their own business process. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Lutz. It's a bit disappointing to hear that end-user issues are pushed to the back of the queue, when really the most important person in there seems to need to be the client, isn't it? It's the clients who have to transfer the domain names from one person to another—from one registrar to another so it's a little concerning here. Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Maybe I don't agree with Lutz totally. There is a majority of attendees from the registrars' side. But there are kind of few that has been vocal. We have been vocal from the registrant's side and I'm hoping to continue to focus on issues that I see will be of benefit and will assist the registrant in a transfer. It is definitely a fact that the owner of the domain name is the one that should initiate and should have the authority to change registrant.

Commenting on Sébastien's experience, from my time as a registrar, I know that there are—shit happens, frankly speaking. Shit happens sometimes. And there are good ways to handle an intra-registrar transfer. There are bad ways to do it. And I think that one of the things that we at some point have to dig into is, is it possible to make policies that will most likely smooth up a scenario that is as Sébastien describes?

And when that comes into—that is added on the agenda I assume there will be more examples describing these kind of issues, but I will also bring that kind of experience that Sébastien has, particularly when you are—you can't reach the reseller of a certain top-level. And that's one of the challenges we have to take into place.

But again, I'm trying really hard to be vocal. I'm not sure that this group agree with me that the paperwork—the formal authentication—is something that we can accept not being mandatory, one way or another, or more or less totally depending on the auth-code. So, we will maybe not answer this today but that is something that we should have in mind. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much for this, Steinar. I guess part of the difficulty is upholding high levels of security because of the resurgence of identity theft, where domain names get stolen, etc. And at the same time making it possible for the situations like the one that Sébastien has faced to be resolved in an easy-ish kind of way. Alan Greenberg is next, and then we'll probably have to move on. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. I was going to make a comment similar to yours. The other side of making it easy and flexible for a registrant to transfer the domain is hijacking. If you make it too easy for you to transfer your own domain, you also make it easier for someone else to transfer it illegitimately. And that's the whole balance that we're trying to play here. So, it's a difficult problem and we're never likely to—because of

the edge cases, the "shit happens." There are always going to be cases which don't quite follow the rules and you need flexibility to address those. And yet too much flexibility gives hijackers the opportunity to take domains. So, it's always going to be a problem. We're never going to solve it perfectly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. And Steinar, any last points, or can we just move on and we'll have your visit next week for a new update? I guess silence is consent. Okay. Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I'm okay. I don't know how we should distribute or how to place the arguments [inaudible] for the auth-code management and so on. I will discuss with my co-members and find a way and hopefully have some ideas until the next meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this and of course, you can always drop a note to the mailing list and that will generate some feedback. I see Sivasubramanian Muthusamy has put his hand up.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Just a point, it's an update or lack of it. To start, I was not in the mailing list and some processes lists, and I did not get information about the meeting, nor was I … And I attended only the third meeting that was yesterday as an observer, in a webinar format. And it was only after that

that I learned a form was sent to me. And I'll start attending meetings from now on. So, far, I've not been able to contribute, even as an observer. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. Thank you. For this update Siva. Right. We can now move to the second one of those work group updates, and that's the Inter-Governmental Organization Curative Rights Work Track. And we have two people on this group, Yrjo Lansipuro and we also have Carlos Raul Gutierrez. And of course, alternates Justine Chew and Vanda Scartezini. I gather that perhaps … Is it Yrjo who's going to provide us with an update today?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I'll do. I'm afraid I sound like a broken record when I say that we are on our way to consensus. Optimistically, I say that but progress is pretty slow. We've been asked to design a solution for a possible stalemate case where an inter-governmental organization wins UDRP or URS about its acronym, and the losing registrant want to go to court, and then the IGO claims immunity.

So, now we are close to a consensus that the appeal mechanism should be arbitration or some sort of UDRP super panel. Anyway, cheaper, faster than the courts, which probably wouldn't even take a case because of the IGO immunity. So, the problem we are stuck on now is how to get the consent of the registrant who is entitled to a court procedure if he wants. So, that's what we spent almost the entire meeting on last Monday.

But now there will be a two-week pause due to holidays in many countries and during that time we will continue the discussion on the list in smaller groups. So, perhaps just a guess leaving the legal route there as a theoretical alternative which in practice, even the registrant wants to avoid.

Now, as far as At-Large is concerned we don't really have a dog in this fight, at least not a big dog. I think the main end user interest is that a workable solution eventually will be found whatever the details. So, that there will be a clear [ensuite of features] to solve issues about possible fraudulent use of IGO acronyms. WHO during the pandemic would be an obvious case in point, but there are many other possibilities for end-user confusion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Yrjo. Are any of your colleagues interested in providing further information or are there any comments and questions from anyone on the call? It looks like things are progressing slowly but no doubt you'll be able to come back with more news next week and hopefully with a bit of progress in this direction.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Olivier, next week as I said … Next Monday, we don't have a meeting. Let's see. Maybe something will transpire. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Yrjo. We always leave the item on the agenda just in case there are—there's any updates on the mailing list and so on.

Sometimes there's a mailing and whatever. So, it might be a very quick update but thank you. Not seeing any hands up, let's move on then to our third group update. And that's of course, the Expedited Policy Development Process specification for gTLD registration data. And I believe that Alan Greenberg is going to be providing us with an update on this. An exciting update, hopefully.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure how exciting. The stage we're at is we had two meetings left before the interim—the initial report will be issued next Monday. The meeting yesterday was canceled. We have been working on a draft of the initial report—specifically of one section of the initial report—which details the specific topic. The rest is essentially boilerplate. The document is 16 pages long. And as of yesterday, we were given about, I don't know, 48 hours maybe to identify any "can't live withs" in that document. That ended two hours ago or an hour ago today.

We now have a 28-page document of "can't live withs" that staff now have to somehow integrate into it with many of them, of course, in conflicting positions. There are even conflicted—what I see as conflicting positions within certain groups. The registries have said—and I won't pretend to get the wording right here—that they support a standardized field for legal/natural, but not actually creating an RDDS field. So, I'm not quite sure where that standardized field would sit that they support if it's not an RDDS field, but so be it. Staff will integrate this—all of these comments somehow into a report, and we will see it, I'm guessing, sometime the end of today for discussion at tomorrow's meeting. And that's it.

The report as it was written I found not balanced at all. It started off with a section espousing to present the two sides. And yet it really only presented the position of the registrars and registries well. Maybe the new version will do better. I'm hoping it will. So, we're going to end up with a report that essentially does very little and I'm not quite sure where that puts us.

There'll be a public comment. I'd like to think there'll be a huge outcry in the public comment and get the EPDP to change its direction, but I'm doubtful of that. That's about it. The comment in the—in our agenda about, a minority position as we have been told under no conditions will they accept minority positions for this report. So, we're doing our best to make sure that the text of the report at least presents our positions so someone else can see them and possibly comment on them. We'll see how well it does. The chair and staff have been adamant that we will not slip from the Monday delivery, at least not by more than a day or so. So, I'm not quite sure what we're going to end up with and what the utility of it is, but that's where we are. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, thank you for this update. Remind us in a minute, what was this Phase 2A supposed to find or to design and whether it has designed it or not? Because there's very little progress, but progress in what? The number of times you've told us there's very little progress, it just feels like, okay. So, what was it that they were supposed to have by the end of this and have they achieved this?

ALAN GREENBERG: We were asked two questions, essentially. One is, should … Phase 1 allowed registrars to differentiate between legal or natural entities registrants or not. Their choice. The question is, should they be required to? Because GDPR, of course, does not protect data of legal entities. And if you don't differentiate, you're ending up protecting everyone's data even though we believe that the majority of domains are actually owned by legal persons, or legal entities.

We have, at this point, decided that we cannot issue a requirement, but we're issuing something called guidance to registrars who may choose to follow it if they choose to differentiate. I can't give you a more positive view of it because I see it as having very little value, because if you don't choose to differentiate, you're just ignoring everything. And if you choose to differentiate, you may or may not follow our guidance for whatever that is worth.

Even for those who choose to differentiate, the guidance basically says, well, but you don't have to do it at registration you can do it later. And it doesn't really talk about the 200 million domain names that already exist within the database. On the annual reminder letter, you may mention it that perhaps they should think about doing that. But registrars are free to just ignore it completely.

On the second issue of should—the second issue was should we anonymize or synonymize? Synonymized essentially means you're using the same algorithm to anonymize an email address for all of the registrations of a given registrant, at least within one registrar if not wider. Basically, we're being silent on that and saying nothing. Legal opinion has been confusing, in that technically anonymized and

synonymized addresses are personal information but they may be personal information that the balance test says we can release. We're not saying anything really specific about that.

One of the things that came out of it is that if you do not use a registrant address, either their regular one or an anonymized address, the registrars are allowed to use a web form. Now a web form basically says, you go to this webpage in the registrar, you fill in a form saying, "I want this message sent to the registrar."

Some registrars give you a web form, which allows you to actually set what you need. Set the subject line saying, "This is a cease-and-desist letter." or whatever and give the reasons. Other registrars, including some very large ones, basically give you a tick box. And you can tick off the box saying, "You're sending out malware or you're violating my rights, or I'm doing research, and I'd like to talk to you." It says nothing more and you can't set the subject line. That seems to be pretty useless. I've put in a recommendation that the PDP should recommend that a web form includes certain minimum information to allow it to actually be useful. That's pretty well been rejected by the contracted parties. So, we'll see if it makes it into the document or not.

So, the bottom line is we were charged with setting policy or guidance. We may set policy that there'd be a new field in the RDDS for the legal/natural, which is not necessarily use. That's as much policy as we might set, that's the high limit that I can see us doing. Other than that, we're providing guidance, which has no formal value and no formal … We don't know who's going to use it. We don't know if anyone's going to

use it and we can't measure it. So, I don't see the utility of having done that, but that's where we are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And of course the floor is open for questions and comments. I have another question for you and that's to do with the needs of law enforcement and governments. From the discussions in the group, does the current outcomes seem to satisfy those, or are they unhappy? And with regards, if you mentioned that the report coming out is quite sterile in some way, what's the steps forward after that? Where do we have to go? And is there any alliance that might need to be made as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can say with some level of confidence that there is great uniformity between us, the GAC, the IPC, and the BC, in terms of our level of satisfaction with the report. And the four groups have been working very closely with each other and I'm talking about multiple meetings per week. And there's very close alignment. The exact words we use sometimes differ but there is a similar level of satisfaction or not satisfaction with what we have right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this update. In the queue is Steinar—

ALAN GREENBERG: And that by the way includes a representative from the European community. So we are very much aligned.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. That's helpful to know. We've got Steinar Grøtterød in the queue now.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I'm not trying to interfere your work, Alan. I'm just curious of if someone could register a domain name as a natural person, but mark this additional field as a legal person. Will that then trump the privacy laws and so on?

ALAN GREENBERG: Nothing traps privacy laws to start with. If there is personal information, it should not be revealed unless you have explicit consent. There's some ifs, buts and ands because there's balancing that has to be done. I'm sorry. I don't know who was speaking. Bottom line is, if you claim to be a legal person and certify that there is no personal information available within your record or that you give permission, and you have the right to give permission, there's all sorts of complexities because the registrant in theory could provide someone else's personal information as an email address and you have to make sure that, in fact, that person has given permission. So, there's a lot of if, buts, and ands but the bottom line is nothing trumps privacy law. But the privacy law has a lot of if, buts and ands in it. I'm not sure if that answers the question.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:	Thank you. Is this field thinking of being used as some sort of filter mechanism in the RDDs in a constant place and [heeds] access to the RDDS? You don't have to answer if this is going back a long time.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. Sorry, I didn't quite catch what you were asking. Can you repeat that again?
STEINAR GRØTTERØD:	The purpose of this additional field, is that to be used for filtering in the—
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. If the additional field is there and it is available, particularly to the SSAD, to the automatic disclosure system, then in theory, it could be used. It would require a decision, which we're not talking about right now. But if the field was there, and it was filled in, and it was available to the SSAD, then the SSAD could use that to determine that the information can be made available to a requester. Remember, we're not talking about making it public. Then there's a different issue of whether that field could be used to make something public but there's a whole bunch of if, buts and ands and decisions which would have to be made first. So, the existence of the field does not necessarily mean how it would be used.

I hope that makes it clear. It's not a very easy subject but the bottom line is, in theory, GDPR and other privacy legislation does not protect the information of legal entities. And therefore, there is no reason to redact |

the information of legal entities. How we in fact implement that is far from clear right now. And at this point, the contracted parties are basically saying they don't have to do any of this. Our policy is that they don't have to do anything.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Steinar. There is a question in the chat from Sivasubramanian which asks the following question. And that's, "Even after the distinction of natural versus legal person, is there a proposal to consider any part pertaining to names of persons responsible, etc., of the legal person's data private?" The people who are responsible, for example.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right now, there is no requirement to make any information available. A registrar can. There is a requirement at a Phase 1 not implemented by most registrars at this point, that a registrant can say, "I want all of my information to be public." So, in theory, if the registrar supports this field—which they all must at some point but the words are very soft when—then a registrant may be able to explicitly say, "I want my information to not be redacted." Okay. That's regardless of whether you are a natural person, a legal person, or whatever. In regards to natural legal, at the moment, there is no requirement for a registrar to

differentiate and they can redact everything and nothing at this point in the PDP is going to change that. Does that answer the question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I guess so. And next in the queue is Laurin Weissinger.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hi. Thank you very much. Alan, first of all, thank you very much for your work as well as Hadia's work. But listening to you, I'm really wondering about what are the next steps here—not necessarily in terms of ICANN procedure but more in terms of your grasp of the situation, your opinion because it seems that a lot of people will be very unhappy with what is coming out of this. But the approach within the multi-stakeholder model, has been used. So, I'm wondering, what do you think will we see in regards of this in the next, I don't know, two, three years? I hope that's not a too vague question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The answer is there's a lot of people coming out of this who are very happy so that is where we are. What's going to happen? Well, we're expecting, for Europe, NIS2 to be enacted. NIS2 will to a large extent address most of the issues we're talking about because NIS2—as it stands right now and it's still in flux—says that information of legal entities, excluding any personal content therein, must be revealed, and it must be revealed quickly, and there's no if, buts and ands about it.

That, if implemented, would force European registrars or those subject to GDPR to do that. It, of course, wouldn't do anything with registrars in

other jurisdictions. And some of the "bad actors" are not subject to GDPR so it wouldn't affect them at all, which an ICANN policy would. So, I'm expecting some of these problems to be rectified because of NIS2. It won't do it for all of our registrars. It will certainly affect some of the largest ones. And other than that, I don't know. It's just going to keep on going.

Why? We're in a curious world where a few years ago, if we had mentioned the concept of regulation, our contracted parties would have been, I think, rather abhorrent of that. And now they're saying, "We want legislation. We want clarity. If there's legislation, that controls our liabilities and we want the government to tell us what to do." So, we're in a rather curious world where we seem to be moving away from multistakeholder quasi-regulation to wanting legal clarity and that's where we stand.

Exactly where we're going to go from here, it's not really clear. And, of course, we believe where we want to see NIS2 go but it's not clear where it will go until we actually see something coming out of the European parliament and council and there's going to be a lot of haggling between now and then.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much for this, Alan. And, I guess, one of the problems, of course, with NIS2 is that you end up having policy that affects ICANN that is discussed outside of ICANN. And the discussion leaves the multistakeholder model and goes straight into intergovernmental discussions which is not—

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. This PDP is playing out very much as we've seen in the past that PDPs can work if all the parties come in with wanting to solve the problems. If you have parties who have very much diametrically opposed views, there are two outcomes. You can have deadlock or you can have a wishy-washy, lowest common denominator set of recommendations coming out of it. And I'm afraid PDP 3.0 has not changed that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks for this update Alan and no doubts we will hear from you next week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, we now have to move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if Hadia has come on, if she has any comments, but I don't see her.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have not seen Hadia on the call. No, I haven't seen her on the call. And I'm not seeing any other hands up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, I'm leaving in a few minutes for an EPDP meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. I'm sure you've missed it. Thank you for this, Alan. Let's go to the policy comment updates now with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. So, this week there are not too many updates. As everyone is aware, those that were recently ratified by the ALAC was the ALAC statement on the GNSO RPM and that's linked to the agenda in case you would like to see the final statement. There are quite a few upcoming public comment proceedings in the pipeline. Several in May and I've already noted at least two At-Large community members are interested in responding to the DAAR public comments that will be coming up. There are also two coming up in June. So far none scheduled for July but we'll be updating that soon after ICANN71. So, there are currently no public comment for decisions for this group. But there is potential ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on EPDP which was just discussed by Alan. So, with that, I'll turn it back over to you, Olivier or Jonathan, in case there's anything else you'd like to discuss. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey. Sorry. I'm still a little discombobulated from my morning. So, those are ones that are coming up but they're still not ready for us. Yeah, I'm not sure there's anything else that we need to discuss, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I see Alan is still on the call. I just wanted to ask a quick one liner which was to do with the EPDP Phase 2 ALAC advice to the ICANN Board. It mentions here 30th of March. Should we update this public comment close or it has to be submitted after the public comment close? What does it look like at the moment?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. We've been waiting to see how this is moving because clearly if 2A had come out with something substantive, that may alter our position on some of the other issues. So, now it's really a matter of going through our minority statement and seeing how much of it is applicable to ALAC statement and something I'm going to be looking at in the coming week. So, yes, we can change it and I would expect we're going to see something going to the ALAC in early June and probably have something for discussion at next week's meeting. On the latter, I'm not 100% sure I'm going to commit to, but we're going to try.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Thank you for this, Alan. Is there any chance of a preview as to what might go into the minority statement, or is that something you'll develop in the future calls?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the preview is what was in our minority statement. Sorry, you're talking about into the Board advice or the minority statement?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, you mentioned the minority statement and I thought—I thought you mentioned the minority statement that we spoke about now, not the Board advice.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. The Board advice that's on our work plan is the Board advice on Phase 2 which will be based on the minority statement minus things that are not applicable to Board advice or no longer relevant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Which was for Phase 2?

ALAN GREENBERG: Phase 2. Yeah. Any minority statement or Board advice we do on Phase 2A, we'll wait until we get closer to the final report on 2A.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I mean, at this point there may not be any Board advice because there may not be any Board action. If the GNSO does not—if there are no policy recommendations or the GNSO chooses not to pass them onto the Board, then there is no Board advice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this update, Alan. And that means we are closing agenda item five and now we can move back to agenda item three and that's the ICANN71 At-Large policy sessions and talking points with Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Yeah. So, this is just a work in progress but we've started a while back to do something where we looked at the program for the upcoming meeting and try to dig back into comments and discussions that we've had to produce some talking points in case—particularly those that are not on the CPWG calls every week but that are attending the meeting, find themselves in discussions or are trying to understand a discussion that's taking place so they're more able to—so we'll be circulating a link to a living document with those talking points after the call on the list so that folks can take a look and make comments and adjustments or make comments for adjustments as they're evolving. And then as usual, they'll get presented during Prep Week to help folks that are less tuned into all of these topics to anticipate in the upcoming meetings. So, they're likely to cover EPDP and GDPR compliance., the regulatory topic that is one of plenaries, the registry block list provider topic to some extent, although we don't have a position on that, we might just try to talk a little bit about what it is and why it matters to end users and things of that sort. So, there isn't a document ready for you, just sort of was waiting on things this agenda to be finalized so I'll try to circulate something to the list this week. That's it, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Questions, comments from anyone on the call? It looks like some of the news on today's call have certainly exhausted our participants to the call. It's not particularly lively today, but that's fine. Sometimes there are days like this. So, with no further discussions or comments on this, then we can move into the next agenda item and that's toward the end of the call. That's the any other business. There are three announcements. The first one is that Maarten Botterman has sent a response to Maureen Hilyard on the letter that she sent to the Board speaking about the subsequent procedures. If you recall, the ALAC sent advice to the ICANN Board outside a public consultation post and Maureen had sent an email to the Board chair asking for this to be considered specifically and so here is the answer. And so, this is now in the Board's advice process pipeline which you can click on and you'll see it's somewhere in the pipeline there and hopefully we'll get, as a community, we will get responses on the points that are being raised. This, of course, is an extensive piece of advice so we don't expect the Board to be able to respond within a matter of weeks. Well, maybe weeks but a matter of days, probably not.

The second announcement is that the schedule for the ICANN71 Prep Week is now available. That's a link from the 1st to the 3rd of June and there are several activities that will be in there. The important ones, I guess, for the At-Large community while they're all very important but the ones that has a significant involvement from At-Large is what to expect during ICANN71, I think. And then we've got ICANN, let me see which one. The universal acceptance I can't remember which ones, the ones that are around there. Anyways, they're all listed here and although they're not officially part of ICANN71, since ICANN71 is four

days long. The Prep Week is becoming increasingly important because it prepares people that might've not originally paid attention to everything taking place at ICANN and it's an interesting crash course into catching up about what's happening.

So that's the second announcement. And the third one is the new ICANN Learn courses that are now available and they touch on the At-Large community. They have been updated so you're very welcome. Again. I'm not sure if everyone knows about ICANN Learn. We can see here. Thank you for jumping into the link. ICANN Learn is a resource that is made available to community members, free of charge. You can follow any course on there. In fact, for ATLAS III, we managed to—we asked our community to follow a number of ICANN Learn courses and a lot of people really enjoyed them and really learnt a lot on these.

So, it's great to see an updated course, a guide for At-Large participants because as you know, things move on in ICANN and sometimes things have to be updated. So, have a look at these in your own time. If you don't have a login for ICANN Learn it's pretty straightforward. You've got the link on this page and the link is just below the ICANN policy development thing. Well, you've got the two links, one is ICANN AtLarge Welcome to Our World and one about ICANN Policy Development, A Guide for At-Large Participants. Take on these. If you haven't got a log in, I think you can ask for it easily and then enjoy. So, that's the third announcement. I see a couple of hands up so I'll give the floor first to Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Hi, Olivier. Thank you. I just wanted to report that a couple of days ago when I was looking for activities, ICANN related activities for our own ALS, I thought, well, welcome to our world, that sounds like an interesting intro thing that maybe I could present because I hadn't seen it. So, I went in to see if I could look at it and I was surprised at the number of barriers that just an interested user, end user person would have to dump in order to actually get into that, something that sounds really friendly, welcome to our world. We need to produce something that's really accessible. Having to go into ICANN Learn and get a username and then—actually it was even hard to find it. It was way at the bottom of the list of stuff. So I just wanted to report that because I thought, yeah, I think that's kind of our role, to try to make stuff really accessible and easy to digest. And just getting at this, I never did get at it in the end. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marita. Did you just say you never did get at it the end?

MARITA MOLL: Well, I could have. I found where it was at the very bottom of the list and I just ran out of time and then my purpose for finding it, I knew it wasn't going to be any good for what I wanted. I could have got out of it. Yes, I have [inaudible] but for what my purpose is, it was no good. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. I was just going to say that ICANN Learn does require some kind of a login and we can look into that but it is also possible to share a deep link to a class so that it's not a search to find it. That part's at least an easy fix. But, yeah, I think it does at this point require a login to get into, but we can try to see if there's a way to bypass that. Because I'm inclined to agree that for that course, at least, [we] might want it to be possible to get to it without it. One of the difficulties is that it is in fact a prerequisite to the policy development course and so the only way to record that somebody's taken that course is for them to identify themselves. So, I don't know whether the course should change or there should be some even more accessible introductory materials that come before you take the course, but that would end up being duplicative, I think in a lot of ways, the content of that course. So, thanks for that feedback.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, Marita, for this feedback. I think maybe an action item here of this feedback to be passed on over to the people in charge of ICANN Learn, certainly the end user experience is particularly important. I noticed that Heidi has chatted on there. She put on the chat, "Please send a note to At-Large staff about your experience" and then, yeah. That will be directly transmitted over to the staff in charge of ICANN Learn. Sébastien Bachollet is next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Olivier. It is [the fourth] announcement. I would like to take the opportunity just to be sure that you know that the 8th of June, it is not Prep Week, it is not a meeting week but it's in-between. As it is impossible to enter in one or the other to make some innovation, we have decided to go into the middle and the 8th of June we will have Flash Pitch Tour of ICANN and At-Large organized by EURALO and you are all welcome. You will receive the Save the Date and an invitation, please come and join us. I hope it will be interesting, fun, and that you will learn, even you who know already a lot. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Can you explain to us what is a Flash Pitch Tour? Is that what you said, Flash Pitch Tour?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you very much. The idea is, in some countries I say the pitch elevator, in some other country TGV pitch or whatever you want to call them. It's in fact we will give to leaders of the different bodies of ICANN three minutes and only three minutes to talk about their organization. The Board, the ccNSO, [ASO,] GNSO, GAC and of course the three pillars of At-Large and the ALAC itself, policy, Org and engagement. And then we will split the full group in four breakout room in language rooms, one in English, one in French, one in Spanish, and one in Russian. All that will be done for the first time. I don't know if we will succeed but you will help us to succeed in participating. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. Thank you very much, Sébastien. It sounds exciting. So, is it just for EURALO members or is it really everyone is invited to take part in this?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It is targeted first to the member of the ALSes. It's an answer, type of answer, of the two mobilization working group who worked to mobilize the ALS and the individual RALO members. But I am sure that it could be interesting for everyone but understand that the idea it's really to go to the bottom of our organization and not to have the same usual suspect. But even as usual suspect, you are welcome and I hope you will enjoy it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sébastien. Just to make sure the At-Large structures need to or should or could publicize this event to their members and hoping there'll be a lot of new people coming into the discussion and learning about these topics. I'd certainly be interested in seeing some people speak for three minutes maximum, myself included but it will be—yeah, it sounds like fun.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [You will have three] minutes and I will cut you and all the other after three minutes. It is your target to do that in three minutes but it will be fun, I am sure. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's very unfair to people who have long names but okay. We'll pass on that. Any other comments or announcements for any other business? I am not seeing anything—

JONATHAN ZUCK: You could be pretty quick in saying your name so I think it would be all right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Well, I always have to keep in mind to say it slower. Right, I think that we're done with any other business in which case we can have a look at next week's meeting, which I understand is going to be devoid of interpretation because next week is already ICANN Prep Week. Wow. That was fast.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thanks so much, Olivier. So, as you said, right, unfortunately we won't have interpretation provided next week but we will be able to hold our call on English only and I'm going to double check if real-time transcription service could be provided. So, it would be helpful for those who don't have English as a native language. And the time that I'm going to suggest is 22:00 UTC as there's a Prep Week webinar at 19:00 UTC so to avoid the clash. And yeah, if it works for everyone, instead of 19:00 UTC, we can do 20:00 UTC next week on Wednesday, of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Thank you very much, Yeşim. So, 20:00 UTC makes it a little late for some people in Europe but certainly not that crazy. We've had some calls at more inappropriate times. In fact, some parts of the world have much more inappropriate times for their calls. So, 20:00 UTC next week. Thank you. I guess, Jonathan, is there anything else that we need to cover today?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. I think that's it. We'll see you at Prep Week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, everyone. Thanks to our interpreters and to the real-time text transcription or captioner. And yes, we'll follow-up on the mailing list and, of course, preparing next week, coming soon to the next virtual ICANN meeting. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are. Take care. Goodbye.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you all.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you all very much. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]