
DEVAN REED:

Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 21st of July, 2021, at 19:00 UTC.

In order to save time, we will not be doing a roll call today. However, all of those in attendance will be noted from the Zoom room as well as the audio bridge.

I would, however, like to note the apologies that we've received from Priyatosh Jana, [K Mohan Raidu], Justine Chew, Satish Babu, Eduardo Diaz, and Leon Filipe Sanchez.

And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Berry Cobb, Caitlin Tubergen, Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Devan Reed, on call management, as well as Claudia Ruiz.

We have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and Paula. Our French interpreters are Aurelie and Camila.

We also have real-time transcribing on today's call. I'll put a link in the chat so you can follow along.

A friendly reminder for everyone to please state their name when taking the floor each and every time and to speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise.

Thank you all very much. And with this, I turn the call over to you, Olivier.

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.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Devan. And welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call.

Am I correct to note that there is no real-time text transcription today? Is there? Because I was just checking the link and it didn't seem to be working as such.

DEVAN REED: I don't actually see it in the transcriber [inaudible] either. Bear with me one moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But in the meantime, while you work this one out, let's have a look at today's agenda. We'll first start with the work group updates with three working groups that are being tracked closely: the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, the Inter-Governmental Organization Curative Rights Work Track, and the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data (the EPDP). After that, we'll go straight into our policy comment updates and we'll have a couple of comments to look at. And then, in Any Other Business, there'll be a reminder about the forthcoming APRALO webinar on internationalized domain names.

At this point in time, I should ask whether we can adopt the agenda as it currently is or whether there are any amendments or additions to be made to the current agenda.

I'm not seeing any hands up, and nobody has shouted that they want to make a change. So the agenda is adopted as it currently is in your screen.

And we can swiftly move on to the action items from our last call, only one of which remains still yet to be done, and that's for Justine to review the dot-aero public comment with a potential presentation on the 28th of July. So that's on next week's call, not this week yet. Everything else in the action items is done.

Are there any comments or questions on any of these action items?

The question was, of course, was I looking at the right thing? And it looks as though I'm looking at the wrong action items. Strangely indeed. And I'm indeed looking at the wrong agenda as well. That's a bit embarrassing. It looks as though my link was the wrong one, which—

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I think that's last week's.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, it was last week's. Exactly. I'm sorry about this. For some reason, my invitation sent me to the wrong agenda. Anyway, that was the agenda. All the action items are done from last week.

And today's agenda—and I do apologize—is going to be focusing more on the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the EPDP Phase 2, and then we'll have the work group updates and, after that, the policy comment updates. So there are quite a few more items on the agenda than we

initially thought there were. I'm surprised nobody has called me on this one. Too many calls in a row, definitely.

Let's proceed forward then with the first of our agenda items—well, Agenda Item #3. That's the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the Expedited Policy Process for gTLD Registration Data. We are in Phase 2. Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi are going to take us through this. They've already summarized it in past calls. They now have 20 minutes to finalize this, as this will be submitted, I think, pretty shortly, pretty soon. So, Alan and Hadia, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can, yes. Welcome, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry, I had many different mutes on. Okay, we also want to talk very briefly about the Phase 2A comment, by the way, but I'll start with the advice.

There have been a number of comments on the advice document on the Google Doc. Most of them were editorial. I have accepted and incorporated all of the editorial ones and grammar and things like that and left as a suggestion—so people could see the changes—the ones that are perhaps more substantive. I'm happy to leave it up for another few days before we try to finalize it. And perhaps we'll give people until,

let's say, the end of this weekend to put any more comments in, and then we'll finalize it and start trying to move it forward. There was nothing that has changed very substantially from the version we discussed last week.

That's all I have really to say on this. I hope people are reading this carefully—not just editing the text but thinking about it: “Is this what we want to advise the Board on? Are we missing anything or is any of this superfluous and not applicable?” So people are looking at it from a very critical point of view. We don't often give advice to the Board. It's a relatively rare occurrence. And we want to make sure that it's something that we can stand behind strongly because this document will have a life of its own once we submit it, and we need to make sure that it's really what we want.

So I don't have anything else particularly to say on it at this point, other than to ask people—and particularly the people who have been paying some level of attention to the EPDP process and the SSAD part of it (Phase 2)—to look at it and make sure that we're really on point. This is something where it's easier to omit something for Hadia and me looking at it from a very detailed point of view. And we do appreciate other eyes on this document.

That's all I have to say on that. And as I said, I do have a very brief report on the Phase 2A comments. But let's finish this one first.

Hadia has her hand up. Please, Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Okay. Thank you, Alan. I don't really have anything to add. I would just like to quickly remind people what this is about. So, actually, when we are trying to think of whether the System for Standardized Access and Disclosure for non-public registration data—the proposed system—is beneficial or not, we tried to look at five main characteristics of the system.

First is whether the system actually fulfills the needs of its users. So that's one characteristic we looked at. The second is we looked at whether the proposed system differs from the current practice. Like, will it introduce an improvement to the current practices in disclosing non-public registration data? And then the third characteristic we looked at is actually the ability of the system to evolve without further PDPs. Like, when future legislation is out or when more legal clarity is known, will this system be able to evolve and adapt without further PDPs? The fourth aspect we looked at is the consensus level that the system [receives]. The importance of this is reflects the community support to the proposed system. And then the fifth aspect that we looked at is the legal versus natural persons' data disclosure. Like, if there is a requirement at some point to disclose the non-personal data or to publish the non-personal data of legal persons, would this be possible through the SSAD? Like, would automatic disclosure of legal persons' data be possible through the current system?

So those are the main characteristics we looked at in trying to evaluate the proposed system. If you have other ideas for other characteristics that this system should support and should be evaluated against, please go ahead and suggest them. Also, definitely, as Alan said, take a look at

the document and try to look at things that we missed or overlooked.
Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. I gather Alan is looking for his unmute button again—or multiple unmute buttons. I'm not seeing any hands up for questions or comments. Of course, the document does mention that any comments at this point can still be added. Please do not edit the text. I see that a couple of people have still added a few comments in there. So I think we're probably on the very last line for this to be submitted imminently. And thank you for—

ALAN GREENBERG: And a couple of people have edited text.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have they edited the text?—

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sure. But that's okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [One] Alan Greenberg has done such a thing. I'm not quite sure he knows how [to do this].

ALAN GREENBERG: Usually they were editorial changes, and that's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this.

ALAN GREENBERG: The real problem with editing these kinds of documents is, if multiple people are making suggestions on the same paragraph, it gets very, very confusing to know whether you're commenting on a previous change or the original text. So you end up with conflicts and things that don't make a lot of sense when it's done that way. So that's why we try to avoid having people make major edits to the document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Alan. Next steps on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next steps is I suggested is until the end of Sunday for any further comments or input. I'll keep an eye on it day by day.

And there is an ALAC meeting early next week. I'll clean the document up and present it at that meeting, not necessarily as final but as getting close to there. So please, people, take a look at it. Don't be bashful at making comments if you think we're off-target.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much for this, Alan, and thanks for this, Hadia.

Let's now go to the next agenda item. The next one is about—

ALAN GREENBERG: How about the second agenda item of the EPDP?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well—

ALAN GREENBERG: The one that isn't on the agenda but I've reminded you three times of.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I thought, Alan, that this was going to be in the work group updates.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we're coming back to you in a moment, just to give you enough time to breathe a little bit. Then you can plow back into it.

ALAN GREENBERG: It means I have to stay awake, though.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, hopefully the other two discussions will be thrilling enough to keep you awake.

Now, the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process (TPR PDP) I understand was on a recess for quite some time. I'm not quite sure whether there's an update that needs to happen for this. But for this, we have Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I don't think we have an update for this meeting yet. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Christopher has his hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Sorry. I see that Christopher Wilkinson has his hand up. So, Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. I wish to extend personal thanks to Hadia and Alan for their work on this.

However, I just wanted to confirm the comment I sent to the last: personally, I have to abstain integrally from this topic for reasons which I have explained to the list in recent postings. I have had a really bad experience with ICANN and particularly with the contracted parties on any attempt to improve ICANN's privacy and data protection policy. This goes back in my personal case for more than 20 years.

So I have abstained, basically because it has become quite clear that the multi-stakeholder model, which, apparently, we still support as

implemented by ICANN, is not capable of taking decisions which respect the public interest.

I have other comments on the list, but thank you, Alan, for your perseverance, and I hope you succeed. But I personally deliberately abstained from joining the EPDP exercise because I could see, at least two years ago, that this was [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Christopher. That, as you mention now, is relating to the previous agenda item, Agenda Item #3, on the EPDP and the SSAD. So thank you for this comment.

Now, let's go and have Steinar Grøtterød for the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. Steinar, you have the floor.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you. I hope you can hear me well. I'm in not my normal place where I have the meetings.

Anyway, very much thank to Evin for bringing up a new PowerPoint presentation about the transfer policy processes. I have confirmed that ICANN staff can actually guide us through the new updates to get a better understanding.

So if we allow timewise maybe 10-15 minutes for this process, is that okay?

Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Steinar. As we are on time—so we're on track for the time being—that would be fine. 10-15 minutes max. Thank you. I can see this would be helpful.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you. Yeah. I'm going to leave the floor to the ICANN staff for the presentation. Okay, I'll go on mute. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not sure who wants to take the floor, whether it's—

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Julie? Yeah, go ahead.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: This is Caitlin Tubergen from ICANN Org. I can quickly present on the general transfer process. Sorry. Is there someone raising their hand or is that an old hand? I want to make sure before I dive in.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's an old hand.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That is an old hand. That's fine. Just proceed forward.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Okay. So [inaudible] has some of the terminology that is in the inter-registrar transfer policy or the transfer policy. So I just wanted to quickly touch on the terms before we discuss the overall process. Hopefully defining the terms will help the overall process make a little bit more sense.

So, first, at the top, at the black icon, you see the gaining registrar. That is the registrar to which the registrant is transferring the domain name. So if I'm a registrant and I chose to register my domain name at Registrar A and I decide that Registrar B has better terms, possibly better pricing and/or a service that I would like that my current registrar doesn't have and I want to transfer my name to Registrar B, Registrar B in this case would be the gaining registrar. And Registrar A, my current registrar or the registrar of record, would be the losing registrar or the registrar from which I want to transfer my domain name.

There are a couple of documents that the transfer policy requires or required, the first being the gaining form of authorization. Essentially, what would happen is, if I want to transfer my domain name to Registrar B or the gaining registrar, that gaining registrar would send me a form of authorization that I would acknowledge. I'm showing my intent to

confirm that I do indeed want to transfer my domain name. The gaining FOA is generally sent by the gaining registrar in the form of an e-mail with a clickable link. It can be sent via a physical copy. The registrar has the option of how it would like to send the FOA, but generally speaking, most registrars do this via e-mail because it's instantaneous.

Next is the losing form of authorization. And that would be a form used by the losing registrar or the current registrar. Once the current registrar receives notice that I would like to transfer my domain name, it is required to send me this losing form of authorization, which essentially serves as a warning that the domain name is being transferred. And if I didn't ask for this transfer, then I need to notify my registrar right away so that the registrar can stop the transfer. This is particularly important in cases of domain name hijacking or what would be an instance where someone may have hacked into my account and tried to transfer my domain name to another registrar. The losing Form Of Authorization or losing FOA would notify me that I need to take action if I want to stop this, if I didn't mean to transfer.

Next slide, please. So the transfer policy was updated slightly following the GDPR or the General Data Protection Regulation, which I'm sure many of you are very familiar with. But in essence, the biggest change is that, when personal information or many aspects of registration data became redacted under GDPR, the gaining registrar or the registrar to whom I'm trying to transfer my name to, in many instances is unable to send that gaining form of authorization to me because they can't verify who I am in the current WHOIS output. And that's generally what the gaining registrar would use to verify that I am who I say I am. Because, in many instances, the gaining registrar is unable to send that gaining FOA,

there was a workaround added to the temporary specification, which was ultimately adopted into the interim registration data policy.

And I'll just note that, in short, the gaining FOA isn't required, and the authority is the auth-info code, which is a unique code that a registrar assigns to a domain name that essentially acts as the keys to the domain name. So the registrar protects that code, and the registry would ultimately verify that the codes match. And following the confirmation that the auth-info code is correct, the registry operator would send a notice of the pending transfer to both registrars, the losing and the gaining. From there, the process is exactly the same. So the losing registrar is still required to send that losing FOA to the registered name holder, which again is sort of an alert, that a transfer is requested, and if the registra[r] did not transfer ... I'm sorry. Someone needs to go on mute. Thank you. And following that—the losing registrar sending the losing FOA to the registered name holder—if there's no objection to the transfer, the transfer would proceed within five calendar days.

Are there any questions that anyone has about the change from pre-GDPR to post-GDPR? In short, the gaining FOA is, in many instances, no longer required to be sent.

And I see my colleague is raising his hand, so I'll let him provide some additional color on this. Thank you, Berry.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Caitlin. Just to build on what you stated, once the temp spec or the temporary specification came into force—I believe the 24th of May, 2018—shortly thereafter, the ICANN Board resolved to instruct Org

that they would no longer enforce compliance on the gaining FOA. However, that does not completely remove the requirement. If a registrar happens to be in a jurisdiction where they still have access to the WHOIS information to complete the FOA, they are supposed to, per contractual obligations, still use that. But again, at this current timeframe, Contractual Compliance is not enforcing it to the full extent that they used to pre-GDPR. And as a result of this, this is one of the primary topics that led to the initiation of the PDP for which you're discussing here. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Alan, I see your hand is raised. I don't know—Olivier, would you like me to manage the queue? You're welcome to take over and we can answer questions. But for now, I'll just note that Alan's hand is raised. So please go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just to note I thought the auth-info code GDPR, but you have no mention of it in the pre-GDPR scenario.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, Alan, for that clarification. That's correct. And this slide is not comprehensive. So to be clear, when a registrant would like to transfer their domain, there are two things that they need to do, and that is to ensure that their domain name is unlocked and that they have retrieved the auth-info code. Both of these tasks are generally done via their client portal at their registrar. Some registrars, again, might do this in a

physical process, but it's generally done via their portal. So the auth-info code did predate GDPR. The main difference is that, post-GDPR, the auth-info code is authoritative. There's no longer a gaining FOA. So there used to be multiple confirmations, but now it's just the auth-info code that we're relying on. I hope that makes sense. Thank you.

Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I hope this is more ... And thanks to ICANN Org for bringing this presentation up. I'd like to add into that that I know we haven't come that far into the discussion in the PDP, but there was some talk in the early discussions that we might see a scenario where the form of authorization is not needed. And it's totally depending on a valid auth code, and the domain name in question is eligible for domain name transfer.

And one of the reasons that we started this discussion in this working group (CPWG) is that we're trying to understand the three different scenarios: pre-GDPR, post-GDPR, and maybe something that ends up in a policy without any form of authentication. So I just want to clarify that.

And we have a figure here that shows the pre- and post-GDPR, but what we could add into that is that we totally remove the form of authentication and just totally depending on valid auth-code and a domain name that can be transferred from one registrar to another one. But I want to emphasize that we haven't finalized that discussion in the PDP working group. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Steinar. I think Berry might want to elaborate on that point. So please go ahead, Berry.

BERRY COBB: Thank you, Caitlin. Really just picking up on Alan's question and your response, this particular slide over on the right-hand side, where, post-GDPR, those elements are highlighted in red, Alan is correct. The auth-info code was used long before the temp spec or GDPR came into force. And in the transfer process prior to then, the registry operator would still confirm the auth-info code that they received from the gaining registrar. And that procedure still exists today. It's not a new procedure that changed as a result of the temporary specification. But the reason why it is highlighted here is because that is specifically called out within the temporary specification that didn't exist in that exact form under the current agreements.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Berry. That was a helpful clarification. And I will note, as I mentioned to Alan, this slide isn't comprehensive. So there are certain requirements with GDPR, like Alan pointed out, with the auth-info code and the registry operator confirming the auth-info code that occurred pre-GDPR and would still occur and also occur post-GDPR.

And to Steinar's point, that's correct. The Transfer Policy Review Working Group will ultimately review the question [of] if the gaining FOA and losing FOA are still necessary. The working group decided that they

would review the security and utility of the auth-info code prior to having that discussion. However, the working group may ultimately decide if the gaining FOA is no longer needed, but no one has made that decision yet or proposed a recommendation.

And thanks, Berry, for noting that, per the project plan, the discussion of the gaining FOA will likely start in September.

Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'll point out I'm not a part of the new PDP, but I was a part of the discussion within the EPDP talking about the impact of GDPR on the transfer policy and the reason that we're now having this review of the transfer policy. So I am moderately familiar with the issues associated with it.

And I'd like to summarize what the real difference is pre-GDPR and now. Pre-GDPR, the registrant had to take action to confirm the transfer. That is, the gaining registrar ... You had to respond to that. Now, all that's left is the message from the losing registrar, and the lack of response indicates consent. So if the losing FOA required you to say yes or no, then we would at least have some action on the registrant or at least who we think the registrant is. I'll comment on that in a second. But the current one ... Lack of action. And we all know that e-mail is not the most reliable of resources. Sometimes messages go into never-never land and don't get delivered. And it's easy enough, if you receive a lot of e-mail, to miss a message. So it's quite possible that your domain could

be transferred without you taking any action if someone else is the one who initiated it.

And, of course, we always have the problem that, if someone hacks into your registrar account, changes your e-mail address and then waits a while until they're then allowed to do a transfer, they could do a transfer and they're the one that confirms. So we still have a problem with hijacking. It doesn't disappear completely. But in the normal case, where your e-mail is the correct one with the losing registrar, the older method did require you to take some explicit action to confirm it, and the new one doesn't. And that's really the substance of where the discussion has to go on whether this is acceptable or whether it's problematic. And registrars have claimed that it doesn't really matter because the lack of WHOIS implies no one knows you have a domain name anyway. But I think that's not a very substantive argument. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Alan. Those are excellent points.

Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I kind of agree with you, Alan. We may have scenarios that could be seen as problem, etc. But I actually think that the key thing here is that any transfer has to be totally dependent on a valid auth-code. So one of the questions we have to ask is, do we improve the improve the security with the form of authentication from the losing or gaining registrar, or is

it just a matter of how secure we can actually make the process connected to the transfer authorization code as we now call it?

So, in my opinion, that's one of the things that might color the discussion and might be relevant for the position taken both by At-Large and by the PDP.

Adding that, also there's a lot of ccTLDs that actually have changed their routine and are now totally dependent on a valid auth-code and no paperwork, also known as form of authentication.

So I think it's a little bit about how this auth-code management ends up in the end. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thanks, Steinar. And I'll note that, while the full working group hasn't met for the last two weeks, there has been a small team of volunteers that have been reviewing potential updated security to the auth code and will be presenting its findings to the working group shortly.

Also, there's some additional charter questions that the team will be reviewing about added security: if there's anything else in addition to the auth-code that should be required that may not be the gaining FOA or if there's anything else that the group should consider to limit domain name hijacking as much as possible.

Berry, please go ahead.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you. Building on Alan's comment just a little bit ago, he is correct that, [with] the pre-GDPR with the gaining FOA, for that transfer to complete, the registrant or registered name holder had to take action to approve and accept and authorize that transfer to take place. And obviously that doesn't exist in a post-temp-spec-initiated world. The losing FOA and the e-mail that is sent to the registrant/the registered name holder is mostly informational, but they do contain links that they could reject or cancel the transfer [of], but the losing FOA does not require an action to complete the transfer.

The final thing I'll say, because Alan mentioned about the registered name holder's account being compromised or hacked—as Caitlin noted, there are other discussions within our charter around the complete security profile for transfers and trying to mitigate unauthorized transfers—way back a long time ago, when we reviewed the transfer policy in IRTP A, B, C, and D, and specifically within Phase B, that's where the discussion happened about implementing ... It was mostly resolved around change of registrant, which is a component of the transfer policy that will also be reviewed down the road. But as part of implementing that policy or the policy that was determined, [it] deals with a material change to the contact information of the registered name holder.

So, in simple terms, if the account is compromised and the nefarious actor changes the e-mail address of the registrant, it would enforce that a 60-day lock be placed on that domain name. Or that was the intent: to slow down the potential hijacking of that domain so that it couldn't be immediately transferred to multiple registrars away from the original losing registrant.

That said, the implementation of that particular lock was ... Caitlin can correct me if I'm wrong, but there's still the ability to opt out of that lock or opt into it if you want to keep it enforced.

So that is where some of the challenges still exist today in the cases where the account itself gets compromised and [it's] also part of the charter for which the transfer group will be discussing. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN:

Thank you, Berry. I just want to be mindful of how much more time we have on this item. I see two more hands, but we need to close the queue after this. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I did allude to the 60-day one. I said, if you're hijacked and change the e-mail address, you have to wait a suitable time.

I'll note that that delay also causes a lot of people increasing significant angst because, if they want to transfer the domain name, they log on, realize, "Oh, I forget to fix my e-mail address, which changed ages ago," and, by changing it, they then stop themselves from being able to transfer the domain. So it's a two-edged sword, of course.

But I guess my overall comment ... This is to Steinar, and it's a discussion that the ALAC has to have and the At-Large has to have. We don't need staff to monitor that one. So I don't really want to go into it in detail here. But the real question is, in many cases, to simply change an e-mail address on a list, I have to confirm that I really want to do it. And having your domain name taken away from you is a far more substantive thing

than losing a position on a mailing list. So, from my point of view, the lack of the ability to transfer a domain name without the registrant taking some positive action is really problematic. But that's something we're going to have to hash through in our own group. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Alan. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sorry, I am in the street walking. But I just wanted to add one point. When it's the middle of the 60 days, when it's the time for the renewal of the domain name, the registrants will need to pay for the renewal and the transfer and pay again the new registrar. I thank you so much. Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Sébastien. I don't see any other hands, so I'm going to turn the mic over to Olivier—oh, I see Steinar.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Sorry, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I was just going to give the floor to Steinar to close off the topic because we do have to move on. So please.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. Just a short comment to Sébastien. For any successful transfer, we actually add one year to the domain name life cycle. So that's the date for the renewal so we actually altered, added by the successful transfer.

Anyway, I appreciate this discussion and I hope that we, at a time when we have more things to report back on from the PDP working group, continue with this discussion and finalize the At-Large statement when there's need to settle this. And thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. And thank you, Caitlin, Berry, and Julie for joining us on this. Very helpful thing indeed and a very interesting discussion here. As you can see, there's significant concern in our community about domain hijacking. Certainly, some comments will probably be originating from the ALAC on this topic

So I think we need to move on now because we have taken a bit more time than expected on this topic, although it's a very interesting topic indeed. The next topic is the Inter-Governmental Organization Curative Rights Work Track (the IGO work track). I think that, here again, there hasn't been very much happening this week. I'm looking for Yrjö or Carlos, and I just think that neither might be on then call. Am I correct?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: This is Yrjö speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you are on the call, Yrjö. Okay.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: I'm on the call, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't see you. So go ahead.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: You were right. There is nothing to report, since there was no meeting on Monday. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Yrjö. That means we can now go to the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, which I managed to say in one breath. Alan and Hadia, it's back to you now for your second exciting EPDP topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Very short report. As I documented in e-mail, the comment on Phase 2A was submitted on time. The only changes from the previous versions were the order of two paragraphs. They were changed in the first question, just to put the clear statement that we do not support saying this is a consensus if it's not a consensus. And based on

the number of other comments that other people made, I added a paragraph at the very end, under Additional Input, pointing out that following arbitrary rules at the expense of good policy is not a good plan. It's something we discussed within this group a number of times, and we never had any objection to that statement. And we had a lot of support, so I didn't feel uncomfortable in putting that in because, again, there were a number of other comments made that basically said adding the additional element, which we are pushing for heavily, that allows a registrar to say that it's a legal or natural registration—doesn't require them but allows them if they choose—is outside of the charter also.

And given the fact that we don't actually have a charter for this PDP, the charter was the original charter that was done before Phase 1, which includes everything. The charter is not exclusive. We're operating under a letter of instruction from the GNSO, and that has been treated as an ironclad charter and interpreted in various different ways. And I was simply pointing out that, ultimately, we're here to develop good policy, not just to follow rules, and that should take precedent. It won't have any effect, but I thought it really should be said.

And other than that, everything was exactly as submitted and a done deal at this point. And there's a meeting tomorrow for the EPDP to start discussing the comments. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Hadia, anything else to add on this?

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Not really. However, let's hope, after we receive all the comments and start discussing them, that we are able to at least have the standardized elements for differentiation. I think, if we are able actually to get out of this EPDP that standardized element, this would be regarded as a [success]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Hadia. And the floor is open for comments and questions from everyone.

I'm not seeing any hands on this topic, so I guess that's it. Alan and Hadia, anything else to add on the topic? Then, if not, we can move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Nothing from me, other than to remind people to please look at the policy, the Board advice statement, and have at it. Thank you. The deadline is Sunday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Yes, Sunday is the deadline. Just to make sure. Thanks very much.

I think we can now proceed forward with our next agenda item. We are welcoming back Evin Erdogan from her lavish holiday around the world, perhaps. Perhaps not. I'm not sure, but, Evin, welcome back. And Jonathan Zuck, of course. And both of them are going to take us through the policy comment updates.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Okay. Thank you, Olivier. So this will be brief this week. Recently ratified by the ALAC—this was actually last week—was the response to the draft white paper on registrant protections and DNS abuse mitigation. So please do visit the workspace if you'd like to see that ALAC statement.

For upcoming public comment procedures, there are several now coming up in September. So there'll be a little pause in terms of ICANN public comment proceedings in the near future. But please do check those out.

And to note, the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) 2.0 public comments is also scheduled for release in September.

There are currently two public comments open for decision, however. One was noted earlier in the call that Justine Chew is currently reviewing. She may have a presentation during next week's CPWG on the proposed renewal of the dot-arrow registry agreement. And there's also a public comment open for the Greek root zone label generation rules.

And besides this, the current statements in progress ... We've already been briefed by Alan and Hadia. Thank you both for the submission for the ALAC statement on the initial report of EPDP Phase 2A, as well as the ALAC advice that's in development, which will be circulated after this call.

As Steinar also noted, there is the draft ALAC statement with regards to the Transfer Policy Review PDP. And the requested feedback for that was

by the 4th of August. So I'll coordinate with the reps on gathering feedback on that statement.

With that, I'll turn it back over to Jonathan. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evin. I don't think we have a lot more to discuss, unless someone on the call believes that we need to comment on the Greek root zone label generation rules, which I don't believe we do. But raise your hand if you think so. Otherwise, I'll follow up with Justine about the dot-aero registry agreement.

Are there any questions about any of this?

All right, Olivier. It's back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. And I should just make a note or air a note: the fact that I've noticed that this year there appears to be less public consultations right in the middle of summer, which is the time when a lot of the people in the European part of the world go for a summer recess. So I guess this will be well-received on this occasion. And of course, we have made this point in the past and mentioned this in the past. So I'm certainly noticing that, moving things with deadlines to September is probably a wise to greater participation in those public consultations. So thank you for that, whoever decided on the calendar. And that's just a personal note from me.

So back to chairing this call, I don't see any other hands on this topic. So we can swiftly move on to Agenda Item #6, and that's several items of Any Other Business.

The first one is to remind you all to register for the APRALO webinar on the Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs): Advancing the IDN Agenda for a More Inclusive Internet—an important webinar. I think that anybody interested in IDNs should follow this. And of course, we've just spoken about even the Greek label generation rules, so this is not just something for the pan-Asian languages, but there are also many across the world, including any non-Latin character sets as such. That's one.

Does anybody wish to say anything to this, or ...

I'm not seeing any hands up. So that's one. That's the first announcement.

The second one is to do with the SAC 117 (the report on the root service early warning systems) and SAC 118 (the SSAC comments on the initial report of the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, Phase 2A. So those two pieces of advice have now been published by the SSAC. Andrei Kolesnikov has shared this with us.

I don't know if anybody wishes to speak to those two documents. I must admit I haven't had a chance to read through those yet. So if anybody wishes to speak to them, now is the time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, we'll arrange from folks from the SSAC to come and discuss them on a future call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Great idea. Yeah, let's do it this way. So that's the second thing.

And, of course, the third note on Any Other Business is the SSAD ODP community questionnaire. So that's the Operational Design Phase. Of course, for those people that are not too good with ... And SSAD is the Standards ... I don't even know. It just reads as a sad thing. It's the Standard Access System for Data, isn't it? Or Standard System for Access to Data. Alan, Hadia, help me out on this one, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: What's the question, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What's the SSAD?

ALAN GREENBERG: Standardized System for Access and Disclosure, I believe.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, there we go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or something very close to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. So you'll be forgiven—in fact, anyone will be forgiven—if you get the acronym wrong.

Anyway, that's the community questionnaire. It's up at the moment. There's a short questionnaire that closes on the 22nd of July at 23:59 UTC, which is tomorrow. Please fill it out and tell the powers that be whether what's being proposed is something that meets your expectations.

Or, Alan, do you want to say anything on this specifically? Is there anything you'd like to share? It does have a number of questions there, but it's a Q&A. And a lot of it comes down to looking to one's crystal ball, by the way.

Alan Greenberg? Hadia Elminiawi? Perhaps not.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have nothing I wish to share at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks for that. So, anyway, the questionnaire is there. You're all invited to have a good look at that.

And that's it for the Any Other Business section, unless anyone else wishes to speak and add any points at this moment.

Not seeing any hands up, it looks as though we're going to finish this call early today, which is great news.

Jonathan, do you have anything else to add? Any other announcements?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. Just don't get used to this because we certainly have a lot of things on the horizon. But enjoy the light August.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan.

So now let's look at when our next meeting will be. And of course, we are undergoing a strict rotation. When is the next one happening?

DEVAN REED: Olivier, in picking back up with the rotation, your next meeting would be on Wednesday, July 28th, at 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wednesday, July 28th, at 13:00 UTC. Indeed, we stop the rotation because of the conflict with some other calls. It looks as though, next week, there will be no conflict, hopefully. So that's it. That's our next call. 13:00 UTC on the 28th of July already.

And with this, I'd just like to thank our interpreters for the great work that they always do. I'm not seeing any real-time text transcription

today, so no thanks possible here. And of course our staff and everyone who has been on the call today. It's been a very interesting discussion, and I hope that you've enjoyed the call. So until then, have a very good week, a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night. And continue on the mailing list. Fill out the surveys out there. See you on the next call. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]