
GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 28th of July 2021 at 13:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, we will not be doing a roll call. However, all those in attendance will be noted from the Zoom room as well as the audio bridges. I would, however, like to note the apologies we've received from Steinar Grøtterød, Christopher Wilkinson, Lilian Bruges, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Länsipuro, Holly Raiche, and Raymond Mamattah.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullirch, Evin Erdoğdu, Devan Reed; and myself, Gisella Gruber.

Please note we only have Spanish interpretation on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and Claudia. We also have real-time transcribing on today's call and I have put the link in the chat now.

A friendly reminder for everyone to please state their names every time they speak to allow the interpreters to identify you on the other language channels as well as for the transcription purposes. Otherwise, it just ends up being man, woman, man, woman. And last but not least, to speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

Please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise, and please do mute all other notifications. Thank you very much. And with this, I'll turn the floor over to you, Olivier. Thank you.

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 CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Welcome, everyone, to this week's call of the Consolidated Policy Working Group. We have a lighter agenda as it is the summer and a few less topics to discuss, and certainly no feature presentations today. So after we look at the action items, we'll have a quick update on the work groups. The transfer policy review policy development process is currently working on some responses and they're not ready yet for consumption. So that will be looked at next week, but we'll have expedited policy development process on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data update and also the inter-governmental organization curative rights work track update.

Then after that we'll have the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck. And contrary to the agenda, Evin Erdogdu is not with us this week, so it'll be Jonathan by himself who will take us through some of the advice that is currently in the pipeline.

JONATHAN ZUCK: She's on the call, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Evin is on the call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, she is. I was under the impression she was not. Okay. Sorry, Evin. I don't know why I thought you weren't.

Then after we'll have the public consultations, we'll have any other business with the SSAD operational design phase questionnaire. So that's the agenda for today. Are there any amendments, any additions to be made? I'm not sure why I thought Evin was away this week.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, just to note I have to leave on the hour.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. Maybe we will ... Well, hopefully we will have completed all of the other things before, so yeah that's quick. Thank you.

Let's proceed forward and let's go to our action items from last week. The action items are all completed, so we're not going to go through them. Everything is in process. Any comments or questions on the action items?

It looks like there aren't any. Let's then proceed further and move to our work group updates.

Now, first, the transfer policy review policy development process. Steinar Grøtterød is not with us this week. I understand that his colleagues—is it Lutz Donnerhacke and Daniel Nanghaka—should be on the call, so we'll have a quick update on this please. And I'm looking for

both on the call and I'm not seeing them, so maybe there isn't an update on that.

Let's see. Perhaps we've gone a little too fast. Let's then move on and we might come back to this. Evin, you have the floor. Evin Erdogan.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to share a note from Daniel. He says he will be joining approximately 20 minutes into the call with his apologies. So he'll be joining in a few minutes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks, Evin. So we'll come back to this topic a little bit later. Therefore, we can now check for the expedited policy development process on the ... Sorry, the inter-governmental organization curative rights work track first. Hoping that we have Yrjö Lansipuro on the call. I know that this might or might not be the case. I'm not seeing him. And Carlos neither. We're way too fast today.

Let's then go to Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi for the Expedited Policy Development Process on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I don't know if Hadia is on the call but I'll talk for a little bit. The group is in the process of reviewing the public comment. There's a meeting tomorrow. In parallel with this, we are having a number of small breakout groups shared by Melissa Allgood to try to get some

dialogue going on some of the key questions. I participated in one yesterday and I guess my only comment is I hope the others are more productive. We'll see where it goes.

Nothing particular to report at this point, however, and I'll just highlight that the advice to the Board on phase two is in its final levels of review. It was presented to the ALAC meeting yesterday and I think we decided to leave it open until the end of Friday. So if you haven't looked at it, please take a look at it. Comment if applicable. Advice to the Board is some pretty onerous stuff that we do and we have to make sure that it's well understood and well representing what we believe. There are likely to be significant discussions with the Board as a follow-up to it, so please take a look at it and comment if necessary. There's a pointer ... I believe there's a pointer in the section on policy review later on.

Other than that, I have nothing to report unless anyone has any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. The floor is open for questions or comments. It doesn't look like there are any, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And I'll note Evin put the link to the Google Doc in the chat here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I missed—what’s our timeline for this again?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe at the ALAC meeting, Maureen said we’ll keep it open until the end of Friday, the end of this week. I guess I can leave it open until the end of the weekend if anyone has any further comments, but hopefully it’s getting close to the end.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. It is the seventh version of the draft, isn’t it? So it looks like there are quite a few ... There’s been a lot of input into that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Most of them were just me and Hadia before it went public.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. I’m not seeing any hands up. Perhaps another email to the mailing list, one last email to remind everyone. But I guess the fact that there’s not many comments means that this is pretty much in the right direction with respect to the participants.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or people aren't looking at it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You're being way too cynical, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not, I'm just pragmatic.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Is that all for the expedited PDP?

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless Hadia has arrived and has something else, that's all from me.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Alan. Looking through the list of participants, I note that Daniel has not made it yet, but Lutz Donnerhacke has made it regarding the transfer policy review policy development process (the TPRPDP). I was going to ask Lutz whether he has the material or is aware of the material that was going to be updated on this topic for this week.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Yesterday we had a meeting about [inaudible] info code for the transfer. There was no substantial progress made. It's more discussion about the usual points, which maybe raised concern to anybody or to somebody who have been able to bring in the point that the domain transfer is not

an issue between registry and registrar but also between the registrants and the resellers, so making it more complex in order to make it more secure, only make the whole process very sticky for the end customers because we can't transfer a domain anymore if there is a [poor vision] to store the [inaudible] info codes to invalidate after several days and to have the two-factor authentication on any step, then make the process so secure that no domain can be transferred without [inaudible] amount of [inaudible] and it's not the situation we are in before.

So, the most interesting point in this discussion was that it might be a solution to have [inaudible] network, to have a process—a [inaudible] process—which is able to catch a misdirected transfer and to revert it if necessary, so that we can release a little bit of level of security in exchange for an easier handling. And if something goes wrong, then we have a [inaudible] process which can be invoked afterwards in order to correct the errors which were made by illegal or erroneous activities. That's all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Lutz. Let's open the floor for comments and questions on this topic. I'm not seeing any hands up. Lutz, I do have a question on this. There was a discussion a while ago regarding the extent to which the end user was going to be involved in the transfers through notifications and so on. Is that being considered as well? I might have missed that.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: It was not discussed yesterday because we had a small group outcome discussion. There were two groups. One group was discussing the security levels for an [inaudible] info code and recommended as strong as possible. And the second group was about [a collection of strong arguments] which was the funny part. And we do not go into much detail to any other subject.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks for this, Lutz. Thanks for the update. And if we do have ... Well, Daniel is supposed to make it to the call shortly. When he does come on, we might just ask him if he has anything else to add to what you've said, although he won't be aware of what you have updated us on. But we'll see then.

Not seeing anyone following the inter-governmental organization curative rights work track on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, there are hands up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I do see a few hands up first. They're just coming on my screen now. They're a little slow. We'll first start with someone called—a newcomer—Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I am a newcomer. I understand. Your screen seems to be delayed by a minute or two. I'm not quite sure what kind of Internet link. Maybe one of those that goes via the moon or something.

In any case, I'll just reiterate what I've said before multiple times. In the end of the game, if a transfer gets done without the registrant of record actively saying yes to some email from one of the registrars or the registry--and I'm not particularly picky where it comes from—I think I'm going to have some level of problem with it. Passive, simply not responding to an email to agree just doesn't hack it in my mind. Thank you very much. I can't join a mailing list with that level of inaction, never mind have my domain transferred away from where I originally thought it should be. I'm not going to comment on the interim discussions, but if the end point ends up being that we are giving up that level of security and hope to fix it by remedies after the fact, which having been involved in a number of those know that's not necessarily a good outcome. We'll see where it goes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. Next in the queue is Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes. Thanks, Olivier. I'm happy to give an update on the IGO work track if you would like.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks, Justine. Let's see if first there's any response or any other points to what Alan has mentioned. Not seeing any further hands, so

let's close the topic of the transfer policy and let's go to the IGO work track then. Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay, thanks. I believe Yrjö is still on vacation. He did say he may not make the meeting, so we kind of agreed that I would step in. We had a meeting on Monday, but in terms of the substantive issue, I'm not going to elaborate on that today yet because I'd like the opportunity to discuss how we're going to present the problem statement and the proposed solution that the work track is working on. I'd like to discuss that aspect of it with my colleagues first and they will probably come up with a presentation either next week or the week after.

But I was going to just talk about an existential issue that's come up. And what I mean by that is, for some reason or other, the GNSO has finally woken up to the fact that we may need to do something about recharging the work track ... I'm going to try and put it very delicately. The thing is, because this work track is not a full-on PDP, it is a trial to a PDP. So the parent PDP working group is actually the Rights Protection Mechanism Working Group.

Now, we know that the RPM Working Group had a phase one and a phase two. The phase one has been completed, so the final report for phase one RPM has been delivered and accepted by the GNSO Council, but there were questions about whether the RPM Working Group was still in existence or not because of the fact that the work has been completed.

I would have thought that it would still be in existence because there is a phase two, but then the thing is the phase two work scope is being rechartered so there is ... It was raised at the point of that being the case. And RPM has actually [inaudible] and what GNSO Council might do is actually to have another working group called for to deal with the phase two work of RPM, which means that if we take the position that the RPM Working Group no longer exists, then this particular work track—the IGO work track—becomes an orphan, and under the GNSO operating procedures, we can't have that.

Meaning to say that any work or any recommendations that the IGO work track eventually comes up with, being an orphan work track we can't present it as consensus recommendation. So GNSO wouldn't take that, which is kind of strange because it's in a novel situation. I don't think GNSO Council has come across this particular situation before.

So, what's happening is GNSO Council is considering what to do with the situation that I've just described. In any event, the work track's work continues. We're just going to keep [prodding] along until GNSO Council decides what they want to do.

Potentially, we're looking at rechartering the work track into an EPDP. That was one of the solutions that was mentioned at the GNSO Council meeting.

But regardless of how the work track gets reshaped, the work of it continues. In terms of that, the timeline for the work has been delayed a little bit, but the impact of it is not negative, per se, because there is a moratorium that's in place for the public comment proceeding system in

the sense that there wouldn't be any public comments called for in the month of August.

So, we were supposed to have come up with the draft report for the IGO work track in early August. But because there's a moratorium on the public comment system, we wouldn't have been able to post anything for public comment anyway. And because of that, we have little time to play with, which means now we're looking at at least September for the production of a draft report of the work track or EPDP or whatever GNSO Council decides to do with the structure of the group.

In any event, the other reason for the pause or the moratorium being good also is because the work track itself has a very narrow charter. We were chartered to just look at one particular recommendation out of five, which [inaudible] IGOs, and the five recommendations from a previous working group which considered the issue. But the fifth recommendation was not accepted by the GNSO Council, so that's why there is this outstanding piece of work that's being undertaken by the work track, the IGO work track.

But in consideration of this fifth recommendation, the solution that we are looking at will possibly impact on some of the other or two of the other five recommendations pertaining to UDRP.

One of the major recommendations of the five that were worked on basically says that we wouldn't touch UDRP. We shouldn't make any recommendations that would change UDRP in any way. But the work track in considering the fifth recommendation that was not accepted by The GNSO Council is looking towards a solution which would impact

UDRP. So there would be necessarily a recommendation that would change the UDRP in order to facilitate the resolution that the work track is going to propose. I hope that makes sense.

But in terms of the substance of the work itself—and this is my personal opinion, because as I said I would like time to discuss it with my colleagues on the IGO work track. My personal opinion is I got onto the work track to essentially become a watch dog for what’s happening with the work.

The way I see it, we just need to balance the rights of an IGO versus the rights of a registrant, to make sure that it is not bias against one or bias for the other party.

I think the way that the work track is going, I can see that we are going to achieve that position, so I’m quite happy with the direction that we’re going on at the moment.

I think what Yrjö has reported in the past goes into a little bit too much of work in progress, really, because sometimes work in progress you talk about something and then next thing we know it’s changed, so it becomes a little bit difficult which is why I’m sort of hesitating to talk about this substantive issue, per se.

I would like to see another week progress on the work track—that IGO work track—and then I think we will probably be able to present concretely on the problem statement as well as the solution that’s being looked at.

So that's the update for the IGO work track. And while I have the floor, I'll just mention that the EPDP on IDNs is going to start its work and the first meeting has been called for on the 11th of August. Back to you, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. And as you were describing the events and providing us with an update, I was trying to click on the IGO link on our agenda and it's just sending me back to our agenda, so I was not able to see the actual IGO work track pages. I should ask staff to please check that and fix this for the next call. But that also prevented me from seeing what was that fifth recommendation that the Council did now allow through. Could you just summarize what the topic was of this one and why it was blocked?

JUSTINE CHEW: That's a good question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry to put you on the spot like this.

JUSTINE CHEW: I don't remember the actual details of it, so I'll have to refer back. Can you give me a few minutes? Or I could put something in the chat. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sure. Yeah. Fine. Please put the follow-up in the chat. Thank you, Justine, for this great update. Are there any comments or questions? And thanks for behaving like a great watch dog, pointing out things that might go wrong. Alan Greenberg, I can see your hand and I hope you haven't put it up two minutes ago.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I just put it up seconds ago, as a matter of fact, just when you asked were there any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I must be opening the right eyes. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's good. Just a brief comment that the description of what's going on with the GNSO Council about the validity of this PDP and whether it really is a PDP or not I think is taking the comments I've made before about the GNSO Council focusing on process to a level of absurdity where they're now looking at their own—what they have done and questioning again whether this is really legitimate and do they have to think about it a different way. This becomes more and more like a make work activity instead of focusing on the real job at hand. But maybe that's just me.

Any case, good luck to you all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this comment, Alan. The link to the IGO work track home has been put in the chat by Evin. Thank you for this, Evin. I don't know. I don't seem to have that link on my agenda but maybe I've got a problem with my browser or something.

No further hands on this topic, so thank you for this. I'm quickly having a look if we have Daniel and he does not appear to have made it here, so we can therefore move forward to our next agenda item and that's the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. I'll just run through it briefly. As everyone is aware, recently ratified by the ALAC was an ALAC statement in response to an ICANN public comment proceeding on the initial report on the EPDP Phase 2A.

There are several upcoming public comment proceedings. August is a pause for public comments, but you'll see at least five there on the agenda including the DAAR 2.0, the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting, which has garnered interest from At-Large, of course.

There's currently just one public comment open for decision and I've made a note that we can circulate this perhaps on the IDN Working Group mailing list for their feedback. That's the proposal for Greek root zone label generation rules closing at the end of August.

Otherwise, as Hadia and Alan have just presented, the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on EPDP Phase 2 is nearing its final stages, so a final call for comments will be sent to the list.

And the request for inputs on topics of transfer policy review PDP charter is an optional feedback that the ALAC reps are determining whether or not they wish to provide any comment. And we may hear from Daniel later on this as soon as he joins. So, with that, I'll turn it over to you, Jonathan, unless there's any other comments from others. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evin. Yeah, it's a thin week, I guess thin month. It occurs to me, because of the significance of DAAR to us, it may behoove us to try and get that conversation started early and spend a significant amount of time on what DAAR does and does not do and maybe devote a half hour or more to it on our next call or a call very soon, so that when the public comment opens, we're not scrambling to understand the issues involved.

So, can we take it as an action item to try and get a presentation on the issues surrounding DAAR and what we'll be commenting on prior to the comment period opening.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sounds good, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. So, I will talk offline but it's such a big topic for us, let's not wait until the public comment opens. There's got to be plenty of material for us to digest prior to that. Thanks. Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Jonathan. I remembered that John Crain did a presentation on DAAR before, unless I'm mistaken or hallucinating. I'm wondering whether that would prove as a useful start as well. Obviously, it's always a good idea to get someone to speak to us on DAAR again if necessary, especially on any updates.

But the second point I wanted to raise is, in addition to DAAR, there is a new tool that we might want to be aware of that's been developed along the lines of DAAR and it's called DNSTICR. That's something for us to be aware of as well. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Let's include that in our August investigation. Thanks, Justine. Any other questions or comments on this stuff? Okay. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Just so that you know, the DNSTICR is the Domain Name Security Threat Information Collection and Reporting Project. That's one thing that has received some boosts because of the COVID-19 related DNS security threats that we have seen across the world. I think it's probably something that our community also needs to publicize, because I have heard from some corners—and this is wearing another hat in my local community in the UK of some saying that ICANN is now taking DNS security seriously and certainly has not responded to anything that was brought forth by COVID-19. And of course, as you can

see, DNSTICR is something that's exactly a response—a fast response—to the growing global threat.

Now, you'll notice I'm speaking rather fast and filling up a bit of time because I was hoping that we would get Daniel Nanghaka to join us in time. Closing a call 30 minutes into it is something absolutely unheard of in this community and certainly in this working group.

That being said, we're not going to waste anyone's time, so I was going to then take us to any other business in the meantime and just provide an update that the SSAD ODP—so that's the operational design phase of the system that was designed by the Expedited Policy Development Process on gTLD registration data. They have a questionnaire that has been extended to the 5th of August. So if you request non-public domain name registration data, it would be a good idea for you to complete the questionnaire. The link that is provided there.

Alan, did you wish to say just a couple of words on this? I gather this comes from your part of the world.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Struggling to point at the unmute button. I have nothing. I haven't been following it at this point. It's clearly relevant and relevant, at some level, to our comment to the Board. But I haven't been putting a lot of effort into this at this point. So, the answer is, no, I can't give a comment on it. I can look at it if you wish and comment next week. At this point, I have nothing I can add.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We'll probably still have time next week since we'll have a few days until the end of that week. It effectively has seven questions and it asks effectively as a user of the registration data services: in what jurisdiction do you function, the number of requests you have made in 2019, in 2020, etc. It's all quite formal but I guess it could work for some users and organizations.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I noted in the discussion at the ALAC meeting yesterday and in the chat afterwards—and Leon did make a comment on it—we're raising flags in our advice that we don't believe the SSAD is going to be viable. We don't believe it's going to be viable because of the constraints put on it in terms of turnaround, priorities, the fact that it's all virtually a manual system once ... It's automated to get to the point of doing some actual work and then it's manual and what we expect to see at the pricing.

But we cannot speak personally on behalf of the actual users. We're not users of it as such and relatively few of At-Large people are going to be participants, certainly wearing the At-Large hat. But we are raising a flag and I made the personal comment saying I trust the Board is going to be talking to the users and getting their feelings directly and this is part of that process.

So I don't think we have a large part to play in it. It may be something to watch and look at the comments coming in and verify that they're in fact in line with what we are predicting they're going to be. But I think that's the level of our involvement.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. And with apologies to Satish Babu. I'll get Hadia's iPhone to jump the queue and she is connected to this topic as being one of our representatives. Hadia, are you able to comment on this?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Or indeed any updates on the Expedited PDP, which is never too late to provide us with an update. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, thank you. So, I'm not sure what Alan said in relation to EPDP 2A, but we have ten more meetings remaining and the final report is supposed to be submitted on the 31st of August, so this is when we need to be done.

And I don't know if you went into the details of the comments, but I'm sure ... But Alan and I have actually distributed ourselves on the working groups in relation to the five topics and we'll be trying definitely to push ALAC's views.

As for the ODP, as Alan said, the questionnaire is targeting the users of the system. So what we could actually do is, as end users, we could take a look at the questionnaire and try to answer it from an end user's

perspective. Like, if I'm an end user now and I would like to use the system, we could try to answer the questionnaire and thus comment on it from that point of view.

Again, as Alan said, we are not the users of the system. And also as Alan said, we as ALAC and At-Large, we don't really support the system because of its limitations. However, if those limitations do not exist or at some point are changed, then that system might be actually useful.

So, again, since it is now extended, we can actually do this. We can try to look at the questionnaire and answer it from a user's perspective [inaudible] and we could try to report back on our next meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Hadia. That sounds like a good way forward, so both you and Alan will be able to do that for next week's call. Now we are off to Satish Babu.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Olivier. Just an update regarding the IDN EPDP. This EPDP is getting started with the meeting on 11th and the chair has been appointed. Edmon Chung is the chair. So just to let everybody know that this is starting quite soon. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Satish. So, we need to get those pages prepared, the link prepared, and the standing item prepared in

our list of PDPs that we pursue in the correct section of our agenda. The 11th of August did you say it starts?

SATISH BABU: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Noted, thank you. And Hadia your hand is still up. Is this a new hand?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It's actually an old hand, but I would just note if you want to go into the details of the comments, we could do that. But if you've already done that, then nothing to add. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks, Hadia. We haven't gone into the details of the comment. We certainly have time to do so. I wasn't quite sure whether it was the—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So I could briefly tell you what the comments are leaning to in relation to each of the recommendations.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Perhaps, Hadia, I'll tell you what we'll do. We'll get Sivasubramanian—

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

So, recommendation one is asking if we have actually considered everything when we took our decision to say that [27] registrars should be able to differentiate but are not obligated to differentiate. That's actually confirming the recommendation of Phase 2A.

As you might expect, the Registries Stakeholder Group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, all of them said that nothing is to be added and that everything has been considered.

However, of course as you would expect, the ALAC, the BC, the GAC, the IPC, the INTA, we all felt that several things have not been considered. One is the public interest. The other is considering the practical experience gained since the EPDP Phase 1.

Actually, this is something we have not considered. What was the practical experience since EPDP Phase 1 final report and how contracted parties would provide WHOIS data in response to individual requests? The public interest. The SSAC also has [inaudible] security [inaudible] perspective and the [need] for the maximum amount of registration data to be available. The GAC has also mentioned that ... So there has not been an objective and a practical justification provided so far as to why such [unprotected] information has been redacted.

So those are basically the comments. We will be trying to reach a kind of consensus to which direction should we ... Of course the ALAC and other groups as well said that there's no consensus in relation to this recommendation which is absolutely true.

And then in relation to recommendation number two, which refers to NIS2 and if the GNSO should be required to follow any implementation or adoption of relevant legislative changes, like NIS2, and the general direction of the comments go towards there is no necessity for such action from the GNSO—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, I think we're—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Especially since this is going to happen anyway because ICANN Org is in all cases following what's happening in relation to new legislation or the adoption of new regulations. So, it is in a way or another happening in all cases.

And as you know, the ALAC or the At-Large said yes, the GNSO could go ahead and follow it, but perhaps it's not needed. And that's the general ... That's where generally speaking the comments are going. And then in relation to number three, [inaudible]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Hadia, just one note, we are losing you. Your voice is very faint at the moment. I'm not quite sure whether it's your phone or your line.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [inaudible] not wanted. The Registries Stakeholder Group would accept having a standardized data element as long as—

ALAN GREENBERG: She's on her phone and apparently can't listen at the same time.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: there is no obligation to use it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: She can't hear us, no.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: The Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, they did not agree to that. INTA says yes. Of course, the GAC [are with] having it standardized, the ISPCP, the BC.

So, it's basically I think, the main objection is from the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. And the Registries Stakeholder Group is—

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't hear anything at all right now, other than her talking in the background.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm reading the transcript. Hadia, I'm really sorry, I think you've dropped off altogether and even the transcriber has a problem with being able to hear you and that's a very, very good ear, the transcriber because I couldn't hear you and I could still read the transcript.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, I can stop here. What's remaining is the recommendation #5. It's in relation to the guidance in relation to having unique contact, anonymized emails, or pseudonymized emails. I would say no one actually agrees that the provided guidance is enough, apart from the BC.

So we can say that this recommendation, this is a recommendation that actually has almost zero support. So I'll stop here and thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Hadia. I think we'll revisit this next week as well. We did have a few audio problems with your going through this. I will reread the transcript again afterwards but thank you for taking us quickly through some of the points that are being developed here.

I think that we can pretty much close the call today. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. Hadia, your hand is up again.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So this is an old hand but I will prepare a presentation for next time. I'll be preparing a presentation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. It will be helpful because you have developed quite a number of points here and it looks as though there needs to be a bit further work on behalf of this group to proceed forward. I think certainly the input has been here but the points obviously being clearly laid out and, with slides, make it easier for people to follow.

No further AOBs, which means that we can check when our next meeting will be.

DEVAN REED: Hey, Olivier. It's Devan speaking. Can you hear me okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, absolutely.

DEVAN REED: Thank you. So, with the vacation, the next CPWG meeting will be on Wednesday, the 4th of August at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, Wednesday the 4th of August. Already the 4th of August. 19:00 UTC. I do note that there is an OFB Working Group recommendation prioritization subgroup call at 20:00 UTC which gives only one hour to this call. Would it be worth advancing this call from 19:00 to 18:30 UTC if this is the case or delaying the OFB recommendation prioritization back? Maybe I should ask Gisella if she is aware of the two calls and how we can do that.

DEVAN REED: I know a lot of you guys do attend both. Evin, do you have any recommendations?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Devan. We might try the 13:00 UTC rotation time, then. Otherwise, we've tried shifting by a half hour to an hour other weeks. It just depends on the preference of the chairs and the group here, but probably the easiest would be to do 13:00 UTC if there's no conflicts for that time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: One of the problems, Evin, with that is that we do have our friends in the Australasia region that are particularly badly affected by this time of 13:00 UTC since it's the middle of the night for them, which is one of the reasons why we have done the rotation. I'd be happier moving forward by one half hour, so instead of 19:00, do an 18:30 UTC which would affect me slightly for my dinner but I don't quite care about that so much as to being able to offer our friends in the Australasian region to have a happier life. Justine Chew, you have put your hand up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, if I may.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am on the phone and working. Just to say that you may also decide to ask Cheryl to push for half an hour. I don't think ... It's Alan, Cheryl, yourself and some others, but very few people in this call [inaudible]. Therefore, if we postpone it a half hour, I guess it could be okay and you can keep the CPWG at the time. I don't know how Cheryl would react but that is my suggestion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Sébastien. Let's do 19:00 and we'll shift the other one. I note from Amrita that 18:30 is a bad time for South Asia and adjoining areas of Asia. There's always a bit of a problem with all those times. Justine Chew, you have your hand up.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Olivier. It's very hard to find a time that caters to obviously everyone around the world, but in particular Asia, spanning from half the world to the other half. It's very hard. I mean, 19:00 UTC is 3:00 AM for me. If you accommodate Cheryl, you can't accommodate me, which is fine. But in any case, 19:00 UTC is when I have NCAT meeting, so that's going to be a clash for me.

And also bear in mind that the IDN EPDP is set for 14:00 UTC on Wednesday, so that could potentially give a blip to our time rotation as well. But we can sort that out offline. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Let's go forward with our rotation. So, 19:00 and the week after it'll be 13:00 and that's when we'll have the potential conflict on the 11th with the first call of the ... Let me just check on this. Yeah, I have a conflict the next week anyway.

We'll follow-up offline. We're not going to take half an hour to describe the next call. It's either 19:00 or 13:00. We'll try and work it out immediately after this call. Thank you so much to everyone for having joined this call.

Jonathan, anything else to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I think that's it. We'll start taking up some of these longer-term conversations next week. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks to our transcriber, the interpreters, and our staff of course. And have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are. Goodbye.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, all. Bye.

DEVAN REED: Thank you all for joining. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]