
DEVAN REED:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 1st of September, 2021 at 13:00 UTC. In order to save time, we will not be doing a roll call today. However, all those in attendance will be noted from the Zoom Room as well as the audio bridge. I would, however, like to note the apologies we've received from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Evin Erdoğdu, Marita Moll, Chokri Ben Romdhane, Bill Jouris, Holly Raiche and Roberto Gaetano. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Berry Cobb, and myself, Devan Reed, on call management.

We have French and Spanish interpretation on this call. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and Paula and our French interpreters are Isabelle and Jacques. We also have real-time transcribing on today's call. I'll put the link in the chat so you can all follow along. A friendly reminder to please state your name when taking the floor, each and every time, and to please speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation and to keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. And with this, I hand the floor over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Devan. Welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call that's going to be a little different from the usual because we've got a presentation of a minority statement—or at least the first discussions for the ALAC to present a minority statement for the Expedited PDP on ... It's funny because it's EPDP Phase 2A Final Report but it's actually on the gTLD registration data.

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.

So we'll start with that and then we'll have our work group updates with the different work groups that we're following very closely. And immediately after that, we'll have policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu and finally, any other business, where we'll remind you about the new milestone for the improved public comment feature. At this point in time, we can move the agenda around or make some additions so the floor is open for suggestions.

I am not seeing any hands up so the agenda is adopted as it currently is listed on your screen. You can, of course, access the agenda by clicking on the link in the agenda page. You've got all the different features there. And it's particularly important when we'll have some documents to look at.

I also remind you of the real-time text transcription that is taking place. Devan has very kindly put the StreamText link in the chat. I really recommend having a look at that because sometimes you miss some things in the discussion and it's good be able very swiftly just scroll back for a second and see exactly what was said. So that's the RTT link.

Now, with the agenda being adopted, we can move to the action items. There are two action items that remain to be fulfilled. The first one relates to the discussions that we had last week on the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. And there was a poll that took place. The question was do you think that the post-notification will work as a losing FOA? So that was when a transfer is being effected, the losing side—the side that has not got the registration anymore—could only be notified afterwards. Or should they be notified in different ways than just being notified afterwards?

The majority response was “not sure,” followed by “yes,” and then “no.” It was a very strange poll. So today, we’ll probably be discussing the follow-up to that—Daniel and Steinar have been working with their colleagues—and see what to do with this kind of result. So that’s happening in this CPWG meeting.

The second, still, agenda action item is Alan Greenberg and Hadia, who are going to be presenting us a draft—well, maybe not the draft minority statement yet but certainly the lines of what they’re thinking of. And this, then, will be drafted. The deadline for minority reports is in just over a week’s time. So we are at the beginning of a short process but it [will be sharp]. Right. Any comments or questions on these? Not seeing any hands up, let’s then swiftly go to agenda item number three. That’s going to be the presentation with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. You’ve got 20 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is Hadia on the call?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Here we go. I have not seen Hadia at the moment yet, Alan. So it looks like you might be the person.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I’m not going to present the statement at this point because we don’t have one. But I’ll tell you where we are in the situation. You may remember that last week I said that tomorrow, the last Thursday’s meeting was the last meeting. It wasn’t. The report is due to be

presented to Council tomorrow. It has not been finalized. At this point, there are still a number of significant issues in flux. They may be fixed. A new report, I believe, was probably—a new draft was probably issued last night. I haven't seen it yet but we did have a meeting yesterday. We may have resolved some of the issues. We may not. We'll have to look at the actual text.

The one thing that we thought we had gained was the creation of a number of fields indicating whether a domain had a legal or natural registrant and whether it contains personal information or not. Both of those fields were to be optional—that is, there is no obligation to fill them in. The way the last draft was worded essentially said the fields will be created but didn't say where. So creating them on a notepad on your desk would have been sufficient. And I believe the current version now has some substantive references to RDAP, which implies that we are talking about WHOIS-type elements.

Phase 1 of the EPDP specified all of the WHOIS-type elements in great detail. We are specifying new elements and not specifying them in great detail. It's not clear why what was deemed to be policy two years ago is no longer needed to be policy but can be hashed out by the Implementation Review Team. But that is the ruling that we're working under at this point. So it's a little bit confusing. To what extent the final wording will be something that we are happy with is not clear.

Another point of contention has been that there were some statements within the body of the report, saying that some of us disagreed and giving a little bit of an indication. I believe the current version is we will remove all of those references. The chair will formulate a statement that

will somehow convey that we have been unhappy with things and point to our minority statements. Again, that document may be out at this point. I haven't seen it yet but I've been rather busy on a number of things.

So the rest of the day is going to be a little bit busy, looking at where we are. There may or may not be another EPDP meeting tomorrow so we may have held the last one already or there may be one tomorrow. And that's where we stand. So essentially, the issues that will be within our minority statement are the same ones we've been talking about ad infinitum for the last many weeks about things we do not believe the process has gone well and we'll say it again. And that's about it. Happy to take any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Alan. I still don't see Hadia on the call. Oh. No, Hadia is now on the call. So I was going to, perhaps, give the floor to Hadia before opening the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will add one more thing quickly. There was a very surreal discussion at the end of the meeting, where some Contracted Parties were claiming that PDPs cannot change contracts. Technically, that is correct. A PDP with consensus policy does not go and alter the form of the written, signed contract. But it does have the effect of changing the terms in that contract and perhaps invalidating terms or replacing them with others. Now, technically, it does not change the existing contract. A new person

signing the contract still signs the old terms but is subject to the changes.

We had this surreal discussion about PDPs not being allowed to change the contract, which is a rather irrelevant issue. The question is does it change the effective terms of the contract? The answer is that is why we have PDPs. And yet, we had this surreal discussion with people claiming we couldn't do anything which makes a change to a contract. So I'm not quite sure where are in the world.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Certainly not the first surreal discussion in that PDP it seems—one of many.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyways ... No. You're correct. And over to Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Olivier. Alan summarized where we are. I would like to go back to recommendation number one, which speaks to the common data element. Now we have reference to RDAP so apparently, the recommendation reads, "The EPDP recommends that a field or fields must be created to allow for differentiation between legal and natural person registration data and/or if that registration data contains personal or nonpersonal data." And then, there is a sentence that says, "The EPDP expects that the technical community—for

example, the RDAP Working Group—will develop any necessary standards associated with such fields.”

However, it says, “The EPDP Team expects,” and, “for example, the RDAP Working Group.” But when we talk about SSAD in the same recommendation, we say, “The SSAD, consistent with EPDP Phase 2 recommendation, much support the field or fields in order to facilitate integration between SSAD and the Contracted Parties.”

And as Alan maybe pointed, that there were a lot of discussions related to including—making sure that this field is included in the RDDS. To us, it didn’t really matter if we mention RDAP if we do mention the RDDS explicitly, since RDAP is the protocol that supports the RDDS. So we don’t have a must for the RDDS and we don’t have a must, also, for the RDAP. But we have a must for the SSAD. And to me, this is a little bit strange because it’s like the Contracted Parties are pushing all the time not to make this field a must in RDDS or a must in RDAP. But we do have it’s a must in SSAD.

Anyway, this is how the recommendation looks like. And currently, in order to be implemented, I would like to say it should be also implemented in RDDS or RDAP but we don’t have a must there. I don’t know if this is by design or this is just how we ended but this is how it is.

And then, the other recommendation, I think Alan covered everything. So we will be removing what each of the groups think and this will be replaced by a statement from the chair and the minority statements. So as Alan mentioned, we might have another meeting tomorrow. By today,

we need to finish highlighting any issues that we see with the report and that's it. Again, I'm open to questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. So now the floor is open for questions and comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. While we're waiting, I'll make one more comment related to what Hadia said. So the field must be created somewhere or other. But one of the things that some of us were trying to achieve was a statement saying that if a registrar or registry chooses to differentiate or to identify whether information is personal or not ... If they do it—that's a freewill choice—then they should put the value in the RDDs. Now, we're not saying we're going to show it to anyone, because we're not talking about whether it's going to be displayed or not, but it should be present there. And we could not get agreement on that.

So I think we're in a new era, where making consensus policy changes which imply requirements and obligations of registrars and registries is going to be exceedingly difficult. I'm not quite sure what that means in terms of impact going forward. But in my mind, we are in a different world than we were just a few years ago with regard to how PDPs will function. And I'm not talking about the process rules. I'm talking about whether they really can have their achieved aim or not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Alan, I just wanted to go back to something you said about the minority statement. Maybe this is a nit and I apologize if that's the case. But you said the minority statement would go into the difficulties that we had or the challenges we had with the process. It just occurs to me that it might make more sense to keep our minority statement substantive to the output and use other means to communicate displeasure with the process. Maybe that's an advice thing or something like that.

It just feels like the minority statement itself ought to be tight and focused on the output and the text of the recommendations, rather than getting into this almost broader philosophical conversation that you're starting to have about where we are with PDPs and whether or not we can actually change behavior of Contracted Parties. That feels like something that somehow transcends the specifics of this particular phase and its output. It's an ill-formed thought but that's what struck me when you mentioned putting that in our minority statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, Jonathan, I wasn't talking about putting that in the minority statement. We've already said something like that in advice to the Board. That's a different level. No. I'm talking about things that are more targeted than that.

For instance, you will recall that we have spent a fair amount of time talking about whether web forms are effective or not. And the way they have been implemented by some registrars makes them effectively unusable. And yet, they are the only means of communicating with the registrant. And they were dictated by Phase 1 so certainly, in my mind, they were within scope. That was ruled out-of-scope, and we can't talk about it at all, and there's not even a reference to it in the final report.

On the other hand, there is a section on code of conduct which might be created. And codes of conduct are something that are created. This is a specific code of conduct in relation to GDPR. And we have a new section on that, which is quite extensive. We spent a lot of time talking about it and yet that wasn't even mentioned anywhere. It was discarded as something we don't want to talk about in Phase 1 and yet it has been deemed to be in-scope because some parties wanted it and it was ruled in-scope. And yet there's no reasonable way that we can explain why it's there, based on the documents under which we're operating. And it's that level of inconsistency that we have issues with.

The other kinds of things are our belief that we have not suitably investigated certain things that we were charged with investigating—that we have essentially discarded them without a lot of substantive investigation, without any research. And those are the troubling ones. So again, we take the legal opinions that we pay heavily for as gospel except when they are discarded as, "Oh. We don't want to follow that." So it's that kind of process that we're going to talk about, not, "Is the PDP on its deathbed and broken?"

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia Elminiawi?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. Also, to Jonathan's question, other issues that we would most probably also mention in the minority statement. For example, when examining it or trying to look at the benefits of differentiation and why differentiation should be obligatory, we didn't rigorously look into the public interest and the balance that should happen between the registrant's rights and the security of the Internet users. So this was not really looked into.

Also, other parts—the common element, for example. We think that the RDDS must support the common data element and the SSAD must support the common data element. However, we don't have that. Also, we think that all Contracted Parties should use this common data element, whether they differentiate or not. So we don't only think that differentiation should be required but we think that every Contracted Parties should be able to use the common data element whether it differentiates or not. And the reason for that is that the suggested data element takes values such as ... The question was not asked. So this would allow Contracted Parties that do not differentiate to use the field as well.

So those are part of the things that the minority statement would most probably include. Also, Alan mentioned the web forms. Another thing, also. I'm not sure how important this is. But for example, we refer to the e-mail, that we are expecting it to be published, in a way or another, as

masked e-mail addresses and pseudonymous, for example, e-mail addresses.

And what does, really, masked mean? Maybe we would define that. But all the time, we defined two types of e-mail addresses—registrant-based and registration-based. And we were, all the time, talking about two types of e-mail addresses, anonymous and pseudonymous. Of course, we all concluded that anonymous won't be possible because anonymous e-mails, by definition, are non-reversible e-mails. So we all decided that we are talking about pseudonymous e-mail addresses. But again, the final text does not refer to that. So those are part of the substantial issues that the minority statement would include.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Hadia. When will you be able to have those on the wiki page? I looked at the wiki page at the moment for building the statement and it's empty at present. So will you be putting these as bullet points.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I think today. I think we can do that today.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Having them in bullet points would be really helpful for everyone to read.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I think we can do that today. Maybe if Alan has some time today, we could chat and put in the minority statement today. I would at least try to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia, have you seen a revised version of the report yet? I haven't seen one. The chair's statement was sent out but I haven't seen an e-mail with a revised version of the report. Did I miss it?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. No. But I refreshed the link that I already had and it had some updates. But whether this is the final or not, I'm not really sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I thought the last version we saw was a PDF or a Doc, not a Google Doc.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It was a PDF. You're right. It was a PDF but it does have a link.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. There was some proposed text within a Google Doc. But okay. I'll check with staff.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. But I'm not sure that we have the final thing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for putting the link, Alan, into the chat to the chair's statement. And yeah. Just a few bullet points would be helpful for people to start thinking about because we only have one week. And I guess you will be presenting this group with a full draft by next Wednesday. Now, we have Alfredo Calderon next in the queue.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Alan made a comment that bothered me for a second there. I was wondering. Is this new report agreeing with the GDPR regulation since I believe, Alan—and correct me if I'm wrong—you mentioned that you're not referring to GDPR in the discussions because that was settled previously. It bothers me when you guys start talking about some issues that affect end users and how we can relate to getting issues resolved with the registries and registrars from the registrant's point of view. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm not quite sure what you were talking about. Certainly, we are subject to GDPR. I'm not quite sure, specifically, what you were talking about, if you can elaborate.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Sure. The discussions that this 2A Phase group is having, are they compliant with everything within GDPR or is this then going to be

referred to Legal to make sure that it complies with everything? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

In theory, everything we're doing is compliant if we're doing it right. And in fact, the real issue is overcompliance—that is, GDPR protects certain classes of information and not others. And right now, virtually everything is protected, regardless of whether it's subject to GDPR or not. That's been the main subject of all of our discussions. So there's no question that we are GDPR-compliant. We are so GDPR-compliant that we are ... I'm not even sure there's a word for it.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

Okay. Thank you, Alan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Alan. I guess it's worth reminding everyone. You have a legal team on all your calls, don't you? There's a legal team that follows that and that basically tells you at all times whether whatever is being presented is GDPR-compliant or not.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Certainly, ICANN Org reviews any documents that come out and usually produces abundant comments when they think there is a perceived problem, either with legality or, more commonly, with implementation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Jonathan Zuck had his hand up and then he disappeared.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. I had a follow-up to my earlier point but I can just wait for the draft report. I think it's fine. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Jonathan. Hadia, your hand is up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. I think Alan answered Alfredo that there is no reason for us to think that what we have produced is not GDPR-compliant. If anything, we think it's over-compliant, if over-compliant is word.

But maybe, for example, if we look into the accuracy issue, some might think that we are not in full compliance with GDPR, given that accuracy, in the way that's being addressed to our policy, does not mean that the data needs to be accurate in relation to the purpose to which it was collected. So, for example, if you collect a piece of data, or an e-mail address, or contact information for the purpose of contacting the registrant, if you cannot actually reach the registrant through this contact information, then this is not accurate and it does not satisfy the purpose for which it was collected. But again, generally speaking, it is in compliance. We think it is in compliance with GDPR.

And then, in relation to Keith's statement, Keith does mention that some groups think that differentiation between legal and natural persons

should have been mandatory and not optional. And he also mentions that the publication of legal persons' registration data, some groups think, was not appropriately balanced against the risk of disclosure. But, for example, he does not mention that we also think that differentiation should have been obligatory—or using the common data field should have been obligatory—not only to those who differentiate but to all Contracted Parties. So Keith's statement is good but it still doesn't cover everything.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Hadia. Alan, anything else to add?

ALAN GREENBERG: Nope.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much to both of you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I did just find the link to the complete report. I will put it on the chat.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. So maybe someone from staff will pick that up, also, from the chat. I guess these are important reports so they have to be added over to the public comment page—the At-Large workspace for this. And I guess the other action item is for both of you to just add

bullet points to that page as soon as possible so that we, as a community, can make our own minds about the points to have in there. Good luck for the next week to draft this. I know that you will keep us aware of your progress. If there is nothing else to discuss on this, then we have to move on. Hadia, your hand is still up so I'm not sure whether you wanted the floor one more time on this topic.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No. It's an old hand. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. Thank you for following this. We might be seeing the end of the tunnel soon. But of course, still plenty of work until then. We're now moving to the work group updates. Of course, we've done the Expedited PDP on gTLD Registration Data. But the first one on our list is the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. And that, of course, follows up from the action item which I spoke about a few minutes ago regarding the poll that took place last week. Daniel Nanghaka and Steinar Grøtterød are both on the call. I'm not sure who wishes to take the floor to take us through the follow-up to this strange call—or unconvincing, should I say—unconvincing call that we had last week.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. I may start on this one and Daniel will hopefully follow me. Again, apologies for not attending the two last calls, and also, to give some sort of vague instructions about the poll. But I think, in summary now, is that in the meeting yesterday, it was more discussed about two forms of

notification—two steps of notification. And I think that is something that should be of interest for the At-Large. The first step is some sort of—how do you phrase that?—notification to the registrant in preparation for a domain name transfer. That means—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Have we lost Steinar?

DEVAN REED: Steinar, we can't hear you. Maybe you're double-muted.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's very strange. Steinar's mic seems to still be on but we can't hear him. I'm just giving it a few seconds. Maybe there's a local connectivity problem. No. And he's disappeared, I think. So I'm afraid, Daniel, it's going to have to be up to you to take us through this, please. And then we'll see when Steinar gets back on. Daniel Nanghaka.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. Just to cover from the connection that Steinar just lost, I'll just continue with update that was going on. So despite the fact that during the last call, we [inaudible] getting two forms of notifications [inaudible], the earlier notification or TAC request could be rewritten. So there was an assumption that probably, we could call it a pre-transfer notification, such that the members can be clear about which kind of notifications are being sent [to the] post-transfer notification of the domain transfer has been [left out].

Also, I'm happy to share that also in the discussions, when the polls were sent out during the working group meeting, there was still no consensus in the discussion. It was told that these discussions will most likely continue going on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're having problems Daniel's line as well. Apologies for this.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I am back, I hope.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It seems to be a game of tagging on. So the baton is back now from Daniel to Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you, Steinar. We just lost Daniel, who was providing us with an update.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I don't know what happened. Normally, my Internet connection is trustworthy. Anyway, what I was trying to say ... I don't know when I was dropped off. But yesterday, we discussed two different phases of giving notification to the registrant. The first phase is the registrant's

preparation for a domain name transfer. That notification will be triggered when the registrant is accessing the losing registrar and asking for the Transfer Authorization Code. Are we two in the line now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Could I please ask the Adigo operator to find out what line the interference is coming from? But please go on, Steinar. Keep on speaking. It's just a little bit of background noise.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Most of this information is similar to what we, today, have with the losing formal authorization. But there is also proposed elements added into this notification to the registrant—at what time and who was given the Transfer Authorization Code. I think that's of great value for the end user and those who receive this because that is in the phase before you actually execute the xml code into the gaining registrar. You have, then, the option, one way or another, to cancel that transfer—not starting that transfer, actually. And you have also the security about who was granted the Transfer Authorization Code.

The details in this is still to be discussed. So my proposal is that until we have some more meat on the bone for that kind of notification, we don't have another poll before we get that information.

The second one is that when the transfer has succeeded—the domain name in question has been transferred from the losing registrar to the gaining registrar—then the registrant will receive a notification about a successful transfer. In my opinion, the best thing here is that this is something that is sent out from the losing registrar but that it's also

possible and can be discussed whether this is an action that is required by the gaining registrar. But if we put it in from the losing registrar, we at least get the possibility to have information given to the point of contact set by the losing registrar.

So I'm really hoping that within the next meetings, we will go into more detail and more formalize this into bullet points. And I can present that to this meeting. Unfortunately, I put a note on the agenda and there was a link to a document that as actually altered after I gave the link. So it doesn't make sense what it says there, except from the first paragraph about the two different phases. So that's my initial report from yesterday's meeting. Hopefully Daniel is back online and can supplement on my report. But for now, that's me. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Steinar. Daniel, you have the floor.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yeah. Thank you very much. Steinar has just walked us through the pre- and post-transfer notification that I was beginning to speak about before I accidentally went mute. But that shows that there is going to be a series of notifications that the registrant will be having and this also is going to raise up an issue of spam, as also in the respective deliberations during the call, it was a discussion that was happening. This much notifications, are they really important or they're not important? Or it's better to be able to package them in maybe one notification. But according to the whole transfer process of the domain, it would be good

for the registration to be updated at what stage the transfer process is. That is some of the discussions that are going on.

Also just to share that a losing registrar can also prevent a TAC from being created, thus block the transfer. So in the process that the transfer has been blocked, the registrant has all the rights to either reinitiate the transfer or accept what the registrar has done in order to block the transfer. So this discussion has still to continue and we shall be discussing, most likely, that the whole transfer process can be streamlined. Just to add on that, we also highlighted that the transfer of the domain should be simple and explicit, such that it reduces back-and-forth communication. That's what I can say. I welcome questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Daniel. The floor is open now for any questions. And I note that Alan Greenberg was the fastest on the button. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't have a question. I just have a comment. If my recollection is correct, problems with transfers is the largest single item that ICANN Compliance receives comments of, other than accuracy. And accuracy, of course, in the current world of GDPR is not really an issue anymore. So transfer problems in the old regime—and I'm talking about pre-GDPR—and under the Temporary Spec, which we're currently under have been problematic. Perhaps not a significant percentage of the large

number of transfers done. But they have been arguably, the single largest complaint from registrants on the overall process.

So as we're going forward, if we are making substantive changes to that, then I think from the At-Large perspective, I think our focus has to be not on can we simplify the process but can we make it more resilient? Again, that's my position. It may not be At-Large's position, although I think it is. And that really does need to be our focus. That doesn't mean we win. But I think, both from a point of view of protecting registrants who are users and making sure that users have reliable access to domains they use, which means they shouldn't be taken out from control of the registrant without full knowledge and understanding of what's happening. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, what was the problem with them? Was it the fact that people were losing domains? You said it was the biggest source of complaints. Just domains being wrestled out of people's possession?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think I've ever seen a detailed analysis. Compliance, as you know, is creating more detailed specs and it has been. But historically, they've only had a very, very rough categorization of the issues that they deal with. And transfers are a very significant part of those. So whether this is domain hijacking or some other problem associated with transfers, I can't speak to that.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Actually, at one of the meetings, ICANN Compliance did present some statistics. I will find the meeting notes for that meeting and publish that to the mailings list. I believe there was no significant difference between Compliance between compliance connected to transfers, post- and pre-GDPR but the numbers may be correct. But this is the second item that is burdening ICANN Compliance.

However, one of the things that, at least in my opinion, may be improving this is a more detailed specification about how the Transfer Authorization Code is being handled and should be handled by the registrars. I think that with adding time to live at the TAC code and giving notification about who has granted this, this is improving security, at least in my opinion. But let's see how these things are being settled down into when it comes into the wording—at least when we have more or less finished this session of discussions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Steinar? Any other comments. I note those of Lutz Donnerhacke in the chat, mentioning that the whole process about to ease work for registrars and registries on the cost of registrants and the concern here that resellers or AuthCode handling will be moved to the registrant's responsibility. They can't even imagine the case of a fraudulent registrar. Alan Greenberg, your hand—

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Just a short comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Comment on this, Steinar.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. It's an old hand.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Actually, it's been definitely more ... My feeling is there is more consensus not to have the creation and the authority of the AuthCode or the TAC into the registrant. It should be on the registrar's side and hashed by the registry, combining that. I think the scenario that Lutz is describing is more likely not to occur. But anyway, yeah. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Steinar. I'm not seeing any other hands up in the queue. And unfortunately, as interesting as this topic is, we need to move on because there other topics on today's call and time is ticking fast. So thanks for this work and we look forward to further details next week. You pretty much know the positions here so looking forward to that.

The next EPDP is about the Specific Curative Rights Protections for Intergovernmental Organizations. And for this, we have Yrjo Lansipuro, who will be able to provide us with an update.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. A very short update. The basics of the initial report of this EPDP are in place. We agree on the definition of the IGO complainant. That's how an intergovernmental organization can initiate

a UDRP or URS in the first place and to do it without waiving its privileges and immunities. There's also a general agreement that arbitration is an appropriate solution when the losing registrant wants to appeal.

But the immunity of the intergovernmental organization precludes "action." But we still continue to debate the final concept and text of the relevant recommendation, including, in particular, whether the authorization option would remain available to the losing registrant after unsuccessfully trying to bring the issue to court. This EPDP also covers both UDRP and URS. And a large part of the last meeting was spent discussing the differences of these processes and how those differences should be reflected in our final text.

So at this stage, the task is really to formulate the text and to write the recommendations in an accurate and neutral language. This is a sensitive subject and just one wrong word can send people through the roof. So this takes time but the wordsmithing is important. And we have very good support staff and they are actually helping us to formulate these recommendations. There will be two meetings before the initial report will be submitted to public comment in September. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Yrjo. I therefore open the floor now for comments or questions on this topic. It certainly looks like there has been some progress here so that's good. No hands up so it looks like we'll just be waiting for more information in a future call. Thank you very much for the update, Yrjo. We can then move to the next update. That's the Expedited Policy Development Process on the

Internationalized Domain names, the IDNs. And for this, we have Satish Babu, who will be providing us with an update. Satish, you have the floor.

SATISH BABU:

Thank you, Olivier. We had the third meeting of the EPDP last week. Things are warming up. Edmon formally intimated to the group that he has changed the SOI, based on his induction into the Board. We were also asked to ensure that read the background documents and then all of us sign the form confirming that we have gone through the documentation. The background presentation by Sarmad, which started in in the previous meeting, was completed.

And we have started on an initial high-level review of the charter questions. There are seven charter questions. The first item in the agenda was to confirm that we will go from A to G in the same sequence. And this was agreed upon by the group.

The next was that we will look into each of these and, as an initial step, do a poll where the participants and members rate each of these items based on the complexity, with very high meaning 10 hours or 10 meetings, medium with 5 to 10, and low with less than 10. So we did two—the first two—and both turned out to be medium complexity. So we're not quite sure if this was actually because the first two are the most complex and the subsequent ones are generally felt to be less complex. But the temperature of the room was not aligned with that argument.

Then we will also be looking at if there's a need for early consultation with the AC/SOs on some of these aspects. That will be discussed in the next meeting.

The group also discussed the fact that the Wednesday time clashes with the CPWG so they were kind enough to offer another day for the EPDP meeting—at the same time but either Tuesday or Thursday. There was a Doodle poll and they decided to move it to Thursday.

So the action items were basically that, first, that all of us read the background documents that was given to us by Edmon and then update the form. And secondly, respond to the Doodle. That has been done.

As far as reporting goes, we'll be now getting into the nitty-gritties of each of these points. And these are fairly involved. Perhaps, not everybody will be able to appreciate some of these complexities. So in terms of reporting back to CPWG, we feel that we don't have to report after every meeting of the EPDP because most of the things will be low-level detail. But whenever we have a logical chunk of information that has been discussed, we will come back to CPWG and present it and take back any information from here. Or if there is something specific that is of importance that we consult the CPWG, then also we will do that. So that's where we are.

So in the next CPWG meeting, we may not be making an update because we are getting into the details of the first one or two charter items. That's it from us. Thank you very much. If my colleagues want to add on anything, they are welcome.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Satish. I'm looking forward to see any additions from Lianna or Abdulkarim. No? I think that's pretty complete. So thank you for all of this update. Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I think Satish covered most things. I don't need to add anything. So [I'm just confirming that]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Abdulkarim, for confirming this. And the point is taken that you won't be providing updates at every CPWG meeting but from time to time, on demand, when there's something happening in the group. So that's well-noted. I think, with no hands up, we can move to the next agenda item and that's the policy comment update. Now, Evin is not here this week so it's going to all fall onto Jonathan Zuck's shoulders to go through this huge section of topics that we have. So, Jonathan, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. It's actually a pretty light list still but promises to be a little bit heavier in the future. There haven't been any recent statements ratified by the ALAC, nor do we have public comments for decision, per se, right now because they're not quite open. There are some that come into our preview, including the Curative Rights Proposed Recommendations, the Japanese Script Root Zone Label Generation

Rules, the renewal of .name, the proposed Latin Script Zone Generation Rules, Myanmar Script, etc.

And scrolling down, the significant one is DAAR. I think Abdulkarim, you need to mute. The significant upcoming comment, I think, for our purposes is on DAAR. And that's going to be opening very quickly. I'm fairly certain that we will want to comment on those recommendations. There was, on a previous call, circulated a link to a presentation on DAAR that I want to, again, ask that people watch because we're going to want as much background as possible so that we're not spinning it up from scratch when this public comment becomes available.

Obviously, as we've already heard, Alan and Hadia are working on a minority statement on the EPDP, on the TempSpec for Phase 2A. But that's still in process and we hope to get some updates on that offline.

So I'm happy to take questions but that's the status of things. It's the calm before the storm. I think DAAR will be big and we'll be back into a number of things, come September. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I guess the list looks longer or larger than what it actually is since many of these are about Label Generation Rules, which the ALAC hasn't generally written much about.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But you're absolutely correct. Maybe we should have an action item on the DAAR, to keep track of where the presentation of DAAR was and already have that workspace ready so anyone can watch that presentation in advance of this landing on our desk.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a good idea. We've posted it in the chat here but I think that's an excellent idea to throw it in the workspace for the comments. I know Heidi is capturing action items for this call in Evin's absence. So Heidi, if you could make sure that page is created and make sure a link to that previous presentation is inserted under resources, as Justine suggests in the chat. We may still try to get—when this public comment comes out, get someone to make a presentation to this group. But ideally, that will be against the backdrop of already having an understanding of the primary issues surrounding DAAR. So I think that is it, Olivier. I can pass it back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. We're now moving to any other business. The first one is the much-awaited launch of the improved public comment feature. We've spoken about it in the past. There is a blog post by David Olive, the senior vice president for policy development support and managing director of the Washington DC office. And I note a whole number of lists onto what the feature improvements are—access submissions, subscriptions, etc. There are some videos on how to use it.

This is all to tell you that, yes, it's all changed there but for us, it doesn't change anything. You're still very much encouraged to help us—as a group, help the ALAC draft ALAC and At-Large policy for these public consultations. So no changes. But that certainly allows you, if you want, to draft your own statements as well to take part in an easier way. We'll see if it's easier with time. It's supposedly an easier way for this. So that's the first one of the any other business.

The second one that I've got listed—unfortunately, I didn't mention it earlier—was with Yrjo Lansipuro, who wanted to speak to us about the preparations for a joint ALAC/GAC meeting at ICANN 72. That's coming up at some point. Yrjo, you have the floor.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Olivier. Yeah. There will be a joint ALAC/At-Large/GAC meeting again at ICANN 72. And with my GAC counterpart, we have started the preparations already, perhaps a little bit earlier than before, because experience has shown that a longer review time is necessary for GAC members to participate actively in a discussion with us.

So the GAC liaison to the ALAC, Shi Young from Korea, has initiated a survey within the GAC, asking GAC members what kind of topics they would like to discuss with us. I'm now asking the same of the CPWG participants. Our meetings, many years they have been dominated or focused on two subjects—on the EPDP, the original EPDP on GDPR, and SubPro. And of course, last time, also topics like DNS abuse, ATRT3, and Internet governance were mentioned. But if you have ideas and suggestions for other topics, new topics, something that perhaps would

be of more interest to a larger number of GAC members also, please let me know by e-mail or put it on the CPWG list.

The intersessional meeting of the leaderships of the GAC and ALAC is set on the 20th September. So there is some time before that. So thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Yrjo. Let me just turn over to Heidi. Sorry to put you on the spot, Heidi. But of course, usually before an ICANN meeting, there are pages being put together for preparing the meeting. One of them is the page about the topics to be discussed with the Board, the GAC, the various groups that we are due to meet with. Do you have an idea of the timeline on how soon these pages will be ready for preparation?

I note that in recent times, we have been told that we're sometimes a little late on some of the formulations or preparations for these things. I can certainly remember the concerns with the ccNSO having last-minute discussions on having joint sessions and so on. So do you know when these pages will be ready. It just feels like—

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can see them here but over to you, Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. What I've put into the chat is the overall workspace. So we're creating the child pages that will include those questions to the Board, and to the GAC, etc. I know that Maureen wished to have the ICANN plenary topics selected first. That has now been done. So I believe that this week's or the next ICANN 72 planning call for At-Large then will move to the topic of the At-Large plenaries. And then, we'll get that date in place—all those dates in place. So it's imminent. That's my short answer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thank you very much for sharing that workspace. And Yrjo, you can see you've got the link there for the GAC discussion. I think it's in there somewhere, possibly. Anyway, it should be in there.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Olivier. Sorry. I'll ask that the child pages be created today, okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you so much. Excellent. Right. So that's two pieces of any other business. Now, anyone else wishes to bring any other business to the virtual table since this is for—just reading this—the sixth ICANN Virtual Public Meeting. So this is the second year of purely virtual calls. Well, calls are always virtual but virtual meetings, as such. I'm not seeing any hands up right now. I could turn to see ...

No. I'm not seeing anyone. So thank you. I guess the next thing is to check when our next meeting will take place and we are rotating.

DEVAN REED: Thank you, Olivier. Sticking with that rotation, the next CPWG meeting will be on Wednesday, the 8th of September at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Devan. And hoping that this doesn't cause major conflicts with the other calls out there. I do note that the IDN PDP that was originally clashing with some of our calls decided to meet at other times. So I thank that other parts of ICANN are considerate in this. I guess Wednesdays were just getting a bit too crowded. Not seeing any other hands up. I just have to ask. Jonathan, is there anything else that we need to cover today because, strangely enough, we're early.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think so. And I think it's okay for us to have a breather. We're going to be hitting it hard with the upcoming meeting. So it's okay to give people some time back, especially if they spend it watching the DAAR presentation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Just as a point ahead, next week we will have, I believe—it's got to be confirmed—but we will have a discussion with the SSAC. So that's one of the discussions. Sorry. What am I saying? Not next week. Next week, we'll have Alan and Hadia and the week after,

we'll have the discussion with the SSAC. This is how we'll negotiate so we don't crowd the meetings too much.

With this, I guess we're finished for today. So thanks very much to our interpreters for the great job that they've done and, of course, the real-time live transcription—great as well. Very helpful. Thanks to our staff, and of course, to all of you who have contributed to this call and have been participating. Looking forward to some more contributions on the mailing list this week, and of course, to our next call next week. Until then, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, wherever you are. Goodbye.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]