DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 15th 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 know this the apologies that we have received from Sébastien Bachollet, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Adrian Schmidt, Evin Erdoğdu from staff, Raymond Mamattah, and Bill Jouris.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Gisella Gruber, and myself, Devan Reed, on call management.

We have Spanish and French interpretation on this call. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and David, and our French interpreters are Isabelle and Claire.

We have real-time transcribing on today's call. I will put the link in the chat so you can all 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 speed to allow for accurate interpretation, and keep your microphones muted for not speaking to prevent any background noise.

Thank you all. With this, I turn the floor over to you, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:   Thank you very much, Devan. Welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. Today we have the visit of our esteemed ALAC liaison to the SSAC, Andrey Kolesnikov, and he'll be speaking to us about SSAC activities, recent activity, as well as the planning for ICANN72. Of course, he'll be available to answer questions as well. So that's him first, then we'll have our workgroup updates. The Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Curative Rights Protections for IGOs. The one on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data—as you know, there was a statement that went on from this one last week—and the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Internationalized Domain Names. So our update will be rather full. Then after that, we'll have the policy comment update, and finally, Any Other Business.

So at this point in time, may I ask if there are any amendments to the agenda or any additions that anybody would like to have? I note whilst you're raking your mind as to what to change that the real-time text link is now in the chat. So, anybody interested, you can click on this and you'll have a separate window that will open up with the real-time text, which is great to have, a great addition. I don't see anybody putting their hand up so the agenda is adopted as it is on your screen.

We can therefore welcome Andrey Kolesnikov, the ALAC liaison to the SSAC. He has a lot of information to provide us with, and of course, the follow up on some of the SSAC statements that were drafted in the past few months. So without any further ado, let's have Andrey Kolesnikov. And by the way, I just noticed that I missed the action items from the 8th of September. But just reading quickly through them, I'm not seeing any updates to these. They're all related to this call having Andrey

Kolesnikov speaking to us, having the minority statement of the EPDP drafted, and having the meeting today. So in order to save some time, let's go straight to Andrey.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:    Thank you, Olivier. Good afternoon, good morning, good night, whatever time it is now. Let me just start with a few recent items. We are going through the annual workshops now in SSAC. For example, yesterday we had the meeting about risks derived from the registrar name management. And the last week we had a meeting on the DNSSEC issues. This is our annual workshops. Unfortunately, it's all online because normally we get together in L.A. and we kind of miss these options to meet each other and greet each other.

Another news is that—I don't know if you heard it—David Conrad, the technical director of ICANN, is leaving the company. He spent quite a lot of time in the ICANN and we're going to definitely miss him because he's very valuable in coordinating of the SSAC stability and security issues in ICANN Org. So we're very sad about this. But I think he spent like 15 years in ICANN. I think it's way too much for the one single great company.

But let me jump to the recent issues. First of all, here the target, which I'm trying to drive from this particular meeting, I think that it's in a good tradition to have joined ALAC/SSAC meeting during the ICANN sessions. And my task and my proposal is to return back on track the next ICANN meeting and have a joint meeting where the core stakeholders of the recent published documents can deliver the information directly to the interested parties and explain the details behind these documents.

Because I'm just the spoiler, I will be giving you quick updates on the recent statements, which is SAC118 and SAC119. Let me jump into it right now.

So let's start with SAC118, which was accepted and published July 15. It's called the SSAC Comments on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP)—everybody knows what it is—on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team, Phase 2A. At this point, most of the people, that disappeared. I'm telling you, all this spanning tree of this Temporary Specification part, Phase 2A, C, B, whatever, it's getting wild but in fact it's precisely watching to the issues which are related to the security and stability issues. And this document 118 is about few specific areas. For example, the EPDP questions should be specific data elements, whether the registrant is a natural person versus a legal person.

The reason why these two documents are important for ALAC is that they directly cause the end user, basically, right? So the second question, should every registrar be required to make this determination for every registration? Question three asked by the EPDP: what evidence should be required to make the determination? And the question four was: what are the risks if the registrar's determination isn't direct? SSAC jumps in any more questions. Question five, should the registrant be required to declare whether they are natural person or legal person, and should the registrar rely on that anticipation? I just don't know how to spell it. Number six, should the contact data for the registrar classified as legal person always be available publicly? Number seven, should we collect data for the registrants classified as natural persons never be publicly available? Good one, right? Number eight, should the status of

the registrant be available publicly? Number nine, how to process with a personality identifiable information, which is PII? I like a P of a natural person is included as a part of registration of the legal person.

Actually, these are questions SSAC believes are critical because the feasibility of unique contact, for example, e-mails, already set of questions of practical examples already implemented various techniques by the registrars. It depends on the registrar. There is no uniform policy for that. That's why it becomes an issue. And also there is a whole list of issues which are not necessary to go over this time. Because as I said, I'm just a spoiler, because the core team who actually initiated and developed this text are much better speakers to explain you all the critical details of this particular document. However, I think it's a little bit appropriate to address these issues during the joint meeting between ALAC and SSAC because SSAC provides recommendation to the GNSO and ICANN Org with appropriate use of the system, which will have registrant data handled based on data security. This is a one of the core projects of SSAC.

Also recommendations to the Phase 2A, a PDP regarding individual versus legal person and related data elements of the registration data are actually important issue which should be addressed. Also, it must include the feasibility of pseudonymous—how do you spell it? Pseudonymous e-mail contact because a lot of e-mail contacts are pseudonymous aliases, not real. Well, it's real e-mail contacts, but it's not the real e-mail of the particular person. It's actually hidden. This is all about the SAC118.

I can jump to the SAC119, which is a feedback to the GNSO Transfer Policy Review PDP. It's dated August 5, which addressed two specific security risks which SSAC is highlighting. The first one is that the registrant's domain name is at risk of experiencing a discontinuity of DNS resolution. And when DNSSEC is in use a discontinuity of validation because, actually, there are two parts of it, there's a resolution and validation. Sometimes they bundle it into one registrar or sometimes they are separated because the infrastructure support is provided by another provider. Because registrant domain name is increased risk of being hijacked, that's the second issue, is the Auth-Info Code that when you change the registrar, you base your transfer on the Auth-Info Code. And if it's not managed accordingly to the best practice of the security principles, basically the registrant can lose the domain name.

So, quickly to observe this document, I can say that the service bundle scenario is when the DNS service with domain name registration is bundled then it is essential that the transfer of the DNS service be coordinated between the DNS service provider who are more often their registrar where the service are bundled in order to ensure there is no discontinuity in DNS resolution, because if you lose DNSSEC record, then the domain is not resolved anymore. When the domain name is DNSSEC signed in the bundled scenario, there's additional risk, basically, a failure to validate if the transfer is not properly coordinated. Because when you transfer your domain name from one registrar to another registrar, you have to transfer not only the domain but also the DNSSEC records. That's why one registrar can support both the registration data, the resolution, and the DNSSEC signature. And the registrar who accepted this, the new registrar accepting your record may lose, for example, DNSSEC record or do it not in a timely manner, and then your service

will be discontinued. The risks are substantially reduced during the registration transfer. If a registrant uses a third party DNS service provider—actually, the guys who's independent of the registration service provider, the registrar keeps your registration data, the DNS service provider maintains your DNS record, and provides the resolution and the DNSSEC support.

So what a SSAC actually recommends is that the Transfer Policy of your team consider this concerns and seek the necessary enhancements to the current process that will ensure a secure, stable, and resilient transfer solution in the best interest of the registrant.

Also, as I mentioned, the next issue address is uniform use of Auth-Info Code. Previously, it was included into multiple SAC recommendations. I don't remember the numbers but I believe it's not less than four different recommendations provided by SSAC. So this issue we consider it as a high risk for the registrant. So this issue might be looked up seriously in GNSO Transfer Policy Review PDP. So that's my short spoiler about these two recent documents. For more information, obviously, I would refer you to the documents. They are not long. And particularly these two documents are not complicated in terms of technical details, but they logically build around the issues which SSAC is addressing to the appropriate parties to put more details into these issues. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much, Andrey. Now we can open the floor for any questions that anybody might have.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:     I see a question in the chat from Steinar. Will SSAC give a guideline for transfer of DNSSEC domain names without using a third party DNS service? Actually, it does on DNSSEC workshops every ICANN meeting. There are, at minimum, two DNSSEC workshops where our colleagues give particular hands-on recommendations based on best practices on how to how to deal with the DNSSEC application also about the transfer of the domain name with DNSSEC. I think that I may deliver the message to my SSAC colleagues saying that once we have this document published, why don't we include the practices of this particular transfer into the workshop into the next workshop? Something like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Steinar, you have your hand up.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:     I do. Very interesting. I'm one of the reps from At-Large Working Group for the Inter-Transfer Policy Review Team. We kind of agreed that the policy should not necessarily put dependencies on technical changes but purely on the changes of the sponsoring registrar for domain names. But on the flip side here, for end users, I think it will be very, very handy to have some sort of a guideline, more in the [inaudible] style, follow me when you have a signed zone and you want to transfer from one registrar to another. So I hope this is something that SSAC or someone with technical notes can write in an understandable way for non-technical people and give some sort of a heads up for those who want to transfer domain name. Thank you.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:    That's a nice proposal, Steinar. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks for that, Steinar. The SSAC is always looking for issues to write about. So if anybody has some suggestions, I recall past SSAC chairs asking us, "Is there anything that you'd like us to have a look at, and then we'll consider it." That's a good thing forward. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment.

I did have one question. Later on in this call, we'll be dealing with the Minority Reports or minority statements made by several parts of ICANN—well, primarily the ALAC—on the gTLD Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2A. The SSAC has also made several comments of course. SAC 118 is one of them. Is there a pattern or anything that shows the alignment between the points that the ALAC is making, and SSAC is making, and the GAC are making?

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:    Well, I think it should be addressed to the PDP guys. They must take the notes and recommendations and handle it accordingly. Because I believe there are issues addressed by the different SOs. So there is a focal point which are the guys who's in a group of the PDP development. So as you see, the SSAC have a limited scope, but basically based on some no technical issues and ALAC has minor statements but the data which I have, so I believe the GAC also have something. At some point that must

be mixed into the one record, as the musician said. So, I don't know how to answer your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     I see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you. The targets that we have in the SSAC have are quite in line. The specifics are not, however. If you look at the minority statement for the raised report that Hadia I think will be reviewing later on in this meeting. The SSAC focuses on saying effort should go into essentially building the best SSAD we can. The problem with that is although it's a rather nice idealistic statement, it's not in line with the PDP recommendations that earlier phases of the EPDP made. So I'm not quite sure how the Board has the ability to effect that. Because simply the PDP that's making the policy recommendations say it. As an example, the SSAC minority statements—and I presume any advice to the Board they give—said that we should make differentiation of legal/natural mandatory for all new registrations. Well, the PDP briefly looked at that not very well, but they briefly look at that and basically went on and ignored it. So without that kind of recommendation coming from a PDP, it's just not going to happen. That's a requirement that registrars do something which they're not going to do necessarily unless it comes out of a policy statement. So although our targets are very similar and we're very closely aligned on those, exactly how we get there is not necessarily as aligned. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Andrey, did you wish to add anything?

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV: Yes. There's another question in the chat. How do I do chat? I have no idea. Okay. Here in the chat which says for TAC and Auth Code registrant [inaudible], what's the key methods do SSAC suggest?

Actually, SSAC is not suggesting any particular technical methods. But it's important to say that there were parts of this issue related to the Auth Code for the transfer which is SAC007, SAC040, SAC044, SAC074, if you look at the previous recommendations. For instance, in one of the first documents, SSAC stated that registrars have an obligation and strong business incentives to reduce the risk of domain hijacking and loss due to mishandling of names and registration information. Also, it says that it must be a part of the Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) which is used for the registration data handling. So, Auth-Info Code must be uniform and establish uniform default settings of domain locks across registrar. I believe that it is implemented by all the registrars. Also in the SAC40 document in the context of measures registrars take to protect registrants against account hijacking.

There was a reiterated advice given following the SAC007. Also, SAC044 reiterated much of what SSAC has already said on the subject in 007 and 040 yet directed towards the registrants. You see SSAC is paying a lot of attention to that. Also, it's all an advice. It's not the technical instructions to the registrars and registrants. But, for example, SAC044 is advice to the registrants, not to registrars, on how they can protect their domain names from hijacking. So the Transfer Policy Review Work Group based their resolution and advices based on this already published but

not outdated documents. So that's basically it's all about the SSAC recommendation. So it's not an instruction, it's not a protocol. It's recommendations to pay particular attention to the certain issues. So that's how it works.

Definitely, the joint meeting, the deep technical questions can be addressed to the team who actually develop and recommend. It's well known that's Greg Aaron, Joe Abley, Steve Crocker, and Patrik, and John Levine, and James Galvin, Jonathan Spring. Definitely, a few of them will be present at the meeting. So, the particular technical questions can be addressed to those guys who are really technically advanced in terms of knowing the particular technical details on how it's done on the EPP level or in registrar policy engines which actually does the transfer. Thank you.


OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Steinar Grøtterød?


STEINAR GRØTTERØD:     Maybe I'll rephrase. If I rephrase it's kind of differently—because in the PDP working group for the inter-transfer stuff, we have discussed very detailed criteria for creating the Auth-Info or the Transfer Authorization Code as we now call it. We have also looked at the SAC documents, etc. But one of the key questions that come up is will it be kind of acceptable to have an inter-transfer policy that it's totally depending on the Auth Code? This has been asked because several ccTLDs do have that kind of provisioning. So my question is a little bit to SSAC. Will SSAC put that on the agenda and give some sort of feedback into that particular question

about having one source of authorization to have a valid transfer being executed?

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV: You mean one source of authorizations like a third independent party for the Auth Code?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. For example, if you trust the Auth Code and not add documentation, notification to registrant, etc., but purely trust the Auth Code being executed by the registry and thereby also change responding registrar. That will be some sort of item for SSAC to discuss?

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV: Let me address this question to the team.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, perfect. Yeah.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:     Olivier, I hope that builds you some issues and minutes to this meeting. So I can just copy paste it and not forget it. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     There will be a transcript. So you'll probably be able to get it from the transcript. Or I noticed that we could have an AI on this. Steinar, if you can just send a note to staff privately to say exactly the AI that needs to be taken.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:     Okay. Very good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you. Thanks very much for visiting us, Andrey. One last question that I did have actually just reading through the list of SSAC comments and SSAC advisory that was sent so far, a lot of it relates to the Subsequent Procedures, to the Expedited PDP on gTLD Registration Data. Presumably some of this advice was sent to the Board. Has there been any feedback or anything from any of your advice in recent times? Or is this all being currently logged as—

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:     No. We do have a system which basically tracks the recommendations and advisory per number. So if I can answer your questions, I would need to go to my computer, return to the office, and look back to the huge table which tracks the Board decisions or recommendations or whatever actions they take for every document. Of course, it has a

backlog because usually it's not an immediate reaction from the Board side. It takes weeks, months, sometimes a year to get a particular action item on the Board side per each SSAC advisory. So for this particular one, I think for the recent ones, I believe there is none yet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Obviously, it's all piling up. I see Alberto Soto put his hand up. Then we'll probably have to move on. So, Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Olivier. As a party ensuring the transfer, I was wondering if it wouldn't be more advisable to implement digital signatures? Because that would help us with the differentiation between legal and natural. Because the trusted third party would be in this case the provider of digital signature. When I go to a digital signature provided, I have to state whether I'm a legal or a natural person. If I'm a natural person, the requirements are minimum. If I'm a legal person, I have to submit lots of documentation to justify that, to explain that I'm a legal person. Thank you.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV: Well, I can quickly answer this question. It depends on the country. It depends on the national regulations. For example, in Russia, in order to obtain a digital signature, it's a license, first of all. Second, you have to provide a lot of data as a legal person in order to obtain a digital

signature. So it all vary by the local laws, and there is no uniform solution for this one. This I can speak about Russia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Okay. Thank you. I think that's it for today. So thank you so much for joining us.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:     Thank you. It's always my pleasure to be with you guys.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     We're going to follow up with you. I guess Maureen Hilyard will follow up with you and the group that's dealing with arranging the meetings will follow up with you on the next ALAC/SSAC meeting, which should take place at the next ICANN meeting 72.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:     Right. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     So watch this space. Thank you so much. And thanks to Justine also for putting the link to the Board Advice page. I'm just looking at it at the moment. I'm rather shocked to see the summary of advice items by Advisory Committees, and the total open items for the ALAC is still 50 items with none of them having been closed in the past 12 months. I'm not quite sure what this is supposed to mean but somebody is going to have to look into this. It doesn't look too good at the moment.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:     That was a good question. That was a good question, Olivier. That's right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Very strange. We're going to have to look at that. But okay, I'll let this to be picked up by someone else. I note Alan Greenberg has put his hands up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Thank you. I haven't looked at that list yet. But typically, every statement the ALAC makes gets listed in the advice register for reasons that are lost in history. Typically, it's just a matter of bookkeeping to say they haven't been closed. Most of them are not really advice to the Board. I've never understood why they're listed as advice, but that has been one that's been done in the past.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Alan, none of them have been closed in the past 12 months is interesting when I can think of at least a couple that couldn't be enacted on. But maybe these are bigger issues because they relate to the advice given on the gTLD registration data and these processes which they probably haven't looked at yet. Anyway—

ALAN GREENBERG:     Olivier, to be clear, there are a few advice pieces in those we should be looking at and tracking carefully. But the registrar probably includes a

very large number of things that are not really advice and should have been summarily closed. But that's a bookkeeping issue and they may not be doing it properly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks, Alan. Justine Chew is next.

JUSTINE CHEW:     Hi. Thanks, Olivier. Just to clarify, if you're looking at that table that I shared the link to, for example, when it says received an acknowledged 40, that's all to do with SubPro. So it's not 40 pieces of advice but it's 40 recommendations in a particular advice that they're looking at. That's how they categorize it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much for this. That explains it all, Justine, and explains that of course you're the originator of this. It's your fault. So I'm not saying you need to fix it. But obviously, we know now how this is all originated. Thanks. I'm only kidding here.

Let's move on. More workgroup updates. We now have the first workgroup update, and that's about the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. There's already been some discussion in the previous agenda item. Let's have an update on this with Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka. I believe Daniel will be giving the update on this.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, absolutely. Apologies for my voice being like this, but I just had a cough that has been attacking me of late. Following yesterday's meeting, we had continued discussion into the losing FOA. And members from the working group yesterday were so confused, some of them about the number of notifications that are being shared at every respective point. And you will discover that in the process of initiating the transfer, there are a series of notifications that take place. First of all, the TAC is created when requested. And once the step has been created, should notification be sent to the registrant to notify them?

So there are a series of poll questions that were shared during the meeting. And most of them were in favor that at least notifications should be sent, should be required in the policy. At the same time, it should be left to the registrar. So some of these questions do not come up to consensus but the deliberations continued to take place and the discussions on how the respective notification should be sent.

One of the things was that the e-mail was not considered as a secure way of transferring the TAC. And so those also need to identify or come up with different secure mechanisms of how the TAC can be transferred.

So in the series of discussions that took place that, one, the members have to consider including or excluding presented in the design of the notification template. But all this text hasn't yet been confirmed but will be shared in the process of deliberations taking place. Also, it was noted that the domain owners need to get notifications with at least [inaudible] to be able to opt out of the notifications. And in case there is need or required to include when a [inaudible] version of the transfer is taking place, then at least a notification should be sent to the registrant

or the owner of the domain. So, all the respective domains that [inaudible] process of transfer at every stage, whether it is pending or in the transfer process, a notification is sent to notify the domain owner that at least there is there is an action taking place. But then it was mentioned that at least a TAC should not be sent by e-mail but also to state that at least a secure mechanism can be created in which the TAC can be transferred. What is the secure way? We haven't yet identified the secure way of how this stuff can be transferred. And further into the discussions, the period or restricted lock or changing e-mail also considered.

But then another issue that rose up in case of transfer has taken place, how is the losing registrant meant to be able to notify the member? Is it through e-mail or something? But still they believe it was delivered at least the notification should be sent.

So there were a lot of raised concerns about our notifications being sent by the losing registrar through the registrant of the domain, which caused a serious concern over spam and security issues within the respective transfer of the domain. Those are just a brief summary of the discussions that took place. In case I've skipped something, I'm going to request Steinar to add on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks, Daniel. Over to Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:     Very good summary, Daniel. Thanks to that. I put some results from an internal poll in the working group for them in this meeting's agenda.

And what I've seen is kind of a swift from the early discussion about negative feedback from particular registrars in brackets paperwork, meaning the form of notification stuff into a more consensus about notifications are needed. I think that is very, very positive, at least in the in the line of work that the feedback At-Large has given to the working group. We're working in the correct direction, at least in the way I see it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Steinar. I understand you've actually included a copy of the responses of that poll at the bottom of the agenda. I wonder whether that can be scrolled by staff. Don't know if it will show on there. There you go. Is that the one?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Correct. That's the one. And you see, this was questions that was addressed to them, to the members of the working group. And only members, not observers, could respond to that one. So take the first question here. Should the losing registrar notify the registrant when the TAC is requested, the Transfer Authorization Code? You see that more than 90% is actually positive in a notification one way or another. The way at least the way I see it, this is one of the central things and essential things that we should be aware of, that a registrant should be notified in the different steps.

One of the things that also come up was that there might be several steps being defined in the policy. But these can be combined into one

step. There was a proposal to combine it into one step as long as they fulfill the policies of the different cases or notifications.

I hope this is highlighting one of the questions we arise in the previous CPWG meeting about what sort of elements should be required to put in the notification on the different cases. And maybe next time, we will try to find some sort of streamlined documentation and give a poll in these meetings. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much for this, Steiner. Of course, we haven't got time to go through each one of these questions. But for people who are interested on this call, that table here is at the bottom of the published agenda page on the wiki so you can look through it. I had a look at it. It's great to see that there appears indeed to have been some shift in some understanding that there needs to be protection for the registrant at the end of the day. That looks good.

We have to move to the next workgroup update, and that's the Expedited PDP Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs. Thanks to Daniel and to Steinar. And now opening the floor for Yrjö Lansipuro.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:     Thank you, Olivier. I have some fresh news and good news. That is to say on the Public Comment page, what has appeared there just a few hours ago is the Initial Report from the EPDP on Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs. That is to say we, the EPDP, at this stage is done. It's out of our hands and it's open for submissions starting today and ending October 24. So I don't know. I could go through the

recommendations once more. But to save time, Olivier, if you agree, I could just let everybody read them in the report.

As far as the follow up is concerned, I hope that time would be found on a CPWG call for Justine and the others who have been there and me to put some questions to the CPWG to get guidance on how we would comment, whether we could file a public comment, I assume the root, and then what we should say on the whole. I think this is a good result for the end users. Because for the end users, in my mind, the main thing is that there will be a mechanism, a procedure for situations which potentially can be confusing for end users. So I will actually stop here and let you all find out the recommendations from the report that is now public and published on the Public Comment page. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks very much for this, Yrjö. I think that what we can do indeed is to perhaps spend some time that either next week or the week after for Justine and you and others who have been following this process to ask your specific questions and let us all read through this report within the next week. I guess the action item being that this announcement needs to be sent to the mailing list for anyone interested to read through it and come back with some feedback. We can therefore move on to the next agenda item.

So next week or the week after, I'll check it with staff, mainly Evin and with Jonathan, and see what we have in the next week. And depending on what our workload is, it will either be next week or the week after. That should provide you with plenty of time to put together a proposal and, of course, this is going to be a comment period. We will require

some volunteers also to help out, so anybody wants to step forward, they will be able to do so at an early stage. Thank you, Yrjö.

Now we've had to two pieces of pretty good news on two policy processes. Let's see if the third one is as good. That's the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data. This one has a number of minority positions that have been sent this week. I was reading through the mailing list of this EPDP and it was staggering to see the number of Minority Reports. In fact, I think that every single group that participated has actually come up with a minority position as well. Is that consensus? Let's find out from the two representatives of the ALAC on this. That's Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you. Hadia has a presentation. But just a quick comment on your comment, these things are called minority statements. There was actually a long discussion about this at the end of Phase 2. Even though they're called minority statements, it's an opportunity for the group to say something, not necessarily to express an opposition or a minority position to some of the recommendations. So don't let the name minority imply that they are against everything. In some cases, they are simply reinforcing things that were actually recommended. That's certainly the case of the Registrars and Registries. So it's a nomenclature issue. Don't let that confuse you and make you think that they're opposing something. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     But reading through these one after the other, it doesn't look like there's so much consensus, though.

ALAN GREENBERG:     There's not necessarily consensus. But the fact that, for instance, the Registrars put in a statement does not mean what they are saying was against the recommendation. They are, in fact, in general reinforcing the recommendations. But they're called minority statements, nonetheless. So yes, there is a lot of opposition, not necessarily from them. But just don't let the name imply that the ones submitting the minority statement is necessarily opposing what the recommendation was. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks for this, Alan. Let's hear from Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:     Thank you, Olivier. I will walk you through the statements. I did not include the ALAC statement because we have already discussed it before and it's been posted. So the next Council meeting we will include a discussion on the EPDP Final Report, which will include the minority statements. The Council will vote in October. So they're not going to vote during the upcoming meeting. So they will take their time to discuss the report and maybe also address any remaining questions between September and October. So if we could have the next slide, please. Thank you. So this is the agenda. I'm basically walking you through the statements. If we could have the next slide, please.

So that's the order in which they appear in the report. So the BC, generally speaking, they say that the resulting policy exceeds what is necessary to protect the data of natural persons. And then in relation to the unique contacts, it says it's an ineffective policy, what we have developed is an ineffective policy. In relation to consensus, the BC does not support a consensus designation. I will note here that the BC is the only group that stated that they do not support a consensus designation that clearly.

Going into more details, in relation to legal versus natural, the two questions that we were addressing. First, whether any changes were required in relation to EPDP Phase 1 recommendation, which said that contracted parties are permitted to differentiate between the data of natural and legal persons but are not obligated to do that. And the other question we were addressing, if there can be any guidance that could be provided to registrars and registries.

So the BC, like us, they see that there is lack of enforceable outcomes, a lack of responsiveness to the European legislative processes that will impact/develop policy. And they namely, of course, mention NIS2. They say also that NIS2 would not only impact the issue of legal versus natural differentiation but also other RDDS policies like accuracy, critical data elements, timely publication of non-personal data, and timely response to legitimate access request systems. They also say that ICANN policy must require such differentiation to ensure the security and stability of the global DNS.

They mentioned a recent survey by the Messaging Malware and Mobile Anti-Abuse Working Group, which details the substantial limitations of

current access to non-public domain name registration records. And that the currently discussed policies would not meet the needs of law enforcement on cybersecurity actors. In relation to Recommendation 17 which says that the contracted parties are permitted but not obligated to differentiate, they, of course, see that differentiation should happen.

In relation to the Code of Conduct, they see that the recommendation as it stands is weak, it's not strong enough. It's worded in a way as to encourage the beginnings of a Code of Conduct and that the construction of that Code of Conduct needs to include all relevant stakeholders or those impacted by the Code of Conduct. And the discussion here was always thought maybe that Code of Conduct needs only to be developed by the contracted parties. Of course, the BC and others, as you will see, they all think that all stakeholder groups impacted by such a Code of Conduct needs to participate in developing it. If we could have the next slide, please?

Feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized e-mail address. The BC continues to say that registrant-based pseudonymous e-mail address should be required to facilitate the investigation of DNS abuse by enable contactability and cross-referencing of registrations by registrants. Also, they recommended that contracted parties evaluate legal advice and assess risks, benefits. Safeguard is likely to result in over cautiousness. Like they said, this recommendation would lead to not having an e-mail address as pseudonymized or anonymized e-mail address that would provide contactability and also cross-referencing.

So as you can see, generally speaking, the BC minority statement, the items that they're handling are more or less the same items that we also

discussed. So there is a general agreement, an alignment between our statements and the Business Constituency statements. If we could go to the next slide, please?

I should note that those statements are more than between three to four pages. So those are just some bullet points. If you want to, of course, get into more details, you need to go back to the report. So this is by no means the exact statements. Those are just some bullet points but I fixed in order to give you a general overview of what the minority statement is saying.

So, the IPC recommend from the general EPDP Phase 2A policy. They say that the EPDP Phase 2A Final Report fails to accomplish its ultimate goal. It fails to meet the overarching goal of the EPDP to preserve the WHOIS database to the greatest extent possible while complying with privacy law. In relation to consensus, they are supportive of the consensus achieved to create standardized data elements to reflect the legal versus natural, from the data element that actually allows for the differentiation between legal and natural persons data.

Then getting into more specifics, of course, the IPC they do not support many other recommendations. But generally speaking, they're also talking about registrants self designation and we should have actually relied on self characterization and allows for differentiation to be obligatory.

In relation to the common data element, of course, they support that. We support that as well. The BC supports that as well. In relation to the Code of Conduct, like the BC, they see that this recommendation is so weak and that it does not allow this Code of Conduct to actually happen

because the community has a lot of priorities, and the way it is written would put it at the end of the world, leaving no space for actual implementation. However, they say it is going to be developed, then it should include all stakeholders that group.

I forgot to mention another thing. We say in our report that the issue of Recommendation 17 which says that contracted parties are permitted but not obligated to differentiate them. We say that this issue has been resolved. So, actually, no consensus has been received or reached in relation to this recommendation, and so here this issue has not been resolved. Reaching no consensus does not mean that the status quo differentiation holds and that there is consensus that the status quo holds. So, this is what the IPP think, and also the BC. If we could go to the next slide, please.

In relation to unique contacts, they also see that pseudonymized e-mail addresses should be required. Of course, they mentioned the reason, which is the public health interest which outweighs the rights of the registrant. Again, what the IPC, the BC are saying, we said as well. If we could go to the next slide.

We have now three groups saying the same thing. And now it's the GAC. As you all know, the statement of the GAC has been supported by us, the BC and the IPC. Then they recommend, generally speaking, on the EPDP Phase 2A policy, they say it falls short of the GAC's expectations for policies that would require the publication of domain name registration data that is not protected under the EU general data protection regulation, and create appropriate framework to encourage the

publication of pseudonymized e-mail contacts with appropriate safeguards.

I just want to note that this title that I put "General EPDP Phase 2A Policy," this does not exist in the report. This is just a title that I put in order to generalize what this group is saying about the overall policy without getting into the specifics. I do see some constructive components in the report such as the creation of the data field to flag legal registrants and personal data. They see the specific guidance in relation to differentiation is also a constructive component, the encouragement of the creation of a Code of Conduct also as a constructive component, but they also note that all affected stakeholder groups should be able to participate in developing this Code of Conduct. Also the encouragement of the GNSO to follow legislative developments, they see this as a constructive component, and the guidance in relation to pseudonymized e-mail addresses. If we could go to the next slide, please.

I would mention here that maybe the GAC is the only group that pointed clearly the constructive elements of the report. So, in relation to again legal versus natural, as all of us there saying that they are concerned that all of the recommendations are optional rather than required actions. Also, they see that differentiation should have been required. They also mentioned the public interest. So, basically, they're saying all what the other groups said in relation to feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform and anonymized e-mail address.

The GAC here welcomes the step to provide guidance from publishing an e-mail address to the data protection methods of using anonymizing

techniques. They note the benefits of publishing pseudonymized e-mail addresses. They also mentioned the web forms and that there have been reports mentioning that they are ineffective system. If we could go to the next slide, please.

So that's the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. Generally speaking, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group is happy with the report. They say that they are glad to see the final topics of the EPDP Phases 1 and 2 completed, and they are glad that ICANN is finally complying with data protections law.

Generally speaking, they put some general comments saying, for example, that the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group usually alone is stressing the rights of the registrants, and saying that they should be joined by at least ALAC, SSAC, and GAC, who have clear roles in representing registrants' rights. I would argue that our position actually rightfully defends registrants' rights. Of course, I would not get into the details now because this is not about our position.

Contracted parties support their customers and pointed out their own obligations to them regularly. Well, yes. But I would argue that also we have also rightfully supported registrants' rights. ICANN should be stressing the rights of customers in its role as neutral broker of the multistakeholder arrangements manage the gTLDs. The precise nature of the roles of ICANN and contracted parties should have been clarified. This is yes. Because we have not really identified the roles of the parties, much time would have been saved and confusion avoided had we been more aware of these eventual contractual relationships. I think the ALAC has also said this many times. We have not mentioned this in our

current minority statement because if we only addressed the two topics that we were discussing during Phase 2A.

Also, they mentioned the desire to curb the implementation of the GDPR years before protection regulation would be enacted and cause international laws. They're within here to NIS2 and similar protection regulation, and they're saying that we should not make such regulation into consideration now. And they say that if we do that, it means that we failed to appreciate data protection law and registrants. Actually, I don't know how NIS2 and protection regulation in order to actually assist data protection law and registrants. I like to enhance it. It's not otherwise. If we could have the next slide, please.

In relation to legal versus natural, of course, as we all know, they say it is not practical or desirable to mandate distinction. They actually say that the guidance is an excellent one, which is the guidance in relation of course to differentiation between the natural and legal persons. I would say that the registrars and the registries do not say that. So the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Groups are convinced that it is good, but they're also convinced that it should remain as a guide and not become part of the policy. So, it should not at any point become an obligation to follow. It should remain a may.

They say ICANN is perfectly capable of pointing it as private sector best practice and contracted parties capable of publishing the guidance on their own. Again, saying it should not be part of the policy. Then in relation to the common data elements, of course, they say that they were not supporting it but since it is optional, they're sort of okay with it because it's not mandatory. If we could go to the next slide, please.

So starting from here, we would find many of the comments actually talking about the common data elements. So the Registries, the Registrars, and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, they're not in favor of such an element. However, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Groups are agreeing with it. And we'll see the others. The Registrars as well, the Registries not as much. So the Registrar Stakeholder Group, they're saying that the Registry Stakeholder Group team is confident but the outcome of the Phase 2A work including the guidance and the optional requirements for differentiation and use of a registrant base or registration-based e-mail address is the appropriate result. So the Registrar Stakeholder Group, generally speaking, is agreeing with the outcome of the report.

Also, they're saying that registrars must be able to determine what they consider to be commercial and technically feasible. We should find the registries also saying the same thing. Each individual registrar must be able to determine the level of risk they assume and the registries will be saying the same.

Policy obligations were not grounded in strict necessity or broadly accepted improvements to the domain ecosystem. Again, many arguments were put through for why actually requiring differentiation was a good thing to do, and why actually the creation and obligating the use of common data elements was a good thing to do and to the benefit of the whole Internet community. However, those arguments were always ignored. If we can have the next slide, please.

So, specifically, speaking in relation to legal versus natural, they are of the view that the question in relation to Recommendation 17 of EPDP

Phase 1, which contracted parties are permitted but not required to differentiate is resolved. So, the issue is closed in their view. They also say that the use of flag or flags to indicate personal type or the presence of personal data as well as the contents of the guidance itself has been accepted or approached as optional. They elaborate on this optional part.

In relation to the guidance, they say it is useful, but it is not applicable in all situations or to all registrars worldwide. So, that is why they see that the guidance should remain as an option. And then the Code of Conduct they say that it can be created by the relevant contracted parties themselves with all due consideration of input from the community. But again, they're saying that if a Code of Conduct is to be developed, it would be mainly to contracted parties who would be doing this.

The feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized e-mail address, they say that each Registrar Stakeholder Group, each individual registrar must be able to determine the degree to which they assume legal risks. So if we could have the next slide, please. So, the registrars, they do agree to the report. They just trust that the common data elements needs to remain optional, and that differentiation should also remain optional.

The Registry Stakeholder Group, generally speaking, they say the Registry Stakeholder Group does not object to the passage of this report and the recommendations as stated. It is noted, however, that this support is based on the good faith, belief that all parties maintain the agreed level of consensus. Agreed level of consensus, of course, means

that definitely you cannot change something from an option to a requirement or change/shift to a must or disclosure to publish.

However, this statement is quite confusing because when we get into the details, the Registry Stakeholder Group, they clearly say that they request the GNSO Council's, first, Examiner Recommendation 1 from the perspective of whether the proposal is in fact within the scope of the Phase 2A work prior to considering whether to approve the recommendation. Recommendation 1 is about the common data elements and they are of the view that the common data elements, the creation of common data elements is out of scope. And the reason for that that they say that, we were instructed to address two questions. One, whether the recommendation from EPDP Phase 1 should remain as is or be modified. The second is in relation to guidance. However, I would note here that the common data element was actually created as part of the guidance. So again, their general statement is they say they do not object to the passage of this report and recommendations. However, they do question whether the common data element is in scope or not and they require the GNSO Council first to examine this recommendation and determine whether it's in scope or not.

Again, they do see that the legal versus natural issue is resolved, like the Registrar Stakeholder Group and like the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. Optional differentiation remains a good outcome. So basically, they're restating their position. The only issue is the part for the common data elements. If we go to the next slide, please.

Okay. That's about the SSAC minority statement. The SSAC did actually—I wouldn't say it's really a minority statement, it's more of a

general comment. So, they put forward a comment on the EPDP in general. And then they addressed the specific issues that we were addressing during this policy development process. So generally, they say that the SSAC believes the focus of the ICANN community and ICANN Org's attention to build and operate an effective SSAD. However, I think we would all agree to that statement. However, maybe we don't agree that this is the current SSAD that we developed. So, I think we all were under the thought that having a unified System for Standard Access and Disclosure is a good thing. However, what has come out of Phase 2 is not really what was envisioned.

Then they put recommendations. One is in relation to SSAD, the first one, and then second is in relation to the legal versus natural distinction. So, they say data owner should be defined that denotes the legal status of the registrant. The data owner should be displayed as part of the publicly available data. Registrant should be classified as either natural or legal persons, and this should happen at the front of our discussions. We also said that with new registrations. And then for old registrations, they would state the value of unspecified until the registrants are contacted and the registrant type or status is updated. If we could go to the next slide, please.

Then in relation to the feasibility of unique contacts, they explain what happens that unique contact was quite a vague term. So the group decided to determine what are the goals for advocating for unique contacts and defining them. We actually had two goals. One is the ability to effectively contact the registrant without disclosing personal data, and the other is actually having a common identifier that helps investigators to correlate domain registrations. As we've seen, the BC

and the IPC, they stress that for the need of both, and maybe the GAC as well to some extent the ability to contact the registrant but also the ability to correlate.

Then the SSAD goes on saying that we propose two terms, registrant-based e-mail contact and a registration-based e-mail contact. They describe that the registrant-based e-mail contact is an e-mail for all domains registered by unique registrants. Registration-based e-mail contact is separate single use e-mail for each domain name registered by a unique registrant. We have actually defined those terms and our question to Bird & Bird, they supplied us with a table associated with those two types of e-mail contacts.

Again, they are the view that the policy objectives, we have two policy objectives. To achieve the first policy objective which is to contact registrants, that registrars should deploy or continue to deploy methods to support registrant-based e-mail contacts. And then in relation to the second objective which is correlation, they think that this should be addressed not at this time, like later. If we could have the next slide, please.

So I'm done. Basically, those are the recommendations. We can see that the Registry Stakeholder Group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group are in agreement, I would say, with the report, apart from the Registry Stakeholder Group which has some concerns about the common data element being in scope or not. And then you find all the other groups, actually, in a way or another, in alignment. So, this is where we stand and this is how the EPDP Phase 2A ended. I would again say that having this common data element is a

positive thing and set the foundation for the technical foundation for differentiation, which in my opinion is a success. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thank you very much for this, Hadia. We are at the half-hour mark. I think that, unfortunately, our real-time text transcriber needs to drop off but thanks to them, we're doing this. We now have a short extension for questions and comments. There are two people with their hands up. Let's just keep this quite short please because we are really on borrowed time. So, Christopher Wilkinson is first.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:     Thank you. Thank you, Hadia, for the detailed exposé. I just want to make one general point. That is the use of this term minority statement. We've had so many minority statements explained to us. I wonder where is the majority? And furthermore, we're told that we have minority statements from the Registries and the Registrars in support of the report. This is totally bizarre. But coming closer to home, it is completely unacceptable that At-Large and ALAC particularly describes themselves voluntarily as a minority. That is completely unacceptable to our membership or it should be.

The multistakeholder model was set up to contain the commercial and business interests of the operators, basically, in the same way that national regulation contains those in the public interest. But if it's not done, it's because we are not doing our job. It's not that we can just put up and say, "Oh, we're a minority." The majority is a small minority and we should reject this term. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you, Christopher. I would say the majority is the report itself. But I do agree with you that the title Minority Statement does not really in many of the cases actually reflect what's in there, really.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm glad you agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, yeah, Christopher, I think we did have a discussion on this, but I guess they're called Minority Report as a matter of procedure in the PDP, is when you've got the main report being drafted, and then each one of the constituent's component parts that took part then falls in a Minority Report. It doesn't make a judgment on whether this is the majority or the minority. That goes further.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Olivier, the outside world, starting with the Board, will treat Minority Reports as minority. And this seriously prejudices the ability of ALAC to represent and argue for and obtain the interests of Internet users worldwide.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's understood. Thank you, Christopher. Let's have Jonathan's Zuck.

| JONATHAN ZUCK: | Thanks, Olivier. I'll be brief. I think there's a kernel of something interesting in Christopher's intervention, in that we may want to just start changing the rhetoric that we use and frame our statements as the majority or something like that. So it's something to think about that we need to look into. |
|---|---|
| | I wonder, my question for Hadia is, what is our takeaway from this recitation that you gave? Is there a way to graph the issues that were handled by the reports and where different groups fell on it? Because that part of defining the "majority" would be due to find some way to make it easy to see some of the positions we've taken as majority positions by putting them side by side or putting them into the same graphic or something like that. Otherwise, I'm not sure what our takeaway was from this detailed presentation that you gave us. |
| HADIA ELMINIAWI: | Okay. Thank you, Jonathan. I was actually thinking of putting this in a graph. But then I was not sure if this is actually a good thing to do. But let me do it. And maybe we can take one minute on our next call to look at the graph. |
| | So I tried to say my takeaways. But obviously, if you can see them through a graph, that would be different. So definitely, you can see that the BC, the ALAC, the GAC, and the IPC are aligned on all of the issues. And then you have the Registrars, the Registry people in the group, and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group aligned also. But we can see that also item by item. |

Thank you for mentioning this. I had also this thought that maybe it's better to see it than just to go through the bullet points. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Hadia. Thanks, of course, for all the work that you've been doing to produce this. We are somehow running out of time. Christopher, I note your hand is still up. I do have to read from the chat that Leon Sanchez, our Board member selected by the ALAC, mentioned that the Board treats all statements on equal grounding regardless of how they are labeled, even if minority. Perhaps that would have been in quotes. So that's something which is important to note and I guess we shouldn't be so concerned. But your point is taken.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. That's an old hand. I thank Leon for his understanding for the precisions. But I see this from the point of view of politicians, legislators, Internet users, registrars and registries worldwide who will take minority for what it means in English and ignore it. It won't do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. We do have to move on. So thanks for that. We have just a few minutes to continue this call. We do have one more Expedited Policy Development Process, and that's on the Internationalized Domain Name. Now, unfortunately, I think that Satish had to leave us at the half-hour mark. And I don't know if Lianna is on the call.

Satish did send me a note quickly regarding the short updates for the EPDP on IDN. The first point being that the draft project plan has been

released and the current version shows completion of the EPDP in the first quarter of 2023. I am reading this 2023. That seems to be quite far away, bearing in mind we're in 2021. However, the basis for the plan will be discussed in the meeting tomorrow and the date may shift. So we'll see that—bearing in mind, this is an expedited PDP so I'm just a bit surprised of the 2023 mark.

The second point that he relayed was after the project plan is finalized, we will be doing deep dive into the first set of charter questions which is consistent definition and technical utilization of our RZ-LGR, which is of course Root Zone Label Generation Rules. So that's the second point that he wanted to make.

That's really the update for this week. And no doubt there will be further updates next week. Any comments or questions? Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW:          Thanks, Olivier. Very quickly, two points. One is expedited is another nomenclature that, unfortunately, provides the wrong impression. There is a reason why they use expedited. I'm not going to go into that. But it actually doesn't mean that it's necessarily a short-term thing. It just means that some parts of it isn't necessary needed, which is more to do with the issues reports that starts off the EPDP or any PDP.

Second point was just administratively, we know that the chair of the EPDP on IDN has been selected by NomCom to go on to the Board and he takes a seat at the end of ICANN72. So in the meantime, GNSO has issued a call for Expressions of Interest for a new chair to be selected. So that EOI call, I believe, closes today. So at some point in time, GNSO

Council will have to look at the applicants and then select a new chair. So we'll wait for that to happen. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Justine, this quick update. Hadia Elminiawi has her hand up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. So I have been also on the high end. I attended the IDNs group. So I would say what has been completed now is a brief survey of the work plan. This would be put in front of the GNSO Council as a project plan. Second, we're not going to split into sub groups through the number of issues, but the whole group will go through the number of issues from A to G. And then on the GNSO side, maybe they will launch a survey or try to collect some data from existing IDN TLD.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this additional piece of information, Hadia. Unfortunately, we have to move on. And so we'll have more updates on the EPDP on IDN next week.

The next segment of this call, which should be short, is the policy comment update. Evin being away this week, it's all down to Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. We have some recently ratified by the ALAC was the minority statements that we've just been discussing. There are some things

coming up soon, but the most interesting which is probably the DAAR that got discussed on previous call. I think it's unlikely that we'll be diving into these Root Zone Label Generation Rules. I don't know if somebody would like to report from the Overhead and Finance Committee. But generally, I think that the one that we're going to be working on the most is the DAAR Report. Other than that, I think it's back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much, Jonathan. So we'll see more next week. We also have Any Other Business now. And that is, of course, a repeat of the announcement that the new consultation system is up in place. So there's a link in the agenda for this. So we can ask for any any other business. There doesn't appear to be any other, other business. So that means we can check when our next meeting will be.

DEVAN REED:     Thank you. In sticking with the rotation, your next CPWG meeting will be on Wednesday, the 22nd of September at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much for this. I gather we don't have any clashes or I'm not seeing any clashes. So hopefully we'll see you all next week at 19:00 UTC. Thanks to everyone who has taken part on this call. All of the updates that we've received, very interesting yet again. And thanks, of course, to our interpreters for having remained an extra amount of time, and to our captioner who I wrongly said was leaving. So thank you, Heather, for that additional amount of time you spent with us today.

|  |  |
|---|---|
|  | And of course, thanks to our staff. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, everyone. Jonathan, anything else? |
| JONATHAN ZUCK: | That's it. Thank you. We'll everyone next week. |
| OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: | Starting your day. Take care. Bye for now. |
| UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: | Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye. |
| DEVAN REED: | Thank you all for joining. Have a wonderful rest of your day. |

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**