DEVAN REED: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call on Wednesday the 22nd of September 2021 at 19:00 UTC.

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

I would like to note the apologies we have received from Judith Hellerstein, Priyatosh Jana, K Mohan Raidu, Vanda Scartezini, Satish Babu, and Eduardo Diaz. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Devan Reed, on call management.

We do have Spanish and French interpretation for this call. Our Spanish interpreters are Marina and Paula. And our French interpreters are Isabelle and Claire.

We do have real-time transcribing on today's call as well. I will post the link in the chat so you can follow along.

A friendly reminder for everyone 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.

Thank you all. And with this, I'll turn the call over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, and welcome everyone to this Consolidated Policy Working Group Call. Today we have an agenda which comes a little bit out of the ordinary because we will first …

I guess we might have to switch the part of the agenda which requires Jonathan Zuck to be here to speak to us about the meeting with the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the ALAC statement on the Registrar Stakeholder Group Draft White Paper on DNS Abuse. We'll [look at it] a bit later or I'll cover this if Jonathan doesn't make it.

Then after that we'll have a reasonably long discussion and presentation on the ALAC statement for ICANN Public Comment on Initial Report from the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Specific Curative Rights Protections for intergovernmental organizations. And this is all ready for the first draft. They will have a discussion and some polls related to the points that are being offered there. So get ready to click away and check out those straw polls.

Then after that we'll have our work group updates. The four work groups, of course. Well, three, really. The IGO will have already been taken care of.

And after this, we will be able to look into the policy comment updates with Evin Erdoğdu. That's today's call. I apologize if you hear any noise. I'm in a greenhouse and it's [inaudible] raining a huge amount. So you might hear a bit of interference in the background. That's probably why you're hearing it. And it's not my line.

So that's what we have for today's call. So I know open the floor to any comments. And I hear Hadia Elminiawi. I see, Hadia, you put your hand up, so you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to mention that I prepared two slides today that include a graph of the different positions. I remember on our last call, Jonathan said if we could see that on a graph or maybe a pie chart. So I have prepared that. I sent the whole presentation and added two slides which contain graphs. And I will be going only through those two slides if we have the [time]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Hadia. We'll see how we can organize this. Point noted. But I'm not seeing any other hands up. Let's therefore proceed forward, and we'll go immediately to the presentation on the ALAC statement for the ICANN Public Comment Initial Report on the EPDP for Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs.

First thing, of course—and it's the second week I do this [inaudible]—I've missed out on the action items. That's because most of them are completed. But there is one about the talking points with Evin and Jonathan to look at the talking points. But that's for the CPWG on the 29th of September.

And there are also two action items that are noted for the GNSO Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. And that will be to ask SSAC to discuss and comment on the option to accept an

inter-registrar transfer to [inaudible] only based on a valid TAC code. But perhaps, could we have these two updates from Steinar during the section on the Transfer Policy Review? Is that okay with you, Steinar?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. I can comment that when we have our slot. Yeah. Okay, let's do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for that. Thank you very much. Let's go then, and we can proceed forward with the next agenda item. And therefore that takes us swiftly to the presentation on the Curative Rights Protection for IGOs. Yrjö Länsipuro and Justine Chew are our ALAC representatives on the EPDP. And they will be presenting their findings and also asking us some questions via poll. You have 35 minutes.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. Let me just say that this is not a presentation of the ALAC statement. This is a presentation of the initial report. And what the team—which is also going to draft the ALAC comment—is asking for guidance from this meeting on certain topics in this report. But I'd like to give the floor to Justine Chew has prepared a presentation on this. So Justine, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Yrjö. I thought that you were going to cover the overview. Did you want to do that or do you want me to do that?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Well, why don't you do it because you have the slides? Just to save time.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, fair enough. Please do jump in if I'm not covering everything that you believe needs to be covered. Can we go to the next slide, please? Who's …? Evin, yeah.

Okay. So just by way of [inaudible], we're going to recap the problem statement that was given to this particular EPDP to resolve. And I'm going to show you how the six preliminary recommendations that are contained in the initial report stick together. And then we'll go through each particular preliminary recommendation. And in some cases you see those with the options. So we're going to ask you, the participants of this call, to indicate which option you think is the better one.

Just a note that in terms of Preliminary Recommendation 2—I'll just shorten it to say PR2—that is just purely administrative, so we don't necessarily need to go through that, per se, because it's going to be dependent on the outcome of what we decide on for the other PRs. Next slide, please.

Just to restate the problem statement. We kept the problem statement so that people understand where the EPDP is coming from in trying to solve the problem that we're trying to solve. In fact we have proposed something that solve this too, and a bit more as well.

So the genesis of this EPDP is this particular Recommendation 5—a previous Recommendation 5 from a previous PDP Working Group which

is the IGO-INGO Curative Rights PDP Working Group. I'm not going to go into the whole shebang of this particular prior PDP working group because we kind of went through that in a prior presentation. So if you want to go back and review that, please by all means. That presentation was made on the 11th of August at a CPWG call.

But just zooming in onto this particular Recommendation 5. I'll call this the old Recommendation 5 so we don't confuse it with the Recommendation 5 that we're going to present later on.

So the old Recommendation 5 talks about where a losing registrant challenges the initial UDRP and URS decision by filing suit in a national court of mutual jurisdiction, and then the IGO succeeds in both the UDRP and URS complaint and also succeeds in asserting judicial immunity in that court.

What should happen? This particular old Recommendation 5 was rejected by GNSO Council and, hence, the problems or the challenges around it were the key questions that this particular EPDP were faced with.

But just to allude to the actual aspects of what was problematic about this particular Recommendation 5 is that the IGOs face two challenges with trying to file a UDRP claim or URS claim. And we know that the UDRP and the URS claim … UDRP is the Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Policy, and the URS is the …

Sorry. The UDRP is the … I forget now. Sorry, it's a bit too late for me. I think it's the Uniform Domain Dispute Resolution Policy and the URS is the Uniform Rapid Suspension Policy. Both were created by ICANN as

mechanisms of quicker resort or alternative resort to courts to resolve a domain name that's in dispute. Okay?

So just coming back to the two challenges that the IGO faces with respect to UDRP and URS. Both mechanisms, the access to them were on the basis of trademark rights. So basically, you needed to show that you have trademark rights tied to a domain name in order to use UDRP or URS.

And also, because IGOs—and here we're talking about domain name strings that match the acronym of an IGO and not the full name. We're not talking about a full name of IGOs. We're talking about acronyms. And in most cases, the IGOs can't really register or hold a trademark right over the strings that match the acronyms. So without the trademark rights, they can't really use the UDRP or URS to lodge a complaints against a registrant that could be misusing the domain name that matches the acronym in their IGO.

So the first problem that we needed to fix was, how may IGO complainants demonstrate rights in order to file a UDRP or URS complaint against a registrant?

And the second challenges is that in order to file a UDRP or URS complaint, the complainant is required to submit to mutual jurisdiction, which means that basically once you file it, you agree that you will use either the courts in either one of two jurisdictions which is where the registrar is located or where the registrant is located if you wanted to demand a review of the decision of the UDRP or URS. And because of

the way that IGOs are set up, by their nature they actually enjoy certain immunities and privileges with regards to court jurisdictions.

So if they were to use the UDRP and URS, they would typically have to waive those immunities and privileges. So they said, why do we need to do that? Because [inaudible] immunities and privileges are actually a valid defense against court jurisdiction.

DEVAN REED: Justine—

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: It seems we're losing you.

JUSTINE CHEW: The second question that we needed to answer was how to [inaudible] of IGO immunities and privileges.

DEVAN REED: I'm sorry to interrupt, Justine, can you—

JUSTINE CHEW: [inaudible] right to file suit in a court of [mutual] jurisdiction. [inaudible] is a combination—Next slide, please. Can you hear me?

DEVAN REED: I'm so sorry to interrupt you but your sound has been cutting in and out. We can't hear you at all.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry, folks, I think my Internet connection is a bit unstable tonight. Can you hear me now?

DEVAN REED: Yes, that sounded great.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry about that. Hopefully it'll remain stable for another 30 minutes or so. Okay, I assume that I've covered this particular slide, so can we move on to slide number four? What I was trying to imply is because of the two key questions that we were asked to answer, the EPDP came up with a collection of six recommendations, and these are preliminary in nature so therefore, the public comment is actually to get input from the community in order to shape this or amend this or whatever we need to do as a result of the public comment.

Okay, so this is an overview of the six recommendations, preliminary—the six PRs. As you can see, some of them address the two particular questions that I've just gone through, which is—I shortened it to facilitated access and also facilitating IGO immunities.

The added bit is to do with binding arbitration. So this is something the IGOs proposed in order to shorten the route of the dispute resolution to finality, basically offering an alternative to court proceedings. And you'll

understand a little bit more when we go through each of these particular PRs.

So this is just an overview, and as I mentioned earlier, the PR2 is administrative in nature, so we're not going to go very deeply into that, or even at all. Next slide, please.

PR1, which is to facilitate access by the IGOs to UDRP and URS, this answers the first question that I related to earlier, and the solution that the EPDP has come up with is that we propose to modify the UDRP and the URS rules in two ways.

The first way is to have a definition of IGO complainant. Now, because we are making some exemptions, we don't want to be making exemptions to everybody who wants to use the UDRP and URS. These particular exemptions are specifically for an IGO only who wishes to lodge a UDRP or URS complaint. So therefore, we needed to be able to identify who might be an IGO complainant or whether an entity qualified as an IGO in order to be an IGO complainant.

So the definition is as stated on the screen. It's too long to read. All I want to say is that this went through quite a tedious process, and we had inputs from the IGO and GAC to make sure that it was complete with reasonable boundaries. So we're not going to make it free for all, kind of thing, but any entity that falls into the description of A, B or C would be considered an IGO complainant for the purposes of filing a UDRP or URS complaint.

And the second aspect of this would be because as I said earlier, you need to demonstrate trademark rights in order to be able to file, so we

are making another exception, so to speak. For an IGO to be able to file, they just need to show rights in a mark, meaning the term that we use is identifier but in this case, it applies to an acronym matching the domain name, by demonstrating use in conducting public activities as per stated mission. So no longer trademark-specific per se.

So these two modifications will allow the IGO to access the UDRP and URS. Yrjö, I hope you're following the comments because I'm not. If there are questions in the chat, then I'm hoping that you'll be able to answer them. If not, then we can address them as we go along.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yes, I'm answering them.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, great. Thank you. I assume that there isn't controversy around this particular PR1, which is why we haven't really put a poll whether you agree or not. So unless you have major objections, we're going to assume that this is acceptable.

Okay, moving ahead, slide number six, please. So the next preliminary recommendation we're touching on is PR3, because we're going to skip over PR 2 and focus on PR3 now. So PR3 attempts to address both the questions of facilitating access and immunity. So two questions are up there in the first part of the screen, and this particular PR3 intends to remove those two impediments, which is to remove the requirement for the IGO complainants to agree to be subject to mutual jurisdiction.

And this we propose to do by again modifying or inserting two particular provisions in the UDRP and the URS respectively, which is what you see on screen, and basically it just says that the IGO complainants are exempted from agreeing to submit to mutual jurisdiction, and therefore they can still maintain their immunities and privileges when they file a UDRP, win, and if they are taken to court on the review where they can then assert their immunity.

Again, because this is one of the key questions that we were asked to address, which is to say how can the IGOs preserve their immunity and privileges, so this is the solution we're proposing. Again, I don't think there's any controversy here per se, so unless there are major objections, I'm going to move on.

Slide number seven. We're dealing with aspects of PR4 in two batches. The first batch, as you see on the screen, it has a number of components. The second batch will be one that there is an option so we'll ask you to indicate your preference later.

The first batch involves PR4 part one to four and part six. And this is the bit that introduces binding arbitration following a UDRP proceeding. As I said before, since we talk about UDRP at the moment, the idea is if an IGO complainant files a UDRP claim and wins in that UDRP claim, then as of right, the losing registrant can file a court proceeding to demand a review of that UDRP decision.

And even though at the court proceeding, the IGO complainant can now assert immunity and therefore not be bound by the court per se, it actually could lead to complications because if you look at the US judicial system, if a losing registrant were to file a court proceeding to

review the UDRP decision and they file it in the wrong court where the court then declines to hear the merits of a case because the IGO complainant has asserted immunity, then by right, the losing registrant can actually take that on, that particular court, the claimant here, that particular decision, on another appeal until they get to the right court which is, my understanding is, a particular court in—I can't remember where it is. Philadelphia I think [inaudible]. I'm not particularly fluent with U.S. jurisprudence.

But the idea is there is a particular court in the U.S. that is empowered to hear and decide on immunities. So unless you hit that court in the first instance on appeal from UDRP, you could end up having multiple appeals until you hit that court, and that is the concern of the IGOs because that involves time, cost and which is all arguably unnecessary if the IGO has actually won the UDRP proceeding in the first place, because to win a UDRP claim, you need to have met certain criteria—can you still hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Still fine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, thank you. So where was I? So the [inaudible] binding arbitration process directly from the UDRP proceeding, so the binding arbitration as an appeal or review mechanism to review the UDRP proceedings, so bypassing the court and the complications and the potentially multiple appeals in the court taking up time and cost.

But we will note that the BC, the Business Community representative in this particular EPDP, is pushing back and they are maintaining that they should retain the right to access the courts regardless and there is an inherent right per se, so we can't say that we can't go to court, but instead, we are offering the possibility of going to binding arbitration instead of going to the court and still using the court system. So that's an option.

And to use this particular binding arbitration option, both parties will have to agree for it to proceed, and the consent for going to binding arbitration is obtained at different points of time. For the IGO, it would be obtained when they file the UDRP complaint. For the registrant, it would be obtained when the UDRP decision is rendered—

DEVAN REED: Justine, we're not able to hear you.

JUSTINE CHEW: And when that happens—yes?

DEVAN REED: I'm sorry, your connection was cutting out again, we weren't able to hear you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we're having problems with Justine's line. I wonder if we can do a dial-out or something.

JUSTINE CHEW: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, we can, Justine, but it's not that great. Your voice does break up from time to time.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay.

DEVAN REED: Can we dial out to you, Justine?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we've lost Justine for good for the time being, which is a bit unfortunate because obviously, it's right in the middle of her presentation. Do we have Justine's number and have staff been able to...?

DEVAN REED: We don't but I will try to get it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. In the meantime—I'm sorry, Yrjö, we're going to have to turn to you to take us through these points. Christopher Wilkinson, you have your hand up.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'll defer to Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: I can try to take over. Not in such great detail as Justine was able to. But anyway, the binding arbitration is a sort of replacement for going to court. That is perhaps the main new thing of these resolutions. And then here on the slide, there are a number of details which I don't want to go into now. Perhaps these slides will remain and you can study these details after the meeting. Next slide, please.

Here, we have a very nice picture that shows what happens in these two options. This is the first resolution where there are actually two options we put to the public comment. Option one is the losing registrant has decided to go to court and the court declines to hear the merits of the case because the IGO has immunity. And this process ends here. That is to say, the IGO wins and there is no possibility to go to arbitration anymore.

Option two is that the losing registrant goes to court, the court declines to take the case, and there is still a possibility to go to binding arbitration after this.

Now, this is the first straw poll question for you, whether you are in favor of option one or two, whether you would let the losing registrant have a second choice after going to court and being rebuffed or whether you think that that's it. Could we have the first—okay, so please submit your choices.

DEVAN REED: While we're waiting, I see that Justine joined again. Welcome back, Justine.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Justine, in your absence I initiated the first poll, but if you have a working line now, you could please take over from here.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. Thank you, Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: But we're waiting now for the results of the first poll.

DEVAN REED: We have 17 responses so far, which is just about half. Would you like me to end the poll so you can see the results?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay. I can understand that there are many people who don't have an opinion on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I should add that if you're undecided, you can decide undecided. And indeed, many people are undecided. So there you are, Yrjö. I'm not sure this is going to help you too much. Well, there is some preference for option one.

JUSTINE CHEW: I see Christopher's hand up.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I have something to say but I would prefer to say it at the end of this procedure. I was just putting my hand up to [inaudible]. But since Yrjö and Justine are back online, I think we should complete the work of the evening, and if there's time, I have a comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Christopher. Over to you, Yrjö and Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. So we're moving on to slide number nine. This particular set of recommendations—PRs—have to do with the URS. Earlier, we dealt with the UDRP, now we're dealing with the URS. It's similar to what we presented for the UDRP except that it takes into consideration the

nuances for URS because there are certain differences between what you do with the URS and with the UDRP.

But the idea is the same, as in we are proposing to allow the parties to opt for binding arbitration, to review UDRP determination. And again, the arbitration would require both parties' agreement. Again, in terms of when the agreement takes place or when the agreement is [sought,] it's similar again.

A slight difference would be that within the URS itself, there is an appeal mechanism provided for. So there is an added option for a losing registrant or a losing complainant so to speak, either party to utilize the appeal mechanism within the URS, which is section 12, to resolve the dispute at another level but also that binding arbitration be available in addition to courts as well.

So again, the premise for introducing binding arbitration is to encourage a losing registrant to opt for this particular arbitral allowance rather than taking an appeal or a review within the court system.

And the other difference between the UDRP and the URS which I should mention is that with the UDRP, there is a cooling off period of ten days before the determination is implemented by the registrar.

Now, these ten days were put in place because of the ability for a losing registrant to actually file a suit in court. But with the URS, the determination once rendered is implemented immediately. Because the outcome of a URS typically is the complaint is either dismissed or the domain name is suspended, whereas for UDRP it's either dismissed, the

domain name could be transferred or canceled. So the remedy itself is different between the UDRP and the URS.

The reason why the extra appeal mechanism in the URS was introduced is because if you don't have the right anymore, then you can't really take it to court to appeal. So by the URS determination being implemented immediately, that actually means that the losing registrant has no longer a valid right to take on appeal, which is why there's an appeal mechanism in the URS.

It doesn't mean they won't try. You can try with the courts. And really, it's a matter of the courts to decide. But typically, if you don't have a right, you don't have standing in court to take a proceeding. That's the basic principle anyway. So moving on to—so again, there isn't any controversy per se with this package of PR5 one, two and four.

Next slide, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Justine, can I ask a quick question?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was surprised when you got to the explanation that the arbitration had been recommended by the IGOs themselves to redirect people away from a judicial resolution. I guess I'm confused about why this option comes into play after a court of appeals decision then, or if they decline

to hear the IGO community—if it's to encourage them to do it instead, why does it feel as though it happens after they've already attempted a judicial resolution?

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. What I was trying to say is the option of the arbitration is actually, as I said, proposed by IGOs. They're trying to encourage the losing registrant to stay away from the courts. So instead of going through the court system, take the arbitration option as the immediate next step after using a URS or UDRP complaint.

Now, the reason why you see these two options is because the BC rep who is trying to protect the interest of registrants is insisting that the right to go to court remains, that is a right that you cannot take away from a registrant.

And you're right in saying that if the losing registrants go to court and they lose, and then they go to appeal and they lose, what is the point, really? If you lose at one stage, then the likelihood of losing again is higher than not losing. But they insist that it's a right they want to retain. Does that answer your question?

So here, again, there are two options that we would like input on which you prefer. Option one talks about a losing registrant, if they take an appeal to the court and they lose there, or if the court declines to hear the merits of the case because the IGO has a certain immunity, then the process ends there and URS determination stands, the domain name remains suspended.

Now, the other option, two, is that the registrant would still have a right to go—they've taken the court route or the URS Section 12 appeal route, and after not succeeding in either, they want to go to then binding arbitration in order to generate the final result. So that's a longer, more expensive route. You probably understand which route is it that's proposed by which groups within the EPDP.

Okay, unless there are questions, Yrjö, do you want to run the poll now, or do you have anything to add?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah. Like on the first poll, please indicate which option you are in favor of, or undecided if you don't want to take a stance. Please vote.

JUSTINE CHEW: I should point out that with the difference between UDRP and URS, how the implementation of a UDRP decision and URS decision is handled actually makes a difference from the perspective of end users. With the UDRP, because there's a ten-day cooling period that allows a losing registrant to then take the decision on review or appeal or whatever, the domain name remains active. There is a lock placed on it which means the registrant can't transfer the domain name, but the domain name is still live and it still resolves.

So if for example the IGO is complaining that the registrant is misusing the domain name in some way, which is why they're filing the complaint, then because the domain name is still active and usable, the risk to the end user of confusion or harm in some form—for example, fraud or

something—would continue to exist until the dispute is resolved in finality. So that risk remains so long as the dispute is not completed or resolved to the end.

With the URS, it's slightly different because once a URS decision is rendered, it takes effect immediately. So if for example the IGO files it and they win a URS complaint, then the domain name is immediately suspended. So therefore, the registrant can't use that domain name anymore, which means the risk of confusion or harm no longer exists.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay, so please vote on the straw poll, option one or two, or undecided, please.

JUSTINE CHEW: I'm wondering whether what I just explained would affect anyone's decision for the straw poll.

DEVAN REED: We have 24 responses so far, so actually a few more responses.

JUSTINE CHEW: Cool.

DEVAN REED: Did you want to end the poll now or give it another few seconds?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I don't see the poll coming up on the screen.

DEVAN REED: I haven't ended it yet so it should be.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: There's a little bubble describing the options, but it doesn't respond to a vote.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I did note in the chat a question that has been asked by Steinar Grøtterød, "Who decides whether to use UDRP or URS?"

JUSTINE CHEW: The complainant. So if the complainant is the IGO, they decide which avenue they want to take, because the criteria to succeed within the URS or UDRP is also different, and the remedies are also different. So it depends on what remedy basically the complainant wants.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the costs are different.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm a little concerned of time, so I think that if people have answered this poll—and I note that some people said the poll appeared and then it disappeared. It might have been that they've already answered it before. So check all your windows if you can't see it. But how many answers have we had so far, Devan?

DEVAN REED: We've had 21 responses, so I could end the poll now if you guys are okay with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. Thank you.

DEVAN REED: I'm sharing the results now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wow. Justine and Yrjö, there you go, that's your answer. Quite varied responses. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Consider the case that maybe this just isn't important to AtLarge.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Alan, you are actually—the most important thing for At-Large in my view is that there is finally a solution to this problem and that we escape situation where there is confusion for end users. Well, perhaps Justine, if we just run the slides through, I think that voting or straw polls have shown so far that this is really a question where straw polls are not that perhaps necessary, or they don't say so much. So let's just run the rest of the slides.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, there's only one—

ALAN GREENBERG: Yrjö, that's exactly what I was implying. Yes, it's important that it gets resolved, and that's why we're participating in this, but it's important that it gets resolved in a way that is ultimately acceptable if not perfect for all of the parties and that we have a way to go forward if the details really are not a major issue for us, and I think that's part of the thing that's relevant in the straw poll, because these are subtle legal things that don't impact us, and which is better? It's a matter of perspective. And I don't think most of us on this call have that perspective or it isn't all that relevant for us. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: I would actually take a different perspective from what Alan said. To me as a pure end user, I actually see potential risk of harm to end users by way of confusion or fraud or whatever, diversion or misalignment of the registrant from the prospective end user. So I actually would take a stake

in this, really. I would like to see—fairness, yes, but to be able to give the IGOs the ability to use the tools that they have, and still not prevent registrars from going to court.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we're saying anything different. It's crucial for an end user perspective that we have a resolution and that we can make sure that misuse of domain names is being addressed even if the registrant is an IGO. So all of the fraud reasons that we care about, the domain name disputes are relevant. But I don't think the mechanism matters to us as long as the mechanism is ultimately acceptable to IGOs and the other parties involved.

What I'm saying doesn't matter is the preference of which path, as long as it meets the ultimate criteria. Whet her these meet the ultimate criteria, I have no idea, but I don't think the details of the resolution are critical. The fact that it must be resolved is critical. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. So consider then I have misunderstood you earlier. Can we finish the last slide, please? The two polls here, the first one, so in both instances of UDRP and URS, if an arbitration was taken, the route of arbitration is taken, the question is what should be applicable law that applies in the arbitration proceeding?

The first and default position is that it would be whatever the law that's mutually agreed by the parties. Then the question came up, what

happens if the parties don't or can't agree on applicable law? And two options were presented.

First option is to just go with either the law present at the registrar's location or the respondent which is the registrant's location, and the IGO gets to choose between those two.

Option two is to let the arbitration tribunal decide. Can we run the poll please?

DEVAN REED: The poll should be launched now.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't really understand what is at stake here. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: In terms of the choice of law—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perhaps I can intervene. In general, for any contract that takes place, it is stipulated in the contract where that contract is applicable, so under what law it's applicable, law in France, courts of France, or the England and Wales or United States or whatever.

The question here is, if there is an arbitral review following the UDRP, URS, whether this should be conducted in accordance with the law of the relevant registrar's principal office location. So effectively, I guess a

large number of registrars are based in the United States, so this would take place in the US, or where the respondent resides because you would have maybe a dispute between two organizations that are based outside the United States if the registrar was based in the US. So you could have a choice between the courts of let's say Switzerland and France. Is that the point? Not the courts but the law, Switzerland or France.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]. Yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. But the first question is where you ask who will take care of the arbitration. If you ask an arbitration from one specific country or is it people from different countries? It's all full of question open with just that. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sébastien, it doesn't matter which tribunal you pick. You can pick a U.S. tribunal and still have a different country's law apply.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Oh, if we are going in that direction, I am very happy when people from one country say something about the law in another country. It's just crazy. It can't work.

JUSTINE CHEW: Which is why the default option is for the parties to agree. So we're considering the consequence of when the parties do not agree. Then do you just let the IGO pick between the two limited options or do you let the tribunal—pick whichever tribunal has been appointed to run this?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But if you pick the second, that means that you picked the arbitration tribunal but if they pick, they will pick the law they know, the law from their country, and you have already made the choice if it's option two. Okay. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Somebody has to make their choice. If the parties can't make the choice, then somebody has to make the choice. So option two would be to allow the arbitral tribunal decide. That's what it is. I'm being pressed for time because we exceeded our 35 minutes, so if you're undecided then you're undecided, just vote undecided, really.

DEVAN REED: Okay, Justine, we have 24 responses.

JUSTINE CHEW: Let's close the poll and finish up.

DEVAN REED: There's your results.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Just very quickly, maybe a one-minute poll on question four so that we can wrap up. The last question pertains to—so if the parties cannot decide on the law to apply an arbitration and it ends up going to either one or two, but complication arises because the law that is ultimately chosen has some deficiencies, then would you allow the parties to raise those concerns to the arbitrational tribunal on the limits of the applicable law? So it's like somebody has chosen the law but it doesn't favor me, I want to raise concerns about this, blah-blah, and let's choose the law again. So that's just an added step. Do we think it's fair or not? Hadia, you have your hand up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: My question is it's very difficult for us to decide on those options. I think it's mostly for the IGOs because they know more their bylaws, their structure, and I think it's up to the majority of t hem to decide which way to go. I don't see how we could make a good decision here.

JUSTINE CHEW: Can I just stop you there and just say that if we want to support the IGOs, then we have to vote in a certain way. That's the basis of it, because it's not up to the IGOs to decide, unfortunately, which is why

you see options being presented, because one of the options is presented by IGOs, the other option is presented by BC which represents the registrants.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I think it is important to know which of the options is supported by the IGO. For me, it's very difficult to make a decision here, but I would go with what the IGOs support, because again, they are more aware of their situations, their bylaws, the structures they fall under, and how things work best for them. Thank you. So I think it's important with each option to know which ones the IGOs support. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: I took the position to remain neutral because I didn't want to influence your vote in one way or the other, but I see your point. I tried to be subtle when I said that the IGOs are proposing this, so therefore I was hoping that you could catch on to what the IGOs were proposing.

Okay, so in this instance, with the straw poll question three, obviously, the IGOs were proposing option one because it's in their favor. But with question four, I don't think they had a position per se.

Okay, Yrjö, I'm going to hand it back to you because it's way over time.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you very much, and we are sorry, these are complicated things and at least we wanted to hear your first opinions. We'll go forward and

write the draft comments and then come back to the meeting for another discussion. Thank you very much, and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yrjö. And it did take a bit more it me than we thought, but it's always, I think, good to have straw polls and sometimes they do [inaudible]

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: We lost Olivier.

DEVAN REED: Olivier, if you can hear us, we're not able to hear you speaking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wow. It looks like I was dropped just when picking up the call again. Christopher, you have your hand up.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Good evening. Allow me to note my interest, congratulations and fascination with the subtleties of the legal structures that Justine and Yrjö have prepared for us. I think it was a fascinating intellectual exercise.

That having been said, may I say that I think this is an abuse of the multi-stakeholder principle? We have been dealing with a situation

where most of the problems are either a matter of privacy—I [meant piracy] or a matter of misrepresentation.

There may be a few problems lurking behind this issue which fall out of those categories. I think it's an absolute abuse of the multi-stakeholder principle to present this matter over a matter of 20 years in a way which in effect ICANN, GNSO, PDP claim the right to arbitrate over the interests and the rights of the intergovernmental organizations and all their services to the international public and indivudals.

No. The underlying premise is unacceptable. The legal structures and organization and arbitration, etc. that we have been instructed in tonight is fascinating and a beautiful exercise in legal structures and alternatives. But we should never have been here at all. This is an abuse of the multi-stakeholder principle and will generate deep, substantial resistance to the ICANN concept. It should never have been allowed to start. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Christopher. That's put to the record. Unfortunately, we're very late now on our agenda so we're going to have to move on, but it is on the record now. Thank you for sharing this with us.

We're now going to move to agenda item three, Jonathan Zuck with I guess maybe even less than ten minutes to provide us with the feedback of the meeting between the registrar stakeholder group and ourselves, and Maureen Hilyard. Over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. The meeting was about the whitepaper, if you recall, that the Registrar Stakeholder Group wrote that was intended to—without using the term—come up with best practices for ensuring that registrants are protected from over enforcement in the case of DNS abuse.

So I think it was in some measure meant to be a reminder about registrants and that there are times when there's bad complaints that are made, abusive complaints that are made, and that there needs to be a kind of due process, if you will, to address those complaints so that a site doesn't get shut down that turns out to be innocent of wrongdoing.

So again, I think the reason that was their first whitepaper was to remind us that the registrants matter too, and that's certainly the case. And we tried to provide some commentary on where they could be more specific and come up with real frameworks for understanding for other registrars—because that's the idea here, it's for registrars that aren't as sophisticated as the ones writing it, and how they could process this information, because it's pretty high level the way it was written.

But one point of contention, and the reason for the call, comes down to the notion of what should be done first. In the whitepaper, there's this notion that oftentimes, it's not the fault of the registrant, that there is a problem with their site. It could be third party hacking of their site, exploiting a WordPress deficiency that hasn't been patched yet, etc. and that it's not a malicious registration.

And so they suggested in their whitepaper that it would be important to determine whether that was the case before taking action with respect to the site, and that's what we took issue with. We discussed our response on the CWG call and suggested that actions should be taken first and placing blame should happen second.

And I reminded them of the parable of the poison arrow, which is something from Buddhism that basically suggests that if you've been shot by a poison arrow, it's best to remove the arrow and address the poison before trying to determine who shot the arrow. That was fundamentally the discussion, and the registrars kept coming back to the fact that there are times when the registrants are not to blame.

And I tried to be a little bit obtuse and say, well, look, if there's a webpage that has malicious code on it, if it has malware, if it's doing damage, that the priority should be to mitigate that threat before anything else. But I think that part of the complexity is the role of a registrar versus a host and things like that, so we got into some of that a little bit. Of course, it's the same company very often, but certainly not in the case of Tucows where they are a wholesaler and sites like Squarespace are actually the host.

But anyway, I feel like that was the core of the conversation, and I continue to believe that as the At-Large, it's not really our job to empathize with the complexity or challenges of being a registrar, even though personally we do sympathize. I think our priority is to look at every possible means of mitigating DNS abuse.

So in some ways, I feel like we try to overly intellectualize these issues and we should stop that. I think that there are times we should say, "But

there's a page that's doing harm right now. How do we address that?" And that was the essence of the argument that took place.

So I think the net result is that they're going to flesh that out and also talk about ways of preventing that kind of abuse from taking place, but we didn't reach a true agreement on addressing the individual instance of abuse as a first priority. So personally, I think that should be our position. But there's obviously plenty of complexity to how that happens. But I'm not sure that that complexity is our responsibility. So those are just my thoughts, and that was the conversation that we had. I'm happy to take any questions or comments about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I was just going to add one thing that I did note is they're taking the problem seriously. They're aware of the challenge. And I was quite pleased that they wanted to actually have a direct chat with us to discuss things, discuss the statement itself. I think that's a first, because in the past, some of our statements might have just been tossed aside and not really taken with much interest. They did have significant concerns about some of the points that we had, and they did share with us the number of—not fictitious but meaningless complaints that they receive, often some kind of mailbombing type complaints, denial of service attacks, thousands of complaints which are often automatically generated and so on which are just there to clog the system. So they did share that they have problems with that and that they are at the same time trying to [flesh through that.]

One of the things I think that we managed to also convey to them was more explanation is needed on their side for people who genuinely want

to file a complaint, because often, they're faced with a webform of some sort which is very difficult to navigate and resulting sometimes in incomplete [input.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: And of course, the most recent audits by ICANN show that plenty of sites didn't even have a form. So there's still a lot of work to be done, and part of the difficulty is that our conversations are with the folks that are trying the hardest on this, and we still need to find a way to effect change among those that are not. And I think that's going to be a perennial problem because that most recent ICANN audit really was telling about the number of registrars that were violating their contract by not having a way to report DNS abuse. So there's still a ways to go.

So the takeaway is they're going to continue to modify the paper and probably circulate another draft, and they took on some of our suggestions to centralize some of the information about what kind of evidence is required for complaints and things of that sort. Steinar, go ahead.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. One of my day jobs is actually to monitor DNS abuse for registry operators and registrars. And what I feel is that very often, there are registrars that even though the request is coming from a registry about a suspicious domain name and some evidence connected [inaudible] phishing, malware, all these things that we have from the reputation blocklist providers, they kind of say, "It's not hosted by us, so we can't do anything." And I think that's a mistake. It won't help anything in

mitigating DNS abuse. At least the response to the registrar is, can you at least point to the name of the hosting? Because they have the data of that. It's very tricky to find out who's the hosting partner for a registrar when it's not the same entity.

So I think for end users that have been hacked, I think it's of importance that the notification from the blocklist providers to the registry operators, to the registrars, is actually doing something on the website and the registrant is also informed of that. So that's the mechanism, the chain of control that we need to have in the agreement that we don't have today. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Steinar. And again, I have all my domains with Network Solutions and I have historically used WordPress quite a bit, and whenever I fell behind on patching WordPress, there were instances in which there were malware that was installed and Network Solutions suspended my site.

So while we call it a nuclear option, if you've got a website that's, by your design or not, distributing malware, I'm not sure that I'm entirely concerned about having that website be unavailable temporarily. I think that the balance of interest is for the users that might otherwise be affected by that abuse. But I'm really just giving my personal opinion, so we can certainly discuss it further. Siva, go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Jonathan, you talked about [both sides.] When you talked about the poison arrow approach whereby you said that a malicious website has

to be first taken down and then investigated and second, you talked about your own difficulties when Network Solutions took down your website for third-party malware in your WordPress site.

So the second argument that sometimes there are false positives and sites are taken down and registrants and registrars suffer, so could there be a compromise or intermediary stage between complete takedown, even on the poison arrow approach? When you take down a website, it completely goes off, and until it's restored by legal process, that site is completely unavailable and the registrant suffers, but instead of that, when you have an alert of a malicious software, could you have an intermediary process whereby you move the website to some kind of a sandbox or something like archive.org specially created for temporary parking of sites that are being examined for malware?

Sandboxed in the sense that there are certain tools available whereby you strip the website suspected of malicious content of its malicious content and then the plaintext or whatever that appears is disaster recovery played alone. The URL of the site actually saying a warning that the site is sandboxed or the site is technically archived in the space temporarily pending examination. Could there be such an intermediary solution? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Siva. It's definitely very intriguing to suggest that—ideally, a host would have the ability to block individual pages, for example, or as you say, block scripted pages or third-party addons, because that's often the case with WordPress, is that you're using some kind of—it's not

WordPress itself brut some tool that you're using for WordPress that's been compromised.

That does suggest that the host is the best solver of this problem, not the registrar. That said, the point I guess I'm trying to make is that the order of things that they should occur, because we're constantly hearing that these abusive pages aren't left up for very long, that if some campaign takes place using bots or something like that and then at least a malicious registration goes dark again—so if a lot of the impact happens early on, it seems like it should be a priority to mitigate that.

So I love your suggestion of a more creative means of mitigating it. I guess I'm still suggesting that ideally, that's what would happen first before the assertation of blame.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: One clarification, if I may. I was not suggesting it at the host level or the registrar level, I'm talking about something, a website when it's suspected of abuse and comes into the global abuse protection mechanism, I'm talking about a space which is created by this abuse mitigation—

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I understood it. I'm saying let's pretend that already exists, and that's great. I'm saying we should use that prior to worrying about the assertation of blame. That's the point I'm trying to make. I'm not saying that taking down the whole site is the best solution, and I think your solution is a creative one.

What I'm saying is that whatever means we have for mitigation should come first, and assertation of blame or malicious intent should come second. That's all I was getting at.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Jonathan, you've muted yourself so you're not going to be heard much. I was going to mention one thing regarding Siva's question, and that's that some hosting companies already offer a service such as the one that Siva has described as part of their package, especially when you're using open software that has a lot of addons like WordPress for example. I've had several instances of some customers having [inaudible] and the hosting company that I was working with doing the work of being able to put it in some kind of a temporary space, offering the temporary space for the client to fix it and then putting the website back on. There often is a staging space.

But we also have to move on. So is that all for this meeting, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is, Olivier. Thanks for the time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Those who are looking at the time are seeing that it's 29 minutes past the hour and we should be stopping at 30 minutes, but we still have working group updates to go through. We're not going to deal with rights protection for IGOs because we've already dealt with this.

I'm going to ask for quick updates from everyone. I know some updates are slightly longer than others, so please bear with the time. First the expedited policy development process on the temporary specification for gTLD registration data, the so called EPDP. Do we have something that's worth taking much time on today? I think Hadia might have had some updates on the minority statements.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. If we could go to the last two slides of the presentation, I would just share a chart of the different positions. I've put together two charts. This one includes the different issues, like requiri9ng creation and use of a common data element, the need to be responsive to potential new regulations, requiring differentiation, recommendation 7.1 should not stand nor become the default policy, all relevant stakeholders need to participate in development of the code of conduct, and pseudonymous e-mail address should be recommended.

So those are the main issues, but they're not all of the issues. We can see that all of those issues, all of these points are supported by the BC, the IPC, the GAC, the ALAC, and two of them by the SSAC which is requiring creation and use of a common data element, and the pseudonymized e-mail address.

It's not that the SSAC do not support the other points, but it is not really clear where they stand. Like they don't oppose them but not necessarily support them. I'm not sure. So we can see eight stakeholder groups here were taken into consideration, and we can see that four groups support these points and five groups support the creation and use of a common

data element and the pseudonymous e-mail addresses or registrar e-mail-based address. This is out of eight.

So there is support to those points. Only the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, the Registrar Stakeholder Group and the Registries Stakeholder Group do not support those points. Next slide, please.

And it's basically this, what I showed before. Again, those are the issues and the support. So the support is either between four and five stakeholder groups, support of these points which we support as well.

I'll stop here. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. That's very helpful, to see this, and certainly interesting to see the graphics. Let's open the floor for any comments or questions from our community. And I'm really sorry you couldn't go through the full set of slides here that you've taken the time to develop. But I invite colleauges and friends to check out the slide deck that is linked in the agenda.

I don't see any hands up, so I think that's it. Any other updates, Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Nothing from my side. I don't know about Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just one question for you, actually, which is of course, considering that we have eight stakeholder groups being considered, some of the points

made here by minority reports are four of those eight groups and some are at five. Is that therefore still a minority statement at that point?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: You're absolutely right. Those are all the groups that actually submitted minority statements, and so they're eight. It does not include the [ISPCP] because they did not submit any—so this is the only group not included.

So I have no answer to you, actually, Olivier, but as you see, this is definitely not a minority.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'm not seeing any hands up, so I think we can probably proceed. I think Alan has had to go, I can't see him on the call anymore. Thank you for this update. And as I said, the full explanation as to the points that were made in the statement is in that slide deck of 19 pages. That includes a thank you note at the end. Thank you very much.

The next one is going to be on the expedited PDP on the internationalized domain names. Do we have an update on this? Abdulkarim, welcome.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes, I'm just going to provide a very quick update because we're still in the initial stage of the work and we had a meeting last week, and we're still trying to get the administrative work done before we go into the details of the work.

During the last meeting, we discussed the project plan, we looked at how we can [inaudible] the framework for the EPDP on IDN, and what we looked at on the project plan is to say that probably, we're going to have the report ready in early 2023, the initial report, and the final report we hope is going to be ready by April 2023.

We also examined questions of the charter. We looked at how we're going to get the work done majorly and agreed that when the reports are ready, we'll examine the topics, we're going to have first and second reading on the active areas, and from there, we're going to take the work further.

Then also, we agreed that we're going to be having 60-minute meetings weekly for now, and if there is a need, we're going to take the meetings to 90 minutes in the future. So it's just basically administrative issues.

We looked at the annex documents on the SubPro, which we hope is going to guide us on factors for the challenge that when there is a challenge or appeals in future, how do we go about the appeals or the challenge and who are going to be the stakeholders, the groups that are going to be affected? Those are the things we started looking at, and we have another meeting tomorrow and we hope that we'll start going gradually into the details of the work. That's my brief summary. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Abdulkarim. I just wanted to make sure. You mentioned 2023. So it's a year and a half away from now, the initial report, with 90-minute calls every week?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: 60-minute calls for now, and we're hoping that probably when we get where we need to, we're going to increase it to 90 minutes every week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That sounds like a lot of calls until then. Good luck. Right, any questions or comments on this? Seeing no hands up, thank you very much for the update, Abdulkarim. That's very helpful. Good luck, and we look forward to hearing from you next week. Now we have the transfer policy review policy development process. For this, we have Steinar Grøtterød and his colleagues.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. I'll take the minutes for today. This is going to be very short. We have finalized the discussion about the notification for what has previously been called a losing form of authentication, and I've distributed a PDF summary of what we have discussed and the preliminary outcome of that discussion. I think it's definitely in the line of initial thinking that we have discussed in these meetings, so saving time, read the PDF attached to this agenda. We will take notes and questions about things that you have questions about for the next meeting.

In the PDP working group, we have now started the discussion on the gaining FOA. We have just started, so let's take the updates on that on the next call. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Steinar. Seeing no hands up, thank you for the very fast update—we are running a little late. And apologies for making you wait so long for this update. But that's good to know.

We've worked through our working group updates, we can now go through our public comment updates with Evin Erdogdu. Evin, the floor is yours.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you so much, Olivier. I'll also try to speed through this quickly. Recently ratified by the ALAC—actually, this is from last week, but the ALAC minority statement as presented by Hadia and Alan had been submitted and ratified by the ALAC to the EPDP temporary specification phase 2A final report. So stay tuned for ongoing development regarding that.

Upcoming public comment proceedings, you can now see under the new public comment feature there are a couple left September to be opened and a few more over the coming months. So please check out the tabs on the agenda as well to see those upcoming public comment proceedings.

And there are currently a few open now, public comments for decision, one being the proposed amendment five to the .name registry

agreement. This closes on the 20th of October, so perhaps this group could discuss whether they would like to develop a response to this.

Another that would fall under the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group would be the draft PTI and IANA FY23 operating plan and budget also closing later in October.

Otherwise, as already discussed was the public comment regarding the EPDP on IGOs, so thank you all for participating in those polls and the discussions, and then there's one more public comment that will be opened in October, but we already have an At-Large workspace for this in case anyone would like to review presentations on the topic, and that is the domain abuse activity reporting, DAAR 2.0.

With that, I'll hand it back over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Evin. And I guess I should ask whether anybody would be interested to have a look at the .name registry agreement amendment five for the next call. So somebody can step forward and maybe I can ask you all to have a quick look and we can have an easy yes or no answer next week on whether the ALAC wishes to make a statement on these.

In general, we have had some cases where we have commented on changes and amendments to registry agreements. In other cases, we have not. So it’s not a historical thing where we've always said yes or no.

Apart from this, I'm not seeing any hands up, so we can therefore move to our next agenda item. Thank you for the update on all of this. Of

course, the domain abuse activity reporting public consultation hasn't opened yet either.

So agenda item seven, that's our final agenda item. Yrjö Lansipuro has advised me that he can move his update for the ICANN 72 ALAC and GAC meeting agenda to next week, so we'll try and add this to the main agenda so he gets this done earlier during the call. And the second point in this Any Other Business is the Information Transparency Initiative that's now got a new public consultation feature.

I think this is probably the last week we can remind you all about this. You probably have heard it a number of times and you're probably well aware of it.

Any other other business? Seeing no hands up. I see a lot of ongoing chat, so I hope you're all having fun in that parallel discussion. Steinar Grøtterød, you have the floor.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: You asked me something about the action items that I should comment, and I think let's take that next time. But this was based on the previous meetings when the representative from the SSAC was joining our call, and it was some questions that ends up in these action items. So that was my intention. I was asked to put it in the action items. I hope [I don't need to follow] to make sure that we have the [inaudible]. Someone else can take that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Steinar. One of the ways we manage to make this call always run over by 15 to 20 minutes is to get people to take action items to then act on them and ask themselves more questions to make more action items. But thank you for this.

Number eight is the next meeting, and it looks as though we're going to continue rotating. So when is our next call?

DEVAN REED: Hi Olivier. [inaudible] rotation, the next CPWG meeting will be on Wednesday the 29th at 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. That's the end of this week's call. So thanks to, of course, the interpreters for having remained an extra 20 minutes on the call, and also our real-time transcriber who's done an amazing job again today. Thank you so much. Thanks to all of you who have provided us with updates and to all participants on this call, and with apologies for the delay, but it was particularly interesting and a full call today, as it always is.

So until we meet next week, have a very good morning, evening, afternoon or night, and continue on the mailing list. Thank you, and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]