
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 10th of November 2021 at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing the roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. And just to record the apologies we have received, we have received apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Christopher Wilkinson, Satish Babu, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, and from Adrian Schmidt. From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Gisella Gruber, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. I'll also be doing call management for today's call.

For today's call, we only have Spanish interpretation. Unfortunately, we don't have live French interpretation available. However, the recording will be translated into French transcripts and it will be posted on the wiki agenda page. Just to note, our Spanish interpreters, they are Claudia and David.

Before we get started, one final reminder is for the real-time transcription service providers as usual. And I will be sharing the link with you right after my intro.

Before we get started, a final reminder is to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes. Now I would like to leave the floor back to Olivier. Over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call which might be slightly shorter than usual due to the lack of topics, strangely enough. But who knows, we might engage in some really interesting conversation. In fact, we will. First, we'll have the ALAC statement on the proposal for the Latin Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules. Last look at this with Bill Jouris and Jonathan Zuck. And then we'll go through our workgroup updates with the Transfer Policy Review PDP, the Expedited PDP on the Specific Curative Rights Protections for Intergovernmental Organizations, the one on the gTLD Registration Data, and finally, the one on the Internationalized Domain Names. So that's the workgroup updates. And then after that, public comment updates. Evin and Jonathan will take us through what's coming up and what's happening at the moment. And then AOB will have just on the SSAD ODP, which is the Operational Design Phase, I believe, or design project. We'll have an update on these. It's effectively the implementation stage of what's been decided in the policy development process. Any comments, questions, changes to the agenda?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi, Olivier. It's Jonathan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just wanted to say that I'm not going to be able to help in stretching out the CPWG call because I think the next step on the Latin Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules is going to be a Google Doc for people's comments, and that'll go up later in the day. So we will circulate a draft for people to look at as we've fully discussed the talking points and things like that. I don't think there's anything to go over on the call. But we will circulate a draft to the list in comment mode in Google Doc. So that'll be coming up here in the next day so you can skip over that item on the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. We'll win 20 minutes then from this, so thank you. And I'm not seeing any other hands up. So if that's the case, the agenda is adopted with items three being removed. Therefore, we can now move to the action items from our last call.

You'll notice there are three action items, two of which are not completed. One of them is, of course, with a work of the GAC and ALAC small group to develop a DNS Abuse white paper. I'm not sure if the work has started or not started yet. It's still very fresh. Would anyone be able to let us know? I know, maybe Steinar is the first person listed here. Have you seen any movement on this? Or Yrjö or Joanna, being our GAC liaisons, that might be the appropriate people to ask.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I haven't seen any notifications about establishing the first meeting, etc. So I'm blank on this one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Thanks for that. I see Joanna isn't here. I see Heidi Ullrich put her hand up. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, everyone. Sorry, sort of early for me here. I had been in contact with my GAC support colleagues. I think we're going to first set how we're going to run this internally. We're also going to see the position that the GAC how ready they are to do this, and then we'll come back to you as well with that. So it's sort of a coordination stage going on right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thank you for this update, Heidi. I guess whilst you're speaking, there's also the next item and that's to send Allan's presentation given during the ALAC72 ALAC Board call to the CPWG list. That's the one about—I believe it was to do with the SSAD.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. Apologies for that. I will take care of that today. That was his presentation. I believe it's on the agenda from last week. But yeah, I'll send it to the list as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes. Thank you. I think the presentation was shown last week but it wasn't actually added to the agenda. So at the time, it wasn't on

the agenda. So maybe just send it to the mailing list. That would be helpful. Thank you. And that's our action items for today.

So now we can go back to our agenda, and we can move swiftly to the agenda item four, skipping agenda three, and that's the workgroup updates. We'll start with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. Our ALAC members on this working group are Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka. There's a whole number of alternatives also there, Raymond Mamattah and Lutz Donnerhacke. I heard Lutz earlier. So I'm not sure who will take this but the floor is yours, probably Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Hi. I can take the lead on this one, and hopefully the rest of the team members will join me afterwards. First of all, I took the freedom to distribute to the mailing list some metrics that were presented by our ICANN Compliance on yesterday's call. I've found this quite interesting because I kind of sense personally that we have been thinking that there is a huge number of unauthorized transfers going on. But this metric from ICANN Compliance kind of indicate that there are approximately 1% per month that is being recorded as unauthorized transfers, also including the change of registrant. The metrics, without going into details, I think everybody can study that. The big bunch is a category, being complaint did not provide the requested information. And that is—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can we show these on the screen? I'm just seeing here, maybe whoever's in charge of the page could click on the PDF. Now we can see—

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: This is the one that ends up with a total of 240. It's in the middle of the screen. Complaints did not provide the requested information. As far as I understand from the information given by ICANN Compliance yesterday was that they received a complaint about a normal transfer or change or registrant and they request more information, and then nothing is happening from the guy that sent this thing in. And then after some time, they closed this case. So that's majority here.

Also, it has to be mentioned that there are other sources for metrics regarding unauthorized transfer. We have to mention that sometimes the registrars handle these kinds of disputes between themselves to gaining and losing registrar. So they're not involving ICANN Compliance. Also, the pure fact that registrant is not aware of ICANN Compliance but still have a problem with an unauthorized transfer. So it's been nothing recorded these metrics. But to some of this session, I think this is valid information because we have some metrics from data saying that not more than 1% of the compliance cases received per month by ICANN Compliance is connected to unauthorized transfers. And this is, in my opinion, a kind of a low number.

So that's the first thing I want to mention. The other thing is that also, on last day's call, we had a discussion about the 60-day lock. And I took the freedom—or maybe that's just me but I took the freedom to

distribute to the list some questions about how do CPWG think about the 60 days transfer lock after the initial registration of a domain name, and also after the successful transfer over domain name. The reason for this is that I was kind of surprised when we discussed this because I always thought that the 60 days lock was something that was defined by ICANN policy. But it is historically more of something that was implemented by Verisign in the very early days. And the rationale for this was to have some time to check the credit card payment, etc.

Many of the new TLDs has implemented the same thing, the same lifecycle, and the same parameters when they applied for the top-level domains. But it is something that the top level has decided upon and not an ICANN policy. So the PDP workgroup have the option actually to put into question whether 60 days is the right number of days to lock, if it should be a lock, both on initial registration and also on the successful transfer. This could be optional or should be a way for the registrant to opt out of this, meaning that when you do a registration, you can actually opt out and saying that it's okay. I will allow transfer of my newly registered domain name before 60 days. Of course, the registrar of record can prevent this in the terms of service because they do need some time to check out whether the payment is clear, etc., etc. So my point in distributing these questions is to have some sort of feedback back to the discussion within the PDP. Hopefully, that's my intro to some fruitful discussion and also some intro that the rest of the team members could fit into that one. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Steinar. The floor is open for other team members to chime in. Of course, if anybody has questions or comments then they now put their hands up as well. I am not seeing any hands up at the moment.

Steinar, I do have a question, actually. So you mentioned the 240 people that did not respond. A complainant did not provide requested information. Is it just a statistic that says, "They didn't answer the request"? Could there be a reason for this? Could there be a reason that maybe the question that's being asked of a complainant is too complicated for that person to answer? Has there been any looking into this? Because it's surprising to see that people would go the extra length to complain and then not actually follow up on their complaint to such an extent.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: That's a very good question. I didn't get any clearance to that because it was somehow touched by ICANN Compliance. But my thinking is that when ICANN Compliance receive a complaint, they kind of categorize this into the different code of descriptions as these metrics indicate. I think the follow up is some basic questions about maybe what's the domain name, what is the registrar of record, the losing, the gaining, etc., and all these kinds of parameters. And they send this out and there is no feedback. But it could be more complex. It could be everything, honestly. But I kind of paid some attention to the number here because that was the highest group. I was kind of surprised because, as you say, someone take the initiative to do all the work, and then it's getting into the dark mode. So that's interesting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very surprising. Thank you for this, Steinar. Now, we have a couple of people in the queue. First is Sivasubramanian.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Steinar, since the Transfer Policy Working Group is all about the validity of a transfer request and to make sure that the transfer requests are legitimate and the transfer is legitimate, for transparency, what are the records kept and maintained by the registry? For example, we always use icann.org as the example TLD. If I were to ask, when was ICANN.org first registered? Who was the first registrant? Was it transferred to somebody else with the same registrar or through a different registrar at various points of time? And at various points of time, who was the registrant for ICANN.org? And who is the current registrant for ICANN.org? Would the registry have such records? Even if it's not made transparently available, does such records exist or rewritten? Is it possible that this question could be raised in the working group by the participants from ALAC, or do you think it's inappropriate? Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I have no clue. I'm looking at a few ways. ICANN.org was first registered in 1998, the 14th of September. The present registrar is GoDaddy. The change of the registrant that is impossible to see today because of the GDPR and the Temp Spec WHOIS data. I have no clue. I'm not sure whether that is of importance for the inter-registrar transfer to see particularly the history of the life cycle of ICANN.org. To my understanding, maybe that's more of the question you're asking is, I

think the registry do you have to keep some historical records. I don't know whether that is being mandated in the contract with ICANN to keep it for eternity. But from my experience, when I was a registry operator, we kept this record as long as they had the TLD at least. So I think there's also a value for the registry operator to keep that record. Thank you. I hope that answered your questions, Shiva.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes, sir, to some extent. Just that I used ICANN.org as an example. And typically, in this example, there are no transfers. Probably there are no transfers even for convenience, and so it might be very relevant in the case of domain names of private individuals or private firms which are transferred often within the same registrar or between registrars. So the question was an example question. Thank you, Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Honestly, looking back on history here is that in '98, it was GoDaddy actually established at that time wasn't on the network solution. So it could be some transfer, historical transfer at least. Yes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Next is Bill Jouris.

BILL JOURIS: Two points. First off, it occurs to me that whoever was officially the registrant might be someone who is no longer with ICANN or the contact information might be a mailbox that's no longer checked. And

that sort of thing could impact whether responses received when there's a complaint. The other question is, I can't quite tell from the table, but it's a differentiation made between a complaint from the registrant that a transfer has happened versus a complaint by a user who notices that something drastic has changed, tries to contact the organization that supposedly owns the site and gets no response until it complains because obviously something has gone wrong, but they can't respond to a follow-up question because, after all, they aren't the registrant or anyone who works with the registrant. Does that differentiation get made at all?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Honestly, I'm not sure. I actually think this is purely a metrics that is independent of whether it was a registrant of record or it was somebody else that went into the ICANN Compliance side and it is paperwork. I'm not sure about that. I think the first thing that ICANN Compliance do is to group this into the two categories from the top of the page, inter-registrar transfer or change your registrant. And then thereby, there comes the closure code descriptions that I have, whether that is from a person entity that is connected to a domain name or a registrant, I'm not sure, honestly. Quite interesting also is to see they do receive complaints about ccTLDs which is not in the scope of ICANN at all. So they are definitely questions that had to be asked here. Thank you.

BILL JOURIS:

Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. In the meantime, I've sent a copy of the WHOIS records for ICANN Org on the chat, for those people that are interested. Gopal Tadepalli is next.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Thank you. Thank you very much, Dr. Steinar. It was a very nice and stimulating post in the discussion. It is a fundamental duty to report any discrepancy to the concern at hand. We need to make people responsible enough to report. However, the lacking concern in many of these cases is that once a complaint is lodged, they keep on giving information. They want more information, more information. How much more information resolves the problem? We don't know. So we should have that, the ambience to make people register the company. When there's discrepancy found, please let us know. After that, what? We don't have any from ICANN we trust. We want ICANN to do that but ICANN doesn't have a contractual obligation. Therefore, there will be more information sought to resolve. We don't know when it will be resolved, one of the [deciding] factors to go further. But it's very good that we are attracting people to register a complaint. We have some preliminary numbers which are interesting. Thank you. Your comments.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you. I like to go back a little bit also to have some sort of view about are we in favor of keeping the 60 days? Is that number correct? Are we in favor of making it optional of an opt-out? I haven't heard too many arguments on that one. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. Looking for any other comments on this.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: If I may, my argument is, why lock the domain for 60 days at all? Is there any technical impossibility that prevents our registrar from transferring domain name to another registrar? If the registrar is providing very good service and that the registrar is ethical enough, and if the registrant feels comfortable, then he has no reason to transfer to another registrar, unless he moves to a geographical zone or some compelling reason. So, removing the lock altogether will gradually lead to a situation where we have only good registrars who provide the required level of service to the registrant. The registrant is not whimsical. He or she would not transfer the domain name from one registrar to another registrar without a reason. And if he does have a reason, he's the one who paid \$10 to register a domain name. There is no particular role for the registrar, except that the registrant chose to do the registration at a profit of a dollar for the registrar. And because he made that decision, should he be trapped with that registrar even for a day, unless there is some technical impossibility that makes the process of transfer very complicated for the registrar and it suits up the cost of transfer way beyond the profit that he has made. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: A short comment to this from Steinar. Technically, I don't see any problems in just removing the 60 days. There are ccTLDs that operate the transfer, particularly the transfer without any locks. I think it's more

practical issue for registration having a period that you cannot transfer it, and it's also the pure fact that there are ways to gain this kind of registrar hopping, preventing to pay for something. But technically, I don't see any problem about that. I hope someone else from the team could give more argument into that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Steinar. In fact, it's worth noting in the chat that Jeff Neuman is mentioning that there are quite a number of processes enshrined to the 60-day period, like the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy, etc. But I've seen quite a number of people queuing. Gopal, I think that must be a previous hand. Is that a new one? Okay, go ahead.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Very quick comment. I think we've covered this on the list as well. You see the concern here is that one is too many administration. Somebody registers a complaint. We have to give registration time. Again, dollar payments take time. Payment realizations take time. And even if we suspect half a chance that something is wrong, we need about three to four weeks to conclude, finishing checking ourselves on the tools. We may not get more information. A good test of time is a couple of months. I agree with Justine. I agree with others saying that 60 days is quite reasonable. We should not change the optimum.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Gopal. Next is Lutz Donnerhacke?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE:

The 60-day lock has a single reason, and the reason is to catch thieves. If a domain is transferred in a valid way, the valid reason there is no reason for technical or procedural issues to stop this and to make and hold it. But if the domain is transferred illegally by spying out access codes or Auth-Codes or by having a social attack on members on the company or on the registrar, we have a problem. We have the problem that the registrant first has to notice that the domain was transferred at all. This takes time. Next, he has to reach out for the authorities and convince them to take action, even the ICANN authorities. So this takes time. If the transfer is not stopped, direct [inaudible] a small transfer to, we have the situation that the domain can be transferred again and again. And we have to hunt through different legal systems to different countries in order to get the domain back. Nobody is interested in such hunting. So the 60-day period is simply there in order to block an illegal transfer at the very first step and get the possibility to get the clearance in legal, in juristical, in procedural issues, even in organizational issues like this front side. So there's the reasons behind the point where we can say, yes, there might be a valid reason for the registrant to pay for 60 days with the registrar which was chosen, even it's a little bit cumbersome. But I would add that could be possible to change domain information or the owner information. Because, yes, you are right. A domain is transferred for a reason, usually. And one of the most common reasons is that the owner has changed. For instance, the company has to cease. If this is the case and we have a problem, we have the problem that we had to convince the authorities that the domain is ours despite we are a different owner than which is mentioned there and we have maybe some weeks where we have to

fight this. So in order to catch this, a sort of transfer lock is fine. An owner change lock is not so fine. That from my side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Lutz. Next is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess I'd find the logic "If it's not broke, don't fix it" somewhat compelling, although what's ironic is that we've had two conversations related to fraud, one which was designed to empower registrants, which was the issue of an affirmative confirmation for a transfer that everybody poo-pooed because of the modernized systems and the decreased likelihood of fraudulent transfers. And now that we're talking about something that benefits registrars, it's suddenly the history of transfer fraud and things like that or things that we need to take into consideration. So I feel like it's an interesting juxtaposition between those two discussions we had, one which imposes an additional burden on registrars that seemed unnecessary because things have become modernized, but one that retains puts an unnecessary burden on registrants is something that suddenly we should be thinking about security. That juxtaposition seems strange to me. I feel like the report from Compliance about the low rates of this transfer fraud about which we've expressed some concern seems to be applicable here. And there's no reason to have such a long delay associated with a transfer lock. But the juxtaposition that I think has me most intrigued.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Next is Lutz Donnerhacke.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Jonathan, I think you can't trust the Compliance data here. Because if you have an issue with the domain front, you will probably try to solve it in a local way. If you ask your registrant or your reseller to get it organized or you go to the local authorities, the local police, or something like this and you will do this in your own jurisdiction. You will not reach out for ICANN. If you go to reach out for ICANN, you have to be in a real mess. I do want to take this data with a grain of salt. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Lutz. I'm not seeing anybody else in the queue. I'm not seeing anyone else in the queue, apart from some interesting comments in the chat. Michael Palage has mentioned the historical note that the 60-day window did not exist at the beginning of the original registrant test bed period. It was put in at the request of Register.com as a way of Registrars being able to retain the domain name and recoup its loss if there was credit fraud. But things, of course, as has been mentioned by others, including Jeff Neuman, things have evolved since then. And so it's been used for a bunch of different purposes as well. Anyway, Steinar, maybe back to you. I see Jonathan. Is that a new hand?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So back to you, Steinar. You've heard a lot. There's a lot of comments on this. I think you guys are very lucky to have much input. I'm not sure whether it's all going in the same direction. But you can see their views from some that it's good to keep the 60-day period. Some think it might be worth shortening it or looking at it, but I don't know what you made of this. Steinar Grøtterød?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I think the value of this discussion is a good one. I think that we have to follow the work in the PDP working group to see whether it kind of ends into a discussion about changing the 60 days lock, both in initial registration and also the transfer. And it comes also to the discussion—at some point, we will have discussion about the change of registrant and the lock connected to this one. My take is that I made some notes and I hope the rest of the team have made their own notes. When this comes up, it is going to be changed in the working group. We will put that into note and maybe go back to the CPWG and ask for some more clearance, maybe in a poll or something like that. I think that's my take on this. But anyway, thank you for a fruitful discussion. And I hope I didn't ruin the name by sending of these e-mails without having it been signed off by the rest of the team. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Steinar. We'll, therefore, follow up next week. I note that several have been saying, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Maybe not next week. I don't know where we are at the PDP next week. So let's put it on action item, and when the time is appropriate, I will put it into action. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. Thank you. So next is Yrjö Lansipuro, who is going to be telling us about the Curative Rights Protection for Intergovernmental Organizations.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. The IGO EPDP is going through the comments given during the public comment period to our initial report on Monday. It talks about the comments that were given to our [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yrjö, your voice is dropping out. Your voice is cutting off a little bit. I don't know whether I'm the only person that has this problem. But can you try again?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah. Well, is it better now? So Recommendation 2 is sort of procedural one. It says that if the Council accepts or approves our substantive recommendations, then they should expressly reject the original Recommendation 5 of the previous working group, that is to say, of the IGO/INGO working group, something that they did not approve and that led to the existence of this work track and now EPDP. There was a lot of discussion about whether we actually need to recommend rejecting it

because the Council already has—we rejected it by not approving. So we got bogged down into this for quite a time.

Recommendation 6 is about the choice of law for the arbitration. Also, it was pretty inconclusive. Actually, we haven't touched so far the most important substantive comments that are shared at the post which is to substitute arbitration for court procedures. That's something that we have to tackle next.

YESIM SAGLAM: Sorry, I'm not sure if it's only me but I cannot hear Yrjö.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have a problem with Yrjö's line at the moment. I must admit, I haven't completely understood what the Yrjö was saying. I'm also seeing "not found" and "indiscernible" in the transcription. So it's not just us. Yrjö? Are you with us or have you dropped out?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Okay. Can you hear me now better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you. In typical fashion, when you do the test and say, "Can you hear me?" it's absolutely perfect. But when "Let me speak about the topic," it gets degraded. But let's try again.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Okay. I'm really sorry. I'm in a bad place with my Wi-Fi. Okay. So the IGO EPDP is going through the comments to the initial report. On Monday, we went through comments to Recommendation 2 and Recommendation 6. Recommendation 2 is a sort of procedural one, basically asking the Council if they approve the substantive recommendations to reject the original Recommendation 5 from the IGO/INGO access to Curative Rights Protections PDP. There was a lot of discussion whether we actually need to have this kind of recommendation since this original #5 already has been, if not rejected, at least not approved by the Council. Recommendation 6 is about the choice of law for the arbitration, and that also was inconclusive.

So actually, we haven't touched so far comments to our recommendations for 3 and 4, which is the beef of the whole thing, that is to say, substituting arbitration for court procedures. And there are a lot of comments, many negative comments, on our proposals. So this is something we have to tackle next Monday. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Yrjö. Now we could hear you. Just one question.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, no. It's all worked out. But I do have one question. You mentioned Recommendation 5. But did you explain what Recommendation 5 was just in one sentence, the one that was rejected?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah, okay. There was an IGO/INGO access to Curative Rights Protections PDP. The Council approved its other recommendations but did not approve Recommendation 5. That was really the genesis of our work track and now EPDP on IGO protections. So that's the explanation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Let's open the floor for any questions and comments. Going once, going twice. Don't all fight for the floor? It seems that you have explained everything. Well, it's an ongoing thing, I guess. So your work is cut out for future calls. We probably look forward for your future updates. I'm not seeing any hands up in the queue at the moment. Okay. Thanks very much, Yrjö.

Let's go to the next one and that's the EPDP on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data, our longest running expedited PDP with phase—I can't even remember which phase it is now. Well, I can but let's not think about it. I'm sure Hadia Elminiawi will have some update for us. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hi. Thank you. No, I do not have any updates. Maybe next week, Alan and I would have an update. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this. That allows us then to go to the next EPDP and that's the one of the Internationalized Domain Names. Now I know that Satish isn't here. I'm not sure if anybody can fill in and let us know what's been happening on this. I know there has been a note sent internally, but obviously sharing it with participants on this call would be helpful. Any volunteers?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. I will briefly give an update. There is a question, though. I have slides but I'm not going to actually present, but maybe I would like to put the charter question on the screen, if possible. It's slide number three, if possible. If not, then we are actually—yes, slide number three. Yeah, that one.

So basically, we are currently discussing Charter Topic number A, which is about consistent definition and technical utilization of Root Zone Label Generation Rules. We are discussing question number three. It's about a SubPro recommendation that requires a challenge process for resolving disagreements with Root Zone Label Generation Rules calculation on certain strings. So, if an applied for gTLD label is supported by the Root Zone Label Generation Rules is determined to be invalid, is there a reason not to use the evaluation recommended by SubPro? And if we are actually going to use the evaluation recommended by SubPro, what is the criteria for filing such a challenge?

So, we have been discussing four basic questions. The first one, it says, "Should the applicant be allowed to submit an application for a gTLD

label, knowing the label is invalid according to the Root Zone Label Generation Rules?” So an applicant would actually go ahead with this if there is a challenge process. So, discussions were about the DNS Stability Panel and its role. It was discussed that the DNS Stability Panel is to check the correct implementation of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. So, it only checks the implementation. It does not challenge or check the rules in itself. So, there were opinions. Discussions were about why would a manual check—so basically this panel would perform a manual check and maybe some other things as well, but in order to check the correct implementation, some thought why would a manual check make a difference? And some agree that challenging the implementation of the algorithm makes sense because mistakes happen.

And then the second question we were addressing was does the DNS Stability Panel has a role in assessing whether the Root Zone Label Generation Rules has been applied correctly? It is envisioned that the DNS Stability Panel would perform a check to ensure that the algorithm was applied correctly. Some think that manual review for all strings is overkill, and again something that it is a good thing to do.

And then question number three says, “Is a change request made to the Generation Panel to update the Root Zone Label Generation Rules outside the challenge process for the new gTLD program?” A change request to update the Root Zone Label Generation Rules can be made at any time and not limited to the application period. This question is more about is there any reason why the change request process for the Root Zone Label Generation Rules should be part of the new gTLD program?

And if yes, then the relevant string should not hold up any other applications. So this was part of the discussion.

And then question number four, it said, “Upon receiving rejection from the DNS Stability Panel, should the applicant be allowed to amend the applied for label in order to conform with the application system?” And then the discussions were some thought that simple syntax changes versus material changes to the strings should be allowed. Others thought that strings can be checked beforehand, it seems that changes should not be allowed. So basically, this was the discussion. We had a flowchart actually explaining the process for validating the strings. I believe Satish would be presenting next week. That’s it for me today. I see Justine’s hand is up. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. Actually, Satish indicated he would be presenting on the 24th of November. So there’ll be a significant time allocation for him and all of you to be able to take us in detail through those potential changes and those developments. Next is Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Thanks, Hadia, for the update. I can appreciate that if people are not following the EPDP on IDN closely, we would have had a hard time trying to figure out what we’re actually doing. And as Olivier has said, the ALAC team is going to prepare a presentation. And we’re going to do that, we’re going to present that on the 24th of November, that week anyway, because there is no IDN EPDP call this week because it is a U.S. public holiday on Thursday. Next week’s CPWG call will

precede the EPDP on IDN call because that's on Thursday where the CPWG calls are normally on Wednesdays. So that's why we opted to do a proper presentation on the 24th of November.

I also want to sort of put on my other hat as vice chair of the EPDP. I would like to say that we are proceeding with the charter questions now. I would say quite fluently, we have had to spend some time doing capacity building because there was a request for more background information and data as well, which I think is what's necessary. And the request actually came from the ALAC team. But the presentations were done by Sarmad and Pitinan. It had to do with the mechanics of the Root Zone Label Generation Rule. I think the whole EPDP benefited from that.

Yes, Jeff. You asked for demo. Yes, the ALAC team asked for background information and Jeff Neuman asked for a demo. Okay. Yeah, we're going through the mechanics of coming back to the call to the EPDP calls the following week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Justine. Very helpful indeed. I guess we can open the floor for any comments or questions. But I shall note that next week, therefore, they will not be an update either and we'll have a full update on the 24th of November. Thank you very much. That pretty much closes our workgroup updates for today. We can now move to the next agenda item and that's the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu. Either of you. Welcome back.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you. Thank you, Olivier. I'll just go first, briefly run through what is on the agenda for us. So recently ratified by the ALAC, none since last week, but of course, there's a lot of recent activity with a couple of statements submitted. There are a few upcoming public comment proceedings. You'll see that this is a little bit in flux towards the end of the year, but there's public comment proceeding to be opened this month regarding the Myanmar Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules, as Bill noted in the chat earlier. There's also a December public comment proceeding that would—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evin, just to cut you off. For some reason, my screen is frozen on continued deliberations of Topic A. I think whoever is in charge of the machine should be taking us back to the agenda, please.

YESIM SAGLAM: I am so sorry, Olivier. Doing this right now.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Yesim.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There we go. Go ahead, Evin.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you both. Yes. So great. So December, this public comment would likely go to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group but that

is on ICANN Operating and Financial Plan and Budget. And so the upcoming public comments—and we look forward to in January next year and the first one that would be released that year is the NCAP Study 2: Impact and Data Sensitivity Analysis. So if there's interest for this topic, I could go ahead and create an At-Large workspace. But just stay tuned for that public comment to come out.

Currently, there are no public comments for decision otherwise for this group. As noted earlier, in the beginning of the call, there'll be a draft ALAC statement circulated on Google Doc regarding the proposal for Latin Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules. So stay tuned for those. I'll turn it over to Jonathan in case he has any other comments. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evin. Not much to add. One of the things I wanted to follow up with is whether or not you or Heidi had heard more about the fate of the DAAR public comment that seems to have disappeared from the upcoming public comment section. Do we know that's been rescheduled or if it's not going to be handled as a difficult public comment? What's the story with that?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Jonathan. That's a good question. I'll let Heidi provide comments if she has any. But to our knowledge, that public comment is no longer a public comment. But I can find out regarding how that information will be updated. There are a few resources, of course, on the DAAR on the ICANN website that are being updated, but I'll give

myself an action item to find out that public comments history. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Thanks, Evin. I think that's it, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. We now are moving to Any Other Business. And in that Any Other Business, there are two announcements. One is that ICANN is hosting a webinar on the 18th of November at 16:00 UTC, and it's about the SSAD ODP, the Operational Design Phase. So as you know, the policy gets done in the policy development process, then it gets sent to the Board, the Board ratifies it, and then there is a process by which the system is being built and designed. That's what the ODP is all about. So there's going to be a full update on this. If you are interested, the registration link is on your screen at the moment. Jonathan is asking for the link to be copied to the chat. Yes, please do so. That would be helpful. But, of course, the link over to that registration is also on your agenda page. So that's one.

And of course, there's the latest SSAD ODP update on contractual compliance and identity verification methodology that has a blog post by Eleeza Agopian. The link to that blog post is in the agenda as well. It makes for an interesting read. Yeah, there you go. See this dated—well, I can't say fresh hot off the press because it's 2 November but it's got very interesting information in there that will no doubt be taken into account in the Operational Design Phase. Any comments or questions on these AOB? Are there any other other business to talk about?

I note from Avri, thank you for mentioning this, the ODP is in preparation for the Board vote. What the Board did was to approve the ODP and a financial allocation for it. Thank you. So it started the next proceeds and gave a green light for the work to proceed. But then obviously, this is all in motion at the moment.

I'm not seeing any hands up for further other business. So that means we're going to end our call early today. Given the light agenda, we've done well in one hour. Thanks very much to everyone who has provided updates and details. It has been an interesting call again. Let's see when we meet next week.

YESIM SAGLAM: Thanks so much, Olivier. As we're rotating, our next meeting will be on Wednesday next week, 17th, at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wednesday at 19:00 UTC it is. Thank you very much, Yesim. That pretty much means the end of today's call. Jonathan, anything else to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thanks to our interpreters and to our real-time transcription. And with this, have a very good morning, afternoon,

evening or night. And continue contributing on the mailing list. Until next week, goodbye.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you all. Bye-bye.

YESIM SAGLAM: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]