
YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 24th of November 2021 at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a 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. For today's call, we have received apologies from Harold Arcos, Gopal Tadepalli, Priyatosh Jana, Sébastien Bachollet, Holly Raiche, and from Judith Hellerstein. From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present on today's call. I'll also be doing call management. Just to cover our interpretation staff, we have Lilian and Marina on the Spanish channel, and Claire and Jacques on the French channel.

As usual, we have real-time transcription service provided for this call also. I'm just sharing the link with you here on Zoom chat. Please do check the service. And with this, the final reminder is for everyone to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. Yeah, Yeşim. I was just looking at the transcript already and seeing that when Jonathan is singing, it does say on the transcript singing. So that's very accurate. Very good indeed. Let's see if we have more of that later.

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.

In the meantime, we are going to be going through a pretty full agenda today, actually, compared to previous week. Starting with the Board advice, the ALAC has received some responses and some further questions from the Board. We're going to be looking through some of the discussion points. First, there'll be the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase 2. Of course, it used to be just the one EPDP but it's to do with the Registration Data services. And then there's the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures, and Justine Chew will take us through this part. After that, we'll have a presentation and Q&A on the Expedited Policy Development Process concerning the Internationalized Domain Names that we had spoken about this in previous calls. So this is the first such presentation that we're going to have about this topic. And then another presentation after that, which will be on the At-Large Registration Data Accuracy, the RDA Scoping Team with Alan Greenberg. So if we make it to the workgroup update, we'll go through these rather swiftly. But that's the main part of the agenda that we have so far. Are there any amendments, comments, questions regarding the agenda at this stage? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just to note that the title on the Scoping Team items is wrong. It's not the At-Large Accuracy Scoping Team, it's the GNSO Accuracy Scoping Team.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. That's a good point. We tend to appropriate a lot of things in At-Large. So maybe it will be the At-Large, maybe it wants to be the At-Large Scoping Team. Now it will be the GNSO. Thank you for this correction. I'm not seeing other hands up. So with that change, with that amendment, we can proceed with the action item.

The action items are all complete. They mostly relate to today's call. In fact, I think they all relate to today's call apart from the one on the proposal for the Latin Script Root Zone Label Generation Rules, which you will have noticed had a public comment closing on the 23rd so that was yesterday and that's now been filed and going through the process. Any comments or questions on these action items? Not seeing any hands.

Let's then proceed forward with agenda item number three, and that's the response from the ICANN Board of trustees on all of the advice or some of the advice that the ALAC has said. We'll start with Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi on the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on EPDP Phase 2. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This is a first pass. It clearly is not in anything resembling a final format nor is it very complete. But I wanted to give people a heads up of where we're going on this and give people an opportunity for changing or suggesting changes to it. We will be distributing the actual detailed wording of the Board requests, which are somewhat more complex than I'm presenting. Similarly, the answers will be a little bit more fleshed out. But I just wanted to give you an idea.

There were only three basic questions that were asked, although several of them have multiple parts to them. But this wasn't a very complex set of questions as, for instance, we've seen from the Subsequent Procedures. Of course, our comment was much more concise as well. For those who don't have the actual piece of advice handy, the URL is on the screen. And the presentation is linked to the agenda so you can pull it down from there. Next slide, please.

All right. As I said, there were three basic things they asked. The first one had two parts to it and there was a reference in our advice to GDPR-related regulations in Europe. And they're asking for information that what we mean is the NIS2 regulations as they evolve, because currently, they are subject to discussion and debate by the European Parliament and the European Council, and then negotiation between those two bodies to decide what format it will finally take. We're just confirming, yes, that is what we're talking about.

We also suggest that the issue be referred to the GNSO. They're asking for clarification of our rather loose term of the word "issue" to make sure that we're all talking on the same page. And they point out Board has an obligation to adopt any PDP recommendations unless the supermajority of the Board, two thirds of the Board, that if not in the best interest of ICANN and the community. And we're confirming that our position was implementing the SSAD as defined by Phase 2 of the EPDP is not in the interest of the community, it would require a huge investment, a lot of time, and we don't believe it will satisfy the need nor will be financially, fiscally viable. Next slide.

This one is somewhat related to it and they ask for clarity. Are we suggesting that this is something be referred to the GNSO in addition to the recommendations in lieu of, instead of approving the recommendations or something else? The answer here is going to be vague because there really is no point in giving the Board very strict advice. They're working in a difficult position right now. Simply not implementing the SSAD does not address the part of the problem that we have identified that the SSAD is needed or something comparable to the SSAD is needed but a working version. And we are suggesting that the current version not be approved because ultimately if the current version is approved and we're later in a position where the majority of registrars must change their practices to closer to what we had wanted out of the PDP, we would then be in a position where essentially there could be registrars who are not subject to European regulation that havens for DNS abuse and problems because they're in a position to redact information and not provide it, even though the registrars subject to European law would have to be providing it. So we would be in a very uneven playing field and ICANN would have no ability to provide oversight.

For those of you who were on the ALAC meeting yesterday, Göran made the strong point saying, "There are things in NIS2 that really are policy and they shouldn't be regulated by governments." At a theoretical level, one has to agree with him. But there is the PDP could not make these things policy. And hopefully, if it becomes regulations, it might be easier to adopt it as policy once it already applies to a large number of the registrars. So that's essentially what we're recommending that we wait

and hopefully we'll see NIS2 address some of the issues, and then we can actually make it into policy which is where it should be.

The secondary part of issue number two was, we had made reference that whatever we do should be applicable to privacy/proxy providers, and they're asking us for clarity, what do we mean? The meaning right now—you may remember we've had a PDP a long time ago that essentially would regulate—sorry, wrong word—would make privacy/proxy providers essentially contracted parties that have an agreement with ICANN. And we're saying since they redact data also, they should be subject to similar rules. The PDP has never been implemented for reasons that are not at all clear. It was put on hold due to the EPDP, although it was never clear that it really needed to be. They were in a very fuzzy situation at the time of the EPDP. Last slide, please.

This one had three parts. One is we said regulations comparable to NIS2 and they were asking for some clarity, what do we mean? The response will point out that NIS2 right now is a moving target. It is subject to negotiations, we don't know exactly what's going to be in it. And it may have a different time we finish. So we're saying NIS2 as it evolves, as it is finally approved. They're asking for clarity that are we requesting that if and when NIS2 is approved, we are asking for policy so it applies to all registrars, and the answer very simply is yes. We also make reference to—they're saying if we adopt policy because it is in NIS2, should we be adopting policy that matches legislation in other European legislation or legislation in other jurisdictions? I believe the only way we can answer that is with a waffling. It says if we find something else that is a comparable seriousness, then yes, we probably should consider it. We

point out that EPDP started off as a GDPR implementation. But as it evolved, it really became regulations that were comparable to general privacy legislation in other places. So for instance, GDPR requires that we treat those subject to European regulations differently from others. The EPDP said treat everyone the same. Treat all registrants the same. We shouldn't have an uneven playing field from a registrant point of view. If someone resident in Belgium deserves privacy then someone resident in Mozambique also deserves similar privacy. So we've already gone down that path in a significant way. We're just saying to extend it to the contracted parties, not only the registrants.

That's the presentation as it is. We've allowed a fair amount of time. I see Hadia has her hand up. Just to make it clear, the responses that you see and the fuller version which we'll be distributing in a while, I drafted and Hadia has been looking at it for the last couple of days. But at the time this presentation was made, I hadn't had the benefit of comments from Hadia. So I gladly turn the floor over to her right now. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAMI:

Thank you so much, Alan. As Alan mentioned, Alan drafted this and we are still looking at it. So in relation to the first question and maybe also in relation to the third question, I think we could also be a little bit more precise as Alan mentioned in the beginning. So the [avoid] SSAD in the first question, can we please clarify what GDPR-related regulations in Europe is referencing, what issue it is recommending. In response to that, in order to be precise, we could refer to Recital 62 and Article 23 of NIS2. Those 23.4 and 23.5, they call on registries and registrars to publish WHOIS data that is not subject to GDPR and to make data that is

subject to GDPR available to legitimate access seekers. And Recital 60 says the availability and timely accessibility of the data to public authorities, to providers of electronic communication networks, and services and providers of cybersecurity technologies and services acting on behalf of those sites, is essential to prevent and combat Domain Name System abuse. Also, we have Recital 62 suggest the use of an interface portal or other technical tool for making the data accessible. So, all of these Recitals and Article 23, they speak directly about WHOIS, the accessibility of the data, the tools to which this data should be allowed or made available to the public. So, this is the response to the GDPR-related regulations in Europe and actually the issue that we are talking about.

Also, part of this could be incorporated with issue number three, when we talk about regulations comparable to NIS2. So basically, what we are saying, we never said that the SSAD is a bad thing. Actually, having a tool is necessary. What we are saying is that the tools that we have now might not be fit to what actually upcoming regulations and clarifying regulations could actually require. And what we're saying right now that spending money on a tool that we will need to adjust may be very soon is not a wise thing to do.

I think this is what we want to make clear because of course the Board is saying we need to actually adopt what comes from the community and they are correct. They do need to adopt what comes from the community or what we're saying that what's coming from the community now, if we implement it as is without any option of upgrading or changing, this is not a good thing because we might need

to change this very soon according to very clear articles and recitals.
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Hadia. Two points. Number one is how do you describe a lot of the current details or the details in NIS2 as we saw them in the original draft legislation? We don't know exactly what will be recommended in the final implementation. And then of course, there's the country notation of that in each of the EU jurisdictions. So that's one of the reasons we use terms like comparable, too, because we don't know what's going to be in the final version. I hope it will be close to what we saw originally or stronger. On the other hand, there are obviously other parties who want it to be weaker. We're not sure exactly where it's going to come out.

Lastly, in terms of implementation, there's another position we could take. And the other position is saying implemented as it was designed, and then go ahead and have another PDP and change it. The benefit of that is you'll have the infrastructure. So we'll get a jump on implementing the good one. The potential problem with that is it's very, very hard in ICANN if you have something to change it. It's a judgment call whether you should implement it poorly and then fix it or wait until you have a better specification because you're much more likely to have that pressure to do something is going to be made stronger if we don't do it. But it is a judgment call and we will be pointing that out. Anyway, I don't see any other hands. Is there anyone else?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to ask, what is your timeline for providing these responses to the Board?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to get them out as quickly as possible. But clearly, there are other things going on so I'm hoping within a few weeks—we're not talking about months but we're not talking this week either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So if I could suggest then that perhaps we have this for the time being for people in this working group to simmer over it and have a look at it and think, "Is that really what we want?" And then we can perhaps revisit this next week and people can ask questions by then, if they have questions, and make further comments. And then you'll have a fuller picture of what you need to put as a response to the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly coming back next week without a new presentation, but just having people have a chance to look at this, is something we could do. And hopefully, by the week after that, we'll have a formal draft of our comments and we can send that out in advance and then have a quick look. It's going to be much longer document. We're not going to read it out here but we'll get it out in time for people to have a look.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Hadia and Alan, for this. So we'll proceed as that. Maybe we could also send an e-mail to the mailing list to point

those people who couldn't make it to today's call to have a look at the deck and to listen to the call. And then we'll have a Q&A session next week on this Q&A plus suggestions, I guess. I'm sure there'll be some suggestions. We can move forward. Let's have a look.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're going to have an action item for me on that, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I guess that's recorded. So the next thing is the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on the Subsequent Procedures. But did I hear that Justine was not with us today?

JUSTINE CHEW: No, I'm here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're here. Okay. I might just be looking—oh yeah, you are. That's really strange. I was scrolling down the list of participants. It looks as though you just moved up the list. Another Zoom feature. Welcome, Justine Chew. So you're going to speak to us about the ALAC advice on the Subsequent Procedures and the response from the ICANN Board or should we say the questions from the ICANN Board and so on. So over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. I have to confess that I am way less prepared than Alan with the questions from the ICANN Board on our ALAC advice on Subsequent Procedures. We did wait quite a while for the Board to come back to us on our advice clarification. We did have one meeting between some of the ALAC people and others who had been working on advice as well with the Board. It was the week before ICANN72. It was only an hour meeting. Even though we only received the questions from the Board the day before the call, I think we managed to provide some answers to the Board's questions. But having said that, our advice covered 12 areas of Subsequent Procedures, 12 out of 41 topics, and we had about 14 bullet points contained in that particular piece of advice. So we can't possibly have gone through all bullet points in an hour anyway. So we basically left it as that at the end of the hour and we were going to come back and draft some text as answers back to the Board. That hasn't happened. I think we sort of got tied up with ICANN72 and other things that were going on. So I guess I have to kick start that effort again.

I will say that I haven't had the time to really think about it. But in the back of my mind, the piece of advice that we provided to the Board was strategically structured to address gaps. What I mean by gaps is that if anything we thought were insufficient in terms of the GNSO recommendations, then that's where we added our point of view. Because we have been constantly told that ICANN Board doesn't make policy, policymaking has gone through GNSO, but insofar as if there is a gap, there's a lacuna, so therefore, there is no policy that determines the decisions per se. Then perhaps the Board could intervene that way

and that's the way we approach the Subsequent Procedures in terms of our advice.

The second thing I wanted to mention was that the Board's role has been kind of like trying to apply their global public interest framework in determining what to do when questions are posed to the Board. So I would like to have a look to see whether we can structure our answers using the global public interest framework that the Board came up with. So we can use that as a mechanism to compel or to encourage the Board to take certain steps in the global public interest. So I'll leave it at that. I'll just say that work is ongoing and we will get started again. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. I see there are a couple of hands in the queue at the moment. So let's start with Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Good morning. I think it's brilliant, Justine, to pull in something about the global public interest into any response that we would do. I mean, I've been looking at that stuff and they would really like it if we did that. I don't know if anybody has really taken that opportunity yet. I think this would be a brilliant time and place to do it and we could also maybe use it as an example of how this can be done in the upcoming ICANN public meeting which will have a public session on the global public interests. That's my comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marita. Let's continue with Jonathan Zuck, and then, Justine, you can comment. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Just to add a little bit of color commentary to our discussion with the Board about this feedback, we've somehow created the impression that we don't want a new round and that we're throwing up obstacles to it. So our motivation seems to be that somehow prevent a new round. I think we need to be careful in our response to clarify that that isn't our position at all. In fact, I think we view a new round as a relatively rare opportunity for leverage on issues such as DNS abuse and the changes to contracts, etc., as happened in the 2012 round. I think our position really is that there's no rush for a new round. There's not demand for a new round that we need to be worried about, and so that we have the time to get it right. I think that's really at the center of our advice is let's not build the airplane while it's in the sky, the metaphor that's often used. That's the foundation of our advice, as I understand our consensus position.

So I was somewhat surprised to hear from the Board that they believe that we were against the new round and that and what essentially we were trying to do was throw up obstacles to it. That means that we haven't communicated clearly enough our intentions because that's definitely not our intentions, but it's something to keep in mind as we continue to balance the interests within the ICANN community that are driving for new round. Again, some of the issues that we are focused on in terms of getting some of the process issues right, focusing on really getting a good applicant support process in place, a good IDN support

process in place, and seeing some material movement on DNS abuse. So that's our motivation and has nothing to do with being against any round. So let's just keep that in mind as we have these conversations and in our communications with the Board so that we don't form a mistaken impression. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, just before I jump in on this—well, I see actually Cheryl. I was going to mention, would do you suggest we move forward with mentioning that Cheryl suggested a small team? I'll let Cheryl Langdon-Orr—

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, let's do it. I don't know that we need to go crazy. I think we're ready. We'll just to do it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just going to wrap that up. I was just going to wrap that up by pointing out to the audio files that in chat with pretty much formalized a small team to work with Justine. I pointed out that that makes sense because Justine and I are, of course, also still listed to the Board as shepherds, as part of the shepherding team from the PDP anyway because of, obviously, my leadership role but also the role that Justine had played, not as the ALAC liaison from the work that you've all been involved with the CPWG, but her role in part leadership of one of the work tracks. So we already have that two-pronged attack to all of this and that we can just sort of get that going. So Evin can sort out a time

together, us all together, and then we can get on to some asynchronous work and hopefully come back to the CPWG before year's end. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Back to Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Nothing more to comment. Let's do it. Find some time to coordinate things with Jonathan and Cheryl. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Marita, your hand is still up. Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: No, sorry. Old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No worries. Thank you. Thanks very much, everyone. Let's move on to the next agenda item. We've now touched on both ALAC advice responses. We seem to have a plan for both. So agenda item number four is now the presentation and Q&A of the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Internationalized Domain Names. We haven't had much updates since the start of this group. But today, everything will be revealed. And with this, Satish Babu, Lianna Galstyan, and Abdulkarim Oloyede will be taking us through a slide deck. So welcome, ladies and gentlemen, and you have the floor.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Olivier. So we want to over the next 15 minutes make a presentation on what we have done so far, what are the questions which have come up, and then we can answer questions or we can take your input, probably both. So giving a little bit of context, then the actual charter questions, and then the work that has been happening until 18 November. Yeah. Next slide, please.

In the last round, 2012, we did have some coverage of ASCII and IDN requirements. But that was kind of partial because we didn't have a framework to compare against. We also did not allow within TLDs. But 2013 was the year when we started off and ICANN started off the Root Zone LGR procedure with the Board approval. And this Root Zone LGR is actually a technical framework which allows for validation of IDN labels and also listing out of the variants and also determining the allocation disposition of the label.

So, now that the Root Zone LGR is available for several languages, it is to be integrated into the Subsequent Procedures and the PDP's mandate is exactly that. So, the questions very roughly—to find out how we can use the Root Zone LGR, how might we use it for all TLDs generate country code? How could we use it for checking the validity and allocability of not yet designed and not delegated labels at the top level? If we use LGR, are we going to create, have any consequences to the ones already delegated TLDs? Now, this is because when these TLDs are kind of delegated, there's no Root Zone LGR. So we are doing a back check to see any of the already allocated TLDs have issues with Root Zone LGR if

you try to apply it. And then finally, we can also use the Root Zone LGR to manage variants at the second level. Next.

Here we have the charter questions A to G. These are the different sections, seven sections. In each of the sections, we have questions like A 1-8 and B 1-5 and so on. We are currently at A. And if you look at the rest of it, it's about the same entity constraint at the top level, second level. The pickings required in the legal contract. Then, again, adjustments to the objection process, string similarity, review, and so on, all the kind of different steps, adjustments in the dispute resolution procedures. And finally, the IDN Implementation Guideline version 4.0 was completed a couple of years back but GNSO they've not actually implemented it for various reasons, so that has been again passed on to the PDP to see how we can update these guidelines. Next.

So our team, three members and three participants to begin with, now it has three members and two participants. The whole EPDP, the Charter Question a3. Earlier, the ALAC team had asked for more background on the Root Zone LGR workings. We have several questions on how the actual the system work. Now that request actually triggered off capacity building process that was uniformly useful to everybody else, to everybody in the EPDP. So there were two presentations made. I mean, actually, it was scheduled for one, but there's so many questions that spilled over to the second session also, pointing to the fact that people were interested in this. So the presentations are useful also because down the line in other charter questions also, this information could be used. Next.

Okay. It gets very technical from this point on, but we're not going to get into all the technical details because we do look at the big picture. Now, what does the Root Zone LGR do? Now, the point is that there are multiple language communities. There's the single root zone. Now how do we ensure that the language communities, what can be captured in a way that can be finally integrated into the root zone? And the way that it works, some of us are very familiar with this, I'm sure because we've been seeing this slide for quite some time. Each language community, sometimes multiple languages together, forms a Generation Panel which looks into several things. For instance, what are the good points? A good point is the Unicode character. What are the code points that can be allowed? Because it's a very conservative subset that is normally used for creating a label. So the Root Zone LGR, what we're expecting from it is that it provides us with a standard procedure which will allow us to kind of validate any label. And it will show us the variant. You'll see an example now. Because the problem with variant, fundamentally, is that, on the one hand, the user community expects variants to behave the same way as the original label. For example, color and colour. We expect that their plugin, you can plugin exchange. Wherever you apply color, you cannot use colour. That's a user expectation. But technically, for the DNS, this is a completely different label. And there has to be a process for kind of accommodating such a kind of expectation from the user. On the other hand, we also have a problem with confusability. That was a problem for the end user. So these are actually two different aspects where the Root Zone LGR impacts end user expectations. I'm reminded when I'm 8 or 9 minutes so that I can wind up without delay.

So the Generations Panel brings together language experts and they apply several principles including—you can see the list here, longevity, least astonishment, contextual safety, inclusion, simplicity, predictability, stability, letter, conservatism. So, the documentation is available on all these. You don't want to get into the details here. The main point to be noted here is that the whole Generation Panel leading up to the formation the Root Zone LGR is an asynchronous process. It is not done on a live basis. Different language, communities work in different periods of time, they submit their work, and then it gets integrated. Now if there is a need to trigger off a review of a GP's work, that process is not well defined. We'll come to that a little later.

So once the GP finishes the work, then there is another panel called Integration Panel which consists of linguistic experts and technical experts who look at the cross script aspects. Earlier the GPs were isolated in a single language or a group of languages. But here the IP looks at all the different GP's work and to see if there's any conflict that impact the end user, and then they integrate it. Currently, we have 18 scripts to put it and 7 are expected to be added into the [inaudible]. Next slide, please.

Now, when you talk about variants, you talk about the combinatorial explosion. Meaning, when you have a label which consists of different code points and some of them have variants, and when you therefore list down all the combinations, you get a very large number of labels, basically. Now, currently, we have an online tool, which implements or which allows us to use the work of the GPs that is basically the Root Zone LGR, and it will allow us to get a particular label. And if you fit in this case, for example, there are 24 that we see on the screen. There are

more, actually. The first one is the original label. This is an Arabic example. So, the tool says the original is valid. Then the tool lists down all the other variants possible and this is then allocatable. That is what the tool indicates. Without the tool, it becomes very hard to kind of do this exercise on a manual basis for a large number of things, which is the reason why we are looking at applying Root Zone LGR for everything, because it allows us to kind of manage or get on top of the data that is involved in this process. Next.

So the first, Charter Question a1 was for existing delegated label, should we use Root Zone LGR as a sole source to calculate variants? Now, since we are permitting variants in the next round, presumably, can we work out the variants of the IDNs which are already available and delegated? So we said, “Look, we need to look at the data on the past labels so that we can run this tool against all the different labels, which has already been allocated and see what is the situation.”

So the last meeting we had, me and Sarmad, coming back with the data analysis. They found that based on 1930 application, the previous round, the analysis only found three anomalies. That means that Root Zone LGR was pretty okay. And out of the three anomalies, two were typos, presumably. I mean, that is what Sarmad was explaining. It is, therefore, very much consistent with the general, the way it has been done earlier, there are no surprises here. So if it strengthens our belief that the Root Zone LGR can actually be applied in future. Next.

The next question is about self-identified variant labels. So when an applicant makes an application, he or she provides—okay, not he or she, it’s an institution that makes the application. So they provide a bunch of

self-identified variants. So we need to check whether the self-identified variants, the originally created and conceived by the applicant, how does it compare when you run the LGR? Do they also say these are actually allocatable variants or not? So this requires a little more analysis, the data. We're currently looking at this question. The data has been collected and we will be looking at to see whether there are any surprises. Is there a label that the applicant has proposed with the Root Zone LGR tool says no. In which case, we have a little bit of a contention. How to resolve that? In the meantime, the two, RySG and ccNSO will be checking with their own groups to see whether they have any concerns regarding the use of consistent use of Root Zone LGR [inaudible] going forward. Next.

Now, the third question, which currently again I just opened now, is about the possibility of challenging the Root Zone LGR. Now, without getting into too much detail, the question is whether an applicant submits a label. The applicant from a language community, they pretty much know the language community, so we assume that they know their stuff and they're putting forth an application with a particular label. But the LGR tool says this is invalid. So then what could be wrong? What could be the possible reasons? Next slide, please. We will not get into this slide. But the slide is available here, the link to the agenda. So anybody who's interested can look at it. Because there's a considerable amount of technical detail where we don't want to kind of get into this in a short presentation.

So the question, if Root Zone LGR rejects a label as invalid that is proposed originally by an applicant, what could be the reason? So the first, there are two boxes here. Two reasons. One is that the applicant

alleges that the implementation of LGR was incorrect. That means the basic LGR is okay, but when it was implemented into this tool, there was an implementation mistake. Now, that's a reasonable question many [inaudible]. And if such a thing happens, then there is a reason why we should have allowed some kind of challenge so that it can be further examined in depth, to see if there's a technical implementation error.

The other possibility is the applicant says, "Look, your LGR is wrong. The language community that did this really did not know language." So the problem with that is that, like I said earlier, the language communities are asynchronous. They're not seated all the time. They come and go. They are set up and they are dismantled. So in such a case, the EPDP can look at that question. It basically gets out of the remit of the EPDP. We feel that we cannot make that as a basis for a challenge because it is for the language community and the GP to consider. And it is outside the kind of boundaries of what they're trying to do. Next.

I'll very quickly run through the slide, but this requires to be examined in depth. Initially, when the applicant submits this, he or she or they, actually, can use the tool any time. In fact, they can use it right now to see whether this is valid by the tool. And it's very clear that if we decide to go with this tool, Root Zone LGR implementation, then we are going to, at every possible time or occasion, we will run it against the tool. So the applicant, even before submission, knows that the tool will say this is invalid or valid.

So in the early steps in the process, we expect that the tool will be applied to validate this thing. Now, if the label is valid, go to the next. So number three, fundamentally here is it is valid. The tool says this label is

valid. But in the eventuality that the tool says it is invalid, we can of course abandon the application. But we're saying we should perhaps provide for an edge case scenario, where although the tool says this is invalid, there should be a possibility for continuing to the next phase where there will be the DNS stability check, which, among other things, can do a manual check. Not an automated tool but a manual check to see whether there is any possibility of something that has gone wrong here, including the decoding or implementation error. So, if the label which failed earlier succeeds at this point, then you can continue. But if it fails here again, then the chances are that you have to abandon the application.

So we are at this point now. I don't want to get into more details here. There is a second part here where there is one more chance to look at whether this is any edge case that goes even further. Currently, we are looking at the problem of should there be a challenge at all? And if so, what should be the basis of that challenge? So we expect that over the next several calls, we will be looking at a1, a2, a3, and we'll be resolving these three. This is not a permanent resolution but to keep a temporary kind of understanding that we are okay with this way, and then we'll go ahead. But the problem is that the question further down in this charter will also have an impact on how we handle 1, 2, 3. So it is actually interlinked. So we are trying to kind of figure out that we're not freezing it. We are saying, "Okay, this is the kind of what we believe as of now."

So that's it from my side. My colleagues can add on if I have missed out anything or I have misstated anything. Next slide, please. We are open for questions and suggestions and any comments. But I'd like to ask my colleagues, if they want to add anything here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Satish, do you want to run your own queue?

SATISH BABU: No, no, no. Go ahead, Olivier. I just wanted to ask them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's probably faster if you do. But I see Hadia Elminiawi is next. But please do. You're fully in charge of your session. Thanks.

SATISH BABU: Right. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much, Satish. Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to note that the responsibility of the content of the Root Zone Label Generation Rule lies with the Generation Panel and the Integration Panel. So, it is important to note that when the applicant is actually challenging the decision, the panel looking into the challenge is not actually looking at the content. It's only looking at the implementation if something did go wrong with the implementation. So the applicant is not actually challenging the content of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules, but it is challenging the implementation. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Hadia. That's absolutely correct. If the applicant is actually challenging the content, then it's out of the scope of what we can do. It has to go back to the GP and all that. So then it essentially gets out of this whole loop. So what can be challenged is essentially the implementation of [inaudible]. I see Cheryl's point that we need to look at edge cases and some means the challenge could be useful. Yeah. So are there any other questions or comments? Yes, Bill, go ahead.

BILL JOURIS: You were just mentioning things getting bounced back to the Generation Panels. As someone who's on a Generation Panel, I have to say there has been no mention to any of us that the Generation Panel would have that function or even that we would continue once the actual proposal for the particular script was done. If someone thinks we're going to go back to those Generation Panels, somebody should mention it to the Generation Panels that they're not done yet. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Bill. We are very much aware of this issue. So technically, what I'm basically saying is that if the applicant is complaining about the content, as Hadia pointed out, then it goes out of the scope of the EPDP. We're not even committing as to what then will happen. But the applicant does have the freedom to go back to the language community and ask them. But that's outside us, outside the scope of the EPDP. But if the applicant feels strongly enough, although we're not going to make any recommendation on how that will proceed, but that's the only way

this can be resolved. Maybe that will trigger another round of GP being—whether the GP is set up in the [inaudible], they are not always seated. And therefore, this is a challenge. But we are unable to comment on this because it's outside the scope of the EPDP, and we are aware of this problem. So it remains to be seen as to how this is going to get sorted out. Justine, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks. Just to jump in here. Bill, you are asking question for which the answer is not fixed yet because we're dealing with policy and the fact that the RZ-LGR is available for the next round to be incorporated through the application process. That's something new that we're considering at this point in time. So if the recommendation from the EPDP is that something that can besides the challenge the content of the rule, then we would say, the recommendation will say something along the lines of, if that happens then that challenge won't be allowed. The applicant has to go back to the GP. Satish has quite rightly pointed out that whatever happens with the Generation Panel and Integration Panel process that is beyond the scope of this EPDP, so that's not something that we can get into. So in terms of what you're asking about being informed, there's not our role. Okay. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Justine. Hadia, is it a new hand?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. It was a new hand. I thank you and, Justine, you said it all. However, I would like to point out that it has been discussed during the EPDP sessions. What I think everyone agrees on that an applicant should be able to, of course, challenge the content but not as part of the application process. So, even an applicant, if you're looking at the string and you think that the Root Zone Label Generation Rules does not give you the right outputs, you could potentially go to the Generation Panel in order to look into this but not as a part of the application process. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Hadia. Justine, is there a new hand?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, it is. Just to quickly let people know that in the last round, there was no challenge process at all. Okay. So this idea of a challenge is something new and we're thinking that it's a good idea because a lot of the applicants from the last round, they were trying to challenge but there was no avenue for them to challenge. And therefore, they ended up using the accountability mechanisms which are actually not designed to deal with issues around applications for gTLDs. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Justine. I see Bill's comment that the EPDP group might want to note explicitly that is part of the process should be addressed. I completely agree. So when the occasion comes then we can raise this point, we will raise it. It will be dealt with by ICANN in some way, we

don't know, but definitely. I am not seeing any other hands. So I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you, CPWG. We'll be happy to take on any questions if any of you have later. Back to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Satish, this is a new hand.

SATISH BABU: Sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry. I think Hadia has a new hand. Sorry for it. Hadia, go ahead, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. This is actually to Bill's comment that the EPDP group might want to note explicitly that this part of the process should be addressed. I don't know if he means addressed through the applicant process and the EPDP or addressed where. Because for sure, it will not be part of the application process. It's foreseen to take some time and it could actually hinder the whole process. Also, you have a tool which you can use even before you have an application process and know whether its string is valid or not and you can try to challenge it. You don't need for an application process to start and then give you an invalid string in order to go and challenge this outcome to the application process. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks very much, Hadia. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Satish, I saw that Bill Jouris had put his hand up as well.

SATISH BABU: Oh, sorry. Bill, go ahead.

BILL JOURIS: I was just going to say this may not be part of the process but it seems to me you folks are the ones who are in a position to tell the IDN projects that they need to think about it. That was all I was saying. I'm happy to talk about it later offline because we have other things to get to today. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Bill. We'll be in touch offline. You have our sympathy, but we are to see how we can best manage this. Thank you. And back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. I just have one more question for you, which is are we going to be able to have you next week on any further questions on this? Because I do note several points made in the chat that this was quite a compact presentation. And certainly looking at the actual last slide, looking at the full process, it might be that it could take some people a little time to immerse themselves in it and they might

have questions next week. So will we be able to have that sort of Q&A follow-up on that?

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. We can have a Q&A follow but I suggest two weeks from now, if it's possible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Two weeks from now. I guess, yeah.

SATISH BABU: I have a time zone issue for the next succeeding call. Otherwise, my colleagues can maybe—we will discuss and get back to you on this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine. It was just a suggestion. So get back to us after the call. Thank you so much for this update. Very, very interesting. Another fascinating topic for those people following this call. So I've certainly learned some more as I always do on these calls.

Now, the next topic is going to be about the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team, the RDA. Something tells me that we're going to have a lot more of that coming up soon. But for the time being, Alan Greenberg is going to tell us about the gap analysis on this topic.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. There's been an interesting history on this. Initially, we were asked to come up with a definition of accuracy from a point of view of the current situation. There has been a lot of pushback on calling it a definition. There's fear certainly among some of the non-contracted parties that if we call it a definition of accuracy, that we're locking it in. Clearly, many of us have some concern about the lack of accuracy under the current rules. So we're probably not going to call it a definition.

Nevertheless, the current rules as implemented in the RAA calls for the following. This is a shortened version but it's moderately accurate. Registrars have to check for the presence and format of all registrant tech contact, if present, and admin contact. Now, note the admin contact is disappearing once the EPDP Phase 1 is implemented, but it's still there today. So, in other words, they have to check to make sure the fields weren't empty, if they're obligatory fields. Tech contact was not obligatory.

Then they have to check consistency where technically and commercially feasible. This is a very fuzzy one. Consistency means, for instance, if I tell you the street I'm on in Montreal and I give you my postal code, they're supposed to verify that the two match. So I shouldn't be able to give you the name of a non-existent street, for instance, and it all should match. Whether this has been done or not is not clear. Registrars have made the claim that this is a very difficult thing to do in many areas and certainly for a smaller registrar. So that's why the weasel words of "check consistency where technically and commercially feasible" are there. So it may be done right now, it may not be done.

Lastly—not lastly—but they have to verify the operational status of either the registrant phone number or e-mail. So, for instance, they may send a SMS text to my phone, if I give a mobile phone number, and with a code number and I have to respond on their website or somewhere with that code number to prove that the message actually got through to me and I can do something about it. But they only have to do it for one of the fields and there’s typically no way of knowing which field it was that was verified if you get the information.

Lastly, this is required only for new registrations and only ones where the registrar does not already have a previously verified contact information. Now, it’s not 100% clear how this has been implemented. That may well be if the client, not necessarily the registrant but if the client already has information then you may not do it. I, for instance, have registered domain names under these rules and I’ve never gotten a verification message on this. That may be because my registrar believes that my information already is correct, although my first registrations predated this RAA. So I don’t believe I’ve ever gotten a verification message but I won’t swear to that. So it’s pretty vague. And more important, there’s roughly 200 million domains already registered which are registered prior to these rules. So we’re still talking about that “definition” but we’ll see where that goes. Next slide, please.

There was then a suggestion that we try to identify, “we” being each of the groups represented on the Scoping Team to come up with an aspirational definition. That is, in the best world, what would we like to see and presumably why? This was highly debated and we are no longer using the term that contracted parties, in particular, really objected to calling something an aspirational target. There was also significant

discussion on whether we should be coming up with the purposes or accuracy, which justifies why we have this aspirational definition. In any case, this is now off the table. There had been a target that we lock in our aspiration definition by next Monday. That's now off the table. So instead, we are now doing something called a gap analysis. Next slide.

The gap analysis, essentially, is trying to ferret out with these questions. I'm not very happy with these questions. But nevertheless, that's the ones that are on the table today that may change going forward. These essentially say what do you think is being done today? Why are we collecting the information? Essentially, what would you like to see? And how should we measure or gauge whether in fact we are being successful? How do we know whether data is accurate or not? As I said, I'm not very happy with the format of the questions, but these are the questions on the table with a target of December 9, which is two weeks from now, roughly, to come up with the answers. So I've drafted some preliminary answers and I don't want to review them here. Next slide, please.

Okay. So the first question is what is from your perspective the current goal that the existing accuracy requirements and enforcement are trying to meet? Again, the wording here implies what is the goal of the current accuracy? Well, when you look at that, there's two angles to look at it from. The first is why did we have an accuracy specification at all? And that is to try to ensure that the contact information works, that registrants are contactable by the fields that are filled in. In an ideal world, perhaps we would have said everything has to be tested but that's not what it ended up being negotiated between ICANN Org and the registrars.

As implemented, however, it's a little bit vaguer than that. It's not all contact. We have to ensure that the fields are credible. That is, an address looks vaguely like what an address should look like in the country where it is. The phone numbers have the right format, the right number of digits in it, an e-mail has an @ sign in it, for instance. And they have to test the viability of one of the contact information. That is, someone must be able to respond to it to say they actually received this.

A key phrase there is it must be accurate at the time it is tested. That may be a very long time ago. In my case, I don't know when my contact information was tested. I'm not even sure it was, but let's assume it was, but that could be a very long time ago and there's no guarantee that it still works. Moreover, there's a huge number of installed registrations that were never subject to it. So what are we trying to achieve? I think the credibility and one contact is viable is what it is trying to achieve right now. Next slide.

How and by whom is it or can it be measured whether these goals are met? Right now, the contracted party said to say, "Well, it's our responsibility to make sure it's accurate and trust us it's accurate." I don't consider that satisfactory. I believe that as has been done before, we need ICANN or a third party contracted by ICANN to investigate and to see to what extent there are registrations. Previous studies have shown that many registrations have errors and a huge number—sorry. Let me start over again. Previous studies have shown that many registrations have errors. They've also shown that most registrations have some accurate information or usable information there. But very few registrations have all the information that meets that criteria. That's

what the studies have seen years ago because we haven't done anything recently. But I don't believe that we can do anything other than have a true regular sampling to understand to what extent accuracy is being met right now. Accuracy, implying real contactability, not just describing a real address. Next slide.

Third question, are there any goals that have been overlooked? And if yes, explain. What additional goals should be considered in the context of accuracy requirements, and why? That is, give the problems and how do we expect them to be addressed? My belief is I think ALAC's belief is the goal to ensure contactability regardless of method. So, if a registrant is obliged to provide a paper mailing address, which is often used, we may rely on e-mail and phone a lot, but for legal documents, a mailing address is often mandatory. So we should ensure that all the contactability information is something that actually gets to the registrant. There are some people who say that we must verify that you are indeed who you say you are, and that's more difficult in some cases.

If someone says they're Alan Greenberg, well, maybe they can prove that with a passport or something. In many of our jurisdictions, you're not obliged to show that kind of information. Moreover, there are many Alan Greenbergs. So how do we know I'm the right Alan Greenberg? On the other hand, if someone says they are Facebook or Google and cannot demonstrate that they really are that corporation, that's a little bit easier to verify. Even that is not 100% guaranteed doable. So essentially, what I think we're looking for is real contactability. The only reason we ask for this data is that we can contact registrants, so we know who the registrant is, and that information should be verified. Next slide.

Last question, how and by whom have these problems need to be documented? How and by whom should it be documented? Again, it's sort of a study. I think the only possible answer is, number one, we should be doing studies. We should be paying someone to look at data and see to what extent is accurate and verify. And second of all, we need to survey those who, on a regular basis, get data, either by looking at it in WHOIS if it's actually there or by requesting it and trying to gauge to what extent is accurate.

So, for instance, if we have a UDRP, that the UDRP provider, the dispute process provider, asks for information and gets it and then that isn't usable to contact the person, then that's clearly an issue. But we know cybersecurity people will try to contact registrants on occasion to tell them that their domain looks like it's been hacked or their website has been hacked and it's being used for malicious purposes. So the only way I think we can determine this is by going to the people who use the data and by proactively doing studies.

Those are the four questions, assuming they stand, I guess I'm looking for comments on are these answers reasonable? And if not, what should we be putting? Assuming these questions stand, the current deadline is the 9th of December, which is almost two weeks from now or a week and a half from now. I open the floor. Marita?

MARITA MOLL:

Alan, thanks for this. I saw it's pretty clear. Maybe I'm displaying my ignorance here by asking this question. But is there always an indication on the record as to when the last time that information was checked or

received even? What is often on our documents we'll have a note on and saying request has been updated. Is that done or even possible?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I was on mute. Presumably the registrar knows which field or fields they have verified and when. That is not information that is supplied in the WHOIS record. One of the questions I proposed that we ask ICANN is does ICANN get that information when they ask for information about a registrant? So it's clearly information the registrar should be keeping. Currently, it is not public. It's not available to the public and it may not even be available to ICANN Compliance. I don't know. Good question. And that's one of the problems right now is the registrar only has to verify one of the fields but we don't know which field it is. And they may choose to verify the e-mail address, and then only give us a phone number, for instance, or vice versa. It's a very vague field.

MARITA MOLL:

Maybe something like that should be added to one of your draft responses.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You bet. As I said, I'm not happy with these questions because it doesn't really give an opportunity to put that kind of request in. We'll clearly get it in there somehow but it doesn't make it easy. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I remember the old days and up to quite recently when WHOIS was in operation, the domain name registrant would regularly receive an e-mail from the registrar telling them that they have to verify their e-mail and their registration details and to make any amendments. It was their duty to make amendments and the process and so on being explained on how to make the amendments. The fact that the e-mail would not bounce where it was warranting or at least was giving some kind of a tick that the e-mail address was still valid. And even before that, this is speaking to some registrars 15 years ago maybe, they used to send postcards around this time of the year to their customers. They don't do that anymore, I guess, because it's costly. But if any postcards were returned, they would also then investigate on how things weren't working. I guess we had heard a few years ago that I think the Compliance department was also doing this from time to time. This seems to have gone totally out of the window. Is that Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it's not correct. The verification requirements are still there annually. However, that does not require a response. You get a message once a year saying ICANN requires your contact information to be accurate, please ensure that it is. There is no response requested. And I don't believe there is any requirement to check for bounces. That doesn't mean a registrar might not do it, but my understanding is there is no requirement in the RAA to verify that the message has been sent to a place that can receive it. If it bounces, if it goes into Never Never Land, if it goes to an e-mail address that may still exist but you never look at, so be it. That's my understanding of the current environment. It

needs to be verified. But I'm pretty sure that's correct. As I said, no need to reply, no need to verify that anyone's even gotten it. So it's still there but it's not clear to what extent it is viable and useful.

Now, registrars could have information on to what extent our domain names change, the contact may change, shortly after the verification letter has gone out. That would be really interesting information. It's not any information we have access to. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Olivier actually made a couple of points I was going to make with regard to the annual process that does certainly still go on. But it seems to me from an operations point of view, that it shouldn't be an insurmountably difficult task to require a response. Be that a simple tick the box and press Send and it states that you have in fact checked that the information as listed is correct. That would seem to be operationally a relatively simple approach to put in.

It does, yes, I suppose, noting what is being said in the chat about freaking out single domain name registrants. But to that extent, the single domain name registrant is probably more likely to take the time to take all of that seriously and look at the record and go, "Oh hang on, my phone number is in fact now incorrect." And this does happen. Let me tell you why. I have a small portfolio of names but I'm actually listed as a reseller. Now, I don't resell very often, but it's within my purview to do so because of how things were set up a million years ago. So I kind of have a ball in both courts here from an operations point of view. I note, however, that over the years, as the businesses has been followed up,

bought and sold, all sorts of things have happened, it's not uncommon for wholesale errors to be put in to the records, and resellers don't always pick that up. They should, but they don't. It's the licensee that really does need to double check. If all of a sudden you find you've got the phone numbers, the contact, has been changed to some things that was typed in wrong or something that was in fact a now defunct company, then that does need to be picked up. So I don't think it's [inaudible], but it is something we need to attend to. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, a couple of things. If I were a registrar, the first thing I would say when you tell me I should expect a verification or an answer to the verification letter is, "What do I do if they don't? Do I suspend the domain name?" Now, remember, we're working in an environment where when domain names expire and many domain names are not on automatic renewal or the credit card is expired that you use for it, we now have policy that says what registrars must do if a domain name expires to try to get your attention. Clearly, if a domain name is going to be expiring, there's a notice sent, but very often those notices get ignored. And the real question is, is a registrar supposed to suspend or lock a domain name if you don't respond to this letter? And we have to presume that a very large number of people will not respond. So if we're going to propose that a positive response is needed to each annual verification, we have to think about what is the remedy if someone doesn't respond and if that's something that's reasonable in the world we're living in. But the reality is that many phone numbers and e-mail addresses may have been valid at the time they were entered but probably are not now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier. I'm going to ask you—

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, did you have a response?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Keep going.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Steinar. Olivier, did you want to get in?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. I was going to say that, thanks, Steinar. And then we have to wrap up because we still have an agenda item. It's very late. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: My understanding so far is that the WHOIS data reminder policy doesn't require any tracking of the responses being sent out from the registrars. But having said that, the majority of the registrars, they operate in a wide area of maybe often located country by country, and they do have some techniques to identify their primary customer base, etc. And they are interested in having accurate client data. So creating more obstacles that most likely will fail to check e-mail addresses, phone numbers, take into consideration that the registrars do want to have an accurate client database. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, there's no question the registrars want an accurate client database, but that does not necessarily map onto the WHOIS. Registrars don't use the WHOIS database, the RDDS, for client contact. They have a completely separate record for their client. And clearly, they have an interest in being able to contact their client, if only to sell them more things. But that's not necessarily the information within the RDDS. Registrars have made it very clear they do not use the RDDS, WHOIS for any internal purposes. It is there solely because ICANN policy requires it to be there. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, for taking us through this complex or maybe not so complex but interesting field, and clearly, this is the beginning of a discussion that we'll have. And as you mentioned, we now have until I guess next week when we probably have to revisit this again and come up with some responses. Let's move on with the working group updates. We have a 15-minute extension from the interpreters. Thank you very much. I should ask people producing updates to be quite swift with their updates. So let's start with the transfer policy review policy development process, the TPR PDP. For this, we have Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. I can start and do it very short. First of all, the feedback that we drafted and sent to the PDP working group was very well taken. The chair of the working group was very happy that we have had intense

discussions about this and so on. And I also emphasize that whatever we said in the conclusion of the poll in bracket was not written in stone, this is something we have to consider when going back to the final wording, answer to the different questions.

We have continued to work with the notices sent from the losing registrar, and there's definitely progress there, and there's some candid recommendation that at some point when these are merged together and more clearly written, the group will present it for the CPWG. So that's my update. I don't know whether Daniel is here, but he can have the rest of it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Steinar. I'm not seeing Daniel listed. So that's a good update. Thank you so much. Any questions or comments from anyone? Not seeing any comments or questions, we can then go to the next EPDP and that's the one on the curative rights protections for intergovernmental organizations. Yrjö Lansipuro should be able to provide us with a quick update on this.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. Yeah, in the interest of time, very briefly. We are going to ask for more time. There's no way we could conclude our work this year before the holidays, so it will be rather in January or February. What we have been doing is going through the public comments and now actually tackling the hard part, that is to say, comments to our Recommendation 3 which sets out everywhere the arbitration as a main channel.

We spent a lot of time on a submission by an outfit called Leap of Faith Financial Services, a registrar in Canada. Their 20-page submission had a new idea, a notice of objection which is something that they have in British Columbia in a small claims tribunal. But just to put it briefly, the IGOs noted that this is a nonstarter because it leads to the same dilemma as we had in all the way, that is to say, the jurisdictional immunity of the IGOs will be a problem, and both Justine and myself as ALAC representatives, we also said that that's not going to solve the problem. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Yrjö. Let's see if we have any questions or comments. The queue is open. Seeing no hands up, thank you for this update, and it looks like we'll have plenty more to discuss going into the next year. Good luck on continuing through your scoping of the responses to the public consultation. And now we've got the two EPDPs and one scoping team that we've already spoken about, the one on the gTLD registration data, the one on internationalized domain names and the scoping team on the registration data accuracy. Could I call on any of the topic leads on these three topics, whether there's anything else they would like to add? Bearing in mind they already had a big section before this one.

Not seeing any hands up, I gather that everything that had to be said on this call has been said on these topics, and more. So we can swiftly move to the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks so much, Olivier. We'll see on the agenda that recently ratified by the ALAC is the ALAC statement on the proposal for Latin script root zone label generation rules. You can see the final statement on its workspace, and it was submitted to public comment yesterday. There are several upcoming public comment proceedings, one more for this month and a couple more over the next month, including in the early new year, but there are several now open for public comment for decision.

The first one has been open a little while, but it hasn't been formally reviewed by this group yet. That's proposed revisions to the ICANN documentary information disclosure policy. It closes, I believe, December 6th.

The next two just recently opened. The first is ccNSO proposed policy on the retirement of ccTLDs and the second, EPDP phase 2A, policy recommendations for ICANN Board consideration. So there are no current statements being drafted, but those three public comments for decision for the group to discuss and decide upon. I'll hand it over to Jonathan for any other feedback. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evin. Yeah, I think we want to take a look at the proposed revisions to the ICANN documentary information disclosure policy. I've asked Evin to schedule a presentation on that at our next meeting. Obviously, December 6th is getting very close. This may be something on which we ask for some kind of an extension because we sort of

misdirected this at the outset and it's probably something that the CPWG should take a look at. Thanks, Evin, for organizing that for the next meeting.

I'm interested in—and I feel as though the EPDP phase 2 policy recommendations for ICANN Board consideration is a given and we don't need to discuss whether or not we're going to respond to that public comment. I would be interested in taking a short queue on whether or not people thought that we should respond to the ccNSO proposed policy on the retirement of ccTLDs. It feels like something of interest to this group, but I don't know if there's somebody that feels strongly enough about it to take the lead on it. Any thoughts on whether or not we should be taking this up?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Jonathan, I think we should have a quick read of whether the revisions are outrageous or not, whether they would affect us badly. I guess one of the points of having the DIDP discussion here is because many of the documentary information disclosure policies have to do with some policy work that takes place, or many. I'm not saying most, I'm just saying many. I don't know the exact numbers.

But one of the things that we have asked in the past is for some more clarity and transparency in how ICANN discusses contracts, and as we are now going into another round of new gTLDs, that might be something that comes on the table again that we want more transparency in these negotiations. Once the policy is done, what

actually happens at a contractual level? And that might require strengthened or amended documentary information disclosure policy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Thanks, Olivier. So that's why we want to bring up the IDP. Hadia requested that I repeat the question. Hadia, I'm interested in finding out who is interested in digging into the ccNSO proposed policy on retirement of ccTLDs. Justine has suggested we go to our ccNSO liaison about that, but that's the question. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was putting my hand up regarding the DIDP. I think it's something that, again, goes to the credibility of ICANN. And there's a lot of criticism that the previous DIDP was far from satisfactory. It's one of the things that was discussed heavily in accountability. So I think there's no question we need to look at it. I'm not sure this group is the right one to do it, but there's no question that somewhere in At-Large, we should be looking at that and trying to see whether this improves things, or are the changes going to make it worse?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Alan, agreed. Hadia, are you saying you would take a look at this, or the ccNSO topic?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, yes, she said she keeps on losing audio, but she said, "If so, I could look at it." So I guess she could look at it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, [inaudible] I'm asking for. We're talking about two different things, and there's text about both.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. For the ccNSO, I'd say ask our ccNSO liaison as a starting point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who is our liaison?

JUSTINE CHEW: Barrack Otieno.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we should ask Barrack Otieno. Is it Barrack? I thought we had a new ccNSO liaison.

JUSTINE CHEW: No, it's still Barrack.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I must admit I'm rather confused with all these new appointments.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. All right, great. Let's put him on the ccNSO thing. Hadia, if you're willing to take a look at the IDP, then that would be great but I think

we'll ask for a presentation on it, and an extension if necessary just because this fell between the cracks for us. So whether it's us or OFB, it doesn't matter, we just need a group of people to put an eye on it. So let's schedule a presentation on it. And otherwise, I think that's it, Olivier. Back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. We now can move to Any Other Business. And whilst you recollect your thoughts about any other business you might wish to bring forward, may I remind you to join the latest standardized system for access and disclosure (SSAD) Operational Design Phase project update webinar—well, if you weren't able to join it, sorry, the video and audio recordings are now available so you can have a look at what's coming next on this topic. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Quickly on that last item, I think I heard Jonathan say perhaps we should ask for an extension on the DIDP. Since the deadline is the 6th of December which is next week, are we asking for an action item for staff to ask for an extension? Just for clarity.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. I was just not going to take up this call with the details of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. As long as I know we have a staff action item on it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. And I'm not seeing any hands up for any other business, so that means we can look at our next week's call, and I understand that there might be a conflict, so let's find out.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thanks so much, Olivier. So as you said, next Wednesday, if we hold our CPWG call at its rotation time which is 19:00 UTC, it's going to clash with the AFRALO monthly call. So in order to avoid that, I would suggest to either hold next week's call again at 13:00 UTC, or if we would like to hold the call at a later hour, I can suggest 21:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Yesim. Any preference or any no-nos? Are we likely to conflict with something else? 21:00, some people say it's too late.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's too late for some people, but rotation is a tool for fairness, and if we can stick to rotation, it would be wise. Do you want to make it earlier at 18:00 and try to squeeze it into an hour, or 17:30? But boohoo if 21:00 is too late for some. I think midnight to 3:00 AM is late as well, and they're the times that this is running at. So we perhaps back the other

direction, Yesim, rather than stick it to midnight call after 1:00 AM call after midnight call for some parts of the world.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Cheryl. I note there are a number of points made in the chat that 21:00 is fine with a number of people, so let's do the rotation on this occasion and make it a later call. I wouldn't go for an earlier one, because knowing how much work we have on this group, it would be very hard for us to stick to the exact time slot without overrunning afterwards. So 21:00 UTC next week, let's do that. And that takes us to the end of this call as well, and so I'd like to thank our interpreters for having remained here for an additional 20 minutes, and of course, the transcriber who has done a wonderful job today, even noticing that there was a dog barking, I think, at some point. So really great call. Thank you, everyone.

And before closing off, I would like to wish, for those people celebrating Thanksgiving, a happy Thanksgiving. I do have a piece of advice for turkeys, the birds that usually end up in the oven. You might wish to hide for the next 48 hours. Just a friendly advice.

And until next week, have a very good morning, good afternoon, good evening and night. And Jonathan, anything else?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Happy holidays, everyone. Happy Thanksgiving to those who celebrate it. I saw a cartoon today with a turkey at a fortune teller that said "You will be surrounded by family, but not yours." See you later.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Thank you all. Happy Thanksgiving to all those who celebrate. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]