

---

YEŞİM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call taking place on Wednesday the 16<sup>th</sup> of February 2022 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.

And just to cover the apologies we have received, we have received apologies from Bill Jouris, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonathan Zuck, and from Yrjö Länsipuro. From staff side we currently have Gisella Gruber and myself, Yeşim Saglam. And I'll also be doing call management on today's call.

And as usual we have Spanish and French interpretation provided. Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are David and Veronica, and French interpreters are Aurélie and Camila.

Before we get started, a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And one final reminder is for the real-time transcription service provided on today's call. And I've just shared the link with you. Please do check the service.

And with this, I would like to leave the floor back 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, Yeşim. Welcome, everyone to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group Call which is likely to be quite a light call since we have a fewer number of items than we usually have and quite a number of people have actually sent in their apologies.

Immediately after the adoption of the agenda, we'll have our work group updates with the various working groups that the At-Large community and our representatives take part in, in mainly the Generic Names Supporting Organization Expedited PDP—policy development process. Then we'll have our policy comments updates after that with just a couple of statements that are currently in the pipeline. And Any Other Business with a reminder of the ALAC-GAC bilateral session topics and the ALAC-GNSO session topics.

So it's a shorter call than usual. Well nevertheless, when I mention this we sometimes end up taking the full length of time. But we'll see how it goes. Let's see first if there are any amendments, any additions proposed for the agenda. And I see Alan Greenberg's hand. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. If the call is short, this may not matter, but I have to leave for another meeting well before on the hour. So if you can schedule me early. And I do have brief reports on both the Scoping Team and a new group that I've been appointed to. The GNSO group, a small team looking at the SSAD ODA, the Operational Design analysis. And I do have a report on that. Again, a very brief report on that also. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think that's listed on the agenda [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No. That one, the SSAD, doesn't appear to be on the agenda. But what we'll do it get you to provide us with an update, both of the RDS Scoping Team and the SSAD during the workgroup updates. And we'll get you to be the first one, so at least we've got you early on, making sure that we don't run over time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. And I'm not seeing any other hands up, so the agenda is adopted with that amendment and we can go swiftly into our action items from last week. And those pertain, of course, to this call and both action items have been completed. One being Jonathan to draft a first draft for the statement that we'll be looking at—the NCAP, Name Collision Analysis Project.

Are there any comments or question on any of these action items? You can see we have a nice page of text. It's great to see they're being kept up to date. And with no one putting their hand up, that means we can

---

certainly move towards the word group updates, starting with the RDA Scoping Team, the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team. And for this will have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. There's not a lot happening. We're in the process of going over what were some ...

Essentially, there was a question asked of the various groups. To what extent do you believe accuracy needs to be measured and by whom? And we had a wide range of answers because the whole definition of accuracy, ranging from what's in the RRA to what it could mean, have been used. So we're going over that.

One interesting thing did come out of a private discussion I had, however, with a registrar. And that particular registrar believes—I think, I haven't seen this in writing—that the annual reminder letter or e-mail that goes out, they believe that if there is a bounce to that e-mail, that it must be followed up on.

Other registrars have said at various other times that it's too complex to look at bounces and try to associate them with an original outgoing mail, so we can't really do that. That's one of the reasons that has been given for why a web contact form, if it bounces, the original sender gets no notification. They just never get an answer. And it's a game changer at some level because, if indeed registrars are obliged ...

And this is implied in the accuracy speciation. A bouncing reminder letter is an example of something which could trigger a check. If the

---

registrars are obliged to track bounces and it's something which ICANN Compliance can audit, that implies that all of the 200 million e-mail contact addresses are verified at some level every year which is a very, very different situation from what has been said before.

And I will be following up on that. That doesn't take all the pressure off, but it does change the picture somewhat. So it's an interesting issue that came up.

And I have nothing else to report on that group right now, Olivier. I can go right into the other group I'm on, or do you want to stop for questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Let's just open the floor for questions on this topic. Questions and comments, of course. And with no questions nor comments, Alan, I think you can proceed forward with the SSAD.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. This is a small team put together by the GNSO to respond to the Board. You'll recall that there have been a number of closed meetings of the GNSO—these closed for discussion; in some cases, they were open to observers, and in other cases, not—that included the GNSO Council and GNSO-appointed representatives to the EPDPs. As you may know ...

Well, and there's an ODA meeting later on today for ALAC to present the Operational Design analysis. The ODA had some negative implications and the Board has asked some rather pointed questions—

---

or at least made some pointed statements—of potential downsides of just accepting the recommendations.

And the GNSO is looking carefully at—should it take some action before the Board takes any action? Should it say, “Well, it’s clear that it’s not going to be adopted. Let’s change it”? Or how do we react if the Board doesn't accept the recommendations? A very different tone than was held in the EPDP itself.

And so a small team was put together to try to advise the GNSO on how to respond to the questions are what actions to take. And they have opened this up to the non-GNSO groups, and Maureen asked me to participate. There was a first meeting last week which unfortunately I couldn't depend. But I’ve gone over the transcript and the Zoom recording.

There's a lot of confusion as to exactly what we're going to try to do. ICANN staff have put together a number of questions that may or may not really address the Board issues. And there seems to be refreshing lack of rigidity, basically saying, “If these questions are wrong, then fine. Let’s come up with other questions.” But our task is to advise the GNSO on responding to the Board. So it looks like it's going to be an interesting group.

The timeline is unclear, but very short and we're supposed to be providing some sort of response to the GNSO prior to a meeting at ICANN73 with the Board which is expected at least to briefly cover this. And we'll see where it goes. So it's going to be moving quickly, but as there's a fair amount of confusion over just how we're moving and

---

where we're moving. So there's a meeting today that I'm leaving this meeting for, actually. So stay tuned for further updates. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much again for this update. Let's open the floor for comments and questions. And whilst you are with us, there was actually a question from John McCormac in the chat which was asking, regarding the registration data accuracy and the bounces from e-mail addresses, whether the ALAC would be recommending anything on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, I'm going to ask the question and find out to what extent this does apply to all registrars and it's something that ICANN Compliance will audit. As John pointed out, some registrars don't actually send a message but use their control panel. I'm not aware of what registrars do that. I think it's a rather feeble way of notifying people since the typical registrant never goes into their control panel unless they actually have to do something. But it's an interesting issue, so I think at this point we're going to pursue it and try to understand what the reality is and then decide if we have to take any action.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thanks very much, Alan. There's another question in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll just point out, the fact that there's a 200 million install base which we did not believe was actively reviewed in any way—in any way—

---

unless there was a complaint or a change initiated by the registrant, this does change the overall picture if, indeed, those 200 million are subject to some level of scrutiny, even if it's only checking for bounces.

But we all know how often e-mail addresses change and old ones die. Just because it doesn't bounce doesn't mean people receive it and it doesn't mean anyone even looks at the e-mail box. Never mind acts on it. But it does change the overall picture, and we think we have to look at that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Alan. There's another questions in the chat and it pertains to the mail bounces. As you know, mailing lists and other customer relationship management systems remove e-mail addresses automatically after a number of bounces. Is there any thought as to how many e-mail bounces would the mail be removed from the list? Or what happens when there's a bounce like this?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry. The accuracy specification in the era says if the registrar has some reason to believe the address is invalid, it must do a verification. So if you believe that they are obliged to monitor bounces and they in fact do that, then that does serve as a notification that there's a potential problem and they must follow up on it. Whether that's an automated thing is up to the registrar.

But clearly they can't just remove the e-mail address from WHOIS and pretend it's not there like you do in a mailing list. Or you can's set a flag



---

saying, “Oh, we're not going to send anything to this guy anymore because the address doesn't seem to be working.” They have to take some action on that.

If they are aware of it, then they must take action. But the first question that comes before that is are they obliged to even monitor responses or can they just go into the bit bucket? Which is what we've been told does happen in some cases. We're talking about some subtle changes here, and this could be an interesting change in the overall picture.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. We now have Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, hi. Alan, I have a question to you because, well, I have to admit it's quite ... It's a number of years since I was working as a registrar and also developed the system for the WHOIS Data Reminder Policy output. At that time we developed a system that could actually track [inaudible] the bunches. And we used that to contact the registrant or the client in a different way.

But do you read the agreement in the way that the registrar has to implement a system that is tracking these bunches? Or is it purely the fact that if they are noticed about the bounces, they have to take action? Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

That is the question. I've always interpreted it as they are not obliged to because, in response to other types of discussions ... And specifically, you know that most registrars these days do not allow you to send e-mail directly to the registrant, but use a web form. And one of the issues that came up in the discussion on that is fine.

But if you send the message and it bounces, do you tell the original sender that it bounced? And the answer that came back was, "No, that's far too difficult. You can't track bounces very easily, so we don't do that." And clearly, if you can track bounces accurately and attribute them to the original message on the WHOIS reminder, then you should be able to do it on the contact ones.

So the answers have been different, yet the registrar I talked to treated this as an obligation that they had to do this and follow up on it. And the question I'm going to be asking is, "What's the right answer? Is this an obligation and therefore it's something which ICANN Compliance can audit? Or is it not an obligation but it's something which might be done voluntarily?"

And so that really is the question, and it's a big question because it does say, suddenly, that hundreds of millions of domains are being checked in some way. Only the e-mail address. If the e-mail address is even used for the reminder. And as John pointed out, not all registrars do that. But it's a game changer, so I think it's something we need to follow up on.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Can I just follow up—

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I suspect the answer is going to be that it's a nice thing to do and many do it, but it's not an obligation. But we have to actually ask the question to get the answer.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: And just to follow up, is that something that ICANN Compliance has investigated and commented on—whether this is an obligation, whether this is something that the registrar has to do; also getting a little bit deeper in saying that you have to have a system that is actually tracking these functions?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, they haven't. That's why I'm going to ask. I'm going to be surprised if it is something that ICANN Compliance believes is a requirement and can be tracked and can be audited. I will be surprised but pleased. But at this point we don't know. It's just something that came up in a private discussion I had. So there's not even a public record of the discussion. So we'll see where it goes.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And thank for the question, Steinar. I'm not seeing any other hand in the queue. So thanks for both of these updates, Alan. And we look forward to further updates next week.

And we can now go, since Steinar has spoken, we can go to Steinar Grøtterød for the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, the TPR PDP.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah, hi. From the outcome from the meeting yesterday, it was that we continue to work on the post-creation lock and the post-transfer lock. And there was, as referred to the previous meeting, there is some tendency that the group wants to put the days for lock in the area around 10 days. There came up a question about whether this will be in conflict with the UDRP process because the UDRP is being ...

In the UDRP, the registrar is being notified. Hence, you can have a scenario where there actually is a transfer while there is a UDRP being processed in a sense. For the URS, the registry is being notified and the action there is within 24 hours. The registry has [to put] different server locks on it, preventing any transfer and updates whatsoever.

So this is something that ... The group will have some clarity and further discussions and continue and coming back to that question. And the last time we had also starting the discussion about the policies for the Losing Registrar to deny a transfer request. So it ended up in this.

But I have to say I feel that the number of days in the area of 10 is more user friendly. But I know that Lütz ... And I know Lütz is on the call. He

---

has a different opinion, so I sincerely hope that he can be vocal for his point of view on this one.

And Daniel, you're also on the call today, so maybe you have some updates to my short minutes from the meetings. Thank you so far.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Thank you very much. Absolutely [inaudible] everything. [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Daniel. And thanks for the update, Steinar. And Lütz Donnerhacke, I'm not sure whether you wanted to add any anything to your point or your perspective to this discussion.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Hi, everybody. Yeah, it's about the time a lock is in place after domain creation or transfer. My position on this is that we do not need a very long lock after creation of the domain because there's no real value in the use of the domain because it's fresh.

There are interests to have such a post-creation block. This is coming from the registrars because they want to have a minimum time frame where they are able to get the money from the registrant and they want to keep it in time frame where they can process the typical payment issues. So that's the time frame the 10 days are coming from.

---

But on the post-transfer lock, I have a different opinion because usually a domain which is transferred is in use, so it's valued for the people who are using it and for the registrant. And if something is going wrong or it's a fraudulent transfer, then the registrant first needs to notice this and to react in time. In many cases, this involves the legal agencies and they take time, too.

If we do not have a post-transfer lock for several weeks, we run into the problem that the domain is transferred again to a different registrar and all the lawful agencies will run into trouble. Or even ICANN might run into trouble if they want to roll back such a transfer. And that's the reason why I think that the post-transfer lock should be at least 30 days—more appropriate, 60 days. That's my position. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lütz. Steinar Grøtterød.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you very much, Lütz, for your input in this. And I think this is something that at some point we have to put some statement whether we prefer, what sort of range we preferred. We did have a [temperature] in the room some weeks ago. That was late last year. But at that time it was a little bit fresh, so I think [we're now] approaching a more mature understanding of the problem and thereafter could have some surveys that hopefully make some sort of statement.

What I'd like to add is also the question ... And I think from an end user point of view, I think it's very important that the policy is equal for all

---

registries, meaning that whatever is being said in the policy when it's been defined, it should be acting for all registries and not ... The registries can't choose a certain day or number of days of locks, etc. I think that will be kind of frustrating for the end user to identify that when you believe you have the option to transfer, you suddenly have to work with a different policy than what you were expecting. So, thank you.

I'll tried to do some wording on this and put that forward to the At-Large working group. Unfortunately, next week I have to be excused because of the winter holiday in Norway. But I will make the time for this preparation, and the week thereafter we hopefully can do something, have a longer discussion about this. So thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Steinar. I would suggest perhaps that the questions be put to the mailing list and mentioning that in one of the future calls, we'll then have a poll to take the temperature of the room again on this.

Clearly, what's interesting is to have more than one point of view within our representatives because that let's, then, each representative put their point across in a very clear way. And hopefully we'll get some kind of a consensus on this. It's a tough judgment on this one, though. And I know that from the previous discussions, a lot of people had a point of view of this.

Let's hear from Alan Greenberg.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to point out that if you go back to the transcript of that poll we did, we essentially asked the question and then gave the analysis of what the implications are. And a lot of people answered that question prior to understanding what the question really meant and the implications of it. And there was a significant number who express some level of, “Ah, is that what it meant” after the poll was done. We didn't redo the poll. I don't think we redid the poll.

So yes that poll was done, but I think we need to do it in a better way going forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And this is why I suggested that perhaps the question and explanation should be put to the mailing list prior to the poll taking place so that people don't have to suddenly squeeze themselves to read very quickly about a topic and choose or make an uninformed choice some time on the topic itself.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, or maybe we just need to explain the question before we ask it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, yeah. That's possible as well, but I'm always mindful of the time and sometimes you might end up on a call with a lot of topics and then having to provide a full explanation plus answers plus questions, and so on.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Assuming everyone read an e-mail prior to the meeting is a dangerous assumption.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan, for making me, well, cheering me up, yeah. Cheering everyone up.

Okay, let's continue. I'm not seeing any other hands up on this topic, so thanks very much for the update, Steinar. And we look forward to ... So possibly not next week, but in the meantime, the e-mails on the building up of those questions and then the poll that will take place in a future call.

The next Expedited Policy Development Process is on the International Governmental Organizations, the Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs. Yrjö Länsipuro is not with us today, but I believe that Justine Chew is on the call. I'm not sure whether Justine has an update, but I'll let her have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Olivier. I hope you can hear me. Yeah, Yrjö is at a subcommittee of the NomCom call, so he sends his regrets. But in any event, I certainly don't have much to update. Suffice to say that we are ... The working group or the EPDP is inching towards some kind of consensus and the group as a whole are working towards more wordsmithing-type tasks to make sure that the text of the recommendation captures and satisfies, you know, is to everyone satisfaction, really.

---

And I believe, though, that we are going to meet the deadline for coming up with the final report which, according to the project plan, is set for the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March. So I do believe we have time to meet that, so I think we're on track for that. And I will let Yrjö come back next week and share any good news that we may have at that point. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update. And the floor is open. Any questions for Justine? Or indeed any comments as well? I am not seeing any hands up. So thank you, and we'll move on.

The next Expedited Policy Development Process is the one on Internationalized Domain Names, IDNs. For this, I believe we have Satish Babu on the call. Satish, you have the floor.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. We really do not have much of an update. So we had our last meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> of February, and the EPDP had ... Actually, the charter document had represented the questions in a certain manner, but the EPDP realized that after starting discussions, that there would be need to reorganize these questions slightly differently in order to have more manageability of the whole discussion process.

So the resequencing has since been done, and the last meeting was about two topics. One was Topic B which is about the same entity at the top level, and the questions ... So they're kind of interwoven with Topic D which is talking about the adjustments required in the registry

---

agreement, registry service, registry transition process, etc., which, as you can imagine, is a fairly complex area.

So we don't have any further reporting at this point in time. There are some interesting discussions going on with respect to [inaudible] bundling. The official term, the meaning of the word "bundling" is that ... Do we have a term that describes the applied-for gTLD with its variants? That package, should we have a name for it? Because, logically, there are a lot of places where we have to treat this bundle as one and not as ...

Because there is a point of view that says, "Look, all these variants are completely independent TLDs." At a technical level, these are completely independent. There's no technological solution to treat them as a kind of package. But in reality they are more like kind of bundle, so we are still grappling with how to define these things. And we will come back with an update once we have had consensus on this topic.

Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much.

SATISH BABU: Back to you, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much for this, Satish. Let's open the floor to any comments or questions. I'm not seeing any hands up. So did you say next week or the week after, that we'll have another update? Every couple of weeks?

SATISH BABU: Yes, I think a couple of weeks [would be fair].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. Thank you. And I'm not seeing any hands up, so that means we have completed our work group update and we can now go to our policy comment updates. And usually what I would say is, "With Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğan," but neither of them are here today, I believe. Both of them have spent their apologies. So I guess we have to go through those ourselves, or I'm not sure whether Heidi is stepping in. Who's stepping in for Evin?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Hi, Olivier. There's just a brief update. So as seen on the agenda, we recently ratified the ICANN draft FY23-27 Operating and Financial Plan and draft FY23 Operating Plan and Budget. That was actually submitted prior to the ratification process.

And we also have the upcoming public comment on the Root Zone Update Process Study, and we do not currently have any public comments for decision.

---

And currently we have the Name Collision Analysis Project, or NCAP Study 2 document. And I see that Jonathan Zuck is the pen holder. However, I do note that, Olivier, you added a few comments onto the page. I'm not sure if you'd like to go through those now.

And then also, the ICANN Bylaw Amendments and the ccNSO-Proposed Changes to Article 10 and Annex B. I'm aware that Holly Raiche, the chair of the OFB Working Group, did ask the CNSO liaison as well as members of her group, and currently there's agreement that the topic does not currently effects end users. So I don't believe that they are going to be preparing a statement on that.

Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Heidi. Let's just first, then, quickly go on to the Name Collision Analysis Project, the NCAP Study 2 document. And just to mention, this public consultation that ends in March, so there's still plenty of time to comment on this. Just explaining my contribution this, I read through it and this is just, I guess, a congratulatory message to ICANN and to show the ALAC support for the process of the NCAP study.

I'm aware that there are some within the ICANN ecosystem that believe that those are now a waste of time in trying to find something when there is nothing to look for. But suddenly the results that we've seen through these studies show that there could indeed be some collisions taking place and the risk is not insignificant, as one would say.

---

Thus I just invite you to read this proposed text. I'm sure Jonathan might add some more. In fact, you're all invited to add some more or to say you don't agree and [inaudible] the exact opposite. We're still early on in the game, but this was just to try and get the ball rolling.

Hadia Elminiawi has put her hand up. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier, but I was going to speak to the next item. So I'll leave you to finish. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Hadia. Let's see if there's any other ... I'm not seeing any other hands. So that's one. And so I just invite you to read through this and we'll no doubt be revisiting this on a future call.

Now the next one. Oh, I see Jeffrey Newman having put his hand up. Jeff, is that to do with this topic or the other topic?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: With the Name Collision topic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, then you have the floor, Jeff.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thank you. And sorry for the late hand. I'm working on my iPad. Yeah, so I don't share your complete view, Olivier. I think the analysis was

---

excellent, that was done. And Matt Thomas from Verisign did an incredible job. I just think that there's a lot of speculation in that report, and I ...

Not with respect to the data, but speculation as to the harm that those collisions may or may not cause and whether the collisions are a result of an intentional use of the root for purposes for which it was not intended or whether they are truly collisions by accidental configurations which is really what we're more concerned with. So I do think we need to be a little bit more nuanced in our response, and I will add some comments to the draft.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jeff. In fact, I think that the draft might benefit from some suggestions for improvement on both the process and the NCAP study itself, and perhaps future work in this arena. There's always room for improvement, so please comment on it. That would be great.

Justine Chew, is this on this topic or the next one?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, it is on the NCAP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Proceed forward, Justine.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. If my memory serves me correctly, I think last week we kind of agreed to have a statement from ALAC that just says, “Thank you, NCAP [inaudible] SSAC for the work done,” and nothing much else because, as I tried to allude to the group last week, these two documents kind of feed into the actual Study 2 report which is coming out soon. In fact, the discussion group is actually looking at the draft of it now. And I had suggested that we reserve more poignant or more extensive comments for the NCAP Study 2 report itself.

But, yeah, that's just a reminder. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Justine. Do you mean to say that you think that the current statement that's on the screen goes further than that?

JUSTINE CHEW: To be honest, to be fair, I have not read the current draft statement, so I'll have to have a closer look at it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, well [inaudible].

JUSTINE CHEW: But as far as I understood, yeah, we were meant to just say, “Thank you for the work,” and that's about it. So, I don't know. Thanks.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Justine. And what I suggest is that ... This is going to be here for the week, so obviously we can have a further discussion on this next week.

Now the second of the current statements under the current public consultations is to do with the ICANN Bylaw Amendments and the ccNSO-Proposed Changes to Article 10 and Annex B. What I've seen so far on the mailing list from Maureen Hilyard was that the ALAC should just vote its support or provide a short message showing its support for the changes and no objection status or, yeah, "no comment" status or "no objection" status, if I understand corrected.

But I see that Hadia Elminiawi has put her hand up, so maybe she has more information on that than I do. Hadia, how do you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. No, I don't have any more information. I just wanted to say what this is about. I actually briefly skimmed it, so I did not read it in detail. But this is basically about the IDN ccTLD the managers joining the ccNSO as members.

And as we all know, currently IDN ccTLD managers are not part of the ccNSO. And I think one of the issues that was always discussed and considered, like voting rights, because if you start having IDN ccTLD managers as members, some countries might have an IDN ccTLD and some countries might have three or four. Others might have zero. So I think the issue was always this kind of balance.

---

And as for the voting rights, the proposal says that the ccTLD managers from the same territory or country would basically assign one person to have those voting rights. I totally agree with Maureen. This is a good amendment and there is nothing else to say but support, I think. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. And one question which I think has arisen in the past, which I think you tried to touch on here. What happens when, indeed, the country has both a ccTLD and an IDN but there are different organizations running them? Are you saying that the proposal is for them to work something out between themselves that could represent the vote for both entities?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: That's what I understood. Again, I just skimmed it. But, yes, you would basically have one vote. And I don't think—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would be interesting, then.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, go ahead.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I think that's what it is, yeah. You will have ... Because you need to have equal representation when it comes to votes. Right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you for this, Hadia. The other question, of course, being if a country has multiple numbers of scripts and therefore multiple numbers of IDNs run by different organizations, I'm not sure whether that exists or not. I can think of some countries with many different scripts. Now does that mean everyone has to agree that—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It does exist, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: —[inaudible] representative.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It does exist, Olivier. For example, in Egypt also we have two separate entities running. We have the Egyptian Universities Network, actually, running .eg, ASCII ccTLD. And we have another entity running the [inaudible] IDN [inaudible]. But I think, yeah, so definitely this situation does exist.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Hadia. The other question I had on this one, then, is does this mean that the ... Because so far IDNs, if I understand correctly, were all under the guise of the Generic Names Supporting Organization, the GNSO. So they were generic names. Does that mean they are then leaving the purview of the GNSO?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Olivier, they are not part of the gTLD—I would say—area because you have also now the IDN ccTLD Policy Development Process that is ongoing, and basically it's addressing more or less the same items that the IDN gTLD EPDP is addressing. And again, what applies on IDN gTLDs does not, by default, apply to an IDN ccTLDs. And you have an ongoing policy now in relation to the IDN ccTLDs. And both policies might, in the end, look very much alike, but not necessarily exactly the same.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. I think that's exactly the answer I was looking for. And so, yes, there is a clear separation between the ccTLDs and gTLDs, although both are IDNs.

It will be interesting to see if there are any major policy differences between the two. And I don't know whether that's the possibility or not. But for end users who often have difficulties to classify what a domain name is or a top-level domain is, whether it's a ccTLD or a gTLD or whatever, they have no idea. It will be interesting.

All right. I'm not seeing any other hands up on these topics, so we can probably move forward. I see no other comments or questions on the

---

chat. So that means we can move swiftly. Hadia, your hand ... Is that your hand up? No, you're taking it down.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, it's a new hand. I just wanted to note, Olivier, that differences already do exist. So for example, in order to have an IDN gTLD, you need to have a new round for gTLDs. You need to open a new round. But for an IDN ccTLD, it's not the same. And there are many other differences.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. Thanks, Hadia. And if you know, and this is just out of pure curiosity, are the Label Generation Rules different with the two, or these are agnostic on whether it's the cc or g?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Those are definitely the same. Right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]

HADIA ELMINIAWI: The label generational rules are the same for both. Those are technical issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. Thank you so much for this very interesting insight. And not seeing any further hands, let's go into Any Other Business. And for

---

this we are revisiting our ALAC-GAC Bilateral session preparation. I note that, once again, there is no link to that page, unfortunately. I'm not sure why. Could we please have ... Well, we don't even have ... I don't think Joanna's with us either. Does anyone wish to take this?

Ephraim Percy Kenyanito.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Hi, everyone. Yeah, just any other business. Just a quick question. It's regarding some action items from ICANN72. I've done an e-mail, I think, to Justine and Jonathan and Joanna. But I'm here to get their response. It's regarding the action item that was suggested that there would be a DNS white paper, which are supposed to be developed with a suggestion that maybe this would be done in conjunction with GAC.

Just curious because you've just mentioned the ALAC-GAC Bilateral session. And I was just following up on that, whether they want to be like ... What is the process and how can we contribute as ALAC members? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Ephraim. I think Justine Chew might have the response for you. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Olivier. Actually, I don't have a response because I'm not actually involved in that. So I'm sorry I haven't replied to your e-mail,

---

Ephraim, but I'm actually not involved in writing up those white papers. So I don't have an answer for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Ephraim.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Yeah. I think, yeah, I think I'll just put my hand down. But I was just curious, yeah, how I can get the response and how we can follow up on that because it's one of the ... I've just looked at all the action item meetings, how some of [them are] pending and I would like to see how I can help.

JUSTINE CHEW: I think what I can do is, if I'm not mistaken, I think Joanna is the lead for that. So let me reach out to her and get her to respond to you. Okay?

EPHRAIM KENYANITO: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for the question, Ephraim. And thanks for the response, Justine. On the ALAC and GNSO Council Bilateral session, there's actually a link to that which is a Wiki page with different suggested topics listed [inaudible].

---

And I'm hoping that staff can provide a link to the other page, please, in the chat. So if anyone has a suggestion for these, could they please let us know.

But let's have, first, Justine, do you wish to go through the ALAC-GNSO Council Bilateral meeting proposed topics quickly?

JUSTINE CHEW:

I can do that. In fact, the timeline for proposing has past. What I've done is I have packaged all of the questions in some way or other. So all of the things that you see in the screen now have gone into an e-mail that has been tabled—or sorry, not tabled—but put on the agenda for the GNSO Council meeting which is happening tomorrow, by the way.

So I presume that I'm going to be invited to speak to that when that agenda item comes up. Suffice to say, as I said, all the items listed here have been included in that particular [inaudible] that's going to GNSO Council [inaudible]. So let's see what happens. I'm happy to provide an update after the GNSO Council meeting tomorrow as to what's happening and any feedback, obviously, from Council themselves.

I do want to just, on a side matter, is to just inform, again, folks about the item on DNS abuse mitigation. Just like how Alan reported on GNSO Council—how do I say—establishing a small team to analyze the SSAD ODA. The GNSO Council has also establish a small team to look at next steps on DNS abuse mitigation from the perspective of GNSO Council, or at least [some perspective of] GNSO.



---

So again, because the small teams are an offshoot of the Council, unless they specifically open it up to certain people, then they only invite councilors to join a small team. And because ALAC and At-Large have express major concerns about DNS abuse, one of the key topics that At-Large takes up as a priority, therefore I have put myself into this small team.

So we've only had one call so far. There's some documentation that I need to go through. I haven't had a chance to look at it yet. But suffice to say, I think the ALAC would be included in one of the entities that GNSO Council may reach out to, to understand a bit more our perspectives of what we think about DNS abuse and what we think should happen and what steps GNSO Council might consider taking.

So details of that will be forthcoming. It's also going to be on the ... Well it's on the agenda for GNSO Council tomorrow, so let's see what happens. I'm, again, happy to provide an update on that after the GNSO Council meeting. So there are things happening, folks, within GNSO Council that we probably should pay attention to. I'll stop there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. Thanks for this, and taking us through the whole list in here. And obviously that's quite a few topics, so that will be weeded down to a specific, or focused on specific topics.

Right. Then the other one, of course, was the ALAC and GAC. And I've checked the page. You've seen the link that I've sent over to the chat. And unfortunately, that page is still empty so I can't tell you what will go

---

there. If you want to make suggestions, you can by commenting in the page. You do have to login for that.

I have noticed a mistake, though, in the ALAC Board topics where it speaks about this Friday 17<sup>th</sup> February 2022. And I think that might be hard to achieve because tomorrow is Thursday the 17<sup>th</sup>. So something might have to be changed with regards to this deadline.

And I think that's it. Oh, I see Justine Chew. Justine, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes. Thanks, Olivier. Just on the list of topics for the ALAC and GNSO Council Bilateral, I'm aiming not to have anything weeded down, as you suggest. I'm going to try and keep everything on the table, and I think a lot of the topics that we have raised are not one-off topics. So there is a high potential that they will be rolled over to the next bilateral that we'll have. Which is why I also think that we shouldn't necessarily agree to any weeding down, per se. But let's see what GNSO Council says tomorrow.

And just for information, everybody, GNSO Council meetings are open to observers. I can post a link to the call details on the chat in a moment. So if you are free, please come and join us. Thank you. Back to Olivier.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, Yeşim. Did we lose Olivier?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And I'm now speaking through the voice-over-IP Zoom because, of course, I was dropped after being for one hour on the call. But I did, thanks to the real-time transcription, manage to see the end of Justine's intervention without hearing it. So, I read it. Thank you.

And I'm not seeing any other hands up right now, so that means I guess we can go to our next ... And in fact, I'm not going to answer this. Adigo is calling me again, but I don't really need that call for these two minutes.

We're now into Any Other Business. Any other business? I'm not seeing any. So I understand that the ... Well, I'm not quite sure what I [inaudible] check on this. When we do our next call be?

YEŞİM SAGLAM: Thank you, Olivier. So as you know, we're rotating. But it looks like we have a clash with one of the prep-week sessions for next week. So two things I would like to underline. First is that there is no interpretation next week due to the Prep Week. But of course, we can hold our session without interpretation. English only.

And the second thing is the clash that we will have if we decide to [move] with 19:00 UTC. So what I can advise is to move the call to maybe 20:00 UTC to avoid this clash.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much for this, Yeşim. I think that's a good idea indeed because the week after that, we would have a clash at the later hour. But we can continue in our strict rotation. So next week, 20:00

---

UTC looks like a good way forward unless anybody else has some kind of a conflict. No? Okay. Then so be it. Thank you very much.

And that means that we are reaching the end of this call. Now I don't have any further questions to ask my colleague, Jonathan Zuck. I'm hoping that he managed to get a little bit more sleep today than he usually gets on the occasion that we have the call at this time. And I wanted to thank everyone who has participated on today's call. And especially, of course, interpreters and the real-time text transcription and our staff for having prepared this, and everyone who has provided updates and taken part. It's a shorter call than usual, so you'll have your half an hour back.

And with this, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night wherever you are.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, everyone. [Good-bye].

YEŞİM SAGLAM: The meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**