YEŞIM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 27th of April 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 our apologies, we have received apologies from Bill Jouris, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alberto Soto, Alfredo Calderon, Yrjö Länsipuro, Sébastien Bachollet, Claire Craig. And Christopher Wilkinson is going to join us slightly late. On today's call from staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Claudia Ruiz, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam. I will be doing call management. As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation. Our interpreters are David and Veronica on the Spanish channel, and Aurélie and Isabelle on the French channel.

A kind reminder, as usual, to please state your name before speaking not only for transcription purposes, but also for the interpretation purposes. And one final reminder is for the real-time transcription service providers on today's call, and I'm sharing the link with you here right now. At the end of the call, we will have a very small short survey popping up. So please do take one or two minutes to complete the survey to help us evaluate the service. With this, I think I'm going to leave the floor now back to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Welcome, everyone, to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which is going to be rather light one yet again. We will first start with our talking points, the initial developments of the At-Large talking points for the next ICANN meeting, the one taking place in The Hague, ICANN74. After that, we'll have our workgroup and small team updates. Bearing in mind, not all workgroups have updates but some of them will. So we'll go through the list that we have currently on the screen. And then after that the policy comment updates or policy drafting or policy commenting drafting pipeline will be studied. Not very busy, which is the reason why we'll probably go quite fast, and then Any Other Business as well afterwards. In fact, right now I should ask, is there any other business? Are there any other things we need to add to this agenda or any amendments to be made? I'm not seeing any hands up. It looks like the agenda will be fine for today. Let's see if we can do it in 60 minutes.

Let's go to our action items from last week. It's empty, actually. The only action item there is it says type your task here. So I think that we've pretty much completed these. There's only one action item from a previous call, the one on the 6th of April, with Steinar Grøtterød to make a summary of the charter questions for the TPR-PDP Phase 1A, together with the present recommendations and distribute this to this group. I have not quite seen it but we'll follow up with Steinar on this. Steinar Grøtterød is going to give an update—

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Olivier, Steinar's hand is up.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hello. I actually distributed a link to the CPWG mailing list on April 19 with a document with the intention that everybody within this group can make their comments into what is being proposed. I do like to emphasize that my document is some sort of a copy of what has been distributed in the PDP Working Group, but its intention that we can make our own notifications and ideas and not publish that before we have consensus, and then distribute it to the PDP Working Group documentation.

Okay. So I believe my task is at least partly done. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Steinar. The person who has forgotten to tick the box will be dealt with using the customary procedures. I'm not seeing any other hands up. So let's proceed forward then with the next part of our agenda. Thank you.

The next one is, of course, the talking points. June is coming fast upon us and Jonathan Zuck is going to lead this section to develop the At-Large talking points for ICANN74. Welcome, Jonathan. You have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. This is just meant to be a little bit of an informal conversation because in the past, when developing talking points, I've just sort of gone through the schedule and tried to figure out what were going to be the hot topics for the meeting. And then from memory or a

little bit of research, I go through and try to figure out what our positions are on each of those issues. What I wanted to do, if I may be so bold as to put some of you on the spot, is just kind of get your impressions about what you believe is going to be the hotly debated topics of the next meeting. For those of you that don't know, this meeting in The Hague is a policy meeting and it is the first hybrid meeting since the start of the pandemic. Many of us will be there in person, and so the use of talking points may be once again a little more widespread perhaps than it's been on Zoom, where your only option has been to throw something into a chat, as opposed to hallway conversations and things like that that are often kind of the hallmark, if you will, for the talking points.

So I just wanted to talk a little bit about some of the topics that folks own and get a sense of what of any aspects of those discussions are going to take place during the meeting. One of the things that we will be discussing is closed generics, which we talked a little bit about on the previous call. So we're going to be having an internal conversation about closed generics to get at some of the nuance of our position on them and make sure that position still holds as well as using the Board's directions to the bilateral discussions between the GNSO and the GAC on this topic as a kind of framework and answer some of the questions about definitions and compromises on the area of closed generics. But in addition to that, let's get a sense of what else is going to be discussed and what we think we might want to include in this document that we prepared for ICANN74. Hadia, I see your hand is up so I'll let you go first.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much. Just some preliminary thoughts. I think two topics, DNS abuse, the role of the community, I would say also At-Large in specific, but the role of the community in general as well in mitigating DNS abuse in relation to the SSAD, the Standardized System for Access/Disclosure. I believe our position is not to implement the current proposed system as is. Alan was talking about a proof of concept but he said that the proof of concept does not really mean proof of concept. It's not like implementing the current SSAD in just a conceptional way, but it's like implementing a ticketing system. So if we are really talking about a ticketing system, I think we do support this. So those are the two points I wanted to say. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. Do you know specific discussions that are going to be taking place on the EPDP on the SSAD during ICANN74? Go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW: I think you should ask that question of Alan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, Alan's got his hand up, too. So we'll hear from both.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So in relation to SSAD, I don't know. We should listen to Alan. I just want to know that I'm not seeing the chat, I'm driving. And then in relation to DNS abuse, I think yes, there are some conversations in that regard with the ccNSO. Maybe also with the GNSO, I'm not sure, but the

ccNSO I'm sure. We also are having an internal discussion at At-Large policy session in that regard. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A have a number of issues. Whether we support the current recommendation that might be coming out of the ODA Small Team, and thus, the GNSO, that's not clear at this point. We certainly recommended a ticketing system, in our initial reply. What this will be, or if it will be for that matter, is not clear, and I'll be talking about that more later. Both Justine and I will talk about later on the report on the SSAD ODA project that's going on right now. The whole scene is just very, very cloudy and it is not clear what the position is going to be. We certainly support a ticketing system in lieu of implementing the SSAD or be more clear, we do not support implementing the SSAD as designed by the EPDP. What will be done or what should be done—there's too many things at play right now for us to say we have a strong position that we are supporting and advocating. So I think we've got to be a little bit careful on that. There's a lot going on in terms of possible directions and it's just not clear. I'll be talking about that more when we go forward.

Will there be any actions at ICANN74? Well, the small team's chair or the person directing it has committed to reporting back to the GNSO at that meeting. Exactly what the substance will be at that point remains to be seen. We missed our target on delivering a definitive response to

the GNSO at this point, and our current target is ICANN74. But there's still far too many things at play to say we support something or other that's coming from it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, to be clear, I'm certainly not asking that question on this call. It's more just trying to get a sense of the folks on this call about what talking points we might want to develop for that meeting. So I guess my question to you, Alan, is do you believe sometime in the next six weeks, you will have a sense of where we want to stand on this and we'll be able to jot some notes down for the newcomers and the virtually participating At-Large members, etc. at the time? So this should probably be on the list, I guess, is the question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm hoping that we have more information now. But at this point, the GNSO Council met to discuss the issue. The small team has not met again since then. So I can't tell you what the outcome will be. I can tell you there's an intent to have more outcome. We are waiting for a significant report from ICANN staff and a stronger commitment from the Board once we get that report that they are interested in what we're talking about. This is very much a dialogue at this point. I would say we're not anywhere close to where we want to go. The other people on the group may have a stronger belief that we're closer, but at this point, there's enough in play that it can go any one of several different ways at this point. So yes, I would hope when we get closer, we'll have a better idea. I'd like to think we're not wasting the time between now

and then. You've [inaudible] from me about how many years have been wasted, however.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Well, hopefully not a waste. Thanks, Alan. Thanks, Hadia. Justine, if I may call on you as our GNSO liaison, what is your sense of the hot topics? I know that staff has been pressing the issue of Subsequent Procedures being a hotly discussed part of ICANN74. What's your sense about what's coming up? What sessions are we to prepare people to participate in?

JUSTINE CHEW: Putting me on the spot as well. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's an informal conversation—

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure, sure, sure, sure. Well, in terms of Subsequent Procedures as a whole, the ODP is still proceeding. Council gets reports from the GNSO liaison to the ODP. I am sorry to tell you that Council doesn't really respond a lot to those updates by the liaison. So I don't know—well, Council says that SubPro is an important area. But in terms of whether there's any discussion going forward, there doesn't seem to be anything that Council is particularly concerned about at the moment because, as I said, there isn't any comments in terms of the updates that's given by the liaison to the ODP. As some of you know, I've reconvened the At-

Large CPWG Small Team on SubPro. I haven't pressed anybody for any input. But if you give us some time, we might be able to come up with some stuff to discuss on there.

But just going on closed generics itself, closed generics is an interesting topic because it is slightly different to the other ones of, say, Applicant Support. In that because close generics there was no recommendation to change the current policy position, which, arguably, but as I think somebody already said, the Board has already indicated that the current policy is that closed generics are allowed, which is why that no one has reached out to GNSO and GAC to try and come to some kind of solution as to how they would like to handle applications for closed generics in the new round. But having said that, again, the scope of discussion and even whether ALAC is going to be involved in that is still up in the air. I can't tell you anything more than that to say.

Even then, also, there is this issue that you might want to consider, which is that within the SubPro recommendation itself on closed generics, although there is no recommendation to change the current policy position, there is something that says that—I'm paraphrasing— but any future PDP type work on closed generics should involve experts, some experts on competition, economics, and some of the experts but would express the exclude anybody who has already participated in the closed generics conversation at SubPro level. So in terms of how we're going to be participating, I don't know. It's going to be an interesting question to answer.

The other ones that we are concerned about which is Applicant Support, well, there isn't any movement out of Council yet in terms of

how they're going to approach the extra work on Applicant Support. So again, I can't really tell you much.

Auctions, it's not currently on Council's radar. So unless you want to throw me a bit more tidbits here, I think that's about all I can tell you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I will be throwing more tidbits and raising the stakes as we get close to the meeting. But I just wanted to get our juices flowing here on what we think are going to be the topics of discussion at ICANN74. So prepare people that are new. I'm sorry, what did you say?

JUSTINE CHEW: By all means, throw things at me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, so my other question, the other business you've gotten into over there at the GNSO is the DNS Abuse Small Team. What do you imagine is going to take place as far as DNS abuse conversations, response to all the various comments, and things like that? What do you think is happening there?

JUSTINE CHEW: We are meeting every week at a time that kind of clashes with the other alternate time for CPWG. I believe we are still waiting on inputs from some of the Cs, if not SGs and Cs. But whatever we receive at the moment, we are going through. The process is a little bit slow because

we are paying quite a bit of attention to what people are saying in terms of the responses that we've gotten back. Last week, we looked at the ALAC response and I think generally they were well received. Nothing alarming or nothing to say pushing back against any of the comments that ALAC make. But there was one bit that was thought that should be subject to input from Contractual Compliance, which is also another party that we're getting input from, by the way. So again, I don't think we have gotten far enough for me to have a proper analysis of where we're headed. We've done four responses, there's still another four at least coming up in our weekly meetings. But the thing that target for the small team is to have something comprehensible by June. I suspect it would be prior to ICANN74. So again, I think it's going to have the progressive thing that I have to bring back to this group or to yourself to see how we can move forward on it. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That sounds good, Justine. The net of that is it does sound like similar to Alan's work. At the very least, it's something that might be discussed and some positions advanced at the meeting. And so we'll probably want to provide some background and some notion of where we stand prior to the meeting. Not today but it does seem like DNS abuse will be a hot topic at ICANN74 as John suggested in the chat.

JUSTINE CHEW: I will be looking for commonalities across the board, especially if they aligned with ALAC so that's something that we can stand on perhaps. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thank you so much. Sébastien, go ahead, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. Just to let you know that we are working as ATRT3 shepherd with the Board and with ICANN staff on the term of reference regarding the pilot holistic review. The goal is to have something published by or before around the ICANN74. Therefore, I think and we hope at large that we will have some discussion with participants on that specific topic, even if there will not be any specific meeting on that topic.

Not linked with, I guess, any specific meeting except that it seems that it's the topic that was discussed yesterday at the EURALO monthly round table, and it's also discussed in some form at NARALO and I guess maybe in other places, it's about split Internet, what is happening in general but particularly with the situation in Eastern Europe. That's the two points I wanted to bring to your attention. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. That's a good reminder. That conversation is definitely ongoing. That was a great EURALO round table. I recommend them to everyone that didn't get a chance to log on, and I would recommend going back and listening to the recording. It was a good discussion.

Okay. Steinar, is there going to be specific discussions about the Transfer Policy, you think, at ICANN74?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I assume it will be because the working group has announced that it will publish the initial report for public comments on June 15, which is within the dates of ICANN74. There will, of course, be a working group meeting. We're getting close to the end of Phase 1A, so it definitely will be on the radar.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. That's great. Anyone else that thinks that the topic they're shepherding is going to be a hot topic at ICANN74? Marita, do you think some of the topics that you own will be hotly debated at ICANN74?

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Jonathan. I don't think so. I don't really see that on the agenda. We just got to thinking maybe we should have kind of a talking point statement on supporting the fact that the Internet should continue to be a single system and that we agree with the way ICANN resolve the situation and other groups resolve the situation. Just that. If there's a way to underline that, to put forward that we're cognizant of the things that are going on in the world.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. I guess I just heard from Göran yesterday that the first money has gone to Ukraine from that program via a different nonprofit. I guess it's actually happened at this point.

MARITA MOLL:	Yeah. I saw that, too, Jonathan. But I was just saying, just reiterating the stuff that came out of yesterday's discussion and in supporting a federal one world Internet—yeah.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Right. Great. Thanks, Marita. Hadia, we'll give you the last word and then I'll hand the talking stick back to Olivier.
HADIA ELMINIAWI:	Thank you. Another topic I think that would be discussed a lot during ICANN74 is in relation to IDNs and management of variants. We have two PDPs going on in that regard, the IDN EPDP of the GNSO and the ccPDP4 of the ccNSO for the IDNs management. So this is also an area I think where we could develop a few points in relation to IDN management of IDN variants.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	That's great, Hadia. Thanks. That definitely could be a topic for discussion in the EU. You reminded me the other conversation that's taking place and that is likely to be going on is this recommendation prioritization effort that's been taking place. Cheryl's been managing a small team call on this for quite some time. We're now sort of finally engaging with the community more broadly on these and fighting for At-Large priorities among the prioritization of all the recommendations. It was a very quick turnaround set of discussions on this pilot that's taken place, but I suspect there will be more conversations about that. I wouldn't have the faintest idea but our talking points reduced to three.

It will be on this prioritization effort at this juncture. So it'll be interesting to see. One of the biggest challenges associated with this effort is a fear that de-prioritizing a recommendation is the equivalent to knocking it off the table. If there's a priority four recommendation, will we ever hear from it again, and certainly we're assured by Xavier and staff that we will, but there is certainly an emotional resistance to letting any favorite recommendations fall into that status. So it's been an interesting conversation that I imagine will continue at ICANN74. Sebastian?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, I totally agree with you, Jonathan, on that. To add to the picture, there is also the current work done on Work Stream 2. This is not anymore to be prioritized because it's already under, but it will be under during this fiscal year and some work will be still going on next fiscal year. And it will bring some elements on the discussion about prioritization because the link between Work Stream 2 multistakeholder model and, of course, ATRT3. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. All right. Well, that's a good start. We're going to intensify this conversation over the next six weeks. So that on day one of ICANN74, we're in a good position to brief people on these things and bring them up to date what the issue is, where we are on it, and the kind of conversations to take place. So thanks, everyone, for getting the creative juices going. I'll be coming back to you as we get closer. And with that, Olivier, I return the microphone to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. A good start for the ICANN74 talking points. We're now going to go to the workgroup and small team update. I see Sébastien still has his hand up. I'm not sure whether that still relates to the previous section. Sébastien Bachollet? You are still muted.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just using my iPhone. Sorry. I will not raise my hand anymore. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. Thank you. Okay, now small team updates. And of course, we've got our different groups that are participating in various policy development processes in Generic Name Supporting Organization. The first one is the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. And for this, we have Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka for a very short update.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. I was prevented from joining the meeting yesterday. Raymond was my proxy and he will take the minutes from there. So over to Raymond. Thank you.

RAYMOND MAMATTAH: Hi. Raymond here. Good afternoon from Accra, Ghana. We had the meeting yesterday. And the update that I can give from there is, as

Steinar mentioned earlier, the working group's work is coming to an end and that draft report will be given to the various reps by 29th of April, then the members are supposed to give feedback by 14th of May, which our reps will seek the input from all the members here before the 14th. Then there'll be a community webinar on the 2nd of June to seek input from members. And finally, it will be open for public comment on the 15th of June. So the reps will let the members have the full report by the 29th when it is gotten so that we can give a feedback by 14th of May. That's the short update I can give now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Raymond. Anything else to add? I open the floor for questions and comments as well. Okay. No further questions and comments. I note that the comments and input can be added. Steinar has put a link in the chat. Comments and input can be added to the Google Doc. Hands are up. Let's hear from Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Just a question for Steinar. Will there be something at ICANN74 so that there will be, from what you say, at the time the final report, but will there be a chance to actually discuss that amongst ALAC so that we can understand better the position that we might want to take?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. According to the proposed timelines for the finalization of Phase 1A, the working group members will receive the present draft for the

recommendation later this week. And as soon as this has been published to the working group members, I will, of course, publish that to the CPWG, and then we have something to work on, and then we have our internal documentation, and then we have a deadline on May 14th to put into the final report. So we do have some wording, some stuff to be read before ICANN74, yes. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next in the queue is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Just questions that I heard two times that comments will be open during the ICANN meeting. It's contradictory to the way the comment period must be open. It must be outside of an ICANN meeting, and the time of the ICANN meeting must not be counted in the 40 days of the comment period. Therefore, just be very careful on that. It's not a good idea to start comments during an ICANN meeting. Nobody will be following that except some very, very expert people. That's not the goal of the comment period. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. I think that this will be noted. Steinar Grøtterød?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: My idea was that we should internally be able to discuss, not to use the word comment, but discuss internally what is being proposed in the initial report for Phase 1A at the Transfer Policy Working Group. That was my intention or all I'm saying. But I hope I didn't mess things up. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Steinar. I see a thumbs up from Sébastien Bachollet. We can move to the next group. And that, of course, if you take along the tabs, you'll see the Expedited PDP on Intergovernmental Organizations, the Specific Curative Rights Protection for IGOs. That one is completed and a final report is being considered by the GNSO Council. We're keeping the tab on since we might have to come back to it once the GNSO Council has considered and given us the feedback.

The next Expedited PDP is the one on Internationalized Domain Names, IDN. And this one also is listed as no update for this week as work is ongoing on this.

The one after that is the RDA Scoping Team, the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team. There's also a link to the GNSO workspace regarding that scoping team. Alan Greenberg is going to provide us with an update on this topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Assuming I can get to the unmute. As I mentioned earlier, the report went to the GNSO Council. There was a discussion on it a week or so

ago. Reading the discussion, I think, probably does not fully give what happened. However, it was very clear, to me anyway, that we use the term proof of concept in the paper, although many of us pointed out this is not a proof of concept of the SSAD. A proof of concept says it's a stripped down version that will give us information about the SSAD how we should finalize it and build it. That's not what it is at all. The report also used a variety of other names scattered through it because we were in flux at the time of what to call it. The fact that it was called a proof of concept largely caused, I think, a lot of confusion. There was a fair amount of discussion that really focused on is it going to be a proof of concept, and we had already determined it really wasn't. But that was the name we used.

I have a long-standing principle. I learned very painfully that when you take a term that's well understood and redefined it in a different way, everyone ignores that redefinition, and that's what happened. So that caused a fair amount of discussion. There was confusion over what the decision was that the GNSO Council was being asked to make if indeed there was a decision. And it turned out that there wasn't a decision. That the actions at this point, assuming the GNSO Council did not object to the small team going back to continue work because we had originally planned to report to the GNSO Council and finalize our work by this time. And passively, there was no opposition to us going back to work so I'm presuming we will.

The point was made and I think a very strong point that we do need clarity on what we're intending to achieve with this proof of concept. Because the name implies one thing, other people have different views on it. We had proposed that the ticketing system, which is functionally

equivalent to the proof of concept was, in fact, an end goal until we could come up with a PDP that would require something else of the contracted parties. It's still not clear, even if there is a proof of concept, whether we are going to be able to get contracted parties to use it, or for that matter, get requesters to use it. So there's an awful lot of fuzziness associated with it, and if we're going to go forward, we need some clarity on these things. I think I'm going to turn it over to Justine and let her comment on what I've said if she leaves us any differences, and talk about what actions we have going forward. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. Thanks, Alan. I think what you've described is more or less accurate. I personally had trouble following what people were following from the conversation because I think people were going all over the place. Anyway, I can tell you that what the Council's resolve is out of that conversation. Well, essentially, my understanding is what the small team was asking Council for was just not to proceed on with its work because, as you say, we need more information. Therefore, the small team wasn't able to present entire picture type recommendation to Council to decide.

So what Council has resolved to do—and this is still under comment, by the way—essentially, Council is supportive of the small team's recommendation to further explore what the small team has called the proof of concept approach. They are now going to be asking ICANN Board to direct ICANN Org to proceed with what is then called the SSAD Light design. I'm not going to go into the specifics of what they call all these things. I think Alan is probably in a better position to answer

questions to that. But essentially, the Council is also expecting the small team to then further engage with ICANN Org on the development or the design at least of the SSAD Light, not implementation but design. And it would expect the small team to review the design once it's completed to make sure that it meets the expectation as determined by the small team in their preliminary report.

I think there were also a number of comments by councilors, which the small team is expected to take on board in its onward discussions in the call. Also there's the expectation that the data and experience resulting from the implementing the SSAD Light is expected to inform how to proceed with the SSAD recommendations. At this point in time, we don't know, Council doesn't know because it's still waiting on information. Potentially, the ultimate outcome could be one of three, which is, one, to adopt the SSAD recommendation, whether in whole or in part, two, to modify them, or three, to reject them outright and to say that the adoption of the recommendation is not in the best interest of the ICANN community. The Council expects the small team to continue its deliberation and to come up with more information and possibly more recommendations. Council, at this point, then requests that ICANN Board pause the consideration of the SSAD recommendations. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, you might be muted. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I didn't hear you calling on me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I thought that you were going to go back and forth between you and Justine. You did give the floor to Justine.

ALAN GREENBERG: I put my hand up just to comment on one thing. Justine said that the ICANN Org team will design this new thing. That's an interesting point. When we, the small team, points out to ICANN Org that they had departed significantly from the original SSAD design and intent in a few very critical ways, their response was, "Well, we did a design of the SSAD, but not necessarily the design." And that would be if the actual design of the future product would be up to the Implementation Review Team and not the ODA. The ODA was there to scope it out at some level, but not do a design or not do the design that would end up being implemented.

It's interesting that we tend to use the term design flexibly and Justine is right that we are now asking the ICANN Org team to go back and look at this new proposal and try to scope it out. And to do that, they will have to do a design. But again, it may not be the design. So it's a very, very fuzzy word. We have to be very careful wording. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Alan. The floor is open for comments and questions. I'm not seeing any hands up. Thank you very much for the update on the SSAD, System for Standardized Access and Disclosure Operational Design Assessment. Now, what about the RDA Scoping Team, Alan? I

know I have asked you and there was no update on this. Is there any update? I think last time, we did the same thing also. I asked about the RDA and you spoke to me about the SSAD. What about the RDA?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I'm getting confused here. RDA and ODA seem to have blurred in my mind. My apologies. On the RDA Scoping Team, that's Accuracy. If we call it Accuracy, I'll remember what we're talking about. The full group has not met recently. We've met the last several weeks in a small group looking at how to implement one particular recommendation, and that is a voluntary survey of registrars on accuracy practices and trying to collect some actual data. That group has now essentially concluded its work and we're going back to a full group meeting this week. And perhaps I'll have a little bit more to say on that.

One of the interesting points is you may remember from past weeks, I've talked about the concept of … The RAA calls for an annual letter or message to go out to registrants saying, "Is your data accurate? It's really important. Make sure it is." And one of the team members, Sarah Wyld, from Tucows had made the statement a number of times that Tucows's practice is the reminders sent out by e-mail. And if the e-mail bounces, then they take action. They treat that bounce as essentially notification to the registrar that the contact data may be improper and goes through a validation process. She was quite sure that the RAA required that. My position was the RAA gave that as an example but there was no actual requirement to track bounces. There had been discussion about bounces in previous parts of the EPDP where it was

implied by some registrars that this was too difficult to do and they didn't do it.

Anyway, I had put forward a question, as you might remember, to ICANN Compliance saying, "What's the answer? Is this required? And is it something you audit or is it optional?" and they came back and said it's optional. Sarah was rather blunt that she said she's rather surprised. Her read of the RAA was that this is indeed something required and Tucows has followed what they interpreted as but that is indeed not a requirement.

So that was an interesting thing. If indeed it was policy that bounced messages from the reminder were checked, that would significantly increase the number of domains of registrations that were periodically checked in terms of the overall installed base. The fact that Compliance confirmed what I believe was the right position does put us back to essentially square one thing. There is a huge installed base of registrations that have never been verified. It's unfortunate, really. I would have preferred to find out that yes, everyone was checking them, and these bounces were being addressed. It wouldn't be 100% coverage because there are other methods of delivering that reminder which wouldn't have a bounced message. But nevertheless, it would cover a very large part of the installed base. And it's unfortunate that indeed I was correct and those aren't being reviewed as Sarah had hoped and thought that it were. I had hoped they were. But at least it does clarify the situation.

That's all I really have to report at this point. We'll see going forward. I mentioned last week or two weeks ago, I believe, that the small group

that was looking at the survey, I went into it believing this was a waste of time. I now believe the survey turns up some interesting information, whether it's worth the effort of going into it is not clear. But it may well actually uncover some useful information. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this comprehensive update, Alan. And the floor is now open for questions and comments. Wow, that's a bit surprising. I would have thought there would have been a lot of questions and comments on this. Okay, great. Well, it looks like there's certainly some progress on that. So that's pretty good moving forward. I guess with this last update on our small working groups, we can move to the next agenda item, and that's the policy comment updates pipeline, which we always review every week. For this, we have Jonathan Zuck and Claudia Ruiz.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Claudia, do you want to go ahead?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Sure. Hi, everyone. So we currently actually do not have anything that has been recently ratified by the ALAC, and we don't have any public comments up for decision at the time. There are no current statements either. But if you click on the tab for May, June, August, and September, you will see the upcoming public comments for proceedings. There is one in May for the NCAP Study 2 draft report, which I guess we can

address later to see if you would like to draft the statement or not. That's all for me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, as predicted, there's not an awful lot there. Perhaps Justine will give us some insight on NCAP. Justine, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEWS: Thanks, Jonathan. I wasn't going to speak to the NCAP 2 report. This is still in progress. We're not releasing that. The public comment isn't due until it's due.

Anyway, the reason why I raised my hand was that I'm not sure if we actually dealt with the public comment on the RZ-LGR 5, because I was looking at last week's agenda and it was on one of the public comments for decision. But today's agenda, it seems to have disappeared. So I'm not too sure what's going on there. But in any event—and I think Hadia will probably back me up on this—I did have a look at the main document for the RZ-LGR public comment. Essentially, I would say that I'm pretty comfortable with it. It's basically the Integration Panel going through the motions for undertaking the set procedures to incorporate seven new script LGRs, Label Generation Rules, into a new version of the RZ-LGR, which is now version 5. Just for completeness sake, I did have a look at what happened to ALAC's comment on the Latin LGR because Latin is one of the seven new scripts that's being added to the Root Zone LGR. And I also read the GP's response to ALAC's comment and a few other comments as well. I think they have pretty much resolved the comments, which is why they submitted a fresh one and

updated Latin LGRs for incorporation under RZ-LGR 5. I think all is good. I'm certainly going to recommend that we don't need to make a comment. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Justine. I really appreciate the update. I had formed the impression on last call that we didn't need to make a comment. But I definitely appreciate the commentary, and also the follow through on the Latin—because we made a number of very specific recommendations in that set of comments. So it's your impression that they were taken on board because I feel like some of them were controversial with the Contracted Party House.

JUSTINE CHEWS: Well, whether they were taken on board is one thing, but they certainly considered it and they gave their response. I can post a link to what I read. I didn't see anything terribly amiss. I think what they have provided is acceptable, in my opinion, anyway.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's good to know. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I've also looked at that. Some quick background information for those who don't really know what this is about. The Root Zone Label Generation Rules provide a mechanism to determine which Unicode points are permitted for using new labels. So what variants, if any, are

possible to allocate in the Root Zone and what variants, if any, are automatically blocked. Successful development of Label Generation Rules, it depends on having community-based Generation Panels for each script awarding system that will be used in the Root Zone. The Generation Panel starts with a broad set of code points for the relevant script known as maximum starting repertoire and proposed relevant Label Generation Rules. These proposals are reviewed by the Community through public comment, and then by the Integration Panel for approval and integration into the Label Generation Rules for the Root Zone. Basically, this version, version 5, is integrating some scripts to the existing Label Generation Rules. The list of scripts could be found on the wiki page. Again, I also looked at it and I don't think that we do need to comment on it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks so much, Hadia. We have some things upcoming, but not much more to do on this today, Olivier. So I pass the microphone back to you for Any Other Business.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Indeed, yes, this was marked in the policy pipeline at this At-Large workspace, Root Zone Label Generation Rules, RZ-LGR 5 has no statement. In fact, there should be a link to that in the agenda. I was checking on that. We will have to check whether there's a link on that because it's always good to have the link to the original policy pipeline. Anyway, thank you for this.

That just leaves us with Any Other Business. I'm not seeing any hands up, which means that we are indeed just off top of the hour. We just made it in one hour. Adigo is calling me now. I don't think there is a need for it since we are going to just ask for next week's call. When will that take place?

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Olivier. Okay. Looking at next week, normally we would have our call at 19:00 UTC. However, I do see a clash there. We have the AFRALO monthly call. So what I could suggest is maybe moving the CPWG call to 20:00 UTC, if that would work for you all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That certainly works for me. That's making it slightly earlier than we usually have that.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: No. One hour later.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry. I'm obviously in the wrong time zone at the moment. I'm having a look if anybody objects to this later time. It looks like it's fine. It'll be a little bit later for us in Europe. And of course, it might actually be better for some of our colleagues in the Far East and in the Australasian region. So one hour later is great for Sydney. Indeed, indeed. Okay. Let's do it at that time then, 21:00.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: 20:00.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 20:00 UTC.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: 11:00 PM Istanbul time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you so much for this, Yeşim. And with this, I'd like to thank our interpreters for today's call plus, of course, our real-time text transcriber, who has done another great job. When you close your browser, your Zoom, you will have automatically a page that will come up with questions being asked about the quality of the transcription and whether it's been useful to you. Please answer these. That's pretty much it for today. Jonathan, anything to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, that's great. Thanks, everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, everybody. Take care. Have a great week. Goodbye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Goodbye.

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great—

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]