
YESIMAR 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 18th of May, 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 [inaudible] and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call.

And just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Vanda Scartezini, Bill Jouris, Justine Chew, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Priyatosh Jana, K Mohan Raidu, Sarah Kiden, and Marita Moll.

And from staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yesim Saglam, present on today's call. And I will also be doing call management for this call.

And, as usual, we have Spanish and French interpretation. And our interpreters are Claudia and David on the Spanish channel, and Jacques and Isabelle on the French.

And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes, please.

And one final reminder is, as usual, for the real-time transcription services provided. And I'm going to share the link here with you on Zoom chat. Please do check the service. And once this session ends, we will have pop-up evaluation questions on your screen. Please do take

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.

one or two minutes only to complete this survey to help us evaluate the service.

And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. And welcome, everyone, to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. That's going to hopefully quite a swift one, although we do have some updates.

First, we'll have our review of the ALAC response to the Board's understanding on the clarifying question responses. That's, of course, to do with Alan Greenberg. He'll be taking us through those.

Then we'll have the review of the proposed topics for the ALAC meeting with the SSAC. Jonathan and I will take us through the list. There are proposed SSAC topics. There are no proposed ALAC topics so far—or rather there are, but we will see them in a moment. We'll review them in a moment.

And then after that we'll have a progress update on the development of the At-Large ICANN74 talking points [themselves]. And we'll hear from the policy leads about this.

Then we'll go through our work group and small team update. And there are some of the groups that will provide some updates. Not sure about the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, but certainly the big update is going to be about the Expedited PDP on IDNs (Internationalized Domain Names).

And after that, we'll also have an update on the Accuracy Scoping Team from Alan Greenberg, who'll be taking us through a deck of slides.

And then after this, we'll have our policy comments. And it's a very empty pipeline for the time being. So it's just some advanced notices.

The floor is open for comments and questions and for any amendments to be made to the agenda at this point in time.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Olivier. Two points. Number one, I have to leave at the top of the hour. And, number two, I have a small presentation under Item #6 on RDA and ODA. They can be omitted if we don't have enough time, but it's probably a five-minute presentation there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Alan. What I might propose then, because the work group update is Agenda Item 6—that's after a whole lot of other things before that, which might take some time—is to perhaps move this forward if we're seeing if we're a bit late on things. So we'll have a review to the ALAC response to the Board understanding on clarifying questions. And if that takes a bit too much time, then we'll go directly to the work group updates, and you can provide your two presentations at that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just one other point. I do have some documents associated with Item #3. I don't see them attached to the agenda. Does staff have them?

YESIM SAGLAM: Alan, I have it ready.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Just wanted to make sure they weren't lost. That's all.

YESIM SAGLAM: Okay. I have it, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

YESIM SAGLAM: Sure.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Yesim. And there is torrential rain outside, so I hope you can hear me well, everyone.

Let's see. I'm not seeing any other hands up. So that's the potential agenda changes: just to move Agenda Item 6 forward a little bit.

And now we'll move to the action items. And there were three action items—all three completed.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am sorry, Olivier. Just to tell you I'm trying to connect my wife on this phone. It's written "Call," and I clicked on "Call," and when I tried to put this on the phone, then everybody is hearing it ring. And that's just a strange way to connect. Therefore, if somebody can call her on the French channel, it would be great. Thank you very much. Sorry for that.

YESIM SAGLAM: Of course, Sebastien. We will right now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The wonders of technology sometimes make it the gripes of technology. There are no comments for the action items, all of which have been completed. And you can see the whole page of action items that's complete.

That means we can move to the next point, and that's the review of the ALAC's response to the Board's understanding on the clarifying

questions responses, a title that means very little. If Alan Greenberg could please enlighten us on this. And I believe there is a document to share. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The documents that I want to share ... I've sent several to staff. The one I want to share is a very simple, three-page document with some table on it. I hope that will identify which one it is.

YESIM SAGLAM: Alan, if I may, is it the PDF one?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the PDF. Three columns and a blue heading. Hopefully that'll be the right one.

YESIM SAGLAM: Mm-hmm.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, that is the right one. Okay.

Let me review the history of this. The ALAC did provide advice several months ago to the Board on the SSAD implementation. We received back a number of questions on, "Is this what you meant by it?" We responded with some relatively long clarifications. And the Board staff have now come back to us and said, "Okay. Factoring in those things. Is

this what you meant?” And we’re now responding to that. And that’s where we are right now.

The first one is we gave three pieces of advice. The first one says ... And they’re now coming back to us and saying, in a shorter of version of what we said, “The Board understands the ALAC believes the Board should either reject the SSAD recommendations or request the GNSO reconsider them, perhaps with a delay, to fully understand the potential changes in data-protection-related legislation in Europe, including the proposed NIS2 directive. The Board also understands that the ALAC does not believe that the implementation of the SSAD, as recommended, is in the best interests of ICANN or the ICANN community. Nor does the ALAC believe that the SSAD will be compatible with the NIS2 directive when adopted.”

And my proposed response is, “Yes, that is the understanding. That is a concise statement of exactly what we said.”

I’m going to stop after each one. And if there’s anyone who recalls something different or thinks that we meant something different, we can go back to the individual advice and look at it. But I believe that is a good, concise summary of our Advice #1.

I don’t see any hands. Let’s go on to the second one. This may take a lot less than 15 minutes, but the third one is a little bit more interesting. The second one is, “The Board understands the ALAC’s suggestion for ICANN Org to design and implement a no-charge ticketing tracking system to track requests for disclosure of non-public gTLD registration

information. The Board has received additional informational from ICANN Org's recently completed ODP assessment of recommendations."

And I think they were talking here about the feedback via the GNSO from the small team that is looking at the ODA. And you'll recall that the small team is currently recommending something called a proof of concept for the SSAD, which is indeed not really a proof of concept but is a stripped-down SSAD which is comparable to the ticketing system that we were requesting.

"The Board looks forward to continue dialogue with the GNSO Council and the entire ICANN community with regard to next steps as it considers the SSAD recommendations."

And my proposed response is, "Yes, this does confirm our understanding. This is essentially what we said."

Unless I have any comments, let's go on to the third one, which is indeed a lot more interesting. Scroll up to try to get the—that's it. Okay. [inaudible] doesn't seem to have come. All of it doesn't seem to be present there. Okay. The third one was a little bit more complex. Actually, Yesim, can you put on the attachment that I sent which ends with dash-AG?

YESIM SAGLAM:

Sure. One second, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: The name ends with dash-AG; my initials. It's a comment of the actual advice, not quite the final one.

YESIM SAGLAM: Oh, yes. The Word document. Okay. Just one second.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, sorry. I didn't remember it was a Word document.

YESIM SAGLAM: [I'm getting] it right now. This one?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. If you can scroll towards the bottom of it.

YESIM SAGLAM: Mm-hmm.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go on ... Okay. We're looking at what is the top bullet on that screen. No, no—yeah, you're perfectly assigned right now. So this was our third advice, and it said, "Should regulations comparable to those related to the domain name registration data in NIS2," which essentially says, among other things, you must publish the data for legal registrants/legal entities." GDPR says you must not publish the data for individuals. Then this regulations says you must publish the data that is not personal data. It says a bunch of other things also, but that's a very top-level summary.

So, “Should regulations comparable to these be adopted by the European Council and Parliament, the ICANN Board should immediately consider initiating a targeted GNSO PDP to ensure that all ICANN registrars are subject to comparable rules.” So if NIS2 is adopted, registrars who are subject to European laws—that is, those resident in or having a major presence in Europe—will suddenly have to display a lot of information which currently they’re redacting. But that wouldn’t apply to all of the registrars. And so we’re saying that the Board should initiate a PDP to make sure that everyone is subject to those rules. This will provide fairness within the registrar community and ensure that we will not end up with registrars outside of the EU being able to provide higher levels of anonymity to those registered domains in support of DNS abuse and other fraudulent or illegal activities. And then we note it’s not really part of SSAD but we believe it’s a necessary step.

Okay. If we can go back to the document now of their understanding of it—that’s it; thank you—I won’t read the left-hand column. The Board is summarizing what we said in somewhat different words. And it’s a reasonable accurate description. “The Board also notes”—roundabout the seventh line in the document—“the ALAC is also able to request an issue report.” So they’re saying we don’t have to ask the Board to do it; we could do it ourselves.

Okay. The response is, “The ALAC notes that the advice to request a GNSO issue report was not for immediate”—oh, sorry. I missed something. The first sentence of the Board’s understanding is, “The Board understands the ALAC is recommending that the Board request an issue report.” The response to that is we note we were not asking

them to request an issue now but at some future date if specific things happen.

The next paragraph is, “We’re aware that we can request an issue report. We’ve done so twice. The difference is that, if we request an issue report, the GNSO Council, once the report is created, must then decide whether to initiate a PDP.” So it still goes to a council decision to initiate the PDP. If the Board requests an issue report, there is no decision. The GNSO Council is bound to initiate a PDP. So we’re noting that that is the difference, and that is why we suggested the Board request it.

The third paragraph: “In light of the Board’s noting that there’s an ongoing focus on NIS2” ... And the response does note correctly that the Board is looking at this. Everyone is looking at this. They’ve also suggested that the GNSO look at it. And in fact, there was a recommendation coming out of Phase 2A that the GNSO monitor the NIS2 initiatives, [saying,]” In light of the Board’s noting its ongoing focus on NIS2 issues and the EPDP’s Phase 2A’s recommendation, the ALAC has prepared to withdraw this item of advice and reissue it, should the situation warrant it in the future.”

Now, in retrospect, although we wanted to put our stake in the ground, saying we expect NIS2 to happen and then we want the Board to take action on it, that may have been premature. And certainly at this point, it’s a lot cleaner to say we withdraw that particular advice and, if and when it becomes obvious that we need to give such advice, we can do it again.

And then I continue with the response: “This withdrawal notwithstanding, the ALAC reminds the Board of the original ICANN intent to keep WHOIS/RDS as open as possible while in compliance with GDPR.” And, “Should it prove that factoring in NIS2[/]GDPR in fact allows more publication than we currently see in the RDDS, policy may well be needed to ensure that such openness is not restricted to contracted parties subject to NIS2.” So we’re simply going back to the original ICANN intent when we initiated the temporary ... When they created the temporary spec and then we initiated the EPDP, the intent of ICANN is to keep WHOIS as open as possible—obviously subject to GDPR and other regulation—so we’re compliant with the law. That is far, far from where we ended up, and we’re simply reminding the Board that that still is our intent and hopefully their intent.

I open it to comments at this point. So, in summary, my recommendation is we withdraw the third part of advice and keep it in our back pocket, unless it should prove necessary in the future. It is a major issue. This statement of course will have to go to the ALAC for approval because it a response from the ALAC, not from me and not from the CPWG. But is everyone here comfortable with it?

I see Jonthan has his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. I guess I’m certainly comfortable with it, but if I understand correctly, it was conditional advice anyway. So is the withdrawal of it just meant to further clarify that it wasn’t immediately required?

ALAN GREENBERG:

In my mind ... First of all, the Board's opening statement is "The Board understands the ALAC is recommending that the Board request an issue report." So that was factually incorrect. And it's correct in the first paragraph of the response. I guess I'm just trying to stop this from going back and forth another three times because, at this point, NIS2 is still some time away. It's not clear what it will contain. The Board is saying, "Hey, we're watching this. We of course are going to be conscious of it. The GNSO has already been told in several ways that it has to be cognizant of it." We don't know how they're going to respond to it. They may respond properly. They may respond exactly the way we want.

So at this point, until we see how things are playing out, to have this advice pending and sitting there as an open item potentially for a few years and potentially while ICANN is actually taking action on our advice, even perhaps through a different mechanism ... It seems cleaner to withdraw it and make sure it goes back if necessary. We're not going to forget about it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I see no other hands. Oh, Greg. Please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

I understand—I don't have a copy of yet—that some form of agreement relating to NIS2 was just made earlier this week, and I'm trying to get new information on it. But I'm wondering if things aren't perhaps moving a little more quickly [inaudible] in a few years. But depending on what's happening, we may want to [inaudible] the list if we can make it stunningly clear to the Board that we're asking them to this when the time is right and not right now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I'm not aware of what has been agreed to. Maybe there has been an agreement between the council and the parliament because there have been negotiations going on. So there may be some clarity. Remember, NIS2 requires national legislation in each jurisdiction to actually come into effect. And presumably there'll be a time limit in which that has to be done. So even if there is agreement in the EU, it's still not in effect at this point. And we've already heard comments that, until we see how nations implement it, it's hard to say, "Do the same thing."

So as I said, we certainly could keep it open and just delete the last two paragraphs, but at this point, I think it would be cleaner, if and when we need to advise, that we make it very specific and targeted rather than the open-ended one we have right now. If there is disagreement or general unease with it, we can just omit the last two paragraphs of what I'm saying and replace it with, "We appreciate there's ongoing discussion"—or "ongoing inspection"—"of these things." I don't feel very strongly. I just think it's a cleaner way of doing it and more likely to

result in what we want and [not] something that may take a turn that goes in a direction that we don't want, ostensibly based on our advice.

Greg?

GREG SHATAN:

I guess let's just see where things go. I, for one, am not one who would support the "wait for all nations of Europe to implement this," given the length of time a PDP takes. I think that we would want to get something done yesterday if we could.

Here's a note that ... A political agreement was reached between the European Parliament and EU member states on the NIS2 directive, reached on May 13th. And I don't even know if it's been released yet.

ALAN GREENBERG:

To be clear, Greg, I wasn't suggesting we wait for all national legislation, but you really need some direction for where some countries—at least some of the major countries—are going before we know exactly what we have to echo.

GREG SHATAN:

I guess part of it depends on what this political agreement [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, indeed.

GREG SHATAN: Supposedly all of the EU nations. So that might provide that sort of guidepost.

ALAN GREENBERG: It may well. And I guess I feel more comfortable making new advice which we can make sure is targeted and really accurate as opposed to this sort of vague one that we've made right now.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah, I agree with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: But if there's disagreement with that, then [I can live with that, too].

GREG SHATAN: I agree that, whether we withdraw and immediately replace it with more targeted advice or withdraw and replace it in three months with more targeted advice—or six months or whatever makes sense—we're better off being more specific, since clearly the Board has a problem with properly interpreting some general statements sometimes.

So let's see where things go.

ALAN GREENBERG: And in light of that, perhaps replace the word "it"—"to reissue it"—with something like "more targeted advice" or something like that, should it be warranted in the future.

GREG SHATAN: I could go with that. And I see John McCormac just put the link for the press release into the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

We have a hand from Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Hello, Alan. The fact is that—the way I see it-- the ALAC advice to the Board is for something that’s going to happen in the future. So even if you withdraw the last two paragraphs, the beginning, if you read this first paragraph, says about a future date should specific things happen. So the whole ALAC advice is for “should future things happen.”

So my recommendation is to leave only the first two paragraphs and leave it there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the problems we are triggering it on something that may be subject to interpretation. As Greg said, they may choose to interpret this advice to mean “Wait for a legislation from all EU jurisdictions,” which wasn’t our intent. So, again, I feel more comfortable being able to reissue it in a more specific way when the time is appropriate.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. I will follow your experience with this type of thing. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Otherwise, number one, we have advice that's going to stay open for a long time, and we may well have to modify it at the time when NIS2 is approved or is whatever the right words are. So I just feel this is cleaner.

All right. So I'll clean this up a little bit, change the third paragraph to replace "reissue it" with something with more clarity, and we'll pass this on to the ALAC, noting the comments that have been made here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I am not seeing any other hands up. Thanks for shepherding us through the process. I'm looking forward to the responses and recognizing the dialogue that our community is having with the Board. I can certainly show some satisfaction that the Board now comes back and asks further questions and we respond and so on. And that's certainly a big difference from a few years ago when we used to lob things over a wall and hope something that came back. So it's great steps forward.

Now, the next part in our agenda is going to be the review of the proposed topics for the ALAC meeting with the SSAC. I believe has ... Has Jonathan made it to the call yet or not?

JONATHA ZUCK: Yes, I'm definitely here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh. Welcome, Jonathan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, he did speak before.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. No, I didn't quite whether know whether he was here or not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: *singing* "Unforgettable. That's what I am." All right.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I know. Fish memory.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I guess I wasn't prepared to lead this conversation, though. So do we have an issue shepherd on this document? Sorry, you caught me unawares here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, we do have the ... Some of the questions here were, of course, the preparation with the proposed ALAC topics. And on the action item, I think we had some ... What do we have? We had the ICANN74 talking points, but we did not have anything to do with the discussion with the SSAC. And if I can recall correctly, I don't think we have actually had suggested topics back then.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, you mean ... Oh, I see. We have the topics that they've proposed.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yeah. And looking at the topics that they proposed: the SSAD, the addendum to SAC114, the Name Collision Analysis Project, and the possible routing security, if the paper has been published by then.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I remember that conversation.

I see Hadia has her hand up. I'll let Hadia provide clarity if she has some. Go ahead, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. So in relation to the proposed SSAC topics, I think we could also include SAC120, the SSAC input to GNSO IDN PDP on Internationalized Domain Names [areas]. And the reason I am suggesting that is because, in their report, they mentioned that variant

management mechanisms serve two purposes. One is definitely it enhances the security and stability of the DNS. And the second is acceptable experience that meets the user expectations. Of course, from the SSAC point of view or perspective, the most important part it has is in the security and stability for DNS. However, from our perspective, acceptable experience that meets user expectations is the most important—of course, the security and stability as well.

But in that regard, when they speak about the measures that need to be taken, they talk about conservative measures. And in that regard, they propose one of two ways. One is that the SSAC calls for a conservative approach. One is to start with asking, “Is one label enough. If it’s not sufficient, then are two labels efficient?” And the other approach is only to delegate the variants that are uniquely differentiated from the primary IDN labels.

I personally think the approach we are taking is the second one, but definitely this is a topic that we could also discuss. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That sounds like a good idea.

Are there are other suggestions for topics that we might want to propose to the SSAC?

I wonder if it makes sense to talk to them about their response to the GNSO with respect to DNS abuse since we both provided responses to them on that topic. So perhaps we would add that to the agenda as well.

And then Greg is mentioning SSAD. And SSAD is already in their list of topics.

Any other thoughts or suggestions for this agenda? I mean, it's a pretty robust agenda, even at this point that we have these two.

[inaudible] connectedness. Gopal, would you like to explain your suggestion?

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It looks like a slogan.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Well, it may be a point. It was what can happen in the next few years since we can think about it. What was spoken of by Kevin Kelly, the leader of Wired magazine [inaudible]. He is now becoming [inaudible] several layers of [inaudible]. Everything gets connected to everything else. And it is very likely that we are seeing several layers of [inaudible] of technologies. So what will connectedness mean? [inaudible] the next eight years. The old archaic machine is there. The brand new machine is there. [inaudible] to understand the concept of connectedness [inaudible]. What is it that we want to talk about [:] security or Internet or connectedness?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Wow, that sounds like a very good topic, Gopal. That might be a [more] dedicated conversation. But I don't know that we're going to put that into an agenda.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Okay. I leave it to your judgement.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But thanks for bringing it up. And let's try to get ourselves [boned] up on that and then perhaps have a bilateral later about that when we're more spun up on it ourselves.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: No problem. I'll leave it to your judgement.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

Any other recommendations?

All right. I think that's a good agenda. So I see that staff has been making notes, but I don't see—oh, Christopher Wilkinson, please go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I'm not being facetious, but staff should keep a very careful note as to what's going on between Mr. Musk and Twitter. If indeed Musk can extract from Twitter the identification of the accounts which are fake,

the methodology and specifics sound very interesting because—mutatis mutandis— ... If that can be done, granted with enormous financial leverage—I’m quite sure there’s more than necessary—(mutatis mutandis) ICANN can ask all the registries and registrars to identify which of their registrations are in any sense fake or subject to abuse. Just a thought.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Interesting. Yeah, Christopher, thanks for the note on that. It is something to keep an eye on then.

All right. I guess that’s it for this meeting. It looks like I’m next on the agenda as well with talking points. I don’t know that we have anything—Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. Just as I mentioned in the chat, the topics that Dr. Gopal had brought forward would be an interesting, quick, informal discussion with the SSAD leadership to see if they have things that they could talk about on this.

I think the topic that Christopher has brought forth is also something we might wish to discuss in the corridors with the leadership of SSAC with a view of perhaps having a future session if some SSAC members are knowledgeable about this and if this pertains, of course, to the ICANN remit. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier.

Any other questions or comments?

All right. I see that a progress update on the development of At-Large talking points is on the agenda. I don't know if the issue shepherds have any updated thoughts on what the topics of conversation are going to be during ICANN74, but I haven't received them via e-mail yet. Claudia has created a—yes?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Sorry, Jonathan. Sorry for jumping in, but earlier, when we did the agenda preparation, Alan Greenberg mentioned that he had to leave at the top of the call, so I proposed swapping some agenda items over and actually having the work group update before the progress update and the talking points because I see here 20 minutes are allocated or could be allocated to the progress update and it could take us beyond the top of the hour. If that's okay with you, I was going to suggest we have the RDS Scoping Team and the SSAD ODA updates from Alan and then we'll have the Transfer Policy Review PDP and we'll have the EPDP on IDNs—so the work group and small team updates—ASAP. And then we'll go back to the progress updates on the development of the At-Large ICANN74 talking points. Is that okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. And sorry for that. And we can therefore zoom to work group and small team updates and, first, the Accuracy Scoping Team update and SSAD ODA. Both updates are in one big PowerPoint presentation with Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not sure a six-page update, including the title, is a big presentation. It'll be relatively quick. There's not a lot going on at this point.

In terms of the Accuracy Scoping Team, there was a Board proposal or Board request at the last ICANN meeting that staff develop a number of scenarios to present to the European data protection authorities in terms of what is allowed and what is not allowed. You'll recall that the ARS (Accuracy Reporting System) was halted when GDPR was enacted or became effective because it required looking at the [country] information in WHOIS, which of course wasn't there anymore. And it certainly was not clear, based on what the PDP said, that registrars are obliged to provide that information to ICANN for purposes of the accuracy review.

So at this point, we are not doing any sort of analysis of whether we have accurate data or not. We have very old historic reports saying there were lots of accuracy problems. There were some trends of how that was changing slightly as we did the ARS, but at that point, everything just stopped.

All right. So the Board said, “Develop a number of scenarios.” The staff have come back to us, and they said, “So far, we’ve come up with four of them.”

And if we can go to Slide #2, please—oh, we’re already on it; sorry—the four that they proposed to us are the following: one, analyze public data—in other words, the stuff that we can see—and analyze it like we did the ARS. Number two is to analyze a sample of full registration data provided by registrars. Number three is a proactive audit of whether registrars are complying with the current validation, registration, and verification requirements. And the fourth is a voluntary survey asking registrars for information regarding how they treat the accuracy issue.

My response to these is ... Well, first of all, the first one and the last one clearly don’t require any access to private data. And the third one probably doesn’t require access to data. So we’re not quite sure why they’re there. ICANN has come back and said, “Oh, well. Well, our scenarios were interesting things to study but don’t necessarily meet approval of the data protection authorities.” And I just, last night, added a comment to that, saying, “That’s fine. These are all interesting things to do, but why are they presented under the auspices of the Board request to interact with the data protection authorities?” So that’s still an unknown.

In terms of whether these are useful or not—number one is to analyze public data—well, to a large extent, there’s no data there. And although occasional organizations or entities say, “You must publish my data,” they’re not really there. So I cannot even see why we would waste time doing number one. Maybe there is something to be gleaned out of it,

but other than to prove that there isn't much data there, I'm not sure what it would do.

Number two clearly requires some sort of level of approval and policy to make sure it happens because right now ICANN cannot get the data from registrars through any known mechanism.

Number three is, again, something that's probably valuable for ICANN to do. If we have contractual conditions, we should be auditing them, but it's not clear what it will really prove in terms of the scoping team.

And on the last one, again, there may be some interesting information, but it doesn't seem to be directly related to what we're likely to come out with. A little bit vague.

Next slide, please. I have made two suggestions. One is essentially restarting the ARS, similar to what we've done before but with policy requiring the registrars to provide us with the data. This would obviously be done in an automated way. There are RDAP facilities that could do that today. Unfortunately, they are not typically enabled for full data. And, number two, they are often rate-limited. So we'd have to make some technical adjustments. But other than that, it's pretty easy to do. At this point, clearly, we would need to make sure that this is viewed as a legitimate use of personal data by the data protection authorities.

The next one is something conceptually similar, but instead of doing it on a sample of all data, [we] do it on a registrar-by-registrar basis—either their full data set or partial one, perhaps, depending on the size of the registrar. That's essentially doing an audit but not the audit that

was proposed on the previous page of an audit of a process but auditing the results. That would also have the benefit of ... Remember, the current verification validation requirements are only on new and changed domains. This one would obviously be on the whole set and give us some idea of whether we still have significant accuracy problems or not. But both of these obviously do require interactions with data protection authorities.

Next slide. The other thing you may want to look at is... In any PDP or working group, the end result is a substantial report. The report conceptually is drafted after you do the work. The reality is that staff starts drafting the report quite early because there's an awful lot of boilerplate and background stuff in there which can be completed before we have the final ending recommendations. And that is true with the report for the scoping team as well. And anyone who's interested can look at that document and, if you have comments on it, please let me know and I'll pass them on.

I see Steinar had a question. "How to verify that data from registrars are valid?" Steinar, I'm not quite sure what you mean by "valid."

STEINAR GROTTOROD:

Hi. The way I read your suggestion is that there should be a dataset from the registrar for investigation for whether it's accurate data. And how do you verify that Mr. John really is Mr. John? Can you do that? Can ICANN do that? Or is it just taking some sort of technology saying that there should be a first name, last name, a phone number, and

address that [sounds logical], etc.? And is it possible even if you get the data from the registrars? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry. That's an interesting issue. If you're asking me, "If the data says that this was registered by Alan Greenberg who lives in Montreal and is at a certain address, can you verify that it really was Alan Greenberg and not Steinar who decided to use all of my contact information?" no you can't. That's verification of identity. And there have been those who have proposed that we should be verifying identity and you can't masquerade as someone else, but at a detailed level, that's pretty hard to do. I mean, even in Montreal, there are quite a few Alan Greenbergs. So how do we make sure it's the right one? How do we make sure you're not using someone else's information? That's much harder to do than simply verifying that the information seems to be correct.

Now, you might be asking another question, which is, "How do we know the registrar is giving us the real information?" If I ask for the contact information for alangreenberg.com and they give it to me, saying this is what is in their database, conceptually a registrar can completely lie and give me information unrelated to that registration and say "It's my information." We have no way of verifying that short of going into their computer systems and looking at it, which is possible in an audit. We really can't do that.

So that comes down to one of the real questions that the group has been focusing on of, "What does accuracy mean? How do we define accuracy?" And the result of that discussion usually comes down to: it

depends on what you're going to use it for. There are different measures of accuracy depending on what your target is. And we still haven't settled on that. That's still an ongoing discussion that we're still having back and forth a number of times. That's actually in the next slide.

But why don't we go to that next slide? And these are some of the discussions that we're having. We don't have answers to them. We may well go back and work on it. One is, "What is the definition of accuracy?" We have finally come up with I think is accepted as the definition of accuracy as required by the current RAA. Even that one was hard to come up with. A more general one is still to be determined. And the next question is, "Are the current requirements sufficient? If not, what should they be? And is it reasonable/practical/viable to include identify verification and verify that this is indeed the identity it says it is?" That's something that's still up for discussion.

So it's a complex issue.

Hadia, your hand is up.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Alan, for this presentation. Just in relation to identity verification, this was actually part of the user accreditation process that was required for users to use the SSAD when SSAD was part of a system that could, in an automated way, return answers to requesters. So if we would have gone with the SSAD as it was envisioned, identity verification would have been part of verifying users' identity, not

registrants' identity, of course. So the idea of having a third party verifying identities there, but it's never there for registrants. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you. Sorry, I'm going to have to leave in about two minutes, so I'll answer that question very quickly and then go back to the rest of the presentation. The answer is, yes, identity verification is certainly possible. If you apply for a passport, they do some level of identity verification. The only question is, can you do it for a process where you may charge seven or eight dollars for a registration? If you were told you can only get an account with a registrar after your identity is verified and it's going to cost \$700 to do that, that changes the whole domain ecosystem. And it could be done. The question is, is that something we want to be done or feel needs to be done? Some people believe it's correct.

Okay, next slide, please. It's a very short one. On the SSAD ODA, we're currently on hold, waiting for feedback from ICANN Org on the proof of concept and a number of other issues that were raised in our critique of the ODA. So there's basically nothing happening on that at this point.

And I'll take questions if there are any, but as I said, I do have to leave very, very shortly.

Sounds like back to you, Olivier. Thank you, all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Alan. Sounds like we just managed to fit you in the hour.

So now we're going to continue on our work group updates. And the next one is the one with Steinar Grotterod and Daniel Nanghaka. And Steinar is going to take us through the update on the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Hi. Steinar was not [inaudible] on the last call.

Can anybody hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, absolutely, Lutz. Welcome. And apologies for this. I should have mentioned that. So we can hear you. Ready for your update.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Okay. Let's make it short. Most of the time was a discussion about how detailed should technical documents [be copied] to the policy if they are subject to change, especially norms about cryptography? The discussion was about if the references [to] algorithms specified in some documents which are subject to change over time should be copied to the policy [inaudible] reference. And there was no clear result, but the main point was that it is sufficient to include a reference.

The next discussion was about who is responsible for the storage of the transfer authorization code. This discussion was nearly of the same logical level as the discussion before. Simply, if you are going to enforce a policy which is saying that the transfer authorization code needs to be expired by a defined period or needs to be cut out of scope or out of

value, and you need to provide a clear error message, for instance, saying this is an expired code or a wrong code, that's an important distinction for the involved parties to know if there is an authentication or there is a missing one or is the wrong one or it's an expired one. And just saying there is something wrong is clearly the wrong error message.

So the [rule communication] where such an error message can be generated is just the registry. So if the registry is storing this information, there would be no problem. There would be even no problem with enforcing policy. Currently, we have the problem that some registrars are [creating] authentication [before] transfer and keep them for a long time and always say it's valid. And that's exactly the point we are trying to remove in this process. So we had to move the power or storage or the power of authority for the authentication code during the process from the registrar to the registry. And this is a loss of power. And consequently, the registrars are against it. This is still an open discussion and will be continued next time.

The most important point for us is that almost nobody has responded to the request for offer some input to the initial draft on what should be changed or what could be extended or what is missing. So the time period to send in some responses was extended to the end of this week, namely Friday.

That's all from yesterday. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank for this.

And let's open the floor for questions and comments.

I'm not seeing any hands up—oh no, there is. Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Lutz. How would you quantify the loss of power associated with that recommendation? And do you think this is something that we should be pressing on?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE:

As I am not working for a registrar, I do not follow clearly the reasoning, but I assume that they want to have some freedom in changing or selecting an authorization code or modifying the authorization code during the process in order to satisfy the needs of some customers. And this is difficult if you are moving the authority of the storage of this code to a different entity and you have to follow a process in order to make such little tricks happen. That's my impression from the discussion.

On the other hand, the main argument they are bringing forward for preventing this power of storage is that their registrant has to discuss this [with] the registry if the transfer [inaudible]. But I think it is worth it, simply because the registrant is communicating with the reseller, the reseller is communicating with the registrant, and the registrar is the person who is in charge for the transfer and is [inaudible] point of communication for the registrant. And nobody is calling the registry directly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And so do you think this is an issue that we should press further?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: No. I hope that it will come to, at the end, that we have to store it on the registry, simply in order to enforce the policy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Lutz.
Steinar, please go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: I think there's two comments there. In previous discussions regarding the technical criteria for the TAC, there has been some comments from entities. They are saying they're using the present authorization code for different purposes than purely in a transfer process. They are also using these security permits for access to subsystems within a registrar or reseller control panel. And there has been pros and cons in whether you should develop something that is technically described to be used for other services than purely the transfer code. So that might be a little bit reflected in the discussion that was taking place yesterday. I'm not sure about that because I just listened to the recording with one ear and not full focus.

The other thing is that ... Oh, what was that? Well, I have to come back to that. Thank you.

Thank you, Lutz, for being my proxy for the meeting yesterday. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar.

And I'm not seeing any other hands up, so that means our update is complete on this topic. Thanks very much, Lutz, for this update as well. And of course we'll continue coming back to you guys for further updates on this very interesting topic indeed.

Let's go now to the Expedited PDP on Internationalized Domain Names. As you know, the one on IGOs is complete, so there's no update on that. And for the Expedited PDP on IDNs, we've got Satish Babu and his colleagues joining us. And there is a presentation here with the whole ALAC team on EPDP on IDNs charter questions A9 and A10. Over to you.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Olivier. As a preamble, A9 and A10 relate to label states and label state transitions. So this particular A9 [is] a label state. And what is a label state? Now, when you have an IDL set—that's an Internationalized Domain Label set—that [inaudible] refers to the [inaudible] domain applied for and [inaudible]. Now, the common property here is that this set should travel through different stages of the application as a bundle. They cannot be separated because they all belong to the same entity. They have to belong to the same entity. So that's a [inaudible] IDN set.

And the [question] here states that a given label in IDL set may be in one of the following non-exhaustive statuses: delegated, withheld-same-entity, blocked, allocated, and rejected. The working group [inaudible] priority to coordinate and develop a consistent definition of [inaudible] status in the IDL set. So [inaudible] the [inaudible] is being asked to a consistent definition.

So [inaudible] delegated status is very clear. Withheld-same-entity means that there is a label and there are its variants. Now, the applicant has to not ask for apply for all those variants. So there are some that are not applied for, but this cannot be given to anybody else because there variants and they mean the same. They're equivalent. So they are withheld for the same entity, even if they're not applied for. So that is that status.

So blocked is then the status that arises from IDNs. Now, for IDNs, basically the EPDP has come to the conclusion that the root zone LGR should be the single source of variants. And the root zone LGR tells us what variant is blocked and what variant unallocatable. So blocked is coming out of the root zone LGR process, which in turn is based on the generation panel's [inaudible]. So the blocking happens because of the fact that it violates some rules in the root zone LGR [then] allocated and rejected.

So these are the statuses that are proposed in the [inaudible].

So the EPDP discussed this and basically—next slide, please—came to the conclusion that the draft conclusion is that ... Remember, all this is a draft. We'll be revisiting these after covering the rest of the questions.

So the EPDP agreed that [inaudible] defined label states for the variant labels [inaudible] preliminary agreement and that they should be consistent with the definition of equivalent [inaudible] in the New gTLD Program.

Next slide. We'll see what this means. Now, these label states are useful for tracking across the different stages of the application process. And [inaudible] gTLD than ccTLD. Now, the EPDP team needs to first know the different roles that these label states play in order to better clarify their definitions. And we cannot say at this point that we are 100% on top of the different roles that these can play. But we are at the starting point of what was recommended in the staff report. The label states should remain purely neutral. That means whether it's a gTLD or ccTLD, they should mean the same thing. So the definition should be consistent.

So we have noticed some overlap. For example, the label state "delegated" overlaps with the application status "delegated." Now, when we use this term, we want them to mean exactly the same thing, so we would like to resolve this. Similarly, the label state "rejected" as two different application statuses: "not approved" and "will not proceed." So the EPDP team will be resolving these as we move forward and modifying for consistency.

Now, this is about A9, which is about label states.

The next one—next slide, please—is A10. This is about label state transitions. Now, the central question here is, what is the procedure to change label status for unusual variant labels? So when do we change

the status? What does [inaudible] transition? So that is [inaudible] going though the text here.

Can you go the next slide, please? We have a diagram there. I'm not sure if you can read this. So this is actually five different state transitions. The first is from block to [inaudible]. This happens when a particular variant is blocked because of the root zone LGR but a new version of the root zone LGR turns up and therefore it unblocks the previously blocked label. In this case, it would then go on to ... The trigger there is that a new LGR has come which is unblocked. In this case, it will move [inaudible] entity [inaudible] status.

The second is from [inaudible]. Now, rejection can happen due to multiple reasons—now, for instance, the manageability of these IDN labels. The registrar [inaudible] operator has to prove that. Then the [inaudible]. You have to ensure that you can actually handle these variants. So suppose they cannot do that. Then their application is rejected. But they go back and work on it and come back. At this point, the rejection status comes up, at which point the rejected label will come back to withheld-same-entity.

Number three is withheld-same-entity to allocated. This happens when the applicant applies for a domain that they had not previously applied for—a variant, that is. So if there is a primary label and it has got three allocatable variants and, in the original applicant, they only applied for one, then we of course we are working out the exact policy as to when they can apply, how long they can apply, etc. Is it during a round or [inaudible] from a round? These questions are being discussed. But [inaudible] three happens when they put in application under

[inaudible] to make an existing label in the withheld-same-entity category to allocated.

Number four is from allocated to delegated. This is what happens when it is officially delegated [inaudible] something that we understand.

And number five happens when it moves from delegated to allocated. For whatever reason, if the domain is removed from the DNS, then it goes back to allocated. It no longer resolves. It goes back to allocated.

So this is the state transitions that we're dealing with currently. As I said, it's not final. This is only draft language. We will come back to until we discover new state transitions.

Next slide. So in a similar fashion, the EPDP team agreed to the following: after the label transition, propose [inaudible] preliminary recommendation. [inaudible] the label transition rejected to withheld-same-entity are automatic but only happens when the grounds for the status is removed. So we are discussing this further using the team—this particular item—because we see that almost all state transitions require some kind of a trigger and it is not really automatic. But we generally agree with the language at this time.

So that's it from our side. Me and our colleagues will be happy to take on any questions or comments. Back to you, Olivier.

I see Jonathan's hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Jonathan Zuck has got his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Satish, for that presentation. Back at the beginning, it said that it was a non-exhaustive list of statuses. Is that meant to imply that you might add additional statuses?

SATISH BABU: Yes. “Non-exhaustive” precisely means that. So we are tentatively saying that we are going ahead with this, but if we discover new label statuses, we’ll have to come back and copy them into the correcting. But we are saying that, in whatever we do, we have to be consistent. So the constituency of definition is what we’re striving for. So as the EPDP progresses, we might discover new label states or label state transitions, at which point we’ll come back and then work on this again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks.

SATISH BABU: Olivier, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Satish. Just a question. When one speaks of redelegation—let’s say the things get redelegated ... And I’ve noticed that number five goes from delegated to allocated. And then when you redelegated or it gets sold across or it stops being registered and then it gets reregistered by someone else, does it then go through number four

again, from allocated to delegated, when the nameservers are added? How does that work? Has it taken that into account or is that a special state?

SATISH BABU:

So the main constraint or concern is that all the variants have to travel together to wherever they're moving. Suppose there is a movement from delegated to allocated. Then the point is that all of them should move together. Now, at this point, we're not exactly sure what will happen if there's a redelegation. So it has been undelegated, sort of, in which case it comes and sits in the allocated status. And then it is redelegated. So we have not actually [inaudible] this point but I think that, again, it will back to the delegated state—the whole bundle of variants. And [inaudible] the kind of ownership transfer in all that. In every case, no matter what happens, these cannot be allowed to split. So if a new owner comes and acquires the registry, then everything has to move—all the domains—together. The variants and the domain has to move together. That is the fundamental point here. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks so much for this.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks.

Hadia, do you want to add?

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Thank you, Satish. No, nothing to add. I cannot see really a case where you could move directly from delegated to redelegated for variants. I don't see how this could happen.

SATISH BABU: Right. Thanks, Hadia.

Are there any other questions?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm speaking of not the variants being delegated and redelegated but of course the domain itself—so the main one being delegated and redelegated. The answer that Satish provided there, where you [can't] stop splitting things and so on, makes sense, but I guess there's going to be some process allocated to that as well.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. Back to you now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Not seeing any other hands up, so thank you. That's a great update. We've finished with the IDN EPDP. Now we're going to go for the progress update on the development of the at-Large ICANN74 talking points.

Jonathan, we don't have 20 minutes. We only have ten minutes left in this call, but I gather that—

JONATHAN ZUCK: And there isn't much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, there was just a little bit to do on that. So over to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, there's a Google Doc that Claudia has created to capture those talking points. There's nothing in yet, so I just continue to [ride herd] on the issue shepherds who are, in most instances, sort of waiting to see how things develop prior to the meeting to determine what the best talking points for the meeting are going to be. So it's an ongoing process, but there's a central document to capture these and keep an eye on this space, as they say.

I think that's it. So I don't think there's anything else to this update.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Jonathan.

And next we have the policy comment update, and that's again with you and with Claudia Ruiz.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Olivier. Hi, everyone. We don't have much for policy updates this week. Nothing has been ratified recently by the ALAC. [inaudible]

comments, we do have the NCAP study scheduled to open this month. And that's pretty much it. I don't think I missed anything.

Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right. It's a light update this week. Thanks, Olivier.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this. And that's the two items that went very fast indeed.

The third one is the Any Other Business part. And so far, no one has asked for additional agenda items to be there, but I'll open the floor now.

Steinar Grotterod?

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Hi. I have a question about those who will physically be attending ICANN74. There was, for the GNSO transfer policy PDP, a form that we had to fill in due to the number of seats at the different sessions. Is this something that also will be required for the At-Large meeting when we meet physically? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. I'll turn it over to staff for this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. This is Heidi. My understanding is that everyone needs to register for the meetings that they intend to attend. However, there will be priority given to the members, for example, of the ALAC and the RALO Chairs who are supposed to be at a particular meeting. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Heidi. I think that's right. They're trying to get people to register in particular for the meetings they plan to attend in person because there are strict size limits on the different meeting spaces. And we've had some discussions with staff about this because there's a tendency for people to register for multiple meetings and then decide later which ones to attend, or they attend some virtually and some physically. So they're doing their best to accommodate this. But right now, the policy is to register for everything in particular that you plan to attend either way, virtually or in-person, so that they have some good counts of people in the different spaces.

Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So what about for those who are on NomCom? We actually can only definitely attend the last day. But what if we somehow get done earlier and we can attend some of Wednesday's meeting and we don't register because we don't know? So does that mean we're not going to be able to attend? That's my question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a pretty unique scenario, Judith, but I guess I would suggest trying to register for things that you're interested in attending physically. And let's just hope we're not at capacity on those days. I think it's better to express your interest than to wait until the meeting to try to get into a particular session.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, but I just don't want to take up the spot from someone else who can actually go when I may not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I understand your question, but I think we have to deal with that scenario. So we need to avoid registering for multiple things, but I'm sure there's going to be some instances in which people aren't able to show up for things that they registered for. And at this point, we don't have any idea what the numbers are going to look like. So, again, my recommendation would be to sign up for things that you think you might be able to attend so that they have a sense.

Amrita, go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: My question is that, for example, if we have to register for each of these sessions, even if the person is in The Hague, would there be an option to select whether the person wants to attend that particular meeting virtually or physically? And that may also perhaps help to understand

whether someone would be attending or not, even if the person is there in person.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, as Hadia mentioned in the chat, you may want to attend the meeting to get more detail on this. And I think we can take it as a task. It'll probably come up at Maureen's desk to throw out a note, maybe, about what your strategy might need to be with respect to registration. It's still a somewhat evolving process, so I don't want to misspeak here, even though I've been attending those meetings. Those conversations are ongoing. So we'll send something around to the At-Large list at some point with a strategy.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Jonathan, I wanted to note also that I think—I'm not sure—there is not a way for anyone to register for multiple meetings at the same time in person.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Yeah, you can only do one for each slot [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, that's exactly true, which includes virtual and in-person, unfortunately, at this point.

All right. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Jonathan. So the IDNs EPDP circulated a link so that members and participants can indicate if they are going to attend virtually or in-person. So I guess you will always have the option to choose.

Then I'm not sure whether Heidi has said that, if you registered for one meeting to attend in person, then, if you try to register for another meeting in person, you will be blocked. That makes sense. However, I have not tried it yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, that is in fact that case. It was Claudia, I think, that was speaking upon that.

Okay. Well, thanks, everyone. I think it's back to you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Question for you. Can we only do that once the schedule is out?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think that's right. I've personally been delayed in doing this process because I've had to wait to register until the funded process completed. So I haven't tried the system. We can't validate it, but, yes, you do need to have the schedule in place in order to register for the sessions.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right because right now we only have the prep week, and that's not in person. That's remote.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So we'll make a point of sending something out to the list. This isn't really a CPWG issue but overall an At-Large issue. So I'll double back with staff and Maureen to try and get some kind of an e-mail out about the details of this.

Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan. So the EPDP team, as I said, sent us a link, and we said if we are going to apply to attend in person or virtual. So when the schedule is out, would I need to, through the schedule, register and indicate again if I'm going to attend in person or virtually?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I believe so, yes, because of just overall counts that are going on. So I would advise doing that.

Okay. Thanks, Olivier. Back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And it's good to see the care and attention that is being taken to prevent the risk of contamination from COVID in what's coming up.

I do note that today is the start of the [cancelled] festival. And I was reading the page that dealt with complying with sanitary measures, and it spoke of that participants are strongly advised to wear a mask inside the [palais]. They're just advised to, but if they don't want to, they can also not. They have to clean their hands, cough into their elbow, avoid physical contact (hugs and kisses), which is what we'll see on the red carpet all the time, and keep a distance of at least one meter between yourselves and others, of course. So don't just cling around in groups, as one does. Definitely not the sort of thing we would engage in during our ICANN meeting. So thank goodness they have these rules.

That's it, I think, for today. And I'd like to thank our interpreters for having done a great job yet again, and of course the real-time transcription. And there is some follow-up taking place on the mailing list, so watch out for this. And of course we'll have a call next week. And our call next week is going to be in strict rotation. So when is our call going to take place?

YESIM SAGLAM: Thank you, Olivier. So as you have said, we will be rotating, and next week's call will be at 19:00 UTC on Wednesday, the 25th of May. 19:00 UTC, it is. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Yesim. Already the 25th of May! The month of May is flying by at an amazing speed.

Thanks, everyone.

Jonathan, anything else to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. Just, you issue shepherds, you know who you are. I'll be following up with you to get your input into the talking points. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, wherever you are. Take care and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]