

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, the 20th of July 2022 at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing the roll call due to the increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. We have received apologies from Gordon Chillcott, Vanda Scartezini, Bill Jouris, Marita Moll, Mouloud Khelif, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alfredo Calderon, Roberto Gaetano, Hadia Elminiawi, Alberto Soto, and Heidi Ulrich from staff side. From staff, we have Claudia Ruiz, Chantelle Doerksen, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present in today's call and I'll be doing call management. As usual we have Spanish and French interpretation. Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Veronica and David, and our French interpreters are Aurélie and Isabelle.

Before we get started, just to kind of reminder to please state your name for speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes, please. Also one final reminder is for the real-time transcription service provided. I'm just going to share the link with you here on Zoom chat. Please do check the service. With this, I would like to leave the floor back to you, Olivier, if you're able to take over. Thank you.

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

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. And yes, I finally managed to master or somehow understand part of the technology and get an agenda on my screen. Welcome, everyone, to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. Today we're going to have a discussion about closed generics with Greg Shatan for the first part of the call, and then the workgroup and small team updates with the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process taking the majority of that section, and a quick update regarding the RDA Scoping Team and the SSAD Operational Design Assessment (SSAD ODA). After that, Jonathan Zuck and Chantelle Doerksen will take us through the policy comment updates. After that, we'll have Justine Chew taking us through the GNSO DNS Abuse presentation. She's got a few slides for us. In the meantime, I'll ask if there is any other any changes to the agenda. And because I'm not on Zoom yet, I would have to ask staff to let me know if anybody has put their hand up, please.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: No hands for now, Olivier. We're trying to [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. So the agenda is adopted as it currently is listed on our screen. The next thing now is to look at our action items from last week where we had two action items, both relating to today. We're going to have a discussion today on the NCAP. But we're going to move that over to the future since we've already got a very full agenda for today's call. That will take place in the future with colleagues from the SSAC coming to speak to us. Is it the SSAC? No, sorry. We [Inaudible]

speaking to us about this. That's what we have today for action items. I don't think there is any discussion to have on this, which means we can now swiftly give a warm welcome to Greg Shatan, who has created a set of slides on the future of closed generic gTLD, framing the topic providing us with good information about it. Over to you, Greg.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Olivier. Welcome. So I'd like to reset the discussion of closed generics that we've been having for quite some time now and go over the essential question and how we got to where we are now and where we need to go. So the essential question is what should happen with applications for closed generic gTLDs in a new round? Next slide, please.

So let's look at where we are now, what's been happening in 2022. It's been busy. So in March, the ICANN Board issued a letter and a framing paper in which they proposed a small group discussion that would be facilitated by the Board or facilitated by an individual chosen with the assistance of the Board, and this will be a discussion between the GAC and the GNSO or between a small group representing those two entities and discussing with the future of closed generic gTLDs. The GAC responded in a letter in April with their views on how to move forward with this small group. In June, the GNSO did the same and responded on a number of points including choosing the facilitator and how to frame the question and the issues that the group would look at.

In July, exciting news, the GAC invited the ALAC to nominate a single participant and the GNSO Council came to support that with some reluctance by some members of the Council. I was asked and agreed to

be that participant on behalf of the ALAC and the At-Large community. Alan Greenberg has been asked and agreed to be the alternate. The group hasn't met yet. I haven't really seen any traffic after agreeing to be the participants. So I'm looking forward to whatever the future will bring on this topic, which makes it all the more timely for us to discuss what the At-Large and the ALAC position is on moving forward with closed generics. So let's take a look at the next slide and how we got here. I see Justine has noted in the chat that both the GAC and the GNSO have not yet put forward their representatives. So I'm the first one at the party, apparently. So next slide. Okay. This slide, please. Sorry.

So back in 2007, you may remember or you've read that a new round was proposed for the new gTLDs. This was exciting news. While there was much policy development around a new round, the issue of closed generics wasn't addressed one way or the other. That was generally understood to allow closed generics to move forward, to allow applications for closed generics.

So, in 2013, the GAC issued advice after the Beijing meeting, the Beijing advice. As one of their safeguards and concerns, they stated—and this is their words for how they describe what we're calling a closed generic—that any new gTLD featuring exclusive registry access or strings representing generic terms should serve a public interest goal. A couple of years later, 2015, the issue of not having been closed yet, the ICANN Board approved a resolution prohibiting what they called exclusive generic gTLDs in the 2012 round, that being the most recent round that was underway at that point. And they issued a request to the GNSO to include the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings serving a

public interest goal in the Subsequent Procedures PDP. However, the SubPro PDP did not really address the issue until very late in the game and did not develop policy on the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings, serving a public interest goal which will be pronounced ERAFGSSAPIG (eraf-jess-a-pig), if that was an acronym that we were to adopt in ICANN land but I think ERAFGSSAPIG may be just a little too much even for ICANN's love of acronyms. So we'll continue to call them closed generics. Next slide, please.

So a question that has bedeviled people, even as we discussed this, is what is a closed generic or ERAFGSSAPIG? Looking back at the both of the Beijing advice from the GAC and that of the Registry Agreement, we can define it as having two essential elements, one of the element of exclusive access or being closed, where the registration within the gTLD are limited exclusively to a single entity or even a single person and to that persons or entity's affiliates. Whether this is done through criteria, or however it's expressed, the idea is that there is only essentially one registrant in the registry or in the domain. Excuse me. The topic can be a little dry so I needed to take a drink.

So what is the generic string? The way it's defined in the Registry Agreement is a string consisting of a word or term that denominates or describes a general class of goods, services groups, organizations or things, as opposed to a string distinguishing a specific brand of goods, services, groups, organizations, or things from those of others. So let's now take a drink with both hands. Next slide, please.

So what does all that mean? That may not be all that helpful. So exclusive access, I think, is fairly easy to define it simplistically. That is

only a single registrant at the second level. There are a couple of rabbit holes that we're going to ignore for this discussion. I'm not even going to mention them. You can read them on the slide. Well, I guess for some people who are on the phone only, we're going to ignore the rabbit hole of registries where there is an exclusive taxonomy of second level domains such as country names, and then public registrations are at the third level. And we'll exclude the rabbit hole of registrations that are exclusive where there is then a contractual right for third parties to use a given second level domain. So I'm not going to mention those anymore. Next slide, please.

A little more interesting is a definition of a generic string. So, in looking at the words, it's important to understand the context is important. The string has to be a generic term, which could be just about any noun in a way is likely to be a generic term, and there can be variants as well as other parts of speech that could be considered to be generic. But the string needs to use that term in a generic manner. Now, of course, strings don't really—it's hard to tell what the context is. So the context really comes from the owner or the operator of the registry.

So, for instance, if Apple registers .apple, that would not be considered a generic string because that is using the term to distinguish a specific brand of goods from those of others. On the other hand, on registering .apple for use by a particular apple grower or, for that matter, any other reason other than a brand reason, essentially, would typically be considered a generic and could not be closed. So a single apple grower could not monopolize .apple unless their brand was Apple. But then again, it couldn't be a brand because at that point, it would be generic for that type of good. Hopefully that is clear enough. Next slide, please.

Then the third part of the topic that needs to be discussed, given the way it's been framed by the GAC and the Board, and now the framing paper is that the closed generic should serve a public interest goal. You're probably all aware of ICANN Rule #137 that any discussion that involves defining the public interest will never move beyond the discussion of how to define the public interest. So the only way around this is to sort of have a "I know when I see it" type approach to public interest or maybe to break the curse. We'll see if the small group here can break the curse of defining the public interest. Next slide, please. So, the question again—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg, can I ask you a quick question?

GREG SHATAN: Please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The definition of a generic, which is a slight ago—and maybe you're already getting into this, in which case then I apologize—but in our discussion during ICANN74, a distinction was drawn. I don't know what they call it, a third category or something like that. But a generic string was considered sort of special if it describes the business of the applicant as opposed to just being generic. Has that been a part of the discussion? Or is it all generics? Does that make sense? In other words, if an apple orchard registered .apple, it would be more concerning than if—unfortunately, Apple already exists. Let's say that somebody just

wanted to get .pear and use it as a metaphor or something like that but they weren't in the fruit business, is that considered less of a concern than the applicant being in the business of pears?

GREG SHATAN:

I think that's an important point. I think that really kind of falls under the public interest goal discussion, the idea being that it's less likely to be in the public interest if a pear grower applies for a .pear as opposed to someone who just liked the sound of the word pear were to apply for it as a closed gTLD. It's basically any non-brand is considered a generic. So it isn't really a third stream so much as there is a qualitative question of looking at what the public interest or what the context is. But a brand application and there are certain specifications that are added to the application and specifications that make it clear when a new gTLD is a .brand or not.

I'm not actually sure if there is a .apple gTLD. Silly me, I should have looked that up. But if it does exist, I'm confident that it was applied for as a .brand. There we are. Thank you, Steinar. There is of course a .apple but no .pear yet. Hopefully somebody will get that one in the next round.

So the question is first should closed generics continue to be prohibited? Or if they are allowed, should it be limited by the public interest goal? If we're going to go down that road, what are the policy and implementation issues that have to be tackled? Again, it's going to have to mean really confronting the public in defining a public interest goal and defining how to express that and how to test that and how to

monitor that over the course of the application process, and also once the gTLD has been delegated and is up and running. We all need to decide or recommend policy positions on all of these issues once we identify them and have an overall approach to this. Kind of a secondary question and one which I'll be looking for guidance from this group and from the ALAC is how we, the ALAC and At-Large community, should approach these small group discussions, which of course will be driven by what our position is on closed generics overall. Next slide, please.

So the floor is open for discussion questions and the like. It will remain open for weeks and months to come. I see hands. Jonathan, is that new hand?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is, yes.

GREG SHATAN: Go ahead, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What do you imagine the questions are going to be that this group attempts to answer? Do you think there's going to be a discussion over what represents a generic? Do you think there's going to be discussion about what represents the public interest? In addition or instead of, do you think there'll be a discussion about actually backing down from the notion that something has to proactively be in the public interest as a topic of discussion? Can you break this down into questions we should

be trying to answer more granularly as we try to develop our positions on this to help you?

GREG SHATAN:

I think that most of the discussion will probably hinge on the discussion of the public interest and how to define a workable limitation on how the application or how the new gTLD will operate. I expect some discussion of the topic of defining a closed generic and the topic of ownership and management, who is the registry operator. But I think that most of the discussion will be about issues of how to frame the application. What are the limitations? What is the public interest goal? And what about conflicts between public interest goals and perhaps goals of the registry operator that are not necessarily in the public interest?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry, Alan, if I may follow up. My impression is that those that are the advocates for closed generics are not advocating them from the perspective of the public interest. That's my impression, is that the compromise they will be seeking is something other than a way to be a do-gooder, if you will, for a generic string. But instead, define safeguards or something like that that prevents undermining the public interest or safeguards the public interest. But I suspect that the proponents of closed generics within the GNSO are not doing so because they are advocates for the public interest. So that's why I raised the question. I feel like this discussion isn't just going to be about what's in the public interest but sort of like what isn't, if that makes sense.

GREG SHATAN:

I think you're right. I think there will be movement. Certainly there'll be discussion of whether in the public interest is the right test or whether there's some other vein that we can go down, trying to essentially move the GAC off of the Beijing advice/position and to find another way to frame the question. So I think that will be worth watching. Alan, why don't we go to you?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two points. Number one, based on discussions that we've already heard happening within the GNSO and the GNSO environment, I think it is reasonably likely that we will be told that our "representative"—and I use that term in quotes—is not representing us. That is, whoever is on the team is acting as an individual representing themselves and not representing the group and the ideas of the group who named them. So I think we're going to have to be very careful in our terminology. If indeed that ends up being said, I think we're going to have to be very careful.

Jonathan was asking: how do we formulate the positions that Greg will take or that I will take as the alternative? My understanding is the rationale for why they have done this is if the various groups send representatives representing them, we will end up with the same discussions we had within the SubPro PDP, that is we take rigid positions and there is no way to compromise and find a middle ground. And if we take individuals who are willing to listen and perhaps change their views based on the arguments, then we may find some middle

ground. This is not the first time this has happened, although it's not all that common in ICANN. Normally we have finessed this and we've had the same problem in naming liaisons, for instance, to the GNSO, where the liaison is going to be asked for opinions for input without the opportunity to go back and consult. What we do is we pick someone who we believe understands the positions that we have taken but can work on the fly and perhaps change those positions, if necessary. So I think we need to be careful about how we define Greg's role and my role as an alternate, at least until we see what the words are that fully define this group. We may have to tread carefully. So just a note on that.

The second part of what I was going to say is the GNSO originally said that they wanted this group to avoid the extremes, that is, avoid the case where closed generics are allowed no limitations and no closed generics allowed at all. The NCSG basically objected to that and it looks like the mandate now does not absolutely reject those extremes, although they're unlikely to, in my mind, to get a majority view. So just those things to keep in mind as we're having this discussion. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can I quickly respond, Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry, Christopher. I concede that that was how they had framed it, Alan. I guess what I was hoping is that we might go through the exercise of adding some nuance to our own positions. So we can be careful with semantics. But I guess what I was hoping the result of this conversation might be, or this plus 20 other conversations might be, is a softening of our own position on this topic and do some of the brainstorming that might eventually happen inside of that group and get to a place where we come up with some ideas for compromise or something like that so that whatever compromise comes up with the group and we find ourselves doing a public comment or providing advice after the fact, we've already gotten to a place where we have a more nuanced position on this topic. That's really the exercise here and not to dictate when Greg or you say, but can we develop some flexibility into our own position? That was kind of my objective was bringing Greg on and starting this conversation internally. I hope that helps.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Jonathan, to be clear, we are not going to be told under no conditions, "May you ever discuss this in your Wednesday meetings." The world does not work that rigidly in ICANN. I'm just saying we have to be careful in our semantics and how we discuss.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's our goal here, not to dictate but to revisit our previous position, which was taken quickly in response to the GAC, etc., and take a fresh view of this so that we're in a position to receive creative solutions more flexibly. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Let's get to Christopher Wilkinson. I'm going to close the queue at this point because we're running late and there are other things to get to.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hello. Thank you, Greg and Alan, for taking on this thankless task. And what you've already done has suddenly clarified some aspects of it. Thank you. But that being said, usually I have a fairly clear, if sometimes theoretical, concept of the business model that lies behind some of the issues that we discussed. But I have to confess that in this case, I remain thoroughly baffled of why would anybody really want to do this. The only business model that I can think of that would justify the investment in a closed generic is to prevent anybody else from registering it. I hope I'm wrong because, basically, that is completely antithetical to the public interest. And for the rest, don't say we're wasting our time because we certainly have values and principles that should influence the final outcome. But it's not clear to me at all as to who would be remotely interested in a business proposition to invest in a closed generic. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Chris, for a good question. We will tackle that question. Maybe get some clues as we go along. Justine, please go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Greg. Just a couple of comments. Number one, I think it's a bit unfair to put Greg on the spot. I've been involved with the toing and froing between GAC and GNSO on this issue of closed generics dialogue. I can tell you that, in my opinion, it's a bit messy at the moment. There are still things up in the air. So I think once the GNSO and GAC names the reps and the dialogue actually starts happening, then we will probably get more clarity as to the scope despite the fact that there's the framing paper, but there are still people arguing against certain things and wanting to include some things. So from that point, when the small group actually starts discussing having that dialogue, Greg would be able to tell us exactly what is within scope and what is not within scope.

Having said that, I think we would be doing well to start from a position of not insisting that closed generics be banned because that is ultimately something that the dialogue is kind of wanting to exclude. Even if we do insist on banning closed generics, I don't think it's going to happen because you will never get community consensus of that. The best thing we can do now is assume that closed generics will be allowed and put some safeguards around that. I think the people in GNSO who have been advocating for closed generics without any restrictions are prepared to come to the table to compromise on just that to have certain safeguards. So it's a question of what safeguards that would be. And those safeguards would be around what is in the public interest or what is not in the public interest. Having said that, I think that starting the discussion now is good.

In terms of helping Greg frame some principles around which he can operate—and I'm thinking of the method that Yrjo and I used when we

were doing the EPDP on IGOs, the production of acronyms of IGOs, where things were moving and things were kind of wavy right up to the end, but we were able to just frame a principle around how Yrjo and I would respond to certain things and we would work within those principles. And if the things that we needed to react on the spot, then we would just use our best judgment within those principles. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Justine. Next is Michael Palage.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you, Jonathan. Speaking in an individual capacity, looking at the difficulties that the ICANN community has had in defining accuracy, I believe the ICANN community attempting to define an operational definition of public interest or what is generic are complex legal concepts that will likely never be achieved in my lifetime. Therefore, I think we need to step back and look at the big picture of what the community is trying to safeguard against, which I believe is the operation of the TLD by a registry operator against the public interest from largely a competition standpoint. I think that is in the root of many of the concerns that I have heard over the last decade. Therefore, what I would like to suggest to At-Large and ALAC is not to propose a new definition or new procedures but to actually leverage or enhance existing provisions in the Registry Agreement. There are already provisions in existing agreements which enable ICANN the ability to refer a matter to the appropriate competition authority.

So to me, this is a much more elegant, quickly implementable solution, and one that provides for future flexibility. We don't need to get everything right. We just need to provide a mechanism where if we see something that either ICANN or the community does not believe is in the public interest or is negatively impacting competition, that there be a mechanism for this potential referral to competition authorities. I think this perhaps maybe aligns with what Justine was just talking about, about providing flexibility to move forward. Maybe not, but those are my comments. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Michael. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Quick question to Michael: competition authorities of what country?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Let me see if I can pull up the ... So if you look at it, they talk about relevant competition authorities. That is the specific wording that has been used in the Registry Agreements, again, showing flexibility. Case in point, there has been instances in the past where the U.S. Department of Justice has actually weighed in in connection with price increases regarding Verisign and the .com registry. So to me, this actually goes to show that competition authorities can actually serve an appropriate safeguard to the broader community and what we should be looking at

is how to leverage those types of mechanisms for referral. So hopefully that answers your question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does that answer your question, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Okay. Sébastien, we probably have to wrap this up before too long.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm sorry. Just to follow this discussion. One of the problems I see we have this within ICANN bodies where decision is taken in one way by one group—and when I say one group, one of the people in charge of saying the law about something and another one thing another thing here. If we go those authorities, we risk to have the decision taken in one way in one country and another way in another country. Therefore, how we will solve that? When I'm talking about what's inside the ICANN, I was referring to the plural of some words that were taken into account as sufficiently similar or not, depending on who was in charge of doing it. It's one of my concerns about decision taken by various groups who are not in the same direction. Thank you.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Jonathan, can I respond to that quickly?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Sébastien, fair comment. But the problem is, if you look at what is happening is governments around the world are implementing laws in China, the real name of verification which ICANN registries have had to comply with. [NIXI] has begun imposing similar requirements, just looking at NIS2 and Article 23 by the European Union. So this idea of there might be national governments that may do something, just look at the GDPR. There are problems. And if the ICANN community does not do something to proactively address those problems in a timely manner, governments are going to start implementing their own solution. So if this is going to be a thing of, well, we can't refer to or defer to government, that to me is just a losing proposition that will not end well for the ICANN multistakeholder experiment or project. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Michael. I think we need to move on. This is just the first of what I think will be many conversations about this. I think that what we want to do is try to come up with a kind of set of principles, as Justine has put it, or a framework or something to help Greg and Alan. So it will be about coming up with some questions that help to draw out those principles that matter most to this group. But good start. This is a topic that it seems to be simple but is more difficult when you delve into it. So

we'll spend more time on it in the future. But thanks a lot, Greg, and more to come. Thanks to you two for agreeing to be our representatives or whatever we want to call them on this group. Olivier, back to you on the agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. We are running late so let's go swiftly to our workgroup and small team updates with Steinar Grøtterød and Daniel Nanghaka speaking to us about the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Hi. We have now with assistance from Chantelle, in particular from ICANN staff, more or less completed the draft for At-Large comment to the PDP public comments. We have also set an internal deadline by the end of this week, July 22. For them, it will be up for At-Large for ratification, and then being published as a comment from At-Large.

What we have tried to do is to put the comment that we received from this group into the Google Sheet that we kind of grouped to questions into: are you agreeing or you maybe agreeing or you don't agree on the proposed recommendation set by the working group? There are particularly three things that I'd like to mention that is being worded into the At-Large public comment, and that is, first of all, that we support that the IANA ID should be visible and given in the losing registrars a transfer complete notification. I think that's a very good idea, first of all, because it's something that is sent by the losing registrar based on the data from the losing registrar to the registered

name holder and informing about the domain name has been transferred away to a new registrar and this registrar is also named in that notification. However, it is possible to do that today because the losing registrar can actually—when query WHOIS/RDAP put that information about the new registrar and give that information into the notice. But if we manage to do that in a more technical, feasible way by the EPP, I think it will improve the service and the security.

The second thing that we have emphasized and we recommend back to the working group is the time to live for the TAC, the Transfer Authorization Code. The recommendation here is 14 days. There has been comment and I appreciate the comment. This is maybe too long. I don't see any harm and I don't see any risk to reduce that to even, example, seven days. So we'd like to put that back to the working group for additional discussions, etc. Finally, we recommend that the registrars are the ones that should manage and be in charge for the time to live for the Transfer Authorization Code.

So this is, in my view, and it's up to this community to see whether this is sufficient and well representatives for all of you, and we can put that up to At-Large for final review and into the public comment. So I'm opening the floor for any comment to this one. Michael is putting his hand up. Welcome, Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, Steinar, this is a comment in connection with yesterday's Transfer call, and perhaps is a little off topic but is relevant. During yesterday's call, at the end of this call, you made a comment about one of the things

that you've learned is that a registrant seeking to transfer a domain name should never update their information before the transfer or find out that it is inaccurate. I think that was summarizing or paraphrasing your comments yesterday.

So what I would like to do is it would be really helpful if you could take that information regarding the inaccuracy of registrant data and how that potentially impede with the transfer process and funnel that information to Alan so that he could share that with the Accuracy group, because I believe that this is proof which some parties are always asking for that there is an accuracy issue. So that is, I guess, sort of my comment. Thanks.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Thank you for that, Michael. For those who were not listening to the call yesterday, my experience is that as a registrant, I'm obliged to update the WHOIS record, the RDAP record when there are changes. I should do that kind of immediately. My deepest recommendation is to not do that when you have decided to transfer your way a domain name, because what we discussed yesterday and have discussed in the two, three last meetings in the PDP working group is that update of the registrant may trigger transfer lock of 60 days according to today's practice, but maybe it should be removed or reduce the day and time. So you end up in a scenario where you actually do your homework in a good manner, and suddenly you cannot transfer your domain name to what you have decided to be your best new sponsoring registrar. That could be a nightmare. Because then you might get into a renewal process that you have to renew it and then wait another year, etc., or

take the cost of doing that. So I'm glad to put that argument into Alan. Also this is something that at least I will have in mind when we are doing the comment for the Phase 1B that is covering the change of registrant.

I forgot to do things. We have additional comments from At-Large. It's the importance, as we discussed last CPWG meeting, is that whatever we decide upon in the new Transfer Policy, it is of importance and must be emphasized in a way that put the responsibility for the registrars for this policy to be implemented and understood for the resellers and all the business models, independent on the business model of the registrar. So we have a clear understanding both from the reseller point of view and the registrar point of view what is the requirement for this new updated Transfer Policy. Sébastien, sorry. Come on.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Steinar. Just to say that I face the same problem as you were describing about the domain name. It happened that it was at the middle of a renewal. As it was done by a reseller with which I didn't add any contact for multiple reasons, my name was taken out, and now it's in Hong Kong and I am very disappointed with that. The fact that you can't access a registrar, you asked for the transfer, you have everything done properly, I will say, and it's the middle of "No, you can't. You need to wait 60 days." And in the middle, you need to pay again, and so on and so forth. It's too complicated for an end user. I will appreciate what you say. Just to give you one more example of that. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you, Sébastien. Any other comments to the drafting? There is a link to the drafting, it is in the chat. I think we will close this by the end of Friday. So make it possible for At-Large to review it in time and publish of comments by August 2. I like to appreciate the work and the assistance from the team members and ICANN staff and Chantelle, in particular, because she led the pen very nicely in the end here. I'm not a native English speaker or writer. So I do my very best in what is definitely not Oxford English. Thank you. Over to you, Olivier, if no further comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar, and thanks to you and your team for your ongoing good work in this respect. And indeed this statement is taking good shape. By the end of the week, it will be passed through the ALAC ratification process, and then be presented over to the relevant public consultation.

We are again a bit late. We don't have anything on the IDNs this week, although I think Satish wanted to say a couple of words, the Expedited PDP on the Internationalized Domain Names. Satish or Justine. Not sure who.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Olivier. I just would like to mention in a minute, it's not really an update, but last week in the EPDP meeting, we had a special session called the [inaudible] where the leadership team of Donna and Justine

met with different constituency groups separately. It's the first time that this has happened. The reason was to kind of briefly discuss between the leadership team of the EPDP and the constituency group on how the process of the EPDP was proceeding, and if there's any hiccups or bottlenecks and what could be improved, and to get some feedback, etc. Unfortunately for us, only two of us, [Javier] and I could attend this and of course [inaudible] from the leadership team side. So we had an interesting discussion. We got some feedback on the ALAC team's contributions to the EPDP. Justine can of course correct me if there's any difficulty. I'm happy to report that the EPDP leadership team communicated to us that the ALAC team's contributions were pretty good and we were active. And with some amount of repetition on the fact that we were regular, we were committed, and we did our homework before we went to the meeting. So this is feedback. It would have been good if there's a formal mechanism of providing feedback directly to CPWG's leaders from every EPDP, every team, not just EPDP and IDNs, because that will be a useful thing to monitor. I'll stop here. Thank you very much. Justine, if you want to add anything, you're welcome.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure. I guess I'm speaking with my hat on as the vice chair of that particular IDNs EPDP. As I posted in chat—and I'm paraphrasing Donna—we all think that the ALAC team that is participating in the IDNs EPDP, and there's five of us there, are doing an excellent job. We're just awesome. But having said that, yeah, we are attending very regularly. We are providing inputs. We are participating in discussions. One thing that I called out—and I think Donna was also appreciative of—is the fact

that despite two of us being participants and three of us been members, the ALAC team has got kind of like a caucus going. So we discussed amongst ourselves what loose consensus position should be, and we post that back to CPWG for endorsement. So if we were to have differences in opinion amongst the five of us, we sought that out internally. So whatever we submit back to the EPDP is a consensus position. I think that should be called out, really, because that is unique to ALAC. It actually isn't actually reflected by some of the other constituencies that's participating in the EPDP. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Justine. Let's open the floor for comments or questions briefly. I'm not seeing any hands up, but I wanted to thank both you and Satish and of course the team for having again also carrying out such great work, and the whole point of having your team—and I'm seeing your messages, your little internal discussions, it's great that you can reach consensus between yourselves, and then have a clear point put forward in the working group.

Let's move swiftly forward. The next two processes are the RDA Scoping Team—that's the Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Team—and also the System for Standardized Access and Disclosure Operational Design Assessment. Alan Greenberg is following both of them. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Just a couple of quick updates on both of them. On the RDA Scoping Team, as you may recall, the stage we're at right

now is we are looking at what the Scoping Team should be doing at the moment. You'll recall that there may well be a request being made of the European Data Protection Board, asking to what extent does ICANN should have legitimate access to the data for essentially measuring accuracy. That's going to take a fair amount of time. There's also a registrar survey going out. That will take some time to get the input back. And the question is, should the group continue at this point, suspend? Are there any other things to do?

One of the other suggestions that's been made—and I'm one of the proposals but not the only one proposer—is to do what we have called stress testing of the accuracy process. That would consist of essentially hiring a firm to register domains with inaccurate information and to see to what extent the rules within the RAA allow them to be caught. And if they should have been caught, are they in fact being caught? In other words, is the process working? A number of objections have been raised—and I just wanted to mention them because I think they're interesting—one is, is it appropriate for ICANN to pay registrars? Because if we register domain names, obviously we'd have to pay for them. So is that appropriate? The second one, is it fair that we test some registrars to one extent or another, but not necessarily all of them? We end up with two competing things. One is, is it reasonable to give them money, which outwardly sounds like a good thing from registrar's point of view. And the other is, is it reasonable to test some, but not necessarily all of them?

I personally don't have any problems. The first one and the second one is we audit some registrars but don't audit them all at the same time. This doesn't sound any different. The most interesting objection is the

ethics or legality of it. That is, when you register a domain name, you attest to the accuracy of the information you are giving. What are the ethics or perhaps even legality of knowingly registering information that is wrong, false, or inaccurate, and at the same time, attesting to the fact that it is accurate? That's something we can even do.

So it raises some interesting questions. If anyone here has any thoughts, we welcome your input. But at this point, I was really just providing some interesting description of how things are going. If there are any comments or something, before we go on to the second item, I'll open the floor. I don't see any hands.

The second item is on the SSAD ODA. You will recall that the small team recommended that we look at what at some point was called the SSAD Light or a pilot project or pilot system to test it. Essentially, it came down to what ALAC had suggested as a ticketing system. So we have a number of different names for this system. You'll recall the SSAD stands for the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure of implicitly RDDS data. The term RDDS is interesting. Yeşim, can you display the first slide, please, the first webpage?

This is one of the first references I could find to RDDS, Registration Data Directory Services. It goes back to 2014. You'll see they're saying the RDDS system commonly known as WHOIS ... Can you display the second page? RDDS often seems to be abbreviated RDS, removing one of the Ds, Registration Directory Service, and this is in reference to the specific review that was done, I guess, now nine years ago. Sorry, not nine years ago, but this is years ago. It used to be called the WHOIS review and the title was changed to the Registration Directory Service RDS Review,

formally known as WHOIS. This goes along with the ICANN philosophy over the last number of years to deprecate the term WHOIS, that is not used the term who is anymore, but move everyone to the to the term RDS or RDDs as a more accurate term, and WHOIS referring essentially to the old web query with which people were being discouraged from using.

I found it quite, I guess, amusing and interesting in a recent letter from the chair of the Board Maarten Botterman to the chair of the GNSO that they are now using a new term to talk about the SSAD Light. We think it's talking about SSAD or SSAD Light. Probably SSAD Light. And the new term that the Board seems to have coined is, and I quote, the "WHOIS Disclosure System." We seem to have now come full circle that WHOIS is no longer a deprecated term but one that is being used publicly. I personally think it's marvelous. WHOIS is a word that everyone has understood forever and is well understood and is still in the vernacular of the common use, even if it hasn't been in use in ICANN, and returning to it as the WHOIS Disclosure System, which essentially is changing from SSAD, an uninterpretable, confusing set of letters, to a term which would be completely understood by everyone. I find this refreshing and somewhat startling. But I thought I'd pass it on. So the term WHOIS may now be back in vogue and we're allowed to use it again. Thank you. That's all I have for today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. For some reason, I haven't got Internet. Any questions or comments? If staff could let me know if there is a hand up.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sébastien's hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien Bachollet, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank very much. Just to say to Alan, it was a discussion at the Board level I guess it was in 2013, something like that, before you refer in an actual document. And it was discussion—I am not supposed to reveal what's happened during in the Board but we're a different party. And the chair in particular at that time, we were discussing why keep WHOIS as we want to change both protocol and the way we think. One of the reasons as I push for changing name, we already spent 20 years, if not more, about WHOIS. Maybe if we change the word, we can go quickly. But in fact, I was wrong. It seems that we will have 20 more years as we are coming back with WHOIS before solving the problem. Sometimes it's a joke, of course. But just to let you know that it started a discussion earlier in the Board at that time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sébastien.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Any other hands? I see nothing. Okay. If there are no other hands, thanks very much for this update, Alan. Yes, indeed, it's

funny that we go back to WHOIS when we started. The circle thus closes itself. Let's go to the policy comment update now with Jonathan Zuck and Chantelle Doerksen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I don't think that we have a lot to report on this. We've put off our presentation on the NCAP another week in order to make room for the presentations we had this week. I think it's best to move on to Justine as quickly as possible, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Justine Chew has a presentation about the GNSO DNS Abuse. Welcome, again, Justine, and thanks for presenting to us. Over to you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. I'm down to 15 minutes. Okay, fine. This is just a little bit of context. We know that the GNSO set up a small team made up of councilors who volunteered themselves, basically. Even though I'm not a councilor per se, I'm the liaison of GNSO so I managed to volunteer myself. That's why I'm on this team.

The team did an outreach to the ACs, the SGs, and Cs, also Contractual Compliance, as well as DNS Abuse Institute. Now, some people think that DNS Abuse Institute is external party so they wonder why DNS Abuse was in that list. But some other people also consider DNS Abuse Institute as part of the PIR Registry, the Public Interest Registry. So you could call it quasi internal. But in any event, the work assignment for

this particular small team was basically to try and get an understanding of the DNS abuse landscape and what were the problems that were severely inadequately mitigated in terms of abuse. We're focusing just on DNS abuse. In the context of if we identify those problems, then would they fall under the mandate of GNSO in terms of policy making to fix those problems? And of course, the team is charged with making recommendations to the Council on next steps.

I want to say that the work has been ongoing since February and the review of the responses that we've received to the parties that we outreached to is still ongoing. The small team itself is using a lot of time to review the comments and to see how we can shape the comments into something that can be formulated into recommendations for Council.

So at this point in time, what I'm going to tell you is preliminary observations. There's no final output at this point in time. I just want you to remember that. I'm going to probably just limit my presentation to the ALAC input because it's only 10 minutes left. It is also in answer to Jonathan's question previously to me because this is part two of this exercise. Part one, I dealt with the responses from Contractual Compliance. Part two, I wanted to deal with the AC's inputs, but as I said, I'm probably going to limit it to ALAC.

The reason why I'm bringing it up now is because there is a weekly call of the small team where we review the responses and then we provide further clarifications or inputs if something is unclear. So I just wanted to take this opportunity to see if At-Large had any more inputs to the written responses that has provided to the small team, because there's

going to be a call at 19:00 UTC later today. Next. Sorry. I forgot to tell you to scroll to the next slide.

I've covered slide number two. Moving on to slide number four. As I said, the small team is actually taking quite some time to find its way kind of thing. And we've come to a place where we are sorting the responses into buckets. This three buckets concept is something that was raised at ICANN74 during the update that the small team provided at ICANN74. You can read the questions on the screen. That is what we asked in terms of the outreach, the three questions. And the responses are being sorted into three buckets. But again, recommendations are pending. Moving on to the next slide.

As I said, this is Part 2, but it's actually Part 1A. Moving on to slide number six. I tried to summarize the responses that were received by the small team. I apologize for it being wordy on my slides. But there's a certain point where you can't summarize anymore without risking losing the context or the meaning of what was written. But here the ALAC said things regarding bulk registrations, especially about registrations made with malicious intent. And concepts that were raised were Know Your Customer, KYC, and also possible use of predictive algorithms as solutions.

Now, I'd like to point out here that throughout the review of the responses, my observation was that most of the responses that we received actually dealt with—if I could put it this way—the curative side of things. So they were more concerned about how do you collect abuse reports, how do you deal with abuse reports in terms of verifying, that sort of thing, and then how do you actually take action on those abusive

reports. To me, that is after the fact kind of position. I consider that as curative.

I would say that we are probably the only ones who actually dealt with the preventive side of things. That's the argument that I put forward at the small team when I was asked to clarify ALAC's comments. And I said that, "Well, everyone else seems to be looking at the curative side of things. We should also be looking at the preventive side of things, which is what ALAC kind of zooms in on and using bulk registrations as the potential source of DNS abuse."

Now, there was certain pushback from some of the other members of the small team, things like bulk registrations necessarily bad. Some of them are valid, some of them are done by researchers or government agencies, that sort of thing. So not all bulk registrations are bad. I clarified to say that we never said that all bulk registrations are bad. We're just suggesting that bulk registrations is a source of bad actors doing and using those domains that are registered like [pending] domain to do bad things. So we accept the fact that not all bulk registrations are bad.

But I tend to focus more on the preventive and how do we move forward with things. KYC is one of the solutions and we said that KYC could be something that could be encouraged with all the contracted parties, especially the clients who do large number of registrations or bulk registrations. So the argument is if you know the customer that is doing the bulk registrations and you can vouch for them, then it can be argued that their registrations are valid or tend to have less problems. But if you don't know your customer who's doing the bulk registration,

then perhaps you should find out. That's the concept of KYC. Also the use of predictive algorithms too as a way of weeding out bad actors or bad domains, domains that are being used for bad purposes.

After rounds of discussing and preliminary observations, the team is converging into identifying issues and how to move that forward. I'll come to you, Alan, in a sec. I just want to get through these two slides, really. In response to the inputs provided by ALAC, the small team have identified a number of issues. So issue one is KYC. Using KYC as a good practice, but they wanted to find out more information about whether this practice is widely used amongst contracted parties. Therefore, it went into the basket for outreach. And based on any response that we might get or data we might get from the outreach, then it could formulate into a policy type question.

Someone did say that there is potential overlap with ICANN work in other pending EU legislation with KYC. So the contracted parties may be forced to move that way anyway or at least the ones based in EU. So there's some overlap and some parallel push for that anyway. That's great. Mark Datysgeld who co-chairs the small team was appreciative of the fact that it is an interesting concept. As I said, most of the other comments actually focus more on curative rather than preventive.

So the issue two, I've already touched upon whether bulk registrations are problematic. Issue three, use of innovative technology to preventive abuse, which is, again, they classified this under outreach. They found it interesting, but there are also issues about how do we determine which technology is good, who's going to pay for the technology. Are contracted parties going to be forced to use this technology? Those are

the questions came up, which is why it fell into the outreach basket as well. And the potential routes, as you can see, is perhaps, parking under OCTO to monitor work with industry partners to socialize these texts, make them more verbatim in terms of awareness and perhaps even adoption. And then have webinars to present the tech to the community so that the community can actually understand better and make a possible judgment on the use of it, just a bit like RBL. Next slide, please. Just quickly moving on.

In terms of contractual obligations with regards to DNS abuse in the Registry Agreement, there was a question. If I can just paraphrase, the ALAC response would be that how well is Contractual Compliance actually using these contractual obligations to enforce compliance? The part one or the earlier bit that I presented on the Contractual Compliance response was, effectively, they said that they have all the tools to do what they are tasked to do. But they also said that “if the community wants to give us more tools to do more things, then happily we’ll take them.” I think it’s a very diplomatic answer, a very politically correct answer. I can understand the fact that Contractual Compliance can be seen to be aggressive against contracted parties. But they are also open to receive help on getting more tools, maybe expanding the scope of what they can monitor and what they can enforce.

One thing to point out also is that the Registry Stakeholder Group, bless their heart, they did acknowledge that the text within the Registry Agreement may be minimal, may be vague. They don’t actually specify what the contracted party is supposed to do. They just say all registries have to have some technical capability to monitor abuse, but they don’t actually specify what that means exactly. But the Registry Stakeholder

Group did say that based on the interpretation of the contracts that have a reason between the contracted parties and ICANN Org, they do have a list which records the interpretation of what the contract actually means. They conceded that if there were more transparency needed around this list, then that is fine. And they were also open to identifying via good faith efforts in interpreting the contractual language a bit more specifically to help tighten it and establish an acceptable minimum standard where it would apply across the board, and then to standardize the obligations.

Because I kept saying that ALAC is not in the business of trying to call out everybody, we accept the fact that there are good contracted parties that try to push the envelope on things that they do. So we just want to see whether there are certain things that the contracted parties find acceptable to put into practice across the board. Meaning to say that if one practice is found as good, then everybody has to adopt that. And that would hit the bad actors because that's what we're trying to get at, to get the bad actors to come and comply to a minimum standard of business practices that we consider as acceptable. They haven't parked this whether it's an outreach or whether it's policy or whatever. The rest of it is really pretty much that. I'm done for ALAC. We're out of time anyway. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'll be very brief. I'm somewhat appalled and amazed that you say the reaction to our comments was to point out that there are some good, valid reasons for bulk registrations and not all bulk registrations are bad. That is exactly what we said and that is

specifically why we introduced the Know Your Customer, so you can recognize customers that are doing it for valid reasons and those that may not be doing it. So for them to react and say “but some registrations are good” implies they didn’t really read what we said at all. And that’s troublesome.

Just one more thing then I’ll be quiet. The other comment I’ll make is when we talked about bulk registrations, we also talked about serial bulk registrations that is not necessarily doing 1,000 or 10,000 at once, but doing a large number over a period of time, which can be treated as equivalent to it. I just want to make sure that both variants of bulk are understood in your discussions. I just find it amazing that someone reacts and saying “but” and reiterating exactly what we said and why we introduce the concept of Know Your Customer.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Let me just quickly respond to you, Alan. I mean, I had the same reaction. I mean, I thought our response in written form was pretty clear. But for some reason, some people choose to just identify certain things, pick up on certain words and not read the rest of the paragraph. Nobody caught onto KYC. Everybody was focused on just bulk registration and they started saying, “Is bulk registration a problem? Not all bulk registration is a problem.” I said, “Look, guys, just look at the word bulk registrations. You got to understand the context of what we’re trying to get at.” It’s more that the practices that we want to look into, really. There you go. But point taken about the serial. They did mention about possibly getting some inputs on what is considered bulk.

So that would fall into the definition of bulk, whether it's 10,000 or 1,000 across two days or something like that. But point taken. Steinar?

ALAN GREENWOOD:

Just one more very quick comment. I know I've been dealing with the perception that ALAC are ignorant people who don't understand the registrar business for 20 years now. So I understand that is their perception. But when we put it in words really clearly, I do expect them to read it. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I think we'll get there, but I guess it helped that I was there to explain it and drill it into them, really. Steinar?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Just a short comment about the tools. You're referring to the tools. In the Spec 11(3)(b) and in the RAA, there is no reference to what is the normal use of tools today seen by the registries and the registrars. That's the reputation blocklist providers. The challenge here is that some of these are free to use, some of these are expensive commercial things. OCTO DAAR report uses a bunch of these. If ICANN Compliance will refer to the reputation blocklist provider that is been used by DAAR to argue with a bad actor, whether it's the registry operator or registrar, they actually have to pay the bills to the registrar for these fees.

And also not necessarily these reputation blocklist providers are the ones to be used. I have experience of small geographic TLDs that's totally depending on their local CERT. That's a kind of national security

mechanism and they are definitely playing by the book, having these as the only two available for monitoring their name space. I think the key essence here is that there should be a more active wording both in the Spec 11(3)(b) and in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement to do this over a more structured way. It doesn't have to refer to you have to use Spamhaus, SURBL, CERT, etc., but you have to do it in a specific way and on more detail, what you should refer to when you receive notification of suspicious behavior. I think that's one of the keys. Thank you. Sorry.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure. Perhaps my bringing of RBL wasn't such a good idea. But in this case, we were talking about predictive technology and we actually named a few. Mark D actually named a few as well. He's from BC, so they're really pushing this as well. But yes. In terms of what I was saying about earlier, that the Registry Stakeholder Group has got an interpretation that is agreed to in some sense with ICANN Org as to what they should be doing. And mind you, they did say also that ICANN Org tries to push the envelope a little bit, and then some of the contracted parties actually push back and say, "Well, there comes to a point where you are encroaching into the business practices of the contracted parties and you shouldn't be doing that."

Steinar, point taken, it's a question of I think we need to be more focused on making certain things clearer. Explaining what we mean by the phrases in the contracts would help. And if there are examples of things like that, then all the better. Any other questions, comments? Anything that we have missed out that you would like me to make sure that the small team is cognizant enough? No? Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Justine, it's Alan. Thanks for all the effort you're putting into it.

JUSTINE CHEW: You're welcome. I'm just doing my job. Just two points, if I can just move quickly, GAC seems to think that this effort is premature for some reason. I'm not going to go into that. SSAC has basically repeated asking the small team to look at SAC115, which is their advice on DNS abuse.

Yeşim, if you can just scroll to slide number nine, you see that the small team has basically said that they consider NetBeacon, the tool that the DNS Abuse Institute has come up with, as a good example. But there were certain concerns about the fact that it is a tool that is sponsored by PIR. So they may be prevented from adopting a tool that is built by a competitor. Those sort of questions, which is—whatever.

There was a suggestion maybe ICANN can come up with a tool of its own. I do note that Contractual Compliance has a form. The layman on the street doesn't really know ICANN per se so they may not necessarily know to go to ICANN website and find this form to report abuse. They're more likely to go to the party that they contracted with for a domain, and then report any abuse that way. Then it goes to the contracted party to solve. It's disjointed that way. And what NetBeacon is attempting to do is have a uniform standardized reporting mechanism which will then accept reports, make sure that all the details are there, and then pass the information onto the relevant contracted party. So they act as a receiving mechanism, really. The issue too that they're

talking about is establishing clear timeframes and firm escalation path. Again, it's more on the curative side of things. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm going to propose a solution to issue number one. If people don't want to use NetBeacon because it's sponsored solely by PIR, the solution is simple. They should provide independent funding for the Domain Name Institute's work. Then it's not only sponsored by PIR. No one's stopping them from putting money into that initiative if they think domain name abuse is an issue. I strongly advocate they fund it and then it's not only funded by PIR. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

That's true. I mean, there's precedent for having a third party solution provider, really. Like what we've done with the Trademark Clearinghouse. Steinar?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Very short. First of all, I like the philosophy behind NetBeacon. But I think it's for a regular domain name holder or an Internet user to report something. I recommend everybody to, when you receive something that is clearly, as a good example, spam, try to fill in the form for the NetBeacon and you will experience that you need knowledge about your browser, you e-mail client, etc. In short, it's good idea, I don't think it's workable. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Seeing no other hand and we are way over time, so I'll hand the floor back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. You did make one mistake. You mentioned earlier in response to Alan that you were just doing your job. And of course you're not. You are doing something else. In addition to your job, you have a job, but you're also volunteering and doing things here. So, well done to you. Congratulations always on your excellent updates and presentations.

Let's go to the end of the call, which is Any Other Business, please. I'm not seeing anyone putting their hand up, so that takes us to the next meeting, which will take place at a rotating time. I wonder what that time will be.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Olivier. So our next—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, I just noticed that Steinar's hand was up. I don't know whether that's a new hand.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yes. It's a new hand and it's just informal. The Transfer Policy PDP will go into vacation in most of August. They will spend time reviewing the public comments, etc. I'm also on vacation part of August. But I hope to

get some summary of what is being discussed in Phase 1B. Let's see. I won't promise anything. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for the updates, Steinar. I'm sorry for having missed that. Over to you, Yeşim.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you, Olivier. Our next call will be next Wednesday, on 27th of July. It's our rotating time, which is 19:00 UTC. Back over to you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Looking forward to see you all next week. In the meantime, of course, you can follow up on the mailing list. Thanks very much to our interpreters and the real-time text transcription for having stayed that extra time. We did run over today a little bit. Jonathan, is there anything else?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. Thanks, everyone. Summer's already kind of over for ICANN work. So we're back to having fuller CPWG meetings. Thanks, everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Take care. For those people in parts of the world that are overly hot or in dangerous situations and so on, take extra care of yourself. And thanks for being on the call today. Goodbye.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]