
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, 22nd of November 2023, at 14:00 UTC.

We will not be doing the roll call due to increased number of attendees as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees both on the Zoom Room and on the phone bridge will be recorded after the call. And just to cover our apologies, we have received apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Roberto Gaetano, Judith Hellerstein, Dave Kissoondoyal, and Mouloud Khelif. And from staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Andrew Chen, and myself, Yeşim Sağlam, present on today's call, and I will be also doing call management. As usual, we have Spanish and French interpretations provided. We have David and Marina on the Spanish channel, and we have Isabelle and Jacques on the French channel.

One more reminder is for the real-time transcription service. I'm going to share the link with you here on the Zoom chat. So please do check the service. My final reminder will be to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes, please. I think I've completed all my reminders. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim. Actually, looking at the transcription that says Michelle DeSmyter. It's, of course, Yeşim Sağlam who's speaking earlier.

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.

So we are now running today's fantastic call. Can you hear me? I guess so. Okay. Thank you. So we are now running today's call. We have quite a busy agenda again today because things are getting warmed up. So we'll start of course with a review of our action items. And then after that, in the workgroup and small team updates, I suggested just changing the order of things. We do have the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process that has a 20-minute update. But the Expedited PDP on Internationalized Domain Names has Satish Babu who needs to actually attend the EPDP on IDNs in an hour or less than an hour. In which case, I'd say we'd start with Satish on the EPDP on IDNs, then we'll go to Steinar on the Transfer Policy Review. Then we'll have the RDRS, Registration Data Request Service, with Alan Greenberg providing us with a quick update. Then we'll have Maureen Hilyard providing us with a longer update and some slides on the Applicant Support GNSO Guidance Process. We'll also have then Justin Chew that will speak to us about Subsequent Procedures. Then the policy statement updates will take us through our policy pipeline. After that, we'll have UA Day planning, Universal Acceptance Day for 2024. Hadia will take us through this call for volunteers and Any Other Business after this. Are there any amendments and other changes to make to the agenda? I see Christopher Wilkinson has put his hand up. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Very quickly, just to mention that, as I suggested yesterday, under Any Other Business I'd like to have a short conversation about the Address Supporting Organization and our relationships with the RIRs. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Christopher. We'll add this to the Any Other Business, but I do know there is a quick update in the action items as well based on last week's work. So let's put this over in Any Other Business as a wider topic.

Any other amendments? I'm not seeing any other hands, so that is fine. We therefore proceed forward with an adopted agenda and the review of our action items. There were two in last week's call. One is to do with Steinar Grøtterød to provide a TPR Change of Registrant update. So he's certainly working on this, and we'll hear from Steinar in a moment. But the other one is for Heidi Ullrich to reach out to John Crain and AFRALO leadership to see if there are any updates regarding the AFRINIC situation since ICANN78. Well, Heidi has proceeded to do so. And so I'll hand the floor over to Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, everyone. Thank you, Olivier. So I did reach out to John and to Steve Sheng. So what I've heard back about some other possible issues, I wanted to remind everyone that there was, first, John Crain did provide an update during ICANN78 during the AFRALO-AfrICANN meeting. I'll go ahead and put the transcript of that meeting shortly into the chat. Then also, I wanted to raise your attention to during the Board meeting with the ASO, John Curran gave a really concise update on the situation with AFRINIC. And I'll go ahead and put that transcript into the chat right now. And also, just yesterday, there was a response from Tripti Sinha, the ICANN chair of the Board, to both Hadia—actually, it

came from Seun but it was returned to Hadia, as she's the new chair of AFRALO. And this was in response to the AFRALO note statement on AFRINIC. So you can see there's the letter right now back. So you'll see that the ICANN Board says that "We will continue to closely monitor the situation and provide support (if and where required) to restore AFRINIC's functional governance, long term stability, and operations."
Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Heidi. We look forward to seeing the links in the chat for everyone to be able to use and dig further into the topic. So that's the action items. Any comments or questions? Michael Palage?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I did not hear you but I'm hearing you now.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Okay, excellent. My question is as follows. While I appreciate these updates, does ICANN intend to do any type of post mortem analysis as to how the situation arose in the first place? Was there something that could have been done legally to have prevented this? Because what is the chance of the same litigation happening in another RIR? So I guess that is my question. It's great to have an update on what is going on.

But how do we prevent this from replicating in the other four RIRs? And was something not done properly during the transition that could have prevented this? I guess that's my question. Does anyone else feel the same way or am I on my own on this one?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Michael.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Obviously, in the light of what I said earlier, I fully agree with Mike Palage's question. The solution to this has to be institutionalized. I don't want to suggest that it is our responsibility to have anything to do with the abuses that apparently took place in AFRINIC. ICANN is quite capable of sorting that out for themselves. But institutionally or organizationally, what has happened is not acceptable. And it's partly by omission, it's partly our fault.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Christopher. We'll see what we do next on this topic. I would think that we probably need an action item of some sorts at the moment so we can take this forward. I noticed that there is support from Jonathan Zuck. As Michael's question is a reasonable question, there's also Laura Margolis in the chat, who is saying this is reasonable. So let's have an action item then in making sure this doesn't get dropped, and we address it. Now, what action item is there? I would suggest speaking to Jonathan Zuck, who is the ALAC chair, and if there is any inquiry or any question to be asked, would be the person who is

either affected or get Heidi to do this. But we'll put it over in his hands, the way in which it will be asked. Perhaps we could ask for John Crain to come over and speak to our community or any other people that are involved in the matter itself on the ICANN side. It certainly is a concern. I can see many people are actually sharing this in the chat as being a concern. Michael, your hand is still up?

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Yes, accidentally, but I did want to actually speak so it was actually fortuitous. My understanding is that there is going to be an update on the litigation or the status at next week's RIPE meeting. So perhaps as far as an action item, perhaps we see what happens at that RIR meeting. And we then use that to feedback our next step. So as far as an action item, let's monitor next week's RIPE meeting, and then determine what our next steps are. I think that would be the most prudent course of action.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much, Michael, for suggesting a proper action item for this. So I hope that staff has been able to record this. Heidi, have you been able to take this down, please?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes. My thought would be that we would send the details of that meeting to the CPWG. And then members can join that meeting or watch. I'm not sure if that's a transparent meeting or if that's an open

meeting, but is that something that you would want to actually be part of or just see the transcript, etc., of that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Michael, is the meeting open for everyone to follow?

MICHAEL PALAGE: I know ARIN's meetings are. So I would assume RIPE is. I know assuming is a very dangerous thing. I will see if they are open and I will try to post a response to the list. And I will see when that particular item is going to be discussed so we could just listen in on that relevant portion of the meeting. But I will post an update via the mailing list, if that works.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. There are several points made in the chat first by Avri Doria. People can register. Lutz Donnerhacke is saying, "RIPE is open," so one can certainly follow things remotely. I do know that the RIPE meetings themselves are for RIPE members. EURALO does have an MOU with RIPE, whereas a ticket might be obtained. But then I don't know if EURALO has someone conveniently in Amsterdam at the moment for this. Perhaps just following this remotely would be the right step forward. I'm eager to move forward, but thank you for raising this, Michael, and for having an action item on that. Let's now consider that these are all the comments on this topic and we can therefore proceed forward with the rest of our agenda.

As I mentioned earlier, there needs to be a slight swap between two of the workgroup updates, and so we'll start with the Expedited PDP on IDNs with a short update from Satish Babu.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Olivier. This is not a substantive report, only a status update. We will be making a more substantive report after our face-to-face meeting in a couple of weeks' time. I have six quick points to report on under five minutes. So I'll be very quick with this.

The first is about the Phase 1 Report which was put through the Public Comment process. And then it was submitted to the GNSO Council. And presently, it is at the Council and it will be put to vote whether to adopt the report's policy recommendations.

Number two addresses as per Justine's update earlier. The second point is about the Phase 2 Charter questions, which are mostly about IDN variant TLDs. The second level is currently being discussed. And the face-to-face meeting also will discuss this and finish most of the work. We think that if the Phase 2 work will not be as long as we originally predicted it to be, we might get done much earlier, maybe even the first quarter of next year. But we're not sure what happens if the voting from the [inaudible] to come through that and go through for whatever reason, I'm not sure what would then happen, whether the Phase 1 Report will come back or not.

Number three, the ALAC team on EPDP on IDN had suffered attrition, as Justine has already quit the EPDP team and Hadia is also planning to quit by the end of 2023. When we started out in 2021, we had five

people. And in January 2024, it'll be down to just two. That is AK and me. Given the highly technical nature of the EPDP's work and given that most of the work is done by now, I'm not sure if we should replace the two vacancies. Maybe the elect leadership of CPWG can provide some guidance on this matter whether we should provide substitutes.

Number four, the Phase 2 Charter questions have significant impact for end users and also for registrants. Now, I'm not at this point clear whether registrants are part of end users or they're separate. In any case, both of them are impacted. End users in some communities have been waiting for over a decade to utilize IDN variants in their domain names, things like Chinese and Arabic, for example. Variant is there for a feature that adds to the end user experience at the second level and top level. However, there could be additional technical issues involved in operationalizing variants at the second level. For registrants, there are additional steps required to complete the registration process, including deciding on the primary domain name, generating the variant set, choosing which of the variants to be activated, etc. We have not modeled the process, but definitely they'll be different from the current registration of domain name and when you have variants in the frame.

The next, point number five, is about a question that has been asked to me by so many people. How is this variant set going to be priced? Is the EPDP making any recommendations on the pricing? Now, the pricing is actually a registry level matter, it is out of scope for the EPDP. We have no idea how this is going to decide this policy. Is it going to be a bundle pay for the whole set for a per name kind of pricing? Since there is some administrative overhead for each of the variant domain name, it is

possible that there will be per name policy, but we don't have any information on the status outside the EPDP.

Finally, number six, the EPDP will end sometime in the next three to four or five months. Sometime before the EPDP ends, it may be useful for ALAC leadership to determine from the EPDP leadership about the contributions and performance of the ALAC team. This can be useful for us for the future when we plan out. This EPDP was very technical, it was also high pressure in the initial period. Right now the pressure has kind of become much less, but the team size has changed and so on. But some kind of a process to assess the EPDP team's performance will be useful for the future.

That's it from me. Any questions? I'll be happy to answer. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this quick update, Satish, very helpful indeed. The floor is open for questions and comments. I am not seeing any hands up. There are just a couple of notes of thanks in the chat. So thank you for this. Good luck on your meeting in just over half an hour or so for the next stage to proceed. Thank you.

Let's now turn to Steinar Grøtterød who is going to be speaking to us about the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process. Over to you, Steinar Grøtterød. And also someone who's not usually with us, but it's Theo Geurts, and I welcome him to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call. He's a Realtime Register. So let's go over to Steinar.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Hi, good evening. Good morning, everybody. I'm, first of all, very pleased that Theo is with me today and hopefully can assist me in what we try to achieve in this 20-minute discussion. I have kind of drafted the following agenda. I will, in a couple of minutes, go through the Change of Registrant Policy as it is today that will take a couple of two or three minutes maybe. Then I'll pass on the scene to Theo, and he will go into the background of the Change of Registrant Policy, and he will spend some time on that. And finally, I'm hoping to have a discussion whether we prefer to have the Change of Registrant Policy into the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy or we should put it into something else or different processes, etc., etc. If we have the time, I have created a very, very simple poll. But let's see whether we have the time for that.

So we can go to the first slide here. Thank you very much. The Change of Registrant Policy has two different keywords. The first is the material change. And the thing is that when you own a domain name, at some point, you may want to update some of the contact information you submitted when you registered the domain name. This is done through the registrar or reseller that you registered this domain to.

Then there is something set as material change. If you change the registrant name, the organization, the e-mail address, or if there is, in the old days, something called the admin contact, if there wasn't an admin contact, you put something else into that, that's a trigger, something that we will see in the next slide.

The other thing that is also a keyword is what is called a designated agent. I really hope that Theo will touch this in his history lesson for what is the Change of Registrant Policy. So let's go to the next slide.

The problem here is that when you do something of this that is defined as a material change, you may—I emphasize “may”—end up in a lock process. That means that you cannot transfer the domain name to another registrar after 60 days. That's the present policy and the time for the lock in the present policy. The thing is that as a registrant, you often kind of check in the face of saying that “I want to change my sponsoring registrar.” And then you go into the present registrar control panel, and then you do the update. And suddenly you are prevented from moving out to the preferred registrar, the registrar that you want to move to. And this is extremely frustrating. Some data we have received from ICANN Compliance is that this is one of the most typical Compliance tickets they have within ICANN Compliance, is the frustration from registrants that it cannot transfer domain names due to this transfer lock, due to the change of any object that has been identified as material change. If we kind of trust the registrars and their data and their experience, they're saying that the Change of Registrant Policy is not something that is the best tool for domain name hijacking, which was, to my understanding, the intention to have this policy. So this is frustrating for the registrant. And it's definitely then frustrating for the registrar, they have to handle this in a way, etc.

So, this is the present policy. I hope Theo can now take us into why do we have this kind of policy. And then we will spend some time afterwards discussing the pros and cons of having this within the Inter-

Transfer Policy or having out of the Transfer Policy. So, Theo, if you're ready—I hope you're ready—please go on.

THEO GEURTS:

Thanks, Steinar. This is Theo Geurts for the record. I'm the Compliance officer of Realtime Register. I spend like 400 hours on IRTPC, the Change of Control IRT back in the day, back in 2014 until 2016. Basically, I'm asking that question that Steinar posed, I'm asking myself that every day, why did we even come up with this? And of course, the IRTP—there were five IRTPs starting back in 2008. So that's pretty much ancient history. It tried to address several problems back in the day, and it was split up in five IRTPs from A to E, if my recollection is correct. And back then, when I received the first draft of the Change of Control, as we call it back then, which was part of IRTPC, I was a little bit worried back then, because from what I've read back then, how it was proposed, there were some massive operational challenges. I joined the IRT and I tried for the best of it, for the amount of time that we had available in those years, I tried to sort of make sure that we had a policy that would achieve the goals and make sure that the experience of the registrants would not be too impactful. And during the course of that IRT, I started to wonder like, "What are we trying to achieve here?" and that's to prevent domain name hijacking.

It wasn't just possible to create a policy to prevent that without having major consequences. One of the results was, back when the policy was released, registrars had a major problem coding it. In fact, there's one section of the policy we had to go back to the Board as registrars because we couldn't code it. There was no developer in the world who

could code a certain section of the policy. So basically, a huge red flag in terms of policy-making in my opinion. I mean, a working group finally created a policy that couldn't be coded. I thought back then it was pretty worrisome.

When the policy was released, at first it was a disaster at the registrar level, the amount of support requested generated, that was quite significant. And Steinar just mentioned, it also created a large amount of ticket load with ICANN Compliance because a lot of registrants were suddenly locked in for another 60 days, missing the renewal dates. It was just a mess. Back in the day, we didn't have any information about how high is the amount of domain name theft. I do recognize that back in 2008 and prior to those dates, yes, domain name theft was an issue. Security was not a priority at the registrar level, and it wasn't a point of sale, so to speak, as it is now. Back in the day, there was no 2FA multi-factor authentication. Nowadays, virtually every registrar has multi-factor authentication, two-factor authentication, so that registrants can use those tools to protect their accounts against domain name theft. A registrar who doesn't offer multi-factor authentication, they are in a disposition disadvantage, competitive-wise. Everybody has it. If you don't have it, you're not competing very well with the rest. So basically, everybody's got it.

Back then, when we were doing the policy, every time we created some language to get to a position that would be acceptable for everybody, we would basically run into the issue that if we would press buttons A to B, then okay, that was working well for the wholesale registrars. But on the retail registrar side, it became an operational nightmare. Then a week later, we shifted the language again, and then also registrars are

having massive problems. And then the retail registrar didn't have a problem. Now, that process went on for a year. And every time we look at the language again and we would hit some major industry parks, so to speak, that would be hit on such an operational level, that would be not feasible without having a complete nightmare on our hands.

But then the designated agent got introduced to the language and that was—I don't want to call it an escape hatch—but it opened up the possibility to streamline the processes for registrars more on a business model-based structure in where registrars could get that, how to process the changes on a better level to the designated agent. It wasn't perfect, but if implemented well by a registrar, you could streamline the processes better and better. Still, it's far from perfect. I mean, if you asked me to this day, I have done many IRTs, I have done many working groups, but I'm the least proud of this one. Back in the day, I didn't like this one. I thought it was too far reaching. Still today, now that we are working on it again, I'm like, "Let's please make this policy more friendly for registrants." And if it's up to me, I would lose the policy, make it go away any time, but that is not up to me. Thanks.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Thank you very much, Theo. That was very informative history lesson. Thank you very much for that. My proposal, what I'm in favor of is to remove the Change of Registrant Policy away from the Inter-Transfer Policy. My key point here is that we have a lot of ccTLDs that doesn't have this lock period. They handle this as something that is totally in the responsibility of the registrar for that particular domain name. So that the registry operator, the ccTLD, kind of trust the registry operator to do

whatever is best for their clients. I believe that it will be, as Theo had shared, it will be very, very tricky to make a policy that kind of falls into and is tuned into all the different provisioning models that registrars have. And also when you take the full line of registrars and resellers, it is very difficult to make a policy that totally gets into this.

I think the key here is that this is an operation that any registrar, a decent registrar, good registrar should handle with care and execute with care and do all the needed verification in-house, not following some a guidebook that's set in a policy description. We are all aware that there are different registrants. There are single registrants, there are corporate registrants. We have scenarios where there is a change of ownership because someone has acquired that domain name. But I believe all these scenarios can be handled in a professional way by the registrar and not necessarily having this guideline set in the policy.

So what I'm hoping to is to have a discussion here about is it the best way to take this out of the Inter-Registrar Policy or is it not? We should also mention. It is not sure that if we propose and the working group agreed to put this away from the Inter-Transfer Policy, it might end up not necessarily ending in a new PDP. That's, to my understanding, something that has been decided by GNSO. It may differ how these registrars are doing this, but all the registrars have different ways of handling different things. So that's not nothing new.

I see some hands and I'm so happy. Justine? Come on, you're the first in line as far as I see. Come on.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Steinar. What you said last triggered a couple of things in my mind, anyway. The first question I had was, if you could remind us, I kind of distinctly remember that when we were discussing this TPR work earlier on, there was mention about this lock. I can't remember exactly what happened to that discussion. So, I was wondering whether you could refresh our memories—or my memory at least—on that, whether this issue about the lock was resolved in another Charter question.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Yes, I can comment on that directly, Justine. Thank you for the question. The working group had discussed in the previous Charter question what has been defined as a transfer lock of the initial registration, which is, per today, 60 days. The working group recommends 30 days transfer lock after initial registration. And also transfer lock after a successful transfer. So you can't jump on to another registrar before it's gone 60 versus 30 days as proposed by the working group. But that's a little bit different than this operation because here the registrant want to actually update what he believes is to be accurate data in the database. Was that answering your question, Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes. Okay. So the triggers for the two periods are different. So that's what I'm trying to say. Okay. Thanks for that. Well, the thing is I don't particularly favor one way or the other, whether we should support this particular work being moved out of the Transfer Policy Working Group. But the thing is, if that happens, then presumably this policy is still going to be in place. So you're saying that we don't know what would happen

or what needs to happen in order to remove this policy in order to remove the frustrations that the registrants are facing right now. Is that right?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: That can be addressed that way, yes.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you very much, Justine. Michael Palage?

MICHAEL PALAGE: So two quick comments. The first I think is potentially the false equivalent in relating to what CCs do. I think John commented this in the chat as well. Most ccTLDs have a thick dataset. Most gTLD registries, I would say today, have nothing but a bunch of privacy/proxy, if any, data. So I think when you look at what a fairly European registry would hold versus what a gTLD registry would hold, I just think it's just not a good parallel.

The second comment was referring to what registrars do to verify the registrant. If we were to go down that path of allowing that, I would hope we could have some safeguards on what that verification process looks like. As Alan could speak to and I'll speak to as myself as the former chair of the Accuracy Scoping Working Group, accuracy for

registrars basically boils down to syntactical validation of the data fields and either an operational e-mail or telephone number, which does not give me a high degree of confidence.

The other thing is the third and final point I would like to point out here is that when you look at NIS2, particularly Article 21, that talks about the supply chain and the security of it, I think there's a lot more that we need to be doing as an industry to meet those requirements under Article 21 paragraph 2D. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Thank you very much, Michael, for this. I do agree that we should definitely look into the NIS2 and the GDPR also when we discuss this topic.

One of the things that leads to my proposal to get away from the Inter-Transfer Policy is if we agreed upon the other security mechanisms that the working group has set forward into the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, I do believe that there is another layer, a higher layer of security being established with a new Inter-Transfer Policy.

Secondly, I'm not sure whether it is possible as part of a policy to get into that detail of verification that you may want to have, if I understand you correctly, Michael. But I do hope that Theo will have some better insight on that because that's his day job to actually do these things. Can I go back to Alan, Michael? Do you want to have a short comment? No? That's good. Thank you. Alan, you're in.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two comments. Number one, you use the expression “Remove the Change of Registrant from the Transfer Policy.” Unless I’m missing something, that means we remove it from the Transfer Policy, therefore, short of another PDP, there is no longer a Change of Registrant Policy. Some other people have implied that if you remove it, it’s still a freestanding policy on its own. I can’t see how that could happen. Because you have a Transfer Policy, if you remove a clause, it’s not there anymore and it’s just gone. So I think what you’re saying when you say remove it from the Transfer Policy is short of another PDP, there is no more Change of Registrant Policy. If that’s not what you mean, please clarify. That’s point number one.

Point number two is we, ICANN, and the contracted parties have just spent an immense amount of time on the new contractual amendments to look to combat domain name abuse. Those contract amendments, everyone seems to agree, are aimed at bad actors. So there’s no way we can go forward with another policy, assuming all registrars will do the right thing. I’m not accusing anyone here of doing these. But we have just spent a lot of time on contractual amendments because we know there are some bad actors. They may be a minority, but they’re there. So we can’t assume that everyone will do the honorable, correct thing going forward. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Thank you, Alan. My thinking was to remove the Change of Registrant Policy and not away from the Inter-Transfer Policy. If we go to the last slide, I think there is three options here, whether there is a need for a start of a new process, a PDP. That’s a question mark. And also, as I said,

let the sponsoring registrar control any changes to the registrant data as they do in the many ccTLDs. I still believe that's a valid argument. Hopefully, that was a little bit more clarifying, Alan. Theo, I really hope that you can save me here. Thank you.

THEO GEURTS:

I'm not sure about that. But from a high level perspective, the question arise within the Registrar Stakeholder Group also, a little bit like, this Change of Registrant Policy, is that still part of a Transfer Policy? They are both separate processes and the change of registrant can be looked upon as a separate process that has no ties to the transfer process itself. So, to me—and Alan sort of touched upon it a little bit—I think the big question is not to discuss all the locks on how long that should be at the moment. I think the big question is how do you make that a stand-alone PDP? And is that something we want? Is that something that needs to go back to the GNSO Council? Or does it need to go back to the Board? I think those are the questions we all should be asking. From my point of view, speaking as a participant in all of this, we had it back in the Transfer Policy back in the day and we already spend some time on it in the current process that we are following, and we are very close to some recommendations there, in my opinion. Do you want to break up the process now and move to a separate PDP, and how does that look like? Thanks.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

Exactly. Starting a new PDP is a very long process even though it may be a fast one. So I'm not sure. No more hands? Do we have the time for a

short poll? I have to test the temperature in the room. So, if we do have that, I have prepared a very simple poll.

This is very simple. Based on the information given and your understanding, will you propose to remove the Change of Registrant Policy from the Inter-Transfer Policy? We have the options “Yes, remove it,” “No, let it stay,” “I’m not sure,” or “I abstain.” So, ladies and gentlemen, let’s give your vote. Thank you. I guess the staff can inform us when there’s sufficient responses to the poll.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

Hi, Steinar. I see that so far 54% of the participants have voted. I’m going to wait a bit more to see if I receive any new responses.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD:

I can inform you that at the last call in the GNSO TPR that took place last week, there was a meeting stopped this week, the chair announced that he didn’t see any way that the Change of Registrant Policy should be taken out of the Inter-Transfer Policy. But he also added we have not kind of concluded that yet. So there is still room, and so on. Based on whatever we have in this poll, I think I will just single out that we have discussed it. And the CPWG is on the track of understanding how important this is. So what’s the status now for the number of responding?

YEŞİM SAĞLAM:

I think 64% of the participants have voted, which means 29 votes. It seems like increasing a bit more. But if you would like me to end the poll

and share the results, I can do that. The poll has been open for two and a half minutes already.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I think we can end the poll. It's just feeling the temperature in the room. So please end the poll and let's have the result, please.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Sure.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: We still have some uncertainty here, that's for sure. There is that 23% for the "Yes," to remove it from the Inter-Transfer Policy, there's 20% to keep it in there, 43% is not sure, and 13% has abstained. Thank you very much. I take that into my summary with the GNSO TPR. But I also sense that we definitely need to spend some time to get the understanding of the pros and cons of this particular sub process in the Inter-Transfer Policy. Again, thank you very much, Theo, for assisting me and joining the call, and everybody that took part in the discussion. Alan, I didn't see your hand. Come on.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just waiting to see. I just have to comment that I'm amazed at the results of that poll. That says the majority of people here either agree that it's okay not to have a Change of Registrant Policy or aren't sure, and I just can't fathom that.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Yeah. But I do think it is somehow kind of a complicated stuff.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand that. But nevertheless, I'm just amazed. Thank you.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Thank you very much. Thank you for taking part. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. It's good to take those polls because it does show sometimes that we're not all aligned always on things. For whatever reason, it is. There are some dissenting views in some cases. But at least you've got an idea of what we discussed here. As you said, these are complicated issues and there are many different angles to touch on those. But thanks so much for bringing Theo Geurts as well to help us out in this. Very interesting indeed.

Let's proceed forward with the rest of our agenda. Next, we have Registration Data Request Service, the RDRS, with Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a very short report. As you all know, the RDRS is the interim system that's been designed to allow individuals with a right, who believe they have a right, to access redacted information to get that information. The system was designed and implemented by ICANN in record time with what I consider a record amount of cooperation and

goodwill on all parts. And it's going live next week. So we obviously won't get any real answers. We're not sure just how many possible requesters will use the system. And we're not sure at this point how many registrars will agree to use it. As of last week, about half of all domain names were covered by registrars that had signed on, I assume the number is higher now. But it will be going live next week. We'll have to wait and see to see what the reception is like and how well it works in practice. But it's been an interesting exercise. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alan. Are there any comments or questions? We'll just have to see how it works. There'll be an interesting moment as well, something that's been discussed for so long, and that is now going live. Thank you.

Let's move on then with our agenda. The next presentation is going to be by Maureen Hilyard. She's going to be speaking to us about the Applicant Support GNSO Guidance Process. Thank you for attending, Maureen. Over to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Thank you very much, Olivier. I hope you can all hear me. This is just going to be, hopefully, a brief rundown on what we've been doing in the GGP, basically, since the last update at ICANN78. But also what we've been discussing with regards to the submissions that came from the Public Comment on the nine recommendations that we made in our Initial Report, and hopefully to provide some insight into the

discussions that are being held and where we're at. So next slide, please.

I'm looking at the initial statement that was made in the report, the public response to it, and what happened as a result of that the response that we got, the comments that were made. With regards to the Recommendation 1, for example, which was on awareness and education, the public response was there was a focus. The actual report recommendation was really increased awareness of the program in the next round among those who may need and qualify for support. And it was really interesting that in the public response, there was a request for an expansion on this recommendation that that we needed to focus on the fact that it's for underserved regions where the main focus and to expand the reach of the support program to include private sectors, not-for-profit sector, just being a little bit more explicit.

Therefore, the statement has been changed. The recommendations that were made have been added to it to be like a little bit more expansive. But I think the focus in the discussions that we've had, the focus has to be on underserved regions, where it says private sector entities, again, looking more at those, basically, the regions and countries and stuff that were previously uninformed, and so therefore, they become the target group for the support. I just thought I'll go through quickly through these. And if there are any questions you can ask at the end. Can I have the next slide, please?

Pro bono services, I've got a lot of airtime in the GGP. This is already a long statement identifying the importance of pro bono services with the industry actually offering advice. But that's what the discussion went

around. If the discussions between the applicant and the provider went any deeper than the advice, then the applicant would pay for any service, which would not be covered under the Applicant Support Program.

So there were three key areas that came out of the discussion in relation to pro bono services. And that was, first of all, that Org sees themselves as facilitators, that is actually like getting interest from people within the industry to provide the services and ensuring that they provide accurate information about what services they offer so that the applicants can make their own choices. And this is related to the GAC's recommendation about matchmaking of applicants and services. The staff felt that it would be, and rightfully so, too time-consuming for all applicants expecting staff to actually do the matchmaking. And that if the services provide adequate information to explain what services they offer, then it's up to the applicant to actually make that contact.

The third item was the fact that in the last round there was no data kept about the efficiencies or otherwise of having the pro bono services or who used them or if they were used at all. So this time, they're always actually going to make sure that there is some feedback so they can actually see what value the service does provide. Next slide.

Guidance Recommendation 3 was about resources. I think the key thing that was in this was the fact that necessary resources was something that was discussed at length, but of course, it was deemed too broad for it to be within scope of the GGP team. We probably felt that we would have had a field day if we'd been given that opportunity to elaborate on

what we considered was necessary resources. So that is actually there's no change being made to that one. Next slide.

Recommendation 4 was around the process. Now, there's been no change made to this recommendation, but it was emphasized by all sections of the GGP community that there's lots of information being available, that there has to be lots of information being available. And that is made available well in advance of the beginning of the application process. There weren't too many people who actually responded to the comments, but the GAC did so quite considerably, and as did many of the GNSO organizations, communities. But yeah, I think everyone was pretty much in agreement with this one. Next slide.

Okay. With this one, a recommendation for change was actually made in this week's meeting because one of the things that the GAC had actually said in their public response was that they felt that 0.5% target was not ambitious enough. So to have 1000 people, or however many, 2000 people, 10 people were successful for getting applicant support. So, what happened was that the GAC and At-Large members got together and put forward a submission to say that the target should be considered a floor and not a ceiling, and that ICANN should strive to exceed this minimum. And surprisingly, although it was raised at this week's meeting, they took it a little bit more seriously. Staff later agreed that if expectations of the target were met and exceeded, then the target could be seen as exceptionally successful. So they were happy to put—there was a bit added to this, but they were happy to make the change to the statement to include that ICANN must ensure that of all successfully delegated gTLD applications, 10 or 0.5% are from supported applicants. However, this indicator of success should be considered a

floor and not a ceiling, and ICANN should strive to exceed this minimum. I felt that this was an important statement because it does impinge on some other recommendations that we made as well. But one thing that neither the staff and Mike was pretty adamant about was that they didn't want to make a stretch target that to actually say that we needed to have 50 successful applicants being supported, so that they felt that this was a reasonable compromise. Next.

This recommendation also was an interesting one. It was to do with the fact that ICANN Org to investigate the extent to which supported applicants that were awarded a gTLD are still in business as a registry operator after three years. NCSG had actually said, "What's being collected? How much is Org going to collect? What kind of data is it going to collect to ascertain the long-term effects of the Applicant Support Program over time?"

I had actually raised in a discussion we were having with the GAC the .kids situation, which .kids was the only successful applicant in the last round for support. So it was awarded the domain around 2012, whenever. And yet, it was only delegated a couple of years ago, and it's been with .asia and supported by .asia. As they build their domain numbers up until such time as the federation .kids group actually become self-sufficient.

So the staff is actually relooking at this period. They want to get some further clarification about when the three-year countdown should begin. And they're considering periodic checks to get more clarification on that. So that's still going to require quite a bit of work. They're investigating that for us. Next recommendation.

Of course, this one was the basic one, to ensure that there is enough funding for the Applicant Support Program. But this recommendation does back up recommendations about minimum funding being available for support of qualified applicants. The staff did mention that these Recommendations 7, 8, and 9 are independent of each other, and they're all relating in some way to financial support. Although there was no change recommended to this recommendation, it does back up support for Recommendation 3 which was to do with making sure that there are necessary resources for the program. And, of course, Recommendation 5 where it says that the 0.5% target for qualified applicants as a floor and not a ceiling. So this is quite an important recommendation to put forward. We've left it as it is. Recommendation 8, next slide, please.

With this particular recommendation, GAC was really supportive of it because it actually does look at the risks that are involved in having a certain amount of funding available but having a number of qualified applicants seeking support so that when we're going to share it equitably, say, within everyone that it becomes diluted to the point of being unhelpful. So this was where the GAC really supported that if there's more applicants who need support, then Org needs to be very clear about what the criteria which was out of scope for us, of course, to create. So that if funding support is needed, then it must be both equitable and helpful for their application process. So I think that this is an important recommendation as well.

Then the final Guidance Recommendation 9 is to do with—next slide. Can I have the next slide, please? Communication. Okay. The GAC supported this recommendation to ensure that if there's more

applicants who need support, then Org needs to be very clear about what the criteria are and make this known. It just reinforces the importance of ensuring that applicants get the information that they need about the requirements and expectations of both the application process and the implications for future sustainability of their registry business. It's all wrapped up and part of the communication, information that all gets the package that Org is putting together for applicants, hopefully, well in advance of the beginning of the process.

Last slide. Really, this report has got to be finished, completed by December to go to the Council and the Implementation Review Team. I think that's one of the things that we've been really appreciative of on the group is just how helpful the staff have been with regards to just guiding us through this whole process. They've done a lot of the heavy lifting, the wordsmithing, making sure that it's acceptable for the next steps. But we've got to get it done by December, and we're nearly there. So that's us. Thank you. Questions if there are any?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. We are a little short on time so let's make the questions quick, please.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay, sure. I had just one question in relation to the first recommendation where you said, I think, to expand it to include private sector. I thought the recommendation as is was it did not exclude any sector. It was inclusive enough. I don't really get what's the point of pinpointing certain sectors.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think that there was a lot of discussion and making sure that these were added to make sure that it was inclusive. There was a discussion very early on about private sector entities from across the board. We just needed to make it more specific by saying that the focus is on developing underrepresented regions and that private sector entities from within those previously uninformed regions need to be the focus rather than making it open slather. That's the decision. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Greg Shatan?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can we take another question? Greg, quick.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. Sorry about that. I'll be as quick as possible. The recommendation regarding pro bono services, I'm unclear. Does that mean that we want all the service providers to basically bear their own costs for providing the services and that neither ICANN nor the applicants will be paying them anything? I note that while lawyers have a certain pro bono obligation, other professions don't necessarily have that. It seems that if nobody is paying people, the service may not be necessarily as comprehensive and easy to get. So if you could explain if that's the intention that basically put everything back on the service providers.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, it is. I think that this is going to be helpful to ICANN that they'll get this support from the community for nothing. But at the same time, they've actually done a survey of the services and that actually had a lot of support from people who are willing to actually come and offer advice. But of course, it's up to a particular level. And beyond that, then it's between the applicant and the provider as to what becomes a paid service rather than advisory service. That's as much as we know. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: So there's a bit of marketing involved in this?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Could be, yes. Thanks. Okay. All yours, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. Thanks for the update. Let's now have a quick update from Justin Chew on the New gTLD Next Round.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Olivier. I'll try to be very, very quick. I just need to bring up two updates. The first one has got to do with the topic that Maureen just spoke of, Applicant Support. Yeşim is trying to pull up the slide number four.

Two weeks ago, I reported back on the pending recommendations of SubPro, which are now no longer pending. We started with 38 of them.

So now, none left which are pending. They are either adopted by the Board with clarification from GNSO Council or they have not been adopted by the Board. The one that has not been adopted by the Board is Recommendation 17.2. That's got to do with the ASP, the Applicant Support Program resources. That is one of the 10 recommendations that have not been adopted by the Board that is now sitting with GNSO Council small team, the SubPro small team.

What we are trying to do on a small team is to come up with strawman draft revisions of those recommendations. Then next week onwards, when the Small Team Plus is seated, then we will look at those strawmen and see how we can tweak them or improve them or shut them down or whatever. That's when the heavy lifting gets done. I'm happy to report that Tijani and Greg will join me on Small Team Plus. So we'll have a jolly good time fighting it out on 17.2, hopefully. That's one of the updates.

The second update is—Yeşim, can you go to the other link, please? Which just came to my attention earlier today is that remember for ICANN78, one of the Board questions to us was in terms of impossibility of Public Interest Commitments and Registry Voluntary Commitments. We provided an answer based on a truncated consultation that I did with CPWG. Now, the next step is the Board is calling for or has directed ICANN Org, actually, I should say, to initiate a proper community consultation on this same question. Apparently, they're going to put out a framework of some kind, either before on the 5th of December, if I'm not mistaken. Yeşim, can you do me a favor? Just scroll down to the bottom, you'll see the timetable. That's it. Right.

Apparently, this framework is going to come out on or before the 5th of December to all the community groups. And they were supposed to have a look at it. There's going to be a webinar where we have first, I suppose, talk about it kind of thing. And then what's expected is the community groups to then submit input to what they think about the framework that's been put out for discussion.

That's just the update. I'm happy to continue to shepherd this discussion on the PICs and RVCs. I'm happy to have an action item for me to prepare something when the framework comes out, which is sometime on or before 5th of December, and we can schedule something with CPWG to discuss it after the 5th of December. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Justine. I'm not seeing any hands up for this. Thanks for the very quick update. Since we are pressed for time, let's then go to our next item, and that's our policy consultations pipeline. Over to you Hadia El Miniawi, Andrew Chen, and Claudia Ruiz.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. Recently ratified by the ALAC is the Closed Generics. And the Pilot Holistic Review Revised Draft Terms of Reference is currently being voted on. I think voting closes today. It's going to ratification process now.

Open for public comment is the draft report of the Root Zone DNSSEC Algorithm Rollover Study. This is quite technical. We have actually asked

for volunteers to present this at the CPWG. We didn't get any volunteers. But I do think that this is too technical and doesn't really have an end user aspect to it, of course, unless something goes wrong, technically. So I guess let's go ahead and say that we are not going to comment on it. Unless anyone has any other view on this, we will mark it as no comment. Olivier, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. I've had a very general browse over it for not more than a couple of minutes. And the gist of the consultation is that as the Internet evolves and as technology evolves, keys for the DNSSEC have to be not only updated, but now the format of them also has to be improved so as to get some higher quality keys and change some of the cryptographic algorithms. So it is a technical thing. We do have the RSSAC working on this, the SSAC is working on this, the office of the CTO is working on this. I would imagine that with all the experts that are involved in this and the years and years of experience that they have, they would know what they're doing. Which I think you're right, having no comment on that is probably okay. And the internet is unlikely to break. Famous last words, but I hate to be proven wrong. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier, for the support. I also see in the chat support for not commenting on this. Let's close this as no comment from the ALAC. Then the only thing undergoing review now is the contention resolution

statement, and that's with Jonathan Zuck. Jonathan, do you want to provide a quick update on this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry. Which statement?

HADIA EL MINIAWI: The contention resolution one.

JUSTINE CHEW: That's a work in progress.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a work in progress. Thank you, Justine. We're working with Andrew to figure out if there's modifications we need to make to the statement before we submit it. It's going to be something that gets overtaken by events if we're not careful. So there's a little bit of a tug of war about whether or not the thing we're proposing is implementable. But I still believe it is. So we're going to try to fight the good fight on it, but it's a work in progress. Thanks. Back to you, Hadia.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. Apparently, my connection is not great. But thank you for the update. Upcoming is the Improved GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency Charter Amendment Process. Most probably, we won't also comment on this. This is related to the Charter of the GNSO subgroup. With that, we finished the Public Comment proceedings.

Unless there is any comment from anyone, we can go to the next agenda item which is the Universal Acceptance Day Planning call for volunteers. If we can click on the At-Large Activities page, please. Thank you.

The Universal Acceptance Day will be held on the 28th of March 2024. You can propose events to happen any time between 1st of March and 30th of May. This is an opportunity for all RALOs and At-Large Structures to spread general awareness about Universal Acceptance and encourage Universal Acceptance adoption.

There are different types of possible events, awareness, technical training, academic curricula, adoption and regional strategy. Please make sure to work with your Global Stakeholder Engagement Team on any Universal Acceptance Day event you are planning. The deadline for funding support request is the 15th of December.

Linked to this agenda is the At-Large activity's Universal Acceptance Day space. And on this space, also you will find the link to the Universal Acceptance Steering Group website, as well as a link to the application form.

Now, At-Large is looking into proposing an awareness event. It could involve both social media as well as e-mails. Jonathan, do you want to speak to the At-Large awareness event briefly?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure. I had the idea that's not completely formed yet to try and mobilize our community around nudging a large multinational or big national

corporation or institution toward Universal Acceptance. The idea would be somebody, a big airline, a big bank, or something like that and try and generate real traffic to them in the form of e-mail or social media, whether public or non-public, to tell them that Universal Acceptance is important. There are questions about whether or not that should be public or not. Is that naming and shaming? Or should it just be private? We don't have the answers to those questions. But we're looking to maybe put together a little small team to put a proposal in front of the UASG on the 15th.

So if you're interested in participating in that proposal development, please let me know and we're going to try to put together a proposal on how we mobilize our community around some kind of social media or letter writing campaign aimed at a large institution that's currently not compliant with Universal Acceptance. Or even possibly a public campaign aimed at an institution that is UA compliant, as we've talked about in the past. So, one of the two. Whether it's one organization that everybody writes to or we choose national organizations and try to get letters or social media posts to several organizations, those are all part of the conversation that we should have as part of the small team.

Let me know if you're interested and we'll put together a little small team to put together a proposal for the UASG on an awareness event and adoption event. We'll have to see what kind of an event it is under their rubric. But the idea is just to see if we can flex our community a little bit to raise attention to the issue. Natalia, I see your hand up. Do you have a question about it?

NATALIA FILINA: Yes. Thank you very much. Sorry for late joining this call. I would like to remind for us that we can use the social media related issue, not just for sharing information but, for example, achievements of our community from the last year, we can gather this information and we can use it, not just to highlight this topic but importance of our work. But we may use this opportunity for getting feedback from our community, maybe with social media tools, set up some kind of survey or a poll, something like this, and then to share the results. Please count me in this work and I will be happy to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. That sounds good, Natalia. Thank you. Any other questions or comments on that? It looks like we got some volunteers in the chat there. Hopefully, staff are capturing those. We'll put together a little call and we'll figure out what exactly makes the most sense to propose. All right. Thank you. Back to you, Hadia.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you so much, Jonathan. Again, you can contact Jonathan directly if you want to volunteer. Staff, hopefully, captured the volunteers that we have right now. Just a quick note also, AFRALO is putting together a regional strategy event. We have a Google Document that has been set for that purpose. So if you want to also participate in this, you can e-mail Raymond Mamattah or myself. If we have no other comments, now we have the Any Other Business. So do we have any other business?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We certainly have. We have Christopher Wilkinson who had asked at the beginning of the call of the relationship between At-Large and the ASO. Christopher, you have the floor. We've got about five minutes remaining to this call. Not even. Let's go through this quick. Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Since I raised this question several weeks ago before Hamburg, I'm quite relieved and have some personal satisfaction that ICANN, At-Large, and other entities have suddenly taken this on board as a very serious issue. I think Michael Palage expressed the point very, very succinctly and very correctly earlier in the call. I would agree. I would just let that stand but do something about it.

My initial proposal, which I maintain, is in the longer term, these kinds of crises must not be allowed to occur. And the minimal role for At-Large, for ALAC itself, would be to have a serious liaison with—I suppose they call it the IP numbering community. Personally, I'll leave it at that. Thank you, everybody, who's taken this issue up. I'm sure it must be pursued to a satisfactory conclusion. There are aspects of what we've learned about AFRINIC that's concerning. But I look forward to, notably, the ICANN staff's details and thorough reporting on this issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Christopher. That takes us to the end of today's call. We have to find out when our next call will take place, please.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thanks so much, Olivier. As we're rotating, the next call will be next Wednesday, on the 29th of November at 19:00 UTC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Yeşim. Noting that we are sticking to the 14:00 UTC time now when we are rotating. I'm not here to open a new debate. But one of the reasons being that we need to be aware that the ALAC has to attend this call and the distribution of people around the world on the ALAC means that the most suitable times had to be adjusted. Staff ran a software that was doing this so as to work it out. So 19:00 UTC on the 29th of November.

Thanks to the interpreters who have stayed a bit longer. Thanks to, of course, transcription, and to all of you who have taken part in today's call and brought also some updates. Follow up on the mailing list. See you all next week. Very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, wherever you are. Goodbye.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]