
YESIM SAGLAM:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 3rd of April 2024 at 14:00 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 in 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 Alfredo Calderon, Tommi Karttaavi, Muriel Alapini and from Sébastien Bachollet, as well as Denise Hochbaum. And a couple of participants have mentioned that they will be joining late. And these participants are Judith Hellerstein, Alan Greenberg and Amita Choudhury.

Before we get started, as usual, we will have Spanish and French interpretation provided and our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Claudia and Marina. And on the French channel, we will have Claire and Jacques. And we will also have real-time transcription service provided as usual. Let me share the link with you here on Zoom chat. Please do check the service provided. And my final reminder will be to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. 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, Yesim. Welcome to everybody for today's Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which is likely to be a little lighter than usual. You'll see shortly, but that means we might have a bit

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.

more time to discuss other topics in further detail. We'll first start with leadership announcements from Jonathan Zuck and then going into our work group and small team updates. The bulk of today's discussions will center around the transfer policy review policy development process with Steinar Grotterod taking us through some of the latest. On the other topics, there's just a quick update on the expedited policy development process on IDN. And all of the other topics in these work group and small team updates are not going to be addressed today unless somebody puts their hand up and needs to say something briefly. But that's what we have so far.

Then we'll look at our policy statement updates, policy pipeline for consultations that take place. And there we'll have a few to go through that are currently in a draft form. So we'll call upon those people drafting and go through those. And then after that, one in particular that we spoke about last week was the public comment consideration for the proposed renewal of the registry agreement for the .xxx top-level domain. Michael Polage gave us a long update last week. We can continue, as we said, we ran out of time somehow. We can continue some of the discussion here. Michael will provide us with a quick update.

And then after that, preparations for ICANN 80, the policy issues for discussion. Jonathan Zuck will take us through these. Yes, it's time to prepare. There's very little time until the June meeting. It comes very, very fast indeed. And we're already in April. And then afterwards, we'll have any other business. So that's what we have so far. Now is the time if you wish to deal with any other topics or add or amend the agenda, now's the time to put your hand up.

I'm not seeing any hands up for changing the agenda. So it's adopted as currently is on the screen. And so that takes us to our last week's action items. And you will notice that there are no relevant action items that remain unfinished. So everything was relating to this week. Andrew Chen did share the draft applicant support program handbook public comment statement on the CPWG for final review. And of course, we've got today's call. Are there any comments on the action items? Not seeing any hands up. Okay. Well, fine. Well, then let's progress to our next agenda item. And that's going to be an announcement from Jonathan Zuck. And I think you'll probably know what that is about. But over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. Yeah, probably it's not a huge surprise. But I'm sure all of you saw the email from Hadia this past week that she's stepping down as the co-chair of the CPWG to really focus in on some outreach and engagement activities in AFRALO, as well as pursuing some other areas in terms of security, et cetera. But she will continue to be an active participant in the CPWG as a drafter and pen holder. So we all thank Hadia for her excellent work as co-chair of the CPWG.

Also, the other half of this announcement is that Avri Doria has agreed to become the new co-chair of the CPWG. Most of you know Avri from the many fora in which she has participated, most recently as a member of the board, but also a very diligent participant in these calls over the past couple of years. And she was, in fact, a past chair of one of the committees that was consolidated into the Consolidated Policy Working Group. So she's no stranger to the At-Large community and to the work

that we do. And we're really excited that she's agreed to join Olivier as a co-chair of the CPWG. I don't know if you want to say hello at this moment, Avri. I don't mean to put you on the spot, but welcome aboard.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. And thanks. Yeah, I've never minded being put on the spot, but now I've actually accepted an offer to always be put on the spot. So I think that's good. I really hope that I can do well following Hadia and her work on this. It really is a sort of long circle coming home. When I first showed up at an ICANN meeting, it was the At-Large at the time that took me in. I eventually ended up going different paths, so it's kind of cool to be here. I have followed this all the way through. I tried to never miss a meeting of this one when I was on the board, because I think this is the most important of many meetings that go on and one of the most informative that ICANN does. So as a renewbee coming back into the community, I'm really grateful that you asked me. I hope to do good, and I'll shut up now.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Excellent. Thanks so much. And that said, Olivier, I'll pass the microphone back to you to head back into the agenda. Thanks, everyone, and thanks, Avri.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. And my really big thanks to Hadya for having been a co-chair, colleague on this working group. It's been an

absolute pleasure to work, and on the occasions that I was not able to do things or things went wrong and so on, she was always there and always has been following the policy schedules very, very closely indeed, and I'm glad that she's still around, because we're still going to need much input from her. So it's not an adieu, it's not even an au revoir, it's see you on the internet, see you shortly. So welcome to Avri. I'm thrilled to be able to work with you, and yeah, welcome, and I think you already know this place a little bit, this madhouse, and yeah, ICANN is not new to you, so I'm really looking forward to benefit from your experience and learning more things, actually, which is a great thing that we do in this organization. So just for the idea, when I joined ICANN, Avri was actually chair of the GNSO council at the time, so that tells you how much experience she has. That's quite some time ago.

Anyway, so I guess we can move on, and we can get going on our call, and the next agenda item is going to be the workgroup and small team updates, and the first one is about the transfer policy review policy development process, the TPR/PDP, and Steinar Grotterod is going to take us through this. He has 25 minutes for that. Over to you, Steinar.

STEINAR GROTTROD:

Okay, thank you very much, everybody, and I'd also like to say thank you for all the good work that Hadi has done, and welcome, Avri, because, well, we need all the clever people in the world to deal with the challenges here. Well, this is kind of an ending phase of quite a long discussion in the GNSO transfer policy PDP working group about the change of the registrant policy, which is per today included in the

transfer policy, and it creates a lot of problems, both for ICANN compliance, and also for the registrars.

So, we have kind of reached some recommendations, and the group was asked to give the feedback from the different stakeholders to these recommendations in the four different categories. The first one category is a recommendation that you can live with, but that you can live with as it is, and the second one is you can live with it, but prefer change. The third one is a grammatical edit, and the last one is that you really support it as it is.

What I have done is that I have made my proposals and distributed that to the CPWG email list, but I have also updated the Google Doc based on yesterday's meeting. So, my idea is that we first... Now, let me go back a little bit. My idea is that we have this discussion now, and the object is that everybody should make their comment into the Google Doc if they disagree or agree upon, and then I can take the rest of the week to tailor that into the form that we were asked to respond to by the ICANN staff and the chair of the working group.

So, let's go to page number nine. No, page number 13. That is what I recommend that we keep as it is, because it's, in my view, definitely in line with my thinking, and I think it's also in line with the end user and the registrant thinking. The first recommendation is maybe cosmetic, but it's kind of relevant, is that we change it. There's an updated change of registrant data, and this is all about the process when the end user updates some of the registration data for their domain name. This has been triggered based on what they updated, if it was an email address and so on, maybe the name and the organization name. This, in the

present policy, has triggered a transfer lock, meaning that you may end up with a scenario that you get some notification from your sponsoring registrar, "Please update the data of your domain name registration data," and then you end up in some sort of a lock. But you would feel like a lock, you can't transfer it to another registrar for whatever reason. And that's what has created the big, big problem. And due to the GDPR and all the privacy things, the registration data has to be accurate and updated on a regular basis.

So I recommend that, well, I don't see any problem in changing it to change of registrant data. That's the recommendation one. Recommendation two is that the working group actually proposed to take this change of registrant data out of the transfer policy and establish a new policy that is not included in the updated transfer policy. I agree with that. First of all, because the majority of the ccTLDs handle this in a different way than the gTLDs. And the registrars should be capable to handle updates from the customers in a good way. We don't need a detailed process, a policy made by ICANN for the Gs, especially for the Gs. That's my view. But if so, that will become a new policy or it will be modified and still be in the transfer policy. There is a set of recommendations that how these things should happen. I think that's logic and it's good. We can live with that. So that's okay. I support that.

And also the recommendation 3.2, that's the more detailed things about what should be included in this notification that is sent to the entity that updated the data. Maybe it's the new registrant or the former registrant anyway. But it's also including a process how to revert if this was done by mistake. So I think it's okay. I think the wording is okay. I can't see

any problems in the way it's been described. And I find the logic behind this very clear. So that's it. Let's have comment on this section and then we can go into the next session.

So let's go back to the next thing that my recommendation is that we can live with it, but let's try to change it a little bit. So the problem here is that the working group proposed a mandatory notification whenever there is a change of registration data. That means that if you change your email address for what reason, you will have a notification about that change. But the recommendation, the working group also recommend that the registrar can make an opt-out feature for individuals, for each of the clients that they will not receive notification if there is a change of registration data.

Two weeks ago, I paid notice to Jim Galvin, the guy from Digital Identity. He's a security specialist. He was kind of afraid that both this opt-out of removing the notification and also what we're coming to is the transfer lock when there is a completed transfer. And that is also being removed. He considered that to be extremely dangerous seen from a security point of view. And that is one of the things that really has created problems in the discussion in the working group because there are so many different business models among the registrars. And some registrars actually see problems in handling this opt-out feature as the working group proposed, both in programming and also in the audit trail. If the wording will be that there is a way to opt-out for the notification, ICANN compliance can actually ask for audit and detailed information about how each and one customer has agreed to this. And that can make a problem for the registrar in both in coding and also in operational issues. And again, it's the security issues.

The opt-out of notification has been very edgy in the sense that there are some really, really edge cases where the notification doesn't make any sense at all. My thinking is that maybe this can be done in a different way than making it in the policy that it is possible to have the opt-out. I'm not sure about how that has been done. But also having said that, the majority of the registrar are saying that we will not spend time and money to enable that kind of features. We will put it straightforward all edited, all updates of the registration data will be notified as according to the policy, no opt-out feature.

So if you're going down a little bit down to the next one, next page please on this screen. Here we come to the recommendation 17. And this one that is also James Galvin mentioned in particular is that when there has been a successful transfer to a new registrar, we agreed in phase 1a to reduce the lock period from 60 days to 30 days. In the present policy, there is also a requirement if there has been a change of registration data, this will trigger a 60 days lock. And here it is a proposal to change that to a 30 days post change of registrar lock, post transfer lock.

But the working group until last evening kind of agreed that there may be an option for the registrar to enable opt-out of this. But based on yesterday's discussion, I think the consensus is more in that there shouldn't be any possibility for any registrar to remove that 30 days post transfer lock. And it is based on security issues and also element of fighting DNS abuse, preventing registrar hopping with a certain domain name that is suspicious and will harm the internet in many ways.

So maybe this recommendation 17 should not go into this category that we can live with but prefer to change it. But maybe put it into the category, this is something that we should stick forward as can't accept as long as the registrar has the option to remove the 30 days transfer lock for an inter-registrar transfer. So I hope that this is understandable for everybody. And I really welcome some comments here. I hope that I will have some feedback that I can put into the Google Doc, distribute that to the mailing list and give a large point of view within the deadline of April 9th, that's next week. This is not written in stone. We still have the option when it comes into public comment, et cetera. But it's the first take and the working group actually want to have some sort of feedback from the stakeholders, whether they are on track, whether we have some sort of consensus. So I open the floor, I hope for some good comments. Michael Palage, please go ahead.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Thank you. So I will try to read through this documentation over the weekend and get you some comments early next week. I agree with you, Steinar, that ICANN should be about promoting competition, innovation and being respectful of the various business models. Although I would like to call attention to one of the comments that Louis Touton, ICANN's original general counsel said that has always resonated. ICANN is about protecting competition, not about protecting individual competitors. And I think that's important as we look at any final recommendations.

So I do agree with Jim about some of the security concerns about allowing an opt-out. And I guess my question here, I wonder if you could

address this because I haven't seen it addressed and I apologize if I've missed this, but can you explain how a change in registrant notification would go and how that plays out in connection with the current secondary market? So when a domain name, if a registrant chooses not to renew, there is the grace period, registrars generally try to auction off these names. So during that time, is there a change of registrant occurring there? How is that notification taking place? Because I have seen a number of lawsuits regarding hijacked domain names, and I'm just worrying about how this safeguard potentially or a safety net could be included. So any insight there on how this change of notification will work out, say pre- or post-sale of a domain name?

STEINAR GROTTNEROD:

Thank you, Michael. You always ask such difficult questions. I'll try to answer that. First of all, the secondary market has been referred to, some of the cases regarding notification. I'm not familiar with it and how the different registrars handle this when a domain name has expired, whether they take the control of it to try to sell it on the secondary market. If that's the case, I assume they update the record of the registration data to make it more controllable for the purpose of selling that domain name that has not been renewed. I guess that in some cases will have triggered legal action because the domain name can be seen as stolen.

But again, that is an edge case. Whether this opt-out will prevent bad business models for those registrars who are dealing with these kinds of things, I'm not sure. Honestly, I am not sure. I hope that maybe that is something that I can put into the working group to get some better

understanding. But let me ask you, do you believe that the problem will be less if we remove the possibility for any registrars to reduce or not send out notification? Michael, can you have some comment on that?

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Sure. Michael for the record. What I will do, Steinar, is I will read through this in great detail. And John has been including some comments in the chat. So this is something that I will look at and will provide some comments early next week regarding the potential scenario. So instead of trying to read the document and wasting everyone's time, again, this is just a question I had. It is something I have seen pop up in a number of cases. And that was kind of top of mind. And again, the reason I was asking this, and perhaps you could speak to this, when I did attend these calls, this call was generally primarily dominated by contracting parties. Has that mix changed? I know it was mostly contracting parties on these calls. Has that mix changed any or is it still that imbalance or domination?

STEINAR GROTTEROD:

I think it's the registrars that have taken the time in the discussions. The change of registration data is not particularly of value for the registries because they consider this as purely the registrar's and their clients' area of responsibility. Some other stakeholders have also been vocal. I have tried to be vocal to get a better understanding of how the different business models work today, how this has been taken in operation today. But I think this has been more of a playground for the registrars.

And it still is that kind of section of the policy that we have spent two months on. Can I give the word back to Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to ask a question, because we've been going around this discussion over 30 days for quite some time and it's come back quite regularly. I'm totally unaware of the domain name market. Is there a requirement for domain names to be transferred very, very quickly and at this amazing speed? Because 30 days seems to be, we're seeing reasons for the 30-day post-change registration. There's quite a number of reasons. And here there seems to be some opposition to that, to try and flip domain names faster than that. I'm getting this wrong. What's the point of it?

STEINAR GROTTOROD: The initial transfer lock of the registration is per today 60 days and is now being proposed to be 30 days. That is maybe to be seen that the registrar has the possibility to collect the fees and establish a relationship, etc. When you transfer domain names, if the domain name is eligible for transfer, and if that succeeds, it will go into a post-transfer lock that is now being proposed to reduce from 60 to 30 days. More or less on the same reason. There are some openings in the present policy as far as I understand. If this was a total mistake, for whatever reason, there is an opening for the domain name to be transferred back to the original registrar before the actual 30 days has taken, you can do that. But the basic idea here is that there should be time for the registrar to establish the contact, establish routines and payments, and also make sure that there is no domain hopping in a sense that trying to avoid a

registration fee. Remember, when you transfer a domain name, it's been added one year to the life cycle of that domain name. You should pay some fees for that anyway. Hopefully that answers your question, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've asked exactly the opposite question. I totally agree with why it's needed. Now the question is, why is it not needed? Why would they want to reduce this even further?

STEINAR GROTTROD: Because of some edge cases. In the proposed wording here, it's something called established relationships. This is some phrase that ICANN compliance has really asked us to, if you want to have that in a policy, please define it in a proper way that we can actually make sure that this revert of a domain name or a new transfer of a domain name before the 30 days period can be done because there is an established relationship. I don't understand established relationship. If you have a relationship with the new registrar for 30 days, then you are in the category of established relationship. But if you have a 30-day period, then you are free to transfer it whenever you like without any pre-definition of established relationship. If you already have a relationship with your new registrar, why did you actually transfer in your domain name to that registrar if you were not happy with that registrar? I don't get it. It doesn't make sense to me. But again, it's the edge cases that some registrars think this is important for us because we take care of high-value clients that definitely need to have the freedom and don't

see the 30 days as a necessary period of lock. I can't give you more detail about it, but it's the edge cases.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. Very helpful. Very interesting.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Any other questions? I see a comment from Judith here in the chat. Several end users who did not realize they used companies who did not register them properly and did not know where they were transferred. Yeah. That is a scenario that is very hard to... Because here, there are some bad actors. They're actually registering domain names not as they should do. How to deal with that? The way here is that the registrars are obliged to send out a notification for WHOIS data reminder policy on a regular basis at least one time a year and ask for confirmation from each registrant about the registration data. But if the registration data is incorrectly registered when the domain name was registered, then you're in a loop that the correct registrant will not receive the data or this reminder. That's the problem. I do agree that the domain owner should take some responsibility here. We have a long way to teach the end users about the value asset they have with a domain name. That is something that we should pay attention to.

I don't see any hands. For the closing here, I urge everybody to review the Google Doc, make your comment. If you want to have write access, just ask for it in the Google Doc. By the end of this week, Monday, next week at the latest, I will distribute the version that I will present to the GNSO TPR meeting on Tuesday next week. Thank you for your time and

everything. Let's hope that we can do this in due time. Thank you. Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steinar. If I could ask as an action item to also make a call on the mailing list for input on this and let people go and comment the Google Doc. I know Justine asks whether the Google Doc is set to comment only at the moment.

STEINAR GROTTROD: The Google Doc is for commenting only for the time being. If you want to have read access or write access, just ask for it and I will approve it immediately. I would like to have the comment and then I will implement it with a new version, distribute that to the Consolidated Policy Working Group email list, both in the PDF and the link to the Google Doc so everybody could have a chance to put that on their agenda within Monday next week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steinar. Yes, much cleaner to do it with comments so you can track things more easily. Great. Thank you for this. We can now move to our next small group and team update and that's going to be the expedited policy development process on IDN. For this we have a short update from Satish Babu.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much, Olivier. This is Satish, for the record. This is a status update on behalf of my colleagues Hadia and Abdulkarim and me. So the phase two of the EPDP on IDN is drawing to a close. There was one outstanding issue. This was relating to IDN table harmonization at the second level. The whole phase two was at the second, of the second level and this is about a particular technical issue because the staff paper had recommended that there should be harmonization basically for security and stability reasons. But when we discussed the harmonization issue in the group, the team, there was some pushback from registries and to a lesser extent from registrars. Their point was that, which is quite valid actually, it takes significant effort and cost to, you know, kind of implement a single unified system of IDN table harmonization.

So to kind of break this difference of opinion, a small group was formed consisting of registry, registrars and IDN staff. They had to meet about three to four times to kind of hammer out a kind of compromise language. So the news currently is that that compromise has been achieved. The rest of the team had basically left it to the small group because we said, look, this is, and for example, from the At-Large side, this is not too much of an end user issue. The end user issue is concerned with security and stability. And once that's taken care of, we don't really have any kind of anything to say on the internal workings of registries. So we had actually signed off, but now last week we have been informed that the small group has achieved consensus on how to handle this. And the basic idea is to not put any language into the recommendation that binds down the registry operators to any single way of doing things. That means as long as the baseline criteria of

security and stability is achieved, we don't really say how they should be doing it, what kind of strategy they should use. And as it is, different registries are following different strategies. So we are just letting them continue, not saying that they have to ensure that it is effective harmonization, but we leave it to you to decide how best to do it.

Also, there are some dependencies about this. So for example, IDNA 2008, IDNA implementation guidelines, and any future versions of these documents. So the implementation guidance for this C5 charter question basically also says that there should be a kind of joint working party of ICANN Org registries and other relevant stakeholders to develop minimum IDN deployment requirements, for example, variant sets. So as of now, the final preliminary text of the phase two is supposed to be published for the IDN EPDP team members today, later today. And the idea is that the team takes a week to examine the full report. And by 11th of April, we publish it for public comments. And with that, we will, phase two also will be kind of public comments and we are gradually moving towards the end of the whole EPDP journey, which started up some three years back.

There is still some work. The board had put out the phase one report for public comments a couple of months back. We do not know whether any—ALAC had submitted a comment, but it did not come to the EPDP itself. So there may be a few other comments also, in which case we will, after this is published for public comments, we will take up those responses that we receive and try to close phase one at the earliest and then come back to phase two and complete it. So I'll stop here. If Hadia or Abdulkarim wants to add on anything, they are most welcome.

Hadia, do you want to add anything? I'm not able to hear Hadia. So Olivier back to you. This is just a status update. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. Thanks for the update. Not seeing any hands up. That means we can move on to our next agenda item. And so, as I mentioned, there are no other workgroup and small team updates on this occasion, but I know of as of now. And that means we can go straight to our policy statement pipeline. And on this occasion, since it is the first call of Avri, first call as I guess a co-chair, I'm not going to dump this on her right away, but we can do it with Andrew Chen and myself. And so I think I can give the floor over to Andrew to take us through what we have at the moment.

ANDREW CHEN: Thanks, Olivier. This is Andrew for the record. So recently ratified, we had the ASP draft handbook that was recently published. And then we have several, a couple different statements that are open. The first one is the string similarity review guidelines, which will be going through a vote after this call. Then there are the [inaudible] handbook, which we have decided not to comment on along with the registry system testing, which [inaudible] decided to not be commenting on.

Lastly, we have the renewal of the registry agreement for the .xxx TLD, which Michael will provide a short brief update for us on after the section here. We have a couple different timelines. These are proposed timelines for getting these public comments published and drafted, though I will work with Michael offline to see if that current timeline

works for him. Other than that, that's it for the public comment updates. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Andrew. Just a quick small question here. The first one, the ALAC advice on contention resolution in the next round does not have a public comment close. Is that because it's just according to our own speed?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, there isn't currently a public comment down. It's just a conversation that we're having and that we've had with the board and with the GAC and continuing to try to get to a place where we can coordinate a joint advice to the GAC to really minimize, if not eliminate, private conflict resolution in the next round. In our last meeting with the board, we talked about how this issue gets continually watered down every time it comes up. We're trying to revisit the joint advice and the big reaction recommendation that we had already approved in this group, but working to coordinate with fleshing that out and coordinating with the GAC. There's no dates on it because it's not a public comment. It's like us initiating advice.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. I think that the last time I asked about it, I also pointed out that the Google Doc is currently locked as such. You mentioned this would be opened up once there was more progress with the GAC. Is that correct?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. We'll try to open it back up this week or so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you. Thanks for the update on this. Now, on the string similarity review guidelines, as you know, we are starting the ALAC votes tomorrow. Would Bill or Alan or anyone want to say anything at all on this? I'm not seeing any hands up. I know that there's another call also going on now. Okay. Probably not, but I guess we are on the final statement, which has been published today. I invite you all to have a look at the actual statement that's there. If you do see something completely out of line, then shout out to Bill or Alan on this.

Then finally, we've got, of course, the proposed renewal of the registry agreement on the .xxx top level domain. That is one which we're going to be dealing with in a second when we have a separate agenda item for this. Just mentioning the upcoming public comment proceedings, the one that works with the CPWG is the initial report of the EPDP on internationalized domain names. As you've heard from Satish Babu, they are completing their work. What we probably will do when this opens up is to have one of our team members who were involved on this project, and I think you can call it a project in such a huge chunk of work, to take us through it and provide us with a summarized set of points and maybe point us as a community to things that might be of importance to At-Large. With no further lingering in this particular agenda item, let's go down to agenda item six, the absence of any hands up from anyone on the screen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, I think Michael was going to give us a little bit of an update on the .xxx.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, that's agenda item number six. He's got his own agenda item. Lucky him. Public comment consideration for proposed renewal of the registry agreement for .xxx top-level domain. Over to you, Michael Palage.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Thank you, Olivier. This update will be quick. I continue to engage in fact-finding and other data gathering. As I had mentioned on, I think, the CPWG mailing list over the weekend, I have submitted a complaint to ICANN Compliance in a personal capacity raising a number of the questions that I had raised last week. I have not yet received a response other than the initial automated, we've received your complaint.

The second thing I have done is I have reached out to IFFOR, which is the current sponsoring organization for the .xxx TLD, asking a number of inquiries. They have acknowledged receipt. They have not yet responded. I have begun to draft an initial response along the lines of those points raised in the deck last week. Unfortunately, was not able to make as much progress as I would like. I guess the question, I've already reached out to Jonathan. I'm going to run an initial draft, obviously, by him before anything is posted on the wiki or shared more broadly. If there is anyone else that would like to lend a hand in the initial drafting, I always appreciate a second set of eyes and a different perspective.

That would be welcome. Otherwise, I believe we will be in a position next week to have a more detailed discussion. I would ask for a larger block of time next week to go into that deeper. Back to you, Olivier, unless there are any other questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Justine has put her hand up.

JUSTINE CHEW: I was putting my hand up to volunteer to help Michael.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Excellent, Justine. I will reach out to you shortly after this call, sharing what I have been doing in more detail and initial draft and greatly appreciate your extra set of eyes and hands and helping draft this response.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Michael. I do have a question of a more general nature. Looking at the longer trend, I do recall the ICANN board mentioning that, and not only board but staff also, mentioning that they wanted to harmonize the registry agreements so as to have a single type of agreement that fits all and everything and not just customized agreements for some top-level domain. How does this relate to the .XXX because it seems this one is treated a bit differently from the others?

MICHAEL PALAGE:

If you go back and look at the deck that I had shared last week, I think it was the third slide, what I did is I gave an entire breakdown of all of the TLDs from the 2004 sponsored round. One of the things that is interesting is every TLD from that round that has renegotiated its contract has taken the original appendix S, which was the sponsorship criteria, and have incorporated that into the new spec 12 of the baseline registry agreement. For those that may not recall or may not know, spec 12 is generally the specification that applicants in the 2012 round that requested a community designation has followed. That is what ICANN has generally been doing to take those legacy agreements, particularly from the 2004 sponsored round, to integrate them into the new baseline agreement.

Now, what is being proposed in connection with ICM Registry is that they do not have a spec 12. Instead, there are a select handful of restrictions that are being incorporated into spec 11. So this is something that I think, and which, you know, Justine and I will detail next week in more detail. So hopefully that addresses your concern about how the ICANN is moving forward with that view of harmonizing or creating a common contractual approach. Does that answer your question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

That would be unusual, or would that be able to set a precedent and then be used for other similar TLDs?

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So the one exception where ICANN has deviated, the only one that I was able to find from the 2004 round was in connection with dotMobi. And just a quick disclaimer, I originally had worked with dotMobi directly and then obviously with some of the work that I did with Afiliat after they purchased dotMobi.

What was interesting about dotMobi when they changed the original application was back in 2004, was in a world pre-smartphone, back when we had BlackBerrys. So the original dotMobi had restrictions on content guides, on what would come in as what would be visually appealing for a small screen with limited bandwidth. Obviously, as we all know, based upon the phones we're carrying around in our pockets now, there's been a substantial change since 2004. That, to me, is the only change. I was not involved in those contract renegotiations, so as part of the due diligence, I will go back and look at any other changes that happened in connection with dotMobi. But basically, almost every other TLD except for Post, which has not yet come up for renewal, has basically taken their Appendix S and translated that into a Spec 12.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Michael. Olivier speaking. And yes, I was going to think about dotMobi. At the time, I remember the ALAC did comment on some of the specs that they wanted to actually change. I think some of the restrictions that they wanted lifted. So there might actually also be something about dotMobi in our own ALAC archives, just to see what we discussed back then.

MICHAEL PALAGE: And Olivier, if you could, I think that would be important to look at those historical documents as well, to see our concerns and to hopefully have consistency in messaging.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Thank you very much. Not seeing any other hands. So thank you for the update, Michael. We look forward to a further update next week. And now we're going to turn to our next meeting, but not the next CPWG meeting, no, the next ICANN meeting, ICANN 80. And Jonathan Zuck is going to take us through policy issues for discussion. And there's a link in the agenda that already points us to the draft schedule and topics. The link does not allow us to access it, unfortunately. So something might need to be dealt with.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, this is just the general sort of crossover check-in. We have so many different calls and overlap between them in terms of participants, but not 100% overlap. And so it seemed prudent to remind folks on this call that the meeting in Kigali is a short meeting and very much focused on policy. So if you go through the table here, once it is available to everyone, then you'll see that it's a lot of discussion about policy-related issues as this gets filled out. We've had just the first meeting of the ICANN 80 planning committee and are looking at what issues are coming into the general eye here.

We're not determined necessarily to have our own plenary. If all the discussions that need to take place are taking place, again, because of the size of this meeting, we'll be more focused, I think, on trying to

participate in the meetings that are already taking place. But it is something about which to be vigilant. If there's something that we really do need to focus the community on across constituencies and advisory committees, then we might once again propose our own session. But there's not a need to do one. There's not slots that need filling or anything like that. But as we're looking through this, we'll continue to have discussions about topics that need to be discussed.

At the top of the list, we have mostly things related to the next round, although there are some sort of floating, ongoing conversations about WSIS+20 and continuous improvement and the pilot holistic review. If you're interested in those things, I really recommend that you begin attending the OFB working group. That's where some of these conversations about how ICANN itself could improve structurally and be more fit for purpose, but also At-Large and what we might do differently and to become fit for purpose as well. So all those things are ongoing discussions. So that OFB call is tomorrow. And while I expect to see all of the ALAC there, I'm hoping to see everyone who has an interest in the role that At-Large plays inside of ICANN. So really just a reminder that it's a short policy-focused meeting, and we're going to just be vigilant about what things are being discussed. We're concerned about contention resolutions, as I suggested, DNS abuse, IDNs, and applicant support primarily. And those are the big topics for us. And so we're going to try to participate in the conversations that are happening around the ICANN community through the volunteers we have there. There are some ongoing things. Steinar's group on transfer policy is still going on. There's still some issues related to the strings and things like that and diacritics that still need to happen. So we're trying to see if

those are going to be ready to happen in time for the June meeting, which is coming up quickly.

But that's it. I wanted to just alert you to the policy-focused nature of the next meeting. Feel free to come and attend the ICANN 80 Planning Committee meeting. And I also want to focus you in on some important conversations that are taking place in the OFB call that takes place tomorrow. So please feel free to join us there. And with that, I'm happy to pass it back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And just to mention that Andrew has put the link to the next OFB call into the chat. I think everybody is allowed to go on that call, isn't it? So everyone is welcome.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you. I'm not seeing any other hands up. So thanks for taking us into this. You see, there's still some time until ICANN 80, but it's good to start early, especially with those sessions. Right. That's it for this session. And it looks as though we've reached the end of the agenda for today, which is pretty good. We've got some spare time. Let's go into any other business. Not seeing any other hands up.

Now, unfortunately, today, one of the reasons why we have a light agenda is several people did get called up on another call that has

clashed with this one. We're going to try and work out a way to avoid this in the future. So not everyone has to do what Cheryl does, which is to be on two, three, four calls at the same time. Quite hard to focus. The other call has finished. Okay. Well, great. Well, this one might finish as well very soon. CIP CWG. Yeah, 12 of us in the other call. So there you go. Anyway, so not seeing any other hands up. Let's find out when our next call will take place.

YESHIM SAGLAM: Thank you, Olivier. So according to the rotation, next week's call will be on Wednesday at 19:00 UTC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. And as you know, there has been a change in time for summertime in some parts of the world. So we will also check if that causes clashes for—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It shouldn't make any difference at all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, it depends if other people shift their calls around. That's why.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Our calls always should be, as you well know from my very biased view, stuck in UTC. Because yes, some of you are going into summertime.

Some of us in some hemispheres are doing the opposite. We're coming out of summertime and we're not bitching and moaning about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, you seem to be quite upset that you're going to be cold in the next few months, where other parts of the world are going to get warmer. Anyway, no worries. Amrita Choudhury.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Olivier. Just wanted to raise that perhaps many may be celebrating Eid that day. So would you be having the call? Perhaps you could think of it because there are others also here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Amrita. That's a good point. We actually have been trying to avoid having to change calls and so on because of religious or local holidays. It's been a bit hard on that. One of the problems is because it's all a puzzle, once you start moving one, everything else has to move as well. I would say we can continue. We'll have the call in the usual times. Of course, there's always a recording and it's not a requirement, I think, except for ALAC members. That's something for Jonathan to check out if ALAC members that are Muslim faith might get their day off if they have to be on the call. But I would say we continue to plow on with the same date and there's always a recording afterwards to catch up. But thanks for pointing it out. On that day, I will wish a happy Eid.

But today, we're reaching the end of this call. So I'd like to thank everyone for having helped us through it, especially our interpreters and the real-time text transcriber. Follow up on the mailing list. There are a lot of things going on, as you know. Please comment and get ready for next week. We'll have some bumper updates from our participants. Until then, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night. Next week, we'll be co-chairing with Avri. So you won't have to listen to me for too long. Thank you so much. Bye for now.

YESIM SAGLAM:

Thank you all very much. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]