

# Zoom Chat: 2021-09-29 At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG)

07:55:34 From Evin Erdogdu - ICANN org to Everyone:  
Hello all, welcome

07:56:03 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
Hi Devan

07:56:14 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
Morning/afternoon/evening all

08:00:05 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
If anyone has been following the Epik registrar hack, it seems to have been a complete compromise and also involved about 1.4 million WHOIS records. Creditcard data of registrants was also released.

08:00:24 From Priyatosh Jana to Everyone:  
hi everyone

08:01:15 From Heidi Ullrich to Everyone:  
Welcome, All.

08:01:17 From alberto soto to Everyone:  
Thanks, hi everyone!

08:01:38 From Lilian Deluque to Everyone:  
Good morning everyone

08:01:55 From Bill Jouris to Everyone:  
@John, are those WHOIS records? Or records that WHOUS would use to generate a response?

08:02:08 From Betty Fausta to Everyone:  
@John if you have a official link or article you can share

08:02:27 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@Bill The had been scraping WHOIS data.

08:02:28 From Betty Fausta to Everyone:  
amazing but bit a surprise. eat privacy is an urgent issue

08:03:28 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@Betty The hashtag #EpikFail has a lot of data on Twitter. There's a bit of politics but some accounts have been posting analysis of the data. Basically 180GB of data was released.

08:05:16 From Gopal Tadepalli to Everyone:  
Greetings. - Dr. T V Gopal, Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, College of Engineering, Guindy Campus, Anna University , Chennai, INDIA.

08:06:22 From Lianna Galstyan to Everyone:  
Hi everyone

08:06:45 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
Hi all

08:07:00 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
sorry we were on the IDN small team call

08:07:07 From Satish Babu to Everyone:  
Hi all

08:07:26 From Devan Reed - ICANN Org to Everyone:  
Welcome!

08:09:49 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
Does the GAC want to extend the definition of DNS Abuse to cover content abuse?

08:11:35 From Steinar Grøtterød to Everyone:  
@John: There is a "standard" response from ICANN Board on this: Content is not within the remit of ICANN.

08:12:14 From Michael Palage to Everyone:  
Can you expand on the "unhappiness" of minority reports?

08:12:54 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@That's a relief, Steinar. Otherwise it would be repeating years of discussions about DNS Abuse.

08:14:41 From Chokri Ben Romdhane to Everyone:  
hi all

08:15:19 From Raymond Mamattah to Everyone:  
Our prayers are with the Spanish colleagues.

08:17:55 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@CW Agree on the time issue. It would never get beyond point 1 with all the interpretations of DNS Abuse.

08:21:12 From avri doria to Everyone:  
Not the case, it has been looked at, but the looking &c, has not been completed.

08:23:05 From Olivier Crépin-Leblond to Everyone:  
Google Doc - needs access

08:23:26 From Evin Erdogdu - ICANN org to Everyone:  
Hello all, please see Google Doc for comment: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fzOhfFpPpDbyRvn67By76ZhZwUfi5KbwCtuijnTcnl/edit?usp=sharing>

08:24:00 From Olivier Crépin-Leblond to Everyone:  
ah ok - the one on the agenda asked for access

08:24:05 From christopher wilkinson to Everyone:  
@Mike Palage: I have argued that ALAC and GAC advice endeavours to take account of a much wider constituency of interests. Not a Minority.

08:24:11 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@JZ It might be a good thing to have some knowledge of the Epik databreach as it might come up. Lots of privacy issues with approx. 110K people affected.

08:24:27 From Justine Chew to Everyone:  
@CW, we have also offered to speak to, bilaterally, with the relevant Board reps in regards to ALAC's Advice on SubPro to help expedite their consideration, also if we can help to reconcile with our advice with that of other ACs. "SubPro hasn't fallen off my desk", not yet, at least.

08:25:17 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@JZ This was just a bit of planning to have a knowledge of the situation rather than have a consensus position on it.

08:25:31 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:

@JZ Just in case it comes up.  
08:27:06 From christopher wilkinson to Everyone:  
Thus I do not accept that the calculus is based only on the individual participation in the PDP. For my part, see my comments on the SubPro PDP which I designate as DISSENTING, Not 'minority'. CW  
08:28:45 From christopher wilkinson to Everyone:  
@Justine: THankyou. Let's keep this high on the Board's agenda.  
08:28:45 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
ok makes sense  
08:33:17 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
ok thank you  
08:35:30 From Sivasubramanian M to Everyone:  
apologies for joining late today.  
08:40:32 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
So those wonderful people who gave the world GDPR have broken yet another part of the Internet?  
08:40:56 From Roberto to Everyone:  
or that when the winning registrar sends notifications they put the losing registrar in copy  
08:42:35 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@Roberto Yep. A possible solution to get the losing registrar to confirm transfer to the registrant's e-mail on record.  
08:43:30 From Lianna Galstyan to Everyone:  
That's an option, yes  
08:43:59 From Roberto to Everyone:  
@JMcC the beginning of the (risk of) the breaking of the Internet is the pushed commercialisation of the information, that the Internet was not built for supporting, not the legal reactions of the different governments who try to support their jurisdiction  
08:44:53 From Roberto to Everyone:  
not that I am happy with GDPR, but I insist that the very reason for having it is the fact that for decades some concerns were not listened to, so the reaction comes  
08:45:03 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@Roberto Bad things happen when politicians get involved in things they don't understand. Still remember Ronald Regan's description of those most terrifying words a business person can hear. :)  
08:45:22 From Chokri Ben Romdhane to Everyone:  
I personally think that the Notification number 4 may be executed by gaining registrar , since he is only one that could confirm the success of the transfer process  
08:45:58 From Roberto to Everyone:  
the problem is that the people who understand the Internet have disregarded legitimate concerns to favour the business  
08:46:01 From Chokri Ben Romdhane to Everyone:  
based on contract or payment confirmation  
08:46:38 From Roberto to Everyone:  
Correction: not "people who understand the Internet", but specifically ICANN  
08:46:55 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@Roberto And the world is multiple jurisdictions so there are always unintended side-effects.  
08:47:35 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
@Roberto SIDN's blog post on NIS2 is even more terrifying than GDPR.  
08:48:34 From Roberto to Everyone:  
Sure @JMcC - that's where a multi-stakeholder model comes to play, to minimise the side effects that the complex reality can bring  
08:50:08 From Justine Chew to Everyone:  
@Steinar, but if the registrant gives consent / authority to facilitate his/her/its own data, then it shouldn't breach the GDPR, no?  
08:50:42 From Justine Chew to Everyone:  
\*to facilitate his/her/its own data being provided....  
08:51:13 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
@Justine I assume consent part won't be approved by the VPs  
08:51:19 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
CPs  
08:51:36 From Justine Chew to Everyone:  
Why not?  
08:52:18 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
I meant "the consent" part  
08:53:05 From Justine Chew to Everyone:  
You're saying CPs won't allow registrants to give consent?  
08:53:23 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
@justine maybe if they see benefits to them in it they could agree  
08:56:40 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
only 17% think no  
08:56:53 From Justine Chew to Everyone:  
@Hadia, let Steinar and Daniel deal with the question  
08:57:12 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
@Justien sure - this is what they need to do  
08:57:26 From Jonathan Zuck to Everyone:  
I guess part of the issue is that they are all "passive" notifications that could end up in spam, rather than an affirmative confirmation  
08:57:57 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
+1 Alan makes sense  
08:58:07 From Lianna Galstyan to Everyone:  
+1  
08:58:07 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://hosterstats.com) to Everyone:  
+1 Alan  
08:58:31 From Justine Chew to Everyone:  
+1 Alan, correct.  
08:58:36 From Roberto to Everyone:  
+1 @Alan  
08:59:06 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Thus if registrant willingly shares their own data with the gaining registrar .....

08:59:18 From Roberto to Everyone:

@JZ - I see your point but that is not a good enough reason for not even sending the message

08:59:41 From Michael Palage to Everyone:

@Jonathan - fair point but here is my concern. If you look at some ccTLD that have implemented digital identity into operations, Registrants are empowered and protected by these digital credentials. I am concerned about policy making that only looks at the present and potentially precludes future innovation that empowers and protects the registrants - does this make sense to you

09:00:41 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

@Siva, such transactions should be completed sequentially not together

09:01:30 From Michael Palage to Everyone:

@Jonathan - while these rules are favorable to resolve the problems facing registrars today, it potentially negatively impacts services empowering Registrants. That is why I share Alan's concerns

09:01:53 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

@Siva they should not happen simultaneously

09:02:19 From Gopal Tadepalli to Everyone:

I need to study this in the context of "Domain Locking" provisions also. - Dr. T V Gopal, Anna University, India

09:02:29 From Michael Palage to Everyone:

Need to drop for another call - will listen to balance of recording later. Good discussions

09:02:55 From Olivier Crépin-Leblond to Everyone:

dropped

09:04:38 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

Yrjo, you sound like you're packing

09:05:14 From Roberto to Everyone:

@Siva I am not sure I understand - the change is initiated by one party anyway - it can only be the registrant, so the first transfer is to the new registrant, then he/she can choose a different registrar and comply with the rules of the case, including possibly pay fees to both

09:08:19 From Roberto to Everyone:

good idea to have Ed as liaison

09:08:51 From Justine Chew to Everyone:

I believe Satish means that Donna Austin has been confirmed as Chair of the IDNs EPDP, to replace Edmon, (and not Vice Chair)

09:12:00 From Sivasubramanian M to Everyone:

@Roberto. Just a thought. When there are simultaneously two distinct transfer tasks involving two registrars and a process between that neither of them might own, it gets a little complicated, the Registrant is changed, and the Registrar is new, who does the Registrant go to in case the transfer is malicious? Another harmless point relates to the complications of two transfer tasks being executed simultaneously.

09:12:43 From Sivasubramanian M to Everyone:

@Justine, thanks.

09:14:08 From Roberto to Everyone:

@Siva I agree that we need to think about, good point, although I believe that there is one initiator, and that should determine the sequence - this said, this is just my first reaction, agree that we should think about

09:15:13 From Jonathan Zuck to Everyone:

it DOES sound odd

09:15:44 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:

Thank you Bill

09:16:04 From Satish Babu to Everyone:

Agree that it's worth commenting upon...

09:16:14 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:

@Bill with some examples please

09:17:38 From Sivasubramanian M to Everyone:

@Roberto. More like present Registrant assuming rights to insist that he (or she) would transfer the domain to the new RegistrANT in his own zone of comfort - his present Registrar's space. The Registrant transfers to the new RegistrANT, after 60 minutes or 6 days, the new RegistrANT is free to move his domain. All within the annual domain fees that the old Registrant has already paid to his old Registrar.

09:18:01 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:

We will be discussing this issue in the IDN EPDP

09:18:16 From Sivasubramanian M to Everyone:

Take delivery in 'my' premises cThen take it anywhere you like.

09:18:49 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:

.co

09:19:26 From Bill Jouris to Everyone:

@Hadia, for example, a dot above a letter and an Acute accent. Originally, those produced variants when they were above a consonant, but not if they were above a vowel. Thanks to the Greek panel, most of the vowels were covered. But there is still one vowel which is not a variant.

09:20:26 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:

Thanks Bill

09:21:01 From Bill Jouris to Everyone:

@Satish, the panel members were from the US, Sweden, Germany, Serbia, and Egypt. But nobody from the couple of hundred other languages using the script.

09:21:26 From Steinar Grøtterød to Everyone:

@Siva: FYI. A successful transfer (of a generic domains name) will always add 1 year. There is no charter question to change this

09:21:39 From Satish Babu to Everyone:

Thanks @Bill...interesting indeed...

09:23:21 From Chokri Ben Romdhane to Everyone:

Thank you all

09:26:03 From Roberto to Everyone:

John mentioned it

09:26:20 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](http://HosterStats.com) to Everyone:

It was an end-to-end compromise of an ICANN registrar.

09:26:39 From Sivasubramanian M to Everyone:

@Steiner If an unknown problem and a probable solution requires revisiting the question of renewing the domain anew, then that question also needs to be considered. If the charter questions haven't anticipated such a corollary, then there must be a way of attending to the charter midway. If there is a process, the process ought to have a process to amend it when the need arises, rather than create rigid and artificial walls.

09:28:10 From Herb Wayne Ombuds to Everyone:

Take care everyone, stay safe and be kind.  
09:28:34 From Jonathan Zuck to Everyone:  
Thanks everyone  
09:28:39 From hadia Elminiawi to Everyone:  
Thank you all bye  
09:28:45 From Evin Erdogan - ICANN org to Everyone:  
Thank you all, great meeting as always!  
09:28:46 From avri doria to Everyone:  
bye, thanks  
09:28:46 From Satish Babu to Everyone:  
Thanks and bye!  
09:28:47 From alberto soto to Everyone:  
Thanks, bye, bye!!  
09:28:54 From Roberto to Everyone:  
Bye all!  
09:28:59 From John McCormac - [HosterStats.com](https://HosterStats.com) to Everyone:  
Later all.  
09:29:02 From Alfredo Calderon (ICANN72 Mentor) to Everyone:  
Stay well and safe!  
09:29:05 From Dave Kissoondoyal to Everyone:  
Thanks and bye to all  
09:29:07 From Sarah T. Kiden to Everyone:  
Thank you  
09:29:08 From Lianna Galstyan to Everyone:  
Thanks everyone  
09:29:14 From Sivasubramanian M to Everyone:  
Thank you  
09:29:18 From Raymond Mamattah to Everyone:  
/bye