

---

ANDREA GLANDON:

Hello, and welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call held on Wednesday, the 12<sup>th</sup> of December 2018 at 19:00 UTC. On today's call, we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, John Laprise, Glenn McKnight, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Gordon Chillcott, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Holly Raiche, Eduardo Diaz, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Christopher Wilkinson, Maureen Hilyard, Alfredo Calderon, Yrjo Lansipuro, Jonathan Zuck and Nadira Al-Araj. We have apologies from Kaili Kan, Justine Chew, Satish Babu, Judith Hellerstein, Alberto Soto, Dev Anand Teelucksingh. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan and myself, Andrea Glandon, on call management.

I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones mute not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. And this is another one of our calls which is going to have first an update from the EPDP, and that's going to come from Heidi and Alan Greenberg. Then we will be discussing the new public comment form that might be used in future public consultations. We'll spend a bit of time on that. After that, the bulk of our call is into the various policy comments update. There are a lot of them at the moment; there are some very important ones. So, I'll try to be as brief as possible in this section so we have more time then. And finally, Jonathan Zuck will

---

*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.*

---

be providing us with an update with the fica that he had with Yoan Marti in D.C. last week.

Are there any other amendments that we need to make to this agenda at this stage? Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi, Olivier. Hi, everybody. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. Just a note that in the discussion of policy issues that are on the table, I would like to say a few words in due course, on the one hand about the work track five work, and particularly about the issues surrounding prior authorization. And also to clear up some aspect of the drafts that we've received about auctions. But we can take that up when you wish to take it up. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Christopher. Jonathan will be running this part. So no doubt he will take note if you wish to take the floor at that point when the topic comes up. So that's great. I'm not seeing any other hands up, so the agenda is adopted as it currently is listed on the screen. There were two agenda action items from last week, one for Justine to note in the public comment that there was a community consensus on one not in support of private auctions, and two in support of the Vickery and for Evan to insure the EPDP report public comment form is placed on this week's agenda, which is what it actually is.

So no surprises in the action items. And that then takes us directly to agenda item three. And that's the updates on the EPDP. And for this, I

---

believe that both -- yes, I see both Hadia and Alan are here. Is it Hadia that's going to be giving the report today or is it Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia will give the report since I wasn't at yesterday's meeting. I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about the public comment, though.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's great, Alan. Thank you. So let's give the floor over to Hadia.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very quiet floor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, it's muted at the moment. And Hadia needs a call to --

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, I'm running a call out to her now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe we can have Alan say a few words then in the meantime while Hadia's call is underway. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would be glad to. The draft of the response to the public comment was posted, I think, a number of days ago, anyway. The public

---

comment must be submitted by Friday. So -- sorry. Not this Friday, a week from Friday; the 21<sup>st</sup>. All right, if Hadia's on, let's go to Hadia and then I'll come to me for the public comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Hadia Elminiawi, we can hear you indeed. Please proceed. And as Murphy's law has it, we're not able to hear Hadia.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah, Olivier, we're reaching out to her. I think we should have waited until we receive her audio on the bridge, because sometimes her AC doesn't work real well. We're calling out to her now, though.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Getting rather confusing here. The public comment is due a week from Friday, I believe on the 21<sup>st</sup> --

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Okay, great. So I should start by highlighting the part, which we think should not be supported as is, and then I'd like you --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, she's dropped out again. Oh, my God.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. This is going to make for some interesting call. Alan, let's please proceed forward with you and wait until we have Hadia stable on there, and we will have to stop her from jumping in and out.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, yes, we can hear you now. But we keep on jumping between you and Alan, so let's try it once more with you. But if you get dropped again we'll have Alan speak and then afterwards we'll try again with you in a moment. So let's start with you now and let's try one more.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Should I proceed?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Please. Yes, Hadia, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I can hear you now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well then, talk.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia, can you hear me now? It's Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is ridiculous.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, I was listening -- one more time. Okay, let's try. So again, I started by --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: What is going on?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, so I should be starting by highlighting the parts that we think should not be supported as is. So first, we regard to the purposes, process six, where it says [inaudible] regarding a relation to the registration of domain names. And the suggestion here was to change the registration by usage, and actually my suggestion in this regard is to use both words legislation and usage, So, the [inaudible] policy for the resolution of this regarding or relating to the registration or on the usage of domain names.

And the reason I'm making this suggestion is that in the user's [inaudible], according to section [inaudible] the complainant should describe the grounds on which the complaint is made, including in particular why the domain name should have been considered as having

---

been registered and deemed in that place. So, Heidi is talking about both, language and usage. In addition, or according to section 3.8 of the UDRP, the complaints should specify the [inaudible] on which the complaint is based, and for each [inaudible] the market's in. So, that's a problem of the usage, and not on the registration.

And then in relation to the URS, [inaudible], one of the reasons for the requests for [inaudible]. So, the consensus that comes from [inaudible] and not this next extension. And so that's not about the registration, it's about both, the users and the registration. And I think if we do it a bit more [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, it's Olivier. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I would also add that internet users [inaudible] for our suggestion, I would add to that that Internet users would be [inaudible]. And actually, there was a survey that came out that was supported by the information commission also sets the use level, and [inaudible] as harm online. And it also says that 50 percent of concerns about online content.

So, [inaudible], so the premise that we think is missing is that [inaudible] and also the things from that, the efforts that they've managed to input. And, in this environment, the EPDP sends out a report to ICANN org, and as per that result, [inaudible] as registration data that is now mass produced to the [inaudible] and an example as an ICANN org super user

---

[inaudible] that now cannot be used, who knows actually who is reporting the system. And in relation to the usage cycle office, ICANN org responded saying regarding the EPDP team followed that section on the [inaudible] usage data for training and out to activity, [inaudible] to identify the message strength and data related to the 99, which parts of the training are serious?

The training shows how [inaudible] and the consensus of training no longer show one how to you [inaudible]. So, now that GDPR has a usage service that does not supply [inaudible], and there is no reason that we won't use that purpose to achieve [inaudible] and also having that presence in this regard is in line with the GDPR transparency principle. So that will --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Just a second. I'm just going to scroll.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, it's Olivier. Just to ask you to speak slightly slowly, please; a bit slower because your voice is rather muffled and not very clear. The line is not very clear. So speaking a bit more slowly does help with catching all of the words, because I think that a number of people have been struggling a little bit with hearing you. Okay? Right, now Hadia has disappeared.



---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, no. I'm here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you're here. Okay.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, just a second. I'm looking at registration. [Inaudible] recommendation as is, I think that's just a command here, not specifically in this place, but maybe something down there that asked [inaudible] And the recommendation says that, is it EPDP to use [inaudible]. It's also agreement on the answers. Nevertheless, they've been answered. So we need to address this part. And we need also to put a connection between that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Hadia, thank you. It's Olivier. It seems that the line is not getting any better. It sort of keeps coming in and coming out. And so it's a little difficult; it doesn't get that quite clear. So if you can just wrap up, I mean, are there any specific points? I think if you can say them slowly,

---

close to the mic, any specific points we need to be particularly alert about? And I think I understand you might have made some notes, and so if you can post these notes over to the mailing list, that would be of help so we can all catch up with this as well. And I'm sure some people will be -- and myself included -- will be listening to the recording afterwards as well. And perhaps stopping it when we haven't quite heard what you were saying.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, I've made my comments, and --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But are there any specific things we need to look out for right now?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, no, I don't think so. No, no, nothing specific. If Alan wants to add something?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yep. Thanks. So, Alan Greenburg, please. You have the floor. And Alan seems to be muted, perhaps?

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you. Go ahead.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. The draft response to the public comment was posted, I guess, almost a week ago. There have been only a few comments on it so far from Holly, Carlton and Shuron. It's really important. It's a long document, but there's not an awful lot of words that we have put into it. In general, when we have disagreed with something that is currently being planned, there is an explicit comment there. I tried to make it pretty clear. Anything that we are submitting in this document is in red, so it's easy to find. It's really important that people look through it.

If you have comments, make them. If you don't understand something, then please put a comment in the wiki and I'll be keeping an eye on it. I've been busy at a meeting this week, but after this, I will be looking at it at least daily. I am going to suggest that we have a fair amount of time allocated to it next Wednesday because the public comment is due on Friday and there will be no extension.

So, I think it's Friday. Can someone confirm the 21<sup>st</sup> is a Friday?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

At this point, there is only one or two issues that people have raised some level of concern, and in neither case has anyone really disagreed, but they've added other things. Holly, supported by Carlton, has pointed out that there are and will continue to be privacy legislation in other jurisdictions other than GDPR. That, of course, is true. This EPDP

---

is focusing on just the GDPR. That may not be a wise move, but that is what we're doing.

Other privacy legislation may end up being more stringent, less stringent, but almost certainly will be different in differences. And they expressed some concern that something may not be allowed in one jurisdiction that is allowed in the GDPR and I have suggested that we add a comment saying that of course, any ICANN contracted party must follow whatever regulations and legislation they are subject to.

The real question in the section they were commenting on, though, is should contracting parties be allowed to redact virtually everything because they want to, even though it is not required by legislation and regulation? And that's the real subset of questions that we're asking. When we've discussed it before, we've gotten a variety of number of answers on redacting for being a legal person, where no redaction is required under the GDPR. We have pretty well uniformity that contracted parties should not be allowed to redact legal persons' information.

On geographic location, in the past, we've had some variety of responses. When we discussed it on the last CPWG, there was pretty strong uniformity that there are some cases where the GDPR applies. It applies to many, but not all cases of people who are in the E.U. It applies to companies that are either present in the E.U. or have processing in the E.U. But it doesn't apply to many, many other areas and jurisdictions. And the question is, should contracted parties be allowed to redact everything just because, essentially.

---

And, you know, we have taken the position they should not. But the question is, does At Large support this? Does ALAC and At Large support this? Pretty much everything else, I think we have uniformity. I don't think we've had much dissension, but I do welcome comments and people either asking questions for clarifications or identifying what they support, what they don't support, because we don't have a lot of time to get this done right.

And that's about all I have. So I do ask you to reserve some time for it next week, and I'm hoping there'll be a fair number of comments because it's really important. Even if your only comment is to say you support what we're doing, say so, because it's really important that we can go to the EPDP and say, "We are representing the voices that we've heard within At Large." Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And so, I think we can move on in our agenda. Not seeing -- no, I am seeing some hands. Sorry. Apologies for this. Let's take some questions and comments. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. And thank you, Alan, for this report and for these comments. As for what Holly said about the EPDP should add this, only the other regulations regarding the privacy. This is right and this is something, which normally should be done. But why doesn't ICANN do that, because there are no sanctions? If ICANN was obliged this time to make our contracts compliant with the GDPR, it is because

---

the high sanctions are imposed on those that are not compliant, that's all. But I can tell you that there is a very good regulation in Canada, but nobody cares, because there are no serious sanctions if you're not compliant. That's all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, thank you, Tijani. I'll point out that interestingly enough, we also haven't had comments from contracting parties in these other countries, you know, saying we must do something. ICANN clearly will allow them to follow their own national law and regulations. There's no question about that. We haven't had a lot of pushing to make specific regulations, and I don't think we're going to until the EPDP is finished and GDPR is addressed. Sanctions are important. There's no question about it. But, you know, going into ICANN's motives at this point may be cathartic and make us feel better. But at this point, we have a job to do, and I think we just need to go ahead with it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. It's Olivier speaking. What I'm doing is --

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [CROSSTALK] about Tijani's comments, there is no issue or problem with regard to the local laws. Local laws are respected; they were respected in the past and will continue to be respected in the future. Also, in the

---

future after the [inaudible] local laws are respected regardless. So, it's not about whether ICANN cares about it, or whether they don't care about it; this is never an issue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This is not what I said. I know, yes, of course, the local law should be respected. And this is not my intervention. My intervention was why the EPDP is focusing on the GDPR only. This is why I spoke. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Let's go down our queue. Let's have -- the way that I'll run this is -- we can't just have people talking back and forth. So, the way I'm going to run this is for each question I'll give the floor both to Hadia and to Alan to respond. So then everyone has the ability to speak. So, Christopher Wilkinson is next.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Olivier. This is Christopher Wilkinson speaking for the record. I think ICANN should develop a uniform best practice global policy. I do not agree with geographical discrimination between different categories and different locations of registrants. And I think it's unreasonable to ask the contracted parties to manage their WHOIS case by case. In fact, I think it must be given the global best-practice policy, which they can commence uniformly for their business worldwide. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Christopher. So, Hadia, you have the floor and then Alan will have the floor after. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Oliver. Holly just mentioned in the comments that GDPR is the most restricted basic reflection for support. And, again, ICANN would never be able to cover all local loans, so this should be taken case by case, but yes; it is true that we should be in compliance now with the GDPR because this is where the problem lies.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. Sorry, I was muted. I keep on doing this. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, let me respond to several of the comments. In regards to Christopher's comment that we should have common rules everywhere, that's fine. That means everything is going to be redacted; we will have literally no WHOIS anymore, other than point you to the name servers; no public WHOIS. And information will only be available regardless of what the laws say. Now, given that we may well find jurisdictions and there are such jurisdictions where they say certain information must be published, we are going to be in really tricky situations because we may well have universal compliance with GDPR even when it's not called for, maybe counter to other national laws. And I would suggest that is a potentially really large problem.



---

The second thing I'll comment is on the difficulty of identifying what jurisdiction you are in and what jurisdiction you are subject to. We have an interesting situation. The registrars are saying we don't need new action on accuracy of WHOIS, because the information is accurate to a large extent. And yet we are told by the same people that we can't identify by what country you're in, because we can't trust the accuracy of the WHOIS information.

Now, I have a part time accepting both of those arguments at the same time, saying, "Trust me, it's accurate, but I can't rely on it to tell me what country the person is in." So that, I think, is somewhat of a problem. Why the GDPR is not addressing other laws, it's because, as Tijani said, there are sanctions. We're on a tight timeline on this one, and I believe ultimately we are going to have subject to many potentially conflicting laws, and we're going to end up with, you know, what I refer to as table-driven algorithms that are going to produce different information depending on which person we're talking about and where the the company is.

But what we're doing right now is hard enough as it is, and no one has an interest in trying to tackle that right now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And Christopher Wilkinson?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Christopher Wilkinson for the record. Alan, just a very quick rebuttal. The second concern, which I recognize as, in fact, an argument

---

for uniform policy. Regarding the disagreements of WHOIS, the risk of -- which I doubt -- ICANN and the community have had 20 years to address the inconsistencies between ICANN policy and European debts protection laws. During the whole of the negotiations with the GDPR, the European Union was open to submissions, consultation, and dare I say, lobbying. ICANN sat on its hands. I know this because I was in working groups about the waiver, where the interested parties, especially the ICR and the staff were opposed to any respect of existing rolls. I think ICANN's just got to bite the bullet and I think adopt a uniform practice for its policies. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. And Alan, you have your hand up, so I'll let you respond. And then I'll let Hadia respond as well, and then we have to move on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. My only comment is at this point, if you look at what is being proposed in the EPDP, we have the treatment of legal persons as natural persons. So companies are treated as people, and all natural persons are going to be subject to GDPR regardless of where the companies are and where the subjects are. That maps to a full blackout of public WHOIS. If that's where we want to be, that's an easy answer. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's hard to go off mute when your phone is locked up. Hadia Elminiawi, please. Hadia's still here?

ANDREA GLANDON: I'm checking her audio line. I see she's still on AC, BUT I'm checking her audio line.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Might have dropped off. So, Jonathan Zuck, in the meantime you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I guess I'll pose the question to Alan. I'm wondering if the provision that says that we're allowing people to treat GDPR as a rule for all their customers still leaves room for their participation in local legal systems, which would then modify their behavior in the future and sort of leave it up to them to find out what's best. Or are we creating a situation of future conflict by saying that it's okay; it has a stamp of approval. Treat everyone exactly the same the world over.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know what's going to happen in the future. And I don't know to what extent other jurisdictions will be forceful about saying, "You must make certain information available." In Europe, for instance, if you are

---

company, your website must declare who you are and give all sorts of information about your directors and your CEO. You know, they haven't done that at this point with the WHOIS record, but they do do it because they consider it exceedingly important that you know who you're doing business with.

How they or other countries will react to WHOIS is not clear. I personally believe that once we start seeing the results of WHOIS disappearing, we're going to see legislation in some countries that is moving in the opposite direction. That remains to be seen. I can't predict more than that, though.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. And I guess I wasn't really trying to get you to predict the future. I was more trying to ask a question about the way we phrase things in the -- I don't know what to call it. What will then now become the permanent sect? Is our phrasing going to make it more or less likely that the conflicts occur in the future? That's all I was trying to get at. By leaving it voluntary, are we leaving enough room for the contracted party to do what's necessary in local jurisdictions, or is it important for us to say that they have to make geographic distinctions?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't answer that really. If other jurisdictions end up saying, "You must provide some information in WHOIS," assuming WHOIS has not

---

withered and died on the vine at that point -- which it may well if it's not being used -- then they will have to comply. And they will have to add information back that they're currently redacting, and it will make their life more difficult. There's no question. It's not going to prohibit them from obeying local laws just because they choose to take some freedom that ICANN gives them.

But the same is true in the other direction. You know, if they choose to only apply GDPR to those who are subject to GDPR, then if someone else in another jurisdiction comes up with comparable laws, they will have to adapt to those. That's why I say ultimately, we're going to look at table-driven things, because they'll be enough variance across the world that no single set of rules is going to apply to everyone in all jurisdictions. That, I believe, is where we're heading in the long term, maybe medium term as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. I see, Jonathan, you still have your hand up. You wish to respond to this? Okay. Jonathan's put his hand down. And Hadia, you have the last word if you're back on.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. I haven't anything else to say. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you faintly, but we can hear you. So, did you say you have no further comment?

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, it's just what Alan was saying, for example, that dissention between natural and group persons is essential, even if -- it's essential to at least gather the data that says there is dissention between a natural legal person, and then you can start debating later if there are problems or not. And again, all the arguments that we are having within the EPDP spurs basically from the tier of the registration, which is charged to put themselves at risk. So, the efforts we make to make this uniform for them can reduce the liability that they have and enable us to get better results.

So basically, you know, the dissention is a tension between natural legal; it's because of the liability presence of the information or the organization, or whatever. They always get the risks that they would be facing, and that's why they're always saying, "Let's make this optional. Let's not make this transitory." And I think at this point, that the EPDP to get clarity on some DPAs or from the data protection board, [inaudible] I think that they might be at risk. So, if we get clarity on those issues, then there's no reason for them to just refuse the parts that we are asking for or just by making it optional. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Hadia. And that's the end for the discussion this week. I take an action items that next week we should have an extended amount of time on the public comments for the EPDP since we are just two days away from the closing date at that point. So, let's have this in the action items, please, for next week's agenda. And now we have to

---

move on. And the next item in our agenda is the item on the new public comment form itself for the community discussion.

Now, this form is the form that we will have to make use of. There's a link to it at the moment. It's a Google Doc, effectively, that one has to fill with the email address -- and this is the form that we're going to have to use to respond to the EPDP consultation. It basically needs to be filled by one person that needs to then fill the email address at the end of the whole form, or somewhere in the form. When they press send, a copy of this will then be sent to them. I understand the link will be sent to them so they can make any amendments to the form if necessary.

And I certainly have a few questions and concerns about this because this looks to me as something that is possibly easy to use, or more efficient for an individual comment. But for one that comes from the ALAC, I'm not quite sure how our processes are going to address that and how we can have all our usual staff preamble, et cetera, et cetera.

So, I thought we'd have about five or ten minutes of discussions on this if anybody has ideas or suggestions on how to tackle this. And I invite, of course, Evan to also fully take part in this discussion, because obviously Evan works with us for finding these public comments. And, it might be more work for -- I'm not quite sure how the whole thing will work out. And let's open the floor. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I'm not particularly worried about how we format our cover sheet and stuff like that. I do have a number of

---

concerns. The reason this form is attractive to those putting out public comments is the answers all automatically get collated and you can display them in a spreadsheet without having to do a lot of cutting and pasting or other activities. So, that makes it really easy for the people receiving the comments.

The downside is if you use the form as a working document -- and as Olivier pointed out -- you can fill in part of it and then go back later and fill the rest in. But be aware that everything you are filled in to date is public at that point. So, people are seeing your partial answers; they're seeing an answer, which may be revised. That may or may not be what you want.

The other thing is, if you do not choose to use the Google Doc as your working document and you use the Word comparable part as I have in this case, that means you have to do a potentially large amount of cutting and pasting to transfer your draft answers into the final document. That, of course, has an opportunity for making mistakes and errors and omissions when you do that final transfer.

So, I see a fair number of negatives for those submitting comments. I see a big positive for those receiving comments, especially if there's a lot of categories as there is in this one -- 150 questions -- and you're expecting a lot of response. So the question is, who are we trying to serve?

And I understand there are other people looking at it, because it does make the ICANN side a lot easier. I'm not convinced it's a good thing. Unless we had an import tool to take the thing from the Word



---

document and transfer -- so, you know, all must to be Public document, and I don't believe that it's a chance at all of getting that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan Greenberg --

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan and I just want to reach in quickly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Jonathan, I'll put you in the queue next. Just saying that, Alan already has the input to, which is the three fingers. You know, the left click, right click, Copy-Paste. These sort of things.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Wow. Maybe -- yeah. I understand totally the --

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, to be clear, I used the Copy-Paste terminology improperly applied for the text. Yes, no and other answers ought to be done manually. It's not a Copy-Paste, it's going and look, and click the right radio button. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan Zuck then will go back to the queue. Jonathan, you have the floor.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry to [inaudible] I guess, my understanding that we were going to [inaudible] a few minutes to kind of talk about what this is first. Before we just started I said again, because I think -- it's probably the case of the most of the people on the call haven't even looked at it [inaudible].

I think, getting an overview; what it is and why it's put in place, etc. might be a place to begin. And I thought we're going to add that and do that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Good point and apologies for having jumped, John, the ship on this. Holly, are you okay with waiting until we first hear from Evin, taking us through the form quickly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I am. I've seen the form but, you know, I'm probably in the minority for that. So, yes. Go ahead, Evin.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Sure. Thank you Olivier, Jonathan and Holly. I'll just be really brief. Briefly mention last week on the CPWG as well, and this in also noted on the form that it's a new format, seeking to query links, comments to specific sections of the initial report, and encourage commenters to provide reasoning or rational for their opinions, as well as enable the sorting of comments so that the EPDP team has them more easily -- or is more easily able to read through all the comments on a given topic.

---

That said, the process from my end, currently is supporting you all in developing that statement is very similar. Essentially, once comments are submitted, they are submitted through the At-Large Staff email account and sent to Public Comments, and displayed publicly.

In this form, it would, as our [inaudible] have to -- they're be saved on the form and public while being saved or it could be drafted on a Word document, Copy and Pasted. And it has a concern as well about errors. And I confirmed with staff on their receiving end that, similar to the current process, if there's a mistake in the submission, we, of course, could remove or update this.

We're also able to receive pdf copies and confirm that what is submitted on behalf of the ALAC is indeed representative of the ALAC's intended statement.

So, to that end, I'm happy to just collect questions that you have or concerns that you have. And maybe, perhaps, between this call and next week's call I can get some feedback. So, back over to you all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Evin. Holly Raiche, you have been queuing.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Okay. First of all, just a general concern. Google Docs actually acquires a lot of personal information anyway. So there's kind of a fundamental problem there. That said, I also have a concern in the -- when forms are developed, they are often developed with particular

---

issues in mind. I would like to think that we can, somehow, come up with our own answers in our own way.

Now, I appreciate the burden that puts on staff and we can -- in trying to develop our own document, focus on questions. But I would like to think we have the flexibility to say, "You didn't raise these following issues and they're issues for us." And to have some kind of text that says, "You framed something in a particular weight. They're easy to frame responses to get the answer you want just by asking the right questions."

And I have a great deal of concern about that, so I'd like to think that we can start free forms, recognize exactly what Alan has said, which is a lot more convenient to staff, to be able to then feed into a larger document. But, I'd like to retain the freedom to say, "We actually have our own way of looking at things," and that's part of our response. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Holly. It's Olivier speaking. I also felt that, indeed, if we're just now reduced to having to answer specific questions, then it makes a lot harder to comment up by the walls that are being set around us. Jonathan Zuck and then Alan Greenberg. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Olivier. This is Jonathan Zuck for the record. I guess, I'm a little bit different in that I've been, you know, so focused on matrix and data for the past number of years that, I find the idea of this kind of

---

appealing. Because a lot of people take Holly's notion and go to town, talking about a lot of issues that the group maybe weren't trying to get feedback on for specific reasons or they've decided without having their scope, etc.

And, a public comment can be very difficult to get through, as a result the staff draft summaries, the team tried to read through them, etc. and I think there's some value to answering specific questions, when they respond.

I guess, the two main concerns that I've heard raised, both seem addressable by modification instead of one. And one is by providing some area that allows to center additional questions or, "What should we have asked that is wasn't raised?" And the answer is probably some kind of flag for privacy or making a document public or not. That we would probably address whether or not you were working in public, which in a large measure we do in the At-Large anyway. But, it's something for which they're certainly minor corrections to those two primary concerns.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And in response to Jonathan's last comment, good luck in getting Google to add a feature that no one else has asked for before. So, I would be -- cross your fingers. I just wanted to say that forms to fill in are not new. We have been using Google forms for expressions of

---

interest and all sorts of things for the last several years. So, they're not particularly new. This is the first time a Google form is being used in an ICANN public comments. But we've been making use of them for a long time now.

Moreover, public comments have made use of fillable pdfs. You know, the recent RDS Whois Review team provided a pdf that you could put all your answers into. And it looks very much the same. It has radio buttons, it has fields you could fill in, and all sorts of things like that. And they've been used for a number of public comments recently. And we've certainly used them in other areas. The difference is, it does not allow you to automatically collate the answers. You have to take some action to do that.

So, the comfort of Google forms is not new. You know. And virtually everyone in At-Large has probably filled out one recently for something or other that we've done, or anyone active in At-Large. And the same with fillable pdfs there. They're a dime a dozen and we see them all over the place. But with a fillable pdf, you keep it until you're ready to send it in. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Echoing slightly what Alan has just said and I certainly want to note that I support what Jonathan was just up -- made in his intervention as well. But yeah,

---

we've been filling up forms, various survey forms in PDP [inaudible] when Alan and I were just making over GNSO's policy tables. That was a long time ago, people. We used Survey Monkey and all sorts of things. Some still do. If you're concerned about your privacy, you need to then contract with a company such as Big Pulse which we do contract with, that's not impossible but there will be a significant additional cost to that to run [inaudible] in a way that makes the function of public comments -- yeah, that's doable.

But, that's it. Everything one puts into a, there I said it, public comment is strange enough, public or will be eventually. There's some tweaking. I see the advantage in this from the management of it as the other end point of view. I hear what Holly says about the more generic and general data of staff not having an honored place in space, and can I just assure her, along with everyone else, having read an awful lot of those, you read them and you go up, "Great, can we fit it into any of the boxes we were looking for?"

Nope, and that's as far as we considered it. So, enjoy making the eloquent statements that you know recently I heard the Council of Europe in one of our PDP public comment analysis groups, "Where is our overall statement for this, that and the other?" And I said, "Listed under Generals, wherever it belongs."

Just recognize these public comments are put out for a purpose and helping efficiencies on meeting those purposes is important. Is this a perfect system? Not yet, and it will certainly need some tweaking. But I'm not affronted by it. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. And one last thing I haven't heard here is the access to the form -- email, sending a comment by email is usually possible [inaudible]. Some countries did not allow access to the Google services so that might be a problem. I understand it is a fringe problem, but it still is a potential concern for some countries. And I'm not seeing any further hands. Not. Yes, hello. Who is there?

Okay. Someone tried to speak but the line isn't working properly. Unless I hear any further people who wish to make comments, let's move on then. We are at the top of the hour so we have 30 minutes until the end of this call and that's the time when we need to plow into policy and Jonathan Zuck is going to take over now for the policy comment updates. Jonathan and Evin.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. So, we have a couple of public comments that are -- please mute your line, we're going to get an echo, I guess -- that are for comment and then there are some drafts that are available that are worth taking a look at. One of the comments that was just finished was on the CCT Review, so that should be up for ALAC votes very soon. There are drafts comments available on a number of different areas. One is the draft PTI and IANA FY20 Operating Plan and Budgets, so that's up for vote as well.

There was just an extension of the comment on the additional subsequent procedures questions, but there's a pretty fleshed out



---

comment from Justine, so this is a rare opportunity to have an extension [inaudible] fleshed out comment to take a look at on subsequent procedures. And so, please do take a look at that and get your comments up as soon as you can.

Evin, do you want to highlight the ones that have been added for which we don't yet have people in process?

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Sure, Jonathan. This is Evin for the record. I think there might be a slight echo. There are three public comments for decision, the first being Policy Status Report: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP). That closes on the 24<sup>th</sup> of December. The second is Application for New Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) Dispute - Resolution Service Provider, which closes just after the New Year on the 4<sup>th</sup> of January.

So those two have yet to have a penholder or ALAC has yet to decide if they would like to comment, or CPWG. And then, in addition, there was a Root Zone Label Generation Rules Statement that Satish has volunteered to draft a short statement if the ALAC would find it necessary to comment on behalf of the ALAC, or he could submit as an individual. So, kind of those three needed some more attention than the others. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess I'm interested in feedback on that last one with Satish. My inclination, even after his attempt to describe the end user interest in

---

that topic was that perhaps he should submit something as a personal comment. His wasn't clear what the At-Large voice was on that particular comment. I'm interested if other people just agree with that, certainly. But it felt like something that -- it wasn't clear what the ALAC voice would be.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Okay. He [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Right. He's not. There was emails that went back and forth on it. Okay. I do know that Christopher wanted to speak hopefully succinctly on the Work Track 5 discussions that are going on as well, and the comment that's in drafting right now was Marita and Justine. Christopher, did you want to speak on that?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Jonathan. It's not alarming to take both of those [inaudible] and the very short statement at this point in time. First of all, Work Track 5, there is a disagreement among the participants, notably in relation to Recommendation Eleven. The intellectual properties communicated [inaudible] some of the contracted parties wished to maintain the 2012 AGB of exclusion to the effect that [inaudible] purposes would not require an authorization or a non-objection from the geography concerned. I think we should recognize that this position is dead in the water.

---

ALAC cannot possibly support it [inaudible] and B, create a situation where ALAC will be supporting of the 2012 AGB [inaudible] political and historical experience, ICANN forecast that the GAC will close it and reject it. So, please bear in mind that this is -- I'm sorry I'm [inaudible]. I'm using the same audio that I usually use. That is the first point.

The second way regarding the auctions, I submitted Group L's comments, only some of which have been taken up. I must make it very clear that I do not support auctions as a matter of principal. The drafts ALAC position is so far distant from what I have submitted as responses to the questions, but if this goes ahead, I should be obliged to make a personal substantive counter proposal to the public comment.

I would request that ALAC reviews the situation. We cannot go ahead credibly in the users' interest supporting auctions. Thanks. Sorry to be so abrupt, but you wanted me very short.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Christopher. Marita, go.

MARITA MOLL: It's Marita, it looks like --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Marita, we can't hear you. If you're speaking, I think you're muted.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Sorry. Can you hear me now?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. I don't want to bring up anything substantive about Work Track 5. Justine and I, and with staff have had a document posted that people comment to. It's a large report, it has more than 100 pages, but actually the number of recommendations isn't that onus. What I did want to say is that I've looked participants in this particular process and At-Large has got the most number of participants in this particular Work Track of anybody; 24 out of 160. NCUC has nine. [inaudible] has 10.

We really have a large number of participants, eight observers, so I want to find a way because all of these people have actually been participating, they've got time in this thing and I want to see at least one comment from everybody who actually participated. But most of them are not on this call, but I just don't know how we can do that. I think we should try because these people know what the issues are and they should be at least putting in one comment, even if's, "Yes, I agree. I disagree." That's my point, I'm going to keep bring that up, I'm going to try to figure out how we can actually get some of these 24 people to at least say something in this particular exercise.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. I'll take that on as I did before, but I guess, rather than waiting to bring it up on this call, keep hounding me offline, and let's make sure that we try to get that group together on a call or something

---

like that to have [CROSSTALK] of that outcome. Thanks for bringing it up.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, I'll send you the list of all the people and work will carry on from there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. OlivierCrepin-Leblond speaking. And in response to Marita's question here regarding all the people that are on that working group, I think most of us have each other's email addresses. It would be good to get in touch with those people and get them to comment directly over to you as the penholder, as this really is your chance to go and collect that input.

On the point that Christopher made with regards to public auctions, I was going to ask Christopher, does he have an alternative, is there an alternative to auctions when there is a conflict or a clash? What do you call it, again? I keep on forgetting this. You know what I mean, when more than one applicant [inaudible]. Thank you.

Contention is the word, that's correct. I think it's not productive to say we are against something and not propose anything instead because the segway against it doesn't actually resolve the problem. So that's my point, thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Cheryl, is it okay if I jump back to Christopher to respond to Olivier?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was going to suggest you did.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Christopher, go.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes, there are alternatives. We've got to some of them in my draft responses which have been posted to the list. I'll send Olivier a working copy later today or tomorrow. There are [inaudible] and my key problem with auctions is how are they financed and what is being resolved over an expensive auction from a [inaudible] registry vis-à-vis their costs, their charges, and ultimately, the costs of the final user. I draw an analogy a few years ago, there were auctions for radio spectrum and the results were so expensive that some telecommunication companies nearly became bankrupt.

The auctions are a very bad idea and there are alternatives, particularly for geographical names. My recommendation is geographical names should be based on requests for proposals, and those requests for proposals should be managed by the interested parties in the geography concerned. The evaluation of applications should deal with

---

most problems long before they get to the level of auctions. But please refer to my draft of responses which are on the list. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Christopher, they're on the list or on the wiki?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: They're certainly not on the wiki.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So you're [CROSSTALK] on an email is what you're saying?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: They're on an email list. Jonathan, I honestly don't have time to [inaudible] stuff from the wiki. It's so complicated.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks Christopher. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. A couple of things, thinking back now with Marita's suggestion of reaching out to those who are listed in the subsequent procedures PDP working group and specifically, Work Track 5. We're just trying to remind you all that Work Track 5 is in fact a standalone PDP, but part of the other ones. That it might also be useful before you have your hopes dashed with perhaps some lack of response from reaching out to make greater

---

effort to those who've actually been shown in the attendance at the meetings, or have put anything to the email list.

We have always have, unfortunately, significantly more people put themselves forward as members or observers that never are actually that engage as members in any way, shape or form, or observers, so it must be a good idea to focus your [inaudible], which I'm supportive that you do do, but put more effort into those to not only stuck an email out in the beginning of the process but have actually engaged since then. The GNSO secs have all of the attendance records for all of the meetings, and if you want to have a look at those, I'm able to get them for you.

Then to Christopher's point of, if I know I came to 100%, I'm wonderful, but I also have to. That was an aside and a joke by the way, although I'm happy to be told differently. The matter of auctions and the concerns that Christopher has raised with the effects on list [inaudible], individual group or community group applicants who are finding themselves in contention and ending up in some form of private or public auction is one that is just limited to the concerns of the ALAC, it's been okay to cross a number of the sectors involved in our PDP process, and it's a matter that's been taken through very seriously.

And to that end, a great deal of work is being that on the measure of auctions and auction processes. Note we're not saying auction proceedings, we're saying "on the matter of". So the feedback on the public comments on this is extremely important, however, we are not standing idly by hoping that some gem of utter brilliance will comes at us from someone who has a ton of emery and the inclination to put in



---

an articulate public comment, but we have reached out to each and every one of the auction houses, the providers for the auction services that were involved post new gTLD rounds and the last one, and indeed in a couple of cases who have been involved in auctions that are main players in auctions within the DNS space and other spaces, since before there was an ICANN in fact.

But, we have only heard back from one of those companies and Jeff and I have, I'm pleased to tell you, only this week managed to have a meeting with that person, and that person, providing it is not going to compromise [inaudible] on being cagey about naming, providing it is not going to compromise his company's ability to offer its services to ICANN in any future auction proceedings, so should such a thing occur, is going to make himself invaluable to explain a great deal about the risks and advantages of all sorts of systems.

It's worthy of not however that this individual advised ICANN against the [inaudible] of auctions that they conducted. But the horse stable door had been opened, or was about to be open, or more to the point, I think they were told, "Oh, we've invested too much into getting prepared to open the stable door on it," and so [inaudible] the significant expertise this person has was put into any implementation.

So, there are a bunch of ways to minimize the concerns that we hear from not only Christopher, but that many of us hold. And we are working on it and we will have, providing the legal advice says it's okay for us to do so, both his and us; we will have him speaking at probably the last meeting in January or the first meeting in February of the subpro, so watch this space, it will be an important one. Thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. So moving on, just to get some specific discussion going, there's a couple of public comments that we need to decide whether or not we should be responding to. One is the policy support report: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, and the other is the Application for New Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy Service Providers. I'm curious to get people's feedback about whether or not they think that we ought to be so many comments on one or either of those topics. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a comment. I haven't had a chance to look at the IRTP. Have you? Because I've sat through God knows how many meetings of that particular working group; there were very few issues that impacted directly on end users, so I'd be a little bit surprised if we need to comment. I'm happy to have a look, but do you have any thoughts as well? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: My initial reaction to both [inaudible] was very cursory, was that there wasn't a strong voice to have either of those concessions. But [CROSSTALK] the IRTP.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, I'll take a look up, but having sat through that many meetings, there wasn't a lot of discussion that involved end users.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right, that was my impression as well. Anyone else feel strongly about those two topics? And you're right, it is in fact an end user [inaudible] when it goes wrong, so we've set very hard policy objections surrounding it and this feels more like an implementation document. So I guess the question then becomes whether or not we really have something that [inaudible] specifically in the implantation issues.

Okay, then I think that's it for that, for the policy comments for this week. I guess I can briefly discuss the SICA with [CROSSTALK].

HOLLY RAICHE: You've got a hand up, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I'm sorry. That's Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, it's Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I am late for many reasons, but I just want to be sure that we take really into account what Christopher said. I understand Cheryl's comments, but I would like to say again that any auction [inaudible] ICANN one because at the end of the day, it's people [inaudible] our community, and I don't like at all the private ones, but I don't like those over the [inaudible] auctions, and we need to find others who listen. People say, but tell us. I remember that we tell a lot when it was [inaudible] for discussion in 2006, 2008, 2009, 2010 and so on.

---

One of the reasons we [inaudible] auction procedure because I didn't want to [inaudible] round in 2000. But for some of the TLDs, I think it's more important to take into account diversity, [inaudible] and so on and so forth. We may end up having to come back to something like a [inaudible] process, and I think it will be better for the overall program. [Inaudible] I want to be sure that we take into account what's Christopher has said, which is very important from my point of view. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sebastian. The issue is going to continue to be a contentious one. And we certainly came out very strongly in the comments submitted in the public one through four in favor of victory option, which at least helps you minimize some of the gain and investment strategies associated with domains. So, it's not a perfect solution. Under the fika -- for those of you who don't know what a fika is -- it's a Swedish term basically a coffee lunch. You get together over coffee and cinnamon rolls.

And [inaudible] was in Washington D.C. recently and just put out a request that each of the SO and AC's representatives deliver geographically desirable, and that turned out to be me. So, we had a call for things for me to raise on the email list, and the issue came about with universal access and also sort of what the temperature was coming out of the planning plots and how we might better use our efforts.

And the general reaction from the planning plots in the IGF was certainly that there's a lot of negativity right now against the Internet,

---

and that a couple of companies are the Internet, and he brought up Google and Facebook. And really stressed that we need to -- excuse me for a second -- I'm getting over a cold. He stressed the need for us to really distinguish between platforms and the Internet itself, and to make sure we're always talking about the Internet with some specificity because there is starting to be some backlash against specific platforms. We need to make sure that the Internet itself is not sort of lumped in with that.

The general agreement in the group -- excuse me -- I have a different problem than everybody else. I've got a strong connection and no -- renewing the group on universal access, the universal acceptance was a critical issue, and we had an interesting discussion about the value of At Large and how to leverage it, and there's a long interest in the other members of the community in At Large playing even more of an outreach role than we have in the past on these issues. And so, I think that that's something we should definitely discuss at the next ICANN meeting. That's pretty much it for the fika summary. Cinnamon rolls were good and it was pretty collegial and a very casual meeting. Thanks for sending me there. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And thanks for holding the road on all these public comments, of which there are so many of. So, please, for everyone, we have to continue on the mailing list until the next call next week. And so, the first thing I have to open to us is for any other business.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-OR: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And Cheryl Langdon-Or did mention earlier she needed to have an AOB, so, Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-OR: Thanks, Olivier. I panicked; I thought you were wrapping up the call after me putting in nice and early that I had a brief bit of other business. Cheryl Langdon-Or for the transcript record. Very briefly, and this is one that I'm hoping that with our group being aware of, then someone in the ALAC will properly action, and that is I noticed in recent sub-group of the subsequent procedures PDP call -- I'm only doing three a week, along with leadership calls for each of them, a work-track five meeting and a normal meeting, that's kind of an aside, people, but never mind -- is that the agreed lowercase liaison so that staff can forward any clarifying questions or inquiries about our public comments at this stage; obviously one to four, but shortly for the subsequent report in the work-track five one to follow.

And I know it's a matter of public record in our records in PDP world that the adjusting is -- I believe it's public knowledge -- is taking to Maureen from the APEC representative in work-track five. And if that's not formal, it needs to be. But I am now well aware that the decision to have her become the lowercase liaison for any of these clarifying questions during our review of the PDP process clearly has not gotten

---

through the seams. So, if it hasn't been said -- because Maureen decided that she would be, along with Jonathan and a couple of others - - and she's agreed, if it hasn't been formally sent across to the GNSO, then our people helping us in the PDP don't know who to email the questions to. So, you know, can we fix that, please? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Cheryl. It's Olivier speaking. I'll make a note of this. I gather this is really for Maureen to enable the --

CHERYL LANGDON-OR: It's actually to start to do it. But I don't care who organizes it, I just want it done, because we've got about four questions lined up already.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Staff is taking notes and we'll follow up after the call. I'm seeing no other hands up now, apart from Cheryl's hand still being up. No, it's not. So, thanks everyone. The next call will be next week. And that should be -- now, are we going to rotate? Let me just ask if there are any objections for a rotation next week. Let's see if next Wednesday -- my Wednesday certainly is clear. Jonathan, your Wednesday? Any preference for the earlier call or the later call?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just make it happen whenever.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this.

CHERYL LANGDON-OR: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, I guess we can do a rotation, which will make this 13:00 UTC, rotating. So, next week, 13:00 UTC we've got the main agenda points, the response to the EPDP, and we have a number of other comments that are actually closing very soon as well. So please have a look at those. Look at the wikis, send your emails out onto the mailing list if you can't comment on the wiki and everyone will try to make some cut and paste of things from one the other. It's been a great call today. Thanks very much, everyone. Have a great morning, afternoon, evening or night, depending on where you are in the world.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. Take care, goodbye.

ANDREA GLANDON: [CROSSTALK] and have a wonderful rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**