ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call held on Wednesday the 9th of January 2019 at 21:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Maureen Hilyard, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Joanna Kulesza, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Alfredo Calderon, Yrjö Lansipuro, Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, Christopher Wilkinson, Kaili Kan, Hadia Elminiawi, Sébastien Bachollet, Glenn McKnight, Alan Greenberg, Alberto Soto, Daniel Nanghaka, Joel Thayer, Marita Moll, Bastiaan Goslings, and Greg Shatan.

We do have apologies from Holly Raiche, Maria Korniiets. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, 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 on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Andrea. Welcome, everyone, to this new year of Consolidated Policy Working Group calls. Today, we've got an agenda that is quite busy, as usual. We'll start with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg speaking to us about the EPDP. There has been some activity since our last call, even, of course, at the end of the comment period, so we'll have plenty to discuss here.

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.

And then on the policy comment update, or weekly presentation, we'll take us through the different updates that we have, including one that is nearing very soon on the 22nd of January, and that's the work track five on geographic names where Justine Chew will be able to take us through a deck on these issues. Of course, other issues there as well that you can see on your agenda.

And then finally, in Any Other Business, we will be taking some time to discuss the proposal from Neustar for a three-phase new gTLD application model. That's of course to do with the Subsequent Procedures Working Group discussions.

So at this point in time, I'd like to ask if anybody wishes to amend the agenda or add any points to this agenda. I see that everyone is still very much rested from the holiday period, so let's then plow straight into the work. Let's go into the action items, and you'll be glad to note that they're all completed. I'm not sure, I think that most of the action items were relating to staff, Justine and Jonathan. Do any of you wish to provide us with any additional details as to the action items?

No further comments on this, then that means we can go straight into the update on the EPDP activity and the Expedited PDP comment period. Both Hadia and Alan are with us today. I believe that a slide deck is – is there a slide deck coming up? Or perhaps not. Let me just turn the floor over to [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: None from me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Alan. So I'm not sure who wishes to do the update, Hadia or Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we're both going to have to, because we've done different things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then let us do that. I understand, yes, that the group has been split into different groups. Let's start then with Alan Greenberg, since you have an A and Hadia has an H.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. But El is an E and G is a G. I will be happy to start, however. The EPDP had received a vast number of comments, many of them disagreeing with some of the recommendations, many of them at odds with each other, and our task at this point is to address all of the public comments and somehow come up with a document to submit as a final report for the first phase of this EPDP, because although we're calling it a final report, it is the final report of phase done. So there's more work to be done afterwards.

We are meeting face-to-face for three days next week in Toronto, and the hope is that we come out of that meeting with most or all of the decisions made. We started discussing the comments last week, and we

went to the first one, one that might have been somewhat simple, and got bogged down and didn't get very far.

The leadership and staff came up with a proposal to divide into three groups for the meetings yesterday and tomorrow and try to do things in parallel, at least address what are perceived as the simpler issues.

There was significant pushback on dividing into three groups, largely from the NCSG, but later on from the contracted parties, for a number of reasons. And ultimately, leadership decided to break into two groups, which was less offensive because then we did not have to have any alternates involved in trying to cover one of the meetings.

We did have a meeting, the two groups did meet yesterday. The meeting was a two-and-a-half-hour meeting, and my section in any case ran over and must have been about two- and three-quarter hours. We addressed about six of the nine issues that we were looking at. We came to some simple conclusions and some things which were going to have to be deferred until the face-to-face.

It wasn't a wholly satisfying meeting, but we did check off some things. And there'll be another meeting hopefully which will finish the list tomorrow. So that's where we are in my section. I'll let Hadia report on how her marathon meeting went.

I'll talk a little bit about the public comment, however, and the ALAC response. In general, almost all of the comments we got from At-Large people were positive, and I thank all of those who both understood the difficulty that Hadia and I had in trying to come up with comments

which met the needs of At-Large, and at the same time try to bridge various gaps. And we got a fair number of comments.

The only questions we got were, why did we not answer specific questions? And the ones we didn't answer had to do with who is the controller and what kind of agreements do we need. There was one comment response to my response from Carlton saying my answer was, although who the controller is is of great importance to At-Large because if ICANN were deemed to be the sole controller, then ICANN might be willing to take risks contracted parties were not, and we would end up with more accessibility and less rigidity on the implementation, because much of the rigidity has to do with risk associated with the contracted parties.

Carlton's comment was that, yes, we may not be the legal experts, but we certainly can participate in the discussion. And that's true at some level. However, the difficulty in determining who the controller is stems from the definition of controller under GDPR. And it's a relatively simple-sounding definition, and I'll read it verbatim. The controller means the natural or legal person, public authority, agency or other body which, alone or jointly with others, determines the purposes and means of processing of personal data.

Now, the difficulty in this section, in this issue for us, is it's quite clear that the rules on what should be done with WHOIS RDS data are determined by ICANN, so we set the purposes that may require contracted parties to do things.

The means of processing the personal data is decided completely by the contracted parties. So it is not clear if one of those takes precedence or if we are independent controllers, a concept which in theory exists but no one has any experience with, or if we are joint controllers, which means we have an agreement between each other as to how we will jointly handle the thing.

So it's very much both a legal question of how will the data commissioners interpret things to decide who are the controllers, and that's one of the reasons that we've had great difficulty. ICANN at some level is clearly the controller. We set the rules. Contracted parties say, no, we determine how it's done and that means all the liability is going to fall on us first.

And although in theory we could participate in that discussion, I and Hadia have not seen a lot of merit in being the proponents to argue for or against one of those solutions. So that's why we didn't answer the question, and that's addressing Carlton's comment that, yes, we could have participated, should we have chosen.

Anyway, that's about all I have to say, and I'll take any questions and/or turn it over to Hadia for reporting on what happened in her section. As I said, we have one more meeting of two and a half hours, and then Wednesday through Friday, we will have a marathon session face-to-face, and I am not going to go anywhere near predicting how that will done or what the outcome will be. That's it for me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. In the interest of time, let's go straight over to Hadia and then have the questions afterwards to both of you. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. Thank you, Olivier. [inaudible] what Alan said about roles and responsibilities, and actually [inaudible] but we also think that it is [inaudible] contracted parties and ICANN have initial agreement first on the [inaudible] because initially, we have to agree as parties on [inaudible] and then after [this initial agreement] start commenting and saying [inaudible].

ANDREA GLANDON: Hadia, I'm going to have to stop you because we're not able to understand you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, none of us are, unfortunately.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'm so sorry for that.

ANDREA GLANDON: Are you talking through the bridge, Hadia, through the phone?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [inaudible] Is this better?

ANDREA GLANDON: No, it's not sounding any better. Can you try your AC mic? If that was the bridge, let's try your AC mic.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. I'll do that. Just a second.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It seems that she's just dropped off the AC for the time being. It shows that she is away.

ANDREA GLANDON: Okay, Hadia, go ahead and try your AC mic.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I am trying my AC mic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm afraid that doesn't seem to work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sounded a little clearer to me.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'm sorry [inaudible]. So you can't actually hear me?

ANDREA GLANDON: That sounds a little clearer.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear well now. Not as loud, but well.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah, just speak up a little bit.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I'll try to be quick. [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I believe that Hadia is still using her phone and not the AC room.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [inaudible] Adobe. Yeah, because you were not able to hear me when I spoke through the AC room.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We don't appear to be hearing you, Hadia, in the AC room at all, and the phone is chopping up a little bit. Would it be possible for a new call to be made? So if you could drop your phone and get the operators to try and call you again perhaps?

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah, we'll hang you up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sometimes the [problem] gets better. And in the meantime, I think if you're able to hear any questions and so on, I can certainly open the floor for questions while this takes place, so people can ask questions to Alan and to you, and you can answer when you're back on. So the floor is open to any comments or questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: We had Jonathan and Christopher but their hands are now down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Jonathan is back with his hand up, so Jonathan Zuck, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Thanks, Alan, for the color commentary, and I guess I wanted to – can you hear me okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can. Please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. It sounds like people are talking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so I wanted to ask whether or not there was anything of substance that has come up. It doesn't sound like it yet, and there isn't a question that you need this group to consider vis a vis the EPDP at this point.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, no. The difficult questions are ones to be handled, and on most of these issues, we have pretty strong comments, statements from At-Large already. Now, there's going to be haggling and negotiating done in the meeting, and we're not going to be able to consult, so hopefully, we've done all the consultation we need to go forward with that meeting next week. And by the way, that implies that Hadia and I will not be on the call next week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. That sounds good. And I guess I'd ask that question of Hadia as well, because I don't know that we need more color commentary on [inaudible]. You guys are just doing the Lord's work there and keeping up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. There may have been something that came up at her meeting that I didn't attend. We never quite got to that, and I guess if we get her back on the phone, we should try to focus on that particular thing. At this point though, I think we have good marching orders, and there was virtually no controversy over any of the comments we made to the response to the public comment. So I think we have our marching orders. And I think I heard Hadia again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, so let's try one more time. I don't know if you can hear me well.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you well. I can hear you very well right now, Hadia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can certainly hear you very well as well. So please, Hadia, you have the floor, and then we'll get all the questions over at the end. So, Hadia Elminiawi, you're back on.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, great. Thank you. So team B, we were discussing purpose three, which is enabling communication with registered name holder, and we actually reached consensus and agreement on that. We discussed also

recommendation six, which is about the rights protection mechanisms working group, and also, we reached agreement on that.

We discussed transfer policy and handling contractual compliance. And [inaudible] when we started discussing e-mail communication, and I think this will [inaudible] to the face-to-face meeting. And basically, the argument according to the initial report, registrars are to provide an e-mail address or a webform through which communication could be made available with the registrant.

And registrars don't actually feel that they should be obligated to do that, and also, some of them don't agree on providing e-mails, and many other [inaudible] comments actually are leaning towards just the opposite. They say that providing the webform is not enough and e-mail is necessary.

So [inaudible] and we are still to continue tomorrow. We are going to discuss contractual agreements, purpose seven, eligibility criteria, and I think also recommendation 20, which is about data retention, and also, we are going to discuss input to transfer policy. So I think our meeting yesterday went very well, apart from the e-mail communication parts, and that's about it from me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Now the floor is open for comments and questions. And I think that the first person who was sin the queue during the time when you went off was Christopher Wilkinson, so maybe we can start with him. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Olivier. Happy new year to everybody. In Belgium, you can welcome people with happy new year for the whole of January, so we have opportunities still to come. Basically, I've put my question into the chat, because I didn't want to interfere with Hadia's presentation just now.

I've seen complaints about extraterritorial application of GDPR. Not surprising, we have been used for years to certain countries' laws being applied extraterritorially as part of life. But I wondered how ICANN was going to handle this one.

Personally, I feel that we saw this coming, and if ICANN had taken initiative a couple of years ago to implement a privacy-favorable policy, we could have avoided most of this. But that's history.

But Alan, how should ICANN handle the complaints, some of which undoubtedly have political support in Washington if not elsewhere, about extraterritoriality? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I take it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd much prefer to answer Christopher's question in the chat where he asked about extraterrestrial application, and my answer to that is simple. As soon as we get the interplanetary Internet going, we'll worry about it. But I presume that was not typed on purpose.

Christopher, can you elaborate on which complaints you're taking about about extraterritorial implementation of GDPR? Because I'm not sure I know what you mean.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Alan, for correcting my typing. I've known for several years that Adobe chat is not favorable to my typing, but so be it. You correctly interpreted [inaudible].

Well, the one that was most explicit was the American Motion Picture Association complaining that ICANN should not be dictated to by GDPR, capacity building that would be an extraterritorial implementation of European law applying globally, and that this whole GDPR exercise is, in effect, supporting extraterritorial implementation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Alright, I think I know what the question –

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: My personal position is [inaudible] I don't wish to repeat it. I think ICANN has a problem. How are you going to respond to organizations, generally non-European organizations who use WHOIS to control, monitor, and sometimes attack [inaudible] WHOIS on the basis of WHOIS data which may not be available to them in the future?

ALAN GREENBERG: Christopher, I think I understand the question now.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: It's a political question. How should ICANN respond to an organization like AMPA who, in effect, are complaining about what is being done?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Christopher. Let's have Alan Greenberg address [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. The bottom line is that there are some extraterritorial applications of GDPR where it might be possible to defy the European Commission. If, for instance, you have a business in Brazil or in U.S. or Canada, or Africa, that is specifically targeting Europeans and it can be demonstrated that you're targeting them, but you have no presence in the European Union, it may be rather difficult for the European Union to enforce GDPR in that case where [inaudible] under the GDPR regulations, it is applicable. So that's perhaps an edge case, maybe a

large edge case, where it's possible to defy and say we don't care what your rules are, we're not going to follow them.

However, both ICANN itself and many of its contracted parties have a very real presence in the European Union and are therefore subject potentially to fines and other action that can be taken under GDPR. And given that neither ICANN nor the contracted parties are particularly interested in being subjected to these fines and other penalties, there is a strong incentive to address GDPR and follow it. And there is no way that ICANN can ignore that, because its contracted parties in Europe certainly will not ignore it, nor will ICANN itself if data commissioners try to take action because of the very real presence that ICANN does have within the European Union.

So, yes, some parties could try to defy it, but ICANN itself cannot, nor will its contracted parties, because ICANN's contracts with its contracted parties make it clear that they have to be able to obey the law within their locations.

So, will people be unhappy with things that will not be the same? Sure. But there's just no way we can ignore it. So our challenge is to try make the world work as well as we can in our definition of "well", factoring in the fact that we must be viewed as compliant. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alan. Are there any other comments or questions? So I had a question for Hadia with regards to the discussions on the e-mail. How does the group, or what process will the group use to be able to resolve issues where some of the comments that came in

regarding the e-mail insisted that e-mails should be listed, and other comments insisted that e-mails should not be listed? Is there a process, or will it be basically down to the negotiations in the group itself? And might it go to a vote? Or how will that be resolved? Because that's a crucial issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, before you turn it over to Hadia, I presume you're talking about e-mail that is an anonymized e-mail. We're never talking about the original e-mail address in this case.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just making that clear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I mean the means to contact the registrant where at one end, you have a webform that some don't deem to be a suitable way to contact a registrant, and on the other end, you've got the anonymized e-mail which some say that it's not anonymous enough, because it's just not anonymous enough.

So, how will one reconcile this? And of course, this s just an example issue, there are countless number of other issues where we're going to see comments coming in from both ends of the spectrum.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. So the problem with the webform is that you actually never know [inaudible] registrant received or got the notice that was sent or not. And the problem with the e-mail, well, of course it's not a personal e-mail, it's an anonymized e-mail, but still, registrars could argue that it could be possible to reveal the registrant.

Anyway, basically, as I see it, it's basically the registrars are the ones that are opposing this because they think that it might put them at risk. But of course, this issue will be taken to the plenary, so I don't think that we will try to reach a decision within the group with regard to this point. So we will discuss it as a whole group, A, B, all the members.

And the other thing that there are many of the comments, as I said, they say, "No, a webform is not enough, we need to have both," and I think that we could reach consensus there if the registrars feel that they are not at risk as they think they are.

I think this is the whole point. And most of the issues we fail to reach consensus on, I think it's also because of the contracted parties not feeling comfortable with what they're going to do or provide. And I think this is the main issue here, is how to remove that great risk that contracted parties feel that they are facing so that we can have a useful WHOIS registration data that would actually serve the interest of all groups.

So we are not going to have a vote, and we are going to reach consensus within the whole group. So we are not going to discuss this within the small group, I think, any more. Maybe just a little bit if we fail

again to reach any kind of consensus. Definitely, it will be the whole group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Hadia. Over to Alan Greenberg, and I think we'll probably have to wrap up this part of the call soon. So Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The problem with both anonymized e-mail and webpages is it's essentially sending a message into a black hole. You don't know if it's actually going all the way through to someone or not, and there's no way to find out.

The argument is made that any of these methods violate GDPR because the person will respond and you'll see who is responding, but that of course is quite specious, because in most anonymized e-mail like this, the return also goes through the anonymizer. So you don't see the real from mail, you see one that's forwarded.

All sorts of organizations around the world use this regularly. Amazon has resellers that you communicate with them through the Amazon interface. You never see who the real person is unless they choose to reveal themselves, and vice versa.

So all of that just doesn't – I don't think the risk issue is real at all. Registrars have also complained that, yes, but if you have an anonymized address, it's subject to spam. But there are some registrars who have anonymized addresses which change every hour or every day.

So there are solutions to these problems, but there are no solutions to the fact that it's a black hole and you have no real confirmation that there's anyone at the end of it.

So I don't know how we're going to resolve. Hadia's confident we'll come to closure. We'll see.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Well, thank you very much, Alan. Thanks to both of you for providing us with details of all the work that's going on, and good luck next week as you travel to Toronto. If you do have any further updates and questions and so on, please let us know through the mailing list.

Let's move to agenda item four, and that's the policy comment update. And for this, I'll hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I think we have some slides to put up for this. Alright, let's charge ahead. Do I have control, or Evin, do you have control? What's happening?

EVIN ERDOGDU: I can go through them, yeah. I don't know, do you want me to go through them?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, go ahead.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Okay, thank you. We'll just go through policy comment updates. In addition to the slides on the screen, also recently ratified by the ALAC statements are included on the agenda. there were three of them. So going to the first slide now, there's a summary as well of each of those statements.

There are four current public comments that need to be decided upon by the CPWG and ALAC [to forward I guess if] they are interested or if there are any volunteer penholders from the CPWG, the first being proposed changes to the Registrar Stakeholder Group charter, and this one closes on the 5th of February.

The second is ICANN strategic plan for fiscal year 2021 through 2025, which closes on the 11th of February. Third is updated operating standards for specific review, which closes on the 11th of February as well, and the fourth is amendment to the IANA naming functions contract annex A, and this one closes on the 18th of February.

So I'll turn it over to you, Jonathan and others, if you have any comments on these for public comment. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, let's get a conversation started on whether there's an end user voice on each of these, and who would like to take the megaphone. I haven't read the proposed changes to the Registrar Stakeholder Group charter. I'm inclined to say that it's not of great interest to us. Is there somebody that disagrees with that? Oh, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I don't disagree. I haven't read it either. I can imagine changes to it which might make it even more synonymous with registrars and therefore dilute the importance of stakeholder groups again. Right now, since there is overlap between registrars and registries, they can be construed in some cases as the same group, and therefore they have an effective veto on the GNSO.

But not knowing what the changes are, in general, we do not weigh in on other people's charter changes. But I can imagine in this case we might, depending on what the changes are, but I unfortunately have not looked at them. Maybe our GNSO liaison can enlighten us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier. Thanks, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I agree with Alan on the first one, the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We generally don't comment on changes to charters and so on. I just wanted to comment briefly on the second one listed here , the strategic plan for fiscal years 2021 to 2025. Unfortunately, I was in the FBSC – Finance and Budget Subcommittee – call earlier this week, and I do not recall a discussion on this. So I think that something is coming. I note that Tijani Ben Jemaa is on the call. Perhaps Tijani will be able to let us know whether there's anything on this so far. And yeah, that's all. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: On its face, it seems like something that we'd be interested in sections of the strategic plan. Historically, that's been something that has had real import to the ALAC and the At-Large generally. Is there somebody who'd be interested in taking a look and identifying the sections of that strategic plan in which we might comment and make a presentation on it on the next CPWG call? Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Hi. I've looked at that strategic plan, and it's got a really large and extended section about how ICANN would want to improve its effectiveness with respect to the multi-stakeholder processes. So I think we really need to look at that carefully and see what's going on there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I agree. Are you interested in identifying the sections of interest and making a short presentation on it on the next call?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Well, the section of interest is, to me, that one, for us anyways, about multi-stakeholder process. that's the one, and there are other probably interesting sections, but that affects us directly. And we ought to know exactly what it says. so I think it's worth having a look at it in the next call. Yeah, absolutely, I'll do it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot, Marita. Updated operating standards for specific reviews. Again, that's another process-oriented issue, but a lot of us participate

and participated on reviews. So again, that might be something that we want to comment on as ICANN participants even though it's not really an end user issue. Do people have opinions about that?

Alright. I'll take a look at that, I guess, since I've done some reviews. It feels more like something that people that have been on reviews should comment on on a personal level. it seems hard to imagine that the standards for reviews is an ALAC issue. But I'll take a look. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Jonathan. And having participated in too many reviews perhaps, if there is a thing as too many reviews, I agree with you. It's not specifically an ALAC matter. It's very procedural as such, it looks at the nomination of candidates for review teams, scope setting, review team working methods, dispute resolution, review output, roles, responsibilities, all of these things which are – I think it's a pretty well-oiled system after ICANN has done these things for so many years, and proposes doing is a number of small tweaks to this.

I have a lot of trust in that the people who are following this very closely and who are driving this process know what they're doing. So I shouldn't imagine that we should spend too much time on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Looks like Cheryl might disagree, but Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I probably disagree as well. I must admit I have not looked at he current comment, and I'm not 100% sure I know what the changes are they are proposing from the draft, last draft standards. The people who are supposed to know what they are doing have proposed some really stupid things in the past. So I would not take it as given.

Now, whether it's of general interest to At-Large, I think the outcomes of these reviews have exceedingly large impact on At-Large, and there is a select number of people who are involved in this process that probably have some input. Now, maybe everything they're saying right now is completely wise, maybe not, remains to be seen. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jonathan. Following on, to some extent, I'm not overly discomforted about this at all. These are not particularly stupid ideas. We certainly should look, however, of the devil in any details. For example, there are some perhaps unknown unknowns that we might want to shake a bit of attention towards, things like for example in this – sorry, my granddaughter feels it's important to give me a background noise with her computer that she's using while I'm doing my call.

But for example, the requirement to have the scope of the specific reviews – and remember, the specific reviews are ATRT, WHOIS, Security Stability, etc. It's not the organizational reviews. And so the scope needs to be predetermined, is the best way I could briefly

describe it. That's fine, but then there's a couple of questions that we need to raise, and 18 months – because it can take four to six months to properly scope something if you're going to really get into it there on some subjects at least. But certainly at least three months is likely.

Many of these reviews, ATRT for example, are limited in bylaws to 12 months. And so what do we do? Do we have separate teams scope? Do we have people unrelated to the then review team's scope? Should there be a carryover of people from the scoping group through to the review team? Stuff like that is well worth looking at.

So I would strongly recommend doing a smart look through it, and certainly putting something in. It may be, "Gee, that's fantastic, thank you so much. We look forward to operating in those principles." But I suspect it might be a, "Have you thought about..." in a couple of paragraphs. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So it's really just us as smart people, as opposed to something that's of specific interest to At-Large or to end users that you're talking about, Cheryl. It's just about having more brains, more eyeballs on the plan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, on the plans. It's not going to – is it going to make any difference to the end user only if something goes really wrong in, say, a security and stability, or even perhaps a WHOIS review team? The end user thankfully shouldn't know anything about all of this.

Is it going to affect At-Large? Some of these most certainly will, and not the least of which would be the accountability and transparency review teams, because they can have significant impost on how we operate. But most importantly, it is part of the empowered community to properly run these things. So that's worthwhile noting as well. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I've taken a brief look at the changes that are proposed. I note that this builds on an earlier update to the rules of these reviews from 2017. I went back and looked at the public comment review tool from that 2017 round of public comments, and note that ALAC or At-Large did not submit a comment as such. However, Alan Greenberg submitted a comment individually. At least the way it's listed, it looks like it's individual. I'll leave it to Alan to correct me if I'm wrong, as I know he will.

I'm looking at the changes that are proposed now, which come from those public comments and come from feedback from some webinars last year. A number of them has to do with how SO/ACs, including our AC, deal with nominating folks for review team members and candidates and the like. So it does go to the question of how – if we like the way the operating changes that are being made, whether they're good for the end users or whether they tend to favor other communities or other interests. I can't tell briefly in my brief review whether there is any such effect ,but a lot of it's got SO/AC all over the

place and roles for the SO/AC chairs and the like, so I think from an operational point of view, it deserves a looksie from us.

I don't know if there's anything buried in there that is somehow going to create something that's highly [inaudible] let's say for the contracted parties –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, Greg –

GREG SHATAN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Given that you're in this a little bit, can I ask you to prepare a short presentation for the next CPWG call on the key issues that you identify that you think might be of interest to us? [inaudible] ACs differ from stakeholder groups and things that we might want to remark on?

GREG SHATAN: I'll give it a looksie and prepare to report back. I consider myself voluntold. If something comes up about choosing gourmet restaurants, I'll voluntold myself for that as well.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. Alright. I think that is something that needs to happen in Kobe, right? Thanks, Greg. Alan, do you still need to comment given that we've decided to –

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, go for it then.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is correct, I submitted a comment. I think Cheryl planned to, and I don't know if she got around to it for the very first one. I would strongly say you want to delegate this to the people who have a very active interest, and specifically those with experience on review teams. And the ALAC may choose to ratify or not as it wishes, but I think it's a stronger comment coming from the ALAC than it is from individuals. It is conceivable Cheryl and I and Olivier – and I'm not sure who else – has participated in these reviews may have differing opinions, and we may not come to a common agreement, but I suspect most of them, we will. I share much of the concerns that Cheryl raised as possible concerns. I believe the only review for instance that is mandated to length is the ATRT, which is a very short one year, suggesting 18 months having not quite completed a review, as chair, I certainly have some input or some feelings on that that I'd like to be able to contribute, and I think it's important that we do make a statement. And I would prefer to see it coming from ALAC. Not my call, but I would prefer to see it coming from

ALAC if the various people involved can come to closure on it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, Alan. I think that's what we'll decide definitively on the next call, but let's go through and identify [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to be on the next call. I've put some of my points forward now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We'll muddle through. But I think that's what we'll do, is focus on some specific issues that we identify. I'll take a look, Greg will take a look. I was a CCT review chair, so I have some experience with taking longer than a year, that's for sure.

Okay, so that's the one that we're going to look at looking at. And then the last one is the amendment to the IANA naming functions contracts. That, again, is one that I did not take the initiative to read. I don't know if anyone else, but it's not immediately obvious to me what the end user perspective is there. I'm happy to open the discussion about that. Olivier, go ahead, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Jonathan, for this. This one is not only just small amendments. It seems to be replacing chunks of text in the IANA

naming functions contract. And given the amount of time that we have spent as a group to work with the legal firm in putting these contracts together, and given the fact that I see Greg Shatan has put his hand up and he was one of the main people working on this, maybe we should be commenting and getting Greg to be involved in this. [Let's check.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I did spend far too much time on the IANA transition and on the IANA naming function contract and related things. I don't know that a detailed comment is required, but as I see what's happening here, it's just making a change to the agreement to make it easier, or less cumbersome, I should say, to update service-level agreements, because the way things were done before, it needed to be treated as a full contract amendment when really, [this all] needs to be on a schedule and to be given a more abbreviated review.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg, can I challenge you to identify what the end user perspective is on this though? You're a smart guy and a legal wizard, and who might have a perspective to bring on this, but is this something that as we represent the interests of end users, will be dramatically affected by amendments?

GREG SHATAN: I need to take a look at it. I would say that the potential end user effect is if we as At-Large or the general end user man and woman and nonbinary in the street have a chance now to weigh in on contract changes because it's very detailed, lengthy, transparent, highly overseen process. Problem is of course that's way too heavyweight for the SLA changes like 99.5 being changed to 99.9% uptime or something like that. So I need to see whether we somehow are getting boxed out. That basically it. If we are loosing an opportunity, either as an AC or the ability of the general public to make a comment that we now have, that is a problem, and I think it would be a canary in the coal mine problem because we always have to watch out for being put in the corner, like a baby, and nobody puts a baby in the corner.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Alright, let's take a look at it. Thanks, Greg. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. Clearly, users will be impacted by any changes. However, the analysis we did a number of years ago when we were looking at the overall IANA transition is our interests are very much aligned with the interests of the other parties, specifically the registries that use the service and the root servers and stuff. We're looking for reliability and things that work, a failsafe, and that's not very different from other parties. So although yes, I think we should look at it, and we may well have a comment, I doubt we're likely to be at odds with some of the other parties involved in this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Thanks, Alan.] Okay, we'll take a look at it. I think specifically for Greg's point about anything that seems to change sort of institutional participation of At-Large in these decision-making processes, I think we should always be on lookout for small changes that have potential impact, and we'll see if there's anything we'll want to "me too" in there as well, but probably [looking for] a fairly short time.

And then what's next? Next slide, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Jonathan. Next is now the current statements that are in progress. This first one is work track five on geographic names. This is being drafted by Marita Moll, Justine Chew and Yrjö Lansipuro, and I believe Justine has a presentation. So maybe we should load that and display it, and have her give a presentation. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Hi. I'd like to actually [give the floor to] Marita, because I'm still [inaudible] Marita, hope you don't mind, I'm happy to take notes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If you want to move –

MARITA MOLL: Okay, Justine –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Go ahead, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Alright. How much time do we actually have to try to talk about this, Jonathan? Five minutes, ten minutes?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Try for ten.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Justine has put together this incredible set of slides. I hope some people had a chance to have a quick look at it, or even a long look at it. I think we should hire Justine – I should anyway – to teach us how to put together a bunch of slides like this, because it's really complex, but she has the incredible ability to boil things down so that we can really take it in. Do I have control of these slides? No. Yes, now I do.

ANDREA GLANDON: You do now, Marita. Go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. So the slides start out with an explanation of the timeline. We are looking at this deadline of the 22nd of January, and the places where you can comment. And the key issues in play here, really nice job in highlighting in red hotly debated topics, marked in red, and you can see there – there's a whole bunch of topics, but continued reservation of two-letter strings, nonavailability of three-letter strings, geographic

names versus generic names. These are the things that we really – I guess we might want to concentrate on when we start talking about it.

It goes on to talk about the background and the context of it, which is a 2007 guidebook and what happened in 2012. So yeah, we need to read this. I'm not going to read it out loud, but background and context issues here. Justine, do you want to say something about this particular page? Are you there?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Hi. No, it's just a summary of what the work track five identified as being existing policy, and existing GNSO 2007 policy, versus what's in the 2012 applicant guidebook. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. So you can see some things are checked off, others, GNSO policy, yeah. Continuing on here, the nice thing about what Justine has done here is that she's highlighted and starred the things that we really need to look at, so controversial stuff, geographic names, two-letter ccTLDs, and then the three of us, Justine, Yrjö and myself who, all three of us, did participate in discussions, we put in what we thought was appropriate under the proposed ALAC position. This is just to give you something to react to. There are going to be people who don't like what we put there. that's just fine, but we thought it better start with something than just to have a blank.

So we're suggesting we agree with PR2, continue to reserve all character letter letter ascii combos. So yeah. So partial agreement, this

requires reading. One thing that has been done here is we've taken apart the whole report and grouped stuff together that looked like it naturally grouped together, like all the questions around the two-letter codes are together, so we can look at them together.

And then we can go down to preventative measures for capital cities, names and translations. This is another one that will require us to look at it in detail, we're agreeing with it sort of partially, but [will be] plenty of opportunity for people to make comments on various places to respond to what we put in it.

In this particular thing, we've agreed with proposal number ten, which is continue to require the letter of support and nonobjection for strings of capital city names, but add that you shouldn't be able to get them because you didn't send in an intended use statement. That was hotly debated in the session, and so I'm sure we'll have some more debates about them.

And carrying on here, preventative measures for noncapital names, when we get down to slide number 17 and 18, there's an area there we didn't put anything in here. When it came to how should the term "geographic name" be defined for the purposes of the new gTLD program, this is a complex – we really haven't defined what a geographic name, what that is, what it means, what are we talking about. And so I could see us having a fulsome discussion on the list, and here in one of the calls, just talking about what is a geographic name and what would we put in that, because this is a very important part of this discussion, because unless we can agree with the term geographic names – and where are we going? I don't know.

So this one, slide 17, 18, and 19, are places where we just put "to be discussed." Again, talking about, what do we mean by these terms and how are we going to place them into categories? There's a lot of unanswered questions in this whole exercise, but we did our best to try to give you some answers to some of them that were a little less controversial. Well, not less controversial but maybe easier to at least put a proposal in there.

And so this goes down to – we've got 22 slides, and we need to continue the discussion as per the various sections that we've put together. So we'll probably take the two-letter names and see if we can agree on what's been proposed there, and then the three-letter codes, see if we can agree on that, and then the use of the capital cities, letters of support or not, noncapital cities, and then go on to some of the stuff that we really have got to get our heads around, like what is the definition.

So I'm going to stop there for now. Justine, do you want to weigh in here?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Hi. Thanks, Marita. Well, that's a great summation of the slides. I suppose we should put it on the floor to ask questions, maybe to have some questions that [inaudible] answered. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Is Yrjö on the call? Yes. Do you want to say something, Yrjö?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah. Thank you. Well, there's hardly anything to add, this is so comprehensive, and I think that basically, everybody who is interested in this should now read [inaudible] and start a discussion on the list and at the next [CPWG] meeting.

One little thing that was mentioned here was this definition of geographic names, and I think that we have all the time in [WT,] we have discussed cities, we have discussed generally geographic names [refer to] administrative units, like cities and counties and whatever, and I think that we should somehow try to separate these and then the geographic features that are mountains and valleys and so on and so forth. I think that it's difficult to discuss all these different geographic features at the same time, but this is one of the things that should be developed further. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: I see Alan's got his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The Google doc that's pointed to on the sheet doesn't seem to have nearly as many answers with the same depth as the slide presentation does, so what is the status of the current draft response, and how does that relate to the rather impressive document that Justine put together?

MARITA MOLL:	That's right, Alan. We've been working on this slide presentation, and we have not put all this stuff on the Google doc yet. [So sorry,] but it's going to happen.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. I'm a little bit concerned with the timing. We're looking at a submission date of about 12 days from now, and I'm assuming the suggested way to comment on your proposed answers is to put comments in the Google doc, and I think that's a fine way to do that, but I think we're going to have to – when do you estimate the Google doc will be ready for us to comment on? That is, be aligned with the various positions or non-positions you've taken in the presentation? I'm just worried about the timing going forward.
MARITA MOL:	Yeah, I hear you. I'll let Justine, who really deals with the process part of this, answer that question.
JUSTINE CHEW:	Thanks, Alan, for the question. Yes, as Marita said, we had began to populate the Google doc with some responses, and then our attention got diverted to preparing a presentation because we needed [it out] in time for the call and for people to digest this stuff.
	I would say if it's alright with people, if people would have a look at slides and use the opportunity, maybe in the next couple of days, to actually comment to the slides or any issues of this topic in the mailing list in response to Marita's call on the mailing list, that would be great,

because that would at least give us an idea of whether the three of us are heading in the right direction. We don't necessarily want to populate something and then the majority of the group comes back and says, "Oh, we're totally against this" and it's flipped, so it's double work sort of thing.

In the meantime, the three of us can look at transposing some of the ideas that we have on the slides to the Google doc. Some of it is already there, but as Alan said, it's not totally a mirror of each other, because of the issue of having to divert our attention to the presentation. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My only comment is I would suggest you put comments on the Wiki, not on the mailing list. It becomes really difficult to coordinate the two, and some people use one and some people use another.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. That's possible too, it's just extra work for the three of us, and I've noticed by experience that aw larger policy documents, very few people actually comment on the Wiki, so I'm open to suggestions as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: What we've done in the past is staff can post them to the Wiki. The only problem with e-mails is as people change the subject, as people do on occasion, it becomes very hard to collate them all together.

MARITA MOLL:	Yeah. I guess we're hoping for staff help on this, and yeah, we're going to get our act together on this. I guess people can comment on the slides, but right, we hear you. Just look at it, give us some ideas, we're moving ahead. Jonathan.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks. I guess I just have kind of a process comment, which is that it may make sense for a call such as this one or even calls for comments on the e-mails to be more specific and discrete topics so that it's not an all or nothing thing, like a call for everyone who's willing to read this entire thing and think about all those issues as opposed to, "Here's a controversial issue that came up between us. Can we get a discussion going on that?" I feel like that kind of a thread is often more productive than one that just goes every which way on all of the issues that are raised inside of the slide deck, for example. So I'd like to put in a request for more discrete discussions, because I think they're more productive.
MARITA MOLL:	Thank you. Alan, you're next on the list.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Sorry, that's an old hand.
MARITA MOLL:	Okay. Thank you. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Hi. I would just like to perhaps suggest that – not to limit people's attention on the extremely complicated topic of geographic names, but just an indication for me, the key issues that people might want to look at is the issue of whether we should make the two-letter letter ccTLD or two-letter letter code [inaudible] open to use as ccTLD, and who should apply.

If people recall, sometime back in August, there was a discussion that was initiated by Maureen, I believe, in respect of what we call the [inaudible], have a look at that. The second area would be whether it's desirable to have preventative measures for noncapital city names.

he third one would be something that Christopher Wilkinson has raised in the work track five discussions, which is to do with ISO 4217, currency codes, whether we feel that those are important to protect and how we go about saying so, because we note that [there are] expressions in work track five to say that these codes are not geo terms, so if the work track five's work slides towards that way, then we would still like to be able to say that ALAC believes that ISO 4217 currency codes are important enough to protect and SubPro should do something about it almost, or something along those lines.

And the last area would be the two questions [that were marked] to be discussed to do with definition of geographic terms. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. Greg Shatan. Greg, are you there?

GREG SHATAN: Yes, I'm here. I guess I'm just still trying to puzzle through the procedural challenge here. I've got a pretty good command of the subject matter. Don't agree with everything that's been proposed, although I agree with a lot of it. But just wondering where the heck I should comment. It sounds like we might do e-mails but there might be discrete e-mails, we might comment in the Google doc but the Google doc doesn't actually have what we're commenting on, so we're going to have to hold the slideshow in our hand while we look at the Google doc and pretend it's in there.

I don't know, I recognize the tremendous amount of work here, but there seems to be a horse changing problem here in trying to get to the actual comment doc and have something to actually comment on. But I guess we continue to refine our processes, and if nobody likes to comment on the Wiki, then driving people to comment on the Wiki is something [inaudible] maybe should be looking at. Although again, I think it has great advantages, but that's something that Jonathan and others can comment [inaudible].

I think there are a number of substantive issues here that I think there should be some real discussion on, such as the balance between preventive and curative, the issue of needing a permission of a public authority or government when you want to use what I'll call a multipurpose term for a term other than its geographic use, and balance against the conceivable potential for abuse of such thing.

So I guess the question is, how, in the time that we have, are we going to actually have some actual back and forth considering if this is being

put in on the 22nd, ALAC itself needs a number of days to deal with this. So I don't know what our kind of deadline is here.

So I think we really need to just have a clear understanding of how we're going about this and hopefully try to find a way that we'll engage in substance on this. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Greg. On that particular issue, I don't know, but is it possible to get some staff assistance in putting these two things together, the slide and the Google doc? Can anyone let me know if there's any possibilities in that department?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Marita, I'll just mention, sure, I'm happy to take a stab at putting the slides on the Google doc, but if Heidi wants to comment, go ahead. Thanks. Maybe not. Okay, so yeah, I'll put the slides on the Google doc.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. Christopher Wilkinson. Christopher, you're on mute.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Here we go. Very briefly, first of all, thank you for the slides, but I need to read them in a printout because I can't absorb quite so much small print in real time on a call. But I congratulate Justine for her ability to do this sort of thing. I couldn't do it.

Three small points. First of all, picking up on Greg's comment, I'm quite sure that this question of approval for the nongeographical use of geographical terms will go right to the top, whether it's the GAC or it's the board or indeed the United Nations. It is quite inconceivable from my point of view that the 2012 provisions regarding nongeographical use could be possibly maintained. Politically, it's just off the map.

Secondly, I've noticed that there are cross-references between WT5, work track five, and the other work tracks in the PDP, and notably, currently, the one dealing with auctions and requests for proposals. I have a distinct impression that we have not fully absorbed the relevant cross-references between existing proposals in the work tracks one to four, and the objectives an requirements of work track five. I think that's an area which needs some more work.

I would also say that work track five is cross-community, but the rest of the PDP is not yet really cross-community. And I'm not quite sure to what extent difficult decisions recommended by work track five will be welcomed or vetoed by the GNSO council. The GNSO council does not function as a cross-community entity in the same way as the work track five.

And finally, there's the question – not finally, but thirdly, there's the question of the jurisdiction of incorporation of geographical top-level domains. So for now, [I'll leave it at that,] and thank you all, and particularly Justine, Marita and others for your work on this particular topic. Thank you. Good night.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Christopher. I'm going to suggest that over the next few days, we're going to have a consolidation of the Google doc and the slide deck. I would, though, suggest to everybody, the slide deck has a lot of background information in it, and it does group things together in a very useful way, so it's still really good to look at that slide deck and take it in as a background for actually dealing with the Google doc if you haven't been deeply involved in this discussion, because we really would like to have a lot of people responding.

So we'll do that in the next few days with the help of Evin. Thank you very much. And then start a few discussions on the list, but I would want to ask Jonathan that we would have a big chunk of time in the next call to talk about certainly the top three, the two-level names and the three-code names and the issue around cities, capital cities and noncapital cities. So we did talk about those three things –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Thanks. And it will take up a large part of that call, but we could probably resolve a lot of these things. In the meantime, we'll work on the process. thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you. During the webinar prior to this meeting, I asked the question for the proposal made during a public session in one of the ICANN meeting about various possible list of cities were taken into account [inaudible] look at annex B, and I tried to look at the annex B, and except the list from the ISO, I don't think or I don't see if other list were taken into account, like the one from IANA or other international organization outside of ISO.

Can you tell me if that was discussed or not? Because I think it could be a partly – or maybe a solution for which city we are taking into account for the top-level domain names. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Sébastien, I'm afraid there were a number of lists suggested, but unfortunately, we never got to the stage where we would be looking at lists. We were in a more background discussion about how we wanted to deal with cities, period. Even, were they on the list or not, didn't really matter. What mattered was how we're going to deal with cities. Are we going to separate them, are we going to put some aside?

We never had any resolutions of any of those basic issues that would have to be resolved before we even started looking at the lists, if that helps answer your question.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I may.

MARITA MOLL:	Yeah. Go ahead.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	Okay. Thank you, Marita, for your answer. I have difficulty to put aside to solve the problem and the possible list when you look at the comments made, for example the size of the cities, the population numbers and so forth are taken into account. There was suggestion for the list looking to the airport cities, the city where there's airport for example, but there were other proposal. And I think it could be useful to take all that somewhere in the reflection, because it could help to solve which city we are protecting and which city we don't want or we can't protect at the same level. Thank you.
MARITA MOLL:	Thank you, Sébastien. I think we will have a fulsome discussion on that next time when we talk about cities, and what's a city and what isn't a city. And there will be disagreement. Guaranteed. So Jonathan, that looks like it. Do you want to take over again?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	You know me, I always want to take over. Thanks a lot for the presentation, thanks for all the effort in this. I look forward to some discrete, in-depth conversations on the next call, so we'll make sure and set aside enough time to do that.
	What do we have next in the agenda? I guess –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan –

JONATHAN ZUCK: – the other is the Neustar proposal, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We still have two other policy comments which have a later public comment date of the 8th of February and the 20th of February. One is the ICANN draft FY20 operating plan and budget, five-year operating plan update, and that is firmly in the hands of the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, and the second one is the first consultation in a two-year planning process, and I believe that this might also be in the Finance and Budget Subcommittee. So I think that because of time, we can probably jump to 5.1, if you're finished with your section.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yeah, I am. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. We'll go over to Justine Chew then for the report on the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. The overarching issues one through four, Neustar's proposal for a three-phase new gTLD application model. And Justine did say that she didn't need very much time for this, she will just take us through the slides very swiftly. So I appreciate that very much, Justine. Thank you.

	And I note that before that – before you start, actually, I note Sébastien's hand is still up. I'm not sure if that was for the previous section, or is that –
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	No, it's not still, it's again up for this topic.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay.
SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	If you'll allow me a few seconds. I am really puzzled that one [organization] within ICANN participants can put like that a proposal not going through any process, any group, and be taken care by a group. I am really astonished by that, and I don't know why we are spending time on that specific issue if a group or subgroup or working group, whatever name come with that and say, "Hey, you need to discuss this issue, but because we think that it's an interesting one, it's something different." Thank you.
JUSTINE CHEW:	Sébastien, I can answer your question.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks for this, Sébastien. And over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Thank you. Just very quickly. In reply to Sébastien's question or his comment just now, I'd just like to say that this is something that I'm doing as part of my role as subsequent procedures liaison for the ALAC on subsequent procedures working group.

This particular proposal is part of the public comment that was submitted by Neustar, so it has gone through a process and it's still going through a process. So don't hold it against Neustar, it's not their doing, per se. They have gone through the right process by submitting it as part of their public comment to the initial report.

Now, moving on from that, this is something that if some of you are not aware, the SubPro PDP used to have work tracks one through four. Now those have been reorganized into what we call subgroups A, B and C. So subgroups A, B and C are charged with reviewing the public comments that have been received based on a group of topics. And I'm currently on all three subteams, which is why I'm [sort of like – I don't know.]

And we are reviewing the comments in terms of identifying where there is consensus, where there are divergence, where there are concerns, and sort of working on how to and what to refer back to the full working group for a more substantive discussion.

So typically, topics that have full consensus where we see no divergence – and obviously, it's going to be an easy referral back to working group to say that this particular question was answered in affirmative, there was no divergence, so no issues.

There are other questions where there are various divergence or concerns raised by the different people who submitted public

comments, and those we are treating with more care to say whether, okay, do we think this is really a concern, do we really think this is divergence? And members of each subteam have been providing those contribution – can be contributing their inputs and feedback on those things.

Now, this particular one on Neustar proposal is something that came up in subgroup A. it was a rather substantive comment, of this particular comment anyway, and the working group co-chair, Jeff Neuman, he's also the co-lead of subgroup A. So in those capacities, he's actually put these forward for the members to take back to the stakeholder group. So in this case, for me to take back to ALAC to find out what At-Large or ALAC thinks about this proposal. So that's why we're here.

This is the backgrounder that I just spoke to you. Now, here on this slide number three, I just want to see that the two beliefs that are stated here are actually beliefs stated by Neustar, okay? So none of this content is coming from me per se, I'm just transposing them to a slide so it's more easily digestible to people who want to contribute to this consultation.

Okay. And here, I think there might be a little bit of confusion as to what people thought would be an open round. Now, from what I understand – and that was clarified by Donna Austin, who is [still] acting as the representative for Neustar, she said to us that open round means open in the sense that it's not specific to whether it's a brand, dot-brand application or a geo-name application or community, so it's the totally opposite of what phase one, phase two and phase three, which is what

they're proposing, does, and don't confuse open round with first come, first serve.

There, as a fine print on their proposal, [it did] mention that, as you see on the far-right column, the second square bullet, they did suggest that there would be a first come, first serve, open application process after this phase three, plus another round, open round.

Okay, so and in this respect, there is no specific timeline for me or At-Large [via me, I suppose] to refer back what At-Large thinks of this proposal. I would like to cap it in the next two weeks at least, or one week. So what I'm going to suggest is because we are running out of time here, is as you know, some of you know, I've already put this on the mailing list. There wasn't a Wiki page per se for me to post, this is why I had to put it on the agenda for today's meeting.

But I've already issued this presentation through the mailing list over the weekend, and I've received some comments. I would like to keep the contracted parties open for another week and see if I can look at distilling some of the feedback for the next CPWG call.

Okay, if any people have got questions, because I see a full list of hands. So, Olivier, Jonathan, are you chairing or am I chairing?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Since you're taking notes at the same time, perhaps I can just try and go through the queue. But I do remind everyone that we are already ten minutes late on our official end time, so please be short in your

comments, and to the point. So I know you are, so let's start with Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Three points. Number one, the PDP is charged with reviewing public comments and deciding how to integrate them or not. This is a very substantive public comment, and I much appreciate the fact that Justine is bringing it to this group instead of adlibbing when the discussion comes up within the working group. And these are working groups that I have participated in heavily in the past. I'm not very active right now because of other commitments. So I do appreciate it. That's number one.

Number two, on the substance of what is being proposed here, we the exception of one or two of the details, these are things that ALAC has advocated strongly in the past, but we never really believed it could possibly happen. So we haven't put in firm proposals, but we have very much suggested that we have phased rounds depending on the categories. So I think we should be very pleased that we have an opportunity to discuss this and to weigh in on it.

And number three, I would strongly suggest that we ask Evin to put up a policy page on this one topic, even though it's not a public comment. We do that on other things, because I think it does warrant specific comments, and an opportunity for us to get our act together and come up with perhaps a unified answer on it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. I note that Cheryl Langdon-Orr also agrees that this is a most useful exercise in her point of view. Christopher Wilkinson, and then we'll get back to you, Justine, after the three remaining speakers. Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yeah. Hi. Very briefly, well, I've already commented on this issue to the list. Secondly, I seem to have been a victim of the confusion between rounds and phases. And I enjoy Alan's solution of speaking of phased rounds. That being said, my principal conclusion reading all this was that if [one] can galvanize attention by writing to [inaudible] rather than posting a comment to the PDP list, more than one of us can play that game, and maybe we should take some of these discussions out of the PDP and put them into [inaudible]. But that's not exactly facetious, but it's tongue in cheek. Thank you, Justine. I'll come back to this in the next few days. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. Next is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you very much, and Justine, nothing against you and the work you were doing in my first comment, but I am a little bit better that we just take one of the comment, even if it seems to be [very substantive.]

When we were thinking about the public comment, we dream to have two phase. One phase was to have the comments, and the second

phase was to have people able to answer those comments before it's going to the working group. But it's never happened like that. In fact, what you are doing is quite useful here, but I hope that if there are other comments where we need to have this discussion prior, it's going back to the working group. It will be done. Well done, Justine.

I think on the substance, yes, we were pushing a long time ago to have categories. I am not sure that those categories are the only one we need to set up, and particularly, I think that the community category must be set aside. Therefore, if we take that as a basis to start a discussion, we need to really agree on what is a phase, what is a round, and what are the different categories we want to have differentiated. And after that, we need to decide in which order we want to have them, if any order we want within those phases, and I [guess that] those phases, if we are doing all of them, it's going to be one run. But that's something I need to understand better. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. And finally, we have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. First of all, I would like to ask Justine if this [inaudible] from the co-chairs or if it is only to make [inaudible] beforehand. This is the first question. And the second thing, yes, Alan, we pushed towards categorization from the first time, and I still think it was a good thing.

But this manner of phasing the applications after the mail of Alexander, suppose that we start by any category, and we finish this application, so we have application, it's okay, so we [agree,] the process is finished or this category and agree we start the other category. Suppose that you have contention. Suppose you have a similarity case. [How will you do?]

So everything will be done at the end of the three phases, so there is no need of phasing in this case. Categorization is different for me, categorization is to make different categories and to give specific advantage or not – priority for some categories. This is what we pushed for before. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tijani, and now over to Justine with all the points that you've heard. Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. I don't think I actually need to respond to all the points. I think they were just [general] feedback, apart from Tijani's questions, which I actually missed [some of,] so [inaudible] put it in the chat and I could come back to it. I think you should continue with the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Justine. So Tijani, please type your point again in the chat for Justine to take note of. Now I see three hands. Let me close the queue as well, because we're so late. But Christopher, you still have your hand up. Is this a new hand? No, so we have Greg Shatan and Alan Greenberg left in the queue. Greg, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Just a couple of brief comments. I think that in terms of dot-brands, to the best of my knowledge, dot-brands have not been trying to elbow their way to the front of the queue, but rather, they're perceived as being the kind of easiest ones to deal with because of relatively low levels of contention sets, not having to deal with issues relating really to many registrations because they're intended to be closed, all those sorts of things.

But I'm not sure that – I saw Alexander's proposal, I don't know that it solves the problem that is actually intended to be solved by this proposal. I think it maybe just screws it up again. So I think that from the point of view of having a proposal, it's probably a nonstarter, although it's an interesting proposal on its own.

So I think whatever points we want to make here, personally, I think that the most likely to happen is an open round if we don't have some form if phases, but since nobody's decided which types of TLDs are better than others, with the possible exception of community, and that's turned into a rat's nest – and I'm not really enthusiastic about this proposal myself. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. Justine, back to you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Hi. Nothing more to add. I would just say that I will listen to the recording to pick up some notes of what people have said on this

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Justine, and thanks for bringing this –

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I did have my hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I was going to give you the last words, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Especially since you won't be with us next week, so this is why you have this extra privilege.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll be very quick. It's not 100% clear how contention will be handled. If you look at the round dates, for instance community TLDs would start on October 2020 if you believe this, and an open round would be October 21. I presume this means that there will not be an opportunity for contention between community TLD and regular TLDs, and they simply get preference if they pass whatever the thresholds are.

so Tijani was worried about contention. I think this removes a significant amount of the contention altogether and says it's no longer an issue. So it's not 100% clear from this proposal, at least what I've seen of it, but it may be in the formal proposal that Neustar has put together that I haven't looked at. So I think we need to look at this carefully, and it may well be quite supportive of the kinds of things we'd asked for before. And it may in fact give community TLDs a very strong preference that they didn't have before because of the existence of possible contentions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. I would say that this having generated much discussion, as was suggested earlier – and I don't see it in the action items, I gather this needs to have its own policy page. So if I could ask Evin to create a policy page for this. It doesn't necessarily mean that a statement will be issued, but at least it will be a home for the further discussion. And obviously, that excellent slide deck would be a good starting point to put on that policy page for discussion, and I ask everyone to follow up on that Wiki page and on the mailing list.

Now, I'm not seeing any further issues in Any Other Business, at least nobody else has put their hands up, so we're very late on time. The next meeting is the last discussion we need to have. Next week, I shall be flying at 21:00 UTC, so it's going to be difficult to have a call at the same time as this week. I gather Alan and Hadia will not be available because they'll be fully involved in the discussion that will take place in Toronto. So we are set to continue perhaps on some of the policy issues that we have here.

Does anyone who is currently holding the pen on any of these policy issues have a problem with using the earlier time? Not quite sure what the earlier time is. Is it 13:00 UTC? I note that [inaudible]

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, for me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so 13:00 UTC on next Wednesday. If I could ask any of the penholders, so Marita, Justine, is this okay with you? Maureen, Tijani.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg Shatan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Greg, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Those are the three presentations that we discussed doing next week, so I think in particular, we need to make sure that we can accommodate Greg, Justine and Marita.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We happen to have the three of them on the call still. "It's awkward, but I can make it work," says Greg. And Marita says okay with her. So if you want, we could certainly make it slightly later if there is

such a problem, or slightly earlier, by an hour, just like we've done for this call where we had to move things around a little bit.

Let's take it as 13:00 UTC, and we'll follow up by e-mail. Staff would follow up by e-mail with the three people who will be presenting if we need to adjust maybe an hour earlier or an hour later or so. Earlier would clash with SubPro. Well, there you go, so can't do it any earlier anyways. Thanks for this, Cheryl. We also need to make sure we don't clash with everything else, which is always a pain.

Okay, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cheryl, do you keep a separate clock on your wall that just says UTC at this point?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't see any clock at the moment, I can't see anything at all, so that's how tired I am today.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Thanks, everyone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a lot easier in Europe because we're just that close to the center of the world. UTC is GMT in the middle of the winter, and when you live just a stone's throw away from Greenwich, it's not that hard.

JONATHAN ZUCK: True.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, everyone. This has been a great call. Thanks, and I guess there's nothing else to add, so this call is now ended, and with apologies for the late end. That has been a great discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, folks.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you all. Bye.

ANDREA GLANDON: [Thank you, everyone.] Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]