YEŞIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group, CPWG, Call on Wednesday.

I hear an echo. If our operator can please stop it, thank you.

So the call is taking place on Wednesday, 16th of January, 2019 at 13:00 UTC. On our call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Carlton Samuels, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Daniel Nanghaka, Eduardo Diaz, Joanna Kulesza, Sébastien Bachollet, Gordon Chillcott, Alfredo Calderón, Kaili Kan, Justine Chew, Marita Moll, Maria Korniets, Satish Babu, Bastiaan Goslings, Greg Shatan, Avri Doria, and Alberto Soto.

We have received apologies from Maureen Hilyard, Christopher Wilkinson, Nadira Al-Araj, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Yrjö Länsipuro, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

And from staff, we have Heidi Ullrich – she will be joining shortly – Evin Erdoğdu, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar, and I will be managing today's call.

And before we start, kind reminder as usual, please don't forget to state your names before speaking not only for the interpretation, sorry, only for the transcription purposes please as we don't have interpretation for today's call.

And now I would like to leave the floor back to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. And welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group Call, weekly call. We've got a busy agenda today yet again with first looking at the last week's action items and we'll have a full 60 minutes on policy comment updates with a number of policy comments, frankly, being drafted which is great to see, by the way.

Then we'll have, Evin will speak to us about the executive summary page that she has created and then we will finish off with an item and any other business, a consultation and [new star] proposal, which you will recall we already spoke about a little bit last week and there's a follow-up on this, this week.

Is there any amendment to the agenda, any other business, any additions or deletions that you would like to see on the agenda, please? Joanna Kulesza.

JOANNA KULESZA: Hello, I hope my audio is audible. I hope you guys can hear me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you're very faint. You sound very far away. She sounds, Joanna sounds very far away. I can try it again.

JOANNA KULESZA: Is this any better? I adjusted my volume.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Much better.

JOANNA KULESZA: Wonderful. Brilliant. So just very briefly, in terms of any other business, Alfredo and I were wondering if there is any chance to include a policy development session during the Kobe meeting. If the policy development group would be willing and interested in working on a short 30-minute, I suppose a session like that, in Kobe or a longer one if you guys feel it relevant, we would be thrilled to accommodate that as part of [capacity] building. So if that could be offered for discussion, I would be happy to hear your thoughts. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for the suggestion, Joanna. If I could, because I'm not sure where the agendas are at the moment in Kobe, but if I could ask staff, we'll have to [inaudible] the whole time for the call to try and find out if already something is scheduled or not, or perhaps, [inaudible] Kobe, Jonathan Zuck will know, then we can discuss this briefly at the end of this call. That's great.

I see no other hands, so the agenda is adopted with the addition of this item and we can go swiftly to the action items from last week. There's one remaining action item and that's for Evin to update the proposed changes to the Registrar Stakeholder Group charter to no statement. I believe that's probably been done. Hasn't it? Evin?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, actually, that's been sent out, a notice, a recommendation that the CPWG recommended it be no statement, but the ALAC leadership team will be meeting later today so that'll be officially marked as no statement after they confirm today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. All the other action items have been done and it's great. You see a lot of action items and they're all ticked, so if there is no other comment or question about any of these, then we can swiftly move to agenda item number three, and that's the policy comment update. And I will hand the floor for this to Jonathan Zuck. Jonathan, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yep.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. All right, great. So we have a number of updates today from a number of folks, so I'm inclined to just dive in. This is the overall state of affairs but we have some presentations on a number of things, so I thought I would give Marita the floor first if you're ready, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Yes. Here I am, ready. Can everybody hear me well or should I go to the phone?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you fine, I think.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. So can I have the slide deck up for people as we put together a nice slide deck pared down from the slides we had last week, put as few words as possible on these slides, although it doesn't meet Jonathan's qualifications, I know. I couldn't get down to just one sentence or two on the slide. Sorry, but this is the best we could do.

Really, we picked out three of what we thought were the major issues or the most contentious issues in the work track 5 geonames group and that was the red ones. Although, it looks like there's more than three, really. We're talking about the two-letter letter strings, the three-letter strings, and the reservation of names for various types of geo entities. I'll go straight on to the first group of issues. Now I'm hearing an echo. What happened? Are we okay?

Okay, so the first slide, we have something. We have these three items. It's the way the comment is organized, there are questions, there are proposals, and there are policy recommendations, and they're all in different parts of the paper, so we put the things that are connected together, so we could think about them together. And these three things are all talking about two letter-letter versus three-character gTLDs.

The very first one, the policy recommendation, is to continue to reserve all two-character, letter-letter ASCII combinations at the top level for existing and future ccTLDs and we are proposing that we would agree with that particular proposal. So I put that one up for discussion, first off.

How does the group feel about agreeing with this particular proposal? So everything was ISO3166 is reserved. There's no change, really, in this but we continue to carry on with this as it is, basically, the work group, one of the things that they were able to come to some agreement on. I see check marks coming up on the list, a few check marks.

Okay, well, I'm going to go down to the questions and things relating to this. More check marks are coming up. Thank you.

Is there, are we recording this agreement, disagreement or abstentions in any way? Can I ask staff if that happens?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Sorry, Marita. There's a slight echo. What was the question?

MARITA MOLL: The question is when I see these check marks coming up, people agreeing, is that recorded?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: I don't see a [inaudible] recording of this call, but I can note that now. Sure.

MARITA MOLL: Justine says she's taking notes, so…

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Yes, yes.

MARITA MOLL: Yes. I really would like to leave here with some feeling that we can be fairly secure in proposing what we're proposing as far as the group is concerned. I might come back to this after we look at the related section. The things that are related to this, oh no, that one's on its own, actually. Sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Do you want to answer Bastiaan's question?

MARITA MOLL: Oh, I didn't see that. I don't see it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: The chat.

MARITA MOLL: Oh, sorry. Where is it?

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS:	So Marita, the question is, is there just an elevator pitch as to why we should agree with this?
MARITA MOLL:	Because it's the way, we have, it's no change from the present. We currently believe that two-letter codes under ISO 366 is what's happening. We don't want, and that shouldn't be changed.
BASTIAAN GOSLINGS:	And just in case a new country pops up and needs one. Is that the idea?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yep.
MARITA MOLL:	Well, what would happen in that case is that they would, nothing is agreed to unless it gets on that list. Things go on and off that list. But the question here is what if there are two characters somebody wants to use that is not on the list at all, so dot-xy or dot-yz. Well no, you can't use that because we're continuing to reserve these two-character letter-letters.
	I see Greg has a question. Go ahead, Greg.
GREG SHATAN:	Thanks. More of a comment than a question, I think two-letter letter-letter combinations are kind of a building block of the DNS and are

recognized instantaneously as belonging to a ccTLD and have since the dawn of time. So status quo is not in itself a reason to do things, but when we're thinking about technical standards and kind of a basic common understanding of how the DNS works and how names and top-level domains are formed, it's almost in the Ten Commandments that the two letters are ccTLD.

My very first ICANN working group in 2007 was the One and Two-Letter Reserved Names Working Group, so this is an issue I've seen for a long time and while I think there are arguments, some arguments we made to the opposite on this of they're really not worth when stacked against this kind of fundamental formulation of how ccTLDs operate.

There's a distinction which is not really part of the work track 5, which is that letter-number and number-number and number-letter would potentially become unreserved. Right now they are reserved. Not for us to worry about, but from the point of view of letter-letter per se, that really is kind of, should remain kind of a stockpile, like a quarry of special granite that you only use to build one thing. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: It's part of the Ten Commandments. I'll remember that one. That's a good one.

Lutz Donnerhacke?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Yep.

MARITA MOLL: Go ahead.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: I do not have to add anything more. We should reserve the possible ccTLDs even if they do not exist at the moment because we can't foresee which countries will arise or not. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, thanks. That's great. So do we have a count that we're pretty secure on that? We don't have any objections, anyways.

All right, thank you. And I think we can move on to the next one, which is the policy recommendation number three, that we continue to consider alpha-3 codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard as country or territory names reserved at the top level and not available with grandfathering exceptions. Obviously, dot-com is an exception. So we are proposing to agree partly with number three. There's strong support for the continued reservation of this.

Justine, can you add a bit of color to that? Justine, are you there?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, I'm there. Sorry, what was the question?

MARITA MOLL: We're agreeing partly with proposal 3, but I seem to have lost some of the reasons why this partly agreed upon. Can you add a little to that?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yep, sure. I think the reason why it's partly agree is also because there was a proposal to make available three-letter strings which are not on the ISO 3166-1 standard. Those should, well, there's a proposal to make them available for application, so the exclusion would be just pertaining strictly to what is on the ISO 3166-1 list, which is why it's partly because it's connected to the next slide. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: I still have a hand up here. Lutz, is it on this or is that an old hand?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Sorry, sorry. I put the mouse on the wrong button.

MARITA MOLL: All right. Maybe this will be a little clearer when we go on to the proposal. ISO should not be the source of three-character streams used by ICANN to identify geographic names. So should work track 5 be asked to recommend a process to delegate three-letter codes or other country and territory names with specific parties, such as governance, public authorities or other entities.

So we're suggesting that the codes be made available for application by relevant government authorities. Carlos Gutierrez suggested that this

particular thing that the application by relevant government authorities, that they be available for public interest and public benefit purposes.

So the three-letter codes are sort of an in-between kind of category. Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I think just for clarity, at this point, in terms of reservation or reservation in potential delegation, we're only talking about the actual 3166 three-letter codes and not about all three-letter combinations. Other three-letter combinations are still available and I support that distinction.

I don't think that reserving all three-letter combinations, whatever they may be, makes sense. ccTLDs are not formed out of three-letter combinations. They're formed out of two-letter combinations and just like one said, "Respect the Ten Commandments," adding to them also is not a good idea and I think that for that reason, I also do support the delegation potentially of the 3,166 cods, but only to the country for which it stands. So that, to my mind, is kind of the way this should lay out. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: So for an example, dot-ca is for Canada but dot-can is also reserved under 3166-1, right? That would be an example of that.

Lutz?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Is this correct?

MARITA MOLL: Greg?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: I would really suggest to reserve the three-letter codes for geographical entities which are commonly accepted, for instance, Catalonia, dot-cat, or something like this. I do not want to see that three-letter codes are gone to private business for some obscure reasons. I think that two- and three-letter codes have a common understanding today for special purposes. Even dot-com or dot-org has a special meaning and you should reserve this and do not give it away for new TLD money, short-time money that's not [attention].

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, and that sort of gets to a little bit of what's being proposed here, that any application for that should go through relevant government authorities. That's a little bit of an in-between stance. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I'm just a little bit confused. I thought, basically, for country codes, it was just two letters and it always will be two letters, so I'm not sure how you use the three letters and how the governments would use the three letters. They would be gTLDs?

I guess I'm just asking and Greg is saying that they would be gTLDs, so three-letter codes, which would be gTLDs. Is that what you're saying, Greg? And we're saying we reserve them for government applications. That's the proposal.

GREG SHATAN: [Inaudible] government [inaudible] manifest.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead, Greg.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Okay, thank you.

GREG SHATAN: It's more broad than government but it's not public benefits, public interest relating to the country for which it stands, so it's not being given only to the government, although I [inaudible] like capacities of the [gTLD] public authority or government would have to bless it if it were to go to anyone other than the government itself.

There obviously are can of worms issues here. We are not the ccNSO and there are also issues in the ccNSO about a number of members of the ccNSO who are very concerned with the idea of establishing a precedent that ccTLDs go to the government because they are nongovernmental owners of the ccTLDs. So there's a lot of delicacy on the margins of this, so I think while I say in this group that they

[inaudible] TLDs, I think that if the proposal comes to fruition, there is going to be some debate about that from the cc side. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Greg. Yeah, there is a can of worms there that we don't have to deal with at all. But at the moment, there are three-letter codes on the 3166-1 list. Part of this proposal is continue to consider those particular ones on the list as country or territory names which are reserved, and then there's the other question about reserve all alpha-3 codes except for the ones that have to be grandfathered like dot-com, whether they're on the list or not.

So the in-between proposal, again, is the one that says anyone that's, make them available for application as long as you apply for the relevant authorities. Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, hi. Just to add to what everyone has said, yes, it's clear to me that ccTLDs would always remain two letters whereas anything that's not two letters would be gTLD. That's how we would distinguish between the two. There's also [inaudible] as to in terms of ccTLDs being used for governmental purposes or public interest purposes. I'm not going to go into the can of worms per se, but there's been allegations that some of the ccTLD managers don't even use the ccTLDs properly, or they actually delegate it to a private entity and whatnot.

So in this respect, we're focused mainly on alpha-3 codes which is three letters and not two letters, and we maintain that they are gTLDs, and

therefore, they can be applied for by any entity. It doesn't necessarily have to be governmental authorities but we would think that the governments have to be involved in some way to vet the entities so long as they are being used for public interest or for public benefit or for the government purposes. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: Do we have any other speaker's comments on this particular issue? Do we have any indication of how people feel about what's being recommended here? Are people feeling comfortable with the suggestion that the alpha-3 codes be made available but for application by relevant governmental authorities? We didn't come up with this idea. Carlos Gutierrez suggested it. There was pretty good support for it in the working group as a compromise situation.

Can we get any suggestion about whether or not there's… People need more time to think about this.

HOLLY RAICHE: Let me put my hand up.

MARITA MOLL: I don't know who's speaking. Holly? Is that Holly? Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I'm just pointing out that the devil's going to be in the detail because once you say, "Well, it's for public interest or public benefit,"

who defines that? Does ICANN define that? Does the government define that? Nice in principal, but I just take a deep breath and go, "Woo, that's going to be interesting to sort once you get down the track and say, 'What on Earth does that mean?'"

MARITA MOLL: You will notice, Holly that proposal also says "More consultation needed on public interest public benefits."

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

MARITA MOLL: Sadly [inaudible] technology. That would be part of our proposal. Carlton? Hello?

HOLLY RAICHE: Carlton?

MARITA MOLL: Hello, Carlton.

Okay. All right, we don't hear you if you're muted.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Marita, we are just checking if Carlton's line is muted. I know he is on the phone bridge. Just give me one or two seconds please.

MARITA MOLL: All right. Meanwhile, people can take another read.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What [inaudible] is up to.

MARITA MOLL: Lutz. I see that. Yes, Lutz. Why don't you go ahead while we're waiting? No, that was an old hand.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Are you hearing me now?

MARITA MOLL: Yes. Go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay, thank you. I wanted to second what Holly was saying. That is a rat hole. It looks like a principal but it's really a rat hole. The problem you're going to always have is who decides what the public benefit is. That is a negotiation. When you have public/private partnerships of some kind or another, oftentimes, the public side of the partnership is what is precisely [inaudible] in the arrangement.

The second thing is that you will have three-letter codes that are not related to any specific country that now exist in the backbone and I'm wondering if the reference to grandfather, of course, would need to be

fleshed out in any way, but quite frankly, in my own view, this represents a rat hole that I don't even think we should go down. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Greg, you have your hand up.

GREG SHATAN: Yes, thanks. I think, having listened to this conversation, I think the rat hole is a narrow one which is that the idea of public interest, public benefit and those words would tend to be an issue because they are so difficult to define. We've had blue ribbon panels that have spent years trying to do it and they've failed. I think that's the…

A simpler formulation for the potential proposal is that it be treated like, let's say, capital cities, in that whoever the applicant is they need to go through the relevant public authority to get there. The idea of a public benefit that does not have any approval from the relevant public authority, I think that's where the rat hole goes and trying to open the policy too broadly.

I think if we keep it simple, stay away from those words that are difficult to define and stick to a process which involves public authority approval, the relevant public authority, obviously, then I think it should resolve in just a few years under standard working group processes and not a few decades. And so that's where I would kind of push a little bit on the proposal. I think that the idea of being able to delegate the ISO-

3166 three-letter codes is a good one, but it really should be limited to the public authority process. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Greg. Are you suggesting then we remove that "More consultation needed on public interest public benefit"? Is that what you're suggesting?

GREG SHATAN: I would not suggest removing the "more consultation" but suggesting that rather than just kind of punting with "more consultation", that we recommend that public interest public benefit should essentially be deleted in favor of a more clear company/public authority approval process and not get into kind of trying to figure out what's in the public interest or not.

MARITA MOLL: So you're suggesting removing all of that "by relevant governmental authorities or entities" and then leave it at that. Is that what you're suggesting? Leaving out the whole bit "Acting in or for the public interest and public benefit".

GREG SHATAN: I would leave that out because I think that it's up to the government to decide how they want their three-letter 3166 code to be used or delegated. It could be a third party applying for it, but if we've given it as noted broad usage rights even for the two-letter code with dot-pv

being used not for the people of, to make money for the people of [inaudible] which they need. The idea that I sometimes, I stumble along this line of socialist, but socialist workers who actually believe that business, although not capitalists, are a good thing. The idea that business is per se bad is something to watch out for, but on the other hand, so I think it may be kind of holier than thou to say that a country could approve its three-letter code but only for the public interest. That's almost colonialism to say that. If [inaudible] wants to make off of an asset that is of value, then they should be able to do so.

So I would say that what we want to do is say that they should be made available through application by relevant governmental, or really, by anyone who is subject to the approval of the relevant government or public authority.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, point well taken, Greg. Sorry. Point well taken, Greg. Would you put those comments into the Google Doc? You probably already have anyhow. Yes. All right. Anymore discussion on this? I think this has been a very good discussion on this.

We could go on then to the next section because we've dealt with all of that. The next section, Justine is going to take over on the chairing. This is about preventative measures for capital names and translations. Justine, are you ready?

JUSTINE CHEW:	Hi. Marita, I was saying that I could help you chair, but not necessarily present. Did you want to carry on?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Let's keep the momentum. We've got a lot to get through.
JUSTINE CHEW:	Okay, we seem to have lost Marita. Okay, I'll take over from here.

Okay, just going back to – I don't have control of the slides – but going back to question E7 a little bit, the question talks about, yeah okay, if you notice, the question actually refers to three-letter codes and/or other country or territory names. Okay?

So the question being asked whether we should allow applications for these things is not limited to just the three-letter codes under the ISO 3166-1 standard. But I think they're also asking in terms of other country and territory names which are currently reserved.

So that's why you see on the right-hand side at the bottom, we're suggesting that the answer in the negative, so it's a no to other country and territory names. We're just saying okay for three-letter codes under the, which match the ISO 3166-1 standard alpha-3 codes.

Okay. If there's anyone who's not clear about that, then by all means, put up your hand.

Okay, so this Proposal 11 has relationship to what Greg was advocating earlier. So they're saying that if we proceed with delegate or the ability

to apply for three-letter codes, or alpha-3 codes, then there should be a requirement of government support or non-objection until a future process is designed specifically for delegation of three-character codes.

So Proposal 11 is something we should look at supporting given the fact that we are saying that we should subject these sort of applications towards government support or non-objection.

I'm not too sure about the "until a future process is designed". That could be we might have to wait and see what happens and how that is actually carried out. But I would focus on the requirement of government support and non-objection as being a mandatory element should three-letter codes be made available for application.

Okay, so obviously, Proposal 12 is a no-go. Well, no-go in the sense that later on, we are saying that we see that we will always propose to ask for any [inaudible] names to be subject to requirement of government support or non-objection irrespective of the use of [strength]. Okay, so just bear that in mind for Proposal 12. We are suggesting that we do not support it.

Okay, moving on to Preliminary Recommendation 10. Okay. So this has to do with capital city names. Again, capital city names refer directly to all the countries and authorities listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. Okay, the current policy is that the applications for capital city names must have government or public authority support or non-objection before they are considered and we're suggesting that to agree with the continuance of this practice, hence, agree with Preliminary Recommendation 10.

Okay, related to this PR 10 is Proposal 17 and 18. Proposal 17, we suggested to oppose because, as I said before, that we should, at least the three of us who have been working on this document, think that all capital city names should be subject to requirement for support or non-objection irrespective of the intended use of the string or irrespective of any statement of use that is submitted by the applicant. Okay, so that's a qualification here and that is a slight change because at the moment, okay, [inaudible].

Proposal 18 talked about elimination altogether of any preventative measures so we would say that we are totally against that. Does anyone want to make any comments on this? Or does anyone disagree with what we're proposing in terms of PR 10, Proposal 17 and 18?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Justine, you've got some hands up. Marita, Holly, and Greg.

JUSTINE CHEW: Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Just further to what Justine was saying, there's a large dispute in this group about whether or not applicants need to have the [permission] of the entity, be it the city or the territory, whatever, to use that name, whether they need to have the support of the entity. You can, at the moment, apply for a city name if you don't call it a city name, if you call it something else, if you say you're going to use it for something else.

Capital cities at the moment are reserved and you do have to apply to the city or the entity for the use of that name and we would like to see that continue that way and to not be downgraded to allowing anyone to apply for a capital city name no matter what they want to use it for.

You've got Holly.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry. Yes, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Carlton got to, said exactly what I was going to say and that is that many cities have, there's more than one Paris and there's more than one sort of thing so I think even though in principal, yes, there should be some, or I think there should be some restrictions, I think, again, it's going to be a difficult one because you're going to be picking which city gets to say what and I don't know how the three of you resolved that so I just wonder if you even though about it. Again, it's just going down a rabbit hole again.

MARITA MOLL: Greg's next on the list.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah. Greg?

GREG SHATAN: There's a lot of background hiss so I don't know if somebody who has an open line also has a lot of static on it.

But in any case, I support this proposal. I think that there's a limited number of governmental, of capital cities of countries and 3166, there is kind of the issue that there are territories on there, but putting that aside, there are very few. I think here we are kind of picking winners and losers to an extent. If the people of Paris, Texas want to apply for dot-paris, they can do so but they would need the approval of the good people of Paris, France.

And fortunately, many if not most of the capital cities have fairly, if not unique kind of instantaneously recognizable and emblematic names and they're kind of, in this limited list, which is about 200 maybe is one. And so Berlin or Bissau or Tegucigalpa or Reykjavik or New Delhi or Seoul or Ottawa, those are kind of a special class and it's not unreasonable to essentially give the veto power or approval power for a capital city in particular to the purveyors of that capital city.

So the Proposal 17, I agree with our opposition to Proposal 17. Even if you wanted to have dot-paris to sell plaster of Paris or Paris brand cosmetics at the [ends of] Paris, I think for this limited list, we should agree with the idea that the dial points for the country, or the city rather. For the same reasons, I don't oppose, I oppose Proposal 18. I might have even actually made Proposal 18 in the working group, but that's in part for kind of educational purposes because I think we do need to look at this debate in several contexts because I don't think the decisions, the outcome should be the same in every context. But in

context of capital cities, I think the status quo is where we should stay. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Marita, did you want to say something else?

MARITA MOLL: Yes. Thank you. Yeah, it really is the capital cities that are on this list. Not everyone in the work group is happy that this was ever created in the first place, but it is there and it was part of the last round. Paris, Texas is not a capital city so Paris, France would have the first dibs on that name. And I don't think there is any appetite in the work group to make a big change, to change that particular thing.

There is a lot of argument, going a little further down the line, but as far as capital cities goes, I think as an At-Large group and a group that's speaking for end users, I don't think we can really say we would dilute or remove this particular item from the current GNSO policy.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, that's the end of the list. Can I just do a temperature check? Are there, do we have strong opposition not to support PR 10? Because I'm only seeing Carlton, I think, who has an issue with PR 10 and Lutz is in favor of Proposal 17, so if those two are the only – pardon the phrase – anomalies, I believe we have consensus.

HOLLY RAICHE: Do you want to [inaudible]?

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure, Holly. Do you want, can we have a show of hands or check marks as to who agrees with the entire three things that we have proposed here?

I think we have two [inaudible] is working. [Inaudible]. Yes, no, yes, no? Okay, how many people are against? Guys, do you want to put down your hands so the against people can vote? And if you want to vote with a red check mark, cross mark, sorry.

Let's see. I don't see any red crosses, so can we take it that we have consensus and move on? Okay, I think we can move on.

Question, sorry, Marita, are you taking over or…? Okay, I don't know where we're up to now.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, where are we and how are we doing on time, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We are way over time, so we're coming up on the hour mark at this point so we need to [inaudible].

MARITA MOLL: Okay, so we should maybe leave this one for the next round. This is a tough one, so maybe we should start the round next time with this one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. How are we doing on time for this comment? And when is it due?

MARITA MOLL: This is the last one that we had on the agenda for today.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I understand that. How are we on time for getting the comment submitted? I'm talking about [inaudible] okay.

MARITA MOLL: January 22nd.

JUSTINE CHEW: The next meeting will be after the 22nd of January.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, so that's why I was asking.

MARITA MOLL: All right, we're going to move on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's try to keep the "me too" comments to a minimum if we can and let's get to the [inaudible] as quick as we can. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: I lost control of the slides.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry.

MARITA MOLL: [Inaudible] see 11. If you've got the slides, Justine, do you want to go ahead? Because I'm not working.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay [inaudible]. Sorry [inaudible]. Okay, just quickly, translations. We say that we should support, continue to support translations in any language. Okay, I [doubt] any of those combinations that the work track has proposed.

Capital city names, Marita has got a particular interest in non-capital city names. Marita, did you want to take this up, PR 11? I can move the slides for you if you want.

MARITA MOLL: Here we are. Thank you for getting that slide back up. Yes, PR number 11, continue to require government letter of support, non-objection for strings at the top level, matching non-capital city names. So we're talking here about any city that's not a capital. Should someone want to apply for that city name at the moment, they can, if they want to use it as a city name, they must apply for support from the city to use it as a

city name or for the purposes of the city. But someone can apply for that name if they don't want to use it as a city and they don't require city support for that, so it's all about how you intend to use that name

And there's been a lot of discussion on the list about nailing that down a little bit. It's wide open right now. There has certainly been discussions around whether or not maybe the biggest cities in the world should be, perhaps, reserved, something like Shanghai, 26 million people, reserved like capital cities are reserved in which you can only apply for it by getting the okay from the city or the particular government authority. That is a big debate. We are supporting.

Now the applicant declares intended use – going back to this slide – the applicant declares intended use of the string primarily for the purposes of city name or the city listed in the official city document. That, we were supporting this in our proposed response. Sorry, there's a lot of noise on the line. I don't know where it's coming from.

And then we need to get some temperature in the room about whether or not we have any support for saying that there's some characteristics of cities that should enable them to also be somehow restricted and not be available for any use outside of the government of the city authorities except with the city's permission.

Now I know that sounded a bit garbled. I know that, let's open it for comments. I know that Greg has a lot of issues with that particular suggestion, so Greg, go ahead although your hand isn't up.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you and I've now put my hand up just for the good of the order.

I support the status quo which is that uses of terms and strings which have, are both geographic terms and have other meanings as well when it comes to non-capital cities, an application for a different use should be free to proceed without any sort of preventative approval or veto process on behalf of one or more governmental entities. In the case of some names, there would be Springfield. There would probably be dozens, or at least 30 or 40 geographic entities you'd have to go to. It gets quite ridiculous. There's no definition of a city in terms of not even within… Within the United States, there's not even a federal definition of a city. It's done on a state by state basis and on a world basis, every country has their own definition. There is kind of "I know it when I see it" sort of a thing and there have been some proposals to do something with a limited number of cities.

Potentially, I could support a very limited number of cities but then again, even size at that point becomes an interesting and concerning use, thing to use. After all, there are countries like China that have many cities that are very large, over 1 million people or even over 5 million people. There are other countries that don't have cities that even approach 1 million people. Maybe it should be the second and third largest city or the second largest city of each country should get capital city-like protection.

But protecting every city name so that it can't be, so that there's this kind of gate privilege that's given to geography above all, I think, there's really, there's no basis for it whether you look at a law or at practice or for that matter, any of the equities.

There's nothing, obviously, that would prevent the good burgers of any cities, say, Shanghai, from applying for dot-shanghai and there's nothing that prevents them from objecting if some other party does apply for Shanghai and they think that is wrong. But giving them the pass, and for Shanghai, one can feel a little bit of sympathy, but for West Bumhole, Louisiana, there is really, I have much less sympathy, although I have little sympathy who would want that as a top-level domain regardless of its use. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Justine, you're on.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Okay, thanks. Can I just ask people to keep their comments to a minimum so that we can move on expeditiously?

Just on another side of the story, well not, the other side of the argument that Greg has put forward, I'm not actually against something if we apply a standard to certain cities based on the criteria, for example, size, population or the size of the population in relation, sorry, the size of the city in terms, in comparison with other cities in the same country. So for example, a small country, you could say because the capital city, sorry, the non-capital city or some other cities may have a population of less than $0.5 million, they don't qualify for the $0.5 million benchmark, but they are still the second-largest city in that country so those kind of criteria we need to look into.

But what I was going to say is on the flip side, I have difficulty with the term "primarily". How do you, how does one decipher intention to use "primarily" for the purposes associated with a city name? It's a subjective thing and I'm really concerned about enforcement. If someone declares that they're going to use it in the way that they said they're going to use it or doesn't declare it but goes ahead and uses it in a way that they said that they weren't going to use it, how do we catch these people? How do we penalize these people? Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Sébastien, you're next on the list.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much. I just wanted to take this opportunity to remind that during the public session, I guess the [inaudible] from dot-berlin made a proposal to ask that of CTI. I can't remember what was this [list] and I made myself a proposal that we take into account all of the cities who have an airport, and therefore, it's quite easy because there are [inaudible] who have a list of those airports. And [inaudible] three-letter code for the city and for the airport when there is just one airport [inaudible]. If not, they are different and I thought it would be a good subcategory [inaudible] be productive. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, there have been a number of lists proposed that could be used to sort of define or point out what cities might qualify under this. As to Justine, the group was unable to – there's a

whole list of them – the group was unable to really. We haven't dealt with that because we haven't dealt with whether or not any of this is going to be considered.

With respect to the "primarily" issue, to me, that "primarily" can mean "sort of". "Sort of" is not strong enough a word to really say "primarily used for the benefits of the city", so that's a weak word. Perhaps we could suggest a stronger word at the minimum for that particular thing. That's it for me.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, Marita, do you have… Jonathan's got his hand up.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. I don't see it. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, sorry because I'm up in the host section. That's why you don't see it. I guess I'm inclined to agree with a lot of Greg's points and maybe it's worth backpedaling a little bit and trying to understand what the risk is that we're concerned about because in my mind, I can think of two things.

One is that a city later decides that they want to launch a TLD and it's already taken, it's already in use. And the other that I've heard on the list is that these things will all be bought up and then sold at a premium to cities later, that they'll be sort of be subject to distortion when it comes to pricing for them.

So as to the first one, I feel like if somebody had created dot-paris and Texas wanted to, or a government agency inside Texas wanted to get a second level domain, they probably could. And on the second one, maybe we should put some rule in place that cities can't be charged over list price for purchasing a TLD to sort of kill the idea of just speculating in that area. That feels like an easier thing to enforce than all these multiple cities and the other issues that have been raised if we shut down speculation by just simply saying you're not allowed to charge a premium for a city domain to a city, that might prevent the sort of over-registration of all the city names in the hopes of [inaudible] and sowing them to the cities in the future. I don't know what people think.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Jonathan. You're absolutely right. The whole concern is about gaining, picking up the city name and then reselling them to the city. And the main thing is if the name is already sold, you can't regulate a price when the name is already sold. So I don't know how you would do what you're suggesting.

This is a very, very thorny issue. I don't think that we're going to resolve it here. It hasn't been resolved in a year of discussion on the work group. I think that people who have really strong feelings about this need to put it in the Google Doc so that we can assimilate that with you, kind of put all that together and try to reflect what people's feelings are on this because there are very strong feelings, and take it from there. Anyone else?

I see a question here. Why can't we regulate it after it has been sold? Well, if somebody has put millions of dollars into something already, you can't exactly take that money away. You can't say, "Well, no, it was really only worth $100,000 and that's all you're going to get because the city wants it". Anyhow, that would be my response to that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, we're not going to resolve this on that call. I just wanted to put that idea out there.

Evin raises the point about whether this is an end user issue or not. That could go either way as well and I don't think we should launch into that debate now on the call, but it's a good point, Evin. Defining what end user interests are, I think it's something that At-Large needs to do an increasingly disciplined job of going forward. But is there more to this, Marita, or can we move on for now? We'll have to table this discussion because we don't have consensus.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, I think we'll have to move on. But on the end user issue, the whole discussion on the hijacking of city names is around the fact that citizens should have the right. That name belongs to the citizens of the city and the citizens should have the right to say, to have that name. That name should not be sold off to someone else without the citizens knowing about it and having the right to say something about it. So yeah, I really do think it's an end user issue and a very big one. Thank you.

So shall we move on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We should. Are you guys finished?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. Well, no, we'll never be finished, but finished for now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: For now I mean.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. So can we switch over to Greg to talk quickly about the public comment and its relevance to At-Large? This was on operating procedures.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah.

GREG SHATAN: What I suggest is that we skip the operating procedures one because I don't have a nice, neat, little PowerPoint prepared and it's not due until February 11th and go on to the next one, which we'll [inaudible] a week

later. I do have a nice little PowerPoint prepared and I think we can [inaudible] in a few minutes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, yeah, that's the one I thought. I got confused on which one you'd done. So let's bring up Greg's PowerPoint and we'll discuss that one. Thanks, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, and this is a discussion of, really, of whether At-Large, ALAC, should provide a public comment or public statement on an amendment that is being proposed for the IANA Naming Functions contract. Next slide, please.

So the proposal is to amend this contract to remove the SLAs, the Service Levels, from the contract where they currently live in Annex 1 to the contract and to place them on the PTI website. The reason being that it's cumbersome to have to go through a contract amendment process every time you want to revise an SLA.

So what it's proposed is an amendment that would move the SLAs out and also to create a change process, or change process, in order to make that change but a more lightweight process than contractual amendment. And also, because this is ICANN, they also had to put together a process to change the process. So next slide, please.

ICANN felt that this needed to be put up for public comment because putting the SLAs in the contract was a key part of the IANA transition and also it appears to be required. So the Customer Standing

Committee, which basically oversees the contract on behalf of the relevant parts of the community, has finally, has recommended changing some of the SLAs that were in the original contract now that we have better information and realizing that that would require the contract amendments or maybe hearing of them as these are refined could cause us to think about, cause the CSC rather, to think about this change. Next slide, please.

So as I said, the SLAs will no longer be in the contract. They'd be on the website, but they should only be changed if the change process is followed. If the change process doesn't result in a change, then there's no change. The process is basically divided into two parts. Next slide, please.

So in any, at every point, they will need to ask the naming customers, if you will, their approval, but for more significant changes, they would have to go to public comment. So what this proposal does not do is change any of the definitions of how SLAs are developed or the proper fields for inclusion in SLA tables. So next slide, please.

So there are four types of SLAs, or four types of changes, but there's really only two. There's those that are essentially minor, which are number four, changing only the target or threshold, 99.9 versus 99.8 uptime or something like that. The other three are, essentially, major, creating a new SLA, removing an SLA, or changing the definition of an SLA. For all of those three, there will be a public comment required, as well as the approval of the IANA Naming Function customer. When it's a change only to the threshold, then it only requires approval of the IANA

Naming Function customers but not the broader, longer public comment. Next slide, please.

I expect that the majority of changes will be type four changes. So they would be reviewed only by the naming customers. So the question, really, for At-Large is whether we can live with the idea that our public comment would be made on major changes but would not be made on minor changes to the SLAs. So if that is, essentially from the At-Large perspective, what we're giving up here. So that is kind of the question. Next slide, please.

So these are technical changes which is not to diminish them. They're important, but in terms of kind of the relative gravity of the process, it's my recommendation or viewpoint that we should not comment on this, that this is a common sense proposal, that anything of significance will be put forward for public comment and that the incentives for the IANA Naming Function customers to keep the SLAs high are very strong, so the concern about oversight beyond the customers over kind of more, of minor changes to the SLAs is not so grave that we must submit everything to public comment. So that would be my recommendation with regard to that. No comment on this comment. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Let's open it up for discussion. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I largely agree with Greg, but if you've got change of the threshold, today, the threshold is somewhere around 98, 99, and the idea is, "Well,

let's drop it down to 75," that may have a significant impact, so Greg, largely agree but what happens if the change is really, really big and it really will impact?

GREG SHATAN: Somebody seems to be having breakfast or lunch on the line and maybe they could mute. I think this is, it's so against the interests of the IANA Naming Function customers to drop that threshold that I think that we can, in essence, kind of trust that subgroup of stakeholders to keep the SLAs high and the Empowered Community will always have the ability to make comments on that and so I think that's, I think we have to balance, kind of, practicality against the potential edge case that somehow the naming function customers don't care about SLAs anymore and don't care how well things work and that somehow we've all gone off the rail. I think at that point, if we have a group of core naming function customers that no longer care how well the Internet works, we probably have bigger problems than SLA levels.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions or comments? In particular, is there anyone that disagrees with the idea of letting this comment go? That seems to be the consensus in the notes as well. So if you believe we should comment on this, then speak now or forever hold your peace.

All right, then we're going to move forward with a recommendation to the ALAC not to comment on this issue.

And Evin, those are the presentations I remember. Oh, the last one is related to the New Star proposal. Do we have somebody that's prepared to lead that discussion?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, yeah, I believe Justine is doing it. Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Justine, the floor is yours.

JUSTINE CHEW: I don't have an updated presentation because I was working on this earlier. But I have drafted a [inaudible]. If someone can pull up the Wiki workspace, you should be able to see that draft there and I'm going to put the link in the chat.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Justine, I'm currently displaying the Wiki workspace, but would you like me to display the presentation which is embedded in the Wiki space?

JUSTINE CHEW: No. This is the thing that I'm after. When I scroll down to page five is what I'm after. But if people want to click on the link that I put in the

chat, they can go straight to the Wiki work space and get a larger though or larger view, whatever.

I'm just going to speak roughly to the point here. There were a number of responses that were given to my call for feedback. I think there were nine responses or eight responses altogether. I haven't had one since last week, I believe. So based on the responses that I've received so far, what I could gather is that these points, and I'm just going to go through very quickly.

First and foremost, there is no decision made on whether another application [inaudible] window or whether the expansion of the gTLD is desirable. Okay? The second one is there has not been substantive cross-community discussion on this issue and I will daresay that there's insufficient comprehensive study despite the CCTRT report that has insufficient [inaudible] to study to establish whether the overall impact of the program has been put for end users or not. Okay?

So those two questions precede everything else.

Apart from that, we also believe that, okay, I'm proposing that we believe that the program still has many issues that need to be rectified and in terms of adoption of priority for community-based applications because we always advocate for community-based applications, in terms of the priority for CPE, or sorry, community-based applications, it was done through the CPE which we know that there are a lot of problems with. Okay, so including things like there is no clear understanding of what the term "community" means and there has not

been community expertise in the CPE process to help evaluate these applications.

Now, okay, I am going to venture and say that these are the key points that we want to put forward upfront, which is why they come up ahead of everything else. But in terms of responding directly to new staff's propositions, and assuming there is consensus around the next round being called, I think the comment [inaudible] suggest difficulties with the new staff proposal, okay?

We have said before in our response [to an] issue report that we do support the five established identities so I'll speak to that under the next section, under the bold header. Okay?

So although we support in principal the five categories, we do have problems with [inaudible] proposition, so I've listed some of the concerns which are there's still no proper guide as to what constitutes a generic string and not a geographic name. So that debate rages on.

And then the work track five work is still ongoing so we don't know, we don't have definitive clarity on dual names versus non-dual names. So put separately and put together these, render the demarcation dot-brands, geographic name, generic names, generic TLDs [inaudible] and it's in reference to, if you go back to the proposal, they talk about phase one being brands, being prioritized for brands, phase two being prioritized for geographic names, and phase three being prioritized for generic and community-based applications and then there will be an open round. So that's the first concern.

The second concern is yes, we do realize that dot-brands applications should, are quite easily evaluated because, obviously, we talk about trademark holders and brand owners so they have some sort of claim over the string. But on the flip side is also an argument that because they have a claim, it's not, there is actually no need to prioritize the dot-brand TLDs. They should come after the other categories so that it doesn't compete or it doesn't steal away opportunities from the other categories, so to speak.

So the third concern that we have was that if a phase approach was to be contemplated and assuming there is an effective demarcation between the categories, then here I have a mixed bunch of responses, but essentially, I think there's consensus that community TLDs should not be locked together with generic. As I've said before in the [new staff] proposal, phase three talks about community applications as well as generic together in one phase.

The second bullet is that there's some support that community TLD applications on the underserved categories from the last round should be prioritized in phase one. The third bullet is there is some support for geographic names to be prioritized in phase two, ahead of generic TLDs and dot-brand TLDs.

The next bullet talks about the issue of contentions. If you were to receive applications and also evaluate those applications within each space, there is actually no way of dealing with contention that may come up between the categories. So for example, dot-brand suggest that for dot-brand, somebody puts up an application. It could potentially be a geoname, that string, so do you argue that it's a dot-

brand or do you argue that it's a geostring? And if it wasn't a phase approach and it was open round, then there would clearly be room for contention, so I'm not sure whether that opportunity for contention would still be possible within the phase approach that [new staff] is proposing.

Okay, the last bullet was clear that there is no support for the first-come, first-served open application process to commence right after the three phases and the open round. I think there is some support that we should take a look and see approach to see how it goes before we decide to go, to move into first-come, first-served.

And a fourth concern was to do with the dates that were mentioned. Somebody had an issue with the dates that were mentioned in the [new staff] proposal and I did clarify that they're supposed to be illustrative only, but the point was to make that, don't take those dates as marked in stone. We don't want anything to imply that rounds are going to proceed and go in the way as [new staff] has proposed because we don't want to interfere with or handicap Board's consideration of the working group's final report and recommendations in [inaudible] costs.

So that's the extent of my summation of the feedback that we received so far. Thank you. If there are any questions, I am happy to take them. Otherwise, feel free to comment on the Wiki workspace. I'm suggesting that we leave this open for a few days or maximum one week before I take it back to the [inaudible] sub-team that has asked for this feedback. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Hey Justine. I raise this on the list and I don't know whether or not it's got traction or not, and Greg's comments just now that the brands are not the ones pushing for this is interesting as well.
	I just feel like the brands are potential allies for us in some of the other conversations that we'll be having with respect to community [inaudible] applications and applications from underserved regions, etc. and if the brands, in fact, are fans of this, then working with them might get them on our side when we're in some trickier issues or even working with some of these people, the people trying to make money off the brands, right? If we can identify those folks and kind of splinter the contracted parties a little bit in our favor, that feels like it might be worthwhile to let the brands go first if it's what they want to do.
	So it's not a well-formed thought yet, but I guess I'm interested in people's idea on the idea of using this proposal as a means to create some alliances for future conversations.
JUSTINE CHEW:	Okay, if I just could respond very briefly on that, I didn't see any sort of traction on your comment in the mailing list. In fact, I think Christopher replied saying no, in effect, so I'm happy for people to keep on posting to the mailing list or posting on the Wiki workspace. As I said, this is just a summation, what I see in terms of the feedback that has been received. Thanks. Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Yes, thank you. I also said I'm all in favor of creating alliances, but this is not an alliance that we can count on. I just don't see how that would work or how we could actually depend on any support that could come from that area as it's not very well-defined so I would not go for that idea.

But as you said, it's not well-formed so maybe you've got some further ideas on it.

JUSTINE CHEW: Jonathan, is that an old hand? Otherwise, I'll go to Greg.

GREG SHATAN: First, I would say that I think as far as I can tell, this proposal is to try to just pump more money through the systems and the reason that dot-brands are put first is that given that they're closed TLDs with no registrants, they're just easier to deal with in some ways, but of course, not in others. But again, brands aren't pushing for this.

So I don't think this is one. I think Jonathan's larger point about looking for alliances is a good one and I think, and perhaps I'm biased, but I think that the intellectual property interests do align sometimes, maybe even a lot of the times, with At-Large interests and where they don't, that's fine too.

But I think looking for areas where we can work across lines with whomever is important where it advances and strengthens our points of view, so I'm sorry that I think Christopher was the only one who replied and Christopher turns green as soon as he hears the words "intellectual

property" so it was only to be expected what he said. And that's fine. Everyone has their position. I'm more of a pragmatist when it comes to this sort of a thing.

But I think in this particular instance, this is one where we don't need to align with anyone and where personally, I don't support this proposal. I think it's just, again, it creates too many ideas of the winners and losers and contention sets and it just, it's messy and I think it really is being done just to juice the system and ultimately, to soak the end user with more unnecessary spin in this area. Thanks.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you, everyone. Take a note of that. It'd be good if Greg can add to the discussion either on the list or on the workspace so that people can have a look and get more input that way.

In the meantime, yes, everything, the job is there, comment. At some point in time, I'll take stock and make some adjustments based on any sort of input that I receive. Okay, that's all. Back to you, Jonathan or Olivier. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well yeah, I think that's it for me. I'll pass the talking stick back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. And over to Evin Erdoğdu to speak to us briefly about the Executive Summary page.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. I just shared in the chat, a link to this page, Executive Summaries of ALAC Policy Comments and Advice Since ICANN 60, and we're looking for your feedback on it. It's attached or linked to the ALAC Policy and Comments and Advice main Wiki workspace and it will be put on the website as well once it's approved and there's feedback from the CPWG.

So just a quick run-through of it since we're a little over time, but the multi-stakeholder advice development graphic is at the top, and then below is our brief definition of ALAC statements, the comments, advice and correspondence and then a few references related to At-Large policy, and then below that are the executive summaries themselves along with the titles and the dates that they were submitted to public comment. And once there is feedback and this is approved, I'll input all the other executive summaries as well. So I just wanted to show you that and maybe even discuss on next week's CPWG. Thank you, Olivier. Back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evin. Just one question, is this in an addition to the policy advice page that you maintain and so on with the building of the statements?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Yes. This is linked to that main page but we could also put it on each public comment page itself if that would be useful. The idea behind this

is that an end user could visit and see a listing of all of them in one spot, but we could also potentially add it to the macro that we have on these At-Large workspaces as well if you find that useful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well thanks very much for this, Evin. Let's put this, if you may send this over to the mailing list and ask for feedback on it and then we can put aside some time during next week's call to further discuss this. But it's looking great. I personally do like it.

I'm not seeing any other hands up, so we can move to the last agenda item and we've already dealt with the consultation and [new staff] proposal. The second point was the one asked by Joanna with regards to the CPWG session in Kobe and I have asked staff if they could check. I'm not quite sure whether anyone has [inaudible], or maybe, Jonathan, you know, you're probably working with staff and with Maureen on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. I've actually written Joanna because I think she's left the AC to get clarity on her request because we're having a policy meeting in Kobe and a number of our sessions in the leadership room are going to be policy sessions, and I guess I consider those to be CPWG meetings. I don't know that we're going to go off and squirrel ourselves away because everybody that's at that meeting should count themselves as members of the CPWG. So it may be a distinction without a difference when it comes to the Kobe meeting, but maybe I misunderstand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Jonathan. Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Yes, thank you. I'm part of the committee so that stuff is being worked in and we're assuming that it's all, as much as we can, policy stuff. I don't know if Joanna means some kid of caucus, that we would caucus somewhere and talk about this stuff. But anyways, her question is a bit confusing. I think she's also part of the working group, the group that's working on the agenda. So yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Marita. Clearly, to be continued and maybe we can have an action item to get back to this topic next week and in the meantime, follow up directly with Joanna.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I reached out to Joanna so I'll update us next week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: With Joanna, yeah, sorry. Thank you. Okay, that takes us to any other business. I'm not seeing any hands up. We are 15 minutes late on our call. Next meeting next week. Are there any times to avoid? We usually rotate between the two. I understand that next week, the 18:00 UTC time is taken up by the ATLAS III working groups, so I'm not quite sure whether there is a slightly later time or if we go again for the earlier time today. Any preferences?

And Evin, what time would we have if we were to go for a strict rotation?

EVIN ERDOĞDU: I believe [inaudible]. Go ahead [inaudible].

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Sorry, Evin. I was just jumping in if I may. So if we would like to do the rotation, as you said, Olivier will have the ATLAS III Working Group call at 18:00 UTC for 60 minutes, so maybe we would like to leave a 30 minutes gap after that call and we can do it at 19:30 UTC instead of 19:00 UTC. Would that work for everyone?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Yeşim. Anybody have a clash or conflict at 19:30 UTC next week? Marita, earlier time works best for her, but we do a rotation so it doesn't work that well for some others.

So unless anybody has an actual conflict, 19:30 UTC and with a break in-between the calls, yeah. Then let's do 19:30 UTC, please.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Well noted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And that's it. So thanks very much, everyone. This has been really, really, really good and Jonathan and I have been discussing this. I think

policy is really developing very well in the group. I do have to thank Jonathan having introduced a number of things to get all these PowerPoint presentations and a lot more structure to the way you do things, and finally, of course, the people that are putting together these PowerPoints. And today, we've heard a lot from Justine and Marita, and it's really, it's great to see this developing like that. So I just thought I'd air this and kudos to everyone who's involved in that for making it work. Thanks for everyone for attending this [inaudible].

So with this, I'll let you get on with your day, afternoon, morning, evening, or even night, and see you next week. Thanks very much.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Please don't forget to disconnect your lines and have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]