
ANDREA GLANDON: Okay. We will now officially start the recording of today's conference call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday the 6th of February 2019 at 21:00 UTC.

Unfortunately at this time, I cannot see who the participants are, but I will update the participant list in the agenda pod once my computer comes back.

We do have apologies noted from Sébastien Bachollet, Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Bastiaan Goslings, Marita Moll, Justine Chew, and Gordon Chilcott.

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, and welcome again to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. We have some usual topics, such as the EPDP, that Hadia will be speaking to us about. Then we'll have the policy comment update as we have in each one of our calls. There are several of them to go through.

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.

After that, Joanna Kulesza will speak to us about the CPWG activities at the ICANN 64 community forum, and finally – of course, I've certainly jumped to the agenda in Spanish, which is difficult for me, but good for our Spanish speakers on the call. Finally, we'll have just a final say on the consultation on the Neustar proposal. I think that this actually might be complete because I've seen an e-mail go across.

Any amendments or changes to the agenda? I'm not seeing any changes, so yeah, I just would like, as we start this call, to emphasize that this call is now interpreted in Spanish as well, so when you speak, please state your name in detail before. I see Sébastien Bachollet has put his hand up. Sébastien, you have the floor.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Just to say that what I've written in the chat, but I am not anymore an apology. My other commitment was cancelled. I am here. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much, Sébastien. So you'll be marked as being present, and we'll cancel the apology. Let's get moving then. Seeing no other hands, the agenda is adopted, and our action items for this week from last week, there are a few that remain there, but I believe that they will be completed during the course of this call.

The first one was for Alan Greenberg, Hadia Elminiawi and Evin Erdogan to note consensus on having ALAC comment on the EPDP report. Perhaps a joint statement with another group. We'll be speaking about

this in a moment. Then the other one that's still pending is for Greg Shatan and Jonathan Zuck to present on specific reviews during this CPWG. It already says what the answer might be. May not be relevant to At-Large. Who knows. We'll find out during our policy agenda item. And then Joanna will present on the next CPWG, and that's also going to be the case.

So, I don't believe there is other any other action items to discuss here, in which case we can move on to action item three, and welcome to Hadia Elminiawi. Alan Greenberg is unable to be on the call this week, so Hadia is holding the steering wheel, and I believe has got a presentation for us. Over to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you, Olivier, and this is a really quick brief on what we've been doing. Can I scroll? I'm not able to scroll through the presentation. Okay, now I can.

ANDREA GLANDON: Now you can.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, yeah, sure. Okay. So, first I will start with a brief about the EPDP timeline, and then I will talk about the degree of consensus reached so far on different topics, and then the floor's open for questions.

So with regard to the EPDP timeline, yesterday was actually the deadline for flagging topics. So yesterday was the deadline for flagging

any further issues that require further discussion or consideration, and on the 8th of February, the staff support team is expected to circulate the final version of the final report. On the 11th, the staff support team and the counsel liaison will submit motion on latest version of final report to the GNSO council for consideration, and then we will have a quiet time or a quiet period from the 11th until the 15th. This period will be an opportunity for the team to review final report to flag any issues that were overlooked, to flag any inconsistencies or errors that are in the final report.

On the 14th, the GNSO council will have a special meeting, and that would be an opportunity for the team leaders to highlight or further update the council on the report, and then on the 15th, this would be the deadline quiet period. And this is the deadline for flagging any issues that were overlooked.

On the 21st of February, the GNSO council will consider the final report for adoption. If this doesn't happen on the 21st, then it will be on the 4th of March. March, the GNSO council will consider the final report for adoption.

We now go to the degree of consensus reached on topics so far, and so [inaudible] has been issuing consensus calls or e-mails and putting some of the topics [and a consensus] is determined through e-mail.

So, we have three categories. The first is the purposes for [inaudible] registration data. And actually, we have reached consensus or agreement on most of these, so the purposes agreed upon on all of these actions.

So the purposes agreed upon are the seven purposes which are to establish the rights of the registered name holder, maintaining the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS to enable [inaudible] access, enabling communication with registered name holder, safeguarding registered name holders' registration data, handling Contractual Compliance [inaudible] registration policy eligibility criteria.

So all of these have been agreed upon. And then we have some other recommendations that are also [inaudible] in our earlier discussions, and those would be recommendation two, which speaks about the commitment to consider a system of standardized access to nonpublic registration data, recommendation three which speaks about accuracy requirements, recommendation 15 which is about URS and UDRP, and then recommendation 16, recommendation 18, which is about dispute resolution provided, 19, 20 – 19 is about transfer policy and 20 is about input to transfer policy review. 21, data protection agreement with noncontracted parties, entities involved in registration data processing. Recommendation 16, which is about escrow providers, and a new recommendation which is consent to publish additional information.

And then we have this set, a set of recommendations where there is, until now, a [inaudible] of disagreement, and we're still working on that. And these would be the organization field, the city field, e-mail communication, responsible parties, data elements to be collected by registrars, data elements to be transferred from registrar to registry, geographic [inaudible] natural versus legal, reasonable access, implementation [transition] period, data retention, impact on other policies, additional purposes, redaction, controller agreement, contractual compliance.

So, these recommendations that we haven't yet reached agreement on are under discussion, as many of them are almost settled or agreed upon. So, that's where we stand to date, and I'm happy to take your questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. So, I open the floor for any questions. And while people gather their thoughts, I do have one question on this. You've listed a number of recommendations which are still, I gather, to be discussed. Are these going to be part of the EPDP output? Do they need to reach consensus before the whole final report gets sent to the GNSO council and then over to the board, or have these been effectively pushed to the next phase, if you want, phase one and phase two? So, over to phase two and not seen as something so important?

Because you mentioned access, for example, and I thought that they had decided that access was going to be pushed to the future.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. So, let me start by saying that recommendation two, which is about commitment to consider a system for standardized access to nonpublic registration data is a recommendation that we already reached consensus on. So, it's a recommendation that speaks about standardized access, but it's a commitment to consider that. And that would be in phase two. So we reached consensus with regard to this recommendation.

All the other recommendations that I actually mentioned, which include the organization field, the city field, e-mail communication, responsible parties, all of these are actually recommendations that are going to be included in the final report. So, these are not recommendations that are going to be pushed to phase two, though in some cases, for example like natural versus legal or geographic [basis,] or reasonable access for example, those recommendations are coming out now, but might include reference to phase two.

So, these recommendations that are coming out now might include phrases [inaudible] investigate more or we need more data, so that we can look into this during phase two. I said reasonable access. Reasonable access currently being discussed and [is going] to be put as a recommendation, but it might be revisited in phase two, and we might put a line that says so.

So, all of these recommendations are recommendations that need to come out in this final report. And I see Holly's hand up, so Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, just I was going to say –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Sorry, Olivier. My suggestion would be that there be some sessions just to go through the final report. We've already been through one

pass, and we've actually looked at both what's already been decided, particularly purposes, although we almost got research, but we got rid of that one for the next phase, but there are still some really big issues, and Jonathan and Olivier have rightly pointed out access and where the temp spec sits and how we deal with that, how we deal with legal and natural persons is still up in the air. And we're going to have to be voting on this the next little while, so I don't know, Jonathan, Olivier, possibly for those who are interested, another session just to go with what are the outstanding issues and what do people think about them as a form of guidance for us all, or just to inform people where we're up to.

It's just a suggestion, but some of the issues are really important ones that we haven't – or that consensus isn't reached on. Just a suggestion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Holly. I definitely think that you're really on the spot for this. It's correct. We definitely need to review these again. It looks as though there's been quite some changes on some of them.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's been a lot of discussion going on on many of them, and so it's not quite the same thing as what we have or what we had last time on the table. So, there definitely are some changes. Are there any other comments or questions?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I note Jonathan mentions that he agrees we should have a dedicated call. I don't know whether we'll make it a dedicated call of the CPWG or we could make it as a dedicated call of the ALAC, whichever, but a call is definitely needed. Hadia, what's the timeline for completion, then sending to the GNSO council? Because we have to find out when exactly we need to do this.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, on the 8th, the staff support team will be circulating the final report, and also, we are continuing the consensus calls. However, we do have a quiet time from the 11th until the 15th, and this quiet time is an opportunity to review the final report and flag any issues that were overlooked or any inconsistencies. So, maybe this is the time where we could have this call or presentation where we could all look at the final report and try to look for any errors or inconsistencies.

The deadline for flagging any overlooked items or inconsistencies is the 15th of February.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. I guess I just have a quick question for, Hadia, and it may be impossible to answer, so I apologize in advance. What do you believe the hallway discussions are going to be in Kobe with respect to this? Is it going to be mostly about the unified access model?

I've been tasked with kind of trying to come up with some talking points for all the At-Large people that are there to speak from the same talking points over the course of that meeting, and I'm struggling to figure out what it is we might actually be talking about with respect to GDPR come Kobe. So I was wondering about your feelings on that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

So, if you're asking about standardized access model, no, this is not going to be discussed now, or we just put a recommendation that there's a commitment to consider such a system, and this would be phase two. So, now this is not the time to discuss the standardized access to nonpublic registration data.

The items that are being discussed now are recommendations with regards – and there's a great debate over these items and recommendations, there are [mainly] debates about the organization field, though we almost settled this, or we did settle this, the city field, the e-mail [inaudible] reasonable access, geographic basis, and we are almost done on that as well, natural versus legal, data elements to be collected by registrars, implementation [inaudible] period, and this is really important, redaction.

Yeah, so those are the items being currently discussed and debated.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, again, I would suggest to have, if we need to have a presentation about the final reports, then we need to have it within the period maybe on the 11th where we will not be flagging the issues because we cannot do that at this stage, but we will be looking for inconsistencies or overlooked items.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Hadia, and that week is the week from the 11th to the 15th, which is next week. So, we need to set up a call sometime next week. We could either do it on the Wednesday as well as we have our usual call, or I would maybe recommend maybe we do it on the Thursday. I don't know if anybody has objections to the Thursday, just for us to be able to spend some time reading through this, or otherwise, what we can do is just Jonathan, you, Hadia and I and staff will look at a suitable time during the week and then do this.

And avoiding the actual GNSO meeting is a good idea, Cheryl. If you could put in the chat when it is, then we'll know when to avoid it. Hadia, I have one more question, and it's to do with the compliance department's correspondence that has gone back and forth with the EPDP where, if I understand correctly – and I might have a completely wrong idea – there are some fields which Compliance are using which they might not be able to have access to.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Well, yes, and for example, we accurately [inaudible] but this is not a part of the work of the Compliance department, does not actually – cannot undergo the work that they were doing prior to GDPR.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible].

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, because they do not have access to the data. And we've been discussing this, and I think – and we've agreed to put that as part of the purpose for compliance, and there are still discussions in this regard.

Also, we've been discussing reasonable access, and the ALAC, we suggested that there should be a kind of auditing from ICANN Compliance with regard to the response timing of the registrars or the contracted parties, and actually, there's a huge opposition from some of the registrars, and so again, we are still discussing and debating this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I don't know if I answered your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's what I saw, I was a little concerned reading this. Hello?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It's just a lot of e-mails going back and forth, and it's really difficult to determine right now where we stand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Can everybody hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, we can hear you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I thought I had been muted or something. Alright. Thanks for this. Any further questions from anyone? So it will be very interesting, and of course, At-Large is on the record for wanting a strong compliance regime. And when I read the occasional exchange on the EPDP mailing list where I sense that they might have to go through a much more complicated legal process to obtain information about whatever domain name it is whose records they're supposed to check, then that certainly raises red flags for me. But it'll be interesting. So I guess the next steps really for this is for us to wait for that report to be published, and if I could ask staff, when that report gets published, to forward a link to it to the mailing list in the view that everyone will have at least read the recommendations part, because I gather that's the part that will

change, and be able to discuss this when we have the call next week. And that will be a dedicated special purpose call just for this.

I think we need to move on. Is there anything else, Hadia, that you need to tell us at this point in time?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No. I think I'm fine. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, and the end of the tunnel is near, so keep on holding on to this. Thanks so much for being able to spend the hours and to follow the process and being very active in the group.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we now move to Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogan who will take us through the policy comment updates. You have the floor.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Olivier. I'll go ahead and run through the first update, and then let Jonathan take it from there. So, recently ratified [inaudible]. We don't have anything since last week. We don't have anything since last week, but there is one comment that was noted to be discussed on CPWG today, and that's the initial report on CSC effectiveness, and this

closes on the 25th of February. So, Jonathan, would you like to lead a discussion on this now, or [wait a bit?]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think that's me. Who was on CSC effectiveness? Probably should have reached out to them before this call.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Actually, no one has volunteered for this comment, and I think the CPWG would just need to recommend to the ALAC perhaps it's a no statement, unless anyone [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I guess I'm interested in feedback on that if other people think that this is necessary for us to comment on. I don't know whether we had reached consensus on the phone last call.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Okay. So –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, if Greg said he'll take a look at it – am I the only one hearing myself echo?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, it's a lovely sound twice.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Great, so somebody's got to mute their line or something.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Alright. Thanks. So Greg will look at it, and so then we have the current statements that the CPWG's looking at. As you know, the ICANN draft FY20 operating plan and budget comment is coming to conclusion. Maureen and Tijani have been working in particular with the FBSC on this comment, so it's in its final stages. That will be submitted this Friday.

We also have ICANN strategic plan for fiscal years 2021 through 2025, and Marita and Bastiaan are both co-penholders. They're both also apologies for today's call, but we touched base beforehand. Then they're also working on putting the final touches on this document since it'll be submitted on Monday. And let's see. Bastiaan had a note. Basically, he said over e-mail if anyone has additional feedback, please put it on the Google doc, and it's linked to the agenda. And updated operation standard for specific reviews. Also touched base with Greg before the call, and if my understanding was correct, we may actually mark this as no statement from the ALAC. But would you like to comment on that, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I circled back with Greg. I feel like what we may have settled on last call is just a very brief comment in support of these, that we didn't have a lot of criticisms of them. Alan may, as he said, post his own

comment about too much process, but Cheryl and I both agreed that we wanted to make sure that this was laid out, and again, hopefully prevent another SSR2-type situation, etc. So, I think we're happy with them on this, so we may just do a very short comment that says so. But happy to hear more opinions about that. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Jonathan. I've just put the link for the FY20 operating plan comment that we've been working on, and I want to thank those people who came to the session this week to actually help us really finalize it. And it's been sitting there for a couple of months with little input, and I really did appreciate the people who came to that meeting and helped us. I think what I've got now is a lot better, but I'd still like people to look at it, and it's due the 8th, so we've only got a day to finish it off.

[inaudible] one late comment, which we're still working through, but it'll be ready to go on the 8th. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Maureen. Oh, I thought there was another hand up, but I guess it's down. Okay, so yes, it sounds like there's some rough support here in the chat for just a short supportive statement on the reviews. What's next, Evin? Is that it?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks, Jonathan. So the last statement that's in development is first consultation on a two-year planning process, and this is being developed by Judith Hellerstein. There's a Google doc as well for this,

and I believe Judith is on the call. If Judith would like to comment on the current statement.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Hi. Thanks so much for the comments received [inaudible] Alfredo, if others want to put comments on it, at least look at the Google doc, and [inaudible]

HEIDI ULLRICH: Judith, could you speak up, please? We're not able to hear you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Let me try to change the microphone. Hold on a minute.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Otherwise we can dial out to you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I don't know if this is any better. I couldn't dial, [I forgot I don't have the dial.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, much better, Judith. That's better.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This is a lot better, yeah. Go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Sorry about that. Using a headset, and I have to hold it closer to my mouth. So, thanks so much to Ricardo and Alfredo for the comments on the Google doc, and Maureen posted it. And I would love to hear other comments on it.

The link is on the page. It's just basically we go through, there's a document, and as Evin can post that larger document that [budget has] posted. Not the Google doc, the Wiki page where it has the document that [budget posted,] that Xavier has posted, that goes to a number of ideas that we've talked about on the Google doc about what should be the priorities. So, looking forward to hearing some people comment and find and helping to formulate this response from everyone. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, I keep unmuting the wrong microphone. What do you feel like the main point is? Are we generally in support of the idea of a two-year rather than a one-year process?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I think we're generally in support of the process, mostly because think it gives us more time to ask questions and find out more information about CROP and other community outreach, either ideas in the budget that would not [inaudible] We were caught flat footed recently because the budget was adopted and we didn't know about things, and things were changed and things were hidden. So, more transparency in the budget is very helpful. More transparency especially on IT issues.

We had the problem with the LACRALO translation tool, and it ended up being more of a problem of a budgetary issue and an IT issue, and thinking that if we had more of a mindset of where the IT resources are going to be going two years ahead of time, we can actually get a handle on some of these issues and they won't come biting us at the last minute, causing problems with communication. So, I'm thinking a two-year cycle that is not just a two-year cycle but is laid out and clear and transparent about what the priorities are, and what the pecking order of the priorities are is very important.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right, that makes sense. The other thing that I feel like I've been hearing a lot from Cherine and Xavier is the idea that something like 83% of the budget is nondiscretionary, and that feels really high to me. Is this a good place for us to talk about that a little bit or to get them to somehow document that as part of the budget to be explicit about what's discretionary and not discretionary? Because it feeds into the empowered community budget veto power, basically.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think also what the problem we've had and that the document lays out is that ICANN has as number of priorities, except there's no pecking order. We don't know how to structure it in order of priority, one, two, three, four. They're just, "Oh, here are a number of priorities," and there's about 20 of them. Well, what are they, where are they going to sit in the priority level? What's more important than others? We need to know what they're going to spend the money on, especially if 83% is nondiscretionary.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I'm just wondering if maybe we can ask them to fully document those things that they consider to be nondiscretionary so that that's part of the transparency.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. That's a good idea. And I think that will go in one section where they talk about the transparency of the document.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: But I think, so the question is we want to know also besides that, how much are salaries, and how much are other stuff that they need to get done? And what are they, and what are the priority levels on things? They often hire a lot of staff or bring staff on and don't really say why [is there need.] So if we look at the past budget from year to year, the

headcounts are often pretty much the same. [That's sort of my thoughts on that.]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Judith, you're fading again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think the Google doc needs to be [inaudible] people look at and then have questions on. I'm happy to discuss it later.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Oh, sorry, I just [inaudible]. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] I do have my hand up. And in response to your enquiry on greater detail, certainly, it can be mentioned in this PC, although I think the benefit of a two-year plan – and remember, this is just part one of

this process, it's the following part where we actually get down to the details after we do or don't agree as a community on the in principle support for this change. And I'm certainly a supporter on it, to be very clear on that.

So, [with things,] with anything, but certainly with your question on the more detail on the discretionary funds and nondiscretionary funds – and thanks, Avri, for making clear to everybody what that actually means, because that terminology is sometimes tricky as well, because yeah, this community decides where most of the money is spent, and I think that's the important message.

This isn't some tiny little backroom, hidden away under lock and key that is deciding in a top-down manner where these funds go. These are community decisions that have made these expenditures be budgeted for. That said, in recent times, huge efforts have been made to improve the degree and the detail that is put into the ability to pull out information, and there are a number of other places in the continual process that goes on in the budget and finance annual events where we can adjust those things.

So the regular meetings with the keen or possibly crazy people who are closely following all things finance and budget and work with Xavier's team and have regular face-to-face meetings and briefings and get right down into the weeds on all of this, that's the place where those people from the ALAC that are attending those meetings can bring forward those types of requests, Jonathan. It comes not just from the ALAC but from the various ACs and SOs. In the dim, dark, distant past, it was simply not possible to pull that information out. Now, all Xavier's team

is interested in doing is giving what we want without giving us too much to handle. So I'm confident that if we need more detail, we can make [a good case] for such detail to be made available but in a way that isn't overburdening those who don't want to drill down. But for those of us who do, we can. Does that make sense?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

It does, and certainly in a general sense. I just mean in the specific sense, because during the CCWG process with which you're very familiar, we negotiated a budget veto power for the empowered community that basically put a hold on everything that was discretionary. So, the [inaudible] if you will, caused by that stoppage is made de minimis if too much of the budget is considered nondiscriminatory. So that's what I was getting at. 83 just seemed like a very high number to me as a percentage. So maybe something we need to try to revisit that definition then that Avri shared, because the purpose of the budget veto is to get everybody back at the table again. So I just want to make sure it doesn't become rendered moot by saying that everything is nondiscretionary. So we can move on.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks, Jonathan. I think we can move on then to the next agenda item, so I'll turn it over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Evin. The next agenda item is activities of the CPWG at ICANN 64 community forum. We have Joanna Kulesza with

us, who is the co-chair of the capacity building group, and I hand the floor over to her on this topic. Joanna, you have the floor.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Apologies for my absence last week, I'm glad to be here again on the call. As you might have noticed, I sent out [inaudible] an e-mail to the group. The issue is very brief and quite specific. Acting as co-chair of the Capacity Building Working Group, Alfredo and I thought it might be a good idea to get our members acquainted with the ins and outs of policy development. In that sense, we'd be happy to welcome [inaudible] policy development session and workshop, however brief or however broad the group thinks it would be appropriate during the Kobe meeting.

In my e-mail, I mentioned a few issues that we felt might be relevant to developing the policy building skills of our community. I'm happy to go through them, but overall, we are happy to accept suggestions coming from the group as such. We talked a little bit about the GDPR challenge that the community's facing, and one of the things that we proposed [is on balancing] privacy and security.

I must admit that my absence last week was caused by a panel that we [inaudible] together with the new stakeholder engagement ICANN staff here in Europe have organized during the CPDP which is a conference in computer privacy and data protection in Brussels. I'm happy to report on the details that the panel was overall successful. During that panel, we welcomed also the presence of one of the members of the EPDP, who was Greg Mounier who's working with EUROPOL, and he was very

effective in explaining what the challenges of balancing security and privacy are. so on top of that session, we figured it might be useful to invite members, other community members also coming from outside At-Large to give us an insight on what their perspective is on balancing those issues.

So, the overall theme is to kindly request the group to [inaudible] being part of capacity building in Kobe. We would love to welcome a session, 30 minutes, 60 minutes, how ever the group feels is appropriate, on the current themes in policy development.

One of those could be focus on the work that Hadia presented so brilliantly tonight, so the EPDP and the current challenges, privacy and security. In my e-mail and in the capacity building agenda we're working on now, we have as the other thing that focus on the work that has been done within ICANN. That could be jurisdiction, it could build upon the work that has been done by the accountability workstream that is now completed [inaudible]

We also suggested that it might make sense to look into the work that is being done around new gTLDs, at least when it comes to the change in business models, the group feels that that would be appropriate. We could introduce the work that is being done there. Some of the suggestions that came during the development of our agenda would be on the [status] of social networks or secure Internet overall. I understand that there are – or at least there is one ICANN learn course that could be used, but we could use those resources also during the Kobe meeting.

Other things included accessibility in the narrow sense [inaudible] related to the core values of ICANN, and then most controversially, directly linking on the content regulation, which might always be challenging, is the question of contractual compliance [inaudible]. So, overall, we have suggested a few things that might be relevant for policy development and capacity building within the At-Large environment.

The question is whether we want to do it, and if indeed we do want to do it [inaudible]. I'll stop here. I'm happy to hear your comments and answer questions. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Joanna. So the floor is open for any questions. And we have – now, I don't know who put their hand up first. Let's start with Holly Raiche, and then we'll have Jonathan Zuck afterwards. Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Jonathan put his hand up first. Joanna [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He did?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, he did. I'm happy to wait for him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, we'll go in the direction that the sun rises, so I gather it rises where you are earlier than where Jonathan is.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Joanna, I think it's a great idea. I like the idea of where we're up to with new gTLDs. I think that we haven't looked at the past, we haven't looked at the [Neustar] and put all that together. And even though, okay, EPDP is absolutely critical, it would be useful to come up with some really good thoughts and policy directions on all of the issues involved in new gTLD. So I'd be happy to work with you on that one, because I think that's really important as a forward-looking issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, Holly, I received your e-mail. Thank you very much for the feedback. I'm planning to set up a call at a time that's convenient [inaudible] to speak about the details. I fully agree and I'm happy to welcome your input into making that session happen. So, thank you very much. It's a yes for me.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Jonathan Zuck, you're next.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Thanks for your discussion. You know that some of these topics we're already planning an hour of discussion on them specifically. I guess that my question is, is the audience different in the session that you're proposing, like who you're trying to get in the room so it'd be more of a high-level topic where we're discussing multiple things in the hour? Or I guess I'm confused about how this differs from the policy discussions we're already planning to have. Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, thank you. The whole point of me participating in this discussion is for us to make sure that there isn't any discrepancy so that we can coordinate to the best of our ability. If you feel that the policy session could be used for capacity building, which is a new term and I'm completely new at this and I'm trying to figure out how to best facilitate the process, then I'm happy to combine, and I'm sure Alfredo's still on the call as well, I'm happy to hear his comments. But my understanding is that we are happy to combine the sessions, the 60-minute session you have for policy building, we would be happy to support that with getting new folks on board, everyone who's around in Kobe to join us and to listen in on the discussions rather than a very narrow group of folks that are already involved in policy building. So we could use the policy development session for capacity building.

If you feel that the policy session would be too specific on the other hand, we would be happy to set up a different one for the newcomers

and for those who are trying to get more involved in the policy development session, and then make it a bit simpler.

So, summarizing, this call right here and this discussion right now is for us to figure out how we want to target this. From our side, we are open to your suggestions and we rely on the expertise. [Yes,] the policy session's more specific, more detailed, you know where you're going, you know how you want to carry that on. We are happy to leave it to you. If you feel that it is open to newcomers, people who feel that their knowledge should be built upon, we're happy to accommodate that as well. I hope that is clear. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Joanna. Continuing our spin around the world, we're back in the Antipodes with Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. [We just need to] bounce from one hemisphere to the other. I'm perfectly [supportive of things] as long as [inaudible] and fit for purpose. I am concerned if, for example, large blocks of time are dedicated to ALAC and At-Large ruminating over new gTLDs with itself and not getting that message, if one indeed is ever wrought out of that process, into the PDP process in a timely manner, which is why I wrote in the chat, do remember you have a whole day on Saturday dedicated in the actual PDP process where the actual decisions are made, and actual influence can happen for our people to get involved. That's why things like the speaking points that Jonathan hopefully will come up with regarding new gTLDs and current thinking. It will be a

great boon for us. So, as long as whatever happens is complementary to that process or in some way meeting a different niche, I'm all for it. I don't think you have a shortage of topics. [inaudible] to do. Just make sure that it is indeed worthy work. That's all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I fully understand where you're coming from. My understanding is that it might not be recommended to get the folks that we want to get more involved directly into that process and for them to be directly facilitating the discussion that's going on with the team, the PDP.

I understand it might be helpful to get them onboard for shorter periods of time, introduce the challenge, understand where we as At-Large are coming from, and then get them going with the PDP process and get them involved. I'm not sure what the timeframe there would be, whether it would be feasible to have a capacity building session first and then put them onto the entire day of the PDP, or whether they might want to listen in on the discussions as they unfold in Kobe.

In that sense, my understanding is that the capacity building session would be the first step for those who [inaudible] discussion. We would, so to speak, equip them with the knowledge or the profile that At-Large presents in that group, and then we can get them on the [inaudible] to facilitate the process. And the same, I understand, goes for every other

policy topic that we decide to choose. So we present the At-Large stance, we present what our perspectives are, we get the people equipped with the knowledge and then we push them forward to policy development. I'm happy to share the floor with Alfredo if he has any suggestions or comments or more specific ideas that he wants to share. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Joanna. I noted that Greg Shatan had his hand up and then he put it down. I'm not sure whether that was for a specific reason, or did he drop? Nothing to add, says Greg from the city that never sleeps. Then we'll go over to Alfredo Calderon. And Jonathan, your hand is still up, by the way, Jonathan Zuck, so I don't know whether indeed you want to intervene again, or have I been very rude to you just now by giving the floor to everyone else?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's okay. I'm used to it from the French. So I'll just go after Alfredo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a national sport here. Over to Alfredo Calderon then.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Yes. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well.

AFLREDO CALDERON: Yes, I tend to agree with what Joanna has graciously explained. And the question that I have for the audience, do you think that we should have before Kobe an online session, a web capacity building webinar, to set the stage for individuals that are going to be face-to-face in Kobe, and probably remotely access some session that might be done at Kobe? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, I'm happy to hear the comment, [that's] a very good question, Alfredo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's continue then with Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess I'm getting a little more clarity now. the capacity building is maybe the newcomers that are at the meeting, and then they sort of self-select into a special overview session to kind of see what sparks their interest and what sessions they might attend, or something like that. Is that kind of the idea behind – just so that people understand what the process is and how they can participate? And it's for the newcomers, basically, to the meeting. If that's the case, then I think it is

different than what we're thinking, which is an hour each on some of these topics where we're drilling in to try and reach consensus. And I guess that's my answer to Cheryl as well, is that I think there's some benefit to the At-Large thinking through some things like community applications to figure out if we can come up with any original ideas on how to improve that as opposed to just participating in the huge meetings that you're going to be having. But I could be wrong about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I see Alfredo Calderon again.

AFLREDO CALDERON: I tend to agree with you, Jonathan, and that's why I mentioned the possibility of before Kobe – and I know we have only about a month – we can set up a capacity building webinar and invite fellows that r going to Kobe, newcomers that might be interested, and make it open to everybody that's interested in participating in a session in Kobe that has to deal with this issue in particular, because it's a hot topic, in the good sense, not hot topic the way we're talking about in RALOs.

But it would be a way to engage more individuals that might be interested in the topic but don't have the knowledge base in order to sit in a whole-day session and follow the discussion. So that's my i9mpression, my perception. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alfredo. Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. In connection with that, I just saw an e-mail that ICANN itself is tweaking its preparations for ICANN 64 by piloting a new initiative called prep week, which is not where we all wear preppy clothes, but rather, all pre-ICANN public meeting webinars will be consolidated into the week of 25th and 28th of February with webinar slots at 15:00 and 23:00 UTC. So we may want to look at what those prep seminars are and make sure that we don't schedule against them, and perhaps [complement them] in terms of any pre-ICANN onboarding or capacity building preparation.

Obviously, it's important to have capacity building where otherwise people just don't know enough of what's going on, taking years of bitter experience for some of us to learn, maybe bittersweet experience for us to learn what's going on around here, and it's still sometimes a mystery. So, anything we can do to get people prepped is great. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Greg. Next is Maureen Hilyard. Maureen, we are not able to hear you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's because I'd only just unmuted myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I guess [to catch up one day from Cheryl this way.]

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Just very interested in the discussion about, as Greg's pointed out, about the prep week. I think that that's going to be an important week, and anyone who's going to Kobe should really – and want to [inaudible] up on the policy issues, there's a [inaudible] to ICANN, I think we should really be taking advantage of that.

I also just wanted to make a point about we have actually organized a capacity building session. I must admit we're trying to find – we've had regular ICANN 64 meetings, and we've tried to – people who have actually wanted sessions, we've incorporated everything into that, and we did leave aside a session specifically for capacity building. And we've had two offers of people who wanted to contribute to that session, and one's from [RSSAC] and the other's from the registrant representative.

My whole view is that when we have these visitors to something like a capacity building session, that the contributions that they make to that session must be integrated into the whole purpose of the capacity building session itself so that people can see the relevance of why we're inviting people with specific knowledge or that is of value to our community to understand and so that – for example, the person who's coming from RSSAC is actually providing an RSSAC 101, so the RSSAC is actually something that not everyone knows much about within our community, and yet it's an important part of it.

And I've yet to talk to Joanna and Alfredo about that particular session, but it's just that we've had these offers, we've put them into that space, and we will work with Joanna and Alfredo to see how we can make it

relevant to end users, make the information that is provided relevant for end users. Okay, that's [me.] Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Maureen. Next in the queue is Jonathan Zuck again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That time I did just leave my hand up. Sorry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Joanna, I gather you're still online, you're still on the call. Have you managed to [inaudible]

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, I am.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So I guess I give you back –

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, I'm enjoying every moment of it. Thank you, everyone. That was wonderful. I have my notes here, and [inaudible]. I see Greg's hand is still up. Greg, do you want to take the floor?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You scared h I'm off.

JOANNA KULESZA: So I understand that concludes the discussion. Thank you very much, everyone. My conclusion is that indeed, we would like to have a brief discussion for those who are incoming into the policy discussions, and then we can export them so to speak into these PDPs or these relevant forums that discuss the specific issues. I'm happy to work together with Alfredo and Holly and Maureen on [making this] more specific, and Olivier and Jonathan of course when it comes to the entire policy development process. I will stop here, but I'm available for e-mails, or I think [e-mails are easiest] for those of you who have specific ideas on how we can push this forward. And thank you very much for all your input.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Joanna. And so we look forward to following up basically on the mailing list and building up those agendas for the ICANN 64 meeting. I should also note that there are two outreach sessions that will be taking place. One is the ALAC and NCUC, and the other one is the ALAC and NPOC. And that's happening on the Monday, and I gather that there will be policy issues discussed there as well. So, hopefully, if our newcomers or people that are following us are interested, they'll be able to go through all of these different sessions, and by the end of the week, they'll probably know more than we do, having been able to participate in all these different debates. But the agenda is still under discussion and being built, so I guess maybe we can follow up on this next week as well if we may.

I'm not seeing any further hands up here, so the other thing that we have now left in our agenda is Any Other Business. And on this, there is a follow-up on the consultation on the Neustar proposal for their three-phase new gTLD application model. Justine Chew has sent her apologies. This is just a note to mention that Justine has sent the ALAC feedback to the chair of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, Jeff Neuman, and so this has not been filed. I've just realized just now that staff hadn't been carbon copied on this. And Evin, you should have in your mailbox the details so that you can update the Wiki page accordingly with the sort of unofficial, informal, formal, well, whatever answers that have been provided by our working group, effectively. And so I ask if there are any other other businesses to do.

And I note from the chat that Cheryl Langdon-Orr mentions the SubPro has received it. Jeff and CLO – I don't know who CLO is – are the co-chair of the SubPro PDP. She did send it to us both. Excellent. You're totally overlooked, Cheryl. I'm absolutely sorry about this. It must be the time of the day.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Night here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Or night. Okay, any other other business? I don't see any other other business, so Jonathan, is there anything else that we need to cover today?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't believe so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then we have to think about next week. Next week, as was mentioned earlier, will have a call that will take place at some point during the week. There will be a single-issue call on the EPDP. And we will have a meeting of this working group. We have to do some rotation, and I turn over to – is it Yesim or Evin, or Andrea? Who is in charge of this?

ANDREA GLANDON: Olivier, our next rotation time is 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 13:00 UTC next Wednesday, the 13th. 13:00 UTC the 13th of 2, 2019. Thank you very much, and I think that with no other hands up at the moment, we can end this call with 15 minutes of your life given back to you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, thank you, and have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, night, wherever you are.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, everyone. Bye for now.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]