

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group CPWG call taking place on Wednesday, 13th of February 2019 at 13:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English channel, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Hadia Elminiawi, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Salyou Fanny, Joanna Kulesza, Eduardo Diaz, Gordon Chillcott, Alfredo Calderon, Alan Greenberg, Joel Thayer, Maureen Hilyard, Yrjö Lansipuro, Glenn McKnight, Kaili Kan, Judith Hellerstein, Marita Moll, Lutz Donnerhacke, and Greg Shatan. We have Avri Doria present on today's call as well.

On the Spanish channel, currently, we have Harold Arcos. We haven't received any apologies for today's call, and from staff's side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogan, and myself, Yesim Nazlar present. Our Spanish interpreters for today's call are Paula and Claudia. And before we start, just a kind reminder to please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And now, I would like to leave the floor back to you, Olivier or Jonathan. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yesim, and welcome everyone to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call, a very special one that we have today because today is the time when we will be spending most of the call on the EPDP, the Expedited PDP, the work that has taken nearly one

---

*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.*

---

year to reach today's state with a report, final EPDP report that will be available for comment.

We have a very tight deadline on this, which is the end of the week, so that's why we will be spending most of the call today on this. And then if we do have a bit of time, we will be looking at other policy things in agenda item number four, other policy comment updates. If we do run out of time, then we have the option for actually having something at the end of the week on Friday afternoon UTC, I believe, and that's just a placeholder for the time being.

So that's our agenda for today, and I think that that's all we can have. So unfortunately, I'm not on Adobe Connect at this very moment, but are there any amendments or any additional other business to add to today's call? And I'll have to ask staff to let me know if there is any hand up in the Adobe Connect room, please. Are there any hands up? No?

YESIM NAZLAR:

Sorry, Olivier. There are currently no hands up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much. So I gather that the agenda is adopted as it currently is on our screen, and we can quickly go to the review of the action items from last week's call. Just to say that all of the action items have been completed, so there isn't really much else to say. If there is any comment from anyone, of the people that were involved in the action items, then please let us know. I know that some of the action

---

items might be related of course to today but also to the next call when we will be dealing with some of this. Any hands up at the moment?

YESIM NAZLAR: Just checking. Nothing, no hands up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so that's the action items then done. Thank you very much. And that means that we're swiftly in the next part of our call, and that's the update on the EPDP. I understand that Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg are with us. I believe that there is a presentation currently shown as to be decided, but it probably is on your screen. So over to you. I gather it's probably Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm going to start, and Hadia will come in as appropriate. Alright, thank you very much for devoting all this time to it. As Olivier said, we were not quite expecting that the deadline would be as soon as this Friday, but it is.

We're in a rather curious situation in that we the EPDP have issued a final report, but it is only the first of two final reports that the EPDP is due to issue, because there are in fact two phases to the process and each of them has a final report according to the charter. It may not make a lot of sense, but it is what it is.

So here we have a final report. That being said, the report is not final. There are still items that are in flux, that are changing. If you look at the

---

report, you'll see a number of places where there are highlights, which means there is language which has been proposed, but it has not received anything resembling consensus. It may well, but in some of the cases, we certainly will be commenting, and that might change the language, it might not.

So we're in a rather confusing state, but let's start the presentation, and I think I have control so I will go ahead. So as noted, it's a final report, but only the first of two final reports. And it's not really final at this point.

The GNSO is having a tentative meeting tomorrow. I think there's a meeting tomorrow on the agenda, and there is also a meeting – I've lost track now. I think there's one on the 22nd and there's also one on March 4th. And depending on the state of the report, plus how long it takes GNSO councilors to consult with their constituencies, it's not clear exactly when this will be voted on by the GNSO. It's not clear to me, anyway. And it doesn't really matter at this point.

Alright, next slide. Phase two was supposed to be, if you look at the charter, to decide on the proposed model for accessing data by accredited users and how to accredit them, and a lot of other things. It's a big project.

Along the way, we have found a good number of issues which were critical to some people. There was great difference of opinion on them, and they were not critical to actually replacing the temporary specification. So they were deferred to phase two. That has now heavily

---

loaded the contents of phase two and heavily loaded with issues which are very controversial, so we're in an interesting position.

A little bit of history. The temporary specification was effective the end of May 2018. For those who don't know why it was called a temporary specification, the answer is pretty simple. The appendices in our registrar and registry contracts are called specifications, so there's ten to 15 specifications in each of them. Normally, the specification is part of a contract which is written to implement issues that are either negotiated between the contracted parties and ICANN or to implement policy.

In this case, the board had the right, according to our contracts, to implement a temporary policy that is for a period of three months, renewable three times. And that is what it did. So we added a specification to all of the contracts, and it was as temporary one, thus the name. It's not a very mysterious name given the nomenclature we use within our contracts.

Because of the expiration date – and the rule says it cannot be renewed, so essentially, the board is allowed to implement policy on its own, but it has a finite time and must not be renewed, and the board does not have any real interest in renewing it at this point. That would send certainly a bad message.

So now we need to replace it with a formal policy, and policy has to be developed by a PDP, it has to be approved by the GNSO, and it has to be approved by the board. And it has to be approved by the GNSO by a

---

supermajority, which essentially says you can lose one of the four subgroups not supporting it, but you can't lose more than that.

The current timeline was set to allow the policy to be approved by the end of May deadline, because we still have public comment periods and a number of other steps to go through. So that's an interesting situation. That is, we never thought – sorry, next slide. I'm getting ahead of myself.

So we can approve a policy, but policies have to be implemented. There will be programming changes that every contracted party will have to make in how their systems work. They will have to change contracts and give notice to users and things like that.

So we never really considered how do we get from May 29th 2019 to a time where the policy is implemented, assuming we come up with a policy. And we now do have an answer, and the answer is the policy will include a provision that contracted parties may continue to operate under the same rules as the temporary spec, and Compliance will not take any action against them as long as they are either implementing the new policy or implementing equivalent to what the temp spec said.

So it's sort of like the compliance model that ICANN was talking about a year and a half ago, but this one is not a vague one because there is a set of rules that must be followed.

Alright. To review where we are, this has been a grueling experience. It started towards the end of last year, in October I believe. There's been an awful lot of hard work done. Staff have done an amazing job of trying to keep up and record what has gone on, and at the same time, put it

---

into documents so that we could eventually get to a point where we have had an interim report and now a final report.

Many of us have learned an awful lot about the GDPR, we've tackled a lot of difficult questions and addressed many of them. There were lots of compromises made. There was also lots of rigidity. In many areas, the contracted parties were in unison with each other, registrars and registries, and there was significant discussion to try to minimize their liabilities and to minimize their work, to be honest, because anything they have to implement, this is costing them money.

So it's not particularly surprising that they were aligned with each other, but together, they do form an effective veto over anything the GNSO does, and therefore, effectively anything that the EPDP does.

So we talk about multi-stakeholder, but we're certainly not multi equal stakeholder. And there's also been lots of posturing, lots of things said which weren't quite true but are hard to dismiss or argue with, and many issues were deferred, as I said, so we're in an interesting position.

Now, we get down to what does the ALAC do at this point. We have a number of issues where we're not happy. Do we agree with them despite not being happy, because this was a compromise? We knew everyone was going to have to make compromises, we knew we were not going to win everything that we wanted.

Do we just accept it because that's the process we go through? Do we agree but note the unhappiness? So we're putting it on paper, but it doesn't have any real effect unless someone chooses to, and we've already noted we're not happy during the meetings.

---

We could not agree. We could say we withdraw from the consensus on any individual item, or on the whole package. That will not likely stop the process from going forward. We don't have a vote in the GNSO, and even if we did, it would not likely break a supermajority.

Do we have a problem with audio that I need to pause for?

YESIM NAZLAR:

Hi, Alan. I think Reina is asking for Spanish audio. I'm just going to share it. We currently don't have any issues on our Spanish channel.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. So if we don't agree on a particular issue or even on the whole package, it will not likely stop it from going through. It of course depends on to what extent any other groups decide to not support the overall consensus. And there is discussion going on in other groups about whether to do that or not. We don't know the outcome.

How do we handle concerns over issues in phase two? As I said, there was certainly a lot of action by the contracted parties and the NCSG that were counter to where we wanted things to go. I do not expect that to change substantially in phase two, so there are critical issues in phase two which we are not likely to get settled in the way that we have said we would like to, in line with positions that the ALAC has taken.

You can't retroactively undo a decision that was made. we could try to change any decisions we make today, but we don't have any control to actually undo them. So us not being happy doesn't really change anything.

---

So the question is, do we withdraw from consensus in part or all of phase one and send a strong message that we have concerns? It will also send a message perhaps to some people that we are not team players, we don't want to play the game, we want to change the rules after the fact, because the rules of the EPDP are we decide things by consensus. That means not everyone wins.

On the other hand, it will send a message that we are really serious, and the board may consider that kind of message. We don't know to what extent the board will consider it. What message will supporting the consensus in part or in full send? Well, one of the messages it might send is, gee, if we team up, gang up against them, we win, and let's keep on doing it.

So we have a hard decision to make. My tendency right now is to object to any items which really are counter to what we want, but support the general consensus in line with the original charter and the terms under which we signed up. But there is an option to doing something much stronger.

But certainly, even if we support the consensus, I think we need a very strong message saying that we have great concern over how the issues that remain in phase two will be resolved. And we'll be talking about these particular issues in a few moments, and you may see why there is some concern.

So as I said, my inclination is to support in general, not necessarily support each item if there are crucial issues within it, but send a very strong message saying we are concerned. But I think we have to talk

---

about what these issues are before we can get support from this group and from the ALAC.

Now, as I said, this statement has to be issued by the end of Friday. I'm assuming whatever we decide today or left up to Hadia and I and the alternates will have something drafted within 24 hours or 36 hours, and then do we issue it on behalf of the ALAC? In other words, you're giving the discretion to the EPDP team to make a statement on behalf of the ALAC, or do you want this actually ratified by the ALAC, which means the ALAC will have maybe 18 hours to do it on Friday?

And if Maureen has any thoughts on that, I would appreciate them. I think we would appreciate them. I'm going to stop now before we go into the substance to see if there's any questions or anyone has comments at this point. I don't want to spend the whole meeting in this period, and first, if Hadia wants to add anything at this point. I think Hadia can speak, but I don't know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani Ben Jemaa.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, let's let Hadia speak first if she can, please.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. No worries. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. I think you covered everything. And as you mentioned, we will be putting the topics on the table, and let's see how people feel about it. And as you noted also that some of the recommendations are not finalized yet, so the final language is not out yet, and another thing, we might be meeting on the 19th and the 20th of February as an EPDP team, and those meetings will be to settle on issues that are brought up during the quiet period.

So though there is no room for new items or new statements, but maybe there could be a possibility for some kind of improvement. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. Exactly. Maybe if. We'll see. Certainly, I believe we have to make a strong statement. If there are any issues that we believe must change, we may not succeed. But if we believe there are issues, we have to say it and say it really clearly here. So that's part number one.

I see a number of people in chat saying let's support the consensus. When people make comments, please be clear: do we support the overall package but not support particular issues, or are you talking about a unified support for everything? So if people could be clear.

---

Alright, Tijani, please go ahead. And let's try to be brief because we really [do] want to have time to go through the specific issues in some detail.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. You have a very specific adjective, Alan, that you use very often, which is, "Interesting." One situation is very difficult –

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, Tijani, I'm having trouble hearing you. Your voice is not very loud for me.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me better here?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a bit better.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I said that you have a very specific adjective that you use very often, which is, "interesting." And when a situation is very serious, very difficult, you say it is an interesting situation. I think that we are in an interesting situation since, as you said, there are things on which we cannot agree or we don't agree. But you didn't say of most of the issues we don't agree on.

---

So I suppose that there are some only, and in this case, as some of our colleagues said, I think we have to support the consensus, but make clear our disagreement for the points on which we don't agree. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. I'm looking at the chat. I'm not sure whether you've answered all the questions there. there was one which basically says the period – that was from Avri – [inaudible] is the period of transition limited to a year or so, or after that, what time do they have to comply with the new policy?

ALAN GREENBERG: The date that we're using is 29th of February, 2020. Originally, it was set to January 1st, and I pleaded that we not make major changes over a holiday period, and it was changed to 29th of February.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Then another comment was, so effectively, the position we're in at the moment is the ALAC can oppose, but it will not automatically stop it. It won't stop the process. Alan? Have we lost Alan?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I was on mute. I didn't quite get a question there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Effectively, what you've been saying is we can oppose points or the process, but we will not automatically stop it?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, this is a poker game. We don't know what all the hands are. If there are significant other groups that will also oppose the consensus, it might be enough to cause the GNSO to think, "Should we really do this or not?" There have been very few cases in the past where a PDP issued a report with items in it which did not have consensus. The only significant one I can recall is the Red Cross IOC one. The GNSO decided to implement the parts of the recommendations that had strong consensus and not implement those with weak consensus. But that was not an issue of great substance and importance other than to the parties involved. So it's not really a precedent. So we don't know what the GNSO would do.

If we and the GAC or we and the SSAC objected, would that change the outcome? [We don't have votes in the actual vote,] would the parties there pay attention to it? We don't know. I suspect it would not change the outcome.

On the other hand, if a major group within the GNSO disagrees and they choose to vote that way when they vote on it, that might have an impact. Us alone, I do not think would have an impact on the final outcome other than people being concerned that we have a path of

---

advice to the board, the board doesn't have to listen to us, but it's a concern.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. There's a note in the chat from Cheryl who says, "I believe supporting the consensus and still making the concerns we hold for phase two clearly known and noted might be the way forward. I see a number of people that are supporting this. I also note that Hadia Elminiawi has put her hand up, so perhaps –

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Olivier, before we hear Hadia, I asked the question in the chat, when people say support the consensus, are they talking about the overall package? Does that mean we still may not support recommendation number X because that particular one is – and I'll give an example, we'll talk about it in a few moments, but an example is geographic differentiation, and I'll talk about the things there.

So it is conceivable we could not support the consensus on specific recommendations, but still support the overall package.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Noted. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I would just like to note that if we decide not to join consensus and phase one will most probably go forward anyway, we are sort of

---

breaking this togetherness and we are still, as a team, going to work together during phase two. So we should think about what if we don't join consensus. Does the outcome change? I think no, it doesn't, but we lose, in my opinion, because we are together working with the EPDP team with this togetherness [inaudible] trying to make it succeed all together, and it's better to step into phase two and still – while acknowledging that we are still able to work together and agree. But then again – [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you. As I said, this is a poker game. We don't know how people react. Us not joining the consensus on some issues or the entire package might impact how we are treated in phase two, but we don't know what direction. Certainly, registrars and registries on a number of issues have said, "Absolutely not. We don't care what you're saying." They didn't say these words, but the matter of fact is, "We don't care what you're saying, this is really important to us, and this is the position we're taking."

So yes, we might be treated as, "Well, you didn't play nice the first time, therefore we're going to ignore you," or, "We see you really have enough nerve to support the consensus. We're going to pay more attention to try to make sure you are satisfied in phase two." We don't know how that's going to play out, and we're not going to know, so we simply have to, like many decisions in life, we have to make a decision without knowing the full outcome.

---

But I'm sensing an inclination here to support the package, perhaps not support any individual issues which have particular problems, and to make a strong statement. Olivier, you have your hand up. Sorry to keep talking.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Alan. I've put myself in my own queue, I guess, because I had just one question on this. I seem to understand that at the moment, we don't know what others such as the GAC and the SSAC are thinking about. Would it be worth – of course, you basically know broadly what the different SOs and ACs are thinking of and the different groups are doing. Would it be worth reaching out to them and comparing notes and finding out if they have some redlines that they seem to not be able to cross? In which case, if their redline is aligning with our redline and there are significant numbers of redlines being crossed, then that makes it not a minority statement at that point. It certainly gives it a lot more weight and doesn't put the ALAC as being the odd one out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, what do you think we've been doing for the last few weeks? I have a lot of information. I'm not going to share it. I have lots of things that have been said to me in confidence, as has Hadia. I have a pretty good idea how the various groups are going to come out, and as I already said, there is a chance that some other groups will not agree with the consensus. There's a chance. I don't know at this point, because they don't know. I don't believe it will be significant enough to have the GNSO vote in a different way. Some people may give a little bit

---

over the next couple of weeks because of that, but I don't know. I have a pretty good idea what the various groups will do. And remember, there's lots and lots of things at play here. This is not just the EPDP. Each of us have a position that we've taken within ICANN, and there are certain things associated with those positions. So this is what is known as a multi-body party. There are many things at play, and there are no simple decisions to make because everything does affect other issues. But yes, we have reached out, I do have some idea how things will play out, but I'm not going to be a lot clearer here in this public meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good. Well, then let's get on with the issues. I see a lot of people want to see them now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope we got some interest up. Alright, the issues I'll be talking about now, the only ones I'm mentioning are the ones where there are issues. They may be major, they may be minor. They all have to do with things that are important to us. They have to do with maximizing the information that's available for those involved in cybersecurity. Everything, of course, lawful, everything within the GDPR. We're never going back to the old world. Some of us may regret that, some may cheer it, but that is where we are.

We're looking at things that maximize stability, resiliency of the Internet, that protect and support individual users and protect registrants. So every one of the items we're talking about has one or more of these bullet points as the reason why it's in our list.

---

Now, caveat. [inaudible] things are changing. There are parts in the report which are not finalized. They could change. There are at least some errors in the report, some of which I've noted and pointed out to staff. That might change things also. So this is a changing game. What it is today may not be what it is tomorrow in some of these issues. Where they are at flux, I'll try to identify them.

Now, here's a teaser. Here's one that we made a case and we won. The decision was made very early to remove the administrative fields in the WHOIS. That is, currently, there are fields for the registrant, for administration of the registrant, of the registration, who to call if there's a problem with it, but it's not the owner. In a large corporation, these might be different entities. There's a billing contact which has never been used in recent decades and is not even published. And there's a technical contact.

So one of the decisions made was to eliminate the billing contact. Remember, registrars, in theory, the billing contact is used to bill for the registration, but in fact, registrars all have private fields. They have their customers and their customer information system, and that's where they have billing information. So the billing fields were collected but never used, never even published. Only would be available if one issued a subpoena or something like that to get eth WHOIS information.

So that one I didn't think was much concern. There is an admin field which was decided to eliminate. And that, again, would have not much impact in any of the groups that we're looking at. However, there are a set of an unknown number of registrations that do not have contact information for the registrant.

---

According to the 2009 RAA, depending on how you read it – because there are conflicting terms in it – those fields had to be collected or did not have to be collected. The general consensus among registrars and ICANN staff is they may not have been collected, and therefore, we may have a registration where if you eliminate the admin field, there would be no contact information left other than maybe a technical contact, and we know that is not necessarily someone responsible for the registration.

That doesn't matter to some extent, because the registration still knows who you are, unless you have to rely on escrow data. The registrar suddenly disappears, ceases to do business, then suddenly, we would have registrations for which there's no contact information whatsoever. And that's a problem.

And we managed to get that changed to say you can't eliminate these fields until you make sure there are no regs with empty contact information [for the] registrant. So it's the kind of discussion we've been having that's complex, it relies on very specific details, but that one, we won.

Alright. Technical contact. Currently, there is a field for technical contact. At some level, it is why the WHOIS existed to begin with if you go far enough back, because the WHOIS was set up among other things to allow you to contact a person on the Internet if things weren't working. So currently, we use technical contact. The decision was made to eliminate the paper mailing address, the street address, and fax, because typically, you would not use those if you're trying to contact people. You'd use e-mail or telephone.

---

The decision was made that it will be an optional field. You do not need to fill it in if you don't want to. And there was a question on whether it was optional for the registrar to even offer it. And the way it left in the current final report is it is optional for the registrant and optional for the registrar, so if a new registrant wanted or when changing a field, or a new registrant wanted to fill in a technical contact, they may find the registrar doesn't even give them the opportunity to do it if they want to. Moreover, for a new registrant, they may not even know the field exists if their registrar doesn't offer it. And in theory, every registrar could decide not to offer it, and suddenly, the field de facto is no longer operative. It is a field, but if you can never fill it in, what's the purpose of it? And the question is, does that matter?

Well, it matters to some large organizations who choose to give a different contact for technical contact. It might be a 24-hour line whereas their regular fields might be the business office, and it's relevant for small users. The field is most often different in registrations done through webhosting organizations where the web hoster becomes the technical contact for the registrant who doesn't really understand any of the technology at all.

And so the question is, does that matter? Well, that's one of the questions we're asking. Registrars have a strong desire to minimize the amount of work they do, and there is some concern with the technical contact that if I put a technical [contact] of Cheryl Langdon-Orr, how do they know for sure that Cheryl Langdon-Orr is allowing their personal address to be used for that purpose?

---

And the answer is relatively simple. When you sign up for a mailing list, normally, the mailing list operator sends an e-mail to you saying, “Did you really want to sign up? Is that really you? Do you allow your name to be used like that?”

It’s a well-known technology, but it’s an extra step that clearly, people don’t want to do if they don’t have to. So that’s the kind of issue we’re talking about.

Next one, organization field. With everything in the contact information in the public WHOIS redacted, that is it’s there but no one can see it unless you are privileged, and/or anonymized and the e-mail contact will implicitly be there but not by showing your real e-mail address. There’ll either be an anonymized address or a webform or something like that to facilitate contact.

The organization field is the only field left that tells anyone who the registrant is. Now, remember, we are now talking about applying to GDPR, not only to natural persons but to legal persons. That is companies. And the organization field was the only field in the temporary spec that had to be shown to give some idea of who the registrant is.

The current spec says, number one, the field is optional, it always was. The temporary spec said it must be published. The current recommendation is that at some point, timing not specified, registrars will ask registrants, “Do you want to have an organization field, noting that if you say yes, it will be published?”

---

Until then, at the registrar's desire, it may not display. It may be redacted. So according to this policy, as soon as the policy is effective, the organization field will likely disappear in most cases, and a registrant will have to take explicit action to take it back, which means in many cases, people will simply ignore it and there will not be an organization field. And we don't know how long this process will take, so until the process is complete, all of the fields may well be redacted and disappear. Is this an important issue?

I'm going to pause after each of these. If anyone has any strong comments to make or Hadia wants to add anything, please go ahead, but we are on a limited timeline. We only have 45 minutes left on the call. Hadia, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Going back to the tech field, I would just like to point out that it is certainly doable, and registrars that decide on keeping the tech field – and actually, we've heard from one or two that they are going to take measures to comply. So first off, the tech contact is not supposed to be personal data. It could be tech@company.com for example. So first off, it doesn't need to be personal information, and then the second point here then, if it is personal information or in any cases, the registrar can simply notify the third party upon registration. And actually, registrars are given by the GDPR a one-month period before the first contact with the data subject. So it is doable, and some registrars are going to do it, so there is no reason why not to have it as a requirement for the registrars and an option for the registrant. Thank you. As for the organization field, the decision, as Alan said, is to keep the field but we

---

don't have a time for now as when this organization field will be back.  
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Hadia. I'll point out that my name could be Tech, so Tech@greenberg.com could well be my personal name. A registrar doesn't know that. You can't parse any name to know it's not personal information.

Okay, I see no other hands. Let's go on. There is a requirement that at some point, when it is economically feasible – and that's a clause that's used often in contracts. That is, you don't have to do it today, but we expect you to do it without undue delay based on reasonable implementation times. But there is no timeframe. A registrant can specify, "I want my real contact information displayed."

So for instance, if you're working with a registrar that is chosen to not differentiate between legal and natural persons, even though you may be the largest corporation in the world, you do not have your information displayed. You can request to be displayed, but we don't know when that will happen. So again, it's one of these "trust me" things, "we'll do it," but there's a lack of specificity, a lack of detail.

Data retention. This is a small one, but it's an interesting one showing how difficult some of these discussions can be. Under GDPR, there are limits to how long you can keep data. You need to have a reason for keeping it past the life, in this case the life of their actual registration. So the question is, how long do you have to maintain information about registrations that are no longer there?

---

And the time frame that was set was one year, plus you're given six months in which to delete it. So you don't have to delete it on the day, but you do have to delete it within a reasonable time at the end. There is a transfer dispute resolution policy, which is if a domain is transferred away, you can dispute it and you have a year to raise that dispute. So we're in a situation because we set a one-year timeline at which the information may be deleted, it might not be deleted immediately, but it might. In theory, we could have a dispute filed – I presume staff will look for that beeping – and the information which is needed to address the dispute is deleted on virtually the same day. I would have thought it would be easy to say, "Let's add three months to it," but this was not an issue that we succeeded in.

Geographic differentiation. We decided that geographic differentiation was important, that for instance a registrar in, let's say China because it's one of the farthest places away from Europe you can get, that only has clients in China, that only work in languages that are native there and therefore are spoken other places, but you're not targeting Europeans. And remember, targeting matters.

But according to this, the registrar may still obey all of the GDPR redaction rules effectively because it's easier. Now, the argument that registrars and registries have used is you cannot rely on the information in WHOIS to determine where someone is.

Now, I have a big problem with that, because we're also told by these same people that accuracy is not really an issue, things are under control. Well, if things are under control, then why is it that we cannot rely on geographic differentiation?

---

Now, it gets more complex, because ICANN itself has offices in Europe. Are these considered a significant enough presence in Europe that everything under ICANN's jurisdiction must follow GDPR. And we don't have a legal answer on that yet. So it could be that although I may want geographic differentiation and Joe may want geographic differentiation, under GDPR, we're not allowed to. So still one of the issues in flux.

I see a hand up from Lutz.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE:

I just said in the chat, the problem we have [inaudible] we tried to [construct this as available] globally and have to follow all local law. That cannot work. There is no way to make a legal construct which is effective on each local law and have a centralized policy, a centralized [inaudible]. It will not work. So that's my concern. Alan had said it just in this case here, if we go on ICANN and say we have an office in Europe so we have to follow the European rules, that might be correct, but if we say the limits of our contract are the registrars or the registries, then everything behind them is local law, and we do not have any effect on those contracts, and those contracts do not need to follow the GDPR. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Things are not as clear as you're implying. But you are right, it may well be – we are looking only at GDPR here. There may well be Turkish laws – and we have an office there – that are directly opposite, or certainly Singapore laws. So we're in an interesting situation, and there's not a lot of legal precedent in some of this. But nevertheless, we're trying.

---

So certainly, we cannot say you must geographically differentiate if the law is that ICANN is not allowed to. But if the law is not that, should we or not? One of the difficult questions. Thick versus thin. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Just to note that we haven't received the legal advice yet, so it's actually premature [on the slide] to put this topic up, and we have a question [inaudible] for legal advice and the response is [not.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I suspect that the legal advice is going to come back as, "We don't know." There's not a lot of case law, and until the data commissioners rule on it, I don't think we're going to get definitive legal advice on this. That's my opinion. I may be wrong.

Thick versus thin. We had a thick WHOIS PDP that went on for a long time, it spent a lot of effort, and decided that currently, all registries are thick, with a few exceptions. Thick means all the information is stored at the registry. Some of it comes from the registrar, but the registry is the definitive, authoritative source. The only exceptions are two legacy and one almost legacy TLD, com, net and jobs, the ones run by Verisign. Those are thin. That is, most of the information resides only at the registrar, and the registry has a very minimal amount of information.

The concept of thick and thin, based on our current recommendations, is essentially out the window, and pretty much everything becomes effectively thin. Not quite, but close. And so the question is, we had a

---

PDP that deliberated long and hard and decided that thick is better. There have been statelets made in the EPDP that thick is illegal, but that's not correct.

If we decide that thick is better for substantive reasons, we make the legal case and it is legal. But there is certainly very little interest in contracted parties in doing that. And therefore, that has not been discussed at all. Essentially, it is off the table, and we will end up with effectively thin registrations for most everything. Lutz made a reference to centralized database. There is no centralized database, there will be no centralized database, even centralized to the extent of at registries.

So that's where we sit on that one. Is that something we want to quibble over? We strongly supported thick WHOIS when that PDP was done, and we were among those who tried to make sure that was the outcome. And that's now effectively reversed. So another issue, another example of an issue.

Registrar transfer. Any registrant can say, "I no longer want to be with that registrar, I want to move to another registrar." There is a process by which that is done. Essentially, you have to provide, and the sending registrar has to provide certain information to convince the receiving registrar that you are the person who is authoritative over this domain and they are accepting it from someone else who currently owns the domain.

That was done with a number of different documents and magic numbers, but it was also done because the receiving registrar could

---

simply look at WHOIS and see who is the registrant. Now they can't. And there are limits to what one registrar can send to someone else.

So currently, the transfer process is significantly weaker than it was before. We are recommending that the GNSO look at it with great urgency, but with great urgency means they will have to decide to charter a PDP, which the GNSO was not going to be readily interested in doing in large numbers, and that PDP takes time. So we're probably looking at, at best, a two-year period, perhaps longer, where we will have a very weak transfer process, and the potential for significantly more hijackings of domain names.

Now, on the plus side, since there is no WHOIS, it's not as easy for someone to find out what domains to take. But the process is much weaker than it was before, and that's acknowledged.

Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. And I need to declare here a very minor role that my old company had, and in fact, to some extent, still managing the small domain name portfolio for a bunch of what was my clients as I say this.

Having also seen how long it can take in correct WHOIS information where the "hijacking" has in fact occurred as a reseller or registrar puts their own information in during purchasing of each other, and you end up discovering that other than in name, the registrant has no accurate information in their WHOIS. I know how long it can take to fix that, because I did it for years.

---

I'm not overly concerned about the apparent diminishment under the registrar transfer issue. [inaudible] I do recognize from an end user point of view how important it is to have resolution of errors. So that's where things like data retention and the amount of time allowable for dispute resolutions to occur to be linked with the matter of registrar transfer. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I will note that you may not be concerned, but the registrars are concerned. So it is acknowledged, it is a big loophole in the process right now, and it is therefore much more vulnerable to issues, problems than it might have been before. Greg, please go ahead. Greg?

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Sorry to butt in, but I have to drop off and then I have a meeting at the bottom of the hour, so I probably will not be able to rejoin. I've been following this quite closely as an observer. I've probably listened to the majority of the meetings and tried to follow the mailing lists, which has turned my e-mail into a disaster area.

But I think this outcome is unfortunately a disaster area. I've been in probably a dozen working groups over the last 12 years. I don't think I've ever advised not going with the consensus that was developed, but these are trying times. And [thinking back] to the IANA transition group [inaudible] completely changed its first attempt and ended up, after three reports, with something completely different than was really in the first or even the second in any way.

---

So there is some precedent for not just going along, and also [for knowing] what happens when you come up with something perhaps not right. I basically think we're being asked to eat a wormy apple on the idea that not all parts of the apple are wormy, and I think if phase two is based on the idea that somehow the wormy apple's going to taste better on the way up rather than it did on the way in, I think it'll taste just as bad on the way back up. I think the whole geographic and legal distinction issues and the loss of [inaudible]

There are really only three sides to this. There's the registrants, there's the contracted parties, and there are those who [inaudible] from WHOIS. I view us as being on the third side, and I think the third side loses big time in this result. So I think either a swiss cheese sort of consensus where we actually object to the things we object to, or even withholding consensus at this point is really what the substance of all of this indicates to me. Again, I'm sorry I have to jump off, but I can't miss this meeting. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you, Greg. And we will get back to that before the call is ended if we can get through to it. Alright, next item on the list is lawful access. Pending the discussion on access, there is an interim policy that is being recommended, and it will also still apply, or some modification of it, even if we have the unified access model, there'll be plenty of parties that are not accredited and will still have to make individual requests.

---

The current recommendation says you must respond, acknowledge the request. Just, “I got your request” within two days. That’s quite reasonable. And you must respond with undue delay within X days. And for urgent reasonable requests – and the definition of reasonable is left up to the registrar/registry, and we haven't defined urgent yet – is less than X or less than Y business days. It may be a different one.

We don’t know what X is going to be. It’s going to be decided during implementation and that’s not clear who it gets decided by. Likely largely contracted parties. But to give you a flavor, the previous proposal said you must respond within three months to a request for access for information. You don't necessarily have to give the information, but you must either come back and say, “Here it is,” or, “No, I'm not giving it to you” and explain why within three months.

Now, X is likely to be less than three months, but we don’t know what it is. And we don’t know if there's going to be an accompanying statement, but likely, there will not be, saying “Normally, we expect to do it within four days, but we reserve the right to say it may take 60,” which is common, to set expectations but not guarantee it.

So at this point, it’s completely open, and we don’t know how it’s going to set up. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Alan. I recall a presentation a few years ago by, I think it was [Symantec] looking at the takedown of websites and prosecution of sites that were running malware and also counterfeit sites and names that were used in [inaudible] squatting and all that.

---

Does this fit within the lawful access thing? Because two business days is huge. You're talking thousands of victims that can be falling for something with two days. They were talking about a matter of hours for this to be affected.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is to release information that otherwise in a previous day would have been within WHOIS. That has nothing to do with takedowns. If I go to a registrar and say, "This domain is doing naughty things, will you take it down?" Registrars differ very greatly in how they respond to that. But that has nothing to do with WHOIS.

But if I asked the question, "Can you tell me who's running this domain so I can contact them?" Then the time we have here does apply.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so that's irrespective of any takedown process.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. This is simply to release the information which otherwise would have been in WHOIS in a prior day. And we're getting towards the end, but to give you a heads up, we have a total of 27 slides, so we're almost there.

Consumer protection was mentioned five times in the temporary specification. It is mentioned not at all in this document. Cybercrime and domain abuse were mentioned as things that we care about in the temporary spec. Cybercrime is not mentioned in the report. DNS abuse

---

will be considered under access, but there's also a statement saying it would be difficult to argue that processing to prevent DNS abuse is necessary for the performance of a contract to which the data subject is party.

Now, that essentially is saying that when you register a domain name, we have no right to try to prevent abuse using that name. And I find that somewhat problematic, but that is a statement there. So the fact that these terms either are not mentioned or are mentioned saying "We'll get to it later but we don't really see the need," I find very problematic.

Research and threat response by the Office of the Chief Technology Officer, or the security group within ICANN. There was a strong plea from the SSAC representatives on the EPDP that we make sure that ICANN and specifically the security people and technology people can get access to WHOIS information. Now, they don't use it on a routine basis today, but we thought that it was very important – they thought, and I agree that it's very important – that we have access to the information.

Now, it's interesting, although we haven't determined who the controller is in this case, and that's a technical term within GDPR, it's clear that ICANN is, at one level or another, a controller. It is relatively rare that a controller doesn't actually have their own data. It's not unheard of under GDPR, but it's quite rare. And we're in that situation.

So we are setting the rules, but we don't actually have the data. If we needed the data for some research purpose or threat response – I'm

---

going to have to drop off for a second – then we don't have it and we have to ask for it. And I'll come back in a minute. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's open the floor in the meantime for any comments or questions. And Hadia, of course, you're still here as well, so perhaps did you want to add a couple of words to this or maybe take us through this slide so we don't waste any time?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, sure. So that was the research purpose that Alan was talking about, and as we thought that we are going actually to have this purpose, right now, it's not clear that –

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, Hadia is taking us through this slide.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let Hadia finish, and then I'll make my comments.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. That's a quick one. So right now, we do have it in the final report, but it's still under discussion, and we have this sentence that says, "Provided that ICANN [inaudible] the data."

---

And of course, we're not sure that ICANN will ever step up and say that. We honestly think that [inaudible] research purpose is very important for the OCTO department, and if you have a link to the mission of the OCTO, you will find lots of information about the research that they are undertaking in areas related to security and threat mitigation. And again, the importance of having a research purpose is that research has this kind of privileged position within the GDPR. For example, you don't need the consent of the data subject if you're processing the data.

So anyway, research has this position within the GDPR that actually, if it is required, it's better to have it as a research purpose [as is.] Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Hadia. I'll reiterate again something I implied, but I was just dropping off the call then. If we had the data, we would not need to even be mentioning this. But because we don't have the data, we will have to request it from contracted parties. It therefore is something that has to be provided for explicitly. And my position certainly is that if an issue comes up next year where suddenly we need the data, we need to have an ability to get it and not start negotiating with contracted parties.

So it's potentially a critical area, and ICANN seems reluctant to make a statement saying this may be necessary. Hadia, and then Olivier, please.

---

HADIA ELMINIAMI: So, one thing to add, that the data could be anonymized data. So it doesn't have to be actually the exact data, it could be anonymized data. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, it could be anonymized for some purposes. Threat analysis and threat response, anonymized data may not be sufficient. But that's a detailed discussion we're not anywhere close to. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. When you mean here research and threat response by OCTO, I notice that this is the office of the Chief Technical Officer, under whom many of the current programs that ICANN is doing on the domain name marketplace health index and a various number of things about domain recognition are making use of this data. Are you basically saying that this specification is going to cut these projects off or is likely to stop the WHOIS data from being able to be used in those projects?

ALAN GREENBERG: To my knowledge, none of the projects you're talking about require WHOIS data specifically, personalized WHOIS data. The DAAR project for instance uses information from various third parties, who may in turn use WHOIS, but that's a different problem we're not talking about. OCTO does not use WHOIS for that, and OCTO does use WHOIS in some teaching programs, but that has not been something they have been willing to say explicitly to the EPDP that they need to be able to continue.

---

Okay. That is the last of the issues. And if we look at a quick summary, the issues that we have identified as critical one way or another are geographic differentiation, legal/natural distinction, tech fields potentially not being collected, organization field unknown timeline, thick, thin WHOIS out the window, weakened transfer policy.

And overall, a lack of concern on public benefit issues. We spent a lot of time in the EPDP talking about issues where contracted parties might have increased liability if they give information out and someone claims it has been done inappropriately. There has been virtually no discussion. It is raised once or twice by us, by business constituency or IPC and SSAC, but it received very little discussion of the damage to users and the Internet if information is not disclosed. So it's been a very one-sided discussion from that perspective.

So that's where we stand, and now we're back to the slides you saw earlier. What do we do? I have an overall feeling that the tendency in this group is to definitely note things that we are not happy about, try to express how deep our concern may be for the ones that are important, provide overall support for the package, but not necessarily support for each of the individual recommendations if we feel there is something problematic with it.

So that's the sense that I've gotten. I may have gotten that sense incorrect, but that's essentially where I read the comments that have been made verbally or in the chat. And the question, do we withdraw consensus hoping that it sends a strong message? I'm getting a message saying "No, don't do that." And therefore, we are sending a message saying we support the process, but we hope to send a strong message

---

saying we have real concerns, and that concern may become lack of support in phase two if things aren't close enough to what we believe they should be.

Now, I may well have misread the feelings of this group, and if so, I'm happy to alter what I just said. So the real question at this point is, is that how we go forward? And number two, do we need formal vote of the ALAC to issue a statement?

Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Answering the first question, just for myself, I'm somewhere between consensus with very strong statements of lack of support and just plain not supporting it at all. I think we can be guarded by your feeling about who else would support anything that we have to say. I think if we are going to do the support, we have to point out particularly what you said, which is there's been almost no discussion about the needs of the end user. And at the end of the day, it's absolutely critical that in many circumstances, the registrant must be identified and identifiable, and I guess that's probably my very short summary, and possibly even say, "Look, if these issues aren't remedied in phase two, then we're going to find it very difficult to support that." I don't know if that helps.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, you're the first person, I think, to suggest that we perhaps should not have overall support for the package. I haven't heard anyone else, but if anyone else feels that they should speak up, I'm seeing in the chat

---

comments that say we should support the package. I have not heard a lot of specific things saying, “Do you agree that we could not support particular recommendations if we find that they are damaging to the Internet and to users?”

An example of that is no geographic differentiation, even if it’s legally allowed, we won't even discuss it again. I find that one really problematic, and there's a few others. Things without timelines I find very problematic, but the question is, does this group agree – the ALAC has to formally be the one to agree, but this group is the advisory group to ALAC on these issues.

Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, I think that Jonathan was before me.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't see Jonathan's hand up, but I'm happy to have Jonathan speak if he wants to talk. He has an “away” right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, but it says on my screen also that he has raised his hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Well, one of the two of you speak. We're running out of time.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I just wanted to note, Alan, that Greg suggested withdrawing consensus.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct. He said he'd consider it, correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I guess I'm with you. I think that withdrawing from the process altogether, unless we actually had a block of folks that could effect a difference, doesn't make sense. Greg's example from the CCWG involved pushback from the board from whom we needed approval, and I think that that was a different kind of situation than this is. And I think that outlining, getting together a coalition of people to correspond with the board and the GNSO after this process about interest of consumers, etc., and the need to deal with those issues in phase two, I think will have ultimately more effect than withdrawing consensus in the near term. I think the nature of the technical spec is such that it's not very easy to renew, and so even if we were successful, I think it would be a mess. So I think we need to have a go forward plan to air our grievances.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, I believe the GNSO has a supermajority to pass this regardless.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly. No, that's my point.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understood. I'm just pointing out that nothing that we do or likely any other groups do who are considering this will likely stop it from going forward. It is sending a message. I would like to be able to suggest in our statement however that we did consider withdrawing support for the whole package, even if we don't end up doing that. Olivier.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that makes sense.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I note in the chat that Eduardo Diaz had mentioned there if more than 50% of the issues that we do not support, then we cannot reach consensus. Otherwise, we can reach consensus but with a strong message.

And I think I agree with this point. I think that the majority of the points that are there, we agree with, but there are some that we definitely feel very strongly against, and so I would say that showing our consensus and saying, "Yes, we agree with this, but these are the ones that we don't agree with," would definitely be a strong enough message. As you quite rightly said, whatever we say, whether we say we support it or not, is not going to make any stroke of difference at all on the GNSO council, and right now, that's where it's going at. However, we need to establish a line today that we can both use during part two, but also use to be able to defend in front of the board so that the board doesn't suddenly say, "Wait a minute, you were in full consensus before and

---

now three months down the line, you're raising all sorts of problems that you have. Why did you have full consensus back then?"

So we need to be quite clear on this, and as I said, with the details and being able to say, "We don't agree with that, we don't agree with that, we don't agree with that. On the whole bill, we agree that the whole thing as a package is current consensus." I think you get the idea. We've got the same idea.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Olivier, number one, I disagree strongly with Eduardo. It is not a matter of numbers. Let me give you an example. If the final product ends up saying that we are not going to accredit private cybersecurity people, that is the people working in corporations and who are not affiliated with law enforcement, to get any ignorance, that essentially is where 90-odd percent of all cybersecurity research and investigation is done.

If we were to end up with that one decision, I would strongly recommend to the ALAC that we not support consensus on the package which does not include that provision. So it's not a matter of 50%. The impact of a single disagreement is enough in my mind to break the back of this kind of thing.

So the real issue is importance. I disagree with you slightly. I believe if we or some other group does not support consensus, I think this is going to be strongly weighed by the GNSO and discussed and considered by the board. I don't believe it will change the GNSO outcome, and I don't suspect it would change the board outcome,

---

unless of course it's the GAC, which puts them in a more difficult situation.

But I think it would have impact. I'm not suggesting we do it, since that clearly is not the will of this group, but don't minimize the impact of simply being a vocal voice saying this is a flawed process.

Alright. Eduardo, please go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Alan. If [we're not] looking at numbers and we're strictly looking at specific issues like the example that you gave, then maybe we need to identify which ones are those issues that we will not – if they are not have the right language or whatever, we say we don't want to support the whole package. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't believe there are any in the current list of critical issues that I gave that are that crucial. Together, they may well be a critical mass, which is why I raised the issue altogether. Otherwise, I wouldn't even have raised the issue if I didn't think there's a possibility we might consider it.

I didn't come not this making a recommendation on which way to go. I'm trying to present the current situation, and as I said, this is a poker game. We don't know the hands that other people are holding. And we know that we don't know whether the board has a fallback mechanism to if we don't recommend something to do, what will the board do?

---

I sure hope they've been discussing it, but I have no idea whatsoever whether they have a plan. And I don't think any of us do.

Alright, we're at the end of the hour and a half. I think the message that is coming back is we support the overall package. We may not support specific items within it, we make a very strong statement saying we are very concern ed about the lack of consideration of public policy-type issues along the way, and we strongly considered whether we should support this overall package or not, and we have very great concerns about how phase two will unfold given what we have seen in phase one, but we are proceeding, going ahead with the process. If anything I said there is incorrect, someone should tell me quickly.

We'll be drafting this over the next day or so. I've gotten the message that we want to go for ratification of the ALAC. I would ask the ALAC – and I see Maureen is not on the call anymore, so I hope someone will give her this message that the ALAC should be prepared to do a vote basically in the last 12 hours or so of Friday, and somehow we'll try to make it a little bit longer than that, but we won't have a lot of time for revision. We will try to get a draft out earlier than that, obviously, but if the ALAC is going to want to vote on this, then things better be geared up to do that quickly.

If I misstated anything or if Hadia has anything to add, we have minus one minute to do it in.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Alan. Nothing to add.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I thank Olivier and Jonathan for turning this whole meeting over to us. We do have one scheduled for Friday. I would suggest we keep it on the calendar and either use it for follow-on to this if necessary or going into the other items which would have been discussed today if we hadn't been here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. And I indeed believe that. Maybe on Friday, will you be able to present to us a statement and take us through the statement that will be before us? I hope, of course, the statement will be in front of our eyes way before then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. And I note in the chat that Justine would be a third person in support of withdrawing consensus for the package.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So that's [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's continue the discussion online for this. Thanks for this, Alan. And I know that a number of people have to leave now. Jonathan, I was going

---

to come over to you and say, what do we do with the rest of the call? Do we then have the rest of the call on Friday? I gather we could allocate maybe half the call of Friday to the EPDP and then the rest of the call to the other topics that we need to have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's fine. We can make use of the list as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, everyone.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all, and I presume someone will communicate with Maureen and let her know what the outcome of this was.

HOLLY RAICHE: I will.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Bye.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] very good day, everyone. Bye.

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now ended. Have a lovely rest of the day.  
bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**