
ANDREA GLANDON:

We will officially start the recording of today's conference call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call, held on Friday, the 15th of February, 2019, at 19:00 UTC.

On today's call, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Jonathan Zuck, Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sebastien Bachollet, Glenn McKnight, Ricardo Holmquist, Yrjo Lansipuro, Daniel Nanghaka, Alan Greenberg, Hadia Elmniawi, John Laprise, George Kirikos, Kaili Kan, Joel Thayer, Gordon Chillcott, [Hadira Al Araj], and Avri Doria.

I'm on the Spanish channel, we have Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges, Maritza Aguero, and Alberto Soto.

We have apologies from Seun Ojedeji, Bastiaan Goslings, Eduardo Diaz, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Alfredo Calderon.

From staff, we have Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Andrea Glandon, on call management. Heidi Ullrich will be joining shortly.

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.

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.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone, to the special purpose call, this additional call focusing on the Expedited PDP [inaudible] Consolidated Policy Working Group. We are going to be going through this quite quickly, I guess.

Today, we've got 60 minutes with Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi, and then, after that, we will have the remainder of the time to spend on other policy issues that we need to focus on. Otherwise, we'll miss some of these deadlines that we have before our very eyes.

So, without any further ado, let's go swiftly to check if there's Any Other Business to add to this agenda or any amendments.

And I note from Alan Greenberg that – he says, “I do not believe anything like [an R],” which] is great.

All right. I see no changes to the agenda. As you know, we had a call three days ago, and there are some action items from that. Unfortunately, the link in the agenda is incorrect, but I've got the correct link to the link, which I'm going to put into the chat. There we go.

So, the three action items that remain. Alan requested from the ALAC Chair, Maureen Hilyard, that the ALAC should be prepared to vote, to do a vote in the last twelve hours in Friday. I gather the last twelve hours being maybe not the last twelve hours UTC but the very last hours of today, effectively.

Have you asked Maureen, and has that been given a green light?

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, we will probably do a consensus call, but if we have enough people on this call, and those who previously in e-mail have agreed to this statement, then we may have a decision before the end of this meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll still formalize it, but it would nice if we came out of this meeting with a decision that we could act on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. With enough ALAC members on it. Excellent. Thank you for this, Alan. The next one: [Olivia] requested Alan to present the ALAC statement before the ALAC bulletin. That's happening now.

So these are the action items. I don't think there's any discussion to be had on this, so we can swiftly then go to the ALAC comments on the EPDP report.

Three days ago, this whole thing was presented over to everyone, and now we have a statement that's before our very eyes. So I had the floor over to Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi to take us through the points that are being made, based on the feedback that received in the last call.

Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. And there'll be a couple small additions to it that I'm proposing. We'll talk about them at the end.

So I believe, and people seem to have confirmed that this roughly matches what we said in the meeting last Wednesday. We're looking at issue that we believe our well within our mandate, so we're not just nitpicking things that I personally don't like or things like that. These are all issues that will affect one of the core bases for why we are participating in the EPDP.

That's essentially making sure that cybersecurity and consumer protection people have access to, maximizing stability and resiliency of a trustworthy Internet, protecting and supporting individual users, and protecting registrants where there is not a conflict between that and the previous items.

I see every has [inaudible] to scroll. I see Christopher's hand is up. Christopher, is that something you want to talk about before we review this document?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

I just wanted to – no. Good evening. Sorry, Alan. I come to this a bit from the outside because, as you know, I think this issue should have been dealt with between the GDPR and ICANN.org. The multi-stakeholder community, over the last five years, has failed if not blocked ICANN's respect of international privacy law.

But setting that aside, just know the initial four bullets – first of all, allow me to ... clearly, the reference to those involved in the first bullet. The whole problem has arisen from the abuse of involvement in access to data. I think ALAC would be advised to be more precise as to what we mean by those involved.

Finally—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Yeah? Finally, on the last bullet, protecting registrants' privacy. You don't start this document with no reference privacy whatsoever. I think the fourth bullet should be "protecting registrants privacy." Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Christopher. Two points, and then I'd like to go on. I don't want to debate this. This were issues that were debated long and hard in At-Large, and these are the concepts that we are defending. We don't know exactly who is involved in cybersecurity. That's going to be part of the access discussion that goes forward and who will have access. We're not trying to debate that. We're just trying to make sure that they're not blocked out completely.

With regard to registrant privacy, we have taken the position that the whole issue of privacy in GDPR and other legislation is a balancing act. Where do other things outweigh the need for privacy? That's what this

whole discussion is about. There are plenty of people in the group. The NCSG has six people there defending privacy. That's not what we're there for. We care about privacy, but it's not the only thing we care about.

And I'd like to go on right now. Olivier, if I may?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, the floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. All right. When we discussed this on Wednesday, we had a very long discussion on the individual issues that there were some concern being raised about. Those are only the issues we're talking about right now.

There are some that we believed are showstoppers that we cannot endorse because of the way they're worded or because of the impact of that decision.

The question that we addressed was, "Do we reject the entire report because there are parts of it that we cannot accept? Or do we take a view that we are participating in the compromise but we have to identify things that we cannot accept as such?" We also would identify things that are not showstoppers but we feel must be noted as impacting our ability to do the bullets that are at the top.

The decision that was taken was that we would not withdraw from the overall consensus but that we would identify, if applicable, individual issues which we think are very important.

During that meeting, there were three people, I believe, who believed – or at least that we should either consider withdrawing from the overall consensus or ... yeah. And since then, one more person has taken that position, but that's far from a consensus in my mind.

This group, of course, can today change the direction of this, but that is where we went on Wednesday and I think where most people think comfortable.

All right. The individual issues that we're looking at. The first one is Recommendation 16, which says that we will not look at geographic differentiation. That is, GDPR applies largely to those in Europe or organizations that are processing or controlling in Europe. It explicitly doesn't even include people in Europe if they are not targeted by the registrar, or resellers in this particular case.

So if someone just wanders upon your website but you operate in a completely different jurisdiction, just because someone happens to fill out a form on your website and pay you a few dollars does not mean that, suddenly, GDPR applies. That's a difficult thing to judge, however. It certainly doesn't apply to an organization that is not in Europe and has no customers in Europe.

So the geographic differentiation would allow or require registrars to identify who is subject to GDPR and who is not, potentially. The current

recommendation, as the temporary spec, allows registrars to do that differentiation but does not require that they do that differentiation.

We believe – and our position that we have stated a number of times is that that geographic differentiation should be done. We should not be wholesale redacting everything within the WHOIS database, the RDDS database, but applying it based on where it is, in fact, applicable. That will likely be supported by a number of other groups based on the communications I’ve had in the last day or so.

If this report were to change, it would likely just kick that into the second phase and have that fuller discussion there, which I think would be not unreasonable. Right now, we are just discarding it without even having the discussion.

Now, I will point out there is a question of whether, because ICANN has an office Europe, that means it is now established in Europe and therefore is subject to GDPR under all cases. That’s not clear. That’s a legal question. It’s not clear. We will get a legal opinion on it, but that legal opinion will likely not be definitive. Eventually, it may go to the European Data Protection or to a court to decide.

Next point is Recommendation 5. That has to do with the technical contacts. The proposal had been made that technical contacts should be made optional; that is, you do not have to fill it in. That’s problematic in one way because, if you don’t fill it in and someone looks for the technical contact, they’ll get nothing. So that has potential impact. But you still will have the registrant contact, so you have some way of contacting, anonymously of course, the registrant.

However, a twist to it was that there was a proposal that registrars do not have to offer the field at all; that is, if you go to a registrar who was not offering the field, you won't even know the technical contact exists. And that, we viewed, as problematic. Conceivably, every registrar could decide not to offer it, and suddenly the field effectively disappears.

The group was divided on this and could not come to closure one way or another. Somehow, along the way staff or leadership in the group – probably leadership in the group – decided that they would select the registrar/registries' position. There's no precedent for that. If a group can't make a decision, typically status quo wins or rules. That isn't what was done in this case.

So ... sorry. I'm trying to find my next piece of paper, and I can't.

Okay ... I'm trying to scroll. Embedded throughout the report is the concept that, essentially, Thick and Thin WHOIS are gone and we have a new regime and the new regime is very, very close to Thin WHOIS.

There was a PDP that looked at the issue and decided there were substantial reasons why Thick WHOIS was better than Thin WHOIS. Thick WHOIS, by the way, right now is currently used for almost all registries, all TLDs, with the exception of the three Verisign ones – dot-com, dot-net, and dot-jobs.

The EPDP effectively discarded the Thick/Thin discussion without ever really looking at it. There were comments made saying, "There's no legal justification for transmitting all of that data." But we never actually discussed it and looked at the pros and cons and tried to decide whether, indeed, we agreed with the Thick WHOIS PDP or not.

So one could argue that maybe the result is a correct one, but we never had the substantive discussions, and that is really problematic because we are essentially overturning a PDP that was overturning a PDP that was a very significant effort and cost without any real discussion over it.

Those are the issues that were identified as real showstoppers and that we're not in a position to accept.

There were a number of other issues raised that we felt were problematic but we could live with under duress. The first one is that all contact has to be anonymized one way or another since we cannot publish the contact addresses because it might be personal information.

Now, remember, we don't know if it's personal information or not. In many cases, we are talking about legal persons – that is, companies – and they may have generic e-mail addresses. But all of these are being redacted and anonymized or communicating through a web form.

The problem is, that is essentially what I call a black hole, were you send a message out and you have no idea whether it really got sent. Did the registrar forward that information? As one of our members has pointed out, that gives the registrar access to your private communications. Since registrars tend to have holdings in domain names, they may be using that for commercial purposes. You don't know.

Moreover, you get no idea at all whether the message has been delivered. You have no ability to even verify if the address to which it is being sent even exists.

So that was felt to be problematic. We may not be able to turn around the whole thing, but there are implementations which can minimize the negative aspects of it. Those were largely completely ignored.

The inter-registrars transfer policy to enable you to move your domain from one registrar to another has been significantly crippled with GDPR because information that was previously available no longer is. Therefore, there is a much increased chance of hijacking of domains; that is, the improper transfer without the approval without the original registrant.

The EPDP chose to not take any action on this because it was another policy and simply told the GNSO to put great urgency on the matter. But great urgency implies probably at least two to three years, if the problem is ever addressed. That puts registrants at significant risk. We decided that was not something that we believed was appropriate.

RDDS information will be redacted or deleted – sorry, the organization field will be redacted or deleted once the registrars take certain action, but we don't know exactly when that will be, and there's no requirement for them to do it within a certain time period. And the field will be redacted until then.

The last specific point made is the retention period. It's not a big one, but it shows the lack of care in that the retention period is one year. Although a registrar has a bit of time to affect the deletion, they may delete exactly at the one-year period.

The policy with the longest delay in it is the transfer dispute resolution policy, the policy which can address hijacking, among other things. And

you have a year to file. So, in theory, you could file the request, and pretty much the same day the data that will be used to fix your problem would be deleted.

That just shows a lack of care. There was no reason it couldn't be made 15 months instead of a year to allow a reasonable processing time for a TDRP request.

The overall problem, however, is we're going into Phase 2 next. Phase 2 is largely going to be access. It will also be looking at things like legal versus natural persons and a number of issues that we haven't been able to address in the first phase that were supposed to be addressed.

The lack of interest in the group on things like consumer protection, DNS abuse, and cybercrime is very troubling because, if we didn't have any flexibility to even include the words in this section, how flexible will we be to make sure that we can address these issues in Section 2?

We already have indications that some people are going to be taking a rather hard line on identifying who is cybersecurity researcher, for instance. And yet we know a very significant part of the work is done in particular by industry, ostensibly in protecting their brands.

But phishing is a major issue, and some people look at it not as a fraud issue but as an intellectual property issue. But nevertheless, it is a fraud issue, and we have to make sure that people will have access.

There is a subtle belief that all cybersecurity work is done by law enforcement and law enforcement can simply get a subpoena, and yet that isn't where the work is being done in reality. So there's a great

concern that, as we move forward, we're not going to be in a position where we'll get what we need out of the second part. And of course, by giving our approval in the first part, we are saying those are the ground rules under which we'll work for the second. So it's a complex issue.

A couple points that were not mentioned in this that I would like to add is, number one, if you note in the section on Recommendation ... where is it? Oh, sorry. I'm having trouble with it. There's one comment on the fact that contact information – you can specify you want your contact information shown. The wording is rather vague. It says, "Additional information." The intent was your original contact information.

But the question is, are things like your name contact information? I don't read a name as contact information. In the temporary a spec, a registrant could request like things like their name be unredacted. It's not clear this version is saying that, and we have to make sure it is. There are many groups that want to be identified as the owner of a domain.

The second point is ...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, Hadia has her hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll go to Hadia in a minute. I'm almost finished. Yeah, the second part I already made but [had to] put in the document of siding with one part instead of on using the status quo. And that's with regard to publishing the technical information.

Lastly, there's simply a comment that needs to be made on the geographic representation differentiation. One of the other problems not mentioned is, if your data is being processed in the European Union, then you are subject to GDPR.

The question is, if you are an organization that is completely outside the E.U. but you have resellers, currently, although you know who your resellers are, you don't know who their resellers are, and resellers can be [stacked and deep]. So it's problematic that, when you get a domain registration from a reseller, you don't know where the original reseller was. A registrar does not know. I believe, given the requirement to know where your processing is being done, that problem has to be fixed, not ignored.

Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Thank you, Alan. I had a comment actually with regards to the ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAMI: To the Part 3 recommendation that we cannot accept. So with regard to Recommendation #16, I could actually think we also need to add here that there has been an [inaudible] advisor. We actually concluded on this recommendation without [inaudible] for the reply.

It doesn't matter what the legal recommendation has been answered [with] right now, but how can we actually conclude on the matter while we pose a legal question and haven't received the answer yet. So I would [inaudible] to that.

Then, with regard to the Thick WHOIS, I think also here there was a suggestion of posting a question to the legal advisors that asks if it should result in policy from the EPDP, continue the requirements for Thick WHOIS. Would this have legal advisors on the GDPR?

I think also that this should be [inaudible] for them or continue to be addressed in Phase 2 if we pose the question now to the legal advisors. And—

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. No, sorry. I thought you were continuing. In terms of legal advice on the Thick/Thin, the fact that we didn't ask for legal advice I think is just part of the overall discussion. We never discussed it, so asking for legal advice could certainly be part of that.

Can you remind me what the legal advice we asked for on geographic was? Because I don't recall that. I'm sorry.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can't hear her.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Sorry. [inaudible]. I'll pull it out. Just give me a couple of seconds. I'll pull it out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you can post something in the chat, then that would be good.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. I'll do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I'd like to open the floor up to anyone else. Christopher's hand is up. I presume it's an old one, but I don't know for sure.

I don't see any hands up, but my Adobe Connect is lagging badly. So, Olivier, please, if you could take the queue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks, Alan. The next person in the queue is George Kirikos.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Thanks. Yeah, I think the letter is a good starting point, and I agree with many of the statements in it.

Just to go with some specifics, on the first point about Recommendation #16, to me that's not a deal killer if and only if the issue of registrant choice is corrected. As I pointed out on the mailing list, I have strong concerns about the fact that registrants' choices aren't really being respected and fields are being redacted in a mandatory manner without thought that the registrants might want to publish those fields to have the experience that they have today, or at least they used to have pre-GDPR, with full contact information visible.

So, if that issue was resolved – and I know Alan has already sent e-mails to the EPDP mailing list today on that issue – correctly, that I don't think Recommendation #16, while not desirable, is necessarily a deal killer.

I can understand the reasoning behind Recommendation #16 because it calls into question whether the GDPR effectiveness is being overapplied and we shouldn't be overapplying the rules to people that are outside the E.U. entirely or are corporations, etc., because another country like the United States might pass conflicting registration. Then what do you do? Whose rule do you follow?

So I say the point about Recommendation #16 [is] being directly on point about that overapplication.

With regards to the technical contact, I agree with that entirely, that people should have the choice of publishing that full technical contact. I could see the other point of view about data minimization but a lot of

people actually do want to have that technical contact as a form of redundancy.

For example, if you're on vacation, you're not going to get that contact immediately while the technical contact might receive it instead and act on it. And in the case of a lawsuit or something where the clock is ticking right away, or UDRP, you want to get notified as quickly as possible and having multiple redundant contacts is important.

The issue about Thick WHOIS versus Thin WHOIS. I agree that Thick WHOIS is technically superior, but it's not necessarily a deal killer if ICANN Compliance is vigilant about making sure that registrars have 100% uptime for the Thin WHOIS, or they're the ones serving up the WHOIS data instead of the registry operator.

So, if Thin WHOIS is superior from a legal point of view on GDPR but reducing liability, I can live with that because dot-com is dominant and it's proven that Thin WHOIS can work. I don't mind if my registrar, Tucows or whatever, is serving up the WHOIS instead of Verisign. It makes little difference as long as the information is public.

The issue about – oh, there's some minor points. On Page 14 of the actual EPDP report, they totally leave out fields like the fax line. If you look at the registrant field on Page 14, fax is entirely missing. They don't say that it should be redacted or it shouldn't be redacted.

Sloppy things like that that are still in the report at this near-final level? People need to go through and clean that up because, like the [UDRP], which hasn't been reviewed in 20 years and will hopefully be reviewed a year from now, this is a policy that will probably be unchanged for

many, many years because people have been fighting tooth-and-nail on both side of the issues. So it's imperative that people get it right and say, no, that there's an overarching question of whether the At-Large should withdraw support or should go along with the consensus. I think it's important to think about that.

I'm not going to say either way. Personally, I want to get the correct results done and not think about the deadline. But, Avri, I notice, is here, and she can maybe talk about whether the Board has the ability to fix some of these errors based on the public comment period. But they're important issues.

But the overarching issue is that registrants need the choice and to have that capability with a firm deadline so that the registrars can't just keep all the WHOIS redacted from now until kingdom come. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The only comment I'll make is the "missing facts" and other things [as] the whole admin contact is not sloppiness. That was a very conscious and long-debated discussion, to eliminate those fields.

Now, I don't believe personally there was any reason to eliminate them, but Contracted Parties and a few others seemed adamant that nobody in the world uses fax, and therefore we don't need it anymore. As I said, there were some of us who disagreed. We didn't win on that one.

Despite my comment initially, we are now 35 minutes into the one-hour we were given, so I ask people to try to be brief, if indeed there are any more speakers.

Olivier, are there any more speakers?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The next speaker in the queue was Jonathan Zuck.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure with my Adobe Connect would tell me that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey. Thanks. I guess the question is, there's some language in this document that says, "we can't accept," etc., and I'm just wondering whether that – and I guess this might have been Daniel's or – I don't remember; maybe it was Seun's – but [inaudible] does that somehow override our overall agreeing [with going] along with this?

Because the way that I understood it is that we wanted to use this an opportunity to really raise hell about Phase 2 and what needs to happen there, but I'm just concerned that we have language that sort of contradicts itself because we accept the document but there's some things we can't accept.

So I get the intention, I get why we're not accepting them, but what does that mean from a literal standpoint?

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia has her hand up, but let me try to give my answer first. I don't know. We decided that we needed to make a strong statement, particularly on some points, but we did not want to have gone through

this whole process, have agreed on many of these things – because there are many compromises here. Not all of them were crucial in our mind. But on the points that were decided, there were compromises.

For instances, on Point #16, we thought the compromise – “we,” meaning Hadia and I and a number of other people, thought that we were simply deferring it to Phase 2. That isn’t what the report said.

On the technical contact, we thought that we had agreed that the status quo would preside because we couldn’t come to an agreement to change it. That isn’t what the report ended up saying.

So on some of these, it’s not that we compromise, but the report just doesn’t say what we thought it was going to say. Maybe that’s because we didn’t pay sufficient attention to the 14,000 e-mails that cross our desk on a weekly basis.

But nevertheless, yes, there is a conflict, and that seemed to be the reasonable way forward based on the call on Wednesday. So I admit there is a potential conflict in how this looks, but it didn’t seem to be of significant enough impact to withdraw the entire support with whatever side effects and follow-on effects that might have, some of which might be good, some which might be bad, because we don’t know. We don’t know if we will be ignored in Phase 2. If we reject this whole report, will we be ignored because we have gone through the motions of accepting things and then reject the whole package? Or will we be listened to more because they’ll be more sensitive to what we’ll say? We have no clue, and we can’t tell ahead how it would be, how it would play it.

But that is the decision that was made. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So my [inaudible] is a little bit different. Actually, we agree. Recommendations 16,15, and the one that was actually [inaudible] we cannot actually live with or accept. We can have some meetings on the 19th and the 20th, and I think that it is possible because we, as a group, cannot really accept Recommendation #16. We can talk [inaudible] we have [inaudible]. We have [inaudible] to the – so, it seems that I’m not clear, so maybe I’ll try to use the Adobe audio.

So, I’m not if this is better.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that is better.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, I think that Recommendation #16 should be opened again because we have a legal question we posed and [haven’t] received the answer to it yet.

And with regard to the Thick WHOIS also, I think we could continue discussing this during Phase 2 if we pose a question now to the legal advisors with regard to Thick WHOIS.

With regard to the technical part, that’s where I’m not sure we are able to fix this. I think we should be thinking now, “Can we look [with] Recommendation #5 as is or not?”

But with regard to 16 and Thick WHOIS, I think we should do more work on that. We should push [still] to have Recommendation #16 into Phase 2, and the Thick WHOIS also into Phase 2, because we, as a group, [built] the At-Large. We do not agree or accept that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Hadia, any of these things could be reopened now. We have no choice but to react this document as it is printed because, at this point, our response is due today and we have no control over what might happen next week.

So we might different paper next week if things change, but I don't think we can presume anything is going to change.

In terms of Recommendation 16, there's no way we are going to get legal advice – or Thick WHOIS, for that matter – that is clear and definitive. Our lawyers don't know enough about Thick WHOIS or all of the arguments that we spent a year-and-a-half or two years talking about in the Thick WHOIS PDP.

So I don't think we can rely on legal advice to give us definitive answers in these cases. That doesn't mean we shouldn't ask the questions, but I think we have to work with what we have today.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Oh, Alan? I was waiting for you. Are you finished? Because I see a couple more people in the queue but I—

ALAN GREENBERG: Over and out.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [I thought we had a lot more] to go through, so ... okay. If you have more, than I've got a couple more people in the queue. George Kirikos is first, and then Marita Moll afterwards, and then we'll have to finish on this specific topic. And perhaps, yeah, finish off with Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who will be able to speak to us about various things, one of them being the GNSO call that took place yesterday.

George Kirikos, you have the floor.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: It was said earlier that fax was eliminated from the fields that are corrected, but that's not correct. If you go to Page 11 and also Page 13 of the draft report, the fax fields are present but are optional. It's just that, on Page 14, the fax field doesn't appear in the table. So somebody just forget to put that field in the table. So it's just a drafting error, it appears –

ALAN GREENBERG: Or the other way around.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Hopefully not the other way around because fax is actually very important because, if you get an UDRP, for example, a legal complaint,

you don't want it ending up in your spam folder. Having it by fax is intentional. People do put in fax fields in order to have those legal communications received to be able to respond in a timely manner.

So it's not technologically obsolete. Trust me. People that have it there do it on purpose. Second—

ALAN GREENBERG:

George, to be clear, there are many people who said what you said. That was not the prevailing answer. But we'll go back and make sure that is at least consistency.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Yeah. Registrants should have a choice. But let me just make the other point, a small point. There was the issue on Page 2 about the form and making a copy of the message sent to the message originator. If not done properly, then that would just create a spam issue because anybody could just put in a third-party's e-mail address as the message originator and have the registrar's contact form turned into a spam delivery tool.

So you want to make sure that, if you're going to argue for that, the message originator's e-mail address is authenticated beforehand, which is typically not the case. The typical form just sends a copy to the recipient. It doesn't send a copy to the message originator because of that harder implementation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Next in the queue is Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. I just wanted to point one thing out. I put it in the chat. It's always nice to know. And we're not the only ones who had issues. Certainly, I happened to see a note on the NCSG list saying that they also have reservations about different sections, although they're other sections than we have reservations about. We're not the only one that are thinking of taking this route, mostly saying, "Well, we approve this in general, but we have major issues."

I think Cheryl may have some more to say about that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marita. Finally, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, Marita is absolutely correct. That is what the current discussion is on the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group's listings, and their intention at this stage certainly is to instruct their counselors at the meeting of the 21st, if not the 4th – I'll get to that in a moment – to be supportive of it but to make a preamble statement about where their concerns still lie.

So what I had undertaken, however, was to let you know, again, what the GNSO Council has done and will be doing – notice that: *will* be doing – regarding this [EPDP] final report for this Phase 1.

First of all, Council did meet yesterday and had a special purpose meeting which consisted, other than some very minor administration to begin with, of having a full briefing and then detailed discussion about the report.

Council, I believe, feels well-appraised now on the matter and certainly has not varied from its previously “advertised” plan, which I will remind you of as follows: our normal GNSO Council meeting date is the 21st of February at 12:00 UTC. A motion to adopt the final report of the Expedited PDP on the temporary specification is listed there. It has a 40-minute time allocation to it. The presentation of the motion will be made by Rafik. We will have Council discussions, and then there will be a supermajority vote on it.

So that is what is planned. The only way that anything will interfere with that is if a member of the Council suggests and prevails that a delay be called for whatever reason. If that occurs – and it is certainly not either planned for nor desirable but it does occur; in fact, many councilors have spoken about why it should not happen – then we have a placeholder meeting date for the 4th of March. At the 4th of March meeting, the Council will resolve the matter. The matter in front of the Council is, to be clear, the adoption of final report as it is writ by supermajority vote.

There you go. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Cheryl. Back to you, Alan or Hadia.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's have Hadia, and then I'll close up with what we're doing going forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Hadia Elminiawi, you have the floor?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So I was wondering here if we actually can submit this [request] on the 19th or the 20th. Is there any kind of possibility that we can propose submission of the statement? Because, actually, I think this is what we need to do in order to be able to – and I think it's possible to push against Recommendation #16, and Thick WHOIS could be discussed further during Phase 2.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia, we—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: And in all places I know that this could happen ... I know ... But again, even if we submit the statement [now], I still think we can do something about Recommendation #16 [officially].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just [drop] something very briefly?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on Phase 2 – I wasn't going to read the whole results under Item 4 for the agenda of the 21st GNSO Council – it is, then, I think important for you to realize that part of the proposed resolution for the GNSO Council on the 21st is a statement that goes, if I'm doing justice to the words – so this is a reasonable quote, not a definite quote – along the lines, "The Council does request that the EPDP team as a first step develop its work plan for Phase 2 and furthermore identify where the GNSO Council should consider any update to the EPDP team to facilitate the EPDP team's work."

So we are planning on having a strong linkage between Phase 2, going ahead and having a well-designed work plan. It seems to me that that is an opportunity, providing, of course, that our representation in the EPDP team is continuing at that point. You know, just the last part of that set of words, that the EPDP team needs to advise the Council whether or not any updates to the team's charter is required.

So nothing should happen sneaky. It should all, it happens at all, be very clear and very well-planned. Hopefully, Alan and Hadia will be active in making that plan be a workable one. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll note that, according to the charter, Phase 2 is only access. We have, without amending the charter or without asking permission, deferred various discussions into Phase 2. It is conceivable the Council would say, "No, you can't," after the fact, but I'm working on the assumption that Phase 2 is what is in the charter plus what we have deferred from Phase 1. That may turn out not to be the case.

Okay. At this point, in response to Hadia, we have no choice but to respond by the 15th, which is today, and we will, as far as I'm concerned. I believe we have to.

The report that we're looking at is labeled a final report. The file title, as distributed by Rafik to the GNSO Council, is, "EPDP Team Draft Final Report." So I am reading that to mean that it is conceivable that the report that the Council will vote on may be different based on whatever happens at the EPDP meetings next week.

If that is the case, obviously I would think that we will be given an opportunity to amend. If some of our points are not longer relevant, then so be it. We'll have to amend. But I don't think we have a choice going forward.

Now, prior to this meeting, we –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry? Olivier, were you trying to say something? Or somebody?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No. Nothing was being said, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, sorry. I heard someone interject. Prior to this meeting, we had approval to submit from Seun, Bastiaan, and Holly. We have an additional seven ALAC members on this teleconference, specifically Marita, Hadia, John, Kaili, Maureen, Ricardo, and Tijani. I would like to take a straw poll. Is there any among those seven ALAC members who are not supporting submitting this document?

Either raise your hand, put some sort indication up, or yell.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Alan, before you go ahead – I am in a very noisy environment. I don't know if you can hear me okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can actually hear you better than normal, so go ahead. I didn't realize you were on the call.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, sorry about that. I wanted to ask one question. It is, where are we now and what is the role of ALAC complying with the GNSO Council? Because we [consider] that we need to have a comment on the final report and we will need to agree on the GNSO proposal about EPDP. So it might be a little bit different.

Therefore, why – and, really, it’s a question – don’t we either support our [four] representatives in the [EPDP] [in making] the statement (but it’s not an ALAC statement) or we ask the CPWG to agree on that in one way or another? And we keep a full ALAC point of view after the GNSO.

If we compare that with what happened in the CCWG on Accountability, as a chartering organization, we were giving the decision at the same time as the others. Here, we are – because it’s a PDP – we are – in fact, if take now this position, it’s ALAC in advance of the final discussion of the GNSO.

That’s a question mark on what I say now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Two points. Number one, there was a discussion about and a decision on Wednesday, which could be rescinded. But the decision was this should be a statement of the ALAC, not of the representatives on the EPDP. And we wanted a formal decision of the ALAC to have the full weight of the ALAC behind it, not just the speakers. So, that was discussed on Wednesday, and that is the way we decided to go forward at that point.

With regard to a comment on the actual final report and the GNSO recommendation, the first thing the Board will do when they receive this from the GNSO, as they do from any PDP output, is put it out for public comment. We will have an opportunity that point to say whatever we believe, which does have to match or be in the same line as this particular statement.

So I think both of your issues were – one of them was addressed already and, subject to change, if Maureen wants to ask that that be rethought – but the decision was made to make it an ALAC statement, which is why we’re doing this right now and taking a straw vote.

And going forward, yes, we have another kick at the can, which might have the same tone or might be completely different.

Olivier, do you want to keep putting more time into this? Our hour is up. At this point, if we – I don’t know whether Sebastien was supporting this or not, but without Sebastien, we have ten people have said, “Submit.” So I’m taking that. Maureen may choose to hold a formal vote to ratify, or a consensus call. But at this point, we have a majority of the ALAC.

However, Olivier, if you want to keep going with [inaudible], I’ll leave that up to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, thank you. Marita Moll has her hand up. As she is one of the ALAC voters, I would give her the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. I was on the previous call, and, to my recollection, most of the people on the call felt that we were going to generally support, with some reservation.

That's not the way I'm reading what I see here on the screen. Basically, I don't see that anywhere. Maybe I'm missing it: to generally support.

Secondly, language like "We cannot accept" simply means we reject. So that means, "[Are] we submitting this? We are rejecting." That's not ambiguous language.

So, as far as I see this, we are rejecting the report because, specifically, there are results we cannot accept. So there's no middle ground here, as far as I can tell. I'm not sure that [I'm] actually in agreement with that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may, the statement – I don't know who's trying to speak.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Who's speaking?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know. Someone has their microphone open.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Marita, if you look at the last paragraph, it says ultimately we decided we would raise objections to a small number of critical issues but we'd still support the report in general.

As Seun and others have pointed out, and Jonathan, that is perhaps, in words, a conflict. But that is the way we decided to go forward, and it does explicitly say we are supporting the report in general.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. All right, Alan. I see there's a little bit of support in the chat for what I said, so the ["We cannot accept"] text bothers more people than me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Marita, can you suggest a way forward? We don't have a lot of hours to do crafting at this point. If you can identify the words that you think would address the issue, still meeting—

MARITA MOLL: Okay. We can say something like, "We are highly uncomfortable with." There's all kinds of other ways of saying that, but "We cannot accept" is a very strong—

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand what you're saying. I will look at those and see if I can soften them.

Now, I was told on Wednesday to make a very strong statement, which is what I did. If there's general agreement that we stop, that we replace, "We cannot accept," with, "We are uncomfortable," I can certainly make that change. It's easy, but it does go against what we said on Wednesday.

So, if I can get some guidance and somebody can make a ruling on this – Maureen, I'll ask you to indicate which words you think ultimately we should use.

I see we have a long queue, however. I see John Laprise and Holly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, let's go put John Laprise, please.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. I would like to suggest, in response to Marita and Alan's call for help on this, if we could actually lead off the statement with a statement of acceptance because, as it stands now, the fact that ALAC is accepting the reports in general with some reservations is delayed to the very end of the statement. If we rather lead off that we're accepting statements, we're accepting everything with some reservations, I think that would address some of the concerns and set off the report on the right foot. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I agree with John, but I also agree with Marita's language. We have very strong concerns. The reason I would suggest is that is a couple of people on the e-mails leading up to this meeting basically pointed out that contradiction.

So I'm comfortable with either kind of language, but if Marita is really uncomfortable with "We don't accept," I would accept her suggestions, which is, "We have very strong reservations" or "very strong concerns." Either way. But I think we should poll the meeting now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. The "cannot accept" will be replaced. I would suggest, however, that we not do what John suggested. I don't believe we should put a statement at the beginning of this saying we're accepting because, at that point, people can stop reading. So I think we should leave it towards the end.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Marita still has her hand up.

MARITA MOLL: Oh, sorry. In the heat of the moment, I forgot to lower my hand. But I'm okay with what Alan's suggesting, if we dilute that statement "cannot accept." I think that's just a little too [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's already changed.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So we have general acceptance from a significant number, more than half of the ALAC, so I will presume that this is a statement of ALAC. I'll talk to Maureen separately about whether we want to take a vote to actually count hands or do a consensus call to formally record it. But at this point, we know we have enough yay votes to proceed as a statement of the ALAC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, for the record, what is the text that "the results which we cannot accept are" will be replaced by?

ALAN GREENBERG: "We have strong concerns."

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, "We have strong concerns with the following"?

ALAN GREENBERG: I really dislike doing wordsmithing, but the “cannot accept” will be replaced with “strong concerns” with appropriate words around it to make it a real sentence.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Maureen Hilyard?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to confirm, basically, what you said, but I just wanted to get some confirmation as to what it is that was replacing “cannot accept.” That seems to be a major issue here.

Also, we do have pretty strong consensus, and I’m quite happy to go with that. If that change is made, then we would accept the statement, not the “cannot accept” issue that we’ve been discussing.

But if there are any other concerns that would prevent us from actually taking this consensus call, then I think Alan has actually taken note of a lot of the concerns. We have to make sure that they are represented in some way.

Also, when you put the call for the consensus vote or anything, I’d rather it was done in a positive way, not a negative one, so that they don’t endorse it. I’d rather have a “do endorse it” that people can actually respond in that particular [whatever] – tech or something. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Maureen, let's talk on Skype after this call for a few minutes, just to make sure we have clarity.

To be clear, a number of changes will be made as discussed as I proposed earlier. I'll try to clean up the wording to make sure other issues are addressed. The "We cannot accept" will be changed to "We have very strong concerns." Any other grammar things people have noted please get to me soon because we'd like to get this in relatively quickly.

Olivier, please. Back to you, and your hand is up anyway.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I've put myself in the queue for two questions. The first one: the next course of events. If I understand correctly, this will get voted – or, if all goes well, this gets voted – by the GNSO Council, then gets sent to the Board, and then there's another opportunity to comment at that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

Olivier?

ANDREA GLANDON: Hadia, this is Andrea. We unmuted your line. That is your line. Are you there?

HADIA ELIMINIAWI: Sorry. Actually, I'm not on the [phone] bridge. I'm only Adobe. So it's not my line.

ANDREA GLANDON: Okay. We'll disconnect that line because it's still showing "connected."
Thank you.

And Olivier has disconnected as well, so it'll be just a moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe someone else should take over this call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, did—

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan – sorry. Go ahead. Cheryl?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: This is my emergency way. I'm Adobe Connect. I just had a last question, which was to do with, just for the record, the number of the people on

the ALAC that are on the call today. I have Marita, Sebastian, Hadia, Holly, Heidi, Maureen, and Tijani. I understand that Bastiaan has also said, “Yes. Proceed forward.” Who else was it that, in the e-mail, said, “Proceed forward”?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, Seun, Bastiaan, and Holly said yes ahead of time. On this call, we had Marita, Hadia, John Laprise, Kaili, Maureen, Ricardo, Tijani, and Sebastien.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ten people. Okay. Ten in total. Thank you very much. And I think we can move on then to the next part of our call. That is—

ALAN GREENBERG: It’s actually eleven, Olivier, but let’s not quibble.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Eleven? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten ...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Evin, do you want to put up your presentation?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let’s hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck and—

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen, I'm going to stay on this call, listening, but I'll be silent. If you can Skype me after we finish.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Olivier and Jonathan. I see Maureen has also noted twelve ALAC members in support because Joanna also indicated support. I'll also follow up with any ALAC members not present.

But now we'll go to the policy comment updates. The presentation's in the AC pod.

Actually, I'm sorry. This presentation should have been updated because just a short moment ago the big pulse vote closed for the first ALAC statement on the ICANN draft FY20 budget. So that has been ratified by the ALAC. But a second statement was submitted this week regarding [our] travel spots. So that'll also be endorsed shortly. So there was a recently-ratified statement by the ALAC.

Public comment for decision? Nothing new has opened up yet. So current statements in progress: as mentioned, the second statement is being ratified, and there's also another statement, ICANN's strategic plan for fiscal years 2021 to 2025. That was submitted on the 11th of this week, so that's also for vote.

Then there are two statements that are currently open for comment which are being finalized. They're both going to be submitted on the 20th of February, the first being updated operating standards for specific reviews, with Greg and Jonathan as the penholders, and the second

being first consultation on a two-year planning process, with Judith Hellerstein as the penholders.

And there's finally one more, the CSC effectiveness public comment, which Greg Shatan is also penholder, which he's currently drafting. That closes on the 25th of February.

I'm not sure if maybe Greg or Jonathan would like to comment on the specific reviews comment since it's more or less finalized. It was a short statement, about a paragraph, so maybe you'd like to comment, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure. I can [inaudible] briefly. Go ahead and take a look at it, but it's basically just a transcription of what we decided to do on the call, which was to give a brief statement in support of the efforts that went into updating these standards.

I realize Alan is potentially going to submit something as an individual on this. We decided as a group, basically, to be supportive. So that's what the comment [does].

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Great. Thank you, Jonathan. I'm not sure if Judith Hellerstein is on the call. I think she is. We chatted briefly before the call, and she has reviewed the doc – go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Hi. Yes, I am in charge of the Google Doc. Let me just put the link into the chat. We have gotten a couple of comments, and Marita especially is helping me fine-tune this. She's been doing a lot of helpful editing on it.

So this is the statement we looked at. Our main thoughts are, in a sense, we think that it would be extremely helpful if ICANN org had identified their priorities, and more in the sense of what is the importance? Does one have a higher urgency? Does [one have it] higher than the others? And if they could rate them. We thought we would be very helpful because then the community could then better talk and collaborate more with ICANN on these priorities, as well as on helping us figure out how the At-Large priorities fit in with the ICANN ones.

And also better understanding the ICANN priorities, we could figure out, "Okay. Well, how can we avoid problems that we have not knowing what things might happen until they do?" So ICANN IT – as we mentioned in the budget talk, we had an issue with the translation tool. But it just gives an idea that the IT is also one of these priorities, and, unless we know what the rankings are, we don't know what's going to happen down the road that will affect our ability to communicate.

So we also talked about the need to have more transparency. The question is whether the identification of priorities should be delinked or linked to the transparency. But we also thought that it doesn't really matter. But, either way, you have increased transparency if you have a longer period where the community can have a chance to collaborate.

We tried to reuse some of the wording that we had done in the strategic plan and the budgeting so we could come out with the same thoughts that we had and it would be a consistent statement all along.

There was another question Marita and I were talking about – there was a discussion on contingency funding. That was mentioned in the paper, and the I was thinking about how the contingency funding, yes, is for emergencies, but emergencies come about because priorities are not known and things are not done in a thoughtful manner until they fall apart. Then emergencies come out.

The other discussion next is on what kind of activities, other than policy development, should be planned. The paper lists a series of ones, being reviews, cross-community working groups. We've added outreach, discretionary spending, CROP, communications. So there's that. There's a category on what are the values of community engagement. And we just listed several of the barriers, but we hoping to close up the statement, as it's due on the 20th.

I did leave out that we also had a discussion on discretionary funding and to have more of a delineation of what's in discretionary funding and what it breaks down as. So that's a summary of what that was talking about.

I welcome any more comments. And a big thanks to Marita. Marita, you have your hand up.

Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Hi. Thank you. Yes, Judith and I have been working on this. So one other thing I wanted to point out is that we want to be careful not to say that ICANN should be setting all the priorities. Priority setting needs to be a community development [activity]. Community has to be involved. So I tried to tie it in a little bit with what we said on the strategic plan but being a little careful with saying, "Yeah, we want to know what you think is on top." But actually, we want to also be in a discussion on what is on top. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Jon, back to you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can you on put me in the queue too, please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead, Cheryl and then Sebastien.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think Sebastien put his verbal in before my hand went up, so over to Sebastien, I think. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. It's quite difficult to adjust your phone in a very noisy environment.

I wanted to come back to what I heard about contingency funding. I am not sure about how we can have this idea that, because we will have a better recognition of priority, we [won't have need for] the contingency funding.

Maybe one way is to have a look to what was the news of the contingency funding in the last two years. I guess we will see that it was something arriving at the last moment or a new initiative or a specific need that couldn't have been put in the priority before.

Especially as we are starting to discuss the budget three years in advance, it's really important that contingency plans stay with enough money inside. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll just jump in. thanks. Sorry, we unmuted at the same time, Jonathan. Regarding the examples given in – I would continue to suggest [in] far to great detail in this document – I will again, as I did in the document comments I made, strongly encourage you to minimize the gory details, things that are only specific to At-Large and ALAC interests because this is a high-level consultation on the principle of two-year planning. We're not even up to the next advertised interaction, which will be about the details of how it goes.

So, yes, the questions posed have been answered. I'm personally very comfortable with the answers to each of the questions, but I still think we are trying to put far too much detail, particularly giving examples that take us down to specifics of particular projects, etc., etc. Look, leave them in, but they're not going to make on iota of difference because nobody is going to bother reading them.

What the interest is in is the high-level, in-principle support for the concept. So I would suggest, if you leave them in, fine. I would suggest, if you want people to actually read the document, you should put Occam's Razor through it and take it to the essence of what you're trying to say.

Okay? That's it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Judith, did you want to respond? I see you writing in the chat? I certainly agree in principle with Cheryl's comments.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yeah. I do agree, in principle, with you, but what we were trying to and what Maureen had guided me on was to use some of the same language that we had used in the budget comments and in strategic plan comments so that all three of those comments come out with us saying the same thing. But we'll try to fine-tune it. Maureen will help me work on it because she did the budget one.

But it's actually, I think, a shorter document than some others. We're just trying to make sure that we touch on all the things. We also do

[have] Marita's concerns that we're not telling ICANN how we make our own priorities. We are just having our priorities set by us. But having a better understanding of the ICANN priorities and the ratings of urgency will help us advocate for our own priorities.

So that's sort of what we're doing. But we'll take another look at it. I know Marita and I have been wordsmithing it, so we'll just keep going on it. But thanks so much for your comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Judith. Yeah, I think the key is it's a very different kind of consultation than the budget and strategic plan. So while we don't want to contradict ourselves, it's got a different objective, which is more of a philosophical answer, I think, and issues that may come up in a more general sense.

Any other comments on this?

Okay. Evin, is there anything else we need to cover there?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks, Jonathan. No, I don't think Greg Shatan is on the call, so perhaps we can save his update for next week's CPWG.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. Great. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. We're just on time for Any Other Business. The main question is our next calls.

First – well, one thing that has to be noted before is the ICANN64 prep week. Evin, do you want to say a few words about [these things]?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Thanks, Olivier. I just shared a link in the chat, and there's also a link on the agenda to the latest update on the ICANN64 prep week, which will have new format. There'll be four webinars per department, and the policy webinar is on the 28th of February at 16:00 UTC. So for more information, you can look at the link. Thanks very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Evin. Any other Other Business from anyone?

I'm not seeing any hands up. So the question we have to ask is, when is our next call? For this, I'll turn over to Andrea.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you so much. The next call we will schedule for Wednesday, the 20th of February, at 21:00 UTC. I will be getting that invitation out today.

Thank you very much for this, Andrea, and thanks to everyone, especially to our two EPDP stars, Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg, for putting together that statement. As we said, it's not the end of the end. It might be the end of the beginning. But there's still quite some discussion to be taken once the GNSO Council has proceeded forward

with their votes. Then it goes to the Board and then it goes to another round of comments. So no doubt there will be more that will be discussed until then and maybe some changes and so on.

In the meantime, we're just on time to end this call. Thanks, everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, and I gather weekend for most of us. So have a good one and see you next weekday—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, you've already used half of my Saturday.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's only a Saturday!

JONATHAN ZUCK: You know there's no better way to spend it, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly and I being a day ahead of you all does take it's toll occasionally. Have a great weekend, Holly. What we've got less of it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: What a better thing than to spend a Saturday with your friends? There you go.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ah, I've been doing it for years, darling. You know that. Take care everyone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, everyone. Goodbye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [See you].

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]