

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 27th of February 2019 at 13:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English channel, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Daniel Nanghaka, Hadia Elminiawi, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Sébastien Bachollet, Antonio Medina Gomez, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maria Korniets, George Kirikos, Gordon Chillcot, Yrjö Lansipuro, Bastiaan Goslings, Alberto Soto, Eduardo Diaz, Joel Thayer, Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, and León Sanchez has just joined us on the English channel as well. And I see Judith Hellerstein has joined us as well.

On the Spanish channel, we have Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges, and we have received apologies from, Joanna Kulesza, Justine Chew, Marita Moll, Kaili Kan, and from Holly Raiche.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Yesim Nazlar and I'll be doing call management for today's call. We have Spanish interpretation for this call, and our Spanish interpreters are Claudia and David. Before we start, just a kind of reminder to please state your names when speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes, please. And now I'd like to leave the floor back to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

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 CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim, and welcome everyone to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. Today's agenda is going to be a bit different from the usual. We'll start with a discussion with León Sanchez, the board member selected by the At-Large community, and he will be speaking to us about the government engagement approach process – I guess we can call it that – that is being currently laid out in a recent ICANN blog post.

After that, we will have Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg speaking to us about the latest on the expedited policy development process, the report that is currently in the hands of the Generic Names Supporting Organization, and of course, the next steps after that.

We'll have a very short policy comment update because there are very few of them at the moment, strangely enough. Usually, there are tons, but it's all come through.

Then Jonathan Zuck will speak to us about his policy sessions during ICANN 64, and we'll finish with Any Other Business, with just a reminder of the ICANN 64 prep week that Evin will be speaking to us about. Are there any other Any Other Businesses or any other discussions that we need to have or amendments to the current agenda?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel for the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Daniel. Daniel Nanghaka.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. [inaudible] agenda [inaudible] announcement that the outreach and engagement strategy deadline is tomorrow, the 28th [inaudible] on that, so call on the last comment before we sent it to the [inaudible].

YESIM NAZLAR: Sorry, Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, please.

YESIM NAZLAR: I'm so sorry for interrupting. We have an echo. Could you please make sure that your laptop, your computer is muted when you're speaking on the phone bridge, please?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Actually, I'm on the phone bridge, in not on Connect, so I don't know where the echo is coming from.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay, and the echo seems gone. It's strange. Okay, please keep on. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Okay. Thank you very much. Should I reiterate what I was mentioning? What I was mentioning was that I'd like to mention that the outreach and engagement strategy, the final deadline is tomorrow the 28th before we send it to ALAC for final [adjustment.] Thank you. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thanks very much, Daniel. I think that the echo might have come from my current headset that I'm wearing. It's actually me that had the echo loop on here. So we'll add this short item to the AOB, outreach and engagement strategy.

Let's get moving. I see no other hands up, so we can immediately start with the first thing, and that's the review of our action items from the last call. There is one that remains that needs to be effected at ICANN 64. The other two are completed. I would suggest we can just swiftly go to agenda item three, and that's our discussion with León Sanchez. So, León I understand is on the call. Shall I just hand the floor over to Jonathan? If you wish, Jonathan, to lead this and provide an intro and pass it over to León for discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Thanks, Olivier. Göran posted a blog about a new charter that has been drafted by ICANN.org with respect to how ICANN will be engaged in government relations, and they're trying to walk a very fine line in this document and suggest that it'll simply be about education and providing technical expertise to legislatures around the world that are

proposing regulations or other legislation that will affect ICANN's ability to do its job.

So I'll pass it to León to give us an introduction to it, and then perhaps we'll have a little discussion about it. León, take it away.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. Thank you very much, Olivier. Hello, everyone. Yes, as I recently forwarded you this blog post published by ICANN Org, a charter on ICANN Organization engagement with government and standards bodies has been published on February 25 2019.

This comes as an action from ICANN Org in order to try to address the many challenges that we see emerging and that ICANN Org and our community and the board will be facing or are already facing in the Internet governance arena.

This charter, as Jonathan has mentioned, intends – as I read it, of course – to establish some guidelines for ICANN Org's engagement with these entities, both governments and standard bodies. Its main intent is to try to of course put limits into ICANN Org's participation in this environment and to try to have ICANN Org action or participation limited to its mission as it's stated in its articles of incorporation and our bylaws.

And for that, they have established three main lines of engagement that intend to create awareness, and I would not say educate, but maybe raise awareness and try to have policymakers understand the impact

that the legislation they are drafting may have in regard to the stability and resiliency of the Internet.

We have seen many efforts of different sorts by governments, intergovernmental bodies and standard-setting bodies set these new rules, and sometimes, these rules or these laws are not necessarily aligned with what the Internet principles are. So ICANN Org has this task to try to, as I said, create awareness of what the impacts of such legislation and new normatives could have in impacting Internet's ability to continue to function as we want it to perform.

So this is why this charter has been published. It is something that Organization has been asked to do in a transparent fashion. We know that the ICANN Org engages through its governmental engagement unit on a regular basis with governments, so what we asked as board to the ICANN Organization was to set things straight and to be transparent on how they are engaging with governments and what has been their role in engaging with governments. And as a product of that request by the board, ICANN Org has published this charter to let everyone know how they are engaging and to what end they are engaging with governments and standards bodies.

With that in mind, I would of course open the floor and pass the microphone back to Jonathan and to Olivier. But before that, I would like to say that this will be of course one topic that we may discuss in our meeting in Kobe. I will be available, and of course, I'm sure that ICANN Org will be available too to comment on this charter and the next steps. I have been in touch with Olivier in regard to some suggested next steps that include participation from the community, the board

and ICANN Org in regard to Internet governance issues and how we address it from the community's point of view. So Jonathan, Olivier, thank you very much. I am here, of course, open for any questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Let me ask you a question. What is it that was the catalyst for this document to be created? Is it a belief that we're codifying what ICANN has done in the past, or does this constitute a new approach to government affairs?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Jonathan. I think it's more the former, it's codifying what ICANN Org has been doing from a long time ago. And of course, try to limit that engagement to these guidelines so that we make sure that ICANN Org remains within ICANN's mission as stated in its bylaws.

It could be a new approach on how ICANN Org is communicating what they are doing to the community, but mainly it's, as you said, codifying what has been happening in the last couple of years, maybe.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, León. Let's go to the queue. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. León, are you speaking only about the engagement of ICANN Org, means the staff and CEO, or are you speaking about ICANN as general meaning?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Tijani. I am speaking on my reading on the charter that has been published. So this would entail only ICANN Org's action. But I have been in touch with Olivier and other members of the community to try to find a way in which the three parts of our community which are of course the community, ICANN Org and the board can continue to work together to address the Internet governance challenges that we are facing and we will continue to face, but in a broader scale, not only pertaining the traditional Internet governance arena that we are familiar with but also looking a little bit outside of that rim insofar other bodies that are making policy or legislating actually impact the way we do things or the way the Internet is supposed to function according to the principles that we are all familiar with.

So this is, as I said, in principle my reading of the charter as it has been published in regard to ICANN Org. But I would definitely see this as something a little bit larger or much larger, and I'm convinced that this should also include coordinated efforts between community, ICANN Org and the board. Does that answer your question?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Second question, León. Do you think that limiting the involvement or the engagement of ICANN in the activities organized by governments or intergovernmental bodies is the solution? Don't you think that on the contrary, perhaps it is better to better engage and be present more strongly to give the argument, to give the point of view of ICANN in all

these questions of Internet governance? If we close our ears and our eyes and say we are here and we don't want to hear what they say, I don't think it is the solution.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

No, but I might be conveying the wrong message. As I read it, this doesn't intend to limit ICANN Org's participation in engaging with governments, but it only establishes the guidelines that they need to follow when engaging with governments. So there have been some concerns from some parts of the community as to what is the role that ICANN has been playing while engaging with governments, is this something that could be seen as maybe a lobbying from ICANN Org in some arenas? Etc.

So what we asked the ICANN Org is to set things very clear in this charter to say, okay, this is not something that we are doing that could equate to lobbying, but it's something that we are doing that, as you said, it's intended to set the record straight on how policy should be built, how the multi-stakeholder model works, how the different stakeholders' positions should be taken into account when building policies and making laws.

So this is more the approach that we want to see from Organization as opposed to limiting their activities with government. So you are right, yes, we need to continue engaging with government, but with clear rules that establish a limit to what ICANN can do in regard to this engagement. I hope this makes it a little bit clear.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, León. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Jonathan. León, I have a question and clarification. So George Kirikos, he pointed a link here of a page that I wasn't aware of, so this is [inaudible] ICANN [lobby] the government. And unfortunately, this new charter or whatever it's called will limit or make ICANN not do this going forward, with U.S. government or any government. So, I just want to understand the [inaudible] behind it. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I'm sorry, Eduardo, could you please repeat the question? I had some cut up on my side.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. George Kirikos pointed a link in the chat that points to a place where it shows that ICANN is putting money for lobbying, up to 2018. So my question is going forward with this new framework, ICANN will stop doing that with the U.S. government and any government in terms of putting money for lobbying? Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay, so the question is will ICANN continue to pay money for lobbying or will it cease to pay money for lobbying? That's the question?

EDUARDO DIAZ: That's correct.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay. So I don't have an answer for that at this point. I think this is something that we should definitely ask ICANN Org to clarify. But I don't think that this would be something that would be stopping from now on. Part of the engagement that ICANN needs to do with government pertains to having lobbyists open doors, so I wouldn't assume that having this charter and establishing these limits to ICANN Org's engagement with government would imply necessarily stopping payments for lobbying matters. But as I said, this is just my opinion, not that of the board or ICANN Org. So I would definitely take this to ICANN Org and ask for clarification.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, León. Thanks, Eduardo. George, go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah, just following up on Eduardo's comment, the letter from Mr. Marby in the third last paragraph, it ends saying, "And we will not be lobbying." So it's hard reconcile that given that they've already been lobbying for many years in the U.S. with those mandatory disclosures to the U.S. Senate and United States House of Representatives.

As Cheryl posted in the chat, it's important to have transparency over what their activities are, not just in the United States but anywhere else

they might be lobbying. So I'm not sure if they're trying to redefine what lobbying means to try to limit it to so-called technical matters, but there's obviously political impacts from technical decisions, so we're kind of playing semantics and wordsmithing things that we're trying to say that it's not lobbying, just providing information.

So I think we need to have those disclosures, not just in the United States but elsewhere as well for that greater transparency and accountability, and have greater consensus on what ICANN's limits should be as to what kind of information it provides.

For example, I'm looking at Canada. I don't proactively contact the government to impact legislation or other matters like that, but if the government contacts me, I'm happy to provide them information that they require for taxes and so on.

So if ICANN is proactively seeking out the government, that's kind of different than reacting to the government outreach to ICANN. So it's just a matter of what the direction of the information and who's asking for that information. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, George. So folks, we may be hitting up a limitation on León's ability to answer these questions. So it's possible we should add this into our questions for Göran when we get to see him. So I'll go ahead and get through the queue, but I think at this point León's reading the document just like we are and providing his interpretation. So let's consider taking this to the source at ICANN 64. Yrjö, go ahead.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah, thank you. León, can this document be seen in a way as a reaction to some very high-level governmental signals about a need for more regulation, like for instance President Macron in Paris? Is this a way that tell them that we want to give them technical information so that they don't go too far and damage the actual DNS?

Which, by the way, there's also an interesting sentence saying that DNS is different from the platform. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Yrjö. Yes, this is definitely linked to what you have just described. In the board Internet governance working group, we have been discussing this. We see this as a trend that is of course increasing, there's an increasing trend, and one of the things that we asked Org was exactly to be a little bit more proactive in how we are addressing these issues.

So yes, it's not strictly a response to what we [inaudible] in Paris in this last IGF, because this is something that would have to happen anyway, but definitely a catalyst was what we saw in Paris. So yes, things got accelerated by this, and this charter is definitely linked to this increasing trend that we're seeing, issuing legislation that impacts the Internet and the way it should work. So yes, it is linked to that, Yrjö.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, guys. And Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. As the blog says, lobbying rules vary heavily. I suspect the statement saying we will not lobby is a generalization which we probably shouldn't be making. When we say our job is to make sure that lawmakers are informed of the impact, well, that's lobbying in some cases. It's perceived as lobbying. We are telling them if you do this, then this will have results. You may not like those results.

I suspect that is classed as lobbying in many jurisdictions, yet if you look at GDPR, we didn't do that, and look where we are. Governments are increasingly legislating things that will have an impact on the Internet without necessarily understanding the impact that they're going to have. And so I don't think this is just limiting what we could do, it's also saying we must proactively do it.

WHOIS1 review team said outreach to people who don't normally come to ICANN. And that includes many parts of governments. Yes, there may be a GAC person, but it's not necessarily the person who's involved in the type of legislation we're talking about. So I think this is a plus and minus, and I suspect the global statement of "We will not lobby" is just misplaced, because I suspect it will be deemed as lobbying some places, even though we're looking at it as education. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I agree with you, Alan. Sorry, Jonathan. Just wanted to point out that I agree with Alan in that we must reach out to actors that we don't usually reach out, and I agree with many of you that maybe having the word "lobbying" in the charter might not be the better choice of word given that lobbying might be defined or understood in different ways in different places. So I agree with you also, Jonathan, that we should take this to the origin and ask ICANN Org to maybe clarify what they mean by lobbying.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great. I think next is actually Olivier, and then Sébastien.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And before I start this – I hope short – intervention, I should say that I'm speaking entirely for my own self and no part of At-Large or EURALO or whatever. I haven't discussed this with anyone. But when I read that charter, I immediately wondered and thought, wait a minute, what kind of triggered this whole thing of ICANN again restricting itself?

Because that's what it is actually doing here, is saying we're going to restrict ourselves to specific things and we're going to follow a process which is going to be transparent but which effectively serious curtails our ability to actually deal with whatever political and geopolitical challenges that are going to come our way.

The way that I read this apparent charter and the statement by Göran is, is ICANN going to continue being involved in WSIS? Is it going to

continue being actively involved in the ITU? Is it going to be involved in the IGF? IGF is Internet Governance Forum, it's nothing to do with technical stuff. Is it going to be involved in national and regional IGFs? Is it going to continue supporting them? Is it going to look actively at what's happening in the World Trade Organization when there's a lot going on at the moment in Internet governance and that actually might lead to stuff on Internet identifier system? And there are also several high-level panels at the United Nations itself, including the United Nations General Assembly, none of which are just purely technical like this. You can't hear me now. Great. Hello?

YESIM NAZLAR: No, Olivier –

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

YESIM NAZLAR: We can hear you, but we have a problem with your line. It's just like a crackling noise. So that's the only problem. It might be because of your headset you said, I guess.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It could be my headset, yes. Okay. As long as you can hear me, it's fine. The concern that I have here is, is ICANN just about to curtail its duties towards the defense of the multi-stakeholder model, including all of the support that it's done for the multi-stakeholder fora out there? The

duties to lead, not just be a side participant providing technical information to the I-star organizations but actually lead the I-star organizations. Is ICANN basically stepping back and saying we're going to become purely technical organization?

And if that's the case, then I'm really concerned about the position of the At-Large Advisory Committee and the At-Large community, because I don't really see us fitting much in a purely technical organization like this.

I just wonder if this is not just a first step for devolution rather than evolution where ICANN is then able to then reduce its budgets even more and say, well, nothing more regarding IGFs, nothing more regarding any of our government engagement activities, which effectively means ICANN is coming back into its egg and ready to take the full frontal assault from everyone else by doing the well-known [antipodes] thing of doing the ostrich and putting its head in the sand, hoping that the storm will pass. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Olivier. I definitely think [inaudible] the case at all. We have asked Org from the board Internet working group is to do exactly the contrary of what was described. We want ICANN to be proactive, we want ICANN [inaudible] and we want ICANN to continue to do the leading efforts that they have performed, but we also want ICANN to [inaudible] basis. So as I told Tijani, this is not something [that aims to] curtail ICANN's efforts in regards to Internet governance but it is a [statement] that codifies what has been happening in the last couple of

years or maybe more, and its intent is, as I said, to have ICANN continue to do what they are doing but with a clear guideline to follow in relation to [inaudible]. I hope that's clear [inaudible] answer your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: León, could I have a follow-up, please? Very short.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. And there shouldn't be any clicking now. Is the line still crackling, or not? I'm not using the headset.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's fine now. It's clear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's fine, so it was the headset. Okay. So, does that mean that ICANN's duties or ICANN's activities with regards to IGF, including national and regional Internet initiatives, is completely unhindered by this specific process?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: It should be unhindered. [As I said previously,] we should ask for clarification to ICANN org, but the intent of the board Internet governance working group is to leave things as is insofar we recognize

what you have just said, but we also want to put a clear guidance to Org as to what they should be doing and to keep Org aligned within the remit of ICANN's mission.

So yes, this [document] should not hinder the efforts in regards to IGF and regional IGF.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, León. Sébastien?

SÉBSATIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, León, for this. First of all, about the process, I really don't understand why it's not going through a public comment as we usually do for a lot of things, including policy. And I think it will be wise for ICANN in general and ICANN Org to put that into a process of public comment.

On the content – and I agree with a lot of things that were said before, and I will be short. I think it's missing a few points, and particularly one, what is currently – how is multi-stakeholder implementation is working with every government, and I think we can't just say that somebody from ICANN Org must go to discuss with and educated some part of the governments who are not participating to ICANN and what all the other stakeholders are doing.

And I guess we as At-Large structures are usually doing part of this job, then it can't be just in isolation. They are not in an island, in the rest of the world and in the continent. Therefore, that needs to be taken into account in such a charter. But in addition to what Olivier and others said before. Thank you very much.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Sébastien. I agree with you in that some input from the community should be taken into account to further refine this charter. I believe – and this is just my opinion, it's not something that I have information from Org or the board, but I believe that this was not put into a public comment because as I said, it's only codifying what has been happening and making it clear and transparent to the community how ICANN should continue to engage with governments. That's mainly the reason why it didn't go to public comment.

However, I am certain that ICANN Org is not closed to receiving feedback and input from the community, so I think [inaudible] causing this, but we'll have an opportunity in Kobe to raise –

YESIM NAZLAR:

León?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Yes?

YESIM NAZLAR: León, I'm so sorry for interrupting, but your audio is very faint at the moment for our interpreters, and they're having a hard time trying to interpret. So, is it possible for you to speak louder? Or we might need to redial out to you. I'm so sorry for interrupting you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yesim, I think we need to close this topic anyway. It's obvious that we need more discussion of it, and I think the time to do that is at the meeting. I think we probably reached the limit of León's ability to interpret this document, so let's put this on the table and make sure we come prepared to discuss it with Laurin, and perhaps even the board. Alright? Hopefully that's agreeable to everyone.

Sébastien, I assume that's an old hand. So León, you've got a sense of how people are reacting, so you can give a heads up to the board.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Thank you, Olivier. Thank you, everyone who has commented on this. I share many of your thoughts, of course. I hope that my reading clarifies some of your concerns, and as chair of the board Internet governance working group, I assure you that the intent is not to have ICANN step back from the Internet governance arena, but on the contrary, it is to reinforce its leading role in the Internet governance arena, just limiting its interaction to what our mission states in the bylaws. So I will remain in the call, and I thank you, everyone, for your time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, León, for your time. We really appreciate it. I'm going to hand it back to you, Olivier, to manage the EPDP discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I have another headset on now. Can you hear me well with this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfectly.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great. that's my oldest headset and it's the one that's the most trusted still.

Okay, so now we're moving to agenda item four, the comment on the expedited policy development process with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. I understand both of them are on. You've only got ten minutes for this because we're not in the middle of writing something, but over to you. I'm not sure who wishes to start, Alan or Hadia?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll start.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg. Yeah, your hand is up, Alan, so you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll certainly start. There's not a lot to report. We submitted the comment that we had drafted. I reported in a following meeting what the outcomes were. There weren't a lot of changes because of it. The report has been published, and we now need to decide – and I presume in Kobe – to what extent we respond to the public comment and to what extent we provide advice to the board independent of that comment. And my suggestion at that point was my gut feeling is we should do both. And I said I hope that we will have substantive time available to discuss that in Kobe.

The only other thing to report since then is the chair of the EPDP, Kurt Pritz, has tendered his resignation saying he'll stay on until a replacement is found, but implying that should happen quickly. And I don't think there's anything else to report at this point. The GNSO is deliberating. The decision was pushed back to the 4th of March, which I think is next Monday. And that's about all I have to report. Hadia may want to add something, or Cheryl may want to tell us what's going on in the GNSO. But I don't think we need to spend a lot more time on the EPDP topic on this particular meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia Elminiawi?

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Thank you, Olivier. So Alan covered almost everything. I would just add a few words with regard to the Kobe meeting. So, the Kobe meeting is going to be mostly maintained, and we shall use the opportunity for planning and preparing phase two.

We currently have a slot reserved for Sunday, Wednesday and Thursday, and it's also likely that we will meet with the technical study group, either Sunday or Wednesday depending on their availability.

I guess Kobe would be the beginning or will be used for planning into the next phase of our work. And that's it.

Another question would be if you would like to post a mail or [inaudible] message to Kurt on behalf of ALAC thanking him for his role and contributions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Hadia. Jonathan Zuck is the first person.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Alan, I guess just a couple of follow-up questions. One is we don't have any reason to expect this, but are you and Hadia going to be able to continue on as our representatives in phase two of this, or are you two totally burnt out and we need to organize others? And then my second question is I wanted to make sure I understood what you said, but are you hoping that we have an ALAC session devoted to phase two in Kobe? Because if so, then we need to make sure we have that on the schedule, because I don't think we do at this point.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. I will answer both of those. I cannot answer on behalf of Hadia. I have no plans to resign at this point. I will note that I and a number of others have expressed a concern about the level of engagement that was required during part of, and certainly the last part of this thing that the 30 hours a week was lowballing based on [what we] ended up having to put into it. That can't continue.

On the other hand, there will not be a deadline such as there was for this one. Therefore, there will be less reason to have such intense work being done. But we also don't want this to go on for years. So I don't know. At this point, I'm not planning on resigning, but it's a possibility as we go forward that we just can't sustain that level of engagement. But I don't think that's unique to At-Large. So we'll see how that goes.

In terms of Kobe, no, I was not suggesting a significant discussion on phase two. I was suggesting a significant discussion on what we say in the public comment, and perhaps more important, whether we issue advice to the board and what that should be. And that is something that I will hope that we will have a fair amount of time, at least an hour or so to talk about, and I'll be coming with some ideas of what we can do, but this is an ALAC decision and I think needs to be made by the ALAC. And of course, the timing has to factor in when the EPDP is meeting, because it shouldn't overlap with that. And I see Hadia has her hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. I'll work with staff to make sure there's time for that. We do have a discussion Sunday morning that is meant in the abstract to

kind of deal with phase two, but it's more just [substance and a discussion.] Again, it's to do some consensus building around At-Large positioning on unified access and things like that. So that should help the discussion that should come later. But I'll work with staff to try [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Jonathan, to be clear, I don't think there are issues associated with unified access that I'm aware of that we have not already discussed. It's core to everything that we've said in our participation within the EPDP. So I'm not expecting any big surprises in terms of decisions we need to make going forward. I may be naïve and I may be missing something, but I don't think we need huge different change in direction from ALAC in terms of our involvement.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Jonathan. So, I'm not planning on resigning as well. I'm happy to continue as a representative [inaudible] ALAC at the EPDP. And I will join Alan, it was very difficult the last week.

For me, the last call, it was four hours, I was attending the Middle East DNS Forum, so I had to finish the forum and run after half an hour to attend a four-hour meeting. And sadly, I couldn't make it to your call, guys, later on that day. But yes, I'm happy to continue what we started. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great news, guys. Thanks a lot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much. Jonathan, your hand is up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That may be it on the topic, Olivier. No, I'll put it down. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. I have one question, which is, do we have any idea of what the EPDP sessions are going to be focusing on specifically in Kobe? Bearing in mind that we've got an outgoing chair and so many things. Are there any ideas of what the discussion is going to be about?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Largely planning. There's a [message for Kurt we could forward. Hadia, actually,] if you have it convenient, if you could forward it to the CPWG. But we're largely looking at planning. I don't think there is discussions to talk about targeted specific substance, although obviously, we have to start looking at the overall list of things we're doing and just try to put some structure to it, because the phase two is much larger than it was in the charter because of things we deferred into phase two. And they're all substantive and difficult issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. The final thing I was going to suggest adding an additional action item, which was to already have a page created for a potential ALAC comment on the forthcoming public comment period that the board will launch. Is that the right time to do it?

ALAN GREENBERG: There's going to be a public comment. Staff knows about it. I'm presuming a page will be set up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, so if we were to discuss this right there and then in Kobe, perhaps already having a home for that will be a helpful thing so ideas can be jotted down in there right away. And we could even publicize the page before that session takes place.

ALAN GREENBERG: The GNSO will be voting on the 4th. I'm presuming the public comment will be set up no later than the 5th. I think our staff can take that under advisement and make sure that we have the page ready before Kobe.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. [Actually, it's coming int other action items.]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. thanks. The GNSO council will vote on the 4th, and assuming that the motion as it is writ at the moment gets the supermajority support it requires in the council meeting, then the report will be transmitted with the GNSO support of it to the ICANN board. Whether or not the ICANN board is poised to start a public comment the day after, I couldn't say and I couldn't guess. But it will be certainly forthcoming.

But I'm a little fearful that if we commit Alan to less than 24 hours after a GNSO vote to accept and then transmit, we might be slightly misleading our community. But nevertheless, I'm supporting putting up the space and being prepared. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. To be clear, there is no rule saying there must be a public comment on the ICANN public comment page before we put up a Wiki page.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thanks very much. Let's move on. I'm mindful of the time and completely failing to beat Jonathan's record short call last week. So without anybody else being in this agenda item in the queue, so let's move on to number five. Jonathan Zuck, Evin Erdogan, policy comment update.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Olivier. I'll be super brief, of course. This week has been a typically short public comment review for the CPWG since there are no current statements under development, but two were recently ratified by the ALAC, Updated Operating Standards for Specific Reviews, and First Consultation on a Two-Year Planning Process. And those executive summaries have also been posted.

There is only one public comment for decision, and this topic is usually not one that the ALAC comments on, but it is to be determined. That is the proposal for Hebrew script rootzone label generation rules. And this closes on the 16th of April. So, would you like to discuss this, Jonathan? Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess I'm just going to reflect that question back to the group. I think my inclination is that we wouldn't comment on this, but if someone disagrees with that, then speak up. Alright, absent anybody speaking up, then we'll recommend to the ALAC that we not post a comment on this.

Alright. And I guess I can jump right into the next discussion, if you want, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Please go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Yeah, so we have three sessions devoted to policy at Kobe. Two on Sunday morning and then one on Wednesday. So the topics that I

came up with for those sessions, the first one is related to subsequent procedures and getting the kinds of application that we keep expressing that we want, and I'm going to try to get Christa Taylor to come and be part of that discussion with us, and it's more of a brainstorming to make sure that we're doing all that we can and figure out what role At-Large can play in that process going forward and have a discussion to make sure that we're doing some active thinking, since every time we comment on this, the topic comes up about how would a brand round affect communities and how do we get more communities, and how do we get more applications from underserved regions, etc.

So that will be the topic of discussion first thing on Sunday morning. The second discussion is intended to be a discussion on security versus privacy, and we have Lauren Kapin from the FTC and someone from the NCSG actually to have a conversation about some of those issues related to access to the undisclosed data, and so the idea there was to air some of these issues because it seems like we have debates about them every time we talk about them on this call, and ideally, we could get some things laid out. But it's possible now, after talking with Alan, that we may want to devote some of this meeting to discussions of the phase two comments, etc. So I will try to figure out how to marry these two things [at] this call.

And then finally on Wednesday, we'll have a discussion with Don Hollander who's the head of the universal acceptance working group, and that's again a brainstorming session on the are ole that the At-Large community could play in helping to mitigate some of the challenges associated with new strings and the websites that refuse to acknowledge them.

This is a personal idea of mine, which is it's an opportunity to show the power of having such a large organization and what some of the implications of that might be on one of the primary problems with the new gTLD round from 2012. So that's the discussion on Wednesday. And I'm happy to take any questions. Those were sort of the three things that we were going to talk about substantively. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. On the privacy versus security, I would suggest you want someone from SSAC also, and I would suggest Greg Aaron if you can get him. And who from the NCSG are you talking about?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's not been nailed down yet. So yes, I think you're right about SSAC. I think that's smart.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Greg, I think, would be the best one if he's available and in Kobe.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Thanks, Alan. Any other questions or comments? Alright, great. Thank you very much. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. We now are reaching agenda item number seven. That's Any Other Business. We've got two pieces of Any

Other Business. The first one is Evin Erdogan taking us through the ICANN 64 prep week.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks, Olivier. So this is just a reminder, this week is ICANN prep week starting today, and it's in about an hour actually. The first webinar is MSSI at 16:00 UTC, then Compliance at 23:00 UTC. And then tomorrow on the 28th of February is the policy webinar at 16:00 UTC, and then a finance webinar at 23:00 UTC.

So, thanks, and we hope to see you there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Evin. And I can't say these are – for those people that haven't been following, all of the things going on at ICANN, it's always great to have those webinars that are there to be able to provide a very good cross section on these different topics. I guess this one is this prep week is a new way of doing things. So I hope that many of us will be able to join.

Now, next we have Daniel Nanghaka who is going to speak to us about the activities of the outreach and engagement strategy. If any comment is required on that. Daniel, you have the floor.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. We've been working lots on different strategies. One of them is the key document which is the outreach and engagement strategy. We have also the capacity building strategy that

has been worked on by Joanna and the respective team. But at this juncture, I just want to put forward that the final version of the outreach and engagement strategy, which the team is naming version two which has lots of recommendations that are coming in from the previous recommendations of the ALAC proposal which [inaudible] collaboration, capacity building and engagement.

So the document is currently on – it's a Google doc. Actually, I'm sorry, [I'm not at a computer, but] I request staff if possible to share that link. [So we're going to welcome] final comments before submitting to the ALAC for approval and ratification.

Also, one of the key agendas in Kobe, we are going to be looking [tentatively] at this document, and then any other changes, we're hoping to come in after approval from the ALAC. Yeah, at least [inaudible] outreach and engagement strategy document. Thank you. So I welcome your final comment. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Olivier. How does one send comments to you? Is it by e-mail?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: The comments can also be sent by e-mail or commenting directly on the Google doc. [inaudible] able to ratify all of that. And then the document immediately after tomorrow will be uploaded to the Wiki and also be shared to all the members respectively. Thank you. Back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Daniel. So we look forward to receiving that link over in the mailing list, and then people can comment on it as a follow-up. I see there's one person in the queue, Alberto Soto. I'm not sure whether it was to ask a question on the first part of this Any Other Business or second part, or to add another topic, but in any case, Alberto, you have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Olivier. This is a third issue, actually, but it's very short. In [Skype,] we have seen and commented on the attacks on the DNS, and we said that the implementation of the DNS would perhaps not be a solution but it would be a way to remediate it. So perhaps we would need to deal with this issue very soon. Thank you. This is [inaudible] I suggest to work with the RIRs, that each RALO work with the RIR. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alberto. That's a good point. For those people who are not aware, there was a webinar, I believe, or I think it was an event that earlier in the week mentioned that the DNS was under attack. And I don't think it was anything specific. It's been under sustained attack for quite some time, and the aim of the session was to have more top-level domains and domain names that would use DNSSEC. That was misinterpreted by Agense France-Presse and it gave rise to a few articles in some newspapers and some press outlets that ICANN was under attack.

Thankfully not. ICANN is still there, still happy, alive. So it's just a case that perhaps sometimes when we try to push for some goal such as more adoption of DNSSEC, the message doesn't quite go through correctly. And we might wish to discuss this at Kobe also, how to make for a better message so as to, on the one hand, pass the message but on the other hand, not just send ripples of fear throughout the community that ICANN is under attack as such.

Anyway, I see no further hands, so I guess that we have nothing else to discuss apart from the next meeting. I believe that next week is going to be a little difficult for next Wednesday since a number of people will be traveling, but I'm certainly able to chair a call. I shall only start travel the day after, so if we want, we can continue with the same rotation of calls. Are there any objections to that?

YESIM NAZLAR: Olivier, if I may.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead, Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: Next week, next Wednesday is the 6th of March, and At-Large staff will be traveling during that time. While we'll have two of our At-Large staff members, Andrea and Claudia not traveling, but the rest of the team will be traveling. So I'm not sure if it would be possible for them to join the call.

OLIIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I note here that a lot of people are traveling, including Jonathan, Cheryl, and some staff as well. What I'd suggest then is unless there is a pressing topic that we need to address, there will not be a call next week, and perhaps then we can – if there is something that turns up, then we'll be able to send a last-minute note. Or we can do it the other way around, we can set up a call and then cancel it before it happens if there's no important topic. George Kirikos.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: I was just curious about the meeting policy of the CPWG. It seems as though there's a meeting scheduled every week. Is that by design? People have different philosophies on that, like some people feel that there shouldn't be meetings unless there is a pressing topic. Others believe in having regular meetings. I was curious about that philosophy. Thank you.

OLIIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, George. The policy is that there is a meeting every week, because until now, there's always been something that needed attention, and there always is something needing attention, whether it's response to public comments, whether it's EPDP, subsequent procedures, etc. So it has been that we have a weekly call, and if there is nothing, then we can always cancel it.

I'd say maybe as a standard then we could set up a call, but Yesim, I didn't quite understand. Did you say there was absolutely no staff available to run a call next week, or some staff were traveling?

YESIM NAZLAR:

So actually, for example I know Heidi and Evin, the lead support staff, will be traveling. So I'm not sure if Evin will be able to help you with the agenda updates and those things. And from the support staff, Andrea and Claudia are not traveling, so they may help you with the call management, but the rest of us will be traveling.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, fine. So let's set a call according to our usual scheduling, and as it was mentioned earlier, if there's nothing that stands out, then we can always cancel it with 48 hours' notice. So we could cancel it on Monday if nothing turns up by Monday. At least we'll have a slot that's ready there. And Evin can certainly update the table if there is something before flying out on Wednesday so she can update it on Tuesday and we'll do without her there on Wednesday.

Thanks very much, everyone, and this call is now ended. Thank you. Have a very good day, very good week. And for those people that are traveling – and if we do cancel next week's call, then safe travels.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thanks, everyone. Bye.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good job, Olivier.

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

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]