

---

ANDREA GLANDON: We will now officially start the recording of today's conference call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 27<sup>th</sup> of March, 2019 at 19:00 UTC. We do have apologies listed from Alfredo Calderón, Kaili Kan, Jonathan Zuck, Alan Greenberg, Justine Chew, and Alberto Soto.

On today's call, we have Holly Raiche, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Vanda Scartezini, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Hadia Elminiawi, Gordon Chillcott, Yrjo Lansipuro, Sergio Salinas Porto, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Tom Dale, Leon Sanchez, Ricardo Holmquist, John Laprise, Sebastien Bachollet, Eduardo Diaz, Sarah Kiden, Bastiaan Goslings, Judith Hellerstein, and Abdulkarim Oloyede.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Andrea Glandon on call management.

I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much and welcome everyone to this first Consolidated Policy Working Group call after the ICANN 64 meeting in Kobe. Welcome back to everyone who was in Kobe and flew home after it or maybe if you're still around Japan, I hope you enjoyed your time. We've

---

*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.*

---

got an agenda here today which is a little different from the usual because there is less policy work usually after a meeting than before one but we do have quite a full agenda since we will be looking back first at what happened at ICANN 64, looking at several policy sessions that Jonathan managed to lead over the week. Then we'll be looking as a sort of short follow-up discussion with Leon Sanchez regarding the ICANN government engagement approach, which was a discussion that we did have in our last call and there was also some discussion about this in some sessions at ICANN 64, but there might have been some more updates on this topic so it's great to see Leon with us.

Then after that, we'll have the comment on the EPDP report and next steps. As you know, Phase One is finished, complete, gone, done, in the Board's hands. But now Phase Two is coming up and Hadia Elminiawi will be able to speak to us about what we are to expect. We'll look briefly at the policy [comment] updates and we'll reach, hopefully, within the hour, we'll reach the "Any Other Business" and I'd like to open the floor to find out if anybody wishes to add or make amendments to this agenda.

I notice Chair George Kirikos mentioning, "Can we add the dot-org, dot-info contract renewal as a topic?" I believe that this will go in the policy review section that we have. Evin, yes, I can see that, policy comment for decision, propose renewal of dot-org registry agreement, propose renewal of dot-info registry agreement. So that's in agenda item six, policy comments. Any other input?

I am not seeing any other changes, so let's proceed with the agenda as it currently is on your screens. So the first things we have to look at are

---

our action items from last call. They're all completed. I'm not going to list through all of them, but it's all been done effectively. Are there any comments regarding a follow-up to any of these action items? I do note that to note, the ALAC position on Government Engagement Approach, Leon Sanchez noted would be a topic for discussion on the Board during ICANN 64, and secondly, the community discussion regarding definition and scope of lobbying, level of transparency, how proactive ICANN should be as an organization. Well, that's all part of the discussions we'll have to agree on shortly.

No hands up. Let's then get moving and we can go to agenda item three, looking back at the ICANN 64 policy sessions. Now there were quite a number of these because this meeting had plenty of time to spend on policy work which was really a great thing and a shift from the usual where we're really pressurized for time.

So this meeting format, I hope, was something that everyone enjoyed and if you look at the policy discussions, there is a summary that you can find now on the Wiki. I would like to thank everyone who was involved with putting this summary together and Evin in particular. And here you have the feedback on first balancing privacy with security and stability for the Internet end user.

And there was first a panel that took place, a panel discussion, with on the one hand, Lauren Kapin, of the U.S. Federal Trade Commission, and Greg Aaron who was from the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee, the SSAC, and is also running some work, research work, regarding malware and spam on the Internet. There was Kathy Kleiman and Farzaneh Badii, both of the ICANN Non-Commercial Stakeholder

---

Group, and in particular, the Noncommercial Users Constituency, so as to have a balance between the advocates of privacy on one side and consumer protection on the other.

A good discussion was had and, well, I'm not going to read through the whole point here but that was one of the panels that took place. The other one was the challenges and possible opportunities regarding Universal Acceptance. This topic of Universal Acceptance was somehow not really very much in the limelight in previous months, or even previous years. And recently, this has really come to the front table or front row for the simple reason that there still, a few years after the launch of the new gTLD process, are problems with the spread of those generic top-level domains, or at least the acceptance of those top-level domains, especially when it comes down to internationalized domain names.

So there was a whole discussion on this with John Laprise leading the development of the plan for multi-tier Internet end user outreach and activation on Universal Acceptance.

Then there was a new gTLD subsequent procedures and objectives for the At-Large community. There was a big discussion within our community to find out effectively if there is support for another round, effectively, of new gTLDs. And for this, we had the visit of Christa Taylor from the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, and so she explained the working group is tending towards trying to identify a middle tier region that was perhaps not served in the last round, but would still be interested in the new gTLD program. Lots of discussions, of course. Our committee has always supported that having, effectively, the next

---

round geared towards communities with something that was important for us. I'm really paraphrasing here. There are a lot of other important facts, including the fact that you do need strong consumer protection for any future round, etc. So it was a good discussion as well.

Then there was something to note, which was a joint GAC and ALAC statement on the Expedited Policy Development Process, and that had been for some time in the works. It didn't just pop out of the woodwork like this. But thanks to Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi, with the assistance of Yrjo Lansipuro, or GAC Liaison, that the joint statement was drafted. This was presented and discussed during the ALAC/GAC meeting and it was decided that the statement, while being drafted jointly, would be presented by each one of the parties independently. And so I understand that the ALAC presentation and sending of their statement to the Board and to the commenting process has taken place.

That was just all these things about policy. Let's open the floor for any feedback and discussions on this, ICANN 64 policy discussions.

Okay. It looks like everyone's either been put to sleep by my monotonal voice or has nothing else to add.

HOLLY RAICHE: I do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

---

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, and it's something I put in the chat. The one session that we haven't talked about was the emerging identifiers technology that raised some policy issues. I don't know if people think they're policy issues we should deal with, but I thought it was a really interesting session. It was in the ALAC room and I'd like to put that in other business if people are happy with that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this, Holly. Let's then keep this for a bit later. Please do remind us during any other business to discuss this. I'm not seeing any other hands. So the next thing, of course, in this section was the At-Large Universal Acceptance Activation [Pilot]. I alluded to this a little earlier just not with John Laprise leading some work. And here, well, there's a whole presentation on that, basically, that effectively is a project to evaluate what size and so on for acceptance of various e-mail addresses, something that could be done by the At-Large Community, perhaps.

And so we're just at brainstorming level at the moment, but one could look at getting a second level domain name in a non-Latin character set and then setting up e-mail addresses on that. Now, of course, the example that's given, by the way, on that webpage might be wrong because you're not allowed to mix scripts. You can't mix the Latin with the Greek script, I believe that is. But what you can do is to have a totally Greek script e-mail address if you wish to. And then, basically, you go check a list of the most popular local websites, looking perhaps at the [Alexa] list of websites and trying to send e-mails using either the web client from these websites or any inquiry form by filling in the

---

actual IDN e-mail, International Domain Name e-mail address, and see if that actually works. Something that could be tested out and that was discussed over at the ICANN 64 meeting.

And then for the sake of time, I'll also quickly and briefly go into the ICANN 64 talking points, and there's a Google Doc out there that was produced, I believe, that was again produced by Jonathan Zuck and that's, please if someone can let me know if that's true or if I'm completely wrong on that.

The GDPR talking points, the strategic plan talking points, I think it was GDPR, subsequent procedures, and strategic plan, and the whole session was devoted to these discussions. And I think that we got quite a lot out of it as well. So all in all, quite a lot of policy. Let me open the floor for feedback and comments on these processes.

Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, I thought they went really well. I love the fact that we had talking points. It meant that [inaudible] pretty much all on the same page. I have to say in the discussions that [inaudible], they were very useful. It meant we all were talking on the same, I was saying the same thing as everybody so I thought that was really useful for discussion. I just found the rest of the discussions really helpful. I don't know if everybody else did, but I thought it was a great session. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Holly. I'm not seeing any other hands, so let me ask you a direct question then. Should we look at having similar parts of session, as you know, the next meeting is going to be a policy meeting, the one that takes place in Marrakech so there's going to be a lot of focus on policy again. Should we look at having the same format of sessions? How can we improve on what we had? Was there something missing here?

No. So I just saw a green [tick] from Holly. So it sounds like Holly Raiche is happy. Everyone else is just not unhappy I guess. I note Greg Shatan has put his hand up. So Greg, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I think that what was done was excellent and I would just urge more of the same, more focus on policy, more focus on policy discussions and airing of different points of view. I think it was excellent that we were able to bring in outside voices. We need to continue to hone our own voice, including in giving of [ALAC] advice, as well as in statements and the like.

But I think the more we pivot to policy and put management in a more, a better proportionate position to the amount of policy, whatever that is, I don't think we've achieved the ideal balance yet so that's why I kind of put my hand up. Obviously, things have to be done for reasons of order and the At-Large Community needs to govern itself appropriately, transparently, and all of that. That's clearly important but if you're not making policy at ICANN or participating in the policy process in some fashion, there is scarcely a reason to be there or at least that is kind of



---

the goal, is to do that and I think At-Large is coming ever closer to maximizing its achievements in that area. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. Very valid points. I was going to ask, actually, with regards to follow-ups, and of course, this really is Jonathan's process on the [inaudible]. Unfortunately, Jonathan wasn't able to be with us today because he's on the road. But the current summaries that we have, and I'm not sure whether you were aware of these summaries that we have, how can we get our At-Large structures to have better access towards these or to be able to make use of them? How should we disseminate these towards our ALSes? How can we get that interaction with them? Because, of course, the ALAC now seems to be really on board, but what about the people at the edge? Greg? I think we might have ... Have we lost Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: I had to reconnect. I got booted out for some reason. So I'm not sure what the question was, but I'm sure it was an excellent question. I think it was how do we get the At-Large structures more involved, which is a very good question since I'm sitting here as a representative of an At-Large structure, ISOC New York.

I think there needs to be more discussion at the RALO level. That's a more manageable kind of subset than having kind of a plenary discussion. I think there needs to be some direct policy communication, the At-Large structures. I think we need to encourage the At-Large structures to have policy chairs or policy contacts and to put policy, and

---

ICANN generally speaking but particularly policy since that's the group we're in, to have somebody who puts policy as their first job and a primary job within their group. And ultimately, try to continue to have a [inaudible] of information open. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Greg. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a thought, but one of the things that Maureen is bringing back. There was a time when all of us were supposed to be reporting back on at least two or three sessions that we attended so that lots of people were bringing back to this forum, their impressions of what they had, the sessions they'd attended. There haven't been too many reports back, which I think Maureen's disappointed about. But if people report back on sessions, then those are the reports that we can then bring back into the APRALO or the other RALOs. And I know note in the chat, Maureen's policy leaders within the regions, that's the purpose of ATLAS III as well, so maybe over to Maureen as well on how to bring policy back into the regions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. And you've mentioned Maureen a number of times. Before I give the floor to Hadia, I was going to, I was noting that Maureen did write a number of things in the chat as well. Maureen Hilyard, would you be interested in providing us with some feedback, please, if you can?

---

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi, I'm just on my laptop at the moment. I hope you can hear me okay. I was just going to be an observer [inaudible].

I just wanted to ... I agree exactly with what ... I'm getting an echo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you without the echo.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Yeah, going with what Greg was saying, I think that the process, I mean, as a first time, the policy sessions that we had were great. They were very much appreciated by many of the observers who came in and I think it was just something different from At-Large. But really, we started ICANN 65 and people have been putting in suggestions already. I'm actually impressed. And among them is Jonathan and he has actually recommended some topics already. So I think that this has been a great start. But I also do take from Gordon, and I think it's a great idea, putting in other people into the discussions.

And I think that's what Jonathan was trying to do anyway, was bringing in other perspectives and that's what we need. But I think it would be really good if we ... We've got enough really good people in At-Large to actually have a solid debate. I think I'd really like to see that. That could be quite controversial, but those are the sorts of things I'd really like to see so that policy, which I'm not [inaudible]. I don't participate in policy as much as I should. But I know that there are people here who have far more knowledge and expertise and would be excellent for representing

---

the Bureau of At-Large in a really good debate. But that's a personal opinion and we'll just see how it goes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Maureen. I note there are quite a number of suggestions made in the chat including a couple from Heidi regarding potential for an ALS read-out session hosted by the Consolidated Policy Working Group for all At-Large structures and individual members prior to each one of the public meetings. And that would, of course, provide a run-down on the key policy issues and how their views, the views of our At-Large structures and individual members are required for us to be able to push them.

Hadia Elminiawi, you are next.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Comment to that, your question about the ALSes, and I think it's important here to ask the ALSes, why did they join the At-Large. So what's their interest and what [inaudible] that they are part of this [inaudible]. And actually, that indeed answers, we could really decide on the way [inaudible] and what Greg said is great, of course, having policy [inaudible]. But again, we should know why did they apply and why did they become At-Large. Why do they join to be part of the At-Large community?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. Next is Gordon Chillcott.

---

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Thanks, Olivier. Look, what I'm hearing here is that part of the discussion here actually is how do you actually get in touch with the ALSes in the first place. This is not easy to do, particularly in our case because my ALS consists largely of technical people who work very, very strange hours. We have two meetings. We have one general meeting a month and one executive meeting a month and that's about as good as we can do. There are two or three of us that get together on other platforms to discuss whatever's coming along, but that's often as far as it gets and managing to get other people really interested in this is difficult because we're not all together that much and it's not easy to get a conversation going when you don't know when any of us are going to be available.

I think there is a general interest in a lot of the things that are going on, even though we're a highly technical group and I do get a fair amount of input I try to present and I report back every month to the Board of my group about what's going on and that does, they do seem to be receptive to that. But you have a communication problem, and I suspect that's what a good many ALSes, and it's just a matter of time and availability. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this insight, Gordon. And I think we probably need to move on, on today's call, but let's keep this matter open and I'll let, well, I think next week Jonathan should be back so I'll let Jonathan pick this up for next week. But what I do take from here is this whole

---

problem with communication on policy issues towards our At-Large structures and that goes more than just outreach. It's an actual interaction with them that is required.

So anyway, let's just move on. Otherwise, we'll be very late again. And agenda item number four is a follow-up to a discussion that we've already had both in a previous call and also at ICANN 64, and that's the ALAC position on the Government Engagement Approach that Leon Sanchez has spoken to us about. There was some questioning of this approach and Leon took some of the points back, or all of the points back, actually, and I wonder whether there's a follow-up on this. And for this, we have Leon Sanchez on the call so I'll hand the floor over to Leon for a quick summary from his side.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier. Can you hear me well?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well, indeed.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks so much. So we had a session on the charter published by ICANN Org on engagement with the government. We spoke about this on the CCWG-IG as well. We received a number of comments which we have task forced through the rest of the Board and through the organization, one of them being whether this charter was going to be subject to public comment as many members of our community were interested in actually commenting on the proposed approach. And I believe that this

---

exercise of receiving feedback is seen as some sort of substitution of open [this] for public comment.

I don't have any [inaudible] notes that this will be published for public comment as we normally deal with policy within ICANN. But I've been told and we've been asking orientation to, of course, listen to the community but have to take this into account for the different versions of this document if there are going to be bigger versions of this document. And the reason for ICANN Org not to publish this for public comment as I understand it is that this is just a [inaudible] that I was referring ...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Leon. Sorry for jumping in, Leon. Could you please repeat the last minute because I understand the interpreters are having a few problems hearing you, and in fact, many of us are. Your voice has faded a little bit, so ...

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, yes. I will try. Let me try to adjust my microphone [inaudible] to see if ... Let me see if that ...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a lot better when you speak into the mic.

LEON SANCHEZ: Is that better?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, yeah, it's better. It was just fading a little bit. It was sort of [inaudible].

LEON SANCHEZ: Good. So is this better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very much better.

LEON SANCHEZ: Good. Thank you very much. So I was saying that with this cost with different members of the community, not only the CCWG-IG session, but in some other sessions that we shared with the community as [for it], on this published for government engagement by ICANN Org, and I think that the main comment we received was why wasn't this published for public comment and for community [inaudible] before it was actually published.

And the reason for this, as I understand it, is that this charter is only meant to publicize what has already happened for years in regard to ICANN Org's role within the Internet governance arena and its engagement with government. So in a way, as I said, this is only qualifying what has been happening for years. But that doesn't mean that the input we received from the community won't be taken into account. Of course, the input we received is very important and will be taken into account and within the Board's Internet Governance Working



---

Group, which I chair, will be further working with organization, with ICANN Org, on trying to incorporate this feedback that we received from many members of our community, not only the At-Large community but other constituencies and stakeholder groups so that we can reflect this feedback into the next iteration of this charter.

We also received some comments on the application for [IT] [inaudible] sector that we have announced, as you may be aware, and we discussed this at length, I believe in the CCWG-IG session. But I would, of course, like to continue to get feedback from you on whether this engagement approach with government by ICANN Org is what the community would be expecting and this is actually [inaudible] the expectations of the community.

One of the comments that I received from many members was that it seems that with this charter, ICANN would be limiting itself to providing some sort of capacity building or just technical information to those bodies that required it and would be perceived as to loosely, a leadership role within the Internet governance arena, maybe going back from supporting different events in the Internet governance arena. But my reply to this is that, that is not at all the intent of this charter, as I said. This only entails ICANN Org's participation and the guidelines for ICANN Org to participate in providing this feedback and these guidelines or guidance or capacity building to the different fora in which Internet governance issues related to the Domain Name System are taking place.

So this doesn't mean at all that ICANN Org will discontinue supporting the IGF or any other fora that has already been supported for years and this will continue to go on. But the organization's view, as I understand

---

it, is that it was good to qualify this so that everyone is aware of how ICANN Org is sharing its work in regard to the discussions in the Internet governance arena.

So with this, Olivier, I would like to hand the floor back to you to continue the conversation if you have any comments or any questions. I am glad to reply to them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon, and the floor is open for any comments or questions.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Hi, this is Bartlett. I am only on dial-in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, hello, Bartlett. Bartlett Morgan, are you wishing? Well, you have the floor.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Yeah. In hindsight, Leon, would there have been any value in getting feedback from the community before this sort of [inaudible] was taken by ICANN Org?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Bart. There is definitely a lot of value on gathering feedback from the community before publishing any document, but as I said, this

---

was not perceived to be a requirement for the organization to publish this charter. It was only meant to qualify what was already being done by ICANN Org. But as I said, this doesn't mean that the feedback and the input that we received in our meeting in Kobe and that feedback that continues to come in via different channels won't be taken into account.

So once this feedback is incorporated to an exaggeration of this charter, I am pretty sure that you will be notified about it and I will make sure that you are aware of it.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Perfect. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this. Thank you. Thank you, Leon, and thank you, Bartlett for asking this question. Let's close the queue with Holly Raiche. Close the queue on this topic, of course. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Leon, was there any comment or feedback on the draft charter and the talk about association with ITUD because I know over the years, it's been a real issue as the sort of relationship between ICANN and ITU. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Leon?

---

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Holly. Yes, there were many comments and Olivier can maybe expand on this subject as he was chairing the CCWG-IG session in which this topic was discussed at length by many members of our community and many [inaudible] in that session. And the main input that I received, of course, varies in whether community members oppose or are concerned about ICANN joining the ITUD sector as a member organization or whether it is a good thing to do that.

So we had comments on both sides. I would say that there seems to be, and this is my interpretation of course of the comments which might defer from Olivier's interpretation and others, but there seems to be some kind of support to go for it but with some clear concerns or even positions on whether this would be diminishing ICANN's role within the Internet governance arena as it would be seen or it could be seen as subjecting ICANN to the ITU's subordination and not having a peer-to-peer approach on discussions related to ITU.

From where I see it, and I'm saying this not only as a member of the Board Governance Working Group, but also as an At-Large community member, I think that it's best for ICANN Org to have the ability to be sat at the table not depending on anyone else to be there and try to contribute meaningfully into any of the discussions [having played] in ITU than not being there or relying on others to have this ability to be at the table.

So when we discussed this in the Internet Governance Working Group, my reasoning was that the work that can happen is to have ICANN Org join the ITU and if it doesn't work for ICANN Org and our community, we can always retire from being a member. We can pull out anytime we

---

want. So I think it's better giving it a try and having this door open for ICANN Org than to just refuse going down this path and never know what would happen if we have actually gone down that way [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon. I note Sebastien Bachollet has put his hand up. Sebastien, if you have a comment, be very brief, please because I did close the queue on this and we need to move on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry [inaudible] time to unmute and I will change from one call to another [inaudible]. Sorry.

I am [inaudible] this discussion because I just want to remind you that from 2002 to 2010, ITU was a gold member, every one year, every three years, in conjunction with the [inaudible] and the [inaudible]. There were three organizations who were all three-year terms as representative of the technical community. And now they are not Board members anymore and we are becoming part of ITU. I think it's a strange move, but I understand now what is at stake. It's that we are not talking about ICANN. We are talking about one small [inaudible] of ICANN with ICANN [inaudible] and we want to give ICANN staff access to something. All that is just no sense. We are a single organization, but we are talking about ICANN Org doing something, but ICANN Org is not doing something for themselves. They are doing something for the

---

whole organization. So first, as constituency, as [participants] and for the [globe] too. And I think we need to start the discussion at that level. The fact that ICANN Org is asking to become a member, a sector member, of ITU [inaudible], it's not [inaudible] because ICANN Org doesn't [inaudible]. It's not a structure. But it's [inaudible] ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien, and I'm going to have to end the conversation on this topic now because we are going to run out of time again. But I would invite you to take note that the Cross-Community Working Group and Internet Governance will discuss this matter in further detail in a single-issue call that is going to be arranged soon. Soon, as in the next few weeks.

So if you want, then I can publicize this call in this working group here when that call comes up and then you'll be able to join us and take part in the discussion. Leon, any additional words before we move on?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. No, Olivier. Thank you very much. I note Sebastien's point. It is a very good point and I will make sure to bring that point into the Board's Internet Governance Working Group discussion and, of course, we'll discuss further with ICANN Org. So thank you very much, everyone, for listening and for your time. I will have to excuse myself. I need to leave the call now, but it's always good to be here with you. Thank you very much, everyone.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon Sanchez. And next is agenda item number five with Hadia Elminiawi who will speak to us about the EPDP report and the current ALAC comment that is being drafted on this EPDP report, comment that is to be sent, of course, to the Board since now we are looking at a public comment period that comes from the Board, and of course, she'll be able to speak to us about the next steps also, including the Phase Two of the Expedited PDP. Hadia Elminiawi, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. So right now, [inaudible] we have [inaudible] from [inaudible] from the first [inaudible] registration data and then the second [inaudible] is the [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, I'm sorry. Your voice is not coming out too well.

ANDREA GLANDON: Hadia, I'm sorry. I think you're going to have to try the AC again. The phone is much worse than the AC was earlier.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So again, we have a mind map for Phase Two which consists of three main streams. The three main streams are [inaudible] system for

---

standardizing nonpublic registration data and there are a set of [inaudible] questions to answer in this regard.

And then there are issues of further community action, like legal versus natural and then we have the [inaudible] stream, which are basically the issues deferred from EPDP Phase One, and those are issues [inaudible] like [inaudible] for OCTO, data retention, city redaction, issues related to legal guidance review like WHOIS accuracy, territorial, technical contact. So those issues are not completely dismissed. They are still partially on the table under legal guidance review.

Also, we've been discussing our next meeting and if an urgent face-to-face meeting is required or we would start our meeting from during Marrakech and there was a discussion about having a [inaudible] meeting so nothing is finalized in that regard. What [Pete wrote] to the Council about resources for the EPDP team, resources like the ones we had in Phase One, like legal advice, mediation. We also should be discussing dependencies like identified relations to dependencies and also identify the next steps in relation to legal guidance and I think we will go as we were doing in Phase One.

And also, we need to define or determine a target date for the publication of the initial report because until now, I don't think we agreed on a date on which this initial report should be published.

With regard to the ALAC comment on EPDP report, I think Alan gave a representation of this part during the Kobe meeting and I think those are basically the ones that are going to be sent for [inaudible] and so I think that that's it for me today and I'm happy to answer any questions.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. The floor is open for questions and comments.

I'm not seeing any hands up. Well, the moment I say that, hands go up so that's always a great thing to stimulate debate. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Hadia, I'm just thinking that some of the issues you raised, have you thought about bringing them separately or as separate things that people can work on in the policy committee because I'm quite aware the issues coming out of Phase Two impact on a lot of previous work that's been done, policies that probably will have to be revisited and probably it's more, it's a lot of work for just you and Alan. So there is a possibility that others of us can pick up some of those issues?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Certainly, yes, Holly. And definitely, you are one of them. So yes. But of course, as you know, we haven't yet really started. But then the questions forward in relation to the dependencies, in relation to a target date for the publication of an issue report, I think all these should be discussed and we should have a common understanding and a common aim and goal there.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Hadia. Next is Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Hi. I'm a little confused here. Hello?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hello, yeah.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. I'm a little confused, trying to think back at where we left this during the meeting. There was the common input together with the GAC. Is that what you're talking about, Hadia? Or are you talking about the other document that there were some discussions around and not complete agreement on?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, so I was not referring to the ALAC/GAC common statement. I was referring to the presentation that Alan made during the Kobe meeting with regard to the ALAC comment. But again, nothing is yet done, finalized or done in this regard. There is a Wiki page section and all of us [inaudible] will have, certainly will have a chance to comment and write down their own opinions and definitely the statement that's going to be presented in the name of the ALAC would have the ALAC members' [inaudible] approval.

---

MARITA MOLL: Okay, great, Hadia. So we are going to get a link to that Wiki page at some point, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That is on the agenda.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: As far as I know, it's already there.

MARITA MOLL: Oh, it's already there? I mean, the link?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. To the best of my knowledge, yes. It was circulated in mail. Yeah.

MARITA MOLL: Oh, I don't seem to have it anyway.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Or maybe not in an e-mail but it was a notification.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much. I'm a little surprised because the link is actually in the agenda. The next section, policy common updates has the link. Policy common name, GSNO Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Policy Recommendations for ICANN Board Consideration, a very long name for this, but that's the public comment process. I note that it ends on the 17<sup>th</sup> of April so we still have plenty of time for the input and what I understand is Alan and Hadia have taken all the input that was given to them so far at the meeting, will put a first draft on there and no doubt in future calls of the Consolidated Policy Working Group, we will be able to get some more feedback on what's being written.

We need to move on and look at the other two public comments that are up for decision at the moment. We're looking here at agenda item number six. Holly, your hand is still up. Is that a new hand?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm sorry. No, it's an old hand. I'll take it down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Thanks. So the two comments that are up for decision are the proposal renewal of the dot-org registry agreement and proposed renewal of dot-info registry agreement. Now as just feedback, historical feedback, in general, the ALAC has not commented on specific renewals of registry agreements. That being said, with the big one such as dot-com and dot-net, on some occasions, the ALAC did comment. And as you know, dot-org and dot-info are classed as some of the large [direct] top-level domains. So that's why they're still up there for comment.

---

George Kirikos, you wanted to touch on this so you have the floor, George.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Thanks. I posted a couple of links in the chat room with articles on this. I think the At-Large might want to comment on this, especially because dot-org is one of the oldest TLDs with 10 million+ domain names registered. Dot-info is obviously a newer gTLD but still has millions of domain name. The two big changes are of concern because dot-org is already allowed 10% annual price increases because previously, they had tried to have unlimited price increases allowed. And so this is the second time this is coming up for debate and ICANN just gave them unlimited price cap. Sorry, unlimited pricing control.

And the second issue is the URS. The URS is actually being reviewed by the RPM PDPs and when this has been tried to be imposed in the past on the big TLDs, there was outrage that these policies are still being under consideration whether they should be content as policies. But ICANN GDD just simply puts it into the agreements with a thought to the fact that this is under discussion by the community and these are policies. These aren't just minor tweaks of a contract and so I hope that the At-Large would push back on these proposed changes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this quick summary of the proposed changes, George. That's really helpful. I really don't know if we can make a decision right now to draft a statement or not. I feel that these two have their Wiki page that's coming up that's in creation as they usually

---

are. So once it will be created, then we'll just have to see. I'm not sure, Evin. I'm going to turn to Evin because I don't know if they, you create Wiki pages for all of these statements even if there is not likely to be a statement or if it might be that there will not be a statement for the [inaudible].

EVIN ERDOĞDU:

Thank you, Olivier. Yeah, every public comment that's out has a related Wiki workspace for the At-Large and if ALAC or CPWG determines not to comment on it, it's just marked as no statement. But there is always a Wiki page for it and I just shared something in the chat for the comment that George was referencing. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Evin. And so what I would invite everyone to do is if you do feel strongly about this, have a look at these changes and comment on that and then we can make a choice on whether to comment or not within the next few weeks. This is a long deadline. 29<sup>th</sup> of April is about a month away so we don't need to jump and make an exact decision today.

George Kirikos?

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

I did want to add one more point, that ICANN posted a redline document on their own pages. The redline is actually very misleading because it's a redline between the proposed dot-org contract and the standardized new gTLD contract. What people actually need to do is

---

compare the current dot-org contract with the proposed dot-org contract, which ICANN did not present a redline for and that's how you can detect the changes. So they kind of used the new gTLD contract as the base which makes no sense at all, but that's something to be aware of for people that are researching this further. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for this, George, and I gather that you ... Did you do a redline yourself?

GEORGE KIRIKOS: No, I don't have that kind of software, but I'm kind of very familiar with these kind of contracts. I knew what to look for. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. No, I thought you had, in which case, I would have suggested that, perhaps, you could share this document with everyone else and then we could add it just to make it easier for our colleagues. But maybe we can try and see with At-Large staff if we can produce our own redline between the old contract and the new contract if there is an interest, of course, to draft this, to put this together.

Right. We are running out of time so let's move to any other business, which is the last point on our agenda today. And I remember there was Holly Raiche who wanted to discuss a specific point. Holly, you have the floor.

---

BARTLETT MORGAN: Before we go on to Holly, can we just ask a question, please?

HOLLY RAICHE: Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Bartlett. Yes, please go ahead. Bartlett Morgan.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Sorry to jump in front of you, Holly, but it's because it relates to that potential policy issue we just raised. My question is when would we decide whether or not we're going to go ahead with a comment on the dot-org issue or not?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Bartlett. Either next week or the week after. Usually it takes a week or a week and a half to make a decision. But in the meantime, if you do feel strongly, as I said, write your comments already on the Wiki page which has been created and that will actually help in making a determination whether a statement should be drafted or not, and we'll already, I guess, gain some advance ground on this. And I see here John Laprise has put his hand up. John, you have the floor.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. I do also want to make a comment on the issue, and this is sort of by way of [inaudible] information that over the past, I don't know, probably year, have had a number of requests from consultants



---

seeking advice [inaudible] paper I should say, which I have not accepted, regarding they're trying to get some ideas about the likelihood of registrars, of getting these price increases going through. So there is some degree of investor interest in this that is outside of the normal issues that we deal with. I just wanted to make the community aware of that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, John. Very interesting. Investors now looking at domain names, and obviously, with those changes in contracts, there would be a number of changes.

Sebastien Bachollet, you have the floor, and I'm getting a little concerned about the time now. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, you may be concerned. Olivier, sorry about that. I may have missed the time to say that I am concerned that the fact that we are asking Hadia Elminiawi to be [inaudible] to be for something and may be against when they are outside of the working group. Therefore, my suggestion is that for the advice to the ICANN Board, we honor people to make this advice. It was good to have them doing the comments about production of the PDP. But now they have done this job, it's time for them to work on the second phase and it's time for some other people to take the job to write the advice to the Board.

---

I was maybe a little bit late to say that, but maybe it could be discussed next week, and I am not candidate to do that. I want to stress that, but I think it is a good move.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think there is a problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Sebastien. Did I hear someone saying there is a problem? Okay, perhaps something that was unrelated to our call.

Ladies and gentlemen, we do have to move on. Sebastien, thanks for your point. Let's take this up next week and discuss who should be the penholder for his. And I understand the point you're making in that we do have our two representatives that are active in the working group and it might put them in a specific, well, in a tricky position if the points that are being argued by the ALAC towards the Board are not entirely aligned with the first draft that was drafted for the working group, which was, as we know, a lot softer in some of the points that we had made than how some people wanted these points to be made. So we need to discuss this in the next call.

I'm going to ... John, I know you wish to speak. But again, I'm going to fail to do the one-hour call here. John, you have 30 seconds.

JOHN LAPRISE: I just wanted to quickly say that I had this discussion at the last ICANN meeting with some folks and one of the things that came up is that we

---

recognize that the EPDP [inaudible] were very time constrained, so in the first round, we were constrained to the imperfect consensus in some respects, in order to meet the time constraints. But that doesn't negate the fact that we still have some reservations and so I think we have some flexibility in changing or altering our position going into Phase Two. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, John. And now over to Holly Raiche for the "Any Other Business" issue she wanted to bring forward.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's literally just 30 seconds. I would like to put on the agenda for the next week, the discussions on the, it was the emerging identifier technologies. They raised policy issues, not necessarily the kinds of policy issues we've been doing before but if there could be a link to the presentation that happened during Kobe, I just think it raised issues that are important for us and should be discussed at another meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Holly. Let's table this for the next call so we have more time for that, have it during the main part of the call.

All right, well, I see no other hands up so thanks, everyone for having been on this call. This is only a one-hour call, 60 minutes rather than 90 minutes, and we need to close. But I see Hadia Elminiawi has put her hand up. Hadia, you have the floor.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Just a quick clarification because I put forward some questions and I talked about the legal questions and I only referred to us talking about meeting, having a face-to-face meeting soon or maybe start our meetings in Kobe. But I must say that right now we are actually [inaudible] on the list, just the dependencies, the next steps in relation to the legal guidance, the target date for publication. So right now, those things are not going to be postponed the next month or maybe Marrakech. We are currently discussing those things on the list. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Hadia. And with this, I'd like to close the call. So thank you everyone for this. It has been very productive. Again, we're a little late but I hope that you've all enjoyed the discussions. And we'll follow-up next week with all of this, and of course, we'll follow-up on the mailing list and on the Wiki. Please check the Wiki. Thanks, everyone. This call has now ended.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**