

---

ANDREA GLANDON: We will now officially start the recording of this conference call. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the consolidated policy working group call, held on Wednesday the 24<sup>th</sup> of April, 2019 at 1900 UTC. On today's call we have Haroun Mahamat Cherif, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Jose Lebron, Tijani Ben Jemaa, David Mackey, Jonathan Zuck, SEBASTIEN Bachollet, Yrjo Lansipuro, Marita Moll, Hadia Elminiawi, George Kirkikos, Holly Raiche, Judish Hellerstein, Gordon Chillcott, Lillian Ivette De Luque, and we have Ricardo Holmquist, as well.

We have apologies from Alberto Soto, Kaili Kan, John Laprise, Eduardo Diaz, Justine Chew, and Alan Greenberg. From staff we have Evin Erdogdu and myself, Andrea Glandon, on call management. We also have Heidi Ullrich. 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 CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Andrea. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And welcome everybody to this other call. Today's agenda is going to be pretty much like last week, with first a review of our action items and afterwards the EPDP, Expedited Policy Development Process phase two now, with Hadia Elminiawi, who will be speaking to us about it. After that a policy comment update. I think someone needs to go and mute their phone if they're coughing. Then after this we'll have any other business.

---

*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.*

---

So, hopefully it should be a fast call, although we do have our four proposed renewal of something registry agreements to discuss, today. And of course the EPDP. Any other business to add? Or any amendments to this agenda?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: SEBASTIEN Bachollet, if you can give me the floor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, SEBASTIEN. SEBASTIEN Bachollet, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I would like that maybe not today in depth, but we start to discuss what could be or would be the main topic of ICANN in Marrakesh, and I interest particularly because I think we need to be ready to concentrate to use the events and be ready to have some comment now on those issues and I think it will be good to discuss some of them and now I am thinking particularly about DNS over HTTPS. I think it's quite new, but quite important for end users. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, SEBASTIEN. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Let's add this topic to the call and we'll discuss it at the end of the call. It would be great, because I don't think anyone has a link to those proposals of high interest topics. It would be great if, at some point,

---

somebody had that. A link to either the proposals or put the proposed topics in the chat.

I'm not seeing any other hands, so the rest of the agenda is [inaudible] as it appears on the screen. And we can go straight to our action items which are all completed. No need to really go over them. One is for the [inaudible] reminder ALAC ratification votes on the EPDP thing that's done. The other one for Greg Shatan to be the penholder for the ALAC statement and the four registry agreements public comments. And for Michelle DeSmyter and Andrea Glandon; Andrea, what did I just say? To setup the CPW call for today.

So, without any further ado, let's go to agenda item three and the expedited EPDP. I understand that Hadia Elminiawi is on the call. I don't think that we're going to have Alan today. I don't think that he's on the call, so Hadia, you have the floor. [AUDIO BREAK]

And I'm afraid we can't hear Hadia at the moment. Yes, Andrea? I know that Alan is in apology, but I'm not hearing Hadia at the moment.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah, I'm having the operator check her line. One moment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I can't see her on the participants list, but she is listed on the participants list, but I cannot see her in the connect room, and usually she is on the connect room.

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah, her audio line is still connected on the phone, so we're just checking on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So in the meantime, the only things that I have seen on this topic is that there has been a new chair for the phase two. And some of you might know him, Janis Karklins, was the previous chair of the GAC and he was also on the ICANN board at some point in the past. He is an ambassador for Latvia, I believe, and he has been involved in internet governments for many, many years, including the internet government forum.

He was also involved with NETmundial, so really he has a very big background on running multistakeholder processes and so he was announced earlier this week, although there had been some rumors about him being selected for at least a week, if not two weeks. The work hasn't quite started, and I know that there's been some preliminary work that was started by the interim chair who was working in the absence of a new chair being appointed. Although the floor has been handed over to the new chair so -- okay, here we go; Avri, thank you for this information. He was ex-official on the ICANN board as GAC chair.

ANDREA GLANDON: Olivier, Hadia is not answering the line now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is she on the line? She's not? Okay.

---

ANDREA GLANDON: No, she's not answering now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Since we do have a problem then with this at the moment, then let's just not lose time. Let's move directly to the policy covered update and then we can come back to the EPDP afterwards. So, I guess time for me to hand the floor over to Evin Erdogan, and to Jonathan Zuck.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Olivier! This is Evin for the record. So, I'll just briefly overview the recent activity of policy comment updates. Recently ratified by the ALAC we have the advice sent to the ICANN board on the GNSO EPDP report, and the executive summary is on the agenda and also there in the slideshow presentation in the AC room. So please do read it. And we currently have no public commons open for decision, but the CPWG today will focus on mainly the four registry agreements that is for .ORG.INFO.ASIA.BIS.

And as noted on last week's CPWG, Greg Shatan volunteered to be penholder of an ALAC statement on all four registry agreement public commons and I believe he has a presentation but I'm not sure if he's online at the moment. But we can perhaps open the floor to discussion on these comments, and a unified ALAC statement versus separate statements. Thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's Jonathan for the record. Jonathan Zuck for the record. We made a decision to, for the most part, not comment on these issues. And so there were just some lingering issues that had to do with, for example, fee increases to the Olivier brought up to support some sort of inflation based view of ICANN costs, and that's where we landed last time, so I haven't seen Greg's comments about the sum of the call last time. SEBASTIEN, do you have your hand up about this issue or is that an old hand? I don't hear SEBASTIEN.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was an old, old, hand. And I would like to, at this time, discuss not about the content of the EPDP advice but how we handle that, and I think that we are now in another topic and I think it's better to come back when [inaudible] my hand at the right time, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, definitely, SEBASTIEN. It looks like Hadia is back online, so we will go back to the EPDP very shortly. George, go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: George Kirikos for the transcript. I posted a link earlier in the chat regarding the public comments so far on .org and I reposted it just now. If you look at it, there's more than 100 comments, and many of them are outraged over the .org fee increases, so I think the At-Large should consider that it might be totally out of step with the public if they don't support the retention of the price caps, or even lowering the price caps, and people feel that 10% are more than justifiable given low rates of

---

inflation and also the fact that whole-sale costs for operators should be under one dollar per year.

The current .org fees are currently \$9.93 per year, which are higher than the \$7.05 a year per domain that Versign get's for .com, and as we mentioned, as we've discussed in the past, the .in ccTLD for India had a tender and we used our [inaudible] per domain name per year. So we're talking huge margins that PIR is already achieving, and this is just really price gouging of consumers, so I don't know why At-Large would not speak out on this, but if their decision is not to speak out about it, then the penholders should just be removed and we should stop having the discussion entirely, but I would support making a statement for the retention of the price caps. And also, of course, he posted the [inaudible] being imposed on registrants as well until the GNSO finishes its review of the RPM PDP. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, George. Again, this is the decision on the live call not to enter into this debate with a public comment is accept so much as we start the fees, so I suppose we should wait for Greg to get back on and make his presentation about how he tried to summarize what went on on the last call before we go further, because otherwise we're just talking theoretically. And if anyone else has an opinion on this, feel free to speak up. So that was the consensus from the last call. [CROSSTALK] I'm sorry?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I raised my hand on this topic, too.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, you did? SEBASTIEN, go ahead. I didn't realize it was new.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I take my hand off and now on again, thank you. We can't leave just this expression on the discussion, no [inaudible] people putting something in the comments, it's maybe the reverse; we need to disagree with them. I am not sure that it's one of the people, I'm not sure it's of the same people 100 times or something like that, and I can see that there are people who are willing to push on the direction. We have already expressed that.

But for me it's quite a specific detail and he's helping to do a lot of things good for the world and the internet and just for, I will not, I think it's not a good idea for At-Large to struggle again, so of course I used to be a member from some ISOC chapters, therefore I am directly involved and concern if I can say, but I am not a domainer, I have no second market domain, and I think really it's important to keep patience and track on what is happening, but not to comment on that.

If it's still happening, it's because Olivier [inaudible] a very good question, is how we under the fact that wishing an increase of income to ICANN could be a good idea since [inaudible] price didn't change, and the prices were not changed, and it could be a good idea to start that with this for TLDs. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, SEBASTIEN. Olivier?



---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was just going to mention that Hadia is back on the call, so if you wish to perhaps wait until Greg makes it to the call, and I will defend that Greg is currently on another call at present, then we can certainly swap back to Hadia for the EPDP and we can come back to this discussion regarding the renewal of .org, .info, .asia.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, I think that's a good idea. Let's revert back to Hadia.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Jonathan. Let's go over to Hadia Elminiawi for the EPDP. Over to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi for the transcript. So what's new with regards to the EPDP is that the European Commission made a comment on our report, and among the interesting parts of the recommendation, in fact, they mention that they acknowledge and recognize the [inaudible], however they say that with regard to recommendation number two --

ANDREA GLANDON: Hadia, I apologize. Hadia? Are you able to speak up a little bit? The interpreters aren't able to interpret.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Lower or?

ANDREA GLANDON: Speak up. Louder.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, louder? Okay. Louder. Okay, thank you. Because I can't hear you really well. Okay, I'll do that. So again, the European Commission made a comment on the EPDP report, and they recognize and acknowledge the [inaudible] defined in the report and the associated activities. However they do say that with regards to recommendation number two, they should not be a mention the sentence that says enabling that [inaudible].

ANDREA GLANDON: Hadia? I'm sorry, we lost our AC connection so I'm going to need you to pause for a minute while I reconnect. One moment, please. Nobody in the AC can hear right now. We're having some issues with Adobe connect, so we'll have to reconnect. It'll be just a moment and I'll let you know when you can continue. For those on the phone, it'll be just a moment, we are having some Adobe connect issues while we reconnect that line.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: They are doing all that just to show us that we can't be unhappy with moving to Zoom.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think it's that but we've had this problem --

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I know, Olivier. It seems to be a way to --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's pretty crazy that it's gone on for more two days now and nothing's been done about it. It's very disruptive by the way. Very disruptive, so I'm not sure what is being done about it, but certainly this is high priority. And I hope this is raised. And what doesn't know whether it's the Adobe connect side or whether it's the Adigo side, but something is wrong with it and it needs to be fixed.

ANDREA GLANDON: Okay, we do have our AC audio back, so Hadia, you can continue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just before that, Hadia, we still have difficulty hearing you. So it will be great if you could be very close to the mic and rather loud. I'm not sure if you're connected by phone or by Adobe Connect, I think you probably are connected by phone because I don't see you on the Adobe Connect.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Phone.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm really sorry, you'll have to speak loudly and your neighbors will probably complain, but that's the name of the game today, unfortunately. Good luck.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Hadia Elminiawi for the record. By the way, I can be on the Adobe Connect in 10 minutes. Anyway, so I was saying that the European Commission made a comment on the EPDP report. And that they acknowledged the purposes and the associated activities, which is something positive of course. But with regards to recommendation number too, they say that there shouldn't be the part that say enabling [inaudible] to third parties. This comment was received by some as [inaudible] contradicting with other comments provided by the European data board. However, in my opinion, this comment does not contradict with any previous [inaudible] and it is not deserving or [inaudible].

And the reason I'm saying that is that the European Commission is simply saying enabling access is not actually a purpose. It's connectivity. [inaudible]. So what they're initially saying is it shouldn't be there because it does lack on purpose. However, they do acknowledge and say that among ICANN purposes is serving the public interest through, of course, maintaining the security and stability of the internet. And that requires access to third parties.

So actually what they're saying is that it shouldn't be put among the purposes, however it is one of the activities or processing activities

---

associated with one of the [inaudible] which is to serve the public interest. Again, I do find their comment supportive and not confusing or contradicting this previous advice. I think this has been the most important thing going on now, and as Alan mentioned, we have a new chair and that's it for me. I'm happy to answer questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for that, Hadia. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So I saw a few people still had a few problems understanding your voice was a little faint. But my understanding is that the European commission has commented on the EPDP. They acknowledged the purposes of data collection. However, they don't acknowledge the parts that says enabling access for specific purposes, which is the recommendation to, and for example, enabling access for a purpose is, granting access is not a purpose, it is an activity.

However, among the ICANN purposes, one of them is serving the public interest, and certainly when it comes down to ICANN dealing with [inaudible] and stability of the DNS. Have I covered that totally? I've seen there's been some discussion with Milton Mueller saying something and a few others agreeing with him; I'm not quite sure what that was about.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Actually I'm having difficulty hearing you as well. So there were some discussions over the mailing list, and Milton did write something which I'm actually going to respond today with an email. I can't remember exactly what Milton said, but yes, there were a lot of discussions

---

[inaudible] they find the European Commission comment confusing and contradicting with previous comments. However, I don't share their points of view, I don't share the [inaudible]. They are simply saying it's not a purpose but [inaudible] it shouldn't happen; it's an activity and not a purpose.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Great, thanks very much for this, Hadia. Let's open the floor if there's any questions or comments, and I see Carlton Samuels has put his hand up. So, Carlton, you have the floor.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Olivier, I hope you can hear me. The EPDP released an advisory on where the purposes for contracts and making contracts. I think, as I look at this, I think the collection for the purpose of contract making is covered. I just don't know how we're gonna breach the free and public [inaudible] of that [inaudible]. That is where I think the problem is. What do we do in terms of publication? How do we covers ourselves and still become [inaudible] to the law? That I think is the question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Carlton. Next is Holly Raiche, and then is Hadia I'll give you the floor, you can respond to any of the comments that were made here. One after the other. So, Holly Raiche is next.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. Mine is a related question. What does the advice from the European commission have on the statements that we've made to the board? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Let's go over to Hadia for response on both Carlton and Holly's comments.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'll first speak to Holly. You're asking what they have to say about our advice to the board or just part of it? Because I don't think -- which parts are you talking about?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm just wondering, let me rephrase what I asked. There are implications for what the general [CROSSTALK]. Can you hear me?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'm having difficulty, but if you could speak louder, thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll try again. What are the implications of what the advice is from the European commission on the position we've taken, and does it have any impact on what we've said to the board? Thank you.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, Holly. So in my opinion, no, it doesn't. So we talk about three main parts, right? What is it [inaudible] who is, and we've spoke also about the geographic distinction, and about the [inaudible] and natural distinction. I don't see any evidence in their comments that affects that part. With regards to the geographic distinction, I've seen nothing in their comments that will affect that part.

And again, with regards to the fake WHOIS [inaudible] with regard to the collection and the disclosure of the data is that the ICANN purposes and [inaudible] with other services, and [inaudible -- 00:31:29] each purpose to see the activities associated with the purpose and then registrars to see well informed how the data that they're providing is going to be used. So again, I don't feel [inaudible] actually affects our plan or have any implications on our advice to the board. That's my personal opinion.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: And as long as the purposes, as long as the [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you.



---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for that. George Kirikos had his hand up earlier. So George, you cut your sound. I don't know whether you still had a comment.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: George Kirikos here. My question was already answered. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for that. Now I'm not seeing other hands. I'm not sure whether you wanted to also comment on Carlton's point, whether you didn't hear Carlton's point well? Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I didn't, actually. I overheard someone mentioning something about maybe [inaudible], but I didn't get exactly what she said. So if you can repeat that --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Carlton, do you wanna oblige, please, sir?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Olivier, I'm not hearing -- what I was saying was that the data protection board issued guidelines on contractual legal services and the basis for collection of personal data, and I feel that as data controller, it covers some of the feel that is collected as part of the registration data services. I was not sure from reading it, however, whether or not I could make that expense to the publication of it. It clearly, in my view,

---

covers our collection, but I am still struggling to figure out whether that means it's also covers the public. That's the point I was making.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thanks. Okay, so previously as I mentioned, some of the purposes, and I think it's purpose number one, to which we could actually collect the [inaudible] contact information. The publication of the data which is enabling [inaudible] this would be a protecting activity associating with; another purpose would be serving the public interest by maintaining the security, stability and resilience of the DNS, which is an ICANN core mission and purpose. And I think this is clear also in the European Commission comments.

One other thing; the European Commission also they commented on the type of whether we should be using six one f or six one b, and they also pointed out that six one f is [inaudible] so they pointed out such things. It's just for us I think to take a [inaudible] and the activity and the lawful basis of the purposes and the associated activity. So I do think we need to take another careful look and maybe do some adjustments, but in my opinion, the overall outcome is not [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. It's Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. Just a couple more questions, I'm not seeing anybody's hands up, but when it comes down to the actual EPDP's work, you now have a

---

new chair; I've mentioned Janis Karklins while you had dropped off. When is the work likely to now take place and how sooner is the machine for phase two going to start? Do you have an idea yet?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'm not sure. I'm not sure, actually, no. Well, we should be starting. I actually don't have [inaudible] to say right now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ANDREA GLANDON: Olivier, this is Andrea. We just lost the AC again. So it'll be just a moment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Testing.

ANDREA GLANDON: Just give me one moment. We're reconnecting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just for those people that are on the Adigo at the moment and can still hear me, this background information on this bridge dropping repeatedly. It seems to drop every 15 to 20 minutes. So we are in an average at the moment. The second drop. And we're in 39 minutes past the top of the hour. Seems to be great. Maybe it should push us to

---

do 20-minute calls. Finish our calls faster. It's one way to think about that. Just like the meetings where there are no chairs so people can't make themselves comfortable and have to do the meeting quickly while standing and then go find a chair after the meeting.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, later on when you think it's a good time, I would like to talk about the comments ALAC made at the board and to discuss that issue. The process issue, not the content issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It sounds like someone has a very dodgy phone line that doesn't work very well. It keeps dropping. Until everything gets -- we have to reset the room and do the dial out again. Test. Here we go.

ANDREA GLANDON: Okay, we are ready to go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Andrea. So, we're back on. Apologies again for the additional break. It could have been like a commercial break in some way. You can go and give yourself something in the fridge and then come back. So we are still discussing, at the moment, the expedited PDP with Hadia Elminiawi. I am realizing the time is passing fast. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. So, Hadia, is there anything else that you wish to update us on with regards to the EPDP? Have we now lost Hadia?

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No. The only thing that I would say is to take another look actually at the [inaudible] and also take a more careful look at the legal basis for the [inaudible] or enabling to go back to the data. But again, I don't think that the outcome is actually the outcome that [inaudible]. I'm sorry because I was driving, but I think that's about it. It's what's been going on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you so much for this. It's Olivier speaking. If I understood correctly, you were just saying you were driving. If you're driving in Cairo and you're able to do a conference call at the same time, well done, kudos to you, because driving a car with something else. For anyone driving anywhere around in the world, that's probably one of the most challenging experiences you can come up with. The other way would be to drive against the flow of traffic in interstate around New York. You'll get the same sort of feeling.

Anyway, let's go over, just before we jump to Jonathan's part again and the EPDP statement. I guess that Sebastien wanted to intervene on the EPDP comment and at the same time I can hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck and I wonder if Greg has made it here. Greg is on the call now, yes. So, let's have Sebastien Bachollet please for your comments on the EPDP statement process. Thank you.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Olivier. I would like to raise a question for you to think about. I think when we as At-Large, we make comments, the rules we have it's okay, but when it's an advice and we were struggling about that, what is an advice, what isn't an advice. Here it's an advice and is a threshold of yes, no and abstain couldn't be different to what is today. I think an advice must be more than from the people and even more [inaudible], and when you are once served on the people who abstain or who are against, it starts to become a question for me, that's why we need to think and discuss about that. I know that the chair will wish to have this discussion at the ALTPlus but I think it might be also a good place to have this thinking and discussion. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. I'm not sure if I'm running the next part of the call or whether this is coming over to Jonathan Zuck. I see Tijani Ben Jemaa put his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Tijani, we can't hear you. Are you speaking or are you on mute?

ANDREA GLANDON: Tijani, your line is on muted.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much, do you hear me now?

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you very much. Thank you, Sebastien, for even this point, I had the same concern. I remember that for something which is much less important than making an advice to the board, we decided that at least 80% of the members should say yes. Such as the selection of our approval, in addition to the outcome. I think that an advice to the board should have at least 80% of the ALAC members who approve the advice, because very important. We don't need a lot of advices to the board, and when we make one, it should be the whole members approving it. At least 80%. Not only those who have a majority is okay. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Tijani. Anyone else want to speak up on advice? Olivier, go ahead.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm going to speak here as the co-chair of the group. This is okay with discussing this whole thing of the vote and the requirement for super majority and so on on this working group is that this working group deals with policy, then passes it over to the ALAC. So this priority should be a discussion that takes place on an ALAC call, not on the consolidated policy working group, as such.

I understand the concern that both Sebastien and Tijani have. I'm not gonna comment on it. But I think that the district needs to be launched on the ALAC mailing list and then on the ALAC Call because it's something for the ALAC to decide on. Here, all we do is just to discuss policy work and then to propose whatever statement gets drafted by the members of this group to the ALAC. They can accept it. They can reject it. They can have split views. But that's really the part here. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good point, Olivier. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you very much, Jonathan and Olivier. No problem with that. I think it's also important that we share when we have concerns from something that's discussed mainly in this area in this group. It's why I raised this issue. It's not [inaudible] but for you to know that there is a discussion open and if anybody has comments, I am, and I guess Tijani will be happy also to receive them and to have them on any list you wish. And thank you for letting me give you this comment now. Thank you.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. Okay, I'd like to hand the floor over to Greg Shatan. Oh, Greg, did you want to comment on advice or are you -- go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Yes, thanks. I'm currently dealing with a situation in my co-op where we have a very high super majority of threshold for a number of things and we're finding it difficult to get anything done. So I caution against high super majority, much less unanimity in these kinds of positions. Again, I don't think this is the right place to discuss how ALAC should deal with this, and there's no need to look up their rules and procedures and bylaws, but I think that if we were to require unanimity, we'd never get any advice. Or ALAC would never give any advice. Perhaps it would only be very anadine advice, so I think we need to consider all sides of the issue before --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg, explain the word anadine.

GREG SHATAN: Anadine means thoroughly lacking any [CROSSTALK] or intensity, just, you know, push, bland or so -- So I think it's something, you know, this is obviously larger issues in considering how the different times are within At-Large and ALAC, and balancing a number of concerns with potentially what it feels to be in a minority on a non-unanimous piece of advice versus getting advice tied up to the point [inaudible]. Thanks. On the other hand I do understand, typically, across the board, ALAC tries to

---

reach consensus that is the goal here and often the turning of advice would benefit from a march towards consensus. But nonetheless, [inaudible] would a wonderful lengthy discussion for some other day to have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's right. I think Olivier's point is well taken. This is something ALAC needs to decide for itself, we're not in a position of power on this issue. Carlton do you have something brief on this?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I do. I actually take a difference view. We revise statements all the time and the ALAC statements, anybody can say and write it over the fence, they don't have to respond. I really believe that if it's in the name of the ALAC, if it's advice of the board, it's gonna at least consensus and consensus in my view is nobody in the ALAC, all 15 members, do not take to anything that is said in there. That's what I mean by consensus and unanimous. I find it very -- I've always been uncomfortable with this idea that just giving advice to the board in the name of ALAC representing 15 members from all over the world and six of them who says it's advice. I think that is ridiculous.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Carlton. Thanks a lot. So now what I want to do is pass the microphone to Greg to share with us his recollection of the last week's call, and what advice we're trying to put together in summary across these different renewal agreements. Greg, take it away.

---

GREG SHATAN:

At the last point though, without one more small comma, I recommend everyone read section 12 of the ALAC rules of procedure which I think speaks to this point. It probably -- and that's all I'll say. I wanted to discuss it again with section 12 in front of us. Moving on to the advice, or rather, merely the statement of central statements I've revised what was circulated. I'm sorry I didn't submit a circulated earlier. Let me briefly go over the changes that were made other than this kind of general changes for style. Most obviously, and this is now a comment on all four of the info in Asia, so they've been added into this.

So, that changes a lot of things, at least in terms of the beginning. Not much other change in the first four paragraphs. I did note the footnote that was not a proposed 10% annual increase even though the previous ALAC statement said it was in .net, but then it was -- in fact it had already been part of .net for some time. I'm not sure whether moving forward or away from the mic -- I'm speaking on a tablet, maybe I might be better here to dial out or dial in. So, in any case, I'll try to sound less muffled.

Going to the bottom of the first page, you'll see that it now notes that 10% cap is a feature of the current .org and .bus and .info registry agreements, the current .asia registry agreement does not include a price cap, so the point of .asia there's no change. And these are all consistent with the base registry agreements.

Then turning to page two, I decided it would be appropriate to insert the explanation that ICANN has put in the public comment page for this

---

change. So that's just quoted except for putting in brackets .TLD [inaudible] actual TLD what is was for them. So this was on all three of the pages, obviously not .asia which didn't have this change. Noting as a form that ALAC in general favorites the standardizing of registry agreements for the same reason that we have last week, the transparency, predictability, easier for the community to deal with, it's based on one time track type instead of many.

However, it can't be merely a standardization measure as I said last time. It is a significant change to remove a price cap, and ALAC did express concern of the 10% price cap in the latest .net renewal, regardless of whether or not that was new or continuing the point is that it raised, an eyebrow was raised, and if we're going to be consistent with precedent, or at least recognizing the precedent of prior ALAC statements, makes sense to note that.

The next paragraph is substantially re-worked so probably needs some, it's usually read out loud, however uncapped pricing does not automatically translate to significant price increases. Notably public interest registries is not increased at all over the last three years, even though it has the right to increase it or them by more than 30% during that time period. This is consistent with the mission of public interest registry which provides considerable comfort in this regard, and as noted in the ALAC.net comments, a significant .org registration fees are returned to serve the internet community through re-distribution of .org funds into the community by the internet society to support internet development.

---

Next paragraph also somewhat reworks. It's not entirely clear how often .bus and .info refresh in the past, and it's unknown how often they'll do it in the future, while uncapped prices makes significant price increases possible. Business strategies and market courses make major price increases inappropriate. There's also conceivable that market forces allow these registries to raise prices significantly and keep them there. There's really no way to tell at this point. What we do know is the domain name marketplace has changed completely since these price caps were established.

So here is kind of a recommendation, if you will. While ALAC does not object to the removal of price caps, it remains concerned about the effect it may have, so it should consider monitoring .org, .asia, .info for future price increases and for any market responses to the price increases. For example, effects on renewals and registrations, and effects on pricing and other top level domains.

So that's all that I've got basically. I know that we talked quite a bit about URS, and ultimately the conclusion that seemed to be -- people seem to be hemming towards was neither to endorse URS or to complain about URS but rather just to stay silent on the point one way or the other. So that's -- this is what we've got.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Greg. George? Go ahead.

---

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Kirikos for the transcript. I disagree with this statement. This jumping to the very last paragraph, while ALAC does not object to the removal of price caps. That's basically agreeing with the contract, and that's how it would be -- the statement would be interpreted, which is something I don't agree with. Furthermore, it removes all negotiating powers. I should considering monitoring -- for future price increases and for market response to those price increases. What can it actually do when the monitoring is in effect?

They can't re-negotiate the contract saying that, well, you got the price caps, now we want to put the genie back in the bottle, we want to reimpose price caps. That's never gonna happen because what, I can't possibly offer the operators once they've given the store away already. So, this is just something that I object to. The part about that [inaudible] favoring the standardization of the registry agreement. That's also going to be read in support for the agreement, and implicitly the URS, which is something I think I disagree with.

And so, I think it's better to make no statement at all and rely on the comments that have already been made by the public rather than make such an extreme statement that diverges from what the rest of the public is saying. They'll just make At-Large seem out of touch with reality if it proposes a statement.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, George. Greg, go ahead.

---

GREG SHATAN: Greg for the record. Obviously, if there are others who agree with George, they should speak up. I would just say that this is not extreme. If anything, it borders on the anadine. And I would not say that it diverges from what's said in the vast majority of what others are saying, they diverge from what some particular stakeholder communities are saying, but I don't think it diverges from what we're hearing from stakeholders, groups that are basically end user concerns, and I know there are disagreements from certain corners, but I would not say that they, if anything, make up an appreciable part of the public. And their statements are very well represented in the public comments. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. I'm gonna agree, this is a pretty mellow statement and kind of in line with what we've said last time which to was sort of not make a statement about this because there was some -- there appeared to be some consensus that there wasn't an in-user interest in this direct interest in this topic. So I'm gonna say I'm not trying to completely agree with that consensus, but that's sort of where we ended up at the end of last call, so I don't know whether or not we should just make this shorter or even consider not filling a comment on these agreements given the discussion we had last week. I don't know the answer there. If other people want to speak up on this. George, I know how you feel. So I don't know. Do you have something new to say, George?

GEORGE KIRIKOS: George Kirikos here again. Perhaps as a below ground people can just put their individual comments because I know there's varying views

---

amongst the people that are present. I feel that it would be perhaps more appropriate if they just put their individual comments forward rather than just represent the entire At-Large community, especially given there's only five days left before the public comments are due, and I don't think that's sufficient time to do a proper consensus measure. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, George. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. I think there a couple of reasons why it's worthwhile making the comments. I think one it's worthwhile distinguishing .org from the idea that they're part of instant and rampant price increases, noting that PIR did not in fact engage in any of the price increases when it had the right to do so. And also noting the general concern with price increases. And so I think it's worthwhile to weigh in.

I think in terms of -- kind of goes back to the last discussion of what level of support does one need to move forward. This support goes up to the ALAC which in turn has to take a look at it or more or less go around it before it gets filed.

The section 12 that I said earlier mentioned the rough idea that consensus and ALAC land is 80% of whatever this number might be. That's probably why there was a mention of 80% majority because that was the context that was being mentioned. So overall I think we should



---

see what the feelings are here. It may have key people who don't agree with this or trouble so I'd overall feel that it is appropriate to make this statement or at least give ALAC the opportunity to make the statement. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm going through an experience which is commonly known as Groundhog Day. I know the languages, the film has been called different names, but it's one of these days that doesn't end and restarts again. And we're having the same discussion as last week. And yet I'm not seeing in the statement any of the comments that I had made with regards to my Groundhog Day which was regarding article six, page 16, where the fees to be paid by the registry are fixed numbers decided many years ago and at the time they were mentioning price set in the agreement. That hasn't gone up with inflation.

And unfortunately, this means that the income for ICANN is going to continue being smaller and smaller every year. Not because of the fact that they're paying less, but because your dollar buys you less. And the income is basically not gonna be able to cover all of the increases in prices brought by inflation. I think I've said this one enough times.

With regards to the other points that we've heard here, we know fully George's position as in keep the price caps because I imagine that for

---

some people taking the price caps off is a risk that the prices are going to go up. We're talking here about the retail prices. Well, wholesale and retail prices might go up. And if you hold a specific large portfolio of domains that might be significant cost increase, and we know also the point that is being made here about the undoing the price caps which Greg has pushed forward.

I'm a little more concerned about the fight with regards to the URS and the Rights Protection Mechanisms, but I think that when these were devised by the special trademark interest group, a number of years ago, I was actually part of that group, seeing them deal with the result was quite balanced and starting to play with the balance here and say that we're not gonna impose this balance on legacy sales and it was a bit of a concern because we're now going to end up with contracts from some top level domains that will have very different constraints and others and the more we go along are we going to have every generation of TLDs with its own specific set of constraints, they'll be like a hierarchy of TLDs; the ones which have the most constraints and the ones which have the least constraints. I'm not quite sure where that would go but I'm a bit concerned with the complexity of how things will then pan out in the long-term. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, I'm a bit torn. I agree with both George -- it's not possible, I suppose. But both George and Olivier, there are very good arguments.

---

One, that the price cap should be removed for probably most registries. The reason we actually originally agreed to separate .org is .org is basically a lot of organization with a public interest component that the other registries don't have. And therefore I understood we were going to comment on .org just because the fact that public interest is very much our constituency and in which case I would have expected to start the stronger statement.

Now the fact that the PIR hasn't raised the price doesn't mean that in the future it wouldn't raise the prices to some extent to cover its costs. But if it hasn't raised the prices then obviously it felt it could contain any of the pressures. I'm just wondering if, as a group, and George is right, do we have five days to deal with something that we've been discussing for awhile, is there an argument that says there is a special interest component for ALAC just with .org and for that reason, we would put price caps on it. That's my only question. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Holly. I think these are complicated issues and they involve a lot of guessing and things like that, and that's why the issue was raised at the last call about whether or not this is the right place for us to intervene, because obviously part of the public interest is addressed by the fact that more than 50% of the funds that come in to a .org are spent on ISOC and other public interests endeavors, and so that argument can go both ways. I think that we probably are at a place where we're not gonna reach consensus in the timeframe of this comment needing to be submitted. I think it would be great for us to have a broader conversation within the At-Large about this and hash

---

these issues out, but I'm not sure we have the bandwidth to do it in the timeframe that we need to for the .org renewal.

If you look at Evan Leibovitch's comment in the queue, you can see that there's a lot of divergence here and our findings as part of the CTT review were somewhat similar to what Evan is suggesting, that in fact in some instances, the price caps are causing a type of sort of unintentional predation and making it difficult for the new ccTLD operators without the economy of scale to compete.

So there's a lot of issues and I don't think we're going to reach a consensus in the time that we have to. I guess I'm inclined to, despite all of Greg's good works and citing previous comments and things like that, I'm inclined to kill the comment if we don't have consensus around it, because I don't think we're going to make a real --

ANDREA GLANDON: Jonathan --

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think we're going to make a real difference in the amount of time we have. Yes, who is that?

ANDREA GLANDON: This is Andrea. I apologize. Our AC line dropped again, so I'm going to need to reconnect that. Just give me a second.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   Okay, thanks.

ANDREA GLANDON:               For those on the phone, we are reconnecting the AC line. We have stopped the presentation and will be back momentarily. Okay, Jonathan, you can continue.

JONATHAN ZUCK:               Thanks, had to make sure it was unmuted. Thanks. It's amazing how this AC has really degraded very recently. I don't remember it ever being difficult. But I guess that some sum of this is that the caps got large, needs to address this broader issue of the end user interest in registry agreements in what this may be and we really need to hash this out when we have more time to do it.

I think that there seems to be a consensus in the group not to file a comment on this because we don't have consensus at this point and I think we should work to have consensus when we're filing comments, so even if it's just majority, and I don't think we have that even in this case. So that's my inclination and I think [inaudible] applies to this as well because as I said there's arguments on both sides about the public interest. Any further questions or comments about this?

So I think that with the CPWG's recommendation, the ALAC, that again are free to do what they wish, but I think that will be our recommendation. Alright. Evan, do we have other stuff to discuss on this particular set of comment updates? I don't think so?

---

ANDREA GLANDON: Jonathan no, that does it for the policy comment updates.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, thank you. So Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I had actually put my hand up for one question --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. One of the statements that was being proposed was one on the .asia registry agreement, and as you can see, there is a different penholder for that one, and some of the contents of that might be different. So I didn't know whether we were going, as a group, to recommend that the ALAC would not comment on .info .org .asia .bus or just .org, .info and .bus and that there was still something going on with the .asia statement. Could we have clarification, please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Maureen is unfortunately not on the call and she's the penholder on .asia and she is indeed bringing up a number of other issues relating to .asia, so I guess I would say we leave that one as pending and suggest that we don't comment on .org, .info, and .bus.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's great, thank you very much Jonathan. That's helpful. And it's Olivier speaking. We are now reaching the "any other business" part of our call, and earlier during this call we had a comment a proposal from Sebastien Bachollet to discuss briefly the main high interest topic in Marrakesh. He mentioned that the DNS over HTTPS, which is another way of securing the DNS is, so an alternative way to using DNS is might be one of the topics that might come up. I'm hoping that somebody has a list of those proposed topics that we can have a look at. Sebastien Bachollet to perhaps take us through it? Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. I guess the last mail on that issue I saw Welcome to the CPWG but I am not sure. Yeah, Welcome to the -- and I don't know if it's still the one, I will copy and paste what I have; it's maybe not the last one because I am not in those groups that are discussing this issue, but maybe it could be a good way. I'm sorry for the way it will appear in -- but there were five policies around the [inaudible] software developer [inaudible] companies.

The second [inaudible], three nominating committee review for evolution of ICANN multistakholder model of governance, and five [inaudible]. I don't think [inaudible] to discuss all those five but we already have discussions about universal assistance. I think that the newest one is [inaudible] the voice of the end user it must be heard and we need to find who will be good to talk about that with a good

---

knowledge of what it's meant and what At-Large's end user could say and wants to say about that. Thank you, Olivier. Back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So indeed we have five topics, now we know previous ALAC call. I think that there was negative feedback on having a higher interest topic discussion on the nominating committee with you, namely because it's still very early on in the game and probably not the right time for the nominating committee for this type of discussion to take place with regards to the nominating committee because it's right in the middle of the year when it actually has to focus on finding candidates rather than discussing its own processes.

When it comes down to the others, and I'm waiting for anybody else to comment, I certainly see interest in DNS over HTTPS. This is a new way of securing the DNS. It's something that a lot of people would probably learn from on this. The high jacking account takeover and attacks has already been discussed by the SSAC. SSAC shared this advice with us recently is the last ICANN meeting. This would be sort of a wider discussion across all of ICANN. And evolution of the ICANN loyalty stakeholder model of governance would of course be a follow up to the discussion that has taken place in Kobe that was lead by Brian Cote at the time; gig question mark was how much further can one go on this.

And of course policy around universal acceptance and steps to be taken by top level domains, operators and registrars. You know there'd be a big push for universal acceptance, and we are communities seeing a big



---

topic and of course our IDN working group has been working quite hard, pushing for this, and you would also be involved with our outreach engagement groups with our communities.

So, Sebastien, I'm not quite sure whether you wanted to actually have us make a proposal on what to go for, but I do find it a little hard at this moment in time, maybe this week, but I would suggest, and I don't know how quickly one needs to make a choice on these, but I would suggest if we were able to perhaps send this to the mailing list. I know there's a discussion going on at the moment on the ALAC mailing list about this, but since some of these topics are policy related, certainly when it comes down to, well, the technical and policy related -- universal acceptance is policy related. Maybe we need to raise it in the group and discuss it further during the next call.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Olivier. I guess you can hear me? I'm not sure --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, thanks Olivier. It was not too much --- I put the five items because you asked me to do so, but my point was more just, if and I guess it will be, we got an interest discussion about DNS over HTTPS, how we organize the discussion on that to have somebody to take the floor to participate in the discussion and what this person will say on our behalf.

---

I don't think the other we need to discuss, it's not our subject to decide if we want this or this, but if DOH is coming to become [inaudible], finally during Marrakesh, how we will talk about that, what are our main concerns and how we are prepared for that. My suggestion maybe if you wish me to do one is that we may decide that one small group can start from the chain on that and we can propose it to our group and we can return that to ALAC and we have not too much time, but we have three weeks to do that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. My understanding from having being at the right meeting and having met at the time with our very own Bastian Gosling, that he is following that topic of DNS over HTTPS closely we might wish to involve him in any discussion on this. Marita Moll?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, I'm Marita Moll for the record. Now Brian Cute is doing another session on the multiset strategic plan and multistate system in Marrakesh, so I don't know if we actually need to duplicate that or would just going along with that. It is a fact that he is entering another phase and doesn't need to be a whole lot more discussion and engagement in that. I'm not sure whether or not we need -- are we talking here about something that we're doing that no one else is doing? If that's a fact then yeah, this would be being done.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Sebastien Bachollet?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Olivier. I am I guess I may be I don't know. I maybe don't be speaking the right language but there is a choice going on about interest, our interest topics. That will be done by the -- it's a time dedicated during a meeting of ICANN by all the community to participate on one specific topic, and not to have anything in parallel with that. Therefore yes, Brian Cuter will have its time and we will discuss about multistakeholder.

Here I am not talking about having a separate session on any of those topics. I am just suggesting that we as At-Large need to be ready for DOH. We are already ready for all the topics, but DOH, what does it bring to our users? If one of us knows that, and knows that very well, great! Let's have this input to us and discuss this issue; if we don't, who will do the work? Because we need to be ready for Marrakesh to give the end user point of view on that issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sebastien. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Further action items is for this question could be asked from our technical issues working group, which has a number of technologists on their -- might be able to step forward and perhaps even send us either a document on what this DOH thing is, or even some kind of a webinar in the next few weeks. Tijani Ben Jemaa? And we do have to end this call soon. Tijani, you have the floor.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier. Tijani speaking. I do agree with Sebastien that we should be involved in the hot topics that will be addressed in Marrakesh because they are sessions where there is no parallel work with them, and also because we need to have our say in the important questions discussed in ICANN.

Coming back to the NomCom review, I agree with you, Olivier, that it is not the right time now to perhaps discuss the NomCom review, but if it is on the agenda, if it's discussed in ICANN we should have our say there, because as you know, several people think that we are overrepresented in the NomCom review and this might be raised, I don't know where, perhaps in some discussions in Marrakesh, so if there is a discussion about the NomCom review, we should be there. We should have our say. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. And I think that will probably be the last words on this topic. Has the sound gone again? We just lost the ability to reconnect. I think that, if that's the case, let's not waste any more time. And we probably have to end this call. Andrea? I'm not sure if somebody wishes to seek on the other side as well, or maybe I can even do something here?

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you Sebastien. I am trying to reconnect. I'm not sure how long it'll take if you want it that way.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: What I'm gonna do, and I'm not sure whether that works or not, is to connect on the Adobe connect as well, I have the TV in front of my computer. But I don't know if people can hear me on the Adobe Connect room as well at the moment.

ANDREA GLANDON: You can certainly try. They may be able to.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But Olivier, we can put in the chat something saying that the meeting is closed and that's it, and we close the meeting?

ANDREA GLANDON: Yeah, if you're done, we can just close the meeting. If you have something else you want to say --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Can you hear me on the Adobe Connect?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let's just close the meeting then, yeah. Okay.

ANDREA GLANDON: Okay. This concludes today's conference. I'm sorry, [CROSSTALK].

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We do have a question, which was -- next week is gonna be the first of May, what time do we have our call? I know that for many countries it is May date, what is the next week?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And it's a holiday for the ICANN stuff, that's why I suggest that we don't have a call next week on the first of May.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's a holiday for everyone, by the way.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, not for everyone, just the U.S. Many, but not everyone. [CROSSTALK] holiday in France.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. The question we have at the moment is next week is the first of May. We need to find out whether we have a meeting or not, or we move it by one day backwards. I understand that at the moment -- is ICANN closed on the first of May?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, this is Heidi. So I know that [CROSSTALK]. Yes. Sorry. I do know that the U.S. offices are closed. I don't know about Istanbul, Evin, I'm not sure if all offices are closed on that day or not.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: I can't confirm, Heidi, but I do know in Turkey they recognize it so like the city itself is pretty shut down that day, but I'll check if it's an official ICANN office closure for Istanbul.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So Olivier, this is Heidi again. Do you wish to just have it tentatively on Tuesday? And maybe we'll get back to you once we know if it's an ICANN staff wide closure?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please. Olivier speaking.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so if it is on Tuesday, did you want it to be the early rotation or the normal time?

ANDREA GLANDON: Olivier, 2100h would be the next time rotation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Next time, I think that we should go for 2100h please.

ANDRA GLANDON: Okay, so at this time, we'll schedule for Tuesday, April 30<sup>th</sup>, at 2100h UTC.

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But it was 2100h this week. How could it be the same time next week?

ANDREA GLANDON: No, it was 1900h UTC this week.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. Okay, thank you very much everyone. Apologizes for all the technology problems. Hopefully, it will be fixed next week, and thank you to our interpreters for staying on the call the extra 8 minutes past the official end of this call. This has been great. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night. Bye bye.

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

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**