
ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call held on Thursday the 2nd of May 2019 at 20:00 UTC.

We do have apologies to be noted from Kaili Kan, Justine Chew, Alberto Soto, Ricardo Holmquist. On the bridge today, we have Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, Alfredo Calderon, Baastian Goslings, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Ejikeme Egbougu, Evan Leibovitch, George Kirikos, Glenn McKnight, Greg Shatan, Hadia Elminiawi, Herb Waye, Joel Thayer, John Laprise, Jose Lebron, Judith Hellerstein, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Luis Valle, Marita Moll, Maureen Hilyard, Sébastien Bachollet, Sergio Salinas Porto, Seun Ojedeji, Yrjö Lansipuro.

Please remember to keep your mics muted and to state your name for recording purposes. Thank you, and over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Andrea, and welcome, everybody, to this call. We've had a very busy week indeed, as you will have seen on the mailing list. We have a number of items to deal with today.

A quick update on the EPDP because phase two has restarted, so we're going to have Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg speak to us about this.

Then on the public comment updates, I'm not sure whether by then Jonathan Zuck will be there, but certainly, the three statements that are closing very soon, today, are on the table, the proposed renewal of dot-

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.

org, dot-info and dot-biz. So that's basically what [we'll be] speaking about today.

If we have a little more time, we will still be looking at the ICANN policy topics. I know that we need to work on this, but the priority today is the 2nd of May public comment closing. Any Other Business to add to this?

Does Zoom show who is speaking? No. Probably not. It does show in a little thingy on the side, but since I'm in the Adigo bridge, [then what you'll have] is Adigo bridge link [inaudible]. Not seeing any hands up, but then I will ask staff if there are hands up, because I still don't know whether it puts the hands in a specific order.

ANDREA GLANDON: At this time, there are no hands.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thank you. So the agenda is adopted as it's listed. Let's [inaudible] our action items. And somebody needs to turn their phone or their mic off. Thank you. All action items are complete, and there was just a note about the potential ICANN 65 policy topics.

Because most of the discussion on our mailing list dealt with the renewal of dot-org, there wasn't any discussion on the potential ICANN 65 policy topics, so we'll be discussing this shortly. About the other ones, everything else is being completed, and I do know personally that the technical issues working group has been asked about the DNS over HTTP, and the dot-Asia registry agreement is dealt with as well.

Moving back up, the next CPWG At-Large plenary discussion, end users interests in registry agreements. I'm not sure, do we have that for this one? I don't think we have a general discussion on this. We weren't tabling on the fact that we would have the statements on this. So maybe this one was not complete.

I'm not seeing anybody put their hand up, so [inaudible] Shall I ask Evin? Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: There was a point at which we were talking about tabling those comments to have a more generalized discussion on this, but things have evolved quite a bit so that's why there's that other, more generalized topic. So I don't think that should be on the agenda probably.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. So we can still keep that as done, effectively, just to take it off the table. Okay. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] the rain is noisy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can't hear the rain. You sound clear. Alright, let's move to agenda item three. I'm not sure who will provide us with an update on the wonderful activities of phase two, whether it's Alan Greenberg or

whether it's Hadia Elminiawi. I think that Hadia is on the call. I'm not seeing Alan listed at the moment.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, chair. Thank you, Olivier, and everyone. I had actually a presentation, but I'm not sure that I'll be able to share it. If Evin maybe can share it, I sent it by e-mail a couple minutes ago, and earlier from another e-mail.

Anyway, in order not to waste everyone's time, as Olivier said –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Do I proceed? Go ahead? Okay, so the EPDP phase two work started today. We had our first meeting, and our new chair, Janis, and there was actually a proposal today to have a small subgroup from the EPDP team to work with ICANN Org to move forward discussions with the European Commission and data protection authorities, because there is a concern about the possibility of having a unified access model.

Also, there was a discussion to the mind map and the EPDP team worksheet, and the EPDP team worksheet mainly consists of the following items which are the purposes for accessing data, credentialing, terms of access and compliance with terms of use, a standardized model for lawful disclosure, expected deliverables, and legal questions. So that's the main stream of the [inaudible].

The first part which will speak about the purposes for accessing data will be handling applicable law, legitimate purposes for third-parties. The legal basis that exists to support the access, the eligibility criteria for access, if the groups or parties consist of different type of third-party requestors. Also, the data elements that each user or party have access to based on their purposes, and that part was actually a bit debated because if we actually get into that many details, maybe we won't ever finish.

So actually, also to what extent can we determine a set of data elements and potential scope for specific third parties, and also RDAP and [how technically] capable it is.

As for the credentialing, this part will handle how will the credentials be granted, who is responsible for providing [inaudible] how these credentials will be integrated into the registries' and registrars' technical systems, and then the main part –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, sorry for interrupting you, but who did you send that presentation to? Because staff tells me they have not received it yet. It is a little concerning.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I sent it to Evin, but apparently, she did not receive it. I sent it through two e-mails. But anyway, I will resend after I finish, and I'll share it with the group and resend it in a couple of minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's just that it's difficult for people to follow when you are speaking about things with no visuals.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I know. Yes. I agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So usefulness is limited, unfortunately.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So let me send again the presentation. So basically, the expected deliverable for now is a standardized access model. There's some uncertainties about the possibility of having such a model, about what this model actually is, and about the definition of the unified access model. But anyway, we have started.

Our next call is going to be cancelled, which is supposed to be on Tuesday, and so our next meeting is going to be on Thursday. So we have one week from now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. And you might have not seen that your presentation has just been received. Murphy's law, as it happens. I don't know how long it will take for staff to be able to upload it to Zoom, if they are able to upload it to the Zoom. Evin says support team will load it. I'm not quite sure what is meant by this. Evin, could you please enlighten us? Because I thought it's down to somebody sharing their

screen effectively and being able to share the presentation so Hadia can go back to her presentation.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Hi, Olivier. I think the call manager, if she's been able to receive it, could quickly load it into the screen. Otherwise, if that doesn't work, then maybe we can work on having Hadia share her screen. But I think Andrea is just loading it.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Yes, it'll be just a moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. And Hadia, in the future, just send it to staff@atlarge.icann.org so everyone gets it, because otherwise, it makes it a bit difficult since it's often not the same person now with this new system that everyone needs a copy of the file, effectively.

Alright, let's open the floor if anybody has got any questions or comments, and then Hadia, I'll give you another five minutes afterwards if you need to go over any specifics again that you've touched on. I'm not seeing any hands up. And I'm seeing also no need for Hadia to repeat the update.

Well, we can't wait any further, so thank you for this, Hadia, and forget about sharing the screen on the update. We're going to have to move on since we have an important discussion now on the [post-EPDP stuff.]

Of course, next week, a lot more going on with the EPDP, so we'll find out then about more news. Let's go now in the public comment updates, and for this, we have – I know that Jonathan is probably still stuck in traffic, but Evin Erdogan is able to take us through some of those public comments to start with, please. Thank you. Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Sure. Thank you, Olivier. So for our policy comment updates this week, we don't have any recently ratified by the ALAC, but we do have two that recently opened public comment for decision, the first involving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, and this public comment closes on the 4th of June, and as you all know, especially those that were in Kobe, the community forum, ICANN 64, Brian Cote is working on conducting an update to ICANN's multi-stakeholder model with community feedback, so this is a public comment related to that, and he'll also be at ICANN 65.

And then the second public comment for decision is a topic that the ALAC usually does not comment on. This is label generation rules for the root zone version three. This also closes on the 4th of June, so maybe you would like to discuss these comments, or I could just move on to the other currently being developed comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. Okay, now I've got hands. So first is Marita Moll. I'm not able to hear Marita. Marita might be muted.

ANDREA GLANDON: Marita, it looks like your mic is muted. Reminder, go down to the bottom, on the left, and unmute.

MARITA MOLL: I love learning new things. I just put my hand up to test the hand up thing, because no one else had seemed to do it yet. I just put it in the chat. What I wanted to say was that I will volunteer to be a penholder on the multi-stakeholder model comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Marita. And next is Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN. Thanks. I've put my hand up to say the same thing. I'm also volunteering to be a penholder on the evolving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. Looking at the questions on the public comment page, this is definitely one, I think, that could benefit from even more than two penholders potentially, because there's a lot of thought questions that are being [inaudible]. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Greg. Next is Judith Hellerstein.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I also volunteer to help out. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Judith. So we have indeed, as mentioned in the chat, a small team that can start a bit of work on this involving the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. We have three co-penholders.

Is anyone volunteering to do something about the label generation rules for the root zone version three, or should we pass this on over to the IDN working group perhaps as a good way forward for them to work out if they recommend a statement to be drafted?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Cheryl. I'm not able to hear Cheryl, but I notice in the chat that she said we usually do not comment on label generation rules.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, we don't. And yes, you can send it to the IDNs group, but they can do what they like with it and very well could, but the ALAC certainly has traditionally not done it, and I can't imagine why we, the Consolidated Policy Working Group, should be advising any different now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Cheryl. Have you read the statement? Because I think the point I was making is that one would look if there's

anything unusual that is being said in this or if it's just a standard thing on labels and label generation rules as such.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As an active person in IDNs, my answer to your question to me is, yes, and no, there isn't, in my view. But feel free to ask the IDN working group, which, yes, I'm also a member of.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Cheryl. I think we don't need to ask the IDN working group now because we've got an answer from a member of the IDN working group who has read the statement and recommends that we don't write anything about this. So that's fine.

Now, let's continue then. I'm not sure whether Jonathan wishes to run this part of the show or whether I should continue or whether Evin deals with this. I'm open for suggestions at the moment. And I'll wait to hear from Evin or Jonathan before giving the floor to Greg, but first – yes, Jonathan.

GREG SHATANA: This is Greg, actually. I was raising my hand on the previous topic to mention that there's yet one more open public comment that just came out, which is the process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews, which opened on the 30th of April and closes on the 15th of July. That's probably, unlike label generation, one that we probably also want to comment on. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Greg. I'm not sure if I can see this on the agenda at the moment, so that's just been added today, has it?

GREG SHATANA: April 30th.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. It's bizarre that it's not here. I'm certainly not seeing it. Evin, has that been not picked up?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It depends who "me" is. I can hear someone. I'm sure your name is not "me."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, it's Jonathan. [I was muted, it sounds like.]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You were, because I couldn't hear you. But just before you start, Greg Shatan mentioned a specific comment period that started, and I can't quite see it on the table. I was asking Evin Erdogan whether –

apparently, that's something that was supposed to be there on the 30th of April. So, was that just an oversight or something?

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Olivier, yeah, I apologize. I actually checked this public comment workspace today and I didn't see this, so I think maybe it just loaded a bit late. But as Greg noted, it was officially opened on the 30th, so I've shared the link to it on the public comment ICANN page, and I'll create an [Arch] workspace for this comment shortly. So that'll be up very soon. And if anyone would like to volunteer for this, it seems Greg recommended this would be one that the ALAC would like to comment on, so I could note that as drafting and open for penholders, if anyone would like to volunteer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Evin. So for the record, the name of this new public comment is process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews. I guess the first question is whether we should draft a statement on this, and secondly, whether there's any volunteer for that. And Greg, you have your hand up. Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN:

My hand is up, but not to volunteer, because I think that this should probably draw largely from those who have been involved in the At-Large and in the At-Large review implementation working group, because that is one of the organizational reviews of the type being

discussed here, and I'm sure that some of the people who are closer to those things have lots to say about organizational reviews. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. Let's take an action item that this public comment should be forwarded to the At-Large review leadership team. And then they'll be able to come back to us. I know that the members are here on this call, but it's for them to discuss in their space. So thanks very much for that.

Let's then go to Jonathan Zuck for the next topic, and that's the one that's been putting the lists on fire, the proposed renewal of dot-org registry agreement. Jonathan, do you want to lead this, or should I lead that? Are you in a position to speak?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm still about five or six minutes out, but I first wanted to say something on the multi-stakeholder comment, if I could.

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

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I want to request that the three of you who volunteered to be penholders don't start by drafting, because that's part of what makes the list so difficult to follow. Please read the document on which we're asked to comment, and then produce a set of slides with the points that

you think we ought to make, and let's drive the conversation from there. Just having text is not going to work as a way to have a conversation either on the list or on the call until we really know the points that we want to make. So hopefully – I think it's Greg, Judith and Marita, if you can next week just sort of say what the key questions are and what it is you think that we should say on them, and put that into a slide as bullets for discussion, that would really be helpful. Is that alright?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I'm absolutely fine with that. I think I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. I see Greg Shatan, you have your hand up.

GREG SHATAN: It's an old hand. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. So Jonathan, since you're still five minutes away from a place with a stable Internet connection, may I suggest that perhaps then since I know you've followed this much more closely than I have, I know that there is a fourth statement here, and that's of course the proposed renewal of dot-Asia registry agreement, perhaps we could discuss this for the next five minutes until you settle down, and we get Maureen Hilyard to talk to us about the proposed renewal of dot-Asia registry agreement. Is that okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Fine by me. Can we see it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great, so Maureen, let's go forward, please. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. Really, the statement has not changed too much from the original that was displayed to everybody a couple of weeks ago. It has been presented to the dot-Asia board so that they could see what we were saying about them, and they've okayed it as well.

And it really just sort of explained the sorts of things that At-Large has supported with regards to the introduction of universal acceptance into the agreement, and mainly because dot-Asia does actually have quite a lot of involvement in universal acceptance, and not only within the Asian region but across the board.

So if anyone's got any comments to make about the statement, I'd be happy to receive them, but yeah, I seem to have – from the comments that I've had, it seems to be okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Maureen. Are there any comments on Maureen's draft? It's a little hard to read – well, it's impossible to read

the draft on the screen, so there is a link in the agenda that takes you to the draft.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: George Kirikos, you have the floor.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: I don't really have a comment on the dot-Asia document given I haven't had a chance to read it yet, but the process that Maureen just mentioned seems a bit puzzling. You wouldn't normally want to necessarily contact the party that you're commenting about to get their approval of a statement. Just as an example, if this was a comment on a Verisign contract, you wouldn't send them a draft of the comment and ask for their input to see if it's alright.

The fact that the dot-Asia board was consulted to see if the statement was alright is just a little bit puzzling to me. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, George. And you're correct. I guess it's the fact that I'm actually a board member, and we had actually been talking about the work of dot-Asia and its involvement during the ICANN meeting, and it was raised there about the fact that I sort of felt was important that it

was put into the agreement and it was agreed to by the board members who [were at the meeting.]

And you're completely right, that would not be normal, and I do know that the dot-Asia directors are putting in their own comment anyway and supporting what we're saying anyway. So, correct, but it's an unusual circumstance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Maureen. George, your hand is still up. Is that a new hand?

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Yeah, that's a new hand. Maureen just mentioned that she's a dot-Asia board member, I believe. If that's correct, I think it's, again, of great concern because there seems to be a conflict having the dot-Asia board member that's so closely linked to them actually holding the pen and writing the statement. Even in the PIR example, you saw the letter that was posted by Greg that linked to the blog of PIR. They refrained from commenting on the proposed contract for dot-org expressly because they didn't want to influence the public comments.

That just demonstrates the potential for conflict of interest. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I completely understand that, George, and I probably wouldn't have felt it was – I guess I didn't feel it was a conflict of interest because there had been a lot of discussion, not only within the At-Large discussions

anyway because of our involvement with – having a session on UA within At-Large.

So yeah, it's complicated, and it may seem to be a conflict of interest, but I think in the broader sense of things, I don't see it in that light. And if anyone else had raised it as I was doing it – because I don't think it's unknown that I am on the board – they could have raised it, and I would have pulled out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Maureen. Greg Shatan is next.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I'll just say that while it is slightly unusual, I don't have the same vivid reaction to it as a problem. I think we have an overall process with reviews by the CPWG, and that penholders don't get to run wild with their statements. We're not necessarily in open combat with every other organization on which we would be commenting. Clearly, we need to maintain a sense of distance at the same time, so important, I think, that others make sure they've taken a look at this, but at the same time, in a group – ICANN is full of stakeholders, and the general concept on conflict is more that – it's what you disclose, because unless you're maybe the chair of the EPDP being completely divorced from everything around you, it just becomes an impossibility.

So I certainly assume – obviously verify that Maureen drafted with the best interest of ALAC. We're not talking about the ICANN board here. And I think the ICANN board, being board of a California corporation, it

has to follow somewhat different strictures there, not a stakeholder-bases organization per se. In any case, I'm a little bothered by being bothered by this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg. I don't want to start making this into a discussion of what is a conflict of interest and what is not a conflict of interest. Would it help to basically assign the penholder as rather than being Maureen Hilyard, it would be John Laprise, who is the vice chair that deals with the policy? And then basically the penholder as such is a different person, bearing in mind that the input that was received in there was received from members of this working group.

Let's see, we have Maureen Hilyard next.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. And I think one of the things that – I was mindful of that, and that in the statement, I tried to be objective in that the statement is really a commentary, as I've stated in the chat, a commentary on the support that At-Large was giving in various forms, and also some consultation with regards to, “Well, what are your price caps and how do you deal with that kind of thing?”

But also, I don't mind having John's name on it. It's not a problem. I was a penholder, but I'm happy to have that changed if it's – I'm okay with it. Make it John.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Maureen. Actually, I've noticed in the chat that Holly has offered to be the penholder. Is that correct?

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's great. Good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly Raiche? I'm hoping to get an eye from Holly.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: She said yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: She's got yes in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. Thank you. So, Holly Raiche will be the penholder for this. There would be some further refinements to this. There's still a little more time. The end date is the 7th of May. I do note that – and this is taking my chair's hat off on here – this statement does not have inside it the comment that I did make for the other top-level domains to do with the price, the basic price plus the price per domain name to go up with inflation.

I know that Justine Chew has written a very good paragraph, very short but very concise paragraph for this, and I would suggest that we also added this in this registry agreement, referring of course to the right

section if the section number is not the same. I don't know if there's any objection to this, for dot-Asia. The point being of course that if we want to comment on this and ICANN wishes to have its different registry agreements going to some kind of a standard, then we will have to make the same points, and every one of the renewals from now on so that this becomes the standard.

Greg Shatan. Okay. George Kirikos.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

One thing I'd like to talk about is the principles behind various policy choices. The idea that the cost should be indexed inflation makes a lot of sense. Why is it that we're saying that the ICANN fees paid by the registry to ICANN should be indexed inflation, but then on the other hand, some people are arguing that the fees paid by registrants or registrars to be more precise should not be indexed inflation but should be, some argue, allowed to be entirely discretionary based on whatever the registry wants to charge? Basically unlimited flexibility to raise prices to any level.

So there seems to be a bit of a double standard, or at least no underlying principle that dictates how one pricing scheme is indexed inflation but another price is not indexed inflation. Can somebody please explain that difference? What's the underlying principle that I'm missing here? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, George. I'm not sure I can provide you with an answer on this. What I can say is that they're the two extreme models, the one where every single pricing level is actually codified and quantified, in which case you would say you can only raise prices by the amount of inflation registry to registrar, registrar to end user level. That's one way, I guess. Or should I say ICANN registry, registry, registrar, registrar, end user? And that, of course, we know is not what's happening at the moment, because we have an absolute free market as far as domain names are concerned, some seemingly fetching prices of several millions of dollars.

So ICANN has gone the other way, and it seems that most of the things are kind of a free market as such. I think that the only actual contract that ICANN is able to do something about in some way is the one where it basically has to get the registries and the registrars to pay them. And further than that – that's just my personal point – regarding price gaps, I have no idea.

I see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. This is a person who's way wiser than I am, so perhaps –

JONATHAN ZUCK: And Olivier, if I could be in the queue, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Jonathan. So two wise men. Let's start with Alan Greenberg. At the moment, I cannot hear Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, your phone is showing as muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I'm new to Zoom relatively speaking, didn't realize by default I was muted. The issue here really is that these are two different things with two different histories. In terms of the general gTLD registry agreement, the correct practice is there are no price limits, there are no price caps, ICANN doesn't do anything for setting prices.

That's not unreasonable for the new gTLD program, because different registries will have different models, different business models, different target audiences that may have price sensitivities or not, and of course, any given registry may determine that, oops, we mispriced these things.

Any given registry may well have set their price wrong and needs to adjust it, and that's how that will be handled by their clients, will determine whether it is successful or not.

The legacy TLDs, which had a large customer base before ICANN even existed, are a different issue altogether, and someone made the decision that the legacy TLDs, including the very large ones, should be subject to the same registry agreement. Obviously, for Verisign and dot-com, the pricing caps, the rule was different because of the history with the US government. Dot-net, someone decided that the new agreement would not be the base anyway.

So, decisions were made purely administratively in ICANN to say we must go to a standardized contract, and that implies no price caps. And I

don't know how that decision was made, and I personally think it was the wrong decision, but that's that history.

The history on what ICANN charges to registries and registrars is every time we have – and At-Large has suggested a number of times that if ICANN is indeed short of money and there was a justification for its budgets, then let's raise fees. When we do that, there's an immediate outcry from registrars and registries, "But if you raise fees, we're going to have to pass it on."

Well, certainly when registrars decide to make more money, it gets passed on. When registries raise their fees, like the discussion we're having, it gets passed on. But suddenly if ICANN says they're going to raise a fee by one penny a year per domain, there's an outcry from registrars and registries saying, "But we're going to pass it on and that will upset the whole market," which I think is garbage.

And we've said that, but that's the reaction, so ICANN historically has been reluctant to touch those fees at all other than to lower them on occasion, and therefore, our suggestion is at least the cost of living is something that is reasonable as a reaction to the normal reaction, ICANN saying "We are not allowed to touch those at all."

So the history is completely different, and that explains the different ways that we're reacting to them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Next is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. I guess part of the issue here is that we haven't historically viewed registries as the same thing as this newly-termed concept of a registry service provider, which is where you would just equate to cost-based fees. Instead, we put registries in competition with each other, and ask them to do their own marketing, ask them to take on their own rights protection issues, etc., and so they operate as for-profit businesses, which is a very different structure than one in which it was just, "Hey, we're asking you to perform a lookup service and this is your fee for doing that."

So I think, George – and we've had this conversation, and I think we just have a difference of opinion about it, but it's not been the history of ICANN that these businesses, even the legacy ones, have been treated in such a way that they were just a utility that was in cost recovery mode.

This is something where their marketing – dot-org is going around the world trying to compete with ccTLDs to get nonprofits that are – even though they're not for profit, but they're still trying to make their domains successful, they're still trying to compete with ccTLDs for domains in other countries, etc., and that involves marketing, etc. So they're operating in a way that is not accost recovery basis.

So I think unfortunately, that parallel falls apart, again as Alan said, because these things have been treated differently historically.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. Greg Shatan is next.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I wanted to mention that the current base registry agreement actually does have an indexing section in section 6.5, I believe, which says that at ICANN's discretion, both of the registry fees can be increased by an amount indexed to the CPI, consumer price index, which is basically an inflation substitute or analog, so to some extent, it seems like this is already being done, and I admit I didn't look before this to make sure that this was a new idea, but maybe this isn't a new idea. I guess the difference might be – I think in our comments, we're suggesting this be mandatory as opposed to at ICANN's discretion, or maybe we're not suggesting anything different.

So I guess the question is if it's already this way, for instance – first off, I don't think there's any reason that these two types of pricing need to be dealt with in any way similar to each other, so there's no need for consistency between these two, but getting back to the brass tacks of what our comment says, perhaps we're suggesting something that's already happening, unless we're suggesting some variation on what's currently in the base registry agreement, and then by osmosis, appearing in all of the renewal agreements. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. I wasn't aware that the dot-Asia one had this. If I recall though, the other ones did not. But maybe I've overlooked this. Let's see, Alan Greenberg, and in the meantime, I'll try to read this. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I have two very brief comments. Number one, on the price increase clause in the registry agreement, I wasn't actually aware it was there. But that's not the issue. The issue is not whether we have a clause that will allow us to do it, the issue is whether we have the nerve to exercise that clause, and clearly, at this point, we don't. The same is true for what we charge to the registrars.

Registries, because there have been price limits on increasing their costs, one could argue should not be done unless they have an ability to pass it on, which they now do. But nevertheless, registrars always had the ability to pass it on because they all set their own prices.

So the real issue is whether we have the nerve to exercise price increases, not whether we have the right to exercise them.

In terms of whether registries should charge more than what it costs to operate their database, I don't think one can presume that their model is purely running the database.

Now, that being said, one can ask the question of, is what Verisign does with dot-com enough to justify literally close to something over \$1 billion a year of annual revenue based on what they're doing, including all of marketing or anything else?

It's a valid question. However, in the free market and based on the contracts that they have been given, that is where it is. So I don't think we can equate the two completely, and some of us learned a while ago that not everything in life was fair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Greg, could you just remind me where you saw that additional clause regarding the consumer price index? Because I'm not seeing it in section 7.2 of the dot-Asia agreement.

GREG SHATAN: It's in section 6.5.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right, transition of registry operator upon termination of agreement.

GREG SHATAN: No. Adjustments to fees.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, it's in the base registry agreement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, it's in the base one. Okay. So they're transitioning to the base one then, or are we saying the base – okay, I'm getting confused. Sorry about this, because I'm not seeing it in the current registry agreements that are there, so if the base registry agreement is there but we're not using the base registry agreement when it comes down to renewal, then it doesn't really amount to much. Let's have George Kirikos in the meantime.

GREG SHATAN: The renewals are all based on the base registry agreement, and the proposed Asia renewal agreement includes this among most of the other sections of the base agreement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. So let's have George Kirikos, please.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Thank you. Just to go back to what I was trying to say earlier, I don't disagree with the language of indexing to the CPIs inflation for the proposed text. I'm just saying that that reflects a principle and there is cognitive dissonance and inconsistency if one is arguing that a reasonable price level increase takes into account inflation, takes into account cost is justifiable based on some cost component.

And one should apply that principle everywhere, otherwise one appears to be very inconsistent in one's reasoning and analysis. Alan raised another point between registrars and registries, and of course, it should be pointed out that that's kind of an apples and oranges situation, because competition between registrars is fierce. I can switch between two registrars if one offers me lower pricing or if one tries to raise their fees too high. So there's ample choice of registrars without impacting one's business, because obviously, the domain name is portable between registrars. But changing a top-level domain, changing one's domain name between different registries is obviously a much different thing. It would be kind of like having a telephone company be able to say, "Well, we're going to raise all the telephone number fees in New York City, say, the 212 area code, to any level we want, \$1000 a month,

and if you don't like it, you can switch your phone number." Think of the havoc that that would wreak.

So that's the huge difference between a registry and a registrar. You have telephone number portability, you can switch your phone between AT&T and Verizon and so on, but you're dealing with one underlying monopoly that has the registry itself. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, George. Next is Alan Greenberg. We're going to have to move on a little bit because I'm a bit concerned of the time, but I know that we're already touching on some of the things that touch on the other statements. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'm not going to talk on substance here. I just have to point out that we are spending an unbelievable amount of time on a subject that, number one, we're not likely to come to an agreement on, and number two, as things go in the overall priority list of things that are relevant to users that we should be focusing, on the amount of time we're spending on this is not commensurate with that in my nut humble opinion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And with these words, let's then move to the next topic, which is in policy, and that's the one about the proposed renewal of dot-org. Jonathan Zuck, are you now sitting with a nice warm cup of coffee and ready to take us through this one?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I am indeed. I guess I'm going to add –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And I understand the statement is being drafted by Justine and Greg. So [I guess that should go on the screen] or that should be shared. Over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess what I'm hoping is to have a structured conversation. I know I sound like a broken record, but if we just have an open field on picking apart anything in this draft, then people have extremely long interventions. So what I would love to do is for either Justine or Greg, take the topics one by one, the main points that we're trying to make in this draft, and the justification that we're giving for making them, and then stop and have a conversation about that point. Because otherwise, everybody is going to feel the need to make ten points every time they raise their hand.

So if it's possible, Greg – I know I'm probably putting you on the spot, or Justine, can you take them one by one? I'm not sure I even know what all of them are, but it's the PICs, the URS, whatever the rights protection stuff is, the price caps, these were all different topics, and if we can take them one by one, what we're recommending and why we're recommending it briefly, and then open that for discussion. Does that make sense?

GREG SHATAN: Yes, I think that makes sense.

JONATHAN ZUCK: In the current draft. Thanks.

GREG SHATAN: Yes. So looking at the latest draft, which is on the screen, we've moved back to commenting on org and biz and info in one comment. So in terms of what's changed of significance between this draft and the last —

JONATHAN ZUCK: Don't make it a delta. We have to move quickly. So literally forget the past. Literally, what are we recommending, and why are we recommending it? Don't think about a change from a previous draft. Pretend nobody knows anything and this is the first draft. What are the main points, and our justifications for them?

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Jonathan. I will proceed in that direction. Starting on the page two I guess it is with the statement, the background doesn't really need to be reviewed again, we begin by being generally in favor of standardizing the registry agreements for reasons of transparency, predictability, ease of review, ease of management, and that ALAC has been generally supportive of this and has not commented on prior use of the base registry agreement for renewals.

We note with approval, the inclusion of the public interest commitments, the inclusion of minimum requirements for rights protection mechanisms and adoption of the registry code of conduct, all of which come along as a result of adopting the base registry agreement as a model, also amending Spec 5 to govern the allocation of two-character labels, and then we note specifically that At-Large has been a strong supporter of PICs and we welcome the formalization of them in this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, maybe we stop there.

GREG SHATAN: Okay, that's a good place to stop.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The general topic of standardization agreement and the things that come with it, rights protections come with it, PICs come with it, definition of two-letter domains, etc., let's open that piece of it, that statement up for conversation and points that people might want to make.

GREG SHATAN: Who was going to manage the queue here?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I can't see it, so maybe if you can manage it, Greg, that would be ideal.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. I have a hand up from George Kirikos. Please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Thanks. Yes, several people in the Zoom chat – I don't know if everybody's been following it – have said we wasted a lot of time on this issue, and it appears to me that people don't necessarily want to have a statement made at all. So it seems as though as a preliminary issue, we should first determine whether or not a statement should be issued, and then it would make more sense to go line by line after that. And we skipped over the history. I'd like to go back to the history and point out various important points in that section that should be highlighted, because I thought they were very important. Do we want to perhaps discuss first whether or not a statement would be made? Because last week, we decided a statement would not be made, and I don't see anything that has changed between last week and this week to justify making a statement. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Let's see. Before I hand it over to Olivier, I note that the discussion of going back to working on the comment was taken up on the list and asked and answered. Clearly, Justine and I wouldn't have been working all week if that decision had not changed. And one of the specific points made was that the list and the meetings work together. And obviously, we've been discussing this quite a bit.

Also, with regard to people saying we took too long on something, I construed that in the list of taking too long and discussing whether there should be consistency between registry and price cap fees, but Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Greg. In general, decisions are not made on calls. They always have to be made on the mailing list because only a subset of the people that are participating in the discussion are actually on a single call. So it's absolutely normal practice that if the discussion gets reopened on the mailing list after the call has said, "Well, maybe we've got no more things to talk about here," then obviously, the discussion gets reopened and that's why the discussion is still on the table today. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'd like to be in the queue, please.

GREG SHATAN: Jonathan, you are the queue. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'm sympathetic to George's point on this. I think the two reasons that came up for not filing a comment was Alan's point that he made that he believed that this was not something of end user interest, and the second point was whether or not we were going to be able to reach consensus. Both of those seemed in question when the topic

came up, and both of those have had new discussion on the list, including Evin's point about end user interest in this, and then there's been a move toward consensus on the list that we can see if it holds up on the call today. But there's been a movement towards a consensus. So I think that's why this is back before us, is because both of those bases for not filing have at least been affected by the conversations that have taken place on the list.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Jonathan. I think we need to pick back up then with the discussion of this point, which is general support for the standardization of the registry agreement and all that comes along with it. I hadn't seen any other support for going back and discussing the background since we're really trying to discuss what our recommendations are. Thank you. So I'll see if there are any hands up on this point. George Kirikos, please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Thanks, Greg. Yeah, I'm not against the principle of standardization. Standardization is a good thing. But the question is, why standardize on the new gTLD agreement which was specifically for new gTLDs which are entirely different than legacy TLDs? And that includes for example pointing to the rights protection mechanisms, which were specifically for new gTLDs, and not for legacy gTLDs, because the assumption for new gTLDs was that there was going to be a huge amount of cybersquatting and we needed all these new rights protection mechanisms.

So on that basis, trademark holders basically insisted on this, and there were lots of statements and predictions made as to the amount⁴ of cybersquatting that would occur. So those were put in, and then it was agreed that those processes would eventually be reviewed, and they are actually being reviewed, by the GNSO's RPM PDP. So to migrate to this agreement and to support the adoption of the URS through the rights protection mechanisms in Specification 7 doesn't seem to be correct because there are apples and oranges, the legacy gTLDs are different than the new gTLDs.

So I can see a general statement for standardization, but it doesn't follow that standardization should be on the new gTLD contract. So if you take out the parts that refer to the agreement that ICANN is standardizing upon, it would have my support. But to standardize on the new gTLD agreement doesn't make sense.

There's actually a good comment from somebody in the public comment period saying that there could be a bridge between the new gTLD –

GREG SHATAN:

George, it's been two minutes. We have to move on.

GEORGE KIRIKOS:

Oh, I didn't see a timer. Is there a timer?

GREG SHATAN: I'm keeping time. We have 17 minutes left on the call, especially given the frolic and detour on the dot-Asia discussion. So we need [to move on.]

GEORGE KIRIKOS: [There's no] frolic and detour, but –

GREG SHATAN: [inaudible].

GEORGE KIRIKOS: I'll give up my time.

GREG SHATAN: Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg. I'm just back from the Consumers International Conference with 140 consumer organizations, 450 participants of consumer organizations around the world, and trust me, they have no idea what is the difference between a legacy TLD and the second round and the third round and whatever. They have no idea. For them, a top-level domain is a top-level domain, and it definitely makes sense that everything gets treated the same way, which effectively means that, turning to George, what tells you that end users one day do not ask for the same rights protection mechanisms for the so-called legacy TLDs? Because in my view, that's what's coming up soon.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'd like to be in the queue.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Jonathan. You are the queue. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. I don't mean to keep doing that. I guess I would only add that this is not necessarily a declaration that the new gTLD base contract is in any way perfect, but that it's just the most modern and has the most things in it that people do in fact appreciate, and they weren't added specifically because the gTLDs were new but were added because these things were already a problem, cybersquatting and other issues were already a problem in the legacy TLDs. There was an opportunity to experiment with new ways of handling issues as part of a new round, so it wasn't meant to be something that was particular to them, and in fact, a lot of folks are hoping that they, as Olivier said, make it into the legacy TLDs as well. So I think it's just the most modern, but I think at the same time, if the policy development process leads to a change in rights protection mechanisms, a standardized contract will make it easier to then apply that change across all those contracts. So I think if it's inside the picket fence, as the term was coined by a board member many years ago, then it's something that having a standardized contract will actually allow the policy development process to have a more global impact when decisions get made.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you, Jonathan. I don't see any other comments on this, so unless there's any support for changing the direction, I'll take that as support for the statement as it stands, and we can move on.

Next point after this, there's just more detail on the things that come along with the registry agreement. I think we've really covered the whole thing at this point. Rights protection mechanisms, code of conduct, PICs, two-character labels.

So that brings us actually now to the price cap. In terms of what the recommendation here is, after a preparatory discussion, it really comes down to page six or so, that looking at everything that's been said by different people on the list, that we are essentially grappling with competing considerations and uncertainties, and after balancing the same, we do not find support for particular position regarding the removal of price caps.

That is followed by a summary of different positions that have been taken on the list, as well as I felt it was worthwhile to mention the NCSG position, which was another kind of middle ground position which recommended, A, perhaps changing from the 10%, and also recommending a review.

So even though that's not our idea and none of these are an At-Large recommendation, at least we kind of have commented on it and put the various threads of discussion out here. So I will take a queue, and I see George Kirikos has his hand up. Please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: You just mentioned that you quoted the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group right now with the price cap section. I'm wondering why you didn't quote the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group with regards to the rights protection mechanisms where they are against the proposal and against the statement that you mentioned.

It seems to me it's highly selective quoting of people that certain people agree with and certain people don't agree with. Can you explain that difference?

GREG SHATAN: Yes. In the section of the change to the new registry agreement, we generally have support and we have a recommendation. Maybe not 100% people agree with it, but there seems to be broad support.

With regard to the price caps, we have, I would say, a diversity of views along a spectrum, and given that diversity of views and the search for ideas, the NCSG idea in this case seemed worth citing.

But if people want to take it out, we can take it out. Thanks. Marita, please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: I think the fact that we are not pretending that we're all in agreement on this and that we've got the guts to stand up and say that, yeah, we have some disagreement, this is a controversial subject and we're putting forward a number of ideas that have come up through our group, and that we've even got the guts to say that there's an NCSG

proposal that we think is also pretty good, I think that's amazing. I really have to applaud Greg. And who else was in it? All of you who put this together –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Justine.

MARITA MOLL: Justine, sorry. This is wonderful. I think this is a terrific [inaudible], and we really need to be proud of this. And one person can tear it down all they like. I don't hear anybody else tearing it down. So yeah, if there's other people on this call who want to tear it down, well, come forward. Otherwise, let's just support this and say this is great, we've done the very best we can, it's been a tough week with hundreds of e-mails and an awful lot of ideas coming forward, and Justine and Greg have really crafted this into a really nice comment. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Marita. Much appreciated. George Kirikos, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

GEORGE KIRIKOS: Thanks. I would go back to page one of this document, which was the comment that ALAC submitted for the dot-net agreement, which said the proposed 10% annual increase which all goes to the registry is significantly high and should be reconsidered.

This is in 2017. That was a definitive statement. What has changed between 2017 and 2019? Remember, the new gTLD agreements were several years before 2017. So those were all always known.

There's a lot of cognitive dissonance in these statements where there's no underlying principle. There was an underlying principle in that 2017 statement, but there doesn't seem to be an underlying principle in this statement. So that's why I see this document is basically a mishmash of various statements really trying to say something. What it's trying to say seems very unbalanced in places. So I'm on the record and people can disagree, and they obviously will disagree, but ...

GREG SHATAN:

Maureen, please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you very much. I think that the conversation is going to such that I'd really like to get a sense, as John has suggested, take a sense of the ALAC on this statement. We've actually had quite a bit of discussion on it, pros and cons. I think that that's fair enough. But we can do a formal vote on it.

But just to move it forward, I'd like to get some [ticks in the space.] Let's trial this Zoom system that we've got. Find your name and give a tick or a cross.

With regards to whether we should – this is for ALAC members only, of course – we do have a quorum, and we'd like to see about how the ALAC members on this call feel about moving this on.

We do have to get something away by the end of the day. So if you could do that right now, that would be excellent for us.

So to find the yes at the bottom, or the no, and put a tick or cross, and it should show up. It did fleetingly – oh, it's still there – for me.

Has everybody found it who's on the ALAC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maureen, I can't see anything on this. I'm not sure who has the ability to see those yes or nos.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I see John Laprise and Baastian.

GREG SHATAN: It's on the list of participants.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I can see them now.

GREG SHATAN: Evan Leibovitch has a hand up. I'm not sure if that is to speak, but if it is, he may speak.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Hi. Just one comment. I'm hearing myself, so I'll try and do this shortly. Essentially, since this is a working group, although I appreciate that there's an intent to have a vote for ALAC members, I think getting a sense of the call and the rest of the working group and the other ALS members that are not on the ALAC, probably at least getting, shall we say, a feel of the room to use a [very good] concept, to get an idea of what the working group would like to do to get its consensus as well as those on the ALAC, since this isn't really an ALAC call. I thought the idea was that this is a working group that would then forward its stuff to the ALAC, so just in deference to the other people that have been working here to try and get a feel of the room, to get a consensus from the group as well as a specific vote from the ALAC people. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Evan, and I wholly agree. And I think I'm getting that consensus from the group. But we've got our staff recording the names of the people who are actually voting for or against this particular issue right now, and we can follow up with any of the others who aren't here or for whom the system isn't working, but also, it gives me an idea that formally, because the ALAC does have to vote on it themselves, it's already giving me an idea now from the people who have responded, both as a group which I think is fantastic, and from those on the ALAC who actually have indicated already, and I thank you very much. [Ta.]

GREG SHATAN:

Shall we then move on to taking ticks and crosses [inaudible] on the call?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Move on. Yes.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Should we take our ticks off?

GREG SHATAN: Have we gotten ticks and crosses from everyone on the call? Just as Evan suggested. I suggest that please put your ticks and crosses up now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Or the chat. [inaudible].

GREG SHATAN: Or in chat if you're not able to tick your cross or cross your tick.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That would be great. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm just on the bridge so you can count me as a yes.

GREG SHATAN: For those still getting used to Zoom, you can put your ticks up wherever you're able to typically raise your hand, or it's called feedback

generically in the system here. I think it's at the bottom of the participant list, or it's in the three dots menu if you're on mobile.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Or you can just put your answer in the chat if you can't find it.

GREG SHATAN: The system's a bit unwieldy at this point. I see only one cross, and I see one indifferent noted in the list, in the chat. Are there any other crosses that need to be planted for this particular question? If so, please put them on the list, on the chat, or in the participant list if you're able to do that.

I see the sane "no" in the chat as I saw as a cross. Evan has a cup of coffee, which probably means he stepped away to get a cup of coffee. I see a "no opinion" from Jose.

Okay, so I think – are there any comments on this? It appears that this has support, and [little] opposition, and some who have not voted one way or the other.

So I think we can move on. I guess I'll work with Evin to finalize the proposal now that we have taken care of that, and I'll turn it back to Olivier as our chair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg. We're not that far behind. The next topic in our agenda was the [temas the politica de ICANN,] otherwise known as the ICANN policy topics for those of you here.

Maureen, I know you asked for this to be added to the call. How much time should we spend on this? Maureen Hilyard.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Are you talking about the proposed topics, the HIT topics?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. Yes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: The SO/AC?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: HIT and the review, pre-meeting, etc. All that stuff.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Okay. I know that we don't have that much time. Do we? How much time have we got? I don't want to take it all up anyway.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have -3 minutes, so it's got to be fast.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay. Well, let's just stop it then, shall we? No, I think that for example along with this, I also sent Keith Drazek's suggestions about consolidating some of the issues, and I really just want to get a feel from the team here about what – did the suggestions that Keith made reflect what it is that we feel important to us as well?

Unfortunately, I can't find Keith's e-mail that I thought I kept, and so I haven't got the consolidated list with me. But we could do a survey on the e-mail. I don't want to take up any more time. But it is quite important that we actually get this, I think by the end of next week. I think it's the end of next week. So if we can get it early next week, that would be really good. Perhaps I'll send out a little kind of survey thing, and if you can fill that in and send it back to me, that would be really good. Is that okay? I only use –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

The action items have the potential ICANN 65 policy topics listed, the first one being policy around universal acceptance and steps to be taken by TLD operators, registrars, software developers and hosting companies, second one being DNS over HTTPS, third one being Nominating Committee review, fourth one being evolution of ICANN multi-stakeholder model of governance and [inaudible] hijacking, account takeover and attacks.

These were the topics, and then of course, there's the link to Keith Drazek's note that is in the agenda as well. I don't know whether that helps you or whether, since we have a few more days, we'll move it to next week's call.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. I think that some of those topics are old. I think the topics that they actually go over are a little bit different to that. I'll send out the one that I find, if you don't mind.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. So now we move into – do we have somebody else who wishes to speak?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I heard somebody.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Judith Hellerstein.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think I posted the ones in the chat. I think they were WHOIS accuracy, GDPR, EPDP, unified access, SSR2, ATRT3, NomCom, effectiveness, UA, privacy and proxy, DOH, future of multi-stakeholder.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's the full list, but I think that – there are seven sessions, and I think one of the things that the SO/AC chairs we're saying is that seven

sessions of high-interest topics is just too much. They wanted to get it down to about four, which is one of four sessions, and give three sessions back to the SO/ACs. So that's where the consolidation of topics came, of those that were actually seen to be relevant. And I certainly know that there was not any real interest in covering all of them, so yeah, we do need to go back to that. And I'll do that on the list rather than take time now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Maureen. Then we can move to our next point, which is Any Other Business. I'm not seeing any hands up. Judith, is that another hand?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I forgot to lower it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Judith. So with no one taking the floor, our next meeting – could I please ask staff when our next meeting will be, assuming rotation? Of course, bearing in mind today is a special day since yesterday was the 1st of May. We are on a Thursday this week, so next week, back to Wednesday.

ANDREA GLANDON: Hi, Olivier. Yes, so next week will be Wednesday, May 8th, and [it'll be the] 13:00 time slot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 13:00 UTC. Is that correct?

ANDREA GLANDON: That's correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Is there any clash within the already existing calls?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, the auction proceeds is at 14:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Judith. Some people might have to leave at some point then during the last half an hour of the call. We'll try and arrange it accordingly.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Thanks. Just for people to give heads up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Judith. That's helpful. So 13:00 UTC next week. Thank you, everyone, for being on this call. It's been yet again very exciting, very interesting, and we saw a lot of movement on the mailing list this week. And really, it's a good sign. It's a sign that a lot of people are getting involved. And yes, okay, we might not always agree with

each other, but that's what actually a good debate comes up with better statements at the end.

So with this, Jonathan, did you wish to add anything to – because I do realize that you don't have access to the net at the moment, so Jonathan Zuck, anything you wanted to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I'm fine. Thank you. We'll see you next week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thank you. This call is now ended. Thank you, and thanks to our interpreters for this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You might have a bit of a clash if you go too long with the subsequent procedures working group next week. But we can multitask, I guess.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: When are the subsequent procedures next week?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 14:00 UTC, so there's a half-hour overlap.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was told that it was only the auction proceeds that were that. If we move this call half an hour earlier, is that easier?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, because then it clashes with ATRT3.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Lovely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So I'd rather you [leave it] where it is and note that some people will have to leave before the end of the call, or multitask.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's all I was going to say, let's just try to do an hour call and we'll only go over if we need to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thanks to our interpreters for staying the extra ten minutes or 11 minutes, and this call has now ended. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night.

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]