
YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call, taking place on Thursday, the 9th of May, 2019, at 13:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Sébastien Bachollet, Vrikson Acosta, Eduardo Diaz, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Gordon Chillcott, Rudi Daniel, Haroun Mahamat Cherif, Jose Lebron, Alberto Soto, and Kaili Kan.

On the Spanish channel – oh, I’m so sorry. I also see that Avri Doria has joined us on Zoom, as well as Abdulkarim Oloyede. On our Spanish channel, we have Sergio Salinas Porto.

We have received apologies from : Justine Chew, Marita Moll, Maureen Hilyard, Jonathan Zuck, Satish Babu, Ricardo Holmquist, Glenn McKnight, Holly Raiche, Herb Wayne, and Bastiaan Goslings.

From staff side, we have Evin Erdogan and myself, Yesim Nazlar, present on today’s call. I’ll also be doing call management for today’s call.

Before we start, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

Now, I would like to leave the floor back you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Can everyone hear me well?

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.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes. Loud and clear.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Well, welcome, everyone, to this call. I'm really sorry to have to apologize to you to start with today because, as you all have heard, Jonathan Zuck is not with us today, so you're going to have to bear with me for the full length of the call. Let's hope that we manage to do it all in time for today's call.

We have a full agenda, as usual, perhaps less than usual with first an update from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. I haven't heard them being here in the roll call yet, which means we might have to move that agenda item a little bit further down until they arrive. I know that we are clashing with a number of other calls, so this is one of the reasons we might have to just jump things around a little bit today.

Then we'll have policy comment updates with Evin Erdogan on a number of comments that are currently being created, and then we'll have a discussion with Maureen Hilyard on the high-interest topics for ICANN 65. You've got the list that is given there.

Any other business to add, or are there any amendments to make to this agenda?

I'm not seeing anybody. You might be hearing some noise in the background. I apologize. There is some drilling going on around the corner from here, and I can't do anything about it. It's been going like this all day.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien speaking, if I can.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastien, please. I'm not seeing your hand up but ...

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, you can't. I'm just on the phone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You're just on the phone? Okay. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just to say that we need also to start to prepare for the Marrakech meeting. It's a good idea that was organized last time by the NomCom to have the who and about what topics we will talk about. It's maybe also linked with the discussion that we will have with the high-interest topics. But maybe an additional point that we want to have some text ready for us to deliver. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. So what we'll do is add this to the high-interest topic discussion for ICANN 65 as a Part B to this. Then I guess we can start the ball rolling here and follow up with Jonathan when Jonathan is with us next week.

Okay. I'm not seeing any other hands up, and therefore the agenda is adopted with that amendment. We can look at the action items, which are all complete from last week. I don't think there's very much else to add to this.

Are there any updates, Evin? I know that most of the action items are allocated to you. You completed them all. Is there any follow-up on any of them?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Hi, Olivier. Can you hear me okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Great. They're all complete, so thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. I don't believe there is any follow-up on them, in which case we can move to Agenda Item # ... Now seeing that neither Alan nor Hadia are with us, I propose to go to Agenda Item #4, which is the policy comment updates. For this, we can go back to Evin Erdogdu.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'm actually on the call.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Great. Thank you, Olivier—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, you're on the call. Okay. Hadia, can we go with you after the policy comments updates, please?

HADIA ELIMINIAWI: Sure.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. It's just because I'm not sure. Alan did not give any apologies, and he also is expected to be here. So he might be delayed by something, in which case, if we do the policy comment updates, then we'll have both you and Alan as a follow-up.

So let's go to Evin. Back to you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Great. Thank you, Olivier. Without Jonathan, I'll just run through the recent comment update. We touched base before the call today, so I have an idea of what he was hoping to get from the group today.

Firstly, recently ratified by the ALAC was a comment from last week, the ALAC statement on the registry agreement renewal: .org, .biz, and .info. The executive summary of this comment is on the agenda for you to see, as well as on your screen in the Zoom room.

Last week, the CPWG recommended to the ALAC to mark a no statement for the label generation rules [inaudible] versus [inaudible] since it's usually not a topic that the ALAC comments on. So today there'll be formally marked as no statement, [barring] any feedback from the ALAC.

Then we currently have submitted and now for ALAC vote is the proposed renewal of the .asia registry agreement. On last week's CPWG call, Holly contributed her draft input with Maureen, and they submitted the statement as co-penholders. That vote will close on the 11th.

Then we have two public comments that the ALAC will be drafting statements on, one that Greg will soon guide us through for further feedback. He has a presentation to share. I'm not sure he's on the call yet, though. There are four penholders for evolving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, and those four penholders are Greg, Marita Moll, Judith Hellerstein, and Abdulkarim Oloyede.

Finally, we just need some volunteers are penholders to get started the public comment on process proposals for streamlining organizational reviews. So, if anyone is interested in volunteering for this topic, the public comment closes on the 15th of July. That's the only [open] public comment now that needs a little bit more input.

Thank you, and I'll turn it over back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Evin. The floor is now open for any comments on these proposals. The one that I wanted to ask about was the process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews in particular – there is phone ringing at the moment. I hope this doesn't [inaudible] block my way. Somebody has to turn their speaker off for the feedback now.

We are frantically trying to find the [mute] [inaudible]. Okay, so not there. If you are both on the phone and on the Adobe Connect, you will have to turn off your – either mute your phone or mute the speaker on the Adobe Connect.

YESIM NAZLAR: Olivier, if I may. I'm so sorry for interrupting. According to the operator, it's coming from Hadia's line. Hadia, could you please mute your computer? I'm not able to mute you from here.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [inaudible]

YESIM NAZLAR: Hadia, please mute your computer, your laptop. Okay. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That was a miracle. Thank you so much. That happened. So, coming back to the question that I was asking, is there any volunteer for

drafting or looking at this process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews? In the absence of somebody putting their hand up, I was going to suggest that we send a note to the people that drove the At-Large review. So, our driving group. I don't have all the names in my head, but maybe we would have someone from there.

Is that okay, Evin? Or—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, if I can. Sebastien.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. I suggest you can send that to a member of the ATRT3. This is one of the topics of the ATRT in itself. Maybe the three members not co-chairing the group. It could be a good group to do that. I am one of them. I suggest that Vanda, Daniel Nanghaka, and myself take that onboard if they agree and if you agree. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Sebastien. You mentioned three members. There's also Cheryl Langdon-Orr, I believe, also in this.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, but she's co-chairing. Therefore, I assume she is not ... Do what you want. I don't care.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to make a comment if you want me to, or I can just stay silent on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Cheryl. Please, you have the floor. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, yes, I am co-chairing. That is a particular role in normal circumstances, so I think it's a role that can therefore assess the [actor] a commentary level but not be a primary penholder. In fact, that's no different to the approach that I've taken within every single piece of input on every single possible comment for every single topic since 2005. I prefer people who are primaries, other than in exceptional circumstances, to not be the primary penholders but to be adjunct and assistant to. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Cheryl. Let me just ask the four members to work out between themselves if they wish to comment. And then come back to us next week with a response, please.

Okay. So that's one dealt with. Now, with regards to the other ones, I do note that there are some presentations here. Of course, the renewal of

.asia agreement has gone into the vote. Evolving ICANN's multi-stakeholder model – was there going to be a presentation from Greg on this, or any of the other members? Marita, Judith, and Abdulkarim could take this. I see there are two presentations, so I wasn't quite sure what was supposed to be there.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Olivier, Greg is making a presentation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Why are there two presentations? Are you aware?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think maybe she put up the PDF and the PowerPoint.

EVIN ERDOGU: Olivier? It's Evin.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Evin? Go ahead.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sorry. If I may. Sorry for the confusion. Greg sent through a wonderful presentation to the CPWG list [inaudible] giving context for this comment. But for presentation purposes, Jonathan requests that we just have a slide deck that's a bit shorter with just the title issue. So, just

for presentation, there's a shorter deck, but the other one is supposed to [be] a resource for all participants.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Evin. That explains it all. Because Greg isn't here, we'll have to wait for him. He has mentioned that he would be delayed arriving into this call.

GREG SHATAN: I'm here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Or I do note Greg is here. Is he here?

GREG SHATAN: Yes, I'm here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, excellent. Okay. Welcome, Greg. You just have arrived. I thought you were going to be delayed, but you just made it. We are reaching the evolving the ICANN multi-stakeholder model presentation, which you have produced. Sorry for putting you on the spot, but would you please be able to take us through those slides.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah. I actually don't know what's on these slides because they're not the slides I prepared. So that's somewhat of a problem, but I can –

EVIN ERDOGDU: Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Yeah?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sorry. This is Evin. I just kept the first slide introducing how this comment and then just listed the issues that you listed. So—

GREG SHATAN: Okay. We need to talk about how the presentation is supposed to be. There were three slides called Preparing the Comment that are important to understand how this particular comment is being requested to be done.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Okay, sure. If I might ask for call manager, we could upload Greg's original presentation. But Jonathan did want a short presentation.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah. I contemplated that issue and I have a way of dealing with that. But I'd like people to see what the full deal is because it doesn't make sense in the abstract.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Okay. Thank you. [inaudible]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If you can bear with us a few moments while the slides are getting uploaded.

YESIM NAZLAR: [Evin], I'm sorry. This is Yesmin speaking. It takes a bit longer compared to Adobe Connect. For me, it's more confusing as well, unfortunately. Okay. So ...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: There we are. So—

YESIM NAZLAR: Sorry. Just give me one second please ... okay. Now I'm remember. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is that working? Fantastic, Yesim. Thanks very much. Over to you, Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. I promise this won't make much more time than the five slides that were here before, even though this is now [inaudible]. So, as we all know, the ICANN Board asked the question at ICANN 63 of, "How can the ICANN stakeholder model be even more effective without

compromising our bottom-up and inclusive decision-making process?”
At ICANN 63 and 64, issues were collected from the community in the [inaudible] public meeting and collected into a document.

Next slide, please. That draft issue list below is the basis for the public comment. The reason I wanted to have it out here is that the job here is to actually add to this list and comment on it and [prioritize]. We won't go through the whole list in detail, but it will be here in the presentation. Basically, this is more or less the raw input from the community.

Next slide, please. As I noted, we're asked to add our statements to those found in the issues list and also to prioritize issues on the impact they have on the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model. All of this together is supposed to provide the final prioritized issues list. So we have two jobs: adding and prioritizing.

Next slide, please. What we were asked to do for each issue is provide a specific example about how the issue hampers effectiveness and a specific and clear articulation of the issue that is clearly and fully defined and that is fact-based. So basically they want to avoid abstract rambling. If there is a new issue to be considered, provide a clear articulation of the issue with examples and rationale. If you believe there's an issue that is on the list that doesn't belong there, provide a rationale about removing.

Next slide, please. Here is an idea about prioritizing: looking for the greatest impact, looking for interdependencies between issues, looking for ways to favorably impact effectiveness at a potentially lower cost,

looking for ways to favorably impact the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model without introduction of unnecessary layers of process or bureaucracy as compared to the necessary layers, of course, and also look for any issues that can be combined or consolidated because they're so similar, and then consider any interdependencies that argue against consolidation – somebody has got [inaudible] me? Hello?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hello, Harold? Are you available?

GREG SHATAN: Excuse me?

YESIM NAZLAR: [Peggy? Peggy], I think that was you. We heard you on the English channel.

Okay. I think it's gone. Apologies for interruptions, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: No problem. So that's the ICANN org advice on how to prioritize.

Next slide, please. Now we get into the issues. I'll basically just be reading the top line. You'll see, as the slides go by, what the issues [inaudible] that came in from the community. For whatever the reason, the issue from ICANN 63 are very short, and the issues from ICANN 64 are very long. I guess that has to do with how they were transcribed or

boiled down. The first issue is the timing of decision-making. Our processes take too long.

Next slide, please. Actually, before we go, what I think would be helpful as people look at this is to think about the issues that At-Large should prioritize, first in terms of where we should comment or add to the comments. I assume we probably will not comment on all 20 issues areas, but we need to figure out which are the ones where we want to have an impact and then think about specifically what the things are that we want to say. I'm sure there's some comments in here that already come from At-Large members or At-Large perspectives. You'll see that there a few topics that have no answers yet because there were essentially added to the big list after ICANN 64. So here are again the issues on timing and decision-making that came out in ICANN 64.

Next slide, please. That's more of the same on timing and decision-making, different points. I will not go into specific points, but they are there.

Next slide, please. Issue #2 is complexity in any way that you wish to define that.

Next slide, please. Issue #3 is the ICANN culture or cultural issue.

Next slide, please. More discussion of problems with our culture, external and internal.

Next slide, please.

YESIM NAZLAR: Greg? Apologies. This is Yesim speaking. Our interpreters are asking to speak a bit closer to your microphone, please. I think your audio is a bit faint for them. If you could please do so moving forward. Thank you very much.

GREG SHATAN: Sure. Okay, I'll get closer to my mic. Is that any better?

YESIM NAZLAR: I think so, yeah. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. I'm on a tablet, so the microphone is in some mysterious locations. So Issue 3 is culture. Here are the comments from ICANN 64.

Next slide, please. As you can see, this got a lot of comments. Issue 4 is how we prioritize our work and who sets those priorities.

Next slide, please. More comments from ICANN 64. As people remember who were there, that was the very big meeting with a lot of people going on at length, so that accounts for these. You might see your own comments in here.

Next slide, please. Issue #5 is demographics, which appears didn't really come up in ICANN 64 discussion. That's a topic that probably could be fleshed out in a lot of different ways: age, gender, geography, background, etc. It looks like the one comment from ICANN 63 really

goes more into of what we'll call engagement or on onboarding or second-level onboarding.

Next slide, please. Issue #6: Recruitment. Obviously, that's a topic near and dear to many people's hearts.

Next slide, please. Issue #7: Representativeness. Somehow it's different from demographics. I think this has to do with stakeholder representativeness really more – internal balance and the like.

Next slide, please. Issue #8: Inclusiveness, which, in many ways, is viewed as a double-edged sword, creating issues, as well as being a hallmark of the system.

Next slide, please.

Next slide, please.

Next slide, please. A lot of people wanted to talk about inclusiveness, and given the spirit of inclusiveness, they did. Next is the issue of consensus and how consensus works or doesn't work and how it's defined and the like.

Next slide, please. Issue #10: Precision in scoping the work. Not much written here, but clearly something to think about.

Next slide, please. Issue #11 – near and dear to people's hearts as well – accountability. Then issues are noted about accountability as well.

Next slide, please. Issue #12: Transparency.

Next slide, please. Issue #13, which has been getting quite a lot of attention lately, especially as the glut of money from the last New gTLD Program has petered out. Costs were noted. I see Eduardo's question in the chat. The question is whether we will be adding any issues to the ones listed here, and the answer is that, yes, we have the option. So add completely new issues or headings as well as , if not almost a requirement, the obligation to try to add where necessary to the issues that are already listed and our own viewpoint on those.

Next slide, please. There's more on costs.

Next slide, please. I think of George Sadowsky when I see this slide. Issue #14: Trust. Really, the lack of trust and how to create trust.

Next slide, please. Issue #15. I probably should have split this into two slides if people actually wanted to read it. But in any case, roles and responsibilities. This has a lot to do, really, with the Board versus org, staff versus stakeholders versus different parts of the community. I'm not prioritizing issues by the amount of time I spent talking about them. I see Alan's comment [that] trust is of critical importance and that probably people would say that's the root problem behind a number of other problems here. So it's really up to decide how we're going to prioritize and what we're going to add to this. In a way, prioritization is at least as important as adding, given the length of this list, as you will see. We only have a few more to look at.

Next slide, please. More roles and responsibilities discussion. Again, really, Board, org, community – the mix, if you will.

Next slide, please. Issue #16: The efficient use of resources. Something that we are always trying to do better. I see a comment, for instance, that our nose is to the grindstone now. The EPDP has been working 30 hours a week. I'm Co-Chair of one of the PDPs. That's a full-time job, etc. So fairly an issue. I would also add to this "identifying the proper resources," to use our human resources most efficiently, not just focusing on how to efficiently use existing resources.

Next slide, please. Issue #17 – a corollary to Issue 16 – volunteer burnout. Noting the issue in ICANN 63 of moving from onboarding to engagement or from recruitment to retention and concerns about how people are coping with burnout. I see endemic lack of preparedness, itself a corollary to volunteer burnout, people tending to show up but not necessarily having done the [homework].

Next slide. Issue #18 is siloes and the related issue of tribalism as part of that. There's too much siloes, too many people in the trenches either not looking at the big picture or not looking at anybody's viewpoint but their own. Tribalism is the idea of being defined by who you're against. There were actually two separate comments on tribalism I combined into one, but I don't want to lose that emphasis on that issue.

Next slide, please. More silo-ing comments. What are silos? Silos are separate compartments that people stay in and don't get out of that don't communicate with each other. It's an analogy to grain siloes, which are sometimes on farms: tall, circular containers that are meant to keep one type of grain or product away from all the other types. Some siloes are not round, although the [cute] farm ones are. But in any case, it's an idea of enforced separateness and a lack of any vision of

what's going on in any other part of the community. So that's the way to decode that slightly idiomatic use of the term.

Next slide, please. Issue 19: Work processes and how well working groups work and how well they're equipped to manage the work as well.

Next slide, please. This is more [a] comment on work processes that feeds into the PDP 3.0 discussions that are being had, really at the GNSO Council and occasionally involving the others. The EPDP is essentially an experiment on a slightly different work process.

Next slide, please. More comments on work processes. I think that's obviously a central issue. A lot of comments on that. The ultimate implementation issue, in a way.

Next slide, please. Issue #20: The holistic view of ICANN. Not commented on at ICANN 63. The question noted about where is the place where we can take a holistic view. Is this ATRT3 or something else? [That's] it's one of the many charts and graphs and infographics prepared by ICANN org. Is it the world's longest set of flowcharts or is that getting us away from a holistic view? Interesting topic [perhaps].

Next and last slide, please. Terms. Really, term limits. The comment was here was, if there was only just a single one, that everyone in this room decides that he or she does not have one or two terms in a row. So concerns about a permanent establishment [but] a semi-permanent establishment.

That is all the slides. I saw a question in the chat that these issues seem so overlapping. Can't they combined? The answer is definitely yes. We're invited to suggest how these issues could be combined. The first two slides discuss a couple of the parameters around how they would like to hear that suggestion expressed in talking about interdependencies and also, if there are any interdependencies or counter-dependencies perhaps, that argue against combination. I can see the comments. I can see the comments, as many in the chat as I can see. Unfortunately it's hard to see all the windows open at the same time in Zoom. [Maybe] that'll change. Yeah, siloes definitely can be used as a power preservation model. Maybe not exist for that purpose, but they can be use that way. Or they may exist exactly for that purpose.

So that is really the end of the slide. I think what I'd like to do is open a queue. One thing I don't have that perhaps Jonathan's presentation does have, or Jonathan's version of my presentation, is all of the issues on just a couple of slides without all of the text. But I wanted everybody to see the text here as it went by because our task is to add to these comments and perhaps to argue that some of them are misplaced or to comment upon them positively or negatively. I thought it was important to see it in this fashion, so I apologize to Jonathan Zuck for overruling his slide and rule, so to speak.

So perhaps we might even want to put up the other presentation now, if that's not too difficult. But I'd just like to see if there are any comments from anybody so far as what you've seen in terms of approach which things – ALAC, At-Large – should comment on, whether we should try to comment on everything, etc.

I don't see any hands, but I'll just stop talking and let this percolate for a bit. That's a lot of information—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. That's certainly a lot of information in front of us. If I could ask Yesim to turn to the other slide deck, please. That's a shortened one with the just the issues. In the meantime, two quick questions. One was from Eduardo Diaz, asking in the chat, "Are we adding any issues to the ones that are already there? Is there a chance to add further issues than the ones that are listed?"

GREG SHATAN: The answer to that is yes, absolutely. They want those to be justified and with facts/examples. So it can't just be, "I think we should talk about kosher food." There needs to be an example, a case made, for it. But very much so. I think they want issues to be added, issues to be combined, issues to be eliminated to be coming from the community.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Greg. Other question. I've slotted myself in the queue. Is there a chance today of suggesting that the whole model should be turned upside down and the ACs – let's say as an example – make policy – and the SOs ... So the advisory committees make policy. The supporting organizations comment.

GREG SHATAN: Well, I would say that, in a sense, everything is on the table. The second-to-last slide, I believe, was the holistic view of ICANN. I think that that's the heading under which I would put a suggestion in like that. I think that that exposes a deeper issue, maybe a feeling of powerlessness among ACs and a feeling of proprietary-ness about policy from SOs. One can always from a SO to an AC, at least individually. It's certainly an interesting question. I would take that as well more than face value. It's actually quite provocative in a good way. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. There are questions as to sharing this slide deck. Both slide decks are on the agenda page. They're both linked in there. The next is Alan Greenberg. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I put my hand up to the question of, "Can we add more things?" As was said, we certainly can. It's not clear there are a lot more issues, so I suspect we're going to find that most of our issues fit already into one of these other areas. There's no prohibition against adding something if indeed it's new.

On your last question of, "Does this process allow for us changing ACs into SOs and SOs into ACs?" or whatever, the intent of this is this is not a reorganization of ICANN, and it's not necessarily a reorganization of each individual AC or SO. There are processes in place for the latter. The lack of a holistic view is one of the issues here, that there is no forum to discuss, "Is ICANN organized in the best way? Or should we be rejigging

the whole thing?” Of course, the difficulty of that is everyone wants to protect their own turf.

So this is certainly a place to identify the lack of such of a forum. The intent was not to have this the vehicle which does the reorganization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Alan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: I'll let you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I don't know if you have any comments on Alan's points.

GREG SHATAN: I think Alan's point is very well taken on several levels. I think that I have nothing to add, but as [I] said, there's a lot to think about there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Dev Anand Teelucksingh asks, “Have the results of the diversity survey done earlier this year been published?” Does anyone know this?

There’s no answer for that, so maybe we can have this as action item and try to find out if the results of the survey have been published and take those into account because I do agree. I think that’s where Dev is going in that there is also a problem or potential problem of diversity in some parts of ICANN. This might have to be addressed one way or another.

I’m not seeing any other points at the moment, so I think we need to move on. Thank you very much for this update, Greg, and for this, and hopefully we get some points back. The Evolving the ICANN Multi-stakeholder Model consultation ends on the 4th of June, so, please, I invite you all to start commenting on this. As I mentioned the link to this Evolving the ICANN Multi-Stakeholder Model PDF is on the agenda page. Could I also ask staff to add this as an explanatory note on the wiki page that deals with this policy comment as well for others to be to look at, instead of having to go into the agenda?

With this, we can now move back to Agenda Item #3, and that’s the Expedited Policy Development Process. We have Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. I’m not sure who wishes to speak first but [work] it out. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It’s Alan. I’ll talk for a minute and then give it over to Hadia if she has anything to add. Can you hear me? Can anyone hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan. Absolutely. We can hear you very well. Proceed forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have been having problems. The EPDP has now restarted. We have had one meeting, the meeting this week. We are meeting in general on Thursdays, although that is about to change. The meeting this week is cancelled because of a GDD Summit, but we'll resume next week.

We have had a, as of yesterday, proposal from the new Chair and staff. He is proposing essentially a compromise, an in-between pattern between those who were saying, "Only work on access model," and, "We should work on that and the carryover stuff from Phase 1 of the EPDP in parallel." He's proposing essentially to do it in parallel but with a slower path on Phase 1 – that is, meet only every second week on Tuesdays in addition to Thursday's meeting on access, which we're changing the terminology from access to disclosure, using the term "access" for accessing one's own information so we have a little bit of clarity because we've had some confusion over those terms and people using them in different ways.

So that's a proposal put on the table yesterday. It has not been exhaustively discussed. It will. There will be some comments. I'm expecting it will go forward pretty quickly and I suspect go forward similar to what is proposed.

There is a proposal for hardlines to be set and trying to keep to them, and a timeline was presented at the same time. The difficulty, of course,

is going to be actually making progress on the multiple number of issues related to access. They have now been enumerated again to be agreed upon. But there is a list on the table.

So I'm optimistic the new Chair is taking a position that I think is quite reasonable. He's leading by example of showing that one can compromise on positions which seem to be quite separate from each other. I'm optimistic that we'll move forward.

The other interesting thing is, to the extent that Phase 1 issues can be resolved prior to the report for the access, the release of data part, that they will be included in that report. So we don't have to wait for all of the Phase 1 issues to be finished before we report on them.

So I'm quite happy with where we're moving. I have some specific comments on the details, but I think we're seeing progress. We hopefully will see movement in the right direction at this point.

I'll turn it over to Hadia to add what I've forgotten.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Hadia Elminiawi?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Olivier. I would add a couple of points. Goran Marby sent a letter to the European Commission, speaking of clarity with regard to the comments on EPDP final report recommendations, specifically referring to processes of assessing, legal basis, and controllership.

Actually, the response of the European Commission was positive in my opinion. They said clearly that their comments specifically the recommendations set forward in the report and that they have constantly urged ICANN and the community to develop a unified access model. They used the word “access” and not “disclosure,” so there’s nothing wrong with the word “access.” Some of the members would like to change it to “disclosure.” I think I’m fine with that. It doesn’t really matter.

So they said that they urged ICANN to develop a unified access model that applies to all registries and registrars and provides a stable, predictable, and workable method of accessing public registration data and, of course, that complies with the General Data Protection Regulation.

So I think their response is quite positive. They provided more detail with regard to the purposes and the legal basis and with regard to controllership, where they said that it was advisable to establish the roles and the responsibilities of the joint controllers for the relevant processing activities.

The second point is the timeline, which Alan also referred to. We’re expected actually to deliver an [initial] report for Work Stream 1 but after ICANN 66 in Montreal by the end of November. Just a reminder, Work Stream 1 is actually the system for standardized access – now they call it disclosure – of non-public registration data. Work Stream 2 deals with topics deferred from Phase 1, like data retention, [inaudible], legal versus natural.

They use in the proposed working method the word “disclosure of personal information,” and actually I oppose the use of this term. I’m definitely going to write this in an e-mail I actually think it should be “disclosure of non-public registration data,” and not private information. The reason for that is that some of the data items are not actually personal information by definition but that are redacted because it was thought that those items in combination with other information could lead to identifying the data subject.

My last point is with regard to the Technical Study Group model. I think we are all in agreement that a legal advice with regard to the proposed Technical Study Group model is required. Also, the question that was raised, “Does a decentralized disclosure model actually satisfy the privacy rights, and is it GDPR-compliant?” I think there’s a difference between a unified access model and a centralized access model. I don’t believe here that we are actually talking about the centralized would refer to a unified access model, and a decentralized would refer to otherwise.

That’s about it, I think. We are going to have a meeting twice a week, as we used to, but the meetings are going to alternate between Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2. So that’s it from me today. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for this, Hadia. I see Alan Greenberg’s hand up. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Some of the discussions we're having are – there's a good segue from the previous discussion to this. The amount of time that we can spend on things which are not substantively leading to solutions is quite amazing. The discussion of access versus disclosure. People have been vehement that we are no longer talking about access and that we should be talking about disclosure, when in reality, the two are the same things but from a different viewpoint. From the contracted parties, it's disclosure. From the point of view of someone who's trying to get the data, it's access. They're just the two sides of exactly the same issue, but yet we politicize it and end up with unending discussions on the terminology instead of trying to address the problem. We've seen that in a number of different places here. Just a comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, a quick question on this. Thank you for this. When one talks about access or disclosure, aren't these legally loaded terms as such?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, they're terms that are used within the documents, within the GDPR, but I'm not quite sure what you mean by "legally loaded." They have meanings, but, as I said, they have related meanings that are from a different perspective.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Like "disclosure" would need a subpoena or a judge or something and "access" would mean something purely technical.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, no. Disclosure is just the act of disclosing and under what conditions and terms will you as a controller or you as a processor be allowed to disclose information to someone else whether it's another process or within the overall thing you're talking about or whether it's a third party.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. The floor is open. Hadia, your hand is up again. Is that a new hand?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Responding to your question as to the difference between disclosure and access, as Alan said, it depends on who's talking. So, if you're a contracted party, you're disclosing, and if you're a third-party or a data subject, you're accessing.

However, I think how other members may see it is that disclosure might refer to disclosing only a piece of information, while access could refer to getting a bulk of information or an array of items. That might be how they're thinking, but actually it doesn't really matter. And, again, the European Commission used in their letter the term "unified access model." So they did use the term "access," so there isn't anything legally wrong with the term access, and it doesn't necessary have to refer to the rights of the data subject because this is how actually it was proposed to use the term "access." It was proposed that the term

“access” would refer to the rights of the data subject while “disclosure” would refer to access of third parties. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Greg Shatan is next.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. More of a comment than a question on the same point. I think it’s definitely a political power tug-of-war on this. I think those who seem to want to call it disclosure seem to want to emphasize that access is not a given, that disclosure is a privilege, that the data exists in its silo, so to speak, until a decision is made on disclosure, and that those who emphasize access emphasize that this database was meant to be accessed, it was designed and built, created, to be accessed. It’s like a discussion about open borders or other such things. I think there’s some people who are offended by the idea of access because that makes it sound like everyone doesn’t need to be invited but can get their way into the WHOIS database. So a lot of it has to do with the attitudes about privacy on the one hand, and attitudes about the different communities or stakeholders that are likely to be [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Greg. Next is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: In my view, Olivier said something very important when he asked what is the legal meaning – legal – that’s here involved. According to the dictionary, both the terms have a difference. Under the GDPR, in my view, there should be no room for interpretation. It is either one thing or the other. To enable access [for] disclosure – well, these two words imply to very different things. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alberto. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: That’s an old hand. However, I’ve heard what Alberto said and definitely could look more into it from a legal point of view and the impact of using the word “disclosure” instead of “access.” Again, I reiterate there’s nothing wrong, legally, with using the term “access.” And it is used by the European Commission. They never use the term “disclosure.” Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Hadia. Any other questions or comments? I’m not seeing any other hands up. Are there any additional things you wish to share on this topic?

I’m not seeing anyone. I had just one last question. You mentioned two different phases I don’t know what they’re called. Now, there’s two different groups. Will both of you be on both groups, or are you sharing the load between both of you?

Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, I guess we are sharing because the meetings actually alternate. So one of the meetings is on a Tuesday and would be on, for example, Work Stream 2, and the other be on Thursday, and that would be a Work Stream 1. So, yes, I guess so, unless we find that maybe it's easier to do otherwise. So Thursdays are usually booked for Work Stream 1 and Tuesdays are for Work Stream 2.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Well, thank you very much for this. Thanks for the slides. Thanks to Alan. I understand Alan has had to leave, but thanks to him as well. Good luck for the rest of the week. We'll speak to you next week for yet another update on the Expedited PDP.

We can now move to Agenda Item 5. That's the – we call the high-intensity topics, but it's the high-interest topics for ICANN 65. Maureen Hilyard, you have a small presentation for us, and you also have the floor. You have 30 minutes for this. Of course, that will also include a preparation for any other topics to be discussed at ICANN 65 upon the suggestion that Sebastien Bachollet made earlier on the call during any other topics.

So go ahead, Maureen. You have the floor.

YESIM NAZLAR: Olivier, this is Yesim. If I may, Maureen has sent her apologies for today's call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's helpful. Sorry, I hadn't noted that. Okay. Who's taking this then?

All right. I see that Evin has her hand up. Evin, you have the floor.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. I [inaudible] with Maureen briefly. As most of you know, she shared on the mailing list the most recent high-interest topics for selections. She wanted to finalize the latest by tomorrow. So most of you are familiar with these, but just to reiterate, there were five that were selected. The first one was DNS-over-HTTPS (DoH). The second was the future of multi-stakeholder model's governance. The third was effectiveness of specific review recommendations. The fourth was universal [access model]. The fifth was combined EPDP [2], GDPR, WHOIS accuracy, and the unified access model.

So today she just wanted to get a sense of finality of these topics and get any final input from the CPWG on this. She sends her apologies once again. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Evin. So, from the long list that was originally provided, these are the five selected topics. Are there any last-minute comments, questions, or any ideas? If the SOs and ACs decide on only

four sessions, which one of those would you remove? So let's go back to those and let's see if anybody wishes to speak to this or ... I'm not sure. Are we able to conduct a poll?

I see that Eduardo is mentioning [inaudible] #3, suggesting this. Hadia, is that another new hand, or not? Oh. And Hadia has disappeared. Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I'm also tending to look at #3, but my only concern there – I wish Jonathan Zuck was on the call because he is at least one of our review-meisters to know whether there is something deeper or more interesting than the title and brief description [that] would let us know. But if it's really just about the topic, I wouldn't say it's dry, and there's no reason not to have a meeting about it, but to give it one of the high-interest topic slots, which are supposed to be largely or entirely non-conflicted. It seems to be overkill. So, unless this is a much juicier topic than it appears on its face and a more broadly important topic, then that would be the one that I would relegate to the regular session – make it a B side rather than a hit. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Greg. We do have to remember two things. One, there is a public comment process that is open until the 15th of July that speaks about process proposal for streamlining organizational reviews. So that's quite a close name to effectiveness of specific review recommendations, perhaps.

The other thing that I do note from the chat that Cheryl mentioned is that this meeting is a policy meeting. So this effectiveness of specific review recommendations might not fit within the actual policy [quote].

I'm not seeing anyone speak against this. I see that Cheryl Langdon-Orr has put her hand up. She has the floor. Now. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just on that – and I'd like to think I'm one of the review boffins. I even have a badge that says, "Ask me about ICANN reviews," from a few years ago, remembering that this is a topic that is limited to specific review recommendations. Therefore, we are talking about the accountability and transparency review, the SSR, and, of course, those ones that are final, mandated, that are not reviewing the component parts of ICANN. The mandate for looking at that clearly fits under the Accountability and Transparency Review Team activities as well, and that is a process that is going on at this time anyway. So it's not that I do not think that this topic is unimportant. Quite the opposite. I think this topic is extremely, extremely important.

But even the public comment for the [inaudible] – have I been disconnected?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Not at all. You're still there.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So someone [inaudible]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But you might have to [inaudible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But, from an ATRT Co-Chair perspective – I haven't had this conversation with Sebastien and Vanda and Daniel yet – I found it, shall we say, "interesting" that this staff-driven public comment on the streamlining of the policy process is associated with specific reviews [and] was popped and published without so much of a [bye or leave] or heads up with an ongoing ATRT3. So I guess that kind of puts my biases clearly on the table for you. So, if you ask me, I'm not disagreeing with ditching 3 out of the [HRT] list.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment, apart from a discussion about A sides and B sides on records, which of course many people will not remember, since we're talking about vinyl. A sides and B sides. Perhaps even microcassette tapes, in some cases. But that gets us completely out of the discussion that we have today.

So, from what I see, the suggestion might be, if we have to come down to four rather than five, ditching the effectiveness of specific review recommendations. I've not seen anyone speaking any of the others. I understand that this is all coming out of the discussions that have been had on the ALAC mailing list. So that's it.

Great. Now, there's a second part to this. I know I can take a poll, Eduardo, but I'm a little concerned about the polling abilities. It's plain obvious that nobody is mentioning anything else, and this doesn't seem to be very highly contested at the moment. So I think we're find with it. So the other thing—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier. It's Sebastien speaking, if possible.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. That's what I was going to say. Now we move over to Sebastien's point. Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I wanted to, before going to my point, just say that maybe we need to have a short discussion on what the ALAC will do if the proposal from the GNSO Chair is supported by the other SOs and DoH is out of scope or something else is [inaudible] out of scope. Of course, we can't know what will we do, but here we have an ALAC position, an At-Large position, and a position of the GNSO Chair, who are different for one topic. DoH [inaudible] and the reviews for GNSO. How do we handle that and do we need Maureen to take care of that? [inaudible] deal with that? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Sebastien. I understand, from what I've seen on the SO/AC/[SGC] list, that the ccNSO has actually asked that the DoH

discussion be one of the discussions to take place. I've also noted that the [XVAC] has also agreed and echoed Katrina Sasaki's (the ccNSO Chair) points on DoH. So it's not like the ALAC are the only people that are interested in having DoH. So far, it looks as though the GNSO [inaudible] is the one that is in the minority opinion regarding DoH. So one can just move this way.

Greg Shatan, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I was just curious what the GNSO reasons were for leaving out DNS-over-HTTPS since we are supposed to be an organization with a narrow technical remit, even though we seem to spend an inordinate amount of time on policy. Just curious about that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Greg. Actually, it comes from a message from Keith Drazek, the Chair of the GNSO, who actually mentioned that this was just his personal view, that he couldn't see this as gaining overall support from the different component parts of ICANN. So that was just a personal thought from him. But, so far, the response has been that there is interest across more than one group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Olivier. Yeah, I was trying to also reach for GNSO Council liaison hat and put it on at this time, as well as various other mantle. I

was going to point, as Olivier did, that this is Keith's personal view. It did not come from a Council resolution. But I can assure you that the Council focus is with the policy issues that are within its specific mandate at the gTLD level and that, preferably, are currently on its list of active activities. So, at this point in time, the GNSO doesn't have on its current actions list the matter of DoH. So that is probably where Keith's personal opinion is also being drawn.

With the reason for Maureen asking this group, of course, giving her feedback I think is not only a healthy process but it is in the opportunity that Sebastien was referring to, and that is for us as a cross-section of self-declared At-Large members who have interest in policy getting some guidance to her as the Chair and representative on the group that is going to be making the final selection of topics where our preferences lie. When you combine that with what is definitely the case of preference from SSAC and from ccNSO, we can probably predict what the outcome will be, assuming we give Maureen similar marching orders of what to drop and what to leave in. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this Cheryl. I think we got pretty straightforward answers for Maureen here. So DNSSEC-over-HTTPs, yes. Future of multi-stakeholder model of governance, yes. Effectiveness of specific review recommendations, possibly no, if one has to shrink. Universal acceptance, yes. And combined EDPD [2], GDPR, WHOIS accuracy, and unified access model, yes.

Now, we still have ten minutes. Sebastien mentioned that perhaps we should also kick around some ideas about what policy discussions one would have in Marrakech. I did ask staff offline whether we had an ALAC block schedule or not as to how many sessions we would have that were available. I have a feeling that this isn't ready yet, so if that's the case, not knowing what sessions we might have, it's going to be a bit difficult. We could definitely just have at least suggestions for topics at the moment and then, for next week, we can have Jonathan take up those topics and see how much time they might take and what to do with them, if that's okay with you. If you have any suggestions, please. So policy discussion topics, in the same manner as what we had in our last meeting in Kobe.

Anyone?

Is it going to be a policy meeting. I hope we're not just going to sit around the table and look at each other.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien. If I can.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I have trouble with my phone in reaching the group. It's not too much add to that, but [to] the previous discussion, I would like to suggest that we find who will write the [totem] points, as it was very

good things we got from Jonathan last time. When you take the [inaudible] we want to put [ahead] for the high-interest topics, we may ask, for example, for the EDPD's Alan and Hadia to do it [inaudible] multi-stakeholder things to have [inaudible] and the two other people who are working on that. Can you hear me? Sorry, I hear a strange noise in my [inaudible]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you. That's fine.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. And about UA, who will do that. I am remember to help with the DoH, to write a short note for the [Brazil] element talking point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sebastien. What I suggest then is – well, actually, I see Greg put his hand up. But what I was going to suggest is that we take this over to the list and have a few ... if you have any specific topic that you think would be important to discuss, that we can each write this on the mailing list. Then Jonathan will have enough in his hands in the next meeting with this.

Greg Shatan, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Just briefly because we're taking this to the list. I presumptively suggest this as a key policy topic: the ongoing major policy initiatives that the GNSO is managing. I would also suggest that we have a discussion of a PDP 3.0 because that has, I think, certain ramifications for At-Large's participation in policy-making. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. Will we have full details of PDP 3.0 then?

GREG SHATAN: It's not clear, but there is actually quite a bit about it floating around. Whether there's an official version of it is not clear. But, for instance, Jeff Neuman, I think, wrote an article about it in CircleID. There are various different things going on on the Council list. So perhaps our Council liaison – ah, she says, "Nothing official yet. That is to come." Thank you, Cheryl. But that's something we should keep on eye on, and, if it is to come before – but even then, if we do have time, [if it comes] out, we should definitely discuss it. If it hasn't, we maybe should discuss it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Let's put this down on the call for issues. Evin, are you taking notes about this? We can transfer this over to Jonathan.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yes, I am.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. If I may, mainly because I was getting bored typing back to Greg all the time, I thought I'd actually speak. I'm absolutely supportive of it being a good internal topic for discussion, wherever that happens, be that in Marrakech or in some other forum. This is not necessarily limited to face-to-face meetings. But it also strikes me that this working group, this Consolidated Policy Development Working group that we're in now, might also want to suggest to the ALAC leadership team that this is likely to be this matter of PDP 3.0 when it comes out for public review is likely to be a matter that not just the At-Large Advisory Committee has great interest in but other advisory committees, not limited to be certainly including the Government Advisory Committee, may have an interest in. So it may very well be a topic that would be worthy of bringing up in our interactions during Marrakech and beyond with at least the Government Advisory Committee as well. I suspect this is a

topic in which we may have mutual if not unified interests in. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. And that pretty much ends this discussion on today's call. So we will definitely follow up next week on this topic. For now, I think we just have to think about when our next meeting is going to be. I can open Any Other Business for a couple of minutes, if there is any other business to discuss.

With no other business, when would our next meeting be?

YESIM NAZLAR: Olivier, if I may.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Go ahead, Yesim. You have the floor.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. Thank you very much. I'm just trying to open my Outlook calendar. So I'm looking at—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I believe it would be the 15th of May because we're back to a Wednesday, but we have to look at the rotation.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Yes. Sure. So I think it has to be at 19:00 UTC for the rotation. Okay, sorry. Having some issues with my laptop. Okay. Looking at 19:00 UTC, if we choose that slot, that time, we're going to clash with the Work Track 5 for the last [30] minutes. The Work Track 5 starts at 20:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may, worse than that, you're going to run in parallel with the rotation of the Nominating Committee Review Implementation Working Group leadership team call, which is a standing 19:00 hour UTC meeting that now runs weekly. I was going to bring that up when we got to this part. It is not the full call. So it is only the leadership team call that it would affect, but it is something that at least every I think it will be then three weeks is going to affect some of the participants; i.e., I'll be in more than one call at once, and that's fine too. But just we need to be aware, Evin, that there are other new meetings that are not necessarily on the shared scheduled yet. So, if I could encourage you to reach out to MSSI staff's Lars or Jennifer so you know when the various ATRT3 meetings and their work party meetings might be being held. That certainly will affect Sebastien and Vanda and Daniel, not just myself. Also, Vanda is a very active part, as are probably about another five or six people that could be on this call that would committed to the NomCom review work as well. So we're just getting more meetings with more potential clashes, and we may need to be aware, if not perhaps adjust an hour each way sometimes. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Cheryl. What if, for the next – did you say five weeks or so? – we [lose] that slot and rotate between the current slot and the latest one that – or would that also clash with something else?

YESIM NAZLAR: If I may, Olivier, the 21:00 UTC will also clash with the Work Track 5. So, actually, what we can do, looking at my calendar – would you like to move it to Thursday for next week as well at 19:00 UTC? I'm not seeing any GNSO calls currently scheduled for that time, and we don't have any At-Large calls either.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The NomCom Review Implementation Working Group call on Thursday, the 16th, is in fact at 19:00 UTC. This is why I was saying you need to reach out to Jennifer to get the call planning for those ATRT3 and NomCom Review Implementation Working Group because several things have happened, unfortunately, Olivier. You've got calls that used to be, for example, in the Subsequent Procedures. You have calls that used to be only cycling every three weeks, and certainly they were rotating through the popular times. But they were only occurring as meetings every three weeks, [then] our weekly meetings. So we're going to get the potential for clashes more frequently. If we're in sync with those, then that's a problem. If we take them out of sync, that may not be a problem. So it's something to be considered. Right now, I think we can manage it, but I'd rather overlap with half-an-hour of SubPro Work Track 5 than I would take the whole block of time. Most people can miss the beginning or the end of a call better than trying to run call

two calls at once. I think there's only about half a dozen of us who can do multiple calls at once.

For example, throughout the first hour of today's call with you, I was co-chairing another call because of a clash. It can be done, but we're limiting our other participants. That's all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. I'm very disappointed with you. I was co-chairing two other calls at the beginning of this call. But that's fine. I can do three. You can do two.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, [inaudible] is fine. [inaudible]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Joking aside, if I take this correctly, we can stick to the 19:00 UTC on the 15th? It's not going to be the end of the world for you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible], but we do need to look at now these other calls that are relatively new in the cycling. That's all I'm saying.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Thanks for this. That's a job for Yesim. That's a huge task, actually, seeing the number of calls that are currently suddenly that are coming up and with the amount of rotation on so on. So, preliminarily, we can

pencil 19:00 UTC next Wednesday. If there are other problems with that call, we might have to move that, but Yesim is firmly in charge of this. She will find out, with GNSO, about the rotation of the calls there as well. We might be able then at that point to maybe rotate things in a different way. So we're out of sync with the others.

With this, I'd like to thank you all for being on this call. I think we had a good call here with a lot of discussions. Thanks very much to all of the people who have presented decks and provided us with updates. See you next week. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]