CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 14th of August 2019 at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Gordon Chillcott, Hadia Eliminiawi, Herb Wayne, John Laprise, Jose Lebron, Kristina Hakobyan, Leon Sanchez, Lutz Donerhake, Maria Kornietts, Ricardo Holmquist, Roberto Gaetano, Sebastien Bachollet. And on the Spanish channel we have Maritza Aguero, Lilian Ivette De Luque, Alberto Soto, and Harold Arcos.

We have received apologies from Holly Raiche, Justine Chew, Yrjo Lansipuro, Vanda Scartezini, Nadira Alaraj, Bastiaan Goslings, Greg Shatan, Alfredo Calderon, and Maureen Hilyard.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. Our interpreters for today are Paula and Claudia.

And before we begin, I would like to remind everyone that we have RTT for this call. I'm putting the link in the chat for anyone who wants to follow along. Also, a friendly reminder to please keep your lines muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise and to please state your name before speaking so that the interpreters can identify you in the other language channel. Thank you very much. With this, I hand it over to you, Olivier.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Claudia. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Welcome, everyone, to this weekly call of the Consolidated Policy Working Group and we have today the usual EPDP Phase 2 update. After that, Jonathan Zuck will take us through the Subsequent Procedures update, and then revisiting or looking in the geonames various scenarios. And since the last call, you have received some details and questionnaire about this. Then CPWG Charter and ideal process, which we've also spoken about last week. We'll then look finally, hopefully within the allocated time, at the three remaining current statements that are being developed, the critical one, a proposed definition of name collision and scope of inquiry and the Names Collision Analysis project.

Are there any other additional points to be added to the agenda or any amendments to be made to the agenda? Not seeing any hands up, the agenda is adopted as it currently is on your screen.

Then we'll go swiftly to the action items from our last call. All of them are complete. Most of them related to a final draft – well, sort of final draft of some of the statements that we had going through, and I understand that this was done, the one involving the Root System Advisory Committee or RSSAC. That's been completed, so there is nothing else really on this. Any comments on the action items? No comments on the action items, so we can then go to agenda item 3.

We have Alan Greenberg who will be able to speak us about what's happened this week at the Expedited PDP Phase 2 Working Group. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have nothing really to report. We are still laboriously slowly going through use cases and that is proceeding. So, I don't have anything else specifically to report at this point. I don't know if Hadia's on the call, she may have something. But from my point of view, we can go on to other topics.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. So, Hadia Eliminiawi, you have the floor.

HADIA ELIMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. As Alan mentioned, there is no new update with regard to the EPDP work. We have discussed again the ALAC use case with regard to the users, and that's about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. That seems to be a very fast update. The floor is open for comments and questions. I'm not seeing any hands up.

I do have one question. Reading the e-mail exchanges that are taking place on the mailing list, some of the questions seem to be going all the way back down to the basics of what the overall mission of ICANN is with regards to transparency – not transparency but consumer confidence, consumer trust, these are the things. I mean are we seeing any movement on this because there are certainly some that are arguing to not make use of the whole points, the whole case scenarios

that the At-Large has brought forward saying this is out of scope for ICANN. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: It demonstrates our ability to get distracted by red herrings. The issue of is consumer trust within ICANN's scope came up. To be honest, I have no recollection why it came up but it came up. And we then spent a significant amount of time certainly on the e-mail list and to a lesser extent during the meetings debating whether consumer trust is within ICANN's remit or not. Remember it's referenced in the Bylaws largely in relation to the CCT Review Team associated with gTLDs. It may or may not be relevant that consumer trust is within ICANN's remit, it doesn't matter in this case because we're not the discussing ICANN purposes, we're discussing the purposes of third parties who may have a valid legal reasons to look at confidential redacted information. Law enforcement will have access under certain conditions. Phishing investigators will have access. None of those are within ICANN's remit but we are obliged to make sure that, for instance, we have confidential data, it can be revealed when a balancing test is made for natural persons. In our case, we have many cases where there will be legal persons, where there is not balancing to be done, once we determined that it is indeed a legal person.

So, we got on to the discussion of whether consumer trust is within ICANN's remit and it's a great discussion. We can have it forever but it's not relevant in this particular case and it demonstrates that these conversations, some we get distracted by things and we've done a large amount of time debating something which really is not substantive to

the issue we're talking about. Somewhat a frustration and it's a result of large P – large groups of people each with their own particular interests, and it's easy for this to happen. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Hadia Eliminiawi.

HADIA ELIMINIAWI: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Consumer trust was as mentioned in the European Data Protection Board letter to ICANN on July 5, 2018 where they acknowledged that ICANN's role goes beyond the technical aspects. They did mention consumer trust. And in all cases, I think in relation to the ALAC use case what we are asking for to this use case is actually totally permissible under GDPR. The only reason this use case exist is because we are making our own laws. We are not making the distinction between the legal and natural persons and we choose to protect personal data of legal persons while GDPR does not require that, and that's why we have a use case like ours and I assume other use cases not explored yet might also arise because of that. Because we are deciding not to make this distinction.

Another thing also, whether we debate if customer trusted in ICANN's remit or not, it's not really relevant here. In all cases, ICANN is responsible for the registration data or the WHOIS for the coordination or the management. Well, this is a legitimate use of the data that is actually permissible by GDPR. So, again we went into those debates. Just to say that this use case, it does not matter and we don't need to

discuss it because it's not within ICANN's remit. But in all cases, WHOIS is and that's what we are discussing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Hadia. I'm not seeing any other hands up, so I think we can move on from the Expedited PDP this week. It's been rather swift and I guess you will continue the work in reviewing the case scenarios, much work to be involved in this. So, seeing no further hands up, let's now move to our next agenda item and that's the consolidated policy working group. It says CPWG, it's just the updates on Subsequent Procedures. For this, I'll hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck who's going to take us through the various points that are related to this. Jonathan, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I had just typed into the chat the most recent question that's come out of Subsequent Procedures related to geonames and it has to do with resolving contentions for not capital cities. So, it's basically two points to it. One is where there is a contention set for non-capital city name string, priority would be given to the applicant that intend to use a non-capital city name string for geographic purposes provided the applicant is based on the country where national laws exist protect such names like in Switzerland and Germany. Recall, that any applicant that wishes to apply for a non-capital city name for geographic purposes is subject to the preventative protection mechanism to get a letter of support or non-objection.

And then the other piece of this is that where there is more than one applicant that intends to use the same non-capital string for geographic purposes and they have both or all have obtained the reclusive letter of support then priority would be given to the non-capital city with the larger or largest population size. So, those are proposals that have come out of the Work Track 5, and that Justine needs guidance as to whether or not we have objections either of them or basically in support of them as she then responds within these Subsequent Procedures Working Group. So, I open the queue to folks that have thoughts on either of those things. This seem relatively logical to me as contention resolution. Alberto, please go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Good morning. I was trying to enable my mic. I think that there may be objections when you talk about the larger population size. Due to health problems, I was unable to continue participating in that group. I will try to join again as soon as possible. But when they talked about the number of inhabitants, the population, the number of inhabitants doesn't give you more or civil rights in order to get the use of a domain name. if you combine some other criterion, that might be possible but what may happen is that the number of inhabitants may not be the deciding element but you can have some other criterion in combination to that in order to allow the use of that domain name.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alberto. Do we have an alternative to population as a means for distinction? Did you have one in mind?

EN

ALBERTO SOTO: This is a strictly legal issue. But if I bring another specific criterion for allowing the use of that domain name, perhaps I may have different criteria related to those use that domain name will have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thank you. Thanks, Alberto. Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Hi, Marita Moll for the record. On the subject of the first case where national laws exist to protect such names like in Switzerland and Germany, I don't think there's a lot of support in the Work Track 5 for making this as kind of an exception. Why would you allow this to happen in just these two cases? So, that's an issue. I don't think it's a very popular idea.

And the other one on giving city name string to the larger city. That presents a whole lot of problems like how much larger does it have to be? Just one person larger, 100 people larger, tens of thousands larger? Now, there's been some support in Work Track 5 for setting aside the names of cities which are really, really large like 20 million people or something like that. This is far too big and why then in this case would you choose a size basis when all you could choose the history or the oldest or any of that stuff? So, that's also pretty problematic. So, on the surface of it, I don't think that we should be supporting either of these really. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. In the chat, Ricardo has suggested that the real solution should be to require the applicants to find a way to cooperate in the use of the TLD. Is that something that there's some support for on this call? Is that something that Justine should be advocating? I just put it out there and I'll keep going through the queue. Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Leon Sanchez. Good morning, everyone. I would like to draw your attention to session of the Standing Committee for Trademarks in WIPO. This session will happen on November 5. And on item 5 of the agenda, there is a proposal by several delegations concerning the protection of country names and geographical names of national significance in the domain name system. So we might be of course, discussing this issue internally within the PDP and I know for a fact that Work Track 5 is focused on this issue but I would like to encourage us to follow also the discussion within WIPO because it might influence or impact the work that we're doing within the PDP. So, this session will take place on November 5. It is part of a larger agenda from the Standing Committee on the law of Trademarks Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications. It is the 42nd session. It will take place from November 4 to 7, but the specific item in the agenda is item #5 and this will be revealed on November 4 and 5. So, I think it would be great if we could also follow that discussion as I think it will inform our work in regard to geographic indications. Thank you.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Leon. Do you have a link to that session? Is it something that everyone can –

LEON SANCHEZ: I do. I will post the link to the chat, the link to the agenda and the link to the main website where you can see all information.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Leon. Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess unless there is an overwhelming belief in At-Large and not just the people in this call, that these kind of solutions are the right way that we just keep silent on them. They're almost impossible to implement. How do we even know whether a specific country has a law in relation to something and then we have to start looking at the law and deciding whether it really applies in this case or not. This is the kind of discussion that judges make and I just don't think we want to get into it. We're building exceedingly complex rules and this still not going to address everyone's satisfaction. So, I think unless there's an overwhelming belief, these solutions are indeed good solutions that we just keep silent on these.

As Marita says, there are continually people raising issues when they don't get the answer they want. One way they raise it a different way and I'm not sure that we want to build rules like this into the Applicant Guidebook. That's my perspective. I don't feel very strongly if everyone

believes these are great things and we should go ahead with it. But I think they're unwieldy. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. I guess I'm inclined to agree with you but I guess the question is do we just stay silent or do we actually restate what you just said, that we're making this unduly complex and that we should be trying to oppose them?

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I'm implying we oppose them but I would like the people who are active in the group and I'm not active right now. I mean I'm watching things and I go to meetings when they don't conflict with something else, so I'm not the best one to speak at these meetings on these things all the way. I do on occasion when things get really silly. We could go either way. We could be against it because we're not for it or we could just be silent. I think it's judgment call at the time when they're having the actual discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know Cheryl has her hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, you do? I'm sorry, I didn't see it. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not a problem, Jonathan. It's not even up for merit. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Thanks for the discussion. I'm trying to be at arms' length as you may imagine seeing as some of the leaders in the whole process for the Subsequent Procedures PDP including the Work Track 5 work on geographic names. At this point, as we are trying to with the leadership team idolize or closed off issues, a lack of voice will result in no recommendation to change the existing Applicant Guidebook.

So, oppositions may extend debate and may encourage finding a middle ground or alternative solution and I would like you to consider, is that meeting your overwhelming or overarching desirability for less complex, not more complex, more onerous, and I'm afraid, therefore, more time-consuming and more expensive processes in any sort of assessment of new gTLDs. So, I'm not trying to guide you one way or the other but right now we are putting things up and saying, is this what's coming from public comments, this is what we've heard, this is what's being discussed, do you wish to continue Work Track 5? Yes or no? And unless a whole lot of voices say, "Yes, yes, yes, yes," then we don't lie or just say you understand where we're up to.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Cheryl. I guess trying to read between the line, you're suggesting that opposition is what may lead to returning back to the default of the existing sections of the Applicant Guidebook.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	No. If I may, Jonathan. No, I'm suggesting that oppositions tends to open the pathway for further debate and for other "new ideas" should be brought onto the discussion table, and perhaps to result in some sort of either compromise or other rulings being recommended.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Jonathan, it's Alan. I've got to leave this meeting in 30 seconds, so if I can just have one very quick word?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Go ahead.
ALAN GREENBERG:	It's the people in the meeting sense that this is going forward with this kind of recommendations that we are opening it to change the guidebook like this. I would think they have at that point consider whether they oppose it because we cannot. We are not actively supporting it. If it looks like it may just die, silence is the way to go. So, it's a judgment call of the people in the meeting at that time. How bad will things be if this gets adopted? If it looks like it's going to get adopted and we think it is bad and it will often depend on the subtle wording at that time, then they may want to speak up.

EN

If silence lets it die then that's a good way to proceed. It's a judgment call. We have intelligent people in the group. I think we have to give it to them at that point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Have a good meeting. I'm off to an auction proceeds meeting that's been postponed six times already, so I can't miss this one. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Get the money, honey. Alright. Olivier, I don't see any further hands, so I think that is it for this topic. I think we have some guidance to give Justine. I'll take it as an action item through reach out to her offline.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Jonathan. The next agenda item is Work Track 5 geonames. Did you treat both of them or that's a separate thing we need to look at?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think the only thing here is to remind people that I've circulated a survey based on our discussions about scenarios, and so there's just a series of scenarios that represent the conflict and an outcome to that conflict. So, they're very simply constructed in that way and the idea is you think that this situation there's a conflict likely is that outcome

satisfactory. Those are sort are the two questions asked about each scenario.

You can find it here at the link that I just put in. It's just a Google Forms document and we should be trying to get that out to as many people as possible. I asked that RALO leaders get it out to ALSes, and ALSes to their members, and let's try just for fun, see if we can get some real feedback from a broad base of our interested parties and members and see how people feel about these scenarios. Because if we get some consensus on these outcomes, we can work our way backwards to the actual policy positions that we support.

What we found in our meeting, in our attempted drive this via policies is that were unattended consequences to some of the policies that were being discussed such as the government having too much power and community is not having enough power etc., and so the idea behind these scenarios was to [inaudible] out or fair it out what outcomes we'd actually like to see and then we can work our way backwards to the policy that we'd like to recommend.

So, to answer your question, Ricardo, I don't think we have enough answers yet. I would – I didn't get this survey out at the time that I thought I did. I drafted the e-mail and then it sat my outbox until the NARALO call, so it was only at the same time as the NARALO call that I even circulated the e-mail with the link. So, please do circulate the link, cpwg.wiki/geosurvey. Let's say we'll give it a week and I'm happy to take any questions. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL:

Yeah, okay. I sent the survey out to my particular group, but in doing the survey myself I thought maybe [inaudible] was really too difficult for people who are not insiders. I think this is a great kind of effort and I think we should be doing a lot more of this kind of stuff. But I'm not sure just how fine tuning we are to whatever the prospective audiences are. Many people involved in ICANN is going to be able to relate to these questions but some of them are actually pretty difficult even for insiders, so it was a bit confusing.

The second question is likely, how would you categorize this outcome? I didn't know if you meant if I thought it was likely or if I don't think it's likely then do I just ignore that second question? There are things in here, so I think that this is really a test. We should continue to do this kind of stuff. Maybe it works off that beforehand. Let's see. I know we don't always have that much time but we could even take bits of this and see whether people could answer bits of it. So, I'm just trying to get across that.

I see [Gisella] also says she finds it confusing. I don't know that we'll get a lot of responses from my community because I think they're going to find it confusing. So, it depends exactly who we're trying to reach and how, and maybe we need different surveys for different kinds of things. That's my comment. And it's a bit late for a comment because I think that you put a lot of work into this particular survey. I know how much work it is and I wasn't there to make these comments as you were doing it and I apologize for that because it was just a rough summer. So, that's my comment. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Marita. I'm sure there's ways it could be improved. I mean that's why we had the survey out for comment from this group for nearly a month but at the same time I guess we were also feeling external pressure that we had come to this conversation rather late, and so I felt it was kind of we should just get it out at some point but happy to take criticism of it and potentially even make live refinements to how things are worded I suppose, as long as it won't change the outcomes that people have already responded and we can try to do better next time. This is our first attempt to do something like this. But thanks for your comments. Sebastian, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Yes, thank you, Jonathan. I will not apologize but I just looked at this two days ago and I say, "Oh my God." No, I have no God, sorry. I can't understand. I am really sorry. Sorry to say that but even for me, it's out of understandable. And therefore, if I give that to any member of ALSes they would say, "What you are asking me? Where is your discussion? Why are you coming to us now?" and "What is this [inaudible] conservative? What is a conservative NGO?" And so on and so forth. Therefore, I am very sorry, but it can't fly.

I know that we are time pressured. We know that we need the answer. We know that you want to do that to help us to get out of some dead end discussion, but frankly it's not possible. I raising that you need to withdraw this and to put it back to the drawing board and eventually with a small team to work on that. But sending a questionnaire is very difficult and this one is a Catholic church getting a domain name but they already got Catholic, so why, why, why? Then you need another

one? And plenty of things like that. I was really unable to get it and I don't know what to answer. I don't understand but I don't know what to answer. If I try to find a solution and I would tell you plenty of those. I will stop here because it's not fair. I'm sorry, Jonathan. Nothing against you and the work you had done but I don't see how we can work with that in multilingual worldwide environment about the very important and specific topic. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastian. Again, I would prefer that people just ask the questions that come up and we try to answer them at this point rather than withdrawing it. We had the document available for comments for a month prior to releasing the survey, so we've been talking about it for some time and presenting slides presentations about it for some time, and so it's unfortunate that it's now that we've released the survey that dejections are coming up. But I guess my preference would be is we get it out to people that we can and then take the questions as they come and then try to make revisions based on that because –

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am really sorry but you can't be like that. It's not possible to send to an ALSes. But I get your point, Jonathan. You're right, we are. I am surprised that nobody else [saw] that before, but it was not my main concern, but now that I have read it, even I stop at the green light. Sorry, but – yeah, I will say at least stop the question with scenario one, scenario two, scenario three because sometime we have the impression that it's already it was done, it was like that, it is your invention. Maybe

it's a good lesson. It's not just because you put it in a discussion in a group of 20 something people that the best place was this in that discussion. Thank you. Sorry, again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I'm taking my Chair's hat off and just as a participant to this. I've completed the survey. I did find some of the questions a bit challenging and I guess I'm not your average participant being quite aware of the points that are being made there. The only thing that I might say is, if we withdraw this, we're going to be back to square one and have absolutely nothing to work on.

What I would suggest maybe is this, one was to preface this or even put out in the e-mail that we sent out to ALSes and so on in to say, "Answer it to the best of your ability and if there are some questions that you don't understand or some cases that you don't understand that you don't need to fill them." I don't think that the survey is at the moment requires input on each one of the questions that are being asked and there are some cases that are a lot more complicated than other cases. Some cases are pretty straightforward and I'd imagine we would get some good answers on some of these cases because they're straightforward and others where people get a bit lost can just ignore them and then move on to the next question. That's what I would suggest, so that at least we get some feedback and something to work on. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier, and to answer Judith's question, like I said, I think we can modify the wording or something that would add more clarity to the question. I mean it is just a live document in that way. So, modifying the text of the scenario is not difficult to do as long as it doesn't invalidate the responses we've already received. So, if it's just to clarify, I'm happy to get that feedback and attempt to make modifications to the survey without withdrawing [inaudible]. And again, if some of it is not understandable to some people as Olivier says, it get certainly not fill it out or again I'm happy to fill questions as well to help clarify for individuals that have difficulty with it. Gordon, please go ahead.

GORDON CHILLCOTT:

Thanks, Jonathan. Look, the survey has already gone out of my home office to a couple of people in my ALS. How does that happen? There is a general meeting of my ALS, a monthly general meeting last night. If this document did nothing else, it started a discussion, that in my ALS unfortunately hasn't happen in too long a while. There are people out there thinking about it now, this survey will go out to several other members of ALS with some of Olivier's excellent suggestion going along with it. A week is may be too short a time for these people to respond. I'm going to get a couple of responses saying about the same thing as Sebastian did and that'll be passed a lot. But it did one thing that was valuable. It started people thinking about it. And with that, I'll say thank you, Jonathan.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Gordon. Since we're already late in the process but with respect to Work Track 5 but potentially on time in the process of making advice to the Board later on with respect to these issues, two weeks is fine or something if we want to give more time to folks so that we could back and forth on some questions that people have or implications. And again, I welcome those questions now. I'm happy to spend the next few days, if either Sebastien or Judith have specific questions that were confusing or overly complex or something, we can try to simplify them and try to get a sense of what were people's priorities are. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, Jonathan. May I suggest that you gather a team of three, four or five people and you have a call and you go through the questionnaire, not with 10 or 20 or 30 people, and try to figure out. If at that time I am available I will be happy to help. That's my proposal. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Happy to do a call. Staff, let's try to put out a Doodle poll for people that are interested in participating on a call to discuss the survey and to go through question by question. Happy to do that.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Jonathan, this is Claudia.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, yeah. Sorry, I didn't see you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Yeah, sorry I didn't put my hand up. Would you like that Doodle to go out immediately for a call early next week?

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah. That'd be great. Thank you. Alright, any other questions or comments. I'd appreciate the feedback and let's continue to refine the process [inaudible] experiment and it's something we want to develop the capacity to do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	I thought I put my hand up but I had to shift into using my mobile because strangely enough I'm in the Work Track 5 geonames call at the same time, so I'm not sure if my hands up or not. I just wanted to let you know that what's happening in my other ear is meaningful compromise on an important issue of quite long debate and from my point of view that this is good, this is healthy, there's possibly a light at the end of a tunnel on a very sticky issue. And I guess I'm concerned about this could work going on in one ear and me feeling very positive and very hopeful about what community-based support for proposal possibly coming out, and while hearing from CPWG in my other ear, which is all about let's get this information however large, response may or may not be, and then let's nip this in the bud based on this information with our advice to the Board if that's the way forward. I'm not sure what's that going to do in terms of reputation and the variation of our input.

Just wanted to raise it. I'm not saying don't do it again. I'm trying to be very careful here, but I am just very aware that there's an awful lot of good community consolidation of concepts and ideas going on at exactly the exact same time where we kind of let's start all of it over again-ish.

And then the other thing is ones it all goes out to the wild, I can assure you there'll be a lot of people who are deeply involved and deeply entrenched in some views in Work Track 5 that will think, "Oh fine, we don't have to compromise because this is going to be nip in the bud or whatever." I just needed to share that of course it was making me feel very uncomfortable, but that's okay. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. It may very well be that this is an exercise for us in consensus building as much as anything else. We will get guidance from Rita and from Justine and Heidi with respect to what makes most sense politically within the organization, etc. It seemed important to many that we began answering questions about this, and so we decided to take this on as an exercise. Like I said, it may mean that we'll be in a situation politically that we'll want to be constrained and thereby I don't know the answer to that. So for the time being, let's consider it an exercise and we'll just see what comes with that. But thanks, Cheryl, for expressing your concern.

Any other questions, comments? Okay, thanks. Olivier, that is now in fact the end of the geoname discussion. Back to you.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for this, Jonathan. I can hit the ball back to you regarding the CPWG Charter and the "ideal" process for our future work. You did send a presentation and you went for a presentation in our last calls. Are there some additional points now and what's our way forward with it? Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I think we made it to the first slide or something. Last time we were just talking about the – because there's some concern about having the CPWG be this Clearinghouse for all and we sort of devolved into a discussion about what the Finance Subcommittee should do to reconstitute itself, etc. I think the best way to handle that is that we will continue this way as those processes evolve to allow for a different dispatch mechanism, but I think there was basic consensus that we will continue to use the CPWG hopefully as an efficient way to dispatch work to others if it wasn't appropriate to fall outside of the boundaries of the CPWG. That was sort of the discussion that we had last time.

If we go to the next slide here, what we had basically is a process that looked like issue presentation. In other words, before the CPWG, either someone from staff or a CPWG member would present an issue, would look at whether or not it's within ICANN's remit and if it's not then we'd let it go. Is it a policy issue that's appropriate for CPWG? If it's not, we forward it to a group or a group reconstitutes itself to address it. We look at whether there's a unique individual end user perspective, and if there isn't then we look at [inaudible] or signing on to the comments of others. Then if all those questions are answered YES, then we go into a

process of developing a position and determining what action should be taken based on that position. That's in yellow because it's the whole next slide. But the next thing would be to forward it to the ALAC who would then vote on either that comment or that action to be taken because we are just the recommending body to the ALAC. The next slide. That was the ingest process.

We talked a little bit about individual end users. This is a conversation that comes up quite a bit. What's clear from those discussions is that there isn't an identifiable group of people, that our individual end users is in fact everyone. Instead, it's a kind of a role. It's a category of activities that fall into individual end user use of the Internet to do things like e-mail, surfing, banking, reservation, social media, media streaming, etc. So it's about everyone when they are in fact engaged as an individual end user and what those activities are and what that experience is that we are endeavoring to try to look into when we talk about individual end users. We attempt to identify the implications of ICANN actions to the individual end user experience and then prevent the degradation of and continuously improve that experience whenever possible within ICANN's remit.

So, I wanted to put that out there as a kind of a strawman definition of individual end users and again try to create that as a funnel for how we take on topics which is relevant to the conversation, so going back and forth with having [inaudible] and others on the list that we do make a pass at this to try and figure out if there is in fact a particular individual end user perspective.

Judith, you have your hand up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. My question is on the previous slide. Can we go back one? Okay, why are we putting end users after? Shouldn't we decide first if it's an ICANN remit and then decide if it's an individual end user perspective before we decide whether to forward it to same as group will go out of this group. I would think that would be the first thing we do. Then once we decide it's an end user perspective then we look at it. Is it a policy issue or do we forward it on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Judith. I guess I could see it going either way. The reason that I have it this way to feed the conversation is because very often issues we'll be forwarding are organizational issues in which we engage separately from the interest of the individual end users. So it may be conversations about areas of the budget for types of funding for education and outreach, etc. It isn't specific to sort of like policies that affect the individual end user but instead are just part of engaging in the ICANN community. That's why I thought that that would come first. There are issues we engage in but don't actually have specifically to do with individual end users because they're organizational. But I'm happy to [keep track] on that, but that was my logic.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No, Jonathan, it's a good logic. But maybe then we could have another line of saying, "Is this organizational or individual?" So then it would lead into that question because it seems that's a good question but if we are working on individual end users, we would think that everything

would be. So I think "Is it an organizational or individual issue?" could come first and then we decide if it's policy. Then is it a unique individual?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We could do that. I mean this could be recursive too. We can go back and forth. I don't know that it's going to be Olivier closing the door on one conversation as we move forward or something like that.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The top part were just reasons to get rid of this particular discussion, right? It's like a funnel, right? So if it's not in the ICANN remit then we need to just stop talking about it. Net neutrality or something like that. Is it something appropriate for this group? It felt like the next conversation, and if it isn't then send it along as well. Then it's a more involved discussion to figure out whether or not a particular topic truly impacts individual end users.

So less of a checkbox question and more of a discussion within the CPWG about whether or not … There's a much more philosophical discussion going on when trying to determine the unique individual end user perspective. As opposed to the policy issue or the ICANN remit which is intended to be more of a checkbox of, should we continue the discussion or toss this out? Does that make sense?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, it does. Marita was right. Maybe either we word something or we either say not organizational perspective because I think we need to have that organizational … I think we'll just lose people.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'm happy to talk about it as a policy versus an organizational issue as Marita suggested. That's just an example I came up with. There may be other instances in which we're trying to take things out of the CPWG that I haven't thought of, but I'm happy to change it to say, "Is it policy or organizational?" for now and we'll see how that goes. This should be a living, breathing process for sure.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: That's exactly what I was … That works for me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Alright, great. Thank you. Thank you for your suggestion. I'll make that change. Any questions about this notion of what individual end users are and how to address that?

This next slide is the idea that often the end user experience is caught in the middle between a lot of competing forces inside of ICANN. So in the past I've used the Latin term of an [amicus] or an outside interest that's affected by the goings on inside of ICANN. But if you think about it, the Contracted Parties may be pulling the organization in one way. Businesses may be pulling it in another way. The NGOs, etc. may be

focused on rights-based issues. Governments may be pulling in one direction. Then you have folks out there engaged in no good, pulling in another direction. And the end user is sort of caught in the middle of these discussions of what will the outcome of these debates be, and so our point is to speak up when we believe that a discussion is going in such a way that on [impending] consequences will happen to the end user experience, and that's when it's really important for us to speak up. That's the idea behind this visual. I hope that makes sense.

I don't see hands, so let's go on to the next slide.

Another conversation that's come up a little bit on the list, and it was just an attempt to write down those discussions and what came of those discussions. I think it's relatively intuitive but again, I'm happy to discuss it further if it isn't.

Where does policy come from? Most often the policy we're talking about is developed by the GNSO in working groups. More often than not, those are the policies we're talking about. Sometimes it's developed by cross-community working groups. Sometimes it's borne out of the At-Large community and we're making a proposal directly. Sometimes it's accidentally developed by the Board or staff and we're reacting to where they stepped outside of their lines or boundaries. There's a sort of areas of "policy" that might end up being discussed.

The CPWG develops consensus positions for use by work group participants or champions. Just as we had a conversation today to give guidance to Justine in her participation to Work Track 5, or any other work group, if somebody is on the Rights Protection Mechanism

Working Group, etc. Or as we work with Alan and Hadia, we try to provide feedback that they can take back to their work on these work groups. That's one way that we're developing positions.

In many instances, the action item is just giving feedback back to our representatives on those groups that's not creating a document. Or we can develop a position to use in a comment or advice and to give guidance to our drafters. Then the third is that we're recommending positions to the ALAC that they can then again evangelize in various vehicles within the organization as well.

Then this last part is forwarding tasks if it's clearly not policy-related. So this can change to say if it's more organizational-related or something like that, if that's more clear.

Line 1 should include ccNSO. Yes. Alright, let's make a note, staff, or that could be fine as well. Alright, thank you, Cheryl. Thank you, Ricardo. Any other questions about this? Okay, great. Next slide.

We have a process that's on –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, please go ahead.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Actually, most of the policy, 99% of the policy that is developed at ICANN is for the generic domain names, the GNSO. If we include the ccNSO in there, it's very, very rarely does the ccNSO develop policy. They usually just coordinate the work between the different country code top-level domain operators to develop policy at national level. So ICANN's got nothing to do with it.

When it comes down to the Address Supporting Organization, that's again a coordinating body and the policy for each one of the regional Internet registries, each one of the regions take place at the regional level, not the Address Supporting Organization. So I'd say we need to just stick to having just GNSO in there. Bear in mind that sometimes policy is being discussed or asked about by the Board, but I'd say we need to steer clear on making people think that we deal policy in the ccNSO and the ASO, the other two Supporting Organizations. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess there's been some instances where proposals have come from these outside organizations to in fact become more integrated into ICANN that we have spoken up on, etc. I don't know. Cheryl, I know you're on two calls at once right now and maybe you're not able to speak up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm able to speak up alright.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: ccNSO do of course do occasional policy development processes. In fact, ALAC has had representatives on the majority of them that would argue it's certainly since about 2004 or '05 that have had anything to do with individual Internet end users. So I think sticking with SOs, which is inclusive of course of the lion share coming out of the GNSO, is far wiser than mentioning any of the Support Organizations specifically. I would suggest that our views – and they were strong and they were vigorously upheld and made quite significant differences that were brought forward in the policy development of what could arguably be ICANN's first cross-community working group with the fast tracking of use of country names in SIDNs is an ideal example of a really important role that ALAC and At-Large had affecting very important policy work out of, for example, the ccNSO.

I don't often disagree whole-heartedly with Olivier. This is one of those times I do. We also wrote documents and comments that affected the management of the [inaudible] numbers which, yes, the policy being developed in the regional Internet registries. But they were certainly very important views that came out of that and fed into those processes. So I still would argue that it should be SOs. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. I guess, Olivier, if you don't have an objection, we can use Roberto's language developed by SOs, mostly GNSO. I mean that's a reflection of reality as it is, as you say 99% GNSO. Alright, great. Thanks, Olivier.

On this slide, this is the current graphic that exists online. It's really confined to the generation of advice which as the At-Large has evolved has become a much less frequently exercised capability of the At-Large and ironically, there's been sufficient pushback on the GAC that they are getting more engaged earlier in these processes as well rather than waiting until everything is resolved and then giving advice. It speaks directly to what Cheryl was talking about with respect to Work Track 5, right?

Part of what we want to do is probably replace this graphic and it came up in our tutorial session in Marrakech. It was part of Judith's presentation. I think that's part of what triggered some the discussion. This may be an outdated way of looking at how we operate and the way that we participate within the ICANN community. It's not anything to jump on right away but this is just the beginning of that discussion. We may want to revisit what this graphic looks like and how we talk about ourselves or how the organization talks about us and how we participate and not just make us look like we are an organization for advice after the fact. Next slide.

This is my first attempt. I'm sure there will be lots of comments flying my way. My first attempt at looking at the position development process. This is only when we get to that yellow bar does this happen. I think historically, we've begun the conversation with asking who's interested in being a penholder and I think we need to turn that around a little bit and go through that process of determining whether or not it's something we'll address as the very first thing before we set up a wiki page for it, etc. and filter it through here to figure out if it's something that we're going to try and jump on.

Then only then do we set up a wiki, identify penholders. And then the first job of the penholders is to go out and come back with proposed position on this. Again, this is ideal. That's why I put "ideal" in there because there are instances in which we're really short on time, etc. I think what we want to do is not start with a draft because it becomes very difficult for most people to engage in the discussion based on pros especially if English is not their native language, etc. and that coming back with a PowerPoint that says, "Here's the three main points that we, the penholder/penholders, believe we should be making in these comments or that should be our position to be the starting point for that discussion," and then that becomes the basis for discussion inside of the CPWG. We reach consensus on those points and only then would we ask the penholders to make a draft based on those talking points. That's currently the next step is just below it. Penholders draft the document, the CPWG discusses the draft, and then the final document is forwarded to ALAC.

That's been the kind of process that we've been trying to get engaged in and moving towards in terms of our process within the CPWG. When there's time and we want to make time when we can, we want to add a broader base of opinions into consensus around those bullet points. That's why there's a red circle around this and this is where we want to try to find ways to more creatively engage our broader community on these fundamental points, these three points that are in a slide presentation first in a broader community.

So what I have here is that the RALOs socialize these talking points. Here's the issue, here's the question being asked, here's what we think the At-Large should be saying. Just that level of discussion should be

EN

socialized out into the community and then those RALO leaders should come back to the CPWG and provide that feedback that they've received on those talking points, and then only then are those position points finalized the penholders to draft a position.

That's the process that I see is the ideal one and I think we will be spending some time actually executing on this and getting this to work. This whole process is the ideal process. The red circle is meant to denote something where we have work to do to execute and often this can be a time constraint but more often I think it's just that we haven't set ourselves up organizationally to do that. So I wanted to put this out there, sort of an ideal process and I opened up the queue for questions about that.

Judith, you have your hand up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, hi. This is a good idea but sometimes the CPWG meetings are too crowded that we can't even get the topic discussed until way later. Then there's no time for that middle section. That's one thing. Also we want to have two lines from CPWG discussed and two or one line of penholder draft and another line to be, if possible, that those three so that it has both of them. If it's not possible – because then the topic what could happen is at least what happened when Marita and Maureen and I were discussing this is that, because we were also late in doing it, we ran out of time. We could either have time to do a PowerPoint or have time to do a drafting. We didn't have time for both. So we decided it's more important to do a draft.

Second, what happens to the wiki? We are encouraging people to put comments on the wiki, so are we just going to abandon the wiki or Google Doc or just abandon that? I think we should present something to people and not just abandon all hope. I think that middle section – we have to put something else for them to discuss. If that's a draft then that's a draft, if it's not a draft then it could be PowerPoint, but it has to be something else. I think a short draft or short bullet point where we could do a draft based on those points is a good idea. I think PowerPoint – I don't know. I'm not a big fan of PowerPoints. I'm thinking bullet points or something else on the drafting because it's difficult to have those comments directly when you want to do a Google Doc or on the wiki on that. I just think we should translate that into some more salient points that we can work off. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Judith. I think those are all great points. I use PowerPoints and bullet points somewhat interchangeably, so I think I should add in here something about develop bullet points as opposed to PowerPoint. That's all I really mean. PowerPoint is just the way of presenting them on these calls, but we should put on the wiki those bullet points and be able to bring back that feedback that gets received on the wiki into the CPWG as well in the same time period that those bullet points are being socialized by the RALO leads as well. I think that that's a perfect thing.

I agree, I don't think PowerPoint is the thing to put on the wiki but above the underlined bullet points are the thing to put on the wiki, and they should definitely be there. I will add them for sure. I can also add a line going directly from CPWG discusses the penholders draft which is,

like I said, kind of our interim process and maybe, again based on time constraints, our process. And then we'll try to figure out what the best – how to expand it to the broader community when we have the capacity or time to do so. So thanks, Judith. I think I agree with everything that you said.

Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELIMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan, for this proposal. I actually very much liked the process that you proposed. I also like Heidi's idea about having a webinar at the very early stage in the process. I think the webinar should be a general one, just after setting up the wiki page, and without having any kind of positions. It's just an introduction to the topic itself and before any kind of positions are proposed, and maybe even before identifying the penholder. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. I guess that is something that requires more clarity. At the top of the pyramid diagram, there's this idea of the presentation of the topic, and that's what I meant. Whether that's a separate webinar or a small PowerPoint on the CPWG call, it could be either one. But it's an overall presentation, and I did mention that it could be staff or CPWG member that's making that presentation.

So I'm in complete agreement that the topic itself needs to be described in high level and the key questions identified before a conversation even begins within the CPWG. We can experiment with whether or not that

would be best done by one of us or by a member of staff or maybe it may just change based on the topic, etc. or it may even be an outsider that makes that initial presentation of what the topic is and what that question is. If we go back up to the pyramid, at the very top of it, there's this idea that there's a presentation at the very beginning of what the topic is and what those questions are. So it's meant to be the very first thing so that we have an understanding of it so that we can even answer these other questions of how whether it's an ICANN's remit, is it a policy issue, etc. that that presentation should come at the very beginning. I'm in complete agreement with that concept.

Thanks, Hadia. We'll just have to keep refining it to figure out what's the best way to execute the concept. So the concept is that there's a presentation at the very top that gets us all on the same page as to what the key questions are to be addressed. Thanks, Hadia.

Any other questions about that? I guess go ahead back down to the process slide. Thanks for bouncing around, Claudia. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Jonathan. One point I would like very much that we try to work on, it's the role of the ALS members and RALOs. I have a feeling that we are in [inaudible] for that much more top-down, not bottom-up, and I know it's very difficult to be bottom-up in this framework but I would like that we think about that and try to find a way, not just to give something and then ask for comments but maybe to try to have inputs at the beginning from our members. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. Perhaps what I should do is change that very top pyramid. Because right now it says CPWG members or staff might make an issue presentation, so maybe we should add RALOs or ALSes or somebody that's making their presentation as well so that others could initiate a discussion by the CPWG. Maybe that begins to scratch the itch that you're describing to make it more bottom-up.

I feel like we're in reactive mode to the organization more often than not. It's not that the CPWG is trying to be top-down. It's that the topics land on our lap and we have to decide how to address them. But they can also be issues that are raised by ALSes or RALOs and brought to the CPWG because it's something they want us to do something about. So that may be one way to address that is make that one of the options for how a presentation is made and how the agenda for the CPWG calls is set at the outset. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. It's worth noting that in the At-Large documentation that we usually share with our community on how the process takes place in At-Large policy processes and ALAC policy processes, we do have the possibility of a single RALO raising an issue, discussing it with other RALOs, and then several RALOs raising an issue together for the ALAC to pick up and I gather this would then be sent to the Consolidated Policy Working Group.

Yeah, it's not explicitly mentioned here but my understanding of the slides in the proposal you're making here is that at least we get some

kind of a way to do this triage of stuff rather than taking on too much and not doing it properly. That's all. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Sebastien, that's an old hand, right?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No. It's a new one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Go ahead then.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. I have a dream. The dream will be that the RALO coordinate the position of the ALS and our group will coordinate the position of the RALO. I know that we are far from that and before going there, we need to work and to deliver. But I think it's in the direction where I would like us to go. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. I think it's a very good direction. Maybe when we're developing our positions on long-range topics, we do the webinar and we really make an effort to get the ALSes' members, representatives from the ALSes to see the webinar and let's take an attempt when it's a longer term like overarching position on something such as we've done with EPDP, for example, then we can potentially try to experiment and exercise that muscle of going literally from the bottom-up which I'd be

EN

happy to see for sure. And maybe we just play a coordinating role, and that's fine as well. The other questions or –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, I know time flies. I'm just a little concerned since we do have real-time transcription and we've only got four minutes until the end of this call. So please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Alright, go ahead. Next slide. Thanks. I don't think there's a whole lot more. That might be it. So, thank you for that reminder. I'll pass the microphone back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. If you have any further feedback for Jonathan on this, because this is quite fundamental to the way that this working group will work and it probably also sets the case for future generations of At-Large participants to be able to optimize the way they work. So please, let's follow-up on the mailing list. We now have just one more really active section which is the one for policy work and the policy comment update.

Evin is on holiday today. It's national holiday in Turkey, so I'm not sure who is taking this. Is it you, Jonathan, taking us through those three that are there?

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm grossly unprepared but I'm happy to look at them.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can send you the [link] to those.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. If there's a discussion to be had, we can have it but I think most of these are just notes on things that have happened. Those are recently ratified comments and then these are current statements that are in the drafting process. So I don't know if folks want to – we talked about the Subsequent Procedure stuff already a little bit. The name collisions thing is already up for vote. So then I guess the SAC105 thing is something you're doing, Olivier. Maybe you want to take that back.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Jonathan. I was just going to say two words regarding SAC105. This is an SSAC document which they have shared that talks about the DNS and the Internet of Things. Very interesting document. It's not one that makes specific recommendations to the Board but what it does do is to look at the impact of IoT (Internet of Things) and opportunities, risks, and challenges to ICANN. It starts with an overall technical description of what the IoT is, the various types of devices that you might have out there. Then it comes up with how this really interfaces with the DNS and looks at various potential threats to the DNS in the operation of the IoT devices. Nice, interesting diagrams. It touches on DNS over HTTPS and also DNS over TLS, so DoH and DoT, as some technology that is there to optimize IoT device identification

but that might therefore have also some impact regarding the DNS itself. It speaks about various other aspects of security including DNSSEC and the challenge of course in running DNSSEC on devices that have a very low amount of memory and very little processing power. Some potential consequences having device manufacturers that don't respect things too well, for example, one that was going to test for connectivity to the Internet by having a device every second pinging or making a DNS inquiry, that of course when you've got thousands and thousands of devices and some kind of a Denial of Service Attack and could be misconstrued as being some kind of a botnet for these things. The whole document effectively [inaudible] that most of what is drafted in there doesn't actually affect ICANN. It's not really in ICANN's remit but it was really just more of an informational document to explain to people a little bit more – some kind of a course, if you want, explain to people how things work out with it.

It does ask for feedback so if you have time or are interested in the topic and read this, then we've got a wiki page on this. It would be great for the At-Large community to be able to provide some feedback as to what we might be interested in the future. One of the points that the SSAC has often said to us is if our community is interested in specific things, and I think that this IoT and soon the DoH that we've already had a webinar on, this could be a potential topic for an interesting webinar or for the SSAC to come to talk to our community about either at an ICANN meeting or through an ALAC call or something. That's all I needed to just say on that. Thank you.

I think that pretty much closes our policy section. Anything else, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's it. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Any Other Business (AOB)? I am not seeing any hands up, so the last thing in our agenda is the dreaded timing of our next call. You will have noticed that today's call was put at a time which came out of a Doodle poll. Gisella is going to set another Doodle poll out with all times opened up and we have found from the responses that we have received in the Doodle poll for this week was that it was particularly challenging to find a time that was good for everyone. So I guess it's always going to be conflicting with someone. Anyway, expect another Doodle in your mailbox and we'll choose the three best times for this. Cheryl, you wish to speak. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do. Because I am in two calls at once. I can tell you there's a good number of people in Work Track 5 geonames and I'm glad they were there. It could've, would've, should've normally would be contributing and have previously been penholders in the CPWG. So yes, there will be clashes. Yes, I heard Jonathan clearly last week saying, "Make a choice." Luckily, I don't have to but other people do. But let's look at what we clash with once you now are down your supposedly top three times because there are clashes and there are common people e clashes. Can I just say listening to two calls at once on the same topic is far more challenging even to me. So, I've said my piece.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. This is where I'm imploring everyone to answer the Doodle because I think some of the people that were not able to make it, because of their clash, did not answer the Doodles. It does help to have those people that are specifically conflicted answer the Doodles on that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: This is [inaudible] CPWG though if we leave good workers, to offer where they need to be in actual policy development processes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We'll keep that in mind. Thank you, Cheryl, when we receive the responses. Obviously all the responses are given people's names listed next to them. So we'll make sure that key contributors are not dropped.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You can but try but you don't know who is in that call. I suggest you look before you judge. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I'm seeing no other hands up. This means it's the end of our call. Thank you, everyone. It's been another great call. For those people that are on the other call, you'll not be able to focus on the other call rather than having one end to each ear. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The other one ended before you have, which is why people like Christopher is now being able to join, Greg, Justine – all of these I could go on. They're probably off having a bio break. But there you go. Bye for now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, everyone. Goodbye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Goodbye, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]