YESIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call, taking place on Wednesday, 4th of September 2019 at 1300 UTC. On our call today on the English Chanel we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Kaili Kan, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Gordon Chilicott, Fouad Bajaw, Sarah Kiden, Maureen Hilyard, Vanda Scartezini, Amrita Choudhury, Sebastien Bachollet, Eduardo Diaz, Avri Doria, Alan Greenberg and Marita Moll.
	On the Spanish Chanel we have Harold Arcos, Sergio Salinas Porto and Lilian Ivette De Linque Bruges. We have received apologies from Cristian Casas, Yrjo Lansipuro, Joanna Kulesz, Holly Raiche, Justine Chew, Tijan Ben Jemma, Alfredo Calderon and Ricardo Holmquist. From Staff side we have Evin Erdogdu and myself, Yesim Naslar, present on today' call. Our French interpreters are Veronica and David for today's call. Just a kind reminder to please state your name 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 to you Olivier. Thank you very much.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much Yesim. Welcome everybody to this Policy Working Group. That's what happens when you press a button and at the same time don't think about what you're talking about. Welcome. This is another of these calls, the weekly calls, where we'll start with a quick update from the EDPD Phase Two. Then we'll have opposite to what's currently said here, it says, "Sub-Pro Update", I believe that Justine is

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.

not going to, it's not going to be with us today. There isn't very much to send, to update you with.

Then we'll have a CPWG Charter and Ideal Process discussion with Jonathan Zuck and then the Policy Comment Updates will be the majority of the time taken today by a presentation from Abdulkarim Oloyede, next steps to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's Multi-Stakeholder Model. Are there any other additional business or points to add to this agenda? I'm not seeing any hands up. Oh, no, I am seeing a hand up. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. You don't have action items to take care -- one moment in the call please, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for much. We will start with Action Items indeed. Apologies for not mentioning this but usually I just mention all the other. I note no other changes to the agenda. Let's get going please.

We've got of course our review of our action items today and the action items that we have are all compete as far as I can see. There is probably a follow-up to do with the GAC/ALAC Policy Cooperation but we're yet to hear from Yrjo Lansipuro on the follow-up on this. I don't know whether Yrjo is able to provide us with any update on this? If he wishes to at this point and time. I'm not seeing him listed and I haven't heard his name mentioned in the rollcall, perhaps he isn't with us.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yrjo is an apology for today's call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: He is, okay, sorry then. So, we'll have to follow that up in a future call. Justine is also an apology for this call, so we'll have to follow that up also in the future. The other action items are completed. Are there any comments or questions on the action items? None, okay. Let's then move on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You have two hands, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can't see them for some reason. Now I do see them, okay. I've got a very slow connection, sorry. Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Nothing long but just an updated, I've drafted a response to subsequent procedures on the section of our document about high standards for applicants. I'm still trying to research a link or a reference to put in related to Rob Hall, but otherwise, that document should go back to the subsequent procedures.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. We look forward to the follow up on this. Next it's Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I know that CPWG directly concerned but I had an action item, I guess it was during the ALAC call, but I think it's useful to give you the feedback about ATRT3 Survey, one question raised was, how collectively we answered to the survey? We can't do it in the current tool, survey tool but after some discussion, request they send -- you can access to a well document and therefore I think that Staff can put that in some place in the Wiki to allow ALAC At-Large to participate collectively to the ALAC answer. It's in parallel with the answer from individual survey for ATRT3, they think it could be a good way to go with collectively. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sebastien. I guess this is something -- it's not a space in the policy space but I gather it's a space in the ALAC space somehow. If we could work with Staff on that, that would be great. Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, that was an old hand but I guess I'll follow up, do we want to try and -- maybe I guess ALAC could do this on their call but do we want to try to identify people that will be penholders on that ATRT Survey? That seems to be what, if I understand correctly, Sebastien, you're talking about like a consensus response to that survey, right?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. My view is we should steer out of this. I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr has put her hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, go ahead. I just want to make sure we're handling the task if it is ours.

CHERYL LANGDON -ORR: The individual surveys have gone out and people are filling them out and everybody can and should fill them out but the almost identical questions with text opportunity as opposed to pull down menu and selection survey, a longer in terms of the amount of time it would take to respond to that survey, has gone to all of the AC's, SO's and indeed the RALOs for their group response anyway. A text version of that was made available in the beginning for this organizational survey and I believe that is what Sebastien is referring to. If multiple penholders were designated by a group, they could work on it not directly in the victual mechanism but work on it as collaborative document and then one of them put the responses from that back into the victual. Just to be clear, the ALAC has an organizational survey that it needs to address, whether it wants this group to interact with that, is the [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Still the old hand. I guess I'm asking the question whether we punt this to the ALAC call or do we attempt to identify a couple of folks to work on a response to this? That's the only question I'm asking. It doesn't need to be CPWG.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: My feeling is if the ALAC wants the CPWG to take a stab at this and of course we can definitely deal with this, I'm not sure from Sebastien's because no we're saying there's two surveys affectively and I didn't quite know which is which? Which is the one that Sebastien was suggesting we would put on a Wiki page and respond to? The larger, the wider one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right, the one that's for the ALAC not for individuals.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I see Maureen Hilyard.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi everyone. I think what we'll do is, we'll take this out of this space for a while and have a look at the document and I don't mind sort of like coordinating that. I think if we can get some responses and connect something that connects and should be brought back here, as anything that needs to be discussed. We'll have a look at it first, from the ALAC point of view and then we'll -- rather than taking up too much here anyway. Is that okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Maureen. Any other comments?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just note my chat.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, do note that both surveys stake the same questions but the org one has text or long form answer options. That's the one that we are speaking about with regards to putting together. I'm not seeing any other discussion on this, let's then move on. Let's go to EPDP Phase Two Update. Let's start with Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Not a lot of new to report, we had what was supposed to be or possibly would be the second reading of the ALAC use case of a person who is trying to do some commerce type activity, asks for contact information, the presumption being that they would not likely succeed if this was a natural person who was the owner but if it was a legal person, a company, then they had a reasonable chance of success. There had been unending discussion on it on the mailing list and at our previous meetings. We were asked to review the altered case because Hadia had made some changes in it.

I chose to intervene first with Hadia's agreement of course, to try to summarize where we were and I made a number of statements and I'll summarize them here. Number one, there had been a lot of discussion whether consumer confidence is part of ICANN's mission or not? I said this is irrelevant, this is an access by a third party, who has an interest and there's no need for it to be in ICANN's mission. Number two, it's not about content, content of the website, if there's a website or an email might trigger the request but it's not based on content. The

Registrar in deciding whether to honor the request or not, might look at content, that's their business, it's up to their business model or they might look at who the Registrant is, the contact information for instance, the one they use to get payment. That may well say this is the widget corporation.

People have said it's not a valid use case; interestingly, just before the meeting, we had a message from Amer, from NCSG who pointed out that even if we say it's not a use case, that doesn't stop a user from submitting a request and that was our whole point. The point is, it is a use case, people can make the request. Just because we legislate it's not a use case doesn't stop people from doing it. Nothing we're saying implies there's a right to access, to get information, just that this is a possible request.

My last point was, I was amazed at how much time we were wasting on a use case that we submitted saying this was not going to be subject to automated access. It was not going to result in any policy recommendations out of the NCSG, it was simply a use case. Amazingly about five other people agreed and said, "Fine, let's stop talking about." And we did. Thank you, that's my report.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Are there any questions or comments with Alan's report today? I'm not seeing Hadia on the call so I gather she is not able to add to what you've said. Any other comments from anyone? I just had one question regarding the process here. The group is set to meet pretty soon, face to face again and I've heard, well I've read about a

zero draft, is this something that goes on in parallel with the use case scenarios? Because it looks to me as though things are moving very slowly indeed.

ALAN GREENBERG: The use case scenarios are supposed council us or provide us help with specific examples in starting to do the work that has to be done to create a report, a set of recommendations. The zero draft is essentially the outline of that. As I said last week and I've said before, I don't really understand how this detailed discussion of specific use cases is really going to do that. The theory was, we would learn about what kinds of questions to ask.   What kind of information the requester has to provide?

I don't think we really learned a lot from that exercise but that is the way we decided to go and we are proceeding. I don't think the use case discussion is going to stop at this point I believe; I think and we will start working on the recommendations based on all the wisdom that we now have from the use case discussions. We have made it very clear that the use cases are not going to be part of the final report, they are a working effort to get there. We'll see where we go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: How many more use cases are there to study?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember put there's not a lot of time left before we go to Los Angeles. I don't think we're starting any new ones at this point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not seeing anyone else with their hands up. I apologize for the background noise, there's some drilling going on around the area and I can't do anything about it. Welcome back to the end of one's holidays. Leon Sanchez, you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier. I just want to ask to Alan. I have been chairing the legal committee of the EPDP and Hadia has been sitting in that legal committee as well and I think that the questions, just to give you a brief overview of what has been discussing, how to try to reduce liability to contracted parties and whether if possible, how can an automated process be implemented from a legal point of view, for publication of non-public data, not publication but for disclosure of non-public data through what we have referred to as SSAP.

To define these questions around about the hypothesis of building this automated mechanism, whether by certifying, credentialing petitioners we could diminish or mitigate liability from contract parties that comes along in the chain of use of the data. This is pretty much what we have been discussing in the legal committee. And of course, any input from the advisory committee is very welcome. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPING-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon, much appreciated. I'm not seeing any other hands up so we can move on in our agenda. Thank you for the update Alan and good luck for the forthcoming week. There's a lot of

calls in the EPDP. The next person that's currently listed on the agenda was Justine Chew and Justine has sent her apologies. I don't believe she is on, sometimes she sends apologies and then she is on. I'm not seeing anything from her. She did mention that she would be pressing on with the major topics, starting next week with objections, so get ready for another presentation from Justine on the objections. I know other people on the call are following these subsequent procedures, if anybody wishes to provide any updates of any discussions that are taking place there, you're very welcome to take the floor now. Not seeing other hands. That's done with subsequent procures for this year.

The next section in our agenda is agenda item number five, the CPWG Charter and the Ideal Process. Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We're finishing up this document, there have been some comments on the document but plan to finalize this document this week because Evan is getting it in front of ICANN Communications so that it can be beautified beyond my capacity in time for various uses in Montreal. The contents of this document finds its way into a number of our different initiatives. One was an internal exercise in defining our own CPWG process, the other is in understanding how we build our positions on various topics and what that process looks like. That's likely to replace a diagram that sits on the ICANN website right now about how we do advice.

Also, Joanna and I are working on both a ALAC platform document, previously called Hot Topics and an ICANN Learn Course on getting

engaged in ICANN policy development from within At-Large. Those are all topics that are addressed in this document and so do take a look at it to see if there anything you think is an anomaly before it get's more cemented by coms. I'm happy to take any questions if people have them from having read it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Two things. First of all, on the chart, i think number six, if we could stop scrolling and go back up, what is policy. That ignores things like the ARTR, where this particular questionnaire may not be something that we are discussing but specific reviews are part of the overall structure of how ICANN does it work and how it refines how it's work is done and they need to be explicitly called out here, that's number one.

Number two, on number eight, if we could scroll down to it. That's a nice theoretical chart. You need to make it really clear that this is the overall structure, it's not necessarily the steps we follow one through ten, that will be followed in every case. To what extent we socialize with RALOs and wait for input and then finalize the points that come from the RALOs, it will depend on a number of things, timing, not everything allows that level of discussion and in some cases there may very little interest or input, even though the subject is one that we believe we need to respond to.

This is an outline, the exact process that's going to be followed is going to have to be flexible, depending on the nature of the specific discussion. The concept there presumes that RALOs will have very different positions that need to be reconciled, that's not necessarily

going to be the case. Certainly experience tells us that's rarely the case and therefore, the diagram presumes that that's our prime source of input where as in many cases, the prime source of input are the people who are actively working on that subject and have spent on ending hours and days of their lives contributing to that subject and are in a position to present it, discuss it and make recommendations and solicit input on it. You've left out the experts in that whole chart. The people who are actually living that particular problem and I think that needs to be integrated into it and make it clear that these are not steps that must be followed diligently one by one, because not everything -- it's not going to apply to everyone and moreover, timing does not necessarily allow all of that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. The red circle was meant to denote that it was kind of aspirational component, if we wrap it in pros, I think the idea of experts or champions is something we're trying to work into this diagram as well. Thanks, Alan. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. Before, a parallel to go to coms, I think we need to finalize what we want to say, if we agree, disagree because if [inaudible] final cut, I am not sure that this will make it. Can have some inputs with the designer and so on but the content must be ours.

JONATHAN ZUCK: For sure the content should be ours, that's why we're trying to get feedback now, to make sure folks are in line with this before it gets beautified by coms, their only role is to make it look pretty, that's all. Any other questions or comments? Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Jonathan, just briefly and really inspiring the aspirational stuff in the circle, when we did our first ALAC review, one of the recommendations that we worked through in the implementation phase was an analysis of the development of policy from an At-Large perspective and the workgroup Tracy headed up, in fact did a huge amount of work that eventually resulted with a good number of people, it particularly focused on the type of aspect that this set of boxes, which

I agree, is not a flowchart, step one has to go before step two and three but it is a general design. The things that came out of the deep analysis on there was to interact diligently and successfully with sufficient time for feedback, etc., with RALOs and the ALSes. the time required to ensure the aspirational bits you've got there did happen in the communication mechanism we had then and I would remind us, we still have now, in other words, monthly meetings, the lists we have, etc., and the requirements you noticed in a various RALOs, you really need 80 ish days for any sort of full fledged interactions.

The effect on the public comment model that's run by ICANN is quite significant, unless you're doing heroic work and a lot of parallel stuff and a lot of short order stuff, which may or may not wise, it's a very difficult task to get it to fit into a 40 day public comment model. That is

of course a rationale for organizing advisory committee or support organization to request a longer public comment for certain things where it's an absolute requirement that this wider community input comes in. Just need to be aware of that and that the analysis that it threw up. There are consequences even the aspirations. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl, and I think we're trying to find a lot of different ways to -- like the experiments we're doing with universal acceptance, to figure out how to more fluidly communicate down through those channels? I think it's all going to be subject to experimentation and as Alan said, this is where we can ask for an extension because we think it's of particular importance to get a regional voice and other times we may need to forge ahead and just expect the RALO leaders to be prepared to represent their regions.

I don't think it's ever going to -- even as an aspiration ever going to be an all the time kind of thing. I think that there seems to be -- really this isn't my aspiration, this seems to be an aspiration of the group to get the RALOs and the ALSes more engaged in the development of our position and so this was is just sort of where they would fit in that process. If we could do if we had the time to do that. But thank you, thank you for that research and if you can point me to it, I'd be happy to read it as well. Thank you. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Jonathan. Just listening to what Jonathan and Cheryl have been saying, I don't know if you remember back that far but when I was

first looking how I envisioned the At-Large would developed is very much along this line, one of the reasons we created the ALT Plus was to make sure there was RALO contributions to the discussions that we actually had before ALT Plus environment and then to take as recommendations to the ALAC.

But I also see that -- it's what we're trying to achieve within ATLAS, is Jonathan is implicating here in this, you're funneling it down so that we're actually getting those messages or getting the discussions first off happening within the RALOs and at membership level, which is really, really important. I like that idea of a public comment type of style, that coming from the RALOs as is appropriate.

As Jonathan said, it may not happen or have to happen, it's not relevant to a particular RALO. I think we really need to incorporate it into the system and to make RALO Chairs more aware of the responsibilities that they have and it's in the RALO MOU. We've actually got to work together on this and really make it so that when we're putting through our statements that we are making more inclusive, a bottom up approach. I think because it's not a flowchart in anyway, it's those things that we're actually making sure that there is some consideration that's actually given to that grassroots level and to the process. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Maureen. I guess the other thing that I'll point out, it might be a little bit subtle is that we talk about position development in that this isn't always related to a public comment, sometimes this is going to be

about figuring out where we stand on a particular issue so that we can raise it in public forum, so that we can send people to work groups to evangelize the At-Large position on a particular topic. Not everything is tied to a public comment, sometimes is about just creating our position for other outlets, trying to get our messages out, that's why we talk about it as position development process as opposed to a comment development process. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'd like to remind everyone that we have At-Large reviews not because it's a punishment inflicted on us by the Board and by the bi-laws but because they are supposed to advise us on how we should get better. The current At-Large Review that we're working on the implementation of came to a startling conclusion, the conclusion it came to is and remember, there was a huge discussion on whether ALSes have value, whether RALOs have value and we said yes, they have value but work is done by people.

Ultimately, statements are drafted by individuals and hopefully we can get agreement on them from larger groups but we are never going to have a million experts and the whole concept of what we came out of the review of and what ATLAS is leaning to, is to get more individuals who come from the regions, to participate and be active. They are going to have to be the focus. One of the things we've lost with the CPWG is, we've lost the ongoing discussion of issues before it gets to the point of us having to develop a position.

The smaller and special interest groups have to some extent dissolved because the CPWG has replaced them and ultimately it's those people, the people who are working in the area on a regular basis, who are going to form the concept that we're going to come out with, so let's not forget it's individuals, it's fine to get RALOs to agree but that's not where the issues are going to be developed first unless they happen to have people who are active in the area and that's the who issue, the whole purpose of the review and ATLAS is to get more real active live people who are knowledgeable in the day to day work. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan, I agree completely. Any other questions or statements about this that you haven't already submitted in the document? Okay, thanks everyone. Thanks for your feedback on this. We'll keep improving it. Abdulkarim.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry Jonathan, I can't put my hand up because the house can't put their hand up. I just had a concern with regards to the CPWG position development process where the RALOs are involved. The difficulty is always one of time. I think that it would be helpful that we would have case scenarios as to whether we could actually hope that happened in case of very tight deadlines, especially when one looks at the standard deadlines of a policy public comment system. That's all, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Olivier. The timing is definitely going to dictate it but as Alan said, we also want to get in the habit of discussing these things before it's time for a public comment as well. I don't think we need to think of this as something that's set-in stone but something we're trying to work into the process. Abdulkarim.
ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:	My question is, I was thinking my own understanding was that the name of this charter was originally to streamline the work process of CPWG, am I right?
JONATHAN ZUKC:	I guess so. I think the purpose of the charter was to sort of define what the process of the CPWG is and also to reconcile the fact that a lot of topics outside of the CPWG filter through the CPWG initially, just because it meets every week and becomes a regular clearing house of ideas and activities that may be then dispatched to other groups within the At-Large. I think it was just to get clarity more so then specifically streamlining anything.
ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:	Okay, thank you. I'm thinking what we have on the charter now is not really streamline because there is no [inaudible] actually trying to say this is what CPWG should discuss or this is what CPWG should not discuss.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Abdulkarim, that's in the slide before this one, it's shaped like a funnel. I don't' know -- can I scroll up? Can somebody scroll up to that part of it? It's this document right here that's upside-down pyramid, that's where we're addressing what the CPWG should and should not discuss. This yellow layer within this funnel is the other diagram, does that make sense?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes, it does now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This first document is like the process by which we take on something in the first place and this entire process is getting rid of things. Is it within ICANN's remit? Is it a policy issue or should be forward it? Is there a unique end user perspective on this? Those are all meant to eliminate the things that we talk about and then that yellow tile is what's expanded in that flow diagram. Does that make sense?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay because what I was thinking is everything is going to fall within the ICANN. I understand what you are saying now, okay that's fine. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Olivier, that's it for me.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jonathan. Now, we can move to our next item in our agenda and that's going to be the policy comment update and for this have back to you Jonathan and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier, I will be very brief. This week there were not recently ratified statements by the ALAC and there's not been new public comments for decision. The group is focusing on the current public comments that they're drafting, an ALAC statement in response to which is next steps to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model. Abdulkarim has a presentation on these subjects he would like to share. Over to Jonathan or Abdulkarim. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's just go ahead and have Abdulkarim go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I have a presentation which is the next steps to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model. What I tried to do is to summarize what has been done before and what I think will require our attention, what is required to be done. So, amongst what was addressed already was ALAC submitted a statement which conveys the 21 issues [inaudible]. These categories are the structural issues, process, participation and inter group relations. ALAC submitted a statement and I also included in my presentation in AFRALO, what we also did was to also submit a statement along the same line of what

ALAC submitted. What we did was to emphasize more of the structural issues. In terms of the structural issues, what was on the ALAC statement, some of the parties are more equal than the others, leading to problems like silos, [inaudible], lack of trust, all those were noted as some of the issues, the structural issues on the statement was submitted by ALAC.

On the process issues, how we do things and what would be the case that we do. Participation issues was who and how? Who does the work and how is it done? Inter group relations, we need to post a positive inter group culture, and actually emphasize all the statements that were submitted.

AFRALO submitted a statement along the same line like I mentioned earlier and we decided to mentioned issues like trust for consideration. Regional challenges and realities, identify the real objective for the community. Inadequate representation, complexity of policy development and process and demographics. Those are the issues discussed in the AFRALO statement.

What I'm thinking of doing is AFRALO decided to give some recommendations which I don't want to read, you can have access to that statement. We gave some recommendations and also which we think are probably are the way forward in addressing some of those issues. That's where we went before the ICANN 65 in Marrakesh. In ICANN 65 I think in the GAC room there was a session which was on the next steps, which is where I think we have now, phase two. The session was supposed to be the beginning of phase two, which involves the

process of developing a work plan, that was submitted, that was discussed during that session.

The outcome of the session is that what needs to be done now is to create a work plan. [Inaudible] what has already been done elsewhere. All the issues have been identified. The [inaudible] end is to identify the community but needs to implement those issues that were identified. We now need to determine whether there is an existing solution or a solution to develop ALAC community work streams that have sufficiently addressed these issues. If there are solutions that will sufficiently address the issue, we need to identify them to ensure we don't do duplicative work involving ICANN multistakeholder work plan. If there aren't solutions that will sufficiently address an issue, we need to identify which entity should take on task of developing and proposing a solution on that issue, e.g., advisory committee, supporting organization or the community involving the ICANN Board or ICANN as an organization.

How do we prioritize the issue? This is part of what we need to do now. Must be addressed in the draft if we decide to pick any of the issue, we need to also prioritize the issue and we need to also state that mostly we address [inaudible] work plan if we think so, or if we do not think so we need to also think about if we should [inaudible] work plan for the ICANN multistakeholder model. Is it fully addressed by solutions developed in another work plan? Should it be discussed, addressed at a later time? The issue is priority and needs to be addressed to improve ICANN multistakeholder model. But we say that we need to do now in phase two.

My next slide is listing off some of the issues that were discussed in phase one.

Go to the next slide which is what's next. My own suggestion is things we already have submitted. I want to suggest that probably we could harmonize what we submitted from AFRALO with what was also submitted by ALAC if possible because I know some of the issues might not be possible. Now identify which of the ICANN group is already treating that and also suggest -- what I suggest we do is to go back to the four general issues in which were submitted by ALAC. Pick those four issues and see how we can effectively suggest, for example structural issues, I know some of the structural issues are already been addressed, probably through the EPDP or even by the ICANN Board itself. I think we need to work together and see how we can identity what's already been done, so that issues are not duplicate.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Are the questions? There's a hand. Marita Moll, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Abdulkarim for a great round up of where been here and suggestions on how we need to move forward. I don't actually agree with your suggestions that this is the time to start rearranging what Brian has put together in the document that he presented for comment. He has in my opinion actually addressed all of the issues that we put forward. He's categorized them into eight issues, in three major sections. In each one of these he identifies current, existing things

going on that could be addressing those issues. He's also given us facilitator observations as to what we need to do.

I think we really need to go and study this document closely and respond in the way that he's expecting a response, because otherwise, our responses won't fit into what he's developing next. I'm afraid this looks like we're getting to the end of this part of the road and if we take too many side turns, we're not going to end up in the right place. I'm suggesting that we take each one of these issues, the first on for example is prioritization of work and we look at what he says, is already in the process of looking at prioritization, on is the ATRT3 and do we think that this is going to actually solve the problem?

Unfortunately, ATRT3 is not finished making its recommendations so that's an issue there. I think we need to look at each one of these and give our perspective and then we also need to talk to people and I am not on GNSO PDP 3.0 work and much of these existing solutions is according to Brian, there are some existing solutions coming out there. We need to get from our own community, the people who are involved in there and get their input on what's happening. I suggest we move forward on addressing each one of these one by one and decide whether we're happy with the way he's raised them? Whether we don't think that's going to resolve the problem? Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much Marita. I totally agree with you. I think that was what I was trying to emphasize, that we probably need to go with the

current structure. Probably a yes or no in some of the statements. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Marita for that overview of next steps. Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess my comments are not dissimilar from Marita's but I'll take a slightly different stand. First of all, on the structural issues, this whole exercise started off saying we're not looking at structural issues, we're looking at process. ALAC chose to mention structural issues anyway but my understanding is we are not looking at reorganizing ICANN, as much as some people feel that is what should be done, that is not what this exercise is about. I think we have to accept that at some point. Second of all, this process is akin to a freight train or a very large ship and it's moving and the direction it's going in is the direction we're going to follow unless we make strong statements.

As Marita said, we need to look at the current plan, the current proposal and say, "Do we support it? Do we not? Is the current efforts that are going on that might address it, ameliorate it or make it worse, are they something we support?" For instance, in regard to PDP 3.0, there is a distinct chance that the direction they're going in will disenfranchise ALAC and At-Large more than it is today, is that something we support? I think we need to look at the proposals and that will mean drilling down into the work that's actually going on and say, "Is this the direction we believe we should be going in? Do we support it? Do we object to it? What are the implications?" Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I would [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Marita, is that a new hand?

MARITA MOLL: No, it's not. It's a new hand, sorry. Actually, Alan, you're absolutely right, we did refuse to ignore the restructuring issue and low and behold, I think it's actually right here in bold print, issue number four, I don't know why it's issue number four on Brian's section, I think its issue number one. Issue number four, Roles and Responsibilities and a holistic view of ICANN and the big question is, who should be responsible for changing the way the community approaches its work?

This is a really key part of this document in my opinion and this is the one we need to really look at in the greatest detail. He says the existing solutions for resolving the way we work and the way things are organized, the holistic view of the organization, he says that we need to look at the bi-laws that define the respective roles and should that be changed? And we need to look at the delegation of authority guidelines to see if that should be changed.

Now, I haven't read the bi-laws yet, I guess this is a good time to do it but there's a lot of people here who really do know this stuff inside out and we need your input in order to really make a good response to this I think highly critical issue number four. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm in two meetings at once. I think this is an appropriate time to remind this group and perhaps the Staff to put the details that I know they've done to various Skype chats today about the -- oh they're asking me a question in the other room, bugger. Anyway, try and finish my sentencing here before I switch it over to audio. Brian is running two sessions on the multistakeholder model evolution and it would be wise for as many of us as possible, I know Marita and I and Abdulkarim and others will be on that call but it would good for us to promulgate that information here. Thanks, sorry I've got to dive into the space.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Cheryl. Staff, if you can please put the link to that session, I think it is important that as many people as possible are on that call. Alan, is that a new hand, old hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a modification. Marita is right, the restructuring is there but that's not something that's going to happen quickly and the other things may well be happening quickly. Whether it should be item number one or item number 473, is a little but moot, we are not going to restructure ICANN in the next meeting or two. Other of these things that we are talking about may well happen quickly, put that in perspective. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I think some of the things can probable be long term issues that we can actually state probably that this is going to be a long-term issue and needs to be addressed at one point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perhaps what we need to do is rank things in terms of importance and prioritize them in terms of timing as two different exercises. We may things something is particularly important but realize it isn't going to happen quickly, whereas there is things that seem less important but that are going to happen quickly that we need to focus on sooner. I think that's probably the take away for our little subgroup here or Marita, Holly and Abdulkarim, just to look at it from that perspective. Other questions or comments?

Okay, thank you. Again, Staff, if you could find that reference to the sessions Brian is holding and throw it in the chat here i think that would be helpful. Otherwise, Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Thanks for this, Abdulkarim, good start to the discussion and you know, there is this webinar that will take place and I guess the details are going to be sent the mailing list.

The second comment in there is the SubPro comment, that's just an ongoing space for the subsequent procedures. Since today we don't have an update on that list, we can move on.   Therefore,   what   we

have remaining on today's call is any other business but I see that Alan Greenberg's hand is up, let's turn to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It can come under either of the items luckily so thank you for calling on me. Just to point out that the specific review on RSD WHOIS 2 was submitted to the Board a few days ago and their obligations is immediately posted for public comment. Just a heads up that that's going to be coming out soon. There are going to be a number of very strong negative comments from certain parties on some of the recommendations and I think it might be wise if the ALAC strongly considers making a public comment for some of the things related to, for instance, accuracy of RDS and WHOIS, that we have taken strong positions on in the past. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. Just one question there, with all the work that's going on with the expedited PDP, it just feels a bit strange to have the work of the RDS WHOIS ongoing and releasing its work before the EPDP proceeds forward. Is there some anachronism here?

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably but there was a strong recommendation not to do a WHOIS review or to only look at old recommendations, that was not agreed to by much of the community and so of us spent a significant part of the last two years doing a review. It is done and we will have to comment on it. The review was not -- the review was well aware of the ongoing

EPDP and in fact had members of the group on the EPDP and it factors it in. On the other hand, there are recommendations that came out of the review and by the way, I'll point out that all the recommendations in the review have unanimous support of all members of the working group, including those from the Registrars stakeholder group and NCSG.

There are recommendations there that it is going to be easy to kill in the EPDP if we allow that to happen. There are those in the EPDP who feel accuracy is not an issue and we shouldn't be doing it and we shouldn't facilitate ICANN being able to look at accuracy. Yet, as a controller, if ICANN was a regular controller who had access to all the data, we wouldn't need anything in GDPR to give us permission to verify accuracy but because we do not have access to the data that may be exceedingly difficult or impossible to do accuracy audits of any sort. There are things that the EPDP may make more difficult if we're not careful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Next is John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you.   Going back to Alan's last comment and I make these comments because I'm on a working group at my job, my day job where we administer GDPR policy for our organization and I can't speak for ICANN's work but I can say that it's really important with respect to GDPR that you ensure the accuracy of the data because that's actually one of the things that's required of us as data controlled. That in and of itself will be grounds for an administrator in the EU to smack ICANN for

failing to adhere to GDPR policy. I can't speak to the work of EPDP working group but they can ignore it and the EU can turn around and just smack them for it. I don't know what more to say but it seems rather peculiar. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, John. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. There are those in the EPDP who believe strongly and believe that the data commissioners agree with them that they only requirement for accuracy is to allow the data subject to correct their data and it's no obligation other than that.   Remember, the presumption is that if you have submitted your data to someone, your contact information, you want to be contacted and therefore there is a presumption that you want your data to be accurate. The reality in the RDS is currently there are some parts of the Registrant community who do not want to be contacted. If you are registering domain names for doing fishing, you have no interest in making sure that people can find you and contact you. The presumption in GDPR is you want your data to be accurate, that is not necessarily a valid presumption in the RDS and that leads to the problems we're having.

As I said, there are significant people who believe that the accuracy provisions are only there for the data subject to be able correct data. That's not what everyone believes and for instance the UK data commissioner has made it clear that the data -- you have an obligation, the GDPR says the data must be accurate for the purpose in which it is

processed, that I believe gives us the requirement that since the data is going to be processed among other things, to provide contact information to people who want to contact you, then you should be contactable but not everyone believes that. Thank you.

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: I would just -- if I could add Alan and Hadia on those points is that, I know privately that we've paid good money to consultants to address this very issues and we are advised that the data accuracy is not in the eye beholder, it is a general requirement and that those holding other opinions on the EPDP are wrong at parallel of ICANN. I guess I would just remind that, they can go down that road but they're basically preparing -- they're prepared to throw ICANN under the bus, a judgment against them. For anyone who's on the line, I'm strongly against this, this line of argument. I think it's foolish quite frankly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, John. Just for sake of record here, you mean as in we, do you mean your organization?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah, I'm speaking -- my knowledge is based on my practical knowledge outside of ICANN but it's applicable to ICANN and that the reading of

the regulation doesn't depend on -- we're actually a non-profit organization too, so if anything we're more closely similar to ICANN then anything else but the reading we have internally is applicable to ICANN and ICANN should take that to heart. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, John, very helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just pointing out that when we say ICANN should take that to heart, the policy is being developed by the EPDP. ICANN has delegated the responsibility of deciding how they handle data, in this case to the EPDP. ICANN is not some body that we have to talk to, it is the EPDP and as I pointed out, like it or not, positions differ. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just last question on this topic, for the record, what was the position of the phase one, with regards to ICANN as a data controller? Was ICANN deemed to be a data controller as such?

ALAN GREENBERG: No position was formally taken in phase one but since ICANN sets many of the rules, they are set in the RAA, they are set in the registry agreement. Since ICANN sets many of the rules, there is no possibility that ICANN is not a controller. One can debate whether it is a single controller, a joint controller, a multiple independent controller, but there is no question that ICANN is in some mode or another a controller

because setting the rules is a key part of the decision of who the controller is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a personal opinion I'm giving on that, not one stated by the EPDP. The EPDP said ICANN should take to people about it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Seems that position Alan are not perfectly aligned with the EPDP. Just a thought here. Any other, other business? I'm not seeing any other hands up. Thank you for everyone, it's been another very interesting call again. I hope that you've all enjoyed this call equally as much. Next week's call is going to be hopefully able to respect the rotation. I am going to ask Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: I was just going to say next week we will be able to rotate and so the call will be on Wednesday, the 11th of September at 1900 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much. With this I'd like to thank everyone who's contributed to this call and everybody who has been on the call. Looking forward to seeing you next week, in the meantime -- yes, I was

going to say in the meantime, do you have anything else to add Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: All I was going to ask is Staff, whether they had any progress in getting us a fixed Zoom Room?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, Jonathan, thank you, Olivier. I'm going to liaise with my colleagues and make sure that we have a fixed Zoom Room for all the future upcoming CPWG calls.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you very much.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Staff will be sending a survey about the RTT after the call, please fill it out. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you, Judith. Yes, the real time transcription tool, very helpful. Alan Greenberg, you have your hand up again.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I do, could I ask you to add an action item for Staff to put the multistakeholder model meetings on the ALAC calendar, the public calendar? I think they're important enough that we should publicize them.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks for this, Alan. I have no say in the matter what so ever, it's up to say to say ah or nay. In any case, thank you everyone and we can end early today, about 10 minutes early. Thank you and have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night. This call has now ended.
YESIM NAZLAR:	Thanks all for joining today's call. Have a lovely rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]