

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 the 18th of September 2019 at 1300 UTC. On our call today, on the English channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Kaili Kan, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, Satish Babu, Sébastien Bachollet, Cristian Casas, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Alfredo Calderon, Herb Wayne, John McCormac, and. Current we don't have anyone on the Spanish channel.

We have received apologies from Evin Erdoğan, Justine Chew, Roberto Gaetano, Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges, José R. Lebrón, Bastiaan Goslings, and Sergio Salinas Porto. From Staff side we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Yeşim Nazlar present, and I will be doing call management for today's call. We will have Spanish interpretation for today's call and our interpreters are Veronica and David. Just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes, as well. Now, I would like to leave the floor back to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Yesim, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And today I will be using Zoom, so if you don't hear me well enough, then I'll have to shout a little bit louder. Welcome everyone to this Consolidated Policy Working Group Call. It may be a slightly different call than usual, we've got a few reminders for people. We're going to start with a review of our Action Items and then hopefully, I know that

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.

Alan is not around, but we'll get hopefully an update on last weeks's work on the ePDP Phase 2, they met in Los Angeles. Than after that we'll have a quick going through the Subsequent Procedures update.

Unfortunately, Justine Chew is not able to join us today, but we will just have a quick update on the topic of objection. Then we have after that a reminder about the ALAC/GAC policy cooperation and that's on behalf of Yrjö Länsipuro who unfortunately cannot make it to this call, either. Then we will have Jonathan Zuck speaking to us about the Consolidated Policy Working Group Charter and the Ideal Process. And then we will dig into the policy comment update with the next steps to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model and the CPWG Subsequent Procedures comments. And then finally Any Other Business, we will have some mentions of the string.amazon in English, Japanese, and Chinese, and finally an example of the sort of video that one could do that Jonathan has put together for the geo names.

At this point in time we have received a request from Holly Raiche, because she is slightly unwell, and of course due to the time zone, if we could move the policy comment updates up forward for her to be able to do the presentation and the next steps to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model. So I open the floor for any comments, if we could move Section #7 forward to take care of it immediately after the Action Items. I am not seeing any objections to this, so we can do that, and then I can also ask is there any other business, any other amendments to make to this agenda?

Okay, I'm not seeing any other changes, I just note that Holly Raiche is particularly happy, so we'll turn over to you in a moment, but in the

meantime we can go to the Action Items of our last call on the 11th of September. We won't go through all of them, there are a couple that are still remaining to be addressed, one is for Justine raising the AI regarding followup to the request of the CPWG Zoom Room. It has notes here, so that's just to have a standard Zoom Room name. Has this been addressed so far? I'm turning to Staff, and I know that Jonathan has put together a little [inaudible] but is there a standard Zoom Room now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: There is, Olivier. So the one that's being sent out now is the same one each time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay, excellent. Okay, thanks very much for this, Jonathan. Very helpful. So, that's one done and then the other one is for Jonathan to present on the CPWG Charter & Ideal Process - Summary of Comments, that's coming up, so that can also be ticked. I'm not seeing any hands for any comments on these topics, so now we can move swiftly to Agenda Item #7, and that's our Policy Comment update and we'll start with the Next Steps to Improve the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model. I should pass it over to Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I'm happy to just pass it directly to Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Jonathan, and I hope my voice holds out for this. I actually reviewed the documentation and realized we had a very useful discussion last week, but what we were doing is identifying issues. If you look carefully at the paper and what we're being asked to do, not to identify the issues because in fact the list that is part of the paper that we are to comment on contains all of the issues we identified, as well as other groups identified. What we are being asked to do is to look at some of the proposed solutions that the consultant who is doing this work suggests may or may not address the problems and is seeking feedback on that. So I sent an email earlier to Jonathan.

I think we start with what are the big ticket items for us and then are they sorts of solutions, and I use that, that's not my term, that's the solution that's the word in the paper we're commenting on, is that going to be adequate. The issues, and I'll just run through them quickly for people. The first four are the prioritization of issues, and the solution seems to be to address it through the planning process in ATRT2. I'm not saying one or the other whether I agree with it, I'm just reporting the suggestions.

Scoping of the work. Now apparently in the GNSO they are working on what is called a PDP3, and in fact, in many of the solutions, we're listed. It's this new GNSO PDP3 and one of my very strong suggestions is we find out about it and find out how to participate, because many of the issues that we've raised have been part of the actual process including the length of time to comment, the complexities of the issues themselves, and how we can better address or be assisted by the GNSO to do that. So one of the solutions that is suggested from scoping,

again, I don't know what's in the PDP3, so I don't know if that's appropriate, but we need to find out about it.

Resources was another thing that was listed, that's supposed to be addressed by the Strategic and Operating Plan, which we've contributed to. And finally the roles of ICANN, supposed to be addressed by the delegations of authority. Those are the first four groups that we've talked about last week. The next is about stakeholder participation and this is something that we've talked about a lot. One of the solutions is again the GNSO PDP3 and the ATRT process, as well. My question is do the measures that we have actually address the issues, I don't know.

The third category that was listed as issues that have been identified were the issues surrounding openness and transparency, things like trust, like what is consensus. And a lot of things are things that we've been involved in, particularly the fellowship, the NextGen programs, those sorts of ways to have people to participate, and my suggestion would be that's another place where we should focus, because it's a way of us involving other people and bringing them up to speed. On the issue of complexity which has been raised, address that through the strategic plan, again, I'm not sure that's the solution.

There is a thing called the global legislative and regulatory group as another way to address some of the issues. Again, I'm not sure, but I think we might start off with again having reviewed the topics that we looked at last week, at least we looked at the top four, what are the ones that we should look particularly at the solutions proposed, and my suggestion, clearly stakeholder participation, but when I look at the things that we also said, we talked about resources, we talked about

scoping of the problem and prioritization. And I think my suggestion there would be to find out more about this PDP3 process.

So, that's where I'm up to at this stage, I'm sorry I haven't been able to do the presentation. So, are there any questions on that one? Otherwise what I can do is even though we're starting to run out of time, I will have a bit of time to flesh out what I have said and if people will just have a look, because I actually wrote this up in the wiki page, it's just a background, this is what we're looking at, but have a think in terms of the actual paper, it's not that long, and are those solutions really solutions to the issues that we've identified as priorities for us. Okay, Jonathan, over to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. Do we have questions?

HOLLY RAICHE: We've got Abdulkarim and Sébastien.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, go ahead Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. This is Abdulkarim for the record. I just want to find out a little bit more about the PDP3 Holly was talking about. I don't know if anybody has more information on that. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't, but maybe Cheryl who was liaison with the GNSO can tell us, that was my next step, what is that process, how far is it, are we going to participate, because it seems to me looking at the solutions that have been proposed, that may address some of our issues. I don't know, Abdulkarim, I really don't know. It's just something I saw and thought that could be a solution; it may not be. Cheryl, do you know anything about it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I know a great deal about it, but perhaps we should hear from Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet speaking, thank you all of you who give me the floor. I wanted to know if we will get news of the two calls that were organized by Brian Cute about the same topic, where I know some of the At-Large members were participating and were talking on one of these two webinars.

I think it would be useful to take that into account in the discussion we have. I participated in one and it was an interesting discussion, not so much participation but an interesting presentation and discussion therefore. Otherwise if we don't want to use those tools to maybe ask Brian Cute to come and to talk to us, it's maybe one other way to do the work. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Sébastien. Jonathan, that may be another way for us to actually get our heads around exactly what we feel are solutions to the issues that we've raised, particularly in the call last week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, and I can talk to Brian about coming to make a presentation for sure. Are there folks on the call that participated on the call and want to raise issues? I know that Alan and Cheryl have actually been talking about PDP3 for quite a while and that there are some potential dangers for a reduction in ALAC influence within the ICANN policy making process which is part of PDP3.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Only for the last couple years, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Cheryl at the risk of forcing redundancy, this is the At-Large GDPR, I guess, the issue that we've ignored until it's a crisis. Is there a crisp summary of the risks that were identified?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not sure I would suggest there is a crisp summary, there is a continued update of where we are in development of the 3.0 opportunity. I do notice that Leon has his hand up and [inaudible] has his hand up. Perhaps before I react and respond to all that including having attended and being relatively closely involved with all of Brian's

work, we might want to hear from, now I just see Leon's hand up. Leon, go ahead, thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much everyone, this is Leon. Well, I guess this is a paramount topic for the future of ICANN and in my mind the challenge that we have here is how to achieve balance in this evolution of the ICANN multistakeholder model. I know that the PDPO may have some dependencies on this and I'm sure that Cheryl is going to talk to it, but how do we for this discussion guarantee that the At-Large community and of course the end users who we represent their interests, are well represented in the outcome?

So far, the way that ICANN has been designed and established has the GSO as the one leading the PDPs, but through the different exercises that we've seen happening lately, these past three years or so we have come to realize that all the other SOs and ACs in the policy development processes may have great benefits for everyone, so I guess that this is the time for us to raise our hands, to express our thoughts, and to try to contribute with tools and formulas that can help us achieve the balance in participation and in representation. That is my thoughts, thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Leon, my question is in what forum are we participating? This is part of the discussion where we put our hands up and make comment and this discussion tonight is about what we say, but are there other places where we should be raising our hands and saying look, we have to be part of this process. And I suspect the PDP3 is one of them. Where

should we be in discussions and perhaps we may need a separate session or something, so that everyone has a chance to say, well, what are you doing and why are we not part of this, and I guess that's my question, why are we not part of this?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Well, I guess we are, I guess it's something that's worth discussing and I think that is exactly what we're doing right now. I feel PDP3.0 we have our liaison to the GNSO which I think we couldn't be in better hands. In terms of this discussion, I think we need to contribute to the exercise when the discussions take place with Brian Cote and I think that another place where we need to raise our hands and to express our thoughts and represent the interests of the end users, is in the level of public interest discussion that is happening.

I would like to remind you all that we have a webinar coming on tonight, my time, which is, if I'm not mistaken, I think it's 0300 UTC on September 19th. This was the time that was chosen to better serve the Asia Pacific region. I encourage all of you that have been following this discussion to participate on this webinar. Yesterday we had a very fruitful webinar, we had participation from some At-Large members, including Cheryl and some GAC members and their input was very fruitful and very constructive. So I guess these are the forums in which we need to raise our hands, Holly, and let the weight of our community, the At-Large community feel and make presence and have better representation in the outcome.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Leon. Cheryl, if you can fill us in on the PDP3 and what we're missing, or not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, Holly, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. What we're missing is as Jonathan indicated, is the fact that some people, me included, as well as Alan, have been saying now for a couple years in regular ALAC updates and indeed in this meeting itself, that we need to be more than aware and cautious of what is coming down the pipeline in the name of this new Policy Development Process 3.0 and there is depending on the choices that is about to be made in the not too distant future regarding the preferences for the modeling of what type of specific design future policy development working groups will be, whether or not for want of a better suggestion, they will be designed in a more representational role.

So think about the type of design that went into the expedited policy development process where there is set aside seats at the table for the component parts of ICANN among other things, as opposed to an open more traditionally multistakeholder model that many of us have been used to working in, in the last decade or more. So, it is one of those situations where not only has the At-Large community, but the rank and file of the GNSO, in other words the constituencies and stakeholder groups have yet to have their say on this matter, so the opportunity to have their say is yet to come, but it is not far off.

What I have been saying for some time is looking at the choices, this is an exercise that is being conducted by the GNSO Council over the last

couple of years. The links in the chat today take you to the public archives and material that is publicly available on all of it.

The last GNSO meeting last month had an updating and a presentation from the small group within the GNSO Council, which includes Rafik and Pam on where their assignment is for the GNSO to become closer to signing off on what will be a set of proposals or white paper for want of a better word, that the community will then explore. It is the matter of what it may or may not do to how ALAC and other parts of the government advisory committee, et cetera, general non-GNSO community within ICANN, as well as the more traditionally involved stakeholder groups, et cetera, how they are going to have their voices heard in the process. It will go through the usual type of public interaction and we need to pay particular attention to that when it happens.

We also raised with Keith the current Chair of the GNSO when the At-Large advisory committee met with him, I think it was three meetings back, and it is certainly the topic that I would strongly suggest the At-Large advisory committee include in the discussion when they meet with him and perhaps Pam and Rafik or the leadership team of the GNSO, when they meet at this current annual general meeting, because it is vital that we have any of our concerns considered.

So if they're poised to release, have not released yet, if they choose to go forward, for example on the representation model, then things like this group and how it briefs the At-Large specified representatives, you will have a couple of [inaudible] and couple of spares designated, as you do in the ePDP for example, how the wider communities in your views

are brought into the discussion or whether or not the ALAC or At-Large have to consider how it creates particular positions so that its representatives are either trusted to act in the best interest of ALAC and the At-Large, or has an ability to brief them.

My personal preference is the way that it has been done during various cross community working group processes over the last four or five years, which is using at regular gatherings of groups like this the genesis of why we are together in this group, is in that area and I think that certainly would make what happens in this type of consolidated policy work more important and more vital than it even is today, because it would be the primary way that positions can be developed so that the representatives, should that be the choice, and that choice hasn't been made yet -- it is a preferred choice, by the look of it -- should that be the choice for representation model, an ePDP style model or ePDP-like style model, the importance of this group for similar activities is going to be heightened.

But it also means that your prior planning, resourcing, and management of things like scoping and things that are involved Brian's work on the evolution of ICANN's multistakeholder model also have a number of crossover or nexus points with it. So, in Brian's work, if I may just wrap at this point, in Brian's work it recognizes that the development of the GNSO PDP3.0 is one way that the ICANN community owning the policy development management of the aspects of the generic names is approaching the issues of volunteer use, resources, scoping, prior planning, and all those sorts of things. Can we do some more about it? Yep, but you probably need to dedicate a huge block of time. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, my wrap up on that, Jonathan, how do we reply to this particular paper when in fact some of the solutions, or what are proposed to be solutions, are a process we don't even know? That's a question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And by the process we don't know, you're talking about the PDP3.0?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep, yep.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's a relatively transparent process in terms of the public deliberations about it, so it's probably a question of looking at trying to make the connections between what is believed to be solutions that are current suggestions within the PDP3.0 discussions and seeing if we agree with those as viable solutions where the risks for us are mitigated. As Cheryl said, the biggest issue for us in the PDP3.0 issue has to do with representational quality of those working groups to make them more like the ePDP and that's the reason we need to be involved in that process.

But that may not be the issues that are being raised in the context of Brian's discussion. I think we just need to draw some lines between those discussions and the issues that are being raised in the multistakeholder model discussions. And then we can have

conversations about those as solutions. I guess that's probably the next step, is to play connect the dots.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, my suggestion is we still need to identify which of the most important things for us, now our discussion last week, the things that we were talking about, the difficulty of the prioritization and scoping were clearly issues. Resources are always an issue for us. Stakeholder participation is always an issue for us. So we can repeat those things as priorities based on the discussion last week, but then I think we're going to have to say one of the solutions that is being proposed in the paper we're being asked to comment on is not formulated and to the extent that we know anything about it, these are our comments about it, but I just don't think we can say it's a solution or it's not a solution.

What the paper we're being asked to comment on is asking us is something a solution, and I don't think we can answer that if something is still being formed. We can simply say the discussions that are taking place about the PDP raise the following issues, and tie that back to the issues that we've raised. That's I think the best we can do. Is that a fair summation?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think so, Holly. I think rather than treating it as an obstruction, we connect the dots to what part of the PDP3.0 are thought to be the solution to a particular issue being raised in the multistakeholder model discussions, then we can take that as a more specific hypothetical and answer from that perspective, all within the context of things being up

in the air, but at the very least I don't think we need to just respond and say, well, we don't have any idea what the PDP3.0 is, right?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Sure, and what Sébastien is proposing, and possibly it's a good idea, is to invite Brian to the group to make a presentation so that everybody can listen and will be more apprised of it. There's links in the chat now so that we can all have a look at that, but I guess that's the way forward. That's the best I can do. If that wraps that up, then I can go to bed.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, get some sleep. I think having Brian Cute come and talk to us is probably a very good idea. I think ideally we would not ask him to do all the thinking about what will impact us the most and try to identify the areas that we want him to discuss, but let's take it as an Action Item to get him a list of issues and get him to come onto the call to make a presentation. I think Sébastien's idea is a good one.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, thank you. Okay, well, I'm saying goodnight to everybody, because going to take my throat and go to bed, thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Holly. Cheryl back again on this. Oh dear, right, I'm sure Brian will be more than happy in his RALO facilitator of the Next Steps to Improve the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model, to come and talk to this group and I'd also remind you all that these

issues, but not the specifics of the paper that is out for public comment, and remember that's what we're talking about now, it's the current paper that is out for public comment, resulting on the work so far, and where to from here, is the question that this group needs to comment of the, or the ALAC needs to decide what it is or isn't going to comment on.

But I'm quite confident asking Brian to come would be successful and you need to give him a great lump to do so. But do remember that Marita has been bringing them all up to speed. The thing Jonathan, I'm going to sound a little bit like I've told you all this before, but I've told you all this before. This is a bit like the GDPR model that you mentioned, again, I've been saying these interactions with community, these already organized up to now activities have been going on for quite some time.

And Marita and Holly and Abdulkarim penholding here and the drafting of our response should be at a stage as a result of our ongoing work and updates, and you've all had plenty of time to mull over this. I think Marita and Holly have done a great deal of thinking and development of collecting what has been said in those meetings and in the meetings here, and it's time to sort of accumulate those together. But yeah, let's do it, your Action Item I think is a great way forward. But the question Brian raises in the part of the process that says who owns the response to these issues?

The example of who arguably owns the response to the issues relating to the generic name policy development is the GNSO Council. As the manager of those PDP processes, the GNSO Council's reaction to these

issues which predate it, that the responses which predated the ICANN multistakeholder model discussion paper and indeed predated the current Board global public interest toolkit discussion which is getting underway now, that Leon mentioned, and is going to have the second of its webinars in a few hours, all those things are going on in an effort to start to work out who is doing what and what can be done in response to these recognized issues.

So, we need to make sure that we're aware of the state of play on all those things. The voice that has been heard when I've attended all of these things is coming from only one or two of us, and that's not a bad thing, but it's also not a good thing unless the rest of us know what those voices are saying. So, do the gathering, give a decent block of time, I do think that your ATRT3 representatives should probably be involved as well with those discussions because there is a great deal of crossover between what ATRT3 is doing and Brian's work, and we need to recognize that if we're not at these discussions about these things, then they will be done without our input, because they are continuing on.

We may wish to say for example the work on PDP3.0 being done by the GNSO Council and yet to be made public, is by their belief, belonging to them, we may believe that our voice the At-Large community and that of the wider ICANN needs to be heard. And if that's your decision then you need to make that clear as an outcome and you could say the same thing in reaction to the questions posed at ICANN's multistakeholder model paper. When asked who owns some of these things, if you just say the specific support organization, then what you are saying is GNSO you sort it out and we'll take whatever it is you decide upon, and I'm not

sure that that's the ideal way forward. But the time to answer that question is in fact now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Cheryl. That's a pretty sophisticated Action Item and I'll work with Staff to break that down into some bullets and such, but I think that is the path forward.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Perhaps we should hear from Marita because I referenced all the work she has been presenting over the last month. Maybe she would like to add a little bit more.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks Cheryl. Hi folks, I am very sorry to come into this late. I just moved continents and my schedule is a little up in the air. However, I did want to say, and I just came in when Cheryl was making her comments, I didn't have a chance to listen in on what's being said this time around, but I did want to say that I'm in the process of writing up what was said last time, and I will submit that to you. I had hoped to have it done by now, but I didn't, I'll have it done by tonight or tomorrow, probably, and as soon as it's available I will listen in on what was said today and I'm offering to write that up, as well, if that is useful.

I don't know exactly what was said, maybe everything we did was thrown out and we're starting over, but if it's useful, I will integrate those things. And I will let Holly know too, I see that she had to leave, but I would do that if that's what the community would like. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, Marita, thank you very much. I didn't even realize that you had joined the call, so thanks Cheryl, for noticing that, and Marita for speaking up. I look forward to your notes coming in the next couple days. I will get with Marita, Holly, and Abdulkarim and Staff to figure out how to break this up into adjustable Action Items. Olivier, I think if aren't hands up, that's probably it for this issue and for open comments, because we don't have Justine here to talk about Subsequent Procedures.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I think that you might wish to have, since probably know about this, the new public comment for a decision that has just come up, Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh yeah, that one. So yes, the public comment that has just come out is about the Board's implementation plan for the recommendations that they chose to accept from the CCT recommendations. That's still a very big ongoing process with the Board so there are essentially four things going on. One is that they accepted some recommendations outright and have asked Staff to put together an implementation plan and timeline, and that is what is up for public comment now. I'll take that and make an internal presentation to this group next week, and so that's just a question of whether or not things are looking like they

interpreted things correctly and that the timeline will work vis-à-vis Subsequent Procedures.

The second discussion is whether or not there were things they should have accepted but didn't, because they misunderstood them. A number of the things that are of particular interest to the At-Large have to do with DNS Abuse and many of the safeguards that were put in place for the 2012 round were simply ineffective in mitigating that abuse.

And so there are recommendations from the CCTRT on potential measures to address them and the Board responded with, well, we don't know what DNS Abuse is, we should launch a process to define it, and the reality is that the CCTRT used the strictest possible definition on which everyone actually agrees. And so it's everything beyond these issues on which there is still some disagreement in the ICANN community. The definitions being used for the DNS Abuse recommendations from the review team are the most strict definitions of technical abuse. And so are probably recommendations the Board should have just accepted outright, because they used definitions that had consensus for some time.

And then the third process that is taking place is that the Staff are evaluating the recommendations that the Board wasn't sure about whether to assess and Staff has not yet reported back on those recommendations, and so they're going to be trying to cost them, and things like that, so that will end up being another public comment, I suspect, on whether we agree with return on investment recommendations that the Staff makes with regard to the remaining recommendations of the review team.

And then finally, and this overlaps with ATRT3, is just a discussion of how the ICANN community generally should address the high volume of recommendations that are thrown at it. Are there recommendations that should be retired, are there reviews that should be retired because they're no longer relevant, and if there are conflicting recommendations, how do we address that? How do we prioritize recommendations in terms of bandwidth and resources?

So that's a big discussion within the ATRT3 and in some measure has sprung out of the transition and the Board's response to the CCT review team. So those are sort of the four things that are going on with respect to CCT. The comments in the short term just cover implementation of the recommendations that the Board did in fact accept, and I'll make a presentation on that next week. Thanks, Olivier, for the reminder. Back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan, Olivier speaking. I thought you would know a little bit about this, so it's great that you were able to present this in such detail. We have Leon Sanchez.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Olivier, it's Leon again. What Jonathan described is accurate and he very much well summed up where we are in terms of CCT Review. I just want to ask that there were some recommendations that were neither accepted nor rejected, but that are dependable as PDPs, so I don't have any particular recommendation in mind at this point but the principle is that there are recommendations that are not up to the

Board to actually implement, but they depend on a policy development process which of course will need to go through the GNSO and to that end, the Board has decided to pass along the recommendation to the incumbent body within ICANN.

Also, in regard to the definition of DNS Abuse, I would encourage At-Large and of course the leadership of the CCT. We have been involved in calls with them trying to clarify issues and providing input, et cetera, et cetera, and I would definitely encourage the At-Large community to push on accepting the definition that is included in the CCT Review as for DNS Abuse concerns. So, Jonathan signaled that this is a widely accepted definition and if that is the case, I think it would be best to recognize that definition instead of going through a whole process that will take a huge amount of resources from everyone and that will likely take us to the point at which we began.

So maybe a good way forward would be to have some advice coming in from the ALAC saying given that there is a process on defining what DNS Abuse means for the ICANN community, maybe we could rely on the definition that has been brought on by the CCT Review Team and that has been accepted by pretty much everyone within ICANN, and use that definition to implement the recommendations from the CCT. So I'm not sure if I'm conveying this message as I intended to, but the message is if we do have a definition for that, let's try to encourage the Board to embrace it, rather than going to a whole new process to define something that has already been verified. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Leon. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Leon, for that, and thank you Olivier for recognizing me, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. What Leon said is very important and I just want to reinforce the importance of us having the appropriate involvement and the right words at the right time going into the processes. So, again the work of this group to help formulate widely held or reflect on what may be more widely held beliefs, so that the ALAC can do its job of advice, acting in the best interests of the internet end users and individual domain name registrants in this case, is as vital as it gets, ladies and gentlemen, this is terribly important stuff.

And clearly I am biased, along with the rest of your representatives in the ATRT3 process because as Jonathan mentioned, a great deal of crossover here. The rubber hits the road, if I can use that, however, by deciding if you're going to work with a recognized definition, then you also may wish to choose whether or not that definition as it is recognized also has any limitations with that definition clearly recognized and an expectation from the community is developed that further work in this may need to go on.

Because what tends to be happening is anything that is too problematic, too complicated, the hot potato for the want of a better metaphor, in other words the thing that gets passed to the Board and the Board goes, well hang on, this needs to get passed over here, in the case of Leon's example, back into a support organization for further development in the PDP process.

And of course those PDP processes are coming to an end when the item is handed back and it's this never ending dance with lots of cycles for development and progress, and that's certainly something that ATRT3 is observing in the way ICANN as an entity, and that's all parts of it, all of us, are currently operating all too frequently with many of the recommendations coming out of all sorts of review processes, the CCTRT one being the most recent, or one of the most recent, and clearly one of the more acute examples.

So we do need to come to some firm thinking on how we can fix that, and there is an opportunity coming up when you get to the part of your work which will be looking at recommendations that are likely to be made out of ATRT3 on these matters, and Jonathan identified some of those in his intervention earlier, we need to start, or at least be getting ready to formulate opinion and reaction to those potential recommendations which I'm not going to second guess on yet because we won't be getting to that until we meet in Singapore's ATRT3.

Another couple of things have changed, which we may as well just briefly mention to you all. In an effort to fix the complexity of all of this, review teams, specific and organizational, from now on, and this came into act after the ATRT3 process was begun, works now and will in the future until the guidelines are changed at some future point in time, the newly adopted guidelines have a whole lot of very particular criteria, a checklist if you will, things that need to be considered, if not definitely met as go or no go, tests and criteria, before anything can even be considered to become a recommendation.

And so we will be seeing reviews in all their forms putting forward recommendations that are not just we heard this and this is a really good idea in our view and it's important because whatever rationale is placed, but that have also gone through a particular development process which hopefully should take into account some of the resourcing, retirement, interaction with what has gone before or what is currently going on in other fora, all those sorts of questions. Because right now it gets very messy. So, watch this space and be ready to interact, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl, Olivier speaking. Thank you for this extensive explanation as to what we're likely to be seeing. Just to close off on this topic for those people that are only on the phone, there is a comment by John McCormac that the DNS Abuse definition doesn't capture the scale of the problem on the webscape side of the issue as opposed to the e-mail/spam side.

Clearly I guess this is the start of a discussion that we have regarding the specific process, policy advice. I think that if we can follow up on the email system on the mailing list until next week so that by next week, or even on the wiki, by next week we start having a clear view as to what the ALAC would like, what this group would like to contribute to this.

YESIM NAZLAR: Olivier, apologies, this is Yesim, could you please speak closer to the mic, our interpreters are having difficulty in hearing you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can try putting the mic in my throat, but that's going to be difficult. Is that better now?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, it is. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can try shouting, but then I won't need a mic, I'll probably sort of go global without Zoom required. Okay, let me start again, sorry. I was just saying that there was a comment from John McCormac mentioning that the DNS Abuse definition doesn't capture the scale of the problem on the webscape side of the issue as opposed to the e-mail/spam side. Clearly this is the start of a discussion that we need to have on the mailing list and on the wiki, so as to be prepared next week for having main penholders for this consumer trust and consumer choice review team issue.

I'm eager to move forward because we are at the top of the hour and as you know we've moved the agenda around, we started with policy comment updates, so now we have to move to Agenda Item #3 and I'm hoping that Hadia Elminiawi is still with us, because I've noticed that Leon has moved on to an ePDP call and I'm hoping Hadia is not on that same ePDP call. The ePDP had a meeting last week in Los Angeles, a face-to-face meeting, and so Hadia, I don't know if you need 20 minutes, but just a quick summary of what's been happening there. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi for the record. Thank you, Olivier, for that. We concluded our meeting last Thursday and I think it was a productive meeting. I think I don't much to update yet. We have our next call following the meeting tomorrow and maybe then, after the call tomorrow, I could provide you with some update. But basically what we've been doing is going through the initial report and we were able to reach a sort of consensus on some of the items.

Some are still pending, especially with regard to the accreditation, authorization part and debates were going with regard to if there is going to be accreditation, who is the entity that is going to take this role, would ICANN be accepted or maybe another third party if ICANN designates another third party. We were talking also about authorization. So, I think those are mainly the sort of controversial issues that we are still discussing and we haven't yet reached any decisions or conclusions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update Hadia, any comments or questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I just want to point out what a beautiful living example, I couldn't have orchestrated it better. Vital conversations going on in the development of prioritization of where we put our human resources, what position points of view might need to be

expressed, and you've got people now having to dash off to other equally important work as this, stretching your volunteers even thinner.

You've got the auction process working out suddenly, taking people away from this weekly call, and of course the PDP work. Now, if you've got a whole lot of representational models like the APDPs going on, if that is the outcome of policy develop 3.0 being enacted, you're going to have more of this, not less of this, as one of your risks. So, how you manage that is going to need to be considered. I couldn't have designed it better, giggle, giggle.

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

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you Cheryl, for that. Maybe also I could add we were discussing a model that we started calling the Hamburger Model, which is a model for access and disclosure, which basically has the supplier as the bun and then the parts in the middle which includes the decision making and then the part at the top is the requester and the parts at the bottom are the contracted parties who are actually going to disclose the model.

We were also talking a lot about automating the decision making and which part actually could be automated and which part cannot be automated, and one of the registrars walked us through a decision making process that he would typically go through, and it was a very long and extensive process.

Another thing also I would add, full automation to the whole process without any kind of human intervention is not actually legal, according to Bird & Bird's advice. So, automation definitely is required and we will be seeking that, but again, there needs to be some kind of human intervention at some point. This is also one of the things in the back we are going through. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Hadia. I was going to mention that last point myself. That feels like a very serious development, that recent legal advice, because they basically came back and said that there can't be any part of this that's fully automated, that at least the lawyers believe would be legal. A lot of people are pretty upset about that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, and that's why I was reluctant to mention this in the beginning, because the small team of the legal committee now is looking into it and may be developing some questions in this regard. However, the advice as I understand it, it's not that you cannot have automation, you could automate the whole process from start to finish and then have a human looking at the decision after it has been made, that's considered human intervention.

So the process is a very long process and if a human is actually to go in and do this, it will take time. But it's not only about time, it's also about consistency, because having the process automated ensures a kind of consistency in the result. Maybe Leon can take to this more better than me. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I've lost the Adobe Connect, but Leon, are you interested in speaking up on that issue?

LEON SANCHEZ: Absolutely, yes. I had actually excused myself from the call to join the PDP call, just to find out I had a wrong entry in my schedule so there wasn't any PDP call at the time, so I apologize for coming back again and out. So, to the automation point, as Hadia rightly has said, yes, the advice from Bird & Bird might not be to encouraging for many, but the truth is that as I read it and as some others within the legal community read them, this doesn't mean that you cannot have automation at all.

This means that, as we read it, of course, and we could be wrong in our interpretation, there are many parts of the process that can be automated, but in certain circumstances there will be a need for human intervention at some point. How this human intervention takes place is of course something that the ePDP will decide and will propose a solution for that. But I wouldn't rule out just yet the possibility of having the SSAC and the automated process for access and disclosure of data.

Yes, the legal advice that we got from Bird & Bird of course pushes the limits this theory to very near the edge, but as I said, I think at least as I feel the spirit of the ePDP team, I sense that there is a lot of goodwill from each of the parts that are contributing to this effort to try to actually find the solution that fits the needs of the different users, of

course including researchers, domain name abuse combating organizations and individuals, et cetera, et cetera.

So what we are doing now is to test the different questions that have been raised by the ePDP in the legal team against the advice of Bird & Bird to see whether those questions have been already answered by this advice, or if we should reformulate some questions, given that we have already received some replies from Bird & Bird.

So, as I said, yes, this seems to be discouraging at some point for some within the community, but as I said, I repeat, I wouldn't rule out having an automated interface to access and disclosure of non-public data, because the ePDP hasn't reached that conclusion and as I said, I believe that everyone in that room is working with a true good faith effort to try to find this solution that could ultimately take us to having this as has been discussed.

So yes, we need to wait for the ePDP deliberations and I think that both Hadia and Alan have done an excellent job representing the At-Large community and I as Board Liaison have also been following the discussions and I have been chairing the legal committee, as well. So my feeling, as I said, is that we cannot just rule out the possibility of having an automatic process. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Leon, this is Jonathan. Is it possible that there could be some kind of, Hadia hinted at the possibility that there could be some sort of audit process after the fact. Is it possible that that could be a statistical audit as opposed to every single transaction, to get a sense of how the

automated process is doing and that the European Commission might be satisfied if the contracted party is engaged in some kind of a regular audit that was human based?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Well, that is certainly a possibility, but I think that the ePDP team is not there yet. We could speak hypothetically of different mechanisms that could help us jump that hurdle, but I mean, to be honest, it's not up to us but to the wider ePDP group to define that. Yes, the option has been on the table and it has been discussed, but you know how discussions take place in these kind of working groups, and at this point I would use a phrase that I learned from our dear friend Kabuz, that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. So I think we're at that point in which everything seems to be very fussy and we don't have yet a clear way forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Cheryl?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Olivier, thank you Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I just wanted to make a point from our perspective here, and this is purely from the Consolidated Policy Working Group activity's perspective. I think what we can do is both compliment and recognize

as Leon just said, the work going on and the role that our representatives in the ePDP process are taking.

What they are able to do, because they work so closely with us, and heard all of our deliberations and concerns, and when there is generally held beliefs or absolute consensus, are knowledge on what that might be from our At-Large community, at least from the CPWG's thinking, and of course later on if anything is put through the ALAC process and ratified, as ALAC advised, is they are able to stick to some high level principles and in this case they would include the importance of certain aspects of transparency and certain aspects of accountability, whether that is a post activity audit or a number of critical control points that may need to be implemented during certain phases as some sort of hybrid outcome where you have partial automation and some not.

They will be able to, I trust, and I'm confident that's what they're trying to do, keep reminding people of the importance of where a risk can be identified, a risk that might just simply be how predictable or not part of the process is, how much human error may or may not come into play, how timely, because putting humans in the mix, you can always make things take longer than an automated process does, all of those sorts of decisions, all those sorts of points, our representatives will at least be able to push the high level principles that they got from our discussions, and that's a pretty darn important thing to both celebrate and recognize, as well. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: Thank you Olivier, and thank you Cheryl for that. So just a clarification to what Jonathan was saying, I didn't really mean it as an auditing process. The human intervention as understood by the Bird & Bird recommendation, the human intervention needs to be part of the decision making process.

But actually also mentioned, we are looking for some cases like that SSAC cases, if it would be possible to automate this, we don't know yet. But again, automation is not ruled out, it's on the table. What I'm thinking about is how much could be automated, and can you automate all of it. And this is the part where Bird & Bird said you cannot automate everything from start to finish until disclosure, there needs to be a kind of human intervention during this process.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this, Hadia, it's Olivier speaking. I'm not seeing any further hands in the queue, so thank you very much for this update, very interesting discussion going on, and we will hear more from you next week. Now, I'm under time pressure here, so I'm going to do the next two quick agenda items, and then I'll have to hand the floor over to Jonathan, I hope you're okay with that, Jonathan.

The next thing is the Subsequent Procedures update, that's there for information only. Justine Chew isn't with us today, she has updated the wiki page that deals all Subsequent Procedures with the next discussion, the next deliberations about the assigned CCT recommendation, Template for GAC Advice to specific TLDs permitting application of

advice by ICANN Board; clarity in process and timeline by which GAC Advice is expected for individual TLDs. So there is also going to be an update on the topic of objections which will be circulated soon after this call. So more next week. If there are no comments for Agenda Item #4, Subsequent Procedures, I'm not seeing any hands.

Fine, then the next Agenda Item is the one on the update of the GAC and ALAC policy cooperation. I just had a chat with Yrjö Länsipuro, he would like first to thank all of the people that have commented so far and that have volunteered to engage in discussion with the GAC. This is just a reminder that if you have any points that you would like to make, which policy issues are we most interested in discussing with the GAC and who from our side would be interested to take the lead on various issues?

There is still time to speak to Yrjö about this, just email him and he will take it up from there. But there has already been a good response from a number of people, but as you know, there are a lot of different topics, so Yrjö would like to build a fuller team of people to address the different topics. Any comments on this? And just for your information, there is a copy of the pdf that Yrjö presented a few weeks ago on a prior Consolidated Policy Working Group call.

Right, okay, so now we have the next Agenda Item #6, CPWG Charter & "Ideal" Process with Jonathan Zuck, and Jonathan will you be okay in being able to take the call over from here and all the way to the close?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure, that's fine.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much, over to you, Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. There isn't an update on the Ideal PDP Process. We just continue to incorporate comments into that document. I made a presentation last week about the comments that were received, so that should be continuing at pace for presentation prior to Montreal with the results of incorporating those comments and then getting a final pass from folks within the CPWG.

So, what else is on the agenda here? I don't think we have anybody on that's going to be able to talk about .amazon, is that right? That's another issue that has been put out for comment, is Amazon's implementation of the PICs spec associated with .amazon, so that's something that we'll need to get a presentation on, as well. Is there somebody that is interested in being the champion of this Amazon issue? Somebody that's well versed and excited about the GEO names issue? Because this is an important test case of how we handle geographic names. I'd love to open it up for any volunteers for somebody to read through this implementation and make a presentation to this group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Marita has stepped forward, she's a hero in my view. Cheryl for the record.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh yes, I see it, I was looking for hands, I see it in the chat. Thank you, Marita. Leon, go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Jonathan. I will not comment on the .amazon issue on substance, because of course that's part of the Board, I don't think would be appropriate. But I would only like to remind you that the comment period lasts 30 days from publication of the PICs, so we have already gone through 3 or 4 of those days, so if you are going to comment on this, I would definitely encourage you to speed up the process so that the At-Large community or the ALAC comment goes in time. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Leon. Yeah, it just came out during the week, so that's what happens. We may need to find an offline way of identifying champions for an issue, as well. But yeah, in the context of GEO names, this is a pretty important test case. So, thanks for that. Cheryl, you've got your hand up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, just as we're looking into this and as we're championing this and finding champions, as we're responding to it, this is going to be one of those can we please at least speak to answering the issues commenting on the matters of substance, when you've got very short amounts of time, and this is the case here, we've got to remember to stick to our meeting, to keep focused. This is not the opportunity to talk about PICs

in general and GEO names in general, this is an opportunity to specifically engage on the .amazon submitted PICs specifications. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank, Cheryl. That echoes the advice that I would give, as well, as we enter into this. No question, we want to assume that what has transpired, has transpired, and just look at the implementation designs here to make this the best possible outcome. Thanks, Marita, for taking that on. So then, the last thing that I wanted to do, and we've sort of reached the end of the call here, I'll just talk about it briefly. We've had some discussions that it would be good to give the group a kind of overview of an issue prior to our deliberations beginning on that issue, and those discussions have taken a number of different incarnations.

One idea was to interview an expert and then make a podcast available for people to listen to. But when we raised that, some folks were concerned about not having any visuals, especially if there is no translation, et cetera, that it would be difficult to just listen to an audio recording of an interview in order to get an overview of a policy topic, and that some slides would be useful.

So, I came up with the idea of doing a little video as the introduction to a topic and did some experiments with how that could be translated, et cetera, so I guess there are three minutes, if people want, we can see this video that I did, it's just meant to be sort of a demo or a test case of what something like this might look like, and then I will on the list share other videos, as well as some experiments with doing language

translations of the video, because some are more work than others, and we want to choose the path of the minimum amount of work that will be most effective to get the most return on investment in terms of how we translate our work.

And so I will share an email with those different experiments, and then people can look at that and comment on that, as well. In the meantime, if there is a way to play the video, then I guess let's go ahead and we can just get your initial reactions to the idea.

[VIDEO]: Hello, and welcome to another At-Large Tech Talk. Again, with these tech talks, no one is trying to suggest what you should think, just something you might want to think about. My name is Jonathan Zuck and this week's Tech Talk is about geographic names, or GEO names for short. A GEO name is a name that signifies some geography such as a country, region, city, or river. In this case we're talking about GEO names being used as top level domains or TLDs, that's the part of the web address to the right of the period. In 2012, over 1000 new TLDs were added to the internet, including a number of geographic names, such as .paris, .durban, and .nyc. There were 38 GEO names TLDs added with the Roman alphabet. All but one of these registered by geographic entity itself, such as a city or with permission from them; .amazon continues to be controversial because it's registered by a company, even though it's a river and a region in several Central American countries. As ICANN, the organization that deals with such things, prepares to take applications for new top level domains, people are concerned about what the future of geographic names might be. Just because a city or country, particularly in an underserved region may not be ready to apply for their own top level domain, it doesn't mean they won't want it

eventually when it's already managed by someone else. In fact, if an investor registers it, a geographic entity might pay a heavy markup to take it over. So, what to do? One of the challenges is that we've identified 13 million potential geographic names. So what do we try to preserve? All of them? The biggest ones? Just the capital cities? The next challenge is that geographic names aren't always unique. Paris, France registered .paris, but it just as easily could have been Paris, Texas, that wanted it. How do we decide who gets it? Size? Capitol city? And what if someone wants to establish a top level domain that happens to be a geographic name, but that's not its intended use? There are 15 cities around the world called Union, but what if someone wanted to create a space for trade unions or civil unions? What if the company Union Carbide wanted to create a secure space for its customers and partners? Should they have to get permission from all those cities? Currently there are three broad categories of thinking on geographic names. First, there are those who believe they are a matter of sovereignty, that as many names as possible should be preserved, and relevant governments should grant permission for their use. Second, there are those who believe that as many GEO names as possible should be protected, but governments aren't always the best to decide who gets them. Perhaps the community that criticizes the government should be able to register such a top level domain. That would call for some sort of independent panel to decide who gets to use it. Finally, there are those who believe this is a free speech question, and that it is impractical to come up with a reasonable system of arbitration for these geographic names. These folks would argue, just let anyone apply for any name. What do you think? Give it some thought. Thanks for listening. I'm Jonathan Zuck, and this has been an At-Large Tech Talk.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bloody brilliant.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. I think because I wrote a script for this one, that I ended up reading it too quickly. But really, what it is, it's just a PowerPoint, like a presentation, and then I threw a little bit music underneath it, and that's not hard to do. The other example that I did, I know we're really short on time, is I took the presentation that I made to LACRALO on the ALAC policy platform which is the latest incarnation of the Hot Topics document, I took that presentation and grabbed the recording from the presentation and paired it with the video so that people can choose what language they want to listen to the video in, based on the translation that took place on the call.

So, that may be a way to very quickly have a video with multiple languages associated with it. And I've done some research that we can in fact capture a presentation off of Zoom as a video. You can take a portion of a meeting and clip it out of there and have an overview presentation that someone has made and turn that into a video, and we could generate it into multiple languages. So, I wanted to get feedback on that as a way for us to deliver this sort of nonjudgmental issue, i.e. here are the key issues, versus what we think on them, so to get our juices flowing in terms of what we think our priorities are.

One of the things that brought this up is that we talked about the poll that I'm working on, on GEO names, and the question is if people don't have some kind of an overview of the issue, is the audience for the poll

too limited. And so would a video like this be helpful for people to watch prior to answering a poll on that issue, for example. So, that's the stuff I wanted to put out there for discussion. I will put all these experimental videos on the list.

I'm particularly interested in the experiment I did with the policy platform presentation, because I just grabbed the simultaneous translation as the audio track for the non-English versions of the video. And so that means that it's a little bit behind, but the experience will be similar to what it would have been on a call, and I'm curious how that works for folks. And so there is a Spanish version, a French version, and a Portuguese version, in addition to the English version of that video, so I'll post these online. Cheryl, you've got your hand up, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Jonathan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I'm impressed with this digestible, entertaining, small bite-sized, non-judgmental, I think this is something we really should all get behind. I also like that it is effective utilization of resources we already have, and that's where using the audio off the realtime interpretation we get and of course we could have in some way, shape, or form, any of the realtime typing that goes on in some of the meetings, as well. But whilst the visuals are important and I would strongly support that visual base for engagement is a great adjunct to all of this, this is also a powerful tool just by the audio tracks themselves. It's a low bandwidth requirement is what I'm trying to say.

And so you can use this type of, almost as a little mini podcast, to go out via mobile devices and to edge communities that normally wouldn't have the opportunity to engage and think about these discussions, get the global briefing on what the issues are via this type of media, and then do some local creation of opinions and bring it back up through the pipeline. It's a brilliant thing and has absolute support from me. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Cheryl. Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Jonathan, I just want to congratulate you, this is a great piece of work. I loved it, and as I said in the chat, I would happily volunteer to have this translated into Spanish. One of the things that we're doing at the Board level is to begin a training program for communications within the Board. And I think that this kind of material would be a perfect example of what I and others within the Board are trying to communicate.

We are striving for a more transparent and more close Board to the community and videos like this one that are short and very concise in their message about what the Board does would be a very good first step to have the community and the Board be closer, and understanding what we do in the Board and how we work things in the Board. So, if I may, I would like to take this video back to my Board colleagues and suggest that we do something of the like within the Board to convey these kind of messages to the community. So, if you

allow me to do that, I would definitely love to take this back to my Board colleagues.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Surely, and part of demo with more time, I actually got Andy Mack to do an informal Spanish version of the video, and he was going to do French and Portuguese, as well. One of the things that we discovered is because I wrote this first and read it, I was perhaps speaking too quickly. And so this video is about 3-1/2 minutes long, and maybe a little too quick even for English speakers, I don't know, I'm curious about that. But Andy's Spanish, Portuguese, and French versions were all twice as long when he did his translations and recorded them. So again, I'll share all this online about those results.

One way is for someone to write a little script and read it, and that makes it easy then for a translator to take it and read another version. The benefit of using a simultaneous translation will be that the translators are already basically in sync with the slides. So, you will see these different options in an email, but I'm happy to talk to you further, Leon. I think videos have often had a much higher overhead in ICANN, there are some videos that are on the ICANN YouTube channel, but they involve going out and hiring a firm to do custom graphics and animations, et cetera, and I don't think that's necessary for this kind of a video, and that we ought to find the most efficient way to create these things, so that more of them can be made available.

LEON SANCHEZ: I completely agree with you, Jonathan. I think that's one of the other things that I like so much about this project. So, count me in to help in anything I can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, thanks. Any other questions or comments about this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Jonathan, this is Heidi, yeah, so this is really great. You might wish to ask the interpreters on the call how they were able to translate that or interpret this. I'm happy to take it to Sally Costerton and to Sally Newell Cohen within Staff, and I would also suggest that you show this during the session that we're going to be having on Saturday afternoon with them, the two Sally's and with the GAC and the NCSG as a means to show what possible tools exist to explain policy issues in a simple and multilingual way. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, yeah, definitely, I'm happy to do that on Saturday, and I can discuss what some of the options are from a technology perspective, because again, I think the degree to which we make this effortless is the degree to which it will actually happen. So that's the objective. So thanks, Heidi, let me know about those opportunities to talk about it, and look for an email on the list for some of these other experiments, and I welcome your feedback on your preference.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. If you're going to be doing more of this, you're going to have to have a few high level principles in place, I pinged you in private chat, so you're not going to be surprised to hear the words out of my mouth now. There are a few things that some of this lower budge stuff which to be honest I think is more edgy, more friendly, more engaging, we've go to watch, there are a few principles that we probably should make sure are always held in violate and that is, for example, as cute as the glasses is on the ICANN logo, I can assure you that the brand management in ICANN Legal will lay an egg and have hysterics about that.

We've all got a sense of humor about it, but that's not how it will be seen, and it's a risk that they would want to be managing. So, yeah, there might be a few high level rules like here are five don't ever's, and here are our go-for-its. But we do need to remember that one of the advantages of corporate control is corporate is always comfortable with that control, and as soon as they give it over to us for the more reactive stuff, which I've got to say, a good thing to do, we've got to learn to set rules that we're all agreeing to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, thanks Cheryl. I was going to do a full face and show the logo like a person thinking, so that's definitely something we should try and address, as you say, come up with some basic core principles. Thanks for your comment. Alright, that's it for that. Thank you very much. Look in your inbox shortly for these other experiments. Next meeting, staff, can you tell us when that is?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes Jonathan, this is Yesim speaking. Our next meeting will be next week on Wednesday at 1900 UTC, as we are rotating.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great. Thanks everyone. Is there anybody that needs to raise any other basically before we close the call? Alright, thanks everyone, appreciate it, great discussion, we've got a lot of work ahead of us, and we need to come up with some processes, as Cheryl said, and build into our process who we're going to have represent us where, and things like that, and formalize more of that, probably. So I appreciate every one of you, for your active participation in these things, so that At-Large can continue to be a force within the ICANN community. Thanks a lot.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all for joining today's call, this meeting is now ended. Have a lovely rest of your day. Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]