
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone to everyone, welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group Call on Wednesday, the 25th of September, 2019 at 1900 UTC. On the call today, on the English Channel we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Gordon Chillcott, Sebastien Bachollet on audio only, Vrikson Acosta, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Joel Thayer, Marita Moll, Leon Sanchez, Alan Greenberg, Ejikeme Egbuogu, Glenn McKnight, Judith Hellerstien, Omir Kerr and Yrjo Lansipuro. On the Spanish Channel we have Harold Arcos and Alberto Soto.

We have received apologies from Eduardo Diaz, Lilian Ivette De Luqu, Nadira Alaraj and Hadia El Miniawi. From Staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Brian Cute and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. Our interpreters for today are Claudia and Marina. Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channel. A friendly reminder that we do have closed captioning on this call and you can also click the link in the chat, which I just inserted if you'd like to follow along. Thank you and with this, I turn it over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Claudia. I hope everyone can hear me clearly. I'm going to be leading today's call and we have some exciting stuff. First, we'll be starting with a presentation or discussion with Brian Cute on ICANN's evolving Multistakeholder Model. You've seen Brian in the

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.

various recent meetings and this is a follow up and him to be able to answer questions that we might have on what's going on in this process. After that, we'll have Justine Chew, who will be talking five minutes to provide us with updates on Subsequent Procedures.

Then, we'll have Alan Greenberg I believe, I think he's the only one who's on the call today from the [inaudible] following the EPDP Phase 2, so we'll have 10 with Alan to provide us updates on what's been taking place in the last meeting but also on Los Angeles, the recent face to face meeting. After this, Marita Moll will be speaking to us about the Amazon Public Interest Commitment, with a presentation. Then, our usual Public Comment Updates with Jonathan Zuck, taking us to Public Consultations currently in place and also one that is in the process, in the pipeline for a decision by the At-Large.

Finally, in Any Other Business, it say Justine in brackets but it's just to speak to us about Amazon in English, Amazon in Japanese, Amazon in Chinese, I'm not quite sure this will fit with -- yeah, that's all to do with specifications, that will be obsolete by the time we reach it which makes it shorter or in fact gives is the possibility of focusing on an At-Large Tech Talk with the Geo Names Video that Jonathan Zuck has put together.

Finally, I do see that we have some space for further Any Other Business and in fact, at this very moment in time I should ask whether anyone would to like make amendments to the agenda or add things to it and perhaps comment on it? The floor is open. I see Alan Greenberg having put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENGERG: Thank you very much. There was a recent email discussion, I think it was triggered by Maureen's report on her discussion with the President and CEO, that money might be available for something. The suggestion was made to do a survey to find out what users really want as opposed to what we think they want and there was a number of comments on. I would like to make a comment with regard to that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Money, money, money, it's a rich man's world as they say. We'll have that over in the Any Other Business part of this call. Be good to have a little more information about it. Any other additional points or any other business to add to this agenda? Not seeing any further comments or suggestions, let's then proceed forward with our action items from our last call.

There are less than a handful remaining. The first one is for Olivier and Jonathan on behalf of the Consolidated Policy Working Group to raise the issue of the PDP 3.0 but that's an action item for ICANN66, so yet to be done, yet to happen. Marita Moll, coordinating with Holly and Abdulkarim, will revise the ALAC Statement on the Multistakeholder Model as needed. I believe that we'll probably hear from her later on on this call, especially after speaking with Brian Cute.

Then the CWPG member to discuss the CCT Review Team on this list, on the mailing list and I'm not seeing any discussions on the mailing list at present, so naughty, naughty, I think we need to get that going. Perhaps we should have someone launch this discussion, that's

particularly important for At-Large. Any comments or questions on the remaining actions items that we currently have? I am not seeing anyone.

We can proceed forward with the next part of our agenda, that's going to be the discussion with Brian Cute. Welcome Brian.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, Olivier, can you hear me well?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you well. Welcome. The floor is over to you.

BRIAN CUTE: Great, thanks very much Olivier. I'll give a brief overview of where we are in the process and leave most of the balance of the time for Q&A and discussion. Thank you all for having me to this session, I'm happy to give you an update. Where we are in evolving ICANN's Multistakeholder Process is we are in Phase Two, which is developing a work plan. For those of you who have been involved, Phase One was about the Community identifying issues that may be hampering the more effective and efficient functioning of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model. That work was done over the course of the first half of the year.

Through that work and input from the Community and comments, a list of issues was identified and it has been organized and consolidated down to a list of eight issues the Community believes may be hampering more effective functioning of the model. In Marrakesh we shifted the

focus to developing a workplan and currently, as you know, there is a request for Public Comments that is asking the Community for inputs that will help us develop that workplan.

Very specifically, there are really two critical questions in that Request for Public Comment. One is, now that we have a list of issues identified, eight issues that Community has said are hampering the functioning of the model, before we put them into a workplan and before we assign a task of developing a solution or an approach to an owner, let's make sure that we're not duplicating any work, that would be the last thing we'd want to do.

The first really critical question in the Request for Public Comment is, are there any solutions that exist or that are being developed somewhere in the Community that could sufficiently address one of the issues in issue in question? The question to the Community is looking around at some of the work that's being done in different places, are there existing solutions? If there are, let's identify them. If we believe they could sufficiently address the issue, let's not put that into the workplan, let's not duplicate work or reinvent a wheel. The Community has spoken clearly about how much it's baring up and delivering and we don't need to create inefficiencies through this process, that's the first key question.

In the Public Comment Document, I have identified certain work that's being done that could represent a solution, the question to the Community is, does it? Would it sufficiently address an issue, yes or no? The answer is no. The Community has identified issue X, it believes it is hampering the more effective functioning of the model and that we

need to develop a solution and take that onboard and improve the way we do our business.

The next critical question is, who should take on the task of developing a solution, proposing a solution? That's the second critical question. The response can range of course from, it should be a particular AC or a particular SO, is the best fit given their role, given their focus to develop a solution to issue X. It could be the Community as a whole really should take on this task. It could be the ICANN Board, it could ICANN Org. The second critical question in the Public Comment is, who should take on the task of developing a proposed solution?

That's what's in front of Community, that is going to close on October 14th. I'm looking forward to the output of that. I will be preparing a summary of comments coming out of that and with those inputs, in Montreal at ICANN66, there will be a Plenary Session I believe on Thursday the 7th, where I'll be presenting the output and presenting the workplan, the elements of the workplan that's been developed through Community comments and through a couple of webinars that we just had on the 11th and 12th and the Community input shaping what the workplan should be.

Last point, the workplan itself will become part of the Five-Year Operating Plan, that will put out for Public Comment I understand in December, the Community will have another opportunity to comment on the workplan as it will be part of the Five-Year Operating Plan.

That's the overview of where we are and that's where we're going. I hope that was helpful and clear. I'm happy to take your questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Brian. The floor is now open for questions or comments. The first person in the cue is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: The issues that the ALAC identified and there are a range of them, include things like the volunteerism, the difficulty with the fact that most of us have got day jobs and they are not about ICANN. The complexity of the issues for the newbies or even the people who have been here for. What amounts to a short period of time, such as 30 days if you're actually trying to actually go out to a constituency and get response and come back. When we looked at the actually proposed solutions, none of those seemed to be addressed with the solutions you proposed.

One of the things we're talking about last time was, the PDP 3 or the revisions that GNSO is doing about the PDP, having looked the headings, that's all I have to go on, it does look as if the PDP 3 will be revising the processes for the PDP but somehow in ways that may not address our issues and in fact may aggravate the problem, things like actually betting and putting conditions on people who participate, those sort of things. I don't see in the headings that now exist for the PDP 3, that they actually address the issues that we've got and we in discussions haven't seen other proposals that necessarily address the difficulties.

Now, one thing I hark back to is the GNSO Review which predated our review and suggestions about the way in which the GNSO can actually assist a lot of people in participating. Things like before a PDP is called

having a webinar or two webinars so that all the global community can participate about a subject or different way in which you can assist in people in understanding the issue and encouraging participating, recognizing the time it takes.

Also, thinking about how you deal with issues that sometimes are very complex and technical and how you make those easy. ICANN Learn may be part of that, webinars maybe part of that but the sort of the things that will assist end users to understand the issue and participate, I just don't see as part of your solutions. I was hoping PDP 3 might be part of those solutions but looking at those headings, I don't think so. I welcome your comments. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thank you, Holly. Everything you just said really reflects the kind of input that I'm hoping comes in through the Public Comment. To make a small but important clarification, the pointer in the link to PDP 3.0 and the other pointers in the Request for Public Comment Documents are not proposed solutions, they are not proposed solutions from me, what I was simply doing was looking across the landscape, pointing to work that's being done that is relevant to the issue. The question which you really are answering and thank you for that is, there is some work that's being done that's relevant to this issue that's been identified by the Community, could it be a sufficient solution to this issue?

And as you analyzed it, it's your conclusion is, no I don't think it is, that's precisely the type of feedback I'm looking for through the Public Comment Period. That's an important clarification, I'm really just

pointing to work that's being done in the Community that's relevant to the issue, that's been described by the Community and asking, "Would this fit the bill?"

There is some important aspects of thinking that through, you've reflected a number of them. It could very well be that work done in PDP 3.0 could develop some efficiencies and effectiveness for GNSO PDP's going forward but because they are tailored to a GNSP PDP they might not be fit for purpose for other work in other parts of the community, at the same time they might be, so I'm really asking the Community to look at the work that's being done and just as you offered, do a careful analysis of whether or not it could satisfy and address the issue.

If the answer is yes and there is confidence coming from the Community on that point, then that's wonderful, we don't have to create a new workstream in the workplan. If the answer is no, which is what I'm hearing the conclusion you're reaching of coming to, then the question becomes, then who in the Community should take on the task of developing and proposing a solution to this issue? Again, that could be an AC, SO, it could be the Community as a whole, it could be the Board, it could be the Org, it could be a combination of entities, that's the input I'm really looking for.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Brian. Next in the cue is Abdulkarim Oloyede.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much, Thank you, Brian for your presentation. My question is a follow up to some of the issues that Holly raised. For example, in your document which you sent around, where you gave some examples of things that have done, things that are ongoing, things that should address the issues, you made mention of probably ATRT3 and for example on the PDP 3. Some of things are just ongoing and the outcome, it's really difficult at times to say, okay are we sure the outcome of this process is going to solve some of these problems. We cannot assume that yes, it's going to solve the problem but until we see the outcome, how the outcome is going to be implemented, it might be really difficult sometimes to say, yes, I agree with you, this will solve the problem. That's my first question.

The other is one, in some of these cases you want a yes or a no answer, sometimes [inaudible] yes or you might need some explanation on a yes. Can we put in more explanation on yes but this can also be done? That's the second one.

The last one, probably on the issue of some of the things that were not properly addressed, can we probably add some things which we feel are important or not addressed by some of your outlines? Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE: Certainly, thanks for the questions. I'll take them in order. Yes, I pointed in on instance to ATRT3, it appears that ATRT3 is in the process of developing a recommendation to the Board that would address prioritization and finances and prioritization of the work is an issue that's been identified by the Community. You're quite right, that's a

work in progress. I've asked and Cheryl is on the call, we don't have great specificity yet, that's work that is being done in parallel. It would not be possible to state with confidence that that piece of work would be a solution to the prioritization work.

However, the reality is the ATRT3 work is going to continue, it will come to an end, there will be recommendations and so that workstream and this workstream which are working in parallel will need to be coordinated and managed and it very well may be at the end of ATRT3's work that there is a recommendation that comes out that addresses sufficiently or significantly the prioritization of work. This is a work in progress, all you can provide at this moment in time is your understanding and your confidence about whether or not work in the Community could address an issue sufficiently and if the answer is, I don't know, that's a fine answer.

In terms of offering explanations beyond a yes and no, please, please do, every bit of input, every bit of thinking, your assumptions, your rationales are all very, very helpful so please don't feel limited in offering explanations. Lastly, yes, it's a request for public comment so if there are other important issues that you think should be noted, you are invited to provide those in your response.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Next person in the cue is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much and welcome Brian. I was on I think the first webinar and I was rather disappointed in that there were perhaps two or three times as many Staff members and a few Board member then there were other participants in the Community. I think Cheryl, I and one other person were the only ones who asked any questions or made any comments. I sure hope your second webinar went a little bit better with more participation.

To follow on on Holly's comment, I think you missed part of the point of what she was making, it's not whether PDP 3.0 will meet the GNSO's desires to make PDP's more efficient, it probably will, the problem is there may be other side effects which are very not desirable from certainly our perspective. A lot of what they're looking and it's not only thing they're looking at but part of what they're looking at is so many people talking and disagreeing with each other slows things down, let's reduce the number of people there, that will not necessarily allow for all of the comments that are needed for an effective policy to be made to be made. It will certainly be more efficient but it's not clear it will result in better policy and I'm not quite sure better policy is one of their targets, maybe it is.

My comment is and you've heard this before, I think a fair number of the issues you have are perceived issues that are really caused by the root cause of the problem is not the issue identified but the fact that we don't have solutions to other issues. Prioritization of work is a mother issue, of course one should prioritize work but it's not clear that inability to prioritize or inability to eliminate things from our priority schedule is the real problem.

I believe the real problem is the lack of ability to come to consensus, the culture trust silos issues, all of those things which make it very difficult to come out and do things effectively so we end up spending an infinite amount of time doing things which aren't really justified, certainly in the eyes of the people putting their time into it and that's why it's so hard to get people to commit to these projects and to follow them through and then come back again. It takes a rather unique person to put up with the frustrations that we subject them to in a PDP for instance or in some of our processes and then come back and do it again. Masochism may be a word that applies. That's it.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thanks Alan. I'll just observe to your last point that the Community was invited from the beginning of this process to identify issues that related to either work processes, working methods or culture and your point is well taken. Work processes and working methods because of their nature and what they are and how they're defined can in some ways be easier to identify and address. Culture, trust and silos, which is an issue, three issues strongly interrelated is its own animal and appreciate your observations on how that can impact the effectiveness and efficiency of the work.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Brian and I see two more people in the cue. In the interests of time, since we do have limited time for this call, I'll close the cue after Greg Shatan. Still in the queue is Marita Moll and then Greg. Marita Moll, you have the floor.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you, Brian for that review. I have to say that the business about asking us to evaluate whether or not a certain process which is not in completion which is still underway would possibly resolve or possibly to some extent resolve these problems is a real barrier here in responding to your request for comment because it's impossible to know. Although we would like it if some of these things would response to some of these issues, we just don't know, I find that as a barrier.

There is a timing issue, it'd be nice if it was a few weeks later and some of this stuff would have come in but it's not, it's right now, it's due on the 14th so we haven't had the answer to that stuff. Beyond that, we don't that, how can we actually say, well who should be doing this work when we don't know if the people who are doing the work, whether they're doing the work we think is going to be useful to this particular issue? You can see there is a confusion here, a barrier in that particular part that I'm finding a little hard to get over. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thank you, Marita. I hear you and particularly if you're not a member of the group, whether it's PDP, GNSO some there that is in question, I can fully appreciate that. I think some of the analytical tools can be used in trying to address the question are, would this solution be fit for purpose for all the Community's work or as I said before, is it fit for purpose for improving the effectiveness of the GNSO PDP but not applicable to another workstream, whether that's precision and scope in the work or

representative verses open. Endeavor to analyze it from that perspective.

I also can say that there has been a fair amount of comment along the way, people offering their ideas on who should take on the task of developing a solution and it's been interesting to see the Community has been put forward a number of times throughout the process and it could be that there are multiple groups. Some of these things, prioritization of the work example, it's been suggested a number of times that the Community as they've been describing the challenge, really is the one to take the lead in developing a purposed solution.

Given the role the Board has in developing strategic plan, operating plan, annual budget and plan and the role that ICANN Org has in that regard, it's hard to imagine a solution being developed or proposed in a silo or in a vacuum. It's hard to imagine a solution being developed that wouldn't involve the coordination between the Community, the Board and the Org. I just offered these are reflections of some comments that have come in, I hope they're helpful to you and I hear you on the challenge.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Brian. Next in the cue is Greg Shaten.

GREG SHATEN: Thanks. Hate to end on a relatively minor note, but just to follow up on what Alan was saying with regard to PDP 3.0, one of the concerns is that in trying to make the group smaller, they are cutting down on

representation and cutting out groups, especially groups that don't have structures for them already in the ICANN space and indeed favoring GNSO entities over for instance At-Large if you look at EPDP as a potential model or implementation of that.

Clearly the GNSO council is tasked with managing the GNSO process but it's not supposed to be the GNSO process maker alone, there is a real concern there about how the circle is being drawn so tightly and a lot of things end up getting worked out in the seating chart before the group even starts. For groups, at least on the ICANN chart, like ALAC and GAC, that are co-equal GNSO, to look at the seating chart, the two seats that we as At-Large are assigned compared to the six seats that are assigned alone to NCSG NCUC, one wonders what game is a foot but it's certainly the not the game of representative multi stakeholderism. That was hard to say but it's even harder to do. Thanks.

BRIAN CUTE:

Thanks for that, and again, all those observations are very welcome and helpful. Thanks everybody, I appreciate the questions and please, look forward to your response in the Request for Public Comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Brian, for joining us to answer these questions. There are a number of comments that were made in the chat as well, good discussion there as well. Our next steps with regards to this is to pick up from the discussions we've had here and to sit with Marita and let other how we're going to proceed forward. Thank you and if we

have further questions and comments can we still fire them off you in some way?

BRIAN CUTE: Absolutely, please do. There is an ICANN website in the email list please do and I'll respond in kind.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Great. Thank you so much for taking the time to speak to us on this very important topic and looking forward to see you and follow up in the Montreal meeting.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you, Oliver, thank you everyone. Bye-bye.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Now, the next point of our agenda is going to be about the Subsequent Procedures and Justine Chew is going to take us very swiftly through a few updates that she has been working on. Justine, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. With regards to the Subsequent Procedures Update Workspace, I have put up another update and circulated that on the list and that's to do with the topic of objections. I wasn't going to go through the presentation itself because it's quite long. The topic of objections does cover a lot of segments. I will leave it to this group and also people on the mailing list to actually go through the presentation

on your own time, if there are any questions, I'm happy to address them either here or through the list.

I just wanted to point out a couple of things with regards to the presentation, which is that the SubPro Working Group has starting drilling on the Public Comments received on the objections, started last week and will continue this week. Part of the segments that we have covered last week, in particular one to do with ALAC objections, the fact that ICANN is suppose to fund objections that are filed by ALAC to any applications that ALAC thinks is problematic and we can actually file objections under the category of limited public interest objections or community objections.

Some parties or some groups within the Community have questioned this funding that's given to ALAC and they are suggesting that we have certain limits or certain limits be placed on this funding that's given to ALAC, that limits in terms of the amount of funding, either the amount of funding or the amount of objections that can be filed. That it be subject to certain guidance or criteria.

Now, I attempted to resist this suggestion by arguing that we already have a stringent process in place to determine whether ALAC is going to file an objection or not and to simply weigh into the mechanics of how ALAC is supposed to go through the process of determining that is a but beyond the scope of the working group, it's something that ALAC should have control over. We are still yet to discuss the comments on the role of the independent objector, that's going to happen later this week.

The next topic after objections that working will cover will be accountability mechanisms which basically deals with appeals. I mentioned that because the question of appeals came up with objections. Basically, the idea that if somebody files an objection and it fails, do they have an appeal mechanism to deal with the failure or do they have a mechanism to appeal against the dismissal of their objections.

With regards to Work Track 5, I'll just give an update on what's happening. We had a bit of a reprieve last week; we didn't have a call last week. But, our colleague, Xavier, didn't enjoy that reprieve, as part of leadership they've been working on how to construct the report, the draft recommendations that's going to go back to the full working group and they come up with a proposed workplan that we're going to be discussing right after this because there is a conflict between this call and the Work Track 5 call.

We're going to go through process for consensus call in the upcoming meeting. The ultimate timeline for coming up with the report that's based on consensus call to the full working group is late October, 24th to 28th of October. Between today and those dates we have time to address what is going to go into the report or what's not going to go into the report. That's it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for these updates, Justine. Thank you for the complete PowerPoint presentation that you've also prepared on the topic of Objections, I know you haven't been able to go through the

whole PowerPoint but I invite colleagues and friends on this call to in their own time have a look at it and of course, this will be added to all of the presentations that are currently stored in the CPWG SubPro Comments Ongoing Work Space, so that the time we will be solicited to make a statement, there will be all this amazing information that will be their basis some of your discussion. Are there any comments or questions at this stage from any of our colleagues on the call?

Well, short of thanking you, I think that's all there is to it today on this specific topic of Subsequent Procedures. We look forward to future updates again Justine and if as usually you need any on the spot recommendations or feedback, just email the mailing list and hopefully there will be a quick response. This is really great to see those updates, those regular updates.

Now, for more regular updates, we're moving to agenda item five in our agenda and that's the Expedited PDP. As you heard last week, the previous week the group meet n Los Angles, a lot of things took place in LA, so much so that Alan Greenberg who is with us today had to take a short break immediately afterwards but he's back and he's back to let us know about what went on. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I presume you did get a report of the face to face but I'll give you a very capsule report. Day one I thought was horrible, we spent a lot of time talking about accreditation and various things like that. We went back and forth, we accomplished virtually nothing. The afternoon was largely allocated to a presentation by the CEO and then

by the group that will be approaching the European Data Protection Board and although there were tidbits of things there that I thought were rather interesting, the overall perception of the group was, it was not a satisfying experience. Just too much was not said, there were some people, I don't agree with but who felt it's quite inappropriate for ICANN to be approaching the Data Protection Board without us, the EPDP being the main consultant on what is said, I won't go into all the details. It was not a very satisfying day.

The second day and then the third were I thought far more productive. At least part of it due to there were more focus on specific issues and perhaps a little bit more discipline and control that we stayed focused on those issues instead of randomly moving on to other pet peeves.

We ended up accomplishing a fair amount at the meeting which I don't think we could have done on teleconferences but not nearly as productive as some of us hoped going into it.

Last week's meeting I can't speak to, I wasn't on it and I haven't had a chance yet to listen to the transcript. There was a -- normally meetings are only on Thursday's, there was a meeting yesterday that I was not supposed to be attending but as it turned out neither Hadia nor Bastian could make it so I rearranged my schedule somewhat and did participate. It may well have been the most productive EPDP meeting that I've attended. It went very well, we went through all the topics we were trying -- at least most of the topics, we didn't quite make it through all of the topics that we were looking at. I think we used our time well. I think we came to some conclusions and are closer to where

we want to be on those issues then we would have been otherwise. Holly was on that call and she may have some other comments as well.

That's where we are right now. Work is progressing. We are going through the various issues on whether there can -- what we have to do to make sure responses for request for redacted information are addressed. There is even some discussion that maybe it is possible for ICANN to take responsibility for this and presumably take liability for it. It's hinge largely on whether the European Data Protection Board agrees that we can but the contracted parties are at some level when originally all you seemed to hear is, it's impossible, now they're saying, we don't know how you could do it but if you can we're happy to have liability removed and work removed of course.

The ALAC has put a comment in on the issue and our position that we've taken is that we don't believe there will be a single method for addressing. Certainly, a lot of people want automated responses for certain types of request. The very common request associated with intellectual property, the cyber security type requests, law enforcement, those are ones that we believe although you have to do a balancing test to see whether one should release the information, to do it on a global scale and not have to do one by one.

The other interesting thing that came out was, the person who is responsible for handling requests for donuts and they don't get a lot of requests they've perhaps gotten 100 requests in the last year or so, but his answer is, once you come to the point where the request is valid, that is you've filled in all the fields, the vast majority of those requests are handled by looking at where the registrant is, saying it's not Europe

or it's clearly company and there is no private information, no personal information in the contact field and that information is just released. He's never had to make a balancing test because most of the ones that he released information for GDPR did not apply, the EPDP Phase 1 work allowed the information to be redacted but doesn't really apply and therefore -- that was a rather interesting revolution. I think that's all I have to say.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this update, Alan. I'm not seeing Hadia on the call so I believe that's the only update we're going to get today. The floor is open for comments and questions. First in the cue is Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: My question for Alan, in the EPDP what is the current status of ALAC's emphasis on the distinction between legal and individual person? Was there any progress? Has it been dropped? What is ALAC doing to peruse that?

ALAN GREENBERG: ALAC's position is very clear, we believe a distinction should be made and the information should not be redacted for legal entities. With the knowledge that a legal person's registration data might include personal data, it might include my name as one of the contacts. There are two ways of looking at that, one is in that case we shouldn't reveal because it clearly looks like personal information and the second is and it's a

position taken by a number of organizations in Europe is, that if my company chooses to put my personal information in registration record, then they are taking the liability and presumably they either have my permission to do it or they take the responsibility of any liability associated with it because they are the ones that are actually consciously putting in personal information into the record.

You can look at how to handle the situation one of multiple ways but in the general case where you have a legal person's information and doesn't contain personal information in the contact, then our position has always been that that should not be redacted at all and GDPR does not require it to be redacted and ICANN should not allow it. That position was stated in Phase 1, we did say we would revisit that in Phase 2, that is not yet known exactly when in Phase 2 we will revisit it. It was explicitly called out by the Board in the response to Phase 1, so I'm expecting we will revisit it at some point, I'm not really expecting a lot of change but I hope it will come up in the discussion again. We are strongly supported by a number of groups including SSAC. We'll see what happens.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I think I had seen Alberto Soto's hand up but it's down again. Giving him the benefit of the doubt, if Alberto wishes to speak, then he can have the floor.

ALBERTO SOTO: No, thank you, Olivier. I was going to make a question but as Alan moved forward with his speech, he actually answered my question so there is no need. Thank you anyway.

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alberto. Thank you for considering asking a question, Alan has these powers to be able to answer questions before they're asked, that's how you ended up in such a job as he is in the Consolidated Policy Working Groups to the EPDP I guess. Any other comments or questions for Alan to answer or Alan, are there any other questions that people are about to ask that you can answer right now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm afraid my powers are failing me, I don't know. I guess they don't know either.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I see Marita Moll has found a question or a comment. Marita, you have the floor.

MARITA MOLL: I just want to point out that Avri's asked a good question in the chat, so maybe Alan would like to address that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Does the ALAC position take into account legal entities that are venerable to attacks such as abused children's shelters? Yes and no.

There is law in some countries that for instance legal entities must reveal certain information but there are actually carveouts in the law to cover things like abused children's centers or abused women's centers or religious organizations in some jurisdiction. Certainly, if we can identify those kinds of things and have similar carveouts in our policy I have no problem with that.

I'm not quite sure how you do it and enforce it but redacting the information of every legal entity because of the fraction of one percent that may deserve it seems to be overkill. Do we support protecting information where there is a valid reason? Of course. Remember, we still right now have privacy services, maybe one day they'll disappear for lack of interest but at this point they're still privacy services that will offer to redact all of the information. There are other options available at this point. Do we support the concept of not revealing that kind of information? Of course, we do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this response, Alan, and thanks for the comments on this, Avri. It's good to think of those cases where there is indeed a requirement for redaction of data, very strong need for redaction of data. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. Clearly the discussion will continue. Thank you, Alan and Hadia, for having continuing to fly the fly in the EPDP, very, very important process and certainly very taxing on its participants. We look forward to hear from you next week. Until then we're going to move on and now Marita Moll will provide us with an update on the Amazon Public Interest

Commitments. A recent request that has been made by Amazon. Over to Marita.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you, Olivier. I prepared a small slide deck here just to update you and what I've discovered about this particular issue. I have to say to start out with that it's pretty tough to find a lot of information about this issue. One of the things that have been commented on in the research that I did on this, is the fact that ICANN seems to have carefully hidden the request to comment on this and put it in a difficult place. I'm not sure when we decide what we want to say exactly how we say it but we can cover that later.

What I wanted to share with you is what's actually being offered as far as I can determine and what's not being offered. At the moment, what's being offered is that nine Amazon domains, dot Amazon domains be set aside as second levels, one for the actual organization which is the organization of countries that line the Amazon basin and one for each of the members of each of the country members, so that's nine, eight countries, nine domains. These have primary and well recognized significance culture and heritage of the reason but they're only to be used for non-commercial purposes. That's one of the things that Amazon Org is offering.

They're also saying that -- the example I've got here is BR.AMAZON, for Brazil and that Amazon would imagine that would basically be a link to Brazil and its position along the Amazon. They could also use specific cultural and heritage, river and rainforest names, they wouldn't have to

use the country name. But Amazon would have a veto power of the content on these websites and these websites would basically have to be static sites, not user generated, content allowed. That's one thing that is being offered as part of this public commitment.

Then they're offering to block 1500 strings per TLD, that is because Amazon's applying for English, Japanese and Chinese TLDs of their strings. Those 1500 strings would represent the culture and heritage of the Amazon regions. Blocking all kinds of names, maybe have to do with indigenous peoples or all that that couldn't be used. There is supposedly a list that is to be set up over the next two years and a steering committee would decide on the names that would be on this list. Amazon however has a veto power but ACTO countries can appeal under PIC dispute resolution policy. There are a few other things being offered in the PIC's, having to do with security things being offered, I didn't include those because they seemed to me to be things that Amazon would have to be doing anyways.

Here are some things that are not being offered. ACTO wanted majority control over that policy steering committee and they wanted a more generous definition of culture and heritage. The current suggestions that these names could not include, cities, towns, villages and all those things that are listed on there animals, plants, ACTO is saying that's far too restrictive a list to be offering. ACTO also wanted a button on every webpage which linked to an ACTO site promoting the Amazon region.

That's what I've been able to discover according to the readings that I've done. The question here to you is, what's at stake for end users? I've suggested a few things. Is this precedence setting? Do you want to

consider it as such? Is there enough respect for cultural right? Is it too restrictive regarding the ownership of local names, etc.? I don't know the answer to these questions but I'm sure that there are GAC's for example, divided on this, on what's been going on with Amazon. Don't know where GAC is on exactly the PIC.

I am asking for your help here on, how we could possibly address this if we want to address this? I guess that's the first question. Do we think it's something we ought to address? Certainly, I think it's interesting and it has been commented on various things that it's extremely well hidden so few people are likely to find this request for comment or how to input it. In fact, I'm going to be asking for help on how to do that when we get there. What are the other ways in which we might want to position ourselves? It's open to questions and I see Alan's hand is up, great. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Question first, where did you find it? Is it a registry change request or was it put in some other place?

MARITA MOLL:

I have to look back to where I found it because I only got to it through other stuff I was reading, like various third party comments on this, in some of the web reports, those various online reports and that's how I got to it because looking all around the ICANN website it was nowhere. I can't answer that question but maybe Staff can answer that question but I can't answer that question right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you go onto the other people and let me look where I think it probably is and come back to afterwards?

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marita. I slotted myself in the cue, I have two very small questions. On I believe it is page two or three, on page three, you mention here public commitments for dot Amazon and what is being offered and you mention blocking of up to 1500 strings for TLDs, is it blocking or is it reserving of up to 1500 strings per TLD because there is a difference, blocking it means effectively nobody will be able to use it, reserving means that the relevant authorities will be able to use those strings? That's my first question.

My second question is, further down, where you just like how are the parties aligned, you didn't quite go through the slide and let us know who was favoring and not favoring the points that were made there.

MARITA MOLL: Okay Olivier, in response to your second question I don't know the answer to that question. The information isn't even out there. I just put that slide as a teaser, maybe other people know the answer to that question. Blocking or reserving, I took it to mean that those are strings that can be used but I'll have to look again, it's good a question and

maybe I've got this confused that those are strings that are set aside. I probably used the wrong word. I'll take that question and go back to it. As I say, it's been hard to get any information about this, I'm depending on you guys to ask the right questions here. I'll get back on that one. I see Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess my understanding of this is that there is an agreement and that strings like represent the culture and heritage of the Amazon region come from that agreement. What we're meant to be evaluating here is comparing their implementation plan to that agreement to the agreement itself and not just against our general thoughts about geographic names or anything like.

I don't think this is the call for that, I think if I understand it correctly, it's meant to be an assessment of their interpretation of the agreement that was struck between Amazon and the regional governments. Did you come across that document because I think that's the key to responding to this public comment, do these offers or whatever you want to call them amount to a reasonable interpretation of the agreement that was reached?

MARITA MOLL:

Thanks, Jonathan, for that question. It wasn't a question of agreement as far as I understand. What I understand happened here was that they're not in agreement and that the ACTO group is asking for more but Amazon the organization has been awarded the TLD and this is their

public interest committee that they have put forward, that's how I understand it. I see Alan's hand up, go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, it isn't where I thought it might be. I guess it would be useful if you could provide us with the link where the actual documents are that you found, the ones from which you extracted your slides so that we can look at the actual source documents and try to understand as well.

MARITA MOLL: Yes, what I'll do is I'll find the -- I can put a whole reference list -- are we going to have a Wiki page on this, anything? I could put a reference documents on there because there is the actual agreement and then there is the background sources that I read, people commenting on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Marita, can I suggest you put them in email and if Staff puts a Wiki page then they'll be copied there as well. Let's not delay waiting for a Wiki page.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, I can put them in email very shortly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. Anyone else in the cue here? Sivasubramanian.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Thank you. This is on blocking up to 1500 strings, whether it's blocking or reserving, the underlying idea probably is to be careful about certain domain names that could be abused or carelessly used. Maybe the idea is to reserve it temporarily and then make sure the domain name goes to the right person or to right group that will not abuse the domain name. How did they arrive at the figure of 1500? Why 1500? Why not 500? Why not 5000? Why not 10000? How did you arrive 1500?

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, that's a good question. Actually, the ACTO group wanted way more than 1500, but Amazon said that it couldn't be an open ended list because they were going to need to use a lot of these words basically for some of their ongoing products so there had to be a fairly restricted list. That is how I understood what it came down too. I think that 1500 is a pretty arbitrary number but it reflects the fact that Amazon Organization is worried about too many reserved names on a list might affect their ability to use these words, if the word book came up, book.amazon, they wouldn't want words like that on a list and I guess that is understandable.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Marita, that's very, very helpful and very interesting. Very interesting discussion and thank you for slides. One last question,

what are the next steps for this because this looks like there is a proposal from Amazon, there are some responses, what's happening next on this?

MARITA MOLL:

What's happening next is, we decide whether or not we should respond, is this something that really is an end user issue? That's how we're really supposed to start with these things according to our upcoming charter and if we do think that it's an end user issue then we do what we're doing now, which is figuring out whether or not where we feel that there are public interest commitments in this case could be improved. More research needs to be done, I've done as much as I can so far and I wanted to share it with you but we really need the input of the rest of the community to make sure that we're on the right page on this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Is there a deadline for this?

MARITA MOLL:

October 14th.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hand is down. I was going to ask if there was a deadline. This time you did it to me.

OLIVIER CREPN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I guess that we can have an action item to get a Wiki page up for this and follow up on the mailing list. This is only a 30-day Public Comment period mentioned Cheryl. We probably have to slightly shorter than usual, have to get moving quite quickly on this.

MARITA MOLL: That's right. I'll continue working on it and maybe Staff could put up a Google Page to start working on and we'll put stuff on the list.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you and I note from Sylvia that the deadline is October the 14th, she mentions on this. A Wiki page will be created and this presentation which you've made could please be added to the Wiki page that would be helpful, so people who have not managed to follow this call are able to quickly look through the slide deck you'd put together. Thank you, another great update and great piece of work to get us alerted and moving on this. Next in our agenda is the Policy Comment Updates with Jonathan Zuck. Jonathan, you therefore have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, I'm on a train so I'm having some technological difficulties. We've already talked a little bit about the Multistakeholder Model and

about the Public Procedures. I've got a short presentation about the CCT Implementation Public Comment, maybe Staff could bring that up?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Jonathan said he had a presentation.

STAFF: One moment. I'm looking for it. All I have [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, I sent one, the subject is CCT PowerPoint for today's CPWG Call. I'll keep talking in the meantime. This is a big issue that spreads across a number of other issues and other sort of vectors of communication that we have going on. When the CCT submitted the report the Board -- thank you -- the CCT submitted its report, the Board responded and unfortunately the optics were bad because it was the very first review team to bring in recommendations after the transition and also the first set of recommendations the Board didn't just accept.

We submitted our recommendations in the next slide the Board responded -- is someone doing the slides or is my internet just really slow? I guess I'm going to keep talking because I'm still just seeing the first slide. They ended up dividing the recommendations into three categories, accepted, pending and forwarded because there were certain recommendations that the CCTRT had directed to more than one entity, we realized up front that there were parallel things going on, it was very similar to what Brian is dealing with on Multistakeholder stuff.

There were some things that they just said noted and forwarded and they went on to subsequent procedures, that's its own category of challenges. The Board accepted a few recommendations and then put a whole bunch into a pending status, where they asked ICANN Org to go over them for a cost benefit standpoint, a return on investment standpoint and get back to them. They have not yet reported back. This particular comment period is about the ones that they accepted and the Staff created implementation time for them.

So, what they did is they talked about timelines and dependencies, et cetera. So the first accepted recommendation was Recommendation #1, that was about taking data more seriously as an organization and formalizing the collection and distribution and publication of data to make it easier for the community as a whole to make more objective decisions, both about what policies to implement and also about what policies to retire if they're not working. Our initial recommendation was just put somebody in charge of this and have them get started, and they didn't want to have their hands tied by that specific of a recommendation.

We could hire a data scientist. And so we just made it more open ended how it could be implemented, and so the implementation is quite broad in terms of trying to develop a model for data collection, identify vendors, et cetera, put that out in front of the community and come back. So it's a pretty big muddle, but it's not an unreasonable timeline, given the complexity of their implementation. And so my recommendation is to say something supportive about their plans for implementation on Recommendation #1. Next slide, please.

So the next recommendation that they accepted was Publishing of Reseller Data. And they noted that there was a new field that was added in 2017, which was a voluntary field, to list resellers, and they therefore believe that this was preemptively accomplished while the CCT was doing its work, and they don't intend to do more. And my suggestion is that the ALAC may want to suggest that that information be mandatory so the you can really get more information about what the chain of custody of the domain was, because it's very hard for the review team to figure out what all the sales channels for things were when we tried to do any kind of quantitative analysis. Next slide.

So, Recommendation 21 was about more granular compliance data. One of the things the CCT was tasked with doing was accepting the success of the face cards that were put in place as part of the 2012 round, and one of the things that made that difficult was that the complaints that came into ICANN were not categorized in a way that made them easy to associate with those face cards, and so there was a request, a recommendation by the CCT that contract compliance publish more granular information about the complaints so that we could figure out what type of abuse it was, et cetera, and more easily categorize things for doing analysis on how a new round or even the physical TLDs were doing. Compliance is done a lot along the way to create more fields that they have made available.

There is still the question about sharing which gTLD is involved, and that's something that's still part of ICANN asking whether it would have a negative impact on their ability to enforce contracts. So it has always been the policy of ICANN Compliance to keep complaints confidential and go and talk to the target of the complaint on the side and try to get

them to resolve it without having to do something public. So I think they're hesitant to change that model because they think they can get more done that way.

But again, it makes it difficult to spot things like problem TLDs who have very high levels of DNS abuse, because they're so complaint oriented in the way that they respond to things. So, this is an area where I would recommend that ALAC support reporting on this field as part of their complaints system. It's something that's being studied, but I think ALAC would want to support the gTLD field being part of their complaint publication. Next slide.

Recommendation 22 is about coming up with some best practices related to Sensitive Strings, things like .doctor et cetera, and how they should be treated differently. The recommendation said that ICANN should engage with stakeholders to come up with best practices. This is something where ICANN has begun this process and it remains to be seen how it turns out. So here I think it makes sense for us to be cautiously optimistic, but vigilant and look to see whether or not it actually scratches the itch.

There was a lot of pushback generally from the Board on thins that might require changes to contracts, and they don't believe they have control over what the contracts are, and yet the first ATRT review had a contract change in it and ICANN.org when out and negotiated that change. So, I'm not entirely sympathetic to the idea that ICANN doesn't have any control over its contracts, and I think we need to push back on that notion, generally speaking. Next slide.

The last ones are about Underserved Regions. They basically said we should do a better job, their recommendations are that we should do a better job, we should have the global staff if it's decided that it's a priority, that new applicants from underserved regions is a priority. We also had a recommendation that said that ICANN should better manage the mentoring program that was set up, because it got set up and then nothing came of it. People signed up to be mentors, and yet nothing happened after that. And so those were accepted, but this is for the SubPro issue and one that we continue to engage in with Subsequent Procedures.

I actually think John McCormack's issue agree registrars might be better taken into that discussion than it is in the GEO names discussion, where he brought it up on the CPWG list. So the underserved regions is something that is a SubPro issues, and not an issue for the Board. So, those are the implementation issues that they brought up and my suggested responses to them. Next slide.

Next Steps. We will also probably do some advice to the Board on the DNS issue in particular, because a lot of things were pushed into pending status, pending a definition of DNS abuse, but because this PRT had a limited mandate that was about safeguards, there was already an established definition of DNS abuse that led to those safeguards, a very conservative definition of DNS abuse and a definition that could be used for the implementation of those recommendations absent the whole community wide effort to do an expansive exercise to define DNS abuse.

This is suggested by Leon, as well, we should do that in the form of advice, not complicate this comment which is specifically implementation with other recommendations, but do separately some ALAC advice on the issue of DNS abuse no acute disease having the Board switch those particular DNS abuse-related recommendation out of pending status, into accepted status, using the more conservative definition that the CC PRT employed.

So, that's what I think Next Steps are, and it will probably be me drafting both of these things, but I wanted to go over them with you and get your sense, see if you have questions, et cetera. That's what this comment period is about, the implementation of the six recommendations that they accepted outright. Any questions?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a question, are we going to actually spend most of the time on DNS abuse but some of the other recommendations, are we going to say what are you going to do about these? Because there are a lot of recommendations that are pending.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, they have led me to believe that the Staff report on those recommendations is imminent, I'll try to confirm that. Because then we'll have something to actually talk about. So, what I was going to focus on in the advice were things that they put into pending status sort of inappropriately. In other words, arguing that they misunderstood them in a way, and that's just some of them, and we'll try to move them, and then the ones they put into pending status, they've got to

process and Staff will come back with a report on those, and I think we'll be able to farm it out.

So, we could throw a line in there, we look forward to the status of these, because there are, in fact there are review teams that were counting on those recommendations being accepted and limited their own recommendations with the confidence that those CCTRT recommendations were going to be accepted. So it's actually put a number of things in limbo. So, there are a lot of things going on right now, both in ATRT, there's also a group of review teams that are wondering what this means, and there's a generalized process for how the Board should react to the deluge of recommendations that they're now facing and will face in the future. So there are a lot of bigger discussions, but I think we'll have something to react to before too long. And if it takes too long, then we can issue more advice.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Okay, that's the only hand I see. So, next step, I'll try to throw some prose around these bullets. But for now, I will hand it back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was just going to ask one thing, which is for that presentation PowerPoint you have to be linked to the agenda so that it's

easily found by people who are covering the call later on or for future reference.

So, I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment, having to fight against the train announcement, it looks as though you're reaching destination, and in this call you certainly are about to reach a destination, as we are reaching Any Other Business, and that includes one small item of discussion about the recent announcement that there would be some funding of At-Large in the ALAC activities. I'm not quite sure how we are to structure this, perhaps a reminder of what the announcement is about would be the first step forward. I see Maureen Hilyard's hand up, as she is the person that broke the news. ALAC Chair, Maureen Hilyard.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I was actually waiting until Alan had actually asked the question or whatever it was, he was going to make a comment. I just wanted to know if Alan had a comment to make first.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Right, let's get Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do I have a comment on what?

MAUREEN HILYARD: You had a question that you were going to raise.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Oh, the AOB question. Just that I think Jonathan had said something about maybe we should use the money to do a survey to find out what users really want. And someone else said yeah, it's about time, things like that. And someone pointed out, I don't remember who, that most things that users will respond that they want are out of ICANN's remit and I think that is largely correct. The real question is what do users want with respect to ICANN's remit, and I don't think you're ever going to get satisfactory answers from the user in the street on that.

That kind of comment gets a lot of popular support, but I think we have to be very careful if we're going to potentially put together a request for a substantial amount of money, and by the way, these kind of surveys take a long time to do when you talk about how to formulate it and then do it, and then get responses, we're probably talking a year, or a significant amount of time, anyways, six months. I think we have to be really careful that we are talking within ICANN's remit and your typical user has no clue who we are, what we are, what we do, or how our decisions are going to influence them.

That's one of the whole problems we talked about with Brian, of doing our work, it's complex and it's built into the underworld of the internet so to speak. So I think we have to keep in perspective, especially if we're talking about using money for surveys, that just who is it we're talking to and do we really believe that your typical user is going to be able to provide us with guidance. That's the only comment I'm asking, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Maureen, it's Olivier speaking. For the sake of those people who are not in the know, would you please be able to provide us with details of what the actual thing is, in 180 characters.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, in Marrakech, or I think before that, Göran actually brought up the fact that there was some extra money, he wanted to know if SO/AC Chairs had any projects that they had in mind that they would like to use the funding for. So, in Marrakech, we sat altogether and we decided that we didn't particularly like the way it was actually being presented, that is it was going to be open, anyone could make a request for a project, and there was no mechanism in place to indicate who it was going to be managed, who was monitoring it. It was nothing, it was just like if you want some money, come and get it.

So we said thank you, but no thanks, until you have some mechanism in place that's going to make it seem to be more fair to all concerned. So this time he raised it again, and as I know my colleagues have done in their sessions with him, I indicated the concerns that we have, and that we felt it was important that it was more transparent about the funding, how it should be used, the constraints, et cetera. So apparently by Montreal they will have a template, they will have the mechanism in place, how it's going to be used, but mainly it is to do with if constituencies want to propose a project following the template and it goes back to the Chairs, and the Chairs have all got to agree on it, as to whether it fits all the criteria.

The criteria, haven't been developed yet, we are assuming that's going to be included in Org's recommendation, that we will discuss in Montreal. So, when I put it out there and said it's still a work in progress, it's not too early to be starting to think about things that we might be able to do. And if I can just stop here for a second, because Yrjö was the one who mentioned about the research, and it was just a suggestion, I'm sure, but he has his hand up and I'd like him to respond to that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Maureen, next is Yrjö Länsipuro, and I'm going to ask people to be quick, because we are already beyond the end of this call and our interpreters are on borrowed time at the moment. Yrjö Länsipuro.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, this is Yrjö, thank you, Olivier. Yeah, that was me, Maureen suggested if you could put your thinking cap on, and I did that, and came up with this suggestion of spending some of the money for research. I think that we should not dismiss this approach just out of hand because even so, of course, we know what is good for the end user, but it might not be entirely inappropriate to devise some research questions, it's not easy, of course, but if that would be why research is not being done, then no research would ever be done. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Maureen Hilyard?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, thank you. The other matter that was raised was the fact that Göran asked about the fact that we have been putting in, there have been lots of public comments and he was very complimentary about the information that is coming from At-Large through the CPWG and our public comments. But he asked about do we have any advice. Apparently at one stage we were giving them advice about every week, and then there has been a lull and they haven't had much in the way of advice coming from this advisory committee.

So they wanted to know did we have advice that we would like to give to the Board. So I just wanted to highlight this, I know that a lot of our advice is actually incorporated into our public comments, but we should be more specific. If there is something specific that needs to go to the Board, they are quite happy to receive it, in fact they're inviting it now. So that's something I wanted to raise, as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. To be clear, there was a period of time where with forwarded every document we published, whether it was a public comment or saying that our toes were itchy, we forwarded them to the Board. We didn't call it advice, but we did forward everything to the Board. Then we stopped doing that and only sent things to the Board which were destined to the Board. Staff in their wisdom decided, and I don't know which staff, we think it's Board Staff, in their wisdom

decided to take every document that we published and put it on the Board advice calendar.

Eventually that was then flagged to be not advice, but for information only. And this was during the time I was Chair, I protested, saying the Board doesn't really need to see all these things, and I was overruled, saying yes, they do, or yes they want to, or something. But regardless, we have never given advice every week, we have always given very, very little advice because we put our efforts into changing in other ways other than screaming to the Board. So, that has not changed. Their perception may have changed, but it has not changed. Thank you. And if I sound a little bit frustrated, it's because I am.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Olivier if I may, just jumping in behind Alan. Going back to my day as Chair, we were giving a little more advice, but in fact the Board at that stage told us to please stop doing all that, just get on with the job of interacting in the PDP processes and cross community working groups you're involved with. They were watching us closely. We now had a member on the Board, remember, that changed too. So it's a bit of a pendulum swing, we just need to keep acting and reacting, but most importantly make sure what we say is appropriate labeled as to whether it is advice, or not. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. Thanks for this discussion everyone. We will follow up on the mailing list as we always do. Finally, the other piece of Any Other Business was the GEO names, we don't

have time for that, so we'll have to move it to the next call, because we really are over, we're nearly 20 minutes beyond the end of this call. Next meeting, please, when are meeting, next week, I believe?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes Olivier, this is Claudia for the record. We're scheduled for next Wednesday at 1300 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you. So that's our strict rotation, 1300 UTC next meeting next Wednesday. Until then, have a very good week everyone. Follow up on the mailing list. Jonathan, anything else to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, thanks everyone. The videos are still up there for comments and I've been getting good comments on them, so I'll make some kind of a policy menu going forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan, and again, a big thanks to interpreters for sticking with us for this additional 20 minutes, really with apologies. Thank you, and have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, everyone. Bye bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Goodbye everyone, thank you for joining, this meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of the day or evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]