
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, 2nd of October, 2019 at 1300 UTC. On our call today, on the English Channel we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Kaili Kan, Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Fouad Bajwa, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Sebastien Bachollet, Jonathan Zuck, Marita Moll, Alfredo Calderon, Satish Babu, Roberto Gaetano, Nadira Al-Araj, Joel Thayer, Alan Greenberg, John McCormac. On the Spanish Channel we have Alberto Soto.

We have received apologies from Maureen Hilyard, Judith Hellerstein, Leon Sanchez, Justine Chew, Jose Lebron and Vanda Scartezini. From Staff we have Evin Erdogan and myself currently present on today's call and Heidi Ullrich will be joining us shortly. We'll have Spanish interpretation for today's call and our Spanish Interpreters are Veronica and Marina. Before we start, just a kind a reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation. Now, I would like to leave the floor back to you Olivier, thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Yesim. I hope you can all hear me well. Welcome to this Consolidated Policy Working Group weekly call. We've got a number of things today. First the usual update on the Phase 2 of the Expedited Policy Development Process. Then we will have the ALAC Question to the ICANN Board, which has been suggested to be Domain

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.

Name Abuse, we'll have a discussion around this and how should we frame the question?

Then after that Jonathan Zuck will take us through the Geo Name Survey and update us on its status. Then we'll have very quick Subsequent Procedures Update, just for information, pointing you to the workspace where we usually add all of the updates. We I guess is usually just been who does all this work. Then, we'll have the Amazon Public Interest Commitments Update and that's Marita Moll, who will take us through the drafting that she's been working on so far. Then of course, our Policy Section, a lot of things in Policy, we'll spend a good amount of time in Policy. Then, Any Other Business.

Is there anything else we need to add to the agenda or are there any amendments that we need make at this point in time? I usually take a little time to wait until somebody's put their hand up, nope. Thank you. It looks like the agenda is adopted as it currently is displayed on your screen.

We'll move directly to the Action Items from our last call and there are three Action Items there. The one that has been unchecked is the CPWG will pick up on the 25th of September, discussion with Brian Cute. Of course, last week's discussion where Brain Cute presented to us and answered questions about the multistakeholder model and will be working forward, particularly forward with the Statement on the MSN Consultation, that's going to be dealt with during our Policy discussion, agenda item 8. Are there any comments on any of the Action Items as they currently are on your screen? I think somebody has to mute their

phone because we can hear background noise. No comments on this. Thank you. Let's then move on.

We have Agenda Item 3, the Expedited Policy Development Process. Phase 2 as you know a couple of weeks ago there was a face to face meeting in Los Angeles, Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg went to that face to face meeting, they briefed us on it last week. Now, we have some further work that's been taking place. Alan and Hadia, you have 15 minutes, I'm not sure who wishes to take the floor? I'm seeing both here, either of you. There are some slides, fantastic.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much Olivier. I don't know if Alan would have prepared his part but I can go quickly through the slides and then give the floor to Alan, if this is okay with him?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine with me, I haven't looked at the slides yet, so please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, sorry for that. Quickly today I'm going to go through the possible models for a System for Standardized Access and Disclosure. Then, the possible accreditation scenarios or some of the discussions with regard to the accreditation scenarios. Then, some questions in this regard from the registrars to ICANN, actually influence many of the decisions.

Basically, we talked during our face to face meeting about a model that we called the Hamburger Model and basically the Hamburger Model could have different scenarios. We are going to talk about the different possible scenarios for a standardized system for access and disclosure.

The first model is the model that was actually introduced by the Technical Study Model. In this model we have all the queries from the requesters coming to one central place and this might be the ICANN and that central point distributes the queries, receives the answers and then after receiving the answers, forwards the answers to the requesters. This model actually is a distributed and a centralized model. The distributed model in the sense of that the data we find with the registries and registrars. Centralized in the sense of you have one central point for which all the queries are received and the answers are disclosed.

The second possible -- of course, each of these models we will need to figure out if there is going to be accreditation and then how is this accreditation going to happen? Who is going to make the accreditation? How is also going to be responsible for the authorization? I will discuss this in our next slide.

The second model, possible model is a model where you have the requester sending the queries directly to the registries and registrars and then the registries and registrars disclosing the data directly or denying data to the requester. This is obviously a distributed model in the sense of, that you have the data residing with the registries and registrars and also the queries and responses are also coming from the registries and the registrars.

The third possible model refers to a really central model, which is you have ICANN processing the data, i.e. holding the GTLD registration data. Not necessarily ICANN but some central point but it is foreseen to be ICANN, receives the request and also gives the responses.

A that's quick reminder about what we mean by accreditation and what we mean by authorization. Accreditation refers to the process [inaudible] authorizing the request to access certain fields of data. I'm sorry, accreditation is through the requester, that is you identify or you say that this -- you recognize a person as having a particular identity and possibly affiliation as well. For example, security practitioners or consumer protection agencies or law enforcement agencies, any type of accreditation. Authorization is authorizing the requester to access a certain field. We note here that accreditation does not mean authorization, that if you are an accredited requester, that does not mean that you are automatically gain authorization to the access and this is very important here.

Also, what are these possible accreditation scenarios that were discussed? The first scenario is identification and accreditation happening through multiple accreditation entities, some of which could be national entities. Authorization could be handled by a single entity or by multiple entities.

The benefit of having multiple accreditation entities is for having those experts in the matter accrediting the affiliated group. Another merit also of this scenario is related to the law enforcement agencies and how to accredit those.

Another possible scenario is having the identification accreditation and authorization, all of this happening through one single entity.

The third option is having identification and accreditation happening through a single entity rather than multiple entities and authorization through another single entity or some other entity. It's foreseen that ICANN should be responsible for accrediting the accreditation entity.

Those are some of the things we've been discussing. Things to consider here or issues to consider here, where does the data reside? Would it only reside with the registers and registrars or would it reside also with some other entity? Who makes the decision or disclosure? Do the registries and registrars make this discussion or should another entity or entities be responsible for that?

Many of the decisions are very difficult to make and partly because there are so many uncertainties about who is willing to be responsible for what? Who is going to be liable for what? That's actually hindering a lot of our work and making this a little bit difficult to reach conclusions. In that regard, the registrars were suggesting some questions, maybe not finalized yet, so those are not the final questions but are actually going to be submitted to ICANN but they mainly talk about those matters.

That's it for me. I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. Thanks for this update. Alan, did you want to add anything?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not really. Hadia's last comment, that the uncertainties, an awful lot of what we're looking at presumes what the Data Commissioners and the European Data Protection Board will agree to something like this, that's not clear. The other thing is, that other people seem to be all looking for a single solution fits all and it's not at all clear to me and to us that that's what we're looking for.

There are certain types of requests which are almost cookie cutter, that they're all going to be the same and although a balancing test might have to be done, the balancing test in theory should be able to be done once because all of the details are the same. Those are much more prone to being automatically implementable and simply instantaneously implementable than others which are going to be far more nuanced and you'll have to do really balancing test.

The other that came out in the discussion, I think I mentioned this last week, is the representative from Donuts, as a registry they don't get a lot of these requests but they do get some and the comment that he made, although we have spent an infinite amount of time talking about the balancing test, that is do the rights of registrants outweigh the right of the third party to need to know the data? In their requests that he's handled and it's about 100 or so over a year, year and a half, he's never had to a balancing test because if the request has all the information in it, in each and every case, when he's looked at the domain, it's not a natural person or it's not geographically located in a place where GDPR applies and he's released the data.

That says although the balancing test is important, it's not necessarily the prime thing that we have to consider. Of course, the decision in Phase 1 to not do geographic differentiation or legal natural differentiation makes that whole discussion much more complex. There's a lot of nuancing involved and a lot of -- a lot more discussion of how to do this but I'm quite convinced that it's not going to be a one size fits all. There are times when to release data, the registrar is going to have to look at their registration data, not the WHOIS data but the data they have on their customer and that will make it really clear to them that this is a natural person or not a natural person.

The other thing that's going on is, the SSAC just put in some legal questions to identify to what extent we can take the position that a number of European agencies have taken and that is, if a legal person puts in a registration with natural person information in it, who's problem is it? Is it the registrar or by nature of that legal entity adding that data, they take responsibility for making sure it's not personal data and they bear the responsibility if it is personal data and is released? Answers to those kinds of questions I think change the whole perspective of how we handle some of these cases. Bottom line is, we're making progress for once but there is an awful lot that is still unknown that we're going to have to work on going forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. I now see that there is Tijani Ben Jemaa in the queue, so Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Comment on the last remark of Alan, if a company deliver personal data, they don't deliver, it is collected by the register or registrar, so it is always the responsibility of the one who collects the data, even if it is inside a company data, but personal data collected by the registrar, so the responsibility is the responsibility of the registrar, not of the company. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Tijani for this and you might be right. This is a question that was put forward by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, however, they did and this is the interesting part of the proposal and the question put forward, that they actually refer to Aaron and RIPE NCC and both of them are actually implementing this method and you can find this on their website. Maybe I can dig up the URL and put it here and that's what's interesting about this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm glad Tijani is so sure about what the law says but as Hadia pointed out, there are European TLDs that are taking the other position, so perhaps it's not quite as obvious to everyone. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I was going to just ask if those slides that you have shared with us will be available to share afterwards, is that okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm assuming if we sent them to Staff, they will link them to agenda.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, great. I'm not seeing any other hands up. Thank you for your update. I guess you've got a full week of further meetings going on, so we'll be looking forward to hearing further updates next week. There is one question though that does say, actually one question from Eduardo in the chat, what is the deadline for the EPDP Phase 2 to be ready?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no formal deadline. We have some targets; we'll see what happens. There is a timeline that's posted on the EPDP Wiki that we can pull up. We're certainly looking to try to get some draft stuff ready for Montreal, whether it will be ready at the time remains to be seen, we are making some progress but the weeks are ticking away. I'm assuming that the March meetings is a target for having some pretty definitive document but exactly the status, I honestly don't remember the timing details, maybe Hadia does but we can try to pull the document up for next week.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan, and thank you for your update, to you and to Hadia. I think that we can now move to the next part of the

agenda, that's agenda item number 4, where we are going to be looking at the ALAC question to the ICANN Board. As you know before an ICANN meeting, we have a change to in advance decide on what topic of discussion the ALAC should have with the Board. The discussion of the Leadership Team and Region Leads has yielded the possibility of going for the topic of Domain Name Abuse, it's been a hot topic with a number of people. You've seen the discussion going on on our various mailing lists.

I guess here is just an opportunity to get perhaps flesh this out a little bit more rather than just say, "Let's talk about Domain Name Abuse." How should we structure this? Or, if somebody has some other topic that they would suggest, then we can weigh the other topic with the topic of Domain Name Abuse. It's kind of an open door at the moment. Maureen Hilyard has asked that this working group discuss the matter so we have about 20 minutes or maybe even less if we find consensus before that, to touch on this. I see that Alan Green berg has put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'm going to have to leave the meeting temporarily for a little, thank you for letting me speak quickly. Number one, I think it's a marvelous topic. Second of all, I think we have to structure the question or questions such that the Board cannot give a 30 second canned answer and turn back to us for our opinion. To do that, I think we have to make it very clear in the question that this is not a question for the Board but for Board members. That is, we are looking for input that may not have been a formal discussion of the Board and may not be a

formal position of the Board, otherwise I don't think they have a position other than abuse is bad. It's quite clear that domain names are used for various naughty things on the internet and to the extent that we facilitate that or don't stop it then I believe we are complicit, whether we want to say that or not, I'll let the rest of the group decide.

One of the aspects however, that I think we want to raise, is there are various estimates of what fraction of domain names are registered for this kind of use and since we know for some aspects, people register 1000 or multiple 1000's of domains names at a single time, may only use them for a short amount of time but they're registered, there is a significant amount of ICANN revenue associated with these and to what extent -- what is ICANN's contingency plan if we are successful at eliminating those kind of things, which will take a major revenue hit? I think we want to bring in not only the fact that abuse is bad but the implications of it and get some real feedback from the Board or from Board members. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a suggestion -- can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: In general, there is an echo when you are both on the computer and on the phone. You have to turn one of the two off.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, just a suggestion, going back to Jonathan Zuck and the Consumer Report, there are a lot of recommendations about this DNS Abuse in there, that I think we should pick up.

YESIM NAZLAR: Holly, could you please mute your laptop?

HOLLY RAICHE: Is that better?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes.

HOLLY RAICHE: Jonathan, who's Chair of the CCRT Committee, pointed out in the report there are lots of suggestions about what we do about DNS Abuse and not all of them follow through, so I think it's ---

YESIM RAICHE: Holly, I'm so sorry for interrupting, it's strong echoes. I muted you on Zoom and I believe you had already muted your laptop also. Can we try one more time please, through the phone bridge only?

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Is that better?

YESIM RAICHE: Yes. It's much better for me.

HOLLY RAICHE: I've said what I want to say twice and I'd really like to hear from Jonathan because it seems to me that the CCRT Report has a lot of suggestions in it which have not been implemented or not implemented in full and that would be a really good place to start if we're going to talk about this topic. Maybe over to Jonathan? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We were asked in particular to look at the efficacy of the safeguards and found them to be woefully inadequate and consequently in the CCTRT we came up with a fairly restrictive definition of Domain Name Abuse that was linked to those safeguards on which there is broad agreements in the community that represents abuse, it doesn't have an IP component or anything like that in it. One of the issues is that the Board decided their reaction to the recommendation surrounding DNS Abuse to go out and launch community effort to define DNS Abuse.

I think one of the things we're planning to say in our advice to the Board is that they should go back and just use the most restricted definition and implement the recommendations at that level, if nothing else in parallel with grander efforts to define it more broadly, which will be a long term and fairly controversial discussion I believe. We looked at a number of different things and we saw, as John McCormac has noted in the chat, that there were certain TLDs that were much worse than

others and a lot of that had to do with volume discounts and things like that.

One of the challenges is that the Compliance Department is not empowered to look at the TLD as a whole very effectively, they just respond to individual complaints and so some of the things that we recommended were about that. The most controversial recommendation of all probably is the DAPRP, similar in structure to the PICPRP that was put in place and has yet to be used but a demand abuse PRP that allows a third party adjudicate a dispute if compliance really can't deal with the level of abuse in a particular TLD.

There is certainly a CCTRT way of getting into this conversation with the Board. There are number of things that are still out to Staff to get back to the Board on the implement ability and cost and return on investments of those recommendations and they may have some answers there I don't know. Certainly, on this definition of DNS Abuse, I think there is a path forward that can be instituted with fairly broad community support right away and hopefully would have some effectiveness.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a final thought, is it worth going through that report and highlighting some of the particular recommendations that were not followed through based on the narrow definition that you used and then that becomes a start for the kind of DNS discussions that we're talking about?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Holly. I think we can. I think it's in my -- I'm the penholder on both our response to the call for public comments, implementation of the recommendations they did accept and also some advice with respect to some of the ones that they did not. The intention is to have both of those things done before Montreal. One of them is in fact due on the 21st of October. There will actually be a document in their hands prior our meeting with them, this will form the basis of the discussion.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent. The next suggestion I think is, some of the comments that John McCormac has made, will they form part of at least the initial documentation or is that down the track?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. I'll have to go back and read them specifically. I think to some extent John was addressing the issue that Alan raised about the fact that a lot of dollars flowed through ICANN and what is their readiness and willingness to see that money go away but clamping down on these practices to some extent? That's a tricky conversation and I believe they'll have difficulty answering it. It can certainly be one worth raising with them.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I note actually from John McCormac in the chat, he mentions that all the registry agreements mentioned uniformity of renewal offers, so there is no mention of promotions. This may require looking at registry agreements to deal with some form of

discounting. Those do into some depth. John, did you want to add anything?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I'll just say quickly that another sticking point with the Board was an unwillingness to respond in anyway definitively on things that required changes to contracts and I think that's something that we should push back on as well. There was a recommendation APRT1, the require to change to contracts in ICANN Org just simply went out and negotiated that change. I think the Board is taking the easy way to say, "Well, we can't do this because we can't guarantee that a change to contract will happen."

We can rephrase that to, as John suggests, "recommendations for changes and prioritization of changes" so ICANN.ORG has a great deal of leverage in the negotiation of these contract, especially with folks that intend to apply for new strings.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, I'm not seeing any other hands up on this topic. We seem to have a starting point for framing the issue to bring it to the Board. The framing would be through the CCTRT and several points. Should we do a follow up as to then have just a list of specific points we would like to make on the one side and specific questions we would like to ask the Board on the other or should be leave this as a wider, more open discussion with the Board? The concern of course being pretty much what Alan had mentioned, which is, a quick answer from the Board and

that it takes five minutes and viola, done. Are there any preferences here?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier. I think when they've asked, the Board I'm referring to, asked specifically to consider a more interactive model for the discussion, the intention is to not have a simple Q&A, more a discussion, so I don't think they'll just be throwing a quick response back and that's sit. Perhaps have the higher-level general question and then a whole lot of subpoints and follow up that can be used. What's required as soon as possible, is of course, the question which will be returned and published. I think you could have the overall question and then without going into too much detail, several bullet points underneath if you wanted to. I don't believe it's their intention to have a [inaudible] discussion but rather something more discursive. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Perhaps as a starting point then, an introduction from the ALAC, like a paragraph. I think that in the past we have used this, the paragraph that would go, that would be read or explained as an introduction with several sticky points into the paragraph and several provocative points in there that then launches a discussion with perhaps a timeline on where we want to go. This of course is all a suggestion that we'll then make to the ALAC.

I note several points that John McCormac is making in the chat. John, did you have the ability to speak or are you just able to contribute on the chat? Chat only unfortunately, okay. I invite you all to read the

chat, there were several points that were made here. I think we'll collect them and then follow up afterwards on the mailing list with them. It's all about---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, do we know when these are due to the Board?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I do not have a deadline for this. Perhaps, I don't know -- well Heidi is not on the call, so I don't know who -- Evin, would you know when is our deadline for this?

EVIN ERDOGDU: For the invitation to provide feedback on the ICANN Board's Proposed Public Interest Framework, the suggested deadline is the 18th of October.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're not speaking about this; we're speaking about the deadline for the questions that we're going to bring to the Board when we meet with them in Montreal.

EVIN ERDOGDU: I'm not sure about that but I can follow up with Heidi---

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: She is on the call, she's in stealth mode. She's not on there but she's still there. Heidi Ullrich, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's the 14th of October.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so that gives us a little bit more time. Not really very much time but 14th of October. Let's try and kick a few ideas as a follow up on the mailing list, picking the points that John McCormac has put there on the chat and the points that Holly has made and Jonathan has made. Does anybody wish to lead this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'll take the pen on this question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Jonathan, that's an action item. I guess we don't need a full three pages, full PHD on this but certainly something that will launch the discussion that we are having with the Board. Let's then move on. Thank you for all this interest.

We now have the Geo Name Survey Update, and for this, Jonathan Zuck is going to take us through some of the questions, comments, etcetera.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not going to do any of that. There is a document with most of the changes that have been made but in the next day or so I'll circulate a revised survey that was based on feedback from a number of folks on making the questions easier to understand and making sure that I didn't use examples that already existed, etcetera. All good suggestions and hopefully this coupled perhaps with the Geo Names Video we can get it out to folks to get their reactions to some of these things.

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

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll circulate in the next two days.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. We've gained a few minutes. We can now move to the next agenda item and that's one which we can also shift through quite quickly, that's The Subsequent Procedures Update. I think that Justine Chew has sent her apologies and so all she wanted to let us know is that in the next couple of days, after this call, she will be circulating updates on the topics of Accountability Mechanisms, specifically the Appeals Process in the Accountability Mechanisms and also the Community Based Applications, which as you know is a very important topic for us, Community Based Application as we had in the past on many occasions said that Communities need to be given priority when it comes down to Applications and this is currently under this discussion.

There is a link in your agenda which goes to the SubPro Update and that's a real mine of information, it's got pretty much everything that's been discussed so far. Once again I have to thank Justine Chew for having really worked on that, it's actually in reverse chronology so you'll see that you've got the issues that have been touched on and would be updates every week, with the recommendations and in some cases some PowerPoint presentations on what's been discussed.

I guess at some point we'll be able to take all of this, we'll have all of that information in one page and be able to produce a statement when and as required. At the bottom the page you'll not the deliberations that are still pending. As I mentioned, the deliberations for this week are the ones on Accountability Mechanisms for the Appeals Mechanisms and the Community Based Applications. Are there any comments or questions at this point in time?

On this topic I'm seeing any hands so we can then move to the next agenda item Amazon Public Interest Commitments. Marita Moll took us through a presentation in the discussion last week and has been working hard, this is one of our policy topics where a deadline is coming up soon. I'll hand the floor over to Marita Moll and I invite you all to click on to the Amazon Public Commitments 2019, which is a Wiki page that has been setup specifically for this. Marita, you have the floor.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you, Olivier. The more I looked into this issue and the more I thought about it, the more I began to ask myself, "Why would be actually -- what can we say about this that could make any difference

what so ever?” And I was unable to answer that question. I put that question out to the list and almost all the feedback I got so far was, there really isn’t anything that we need to say on this because it’s not going to make a difference and we really ought not to be submitting anything. In addition, I haven’t heard anything from anywhere else and anyone else who’s going to be submitting anything. Still a controversial issue in the GAC.

I also think that for many in our Community who don’t really agree with the way this thing evolved, just submitting anything is [inaudible] to saying, “Yeah, well it’s okay.” My suggestion here is that we don’t submit anything, contrary to what Olivier has said, no, I have not drafted anything because I still don’t have a clear path forward. I’m waiting to hear from the group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marita, and thanks for chastising me for not having read that page before presenting. I was caught red handed, there you go.

MARITA MOLL: I wasn’t chastising you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Are there any comments on this? Thank you for taking the time to collect input on this and of course, it’s interesting because the ALAC in general often doesn’t comment on specific cases that are there some of course where it has in the past, it’s more the exception that we comment on it rather than the norm. That being said, I now see a

number of hands coming up, so it might well be that there needs to be something said about this. Let's start with Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I do agree with you, Marita, because this issue of .AMAZON has never been a matter of consensus among us, so we will not go through something where we'll be divided. It is still controversial, years ago we had a meeting in Argentina and people came to the open forum and made a lot of notes about .AMAZON, geographic that concerns their region. It is not something that will give us any answers. It will not make the end users more happy if we comment on it. I am not sure that all the end users have the same opinion about this. Let's be far from it, let's not comment on it, it's better for me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tijani. There is an agreement. Next is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess I want to make a general point and then perhaps a specific one. The conversations that have been happening in the email list I think are important and I think the most important point is that we don't have consensus on the issue of .AMAZON generally and we shouldn't be speaking on things about which we don't have consensus. Where I'm a little more cautious is the notion that we shouldn't comment if we don't think it will make any difference because that argument could be made at almost every Public Comment Period and so I think it's really about

whether or not we have consensus and we have something specific to end users to say, to individual end users to say and that should be our criteria. Not necessarily whether we think it will have an impact.

I think forming consensus is what we'll have, have things have more of an impact. I also agree that this is in no way an opportunity to relegate whether or not .AMAZON should have been awarded or not, this is more about whether or not there is any creative solutions to improve on these particular picks to help reconcile these differences but at the same time it looks like a fairly aggressive set of commitments on the part of Amazon and I think in this particular case, as I mentioned on the list server, they're likely to follow them. They're not a company in need of money, where they're going to change their voluntary picks because they are trying to improve a business model or something like that. I think in this particular case, even the enforceability of these becomes less of an issue and I think that we don't need to say anything but I don't think there is any reason not to be supportive of this generally as we talk about it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Next in the cue is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Olivier. The issue of Amazon is extremely complicated because it involves nine countries in the Amazonian region. My guess is that these nine countries do not even come to terms on how they are individually going to agree. I think Amazon will move forward. I think they are offering users to the government. There is also an

organization, I can't find the information, an organization gathering several entities of the Amazonian region from several countries which said that they didn't want to be defended, that they were going to find a solution for themselves. This is an indication of the level of commitment and consensus we can have and I will try to find information to give you the name of which organization said we do not want to be defended. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alberto, good to have a position or a view from the ground, from one of the countries that is local in the region. Let's see Marita Moll now.

MARITA MOLL: Jonathan, I didn't really mean that we wouldn't make any -- not making a difference is not a good reason not to respond to something, I completely agree with that. What I meant; is I haven't got any idea what we could possibly say here that would improve. Should we say, "Okay, let's suggest we give them 2000 restricts rather than 1500? Give the Amazon region more decision making on the Board?" We could say those things, those are the sorts of things that they've been advocating for, if we do that then we're coming down on one side or the other. It's just a bit awkward when this whole situation is so almost toxic. I just don't know what we could possibly say.

I just saw something on the GAC list, that was a note from the AUCTO group of countries, again stating that they were not really happy with the way things had gone forward. There is no agreement there.

Certainly, these organizations and Amazon have tried to work together but they didn't come to anything. I just don't see how we can intervene in this without upsetting one party or another within our group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marita. I see actually more hands here, I'm not quite sure whether they were added to this. Alberto, I believe is still an old hand, so maybe Tijani is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Marita, perhaps I may agree with you, if our colleagues, our end users from the region, from this region give us some proposal like this, that we don't have to make any statement or any position if we don't have the -- if it is not the initiative of people from this region and if we don't have the consensus about them. It is very touchy, this subject is very, very touchy. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. What I wanted to ask then was also in a situation like this one, where there is no consensus, is it better for the ALAC to not comment at all or should the ALAC send a note that it has discussed the issue and has not found consensus on the topic? There is a difference between those two because the first one might mean or might be interpreted as in the ALAC hasn't looked at this. The second one indicates that the ALAC has looked at it and the At-Large Community has discussed it and so there is either support or no support, on this

occasion, I'm not saying in the general but on this occasion would it be worth commenting as I just mentioned? Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Olivier. I think the later is the case, I think it is important, especially on perhaps these more volatile or expensively of great interest to many people topics, to put in a statement of even the diversity of view. It's not saying the ALAC can clearly recommend the following for your consideration, it is saying we have discussed, we are concerned, our community is divided in the following ways or is divided and just leave it at that without going into what the following ways are if that is easier. I think it is important to make it clear for the record, for the Public Record because these are assigned for Public Record. It is an issue that has great interest.

I just draw your attention to extensive comments received in the Subsequent Procedures for new gTLDs work, from the Registry Stakeholder Group, we got comments in on whatever that was 100 and something questions and at least three quarters of them the comments in from that, of the ICANN Community was split, as if we had two entirely different sets of Public Comment and they certainly were two entirely, sometimes opposing opinion but it hasn't received value getting those diverse opinions as we've gone through the analysis. Just give you a real life and current example where not having consensus and reporting not having consensus and telling it like it is can still be useful.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Next is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess my hesitation is that we don't even have a running disagreement about these particular picks inside of At-Large, that would require another discussion. I don't know what we're discussing between, is it just supporting the requests by the government to increase the number of reserve names? That's the thing, I just don't even know what proposal that half of us would make, let alone all of us. I don't know, I don't know that we have any opinions on this much less a consensus opinion.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Let's turn to Marita because she obviously has read all the comments.

MARITA MOLL: Exactly as Jonathan said, I don't -- no one has come forward and said that they actually think we should or give a particular suggestion that we should come forward with. Just absolutely everyone who has come forward has said, "We need to be wary of this. Maybe we should not go there."

It's very different from the Subsequent Procedures one that Cheryl was mentioned because I was involved in that too and we really did have a discussion and diverging opinions on some of those things in the Subsequent Procedures, I don't see that here. I don't see anyone coming forward saying, "Yes, we really should do this and this is what

we should be suggesting.” Hasn’t come forward from anyone yet. I just don’t know what we could write this letter about or around except just to say that, “We thought about this and we decided not to say anything.” Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was not being very clear. I was saying even saying what you just said Marita is valuable and important because it shows in a Public Comment mode that we have taken interest and time to consider it. Even if we did have consensus on what we were saying, saying that is valuable, that is what I was saying. I wasn’t comparing apples and oranges; I was saying having consensus is not the be all and end all of everything useful in a Public Comment. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. There is somehow not a parallel but it makes me think about the time when one provides references, personal references when you go for a job interview or in deed a nominating committee or an ICANN position of some sort, provide the reference, that reference gets written to and that reference does not respond. The fact that the reference does not respond is sometimes interpreted in a specific way.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, thanks Cheryl. I don’t mind writing such a letter, that’s fine, that’s easy. I’m sure where it would go. As I think I mentioned once on the list, it’s rather confusing where ICANN -- the spot where ICANN has put

aside for people to say something about these picks and individually, put in your individual name and enter your comments. I'm not sure how a group like At-Large submits a letter like that. I'm happy to do it as long as someone tells me how to do that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marita. I think this is an action item, as a follow up item for mechanisms and it might well be that it's Maureen Hilyard that has to file this or Staff will file it on our behalf one way or another by going through the motions but that's just a technicality. I hope we've reached some kind of an understanding here for just a simple pick, that will speak of our concern over the issue but lack of consensus on the one hand and perhaps even our recognition that this is a very sensitive issue as such.

Let's move on then. The next topic here is now the Policy Comment Update with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. As you know, there is a lot going on with Policy this week so we'd like to focus mainly on Next Steps to Improve the Effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model. There has been significant work done on the Draft Google Doc, but Marita, Holly and Abdulkarim and the Community and so I'd like to turn it over to one of them to comment on this statement in progress. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

The points that I think are important, at least important for me are since we are -- since the nub of this inquiry is to comment on the proposed solutions to the issue, for the me the real issues that are facing At-Large are the ones that we're all very, very familiar with, we're all very time poor, we actually all have jobs or most of us have jobs and therefore just cannot commit to time that is required and other resource constraint.

Given all of that, the kinds things that will actually increase participation which is actually the second heading on which comment is sought, should be strategies to inform and to encourage participation and expression of views, noting that there is more than one way to participate, that in fact membership and working groups is only one way and that mechanisms such as this particular working group where we can all talk about viewpoints to come to views is a good way of canvassing opinion and then reflecting what is a really a broader discussion into the outcome.

Now, in terms of looking at solutions, the things that stand out maybe ATRT 2 will be, we don't know. One of the solutions that we have discussed was the reason we actually had Brian on the call was the possibility of PDP 3. The difficulty with PDP 3 is it is not focused on increasing participation, it's talking about defining scope, better defining membership, possibly confining membership but not really addressing our issues.

The one thing that do mention is that in the GNSO Review of a few years ago, some of their top recommendations were to increase and broaden the membership of their workings groups, that still doesn't address our

issues because a number of simply cannot or don't have the time or a for a number reasons can't participate weekly but would like to be more informed.

What I said last week to Brian and should say is, there needs to be other strategies to address our issues and those might be ways to better inform ALAC, that might be through webinars, it might through webinars before an issue is turned into a PDP, it might be during PDP's. The kinds of strategies that will be formed and include ALAC membership without necessarily increasing ALAC membership on working groups. Those are the points that I think are important to make. Over to you, Marita, if we've got things to add to what are my main points. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:

Thanks, Holly. I think from being involved in this from the beginning I really think that our comment on everyone of the points that are offered in the paper is important. This is the period in which I think Brian and his team are looking for details. Of all the things that Holly said are the kind of details that they're really looking for. I think they're all in the document at the moment along with many other things. I went to a number of things, some of us participated in the webinars and I went back and listened to what we said in the webinars by members of our team who were on that and included some of that stuff. You people may have to go in there and look at it, may have ideas about more details that we could add.

Really a big point in all of this, is that most of the solutions that Brian has offered are not going to solve the problem for ICANN or for At-Large, both of us. Basically, these are all things that we're going to have to bring to the floor and this is probably not the last time we're going to have to do it. I really invited you all to go in, look at it, make your comments, tell us if there are things that shouldn't be there, things that should be there are not, it's a fairly extensive document so it will take a little time but please do go look at it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I haven't read the document on the screen; I will give that disclaimer. I also feel that many of what things Brian is suggesting as possible solutions will not really address things. The PDP 3.0, which should be the fix for PDP problems I think is closer to going back to PDP 1.0, when instead of working groups there were task forces and they were allocated from Council Members or their substitutes, it was much more a closed group. The whole concept of working groups was it should be open all and allow more input into the process. I think we're going backwards in that area. I think that's going to more pressure on one or two people in At-Large to be the focus and the only experts on an area and I think that's going backwards from where we want to go.

Overall, I'm not particularly happy. I think a lot of our problems focus on -- as I said on the meeting with Brian for those of you who were there, I think a lot of the problems focus on the inability of the current multistakeholder model to really come to compromise and to come to solutions.

Jeff Newman, who has a long history in the GNSO said, “There’s too many people who have a vested interest and no change.” That’s a powerful thing to have to fight because essentially stonewalling is a way of delaying. I don’t see the solutions in a lot of what he’s saying but maybe others can come up with some ideas that may move forward. I think we have to be really clear though that if we don’t see the solutions to the problems that we see within ICANN, we have to say that clearly. Thank you. We don’t want to be negative but I think we have to be candid. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:

Are there any other comments? First of all, thank you, Alan, and I think that’s kind of the direction I was heading anyway but maybe we can strengthen it simply to say that PDP 3 is going backwards because that’s the way I read the heading. We have to find solutions that are more inclusive not less.

CHEYL LANGDON-ORR:

I have been ringing the warning bells on PDP 3.0 now for coming up to my third year, thank you for all catching up with me but apart from that, I certainly want to also remind you that the opportunity is there for outside of the specific -- Public Comment process with 3.0 to raise our concerns within the proposed policy comes out for public commenting. Don’t use this reaction to the evolution to the ICANN multistakeholder model as only or the main mechanisms for raising concerns and hopefully getting some change in the 3.0 PDP modeling. There are some other stuff there too.

I just didn't want us to get star struck or totally restricted onto this one all be it very important topic, certainly raise it, it is going to be an issue, we need to keep saying it's an issue. For example, even when we meet with the Leadership Team of the GNSO in the upcoming in Montreal, guess what the topic is? The possible adoption or some of the proposals in PDP 3.0. Raise it by all means and please do because I'm very concerned about it but let's also make sure we recognize it as it's not the only venue for dealing with that, there is other things, including other ways of managing resourcing and doing smart drafting of charters and bit size pieces in the design end that needs to be addressed as well. Thanks.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Alan, is than old hand or do you have more to say?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's a new hand. I have a comment to make but if Cheryl is still listening in, I'm curious what the reaction is in the GNSO when she raises the concerns on PDP 3.0 and the exclusivity of it with the GNSO? I've raised it and I'll share what results I've gotten but I'm curious what reaction Cheryl gets as the formal liaison from the ALAC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Happy to respond to that, Alan. At this stage it's all in discussion mode is the reaction. It is one of the several models, although I say the models are many and they hold up the succession efficiency of the EPDP. Stop chocking, come on. My reaction to that is has been and you

do see the costs both in real term and in human resources of the EPDP, don't you people? Those are only going to be exacerbated to the entity outside of the GNSO who are not resourced fully for the limit of GNSO activities. That's my reaction to their reaction and now I'd love to hear.

ALAN GREENBERG:

When I've raised the issue, the answer that basically comes back is, well that's not our problem, our problem is to make PDP's more efficient. I think they should be made more effective not necessarily just more efficient. I am really, really troubled that this whole thing is being driven by the unsatisfactory conclusion to the WHOIS PDP and the answer developed for the EPDP on WHOIS. They are taking what essentially is a very extreme edge case, the tail end of the curve, the worst possible we could ever do in ICANN and trying to model the general process after what they feel might have been successful before it actually concludes on that.

Taking the problems that were visible on the WHOIS PDP, ignoring all sorts of other PDP's that have been far more productive and successful and using the WHOIS one, both the original PDP and the EPDP as the governing situation to govern all PDP's. I think it is just so wrong headed to be governing things off the extreme edge case. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just in final response and remember, this as I kept trying to say, not only the opportunity we have to deal with PDP 3.0. There is an awful lot of good stuff in there as well but there is a lot more work to be done. The other thing, which I have also said in council and certainly to the

leadership and I'm not alone in this, Jeff Newman has said the same thing as well, we find it also a little disturbing that this is modeling which has come out of a council deliberation which pretty much meant it was being done by people who have never actually run PDP. It was certainly done in the absence of direct input or interaction with people who were running current PDP's. Again, we're all lining up to bring that forward at the right time.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. If we are talking about the document that was done by Brian's team, after a little discussion it seems that the proposal that PDP 3.0 is not right way to go. These documents I don't think we need to answer to any detail on that as Cheryl said, there will be other possibility to have discussion on that specific issue. A comment about where we are in this discussion. I have the impression more and more as the multistakeholder model is evolving to be only for professionals, people who have time [inaudible], and it seems that it's becoming more and more in competition with I would say a renew or a new way of doing multilateralism; it was a discussion at IGF in Paris, it will be a discussion at IGF in Berlin, I am sure it's a discussion in different places.

The question for us must be, how we will still be able to have the voice of end user, including how we do that if we are aligned with the other. If we are to be also professional to be able to do that, we are losing. What we can do and how we can evolve end user. Therefore, I think we really need to participate in this discussion and to put some ideas on how it will be discussed and where it will be discussed and the proposal made to the document, is not yet the best place to have this discussion.

At the end of my talk here, if it's becoming for professional, let's leave the government do that, pay for that, they are elected by us it seems to be generally, therefore we can take some holidays. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I agree with some of the points that Sebastien has mentioned and I have similar concerns. One question that I do have is, as the EPDP was sold to the community as being something that needed to be done very quickly so it was an extreme case of something to be exceptional, you could actually put the E as more like not only expedited but exceptional PDP because of the amount of time given to find a solution to the question that was on the table.

The concern that I have is whether this and I guess people who are aware of the ICANN bylaws and more aware of maybe even the GNSO's bylaws, is the inclusivity and the inclusivity of a full multi stakeholder model where at the start, when ICANN was created there was full model on how SO's and AC's where there in order to get the input from everyone. The question is, is this new type of PDP likely to or this format of PDP likely to break any such bylaws of core value? Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Jonathan and Marita, and then I think we're out of time. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess part of the complexity here is, as is being said in the chat, that's it's not just PDP 3.0 that we're talking about. I feel like the

question that Brain is trying to ask in this document is whether or not that's the right venue for a particular issue to be address? Which is different than saying that we agree with everything that's going on in that discussion but is that where that discussion is and should be happening now or does there need to be separate initiative to launch, to discuss it?

It sounds like a lot of what we're saying now as we're waking up to the warnings from Alan and Cheryl from long ago, that we need to be more engaged PDP 3.0. If we accept that as fact, do we also say that the -- are those discussions the right place for these discussions about the multi stakeholder model or not? I think that's really what this comment is about, not about whether or not the current proposals that are not yet even published yet are good ones or not? Just a thought.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a couple personal notes from me and then Marita, and then I think we really have to close the discussion up. First of all, I actually went back to the GNSO Review and the recommendations, which they accepted and said they implement are to have more inclusive working groups.

Now, that's what they decided. One of the things we can say is, "You're going back on your implementation of your own latest review." Jonathan, I agree with you. I think this is -- it's not just about PDP 3, it's about the way to be more inclusive and think we have to approach the answer that way, not simply and this is what Cheryl's been saying as well, we have to find ways to actually say, "We have to retain or

enhance the Multi Stakeholder participation.” And PDP is just one small part of that. Marita, can you make it quick? We’ve completely run out of time.

MARITA MOLL:

I think we’re getting totally hung up on just one single thing. The take away I got from Brain last time was that he wasn’t really meaning to suggest that PDP 3 was going to be the answer to the problem. He had to put it there because it’s one of the things in process that could present some kind of response but he wasn’t expecting us to go ahead and endorse all of that kind of stuff. I think we got the message across to him also last time that, we’re really uncomfortable with it. I think, let’s not get hung up on this. I think we’re too hung up on it. There is a whole lot of other things going on that we need to discuss. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Hadia, do you have something really quickly, because we’re way out of time?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you Holly and Marita, that was a quick comment to what Jonathan just said about the PDP 3.0. I would expect also that we are not expected to say that they solution that the PDP 3.0 really answers or does not answer or does not solve the issue, it’s more like, do you think this issue could be tackled by the PDP? Because and again you know, even if we think that one of the issues could be or many issues could be tackled by the PDP, finally the end results could be but though it

addressed the issue, it did not really solve it. At this point, to say that -- at this point we could say that PDP 3.0 could actually tackle this issue, could solve this issue but whether it does or not will depend on what comes out of it. Again, we could present our own solutions in this regard. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Olivier, I think it's back to you. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, just briefly if you don't mind.

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because Marita, I and Alan, we turned up to all of these evolution meetings, we know that it's not all hanging off one thing but several. I definitely want you to hear that plea. There is also a very important question to be answered and it kind of fits in here and that is the question that says, where should the solutions be being designed? Is it a solution to the issues raised in the work that Brian facilitating need to be looked for within a single support organization or advisory committee or more broadly?

I think this is a perfect example where some suggestions can come out of the single, in this case GNSO but the broader ICANN community has to own the final outcomes because what we're seeing is the tension between efficiencies which work beautifully in the restricted singularity, if I can use that term, of GNSO PDP management. But, will not doing anything good as she's wrote at the moment, for the input from groups like us. It's a good example but let's not get hung up on it. I think a lot of these things need to be owned the wider community, even if it is a matter of in reaction to work being done by and AC or and SO. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. Jonathan, I think it was down to you this section.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, that's an old hand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Are there any other Public Comments on this that we need to look at today?

EVIN ERDOGDU: I suppose we could focus on the remaining comments for next week's call but there were two, one it's informal feedback and not a formal INCANN public comment. The invitation to provide feedback on the ICANN Board's proposed Public Interest Framework and linked to the

agenda is the GPI Toolkit. The other is and ICANN Public Comment, that was discussed last week. Jonathan had a presentation on the CCTRT Recommendation and Next Steps. We may just discuss either one of these or perhaps wait until next week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Evin. Jonathan, did you wish to say a few words on the CCTRT or just wait till next week?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I presented the points that I thought we should make and I see there was rough consensus around making those points. I just need to turn those slides into pros next. We'll set up a Wiki space and try to have something up there by next week.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Then the Invitation for the Community to provide feedback on the ICANN Board's Proposed Public Interest Framework?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's probably a bigger topic and we should just do it next week.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. The deadline is the 18th of October, it seems to have just crept on us. Let's put this as next week. Can we move it one week? We'll still have a week and a half to finalize this. Evin, if you can please forward this to the CPWG mailing list and let's try and start the discussion on the

mailing list and take it from there, with a bigger topic next week. Of course, we need to find a penholder on that or somebody who is going to accompany this. If anybody has an urge to step forward then please make this known as soon as possible. We are indeed --

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, can I jump in? Sorry. Just to remind people, the toolkit paper is very, very brief, it's not a big thing. We should be able to review next week even without slides. It's a 10-minute read.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Cheryl, that's noted. We are beyond the end, the official end of this call but that's kind of normal, we often are. I'm not seeing any further hands up on this topic, which takes us then to the Any Other Business part of this week.

For once, we haven't got that much. We just a reminder that ICANN Prep Week, ICANN66 Prep Week will start very soon, it's the end of next week. It starts just before the ICANN meeting. You have to register for it prior to this. There is a link in the agenda to take you to the registration of the Prep Week and that basically prepares you for all the different topics or discussions that are going to take place.

Of course, I know many of you know these things inside out but there is always more in there and you can brush up on some of the points that you might have not followed or some of threats you might have not followed so closely. I note here that on the 17th of October, there is a Pre ICANN66 Policy Webinar at 1600 UTC. We'll be able to remind you

of this next week. I think, not seeing any other hands, that we're pretty much done for the day.

I was just going to remind you of one thing before we close, that there will be a survey in your mailbox regarding the real time transcription that takes place. I've opened a separate window to follow it and it looks pretty good this week but you will receive a new email, a questionnaire, please answer it, it only takes like two minutes and it would be of great help to have the answers. Whether it's good or bad, please let us know because that is a pilot so we need to know. Alberto Soto, you have lifted your hand; you have the floor, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Very quickly, I was asked about transcription and I have been following it. I am following it in English but I saved the transcription as a file with no problem and translated into Spanish and forwarded it to my colleagues and I'm suggesting this could be done with other languages as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Alberto. That's a very good thing that you're doing here. I'm glad that it's actually working.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just on that, maybe we can collect some of that important information like Alberto has just shared because I personally find the -- I answer the damn surveys every damn time as well, that the questions are poorly designed and far too restrictive. That's one of those any other

advantages could be listed. I think we probably as a group should make sure Staff collect those things. For example, when it asks why you used it, all the above or none of the above should be a question in one of these responses. I'm a supporter of it, don't get me wrong, it's just the survey doesn't actually allow me to support it fully and having other advantages would be good, he's just given us one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. I understand you could in your position do what I do which is that English is not my first language, so you could do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I click all sorts of things, I click everything. I have to say something because -- and I covered off in the email that says, and yet again I have given you a piece of total tripe in question blah because it insisted I chose one, so I've randomly chosen this one, this basically makes this part of the survey useless. I think the whole thing is important and we should have good surveys.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, that's noted and that will be transmitted back to the people who have put this together. Now, I don't see any other hands up, so it's time for us to chose when our next meeting will be and for this, I Staff to let us know.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Olivier. Next week's call will be at 1900 UTC on Wednesday, 9th of October.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect, thank you very much for this, Yesim. With this, I'd like to thank you all for having attended the call this week. Look forward to seeing you all in the call next week, 1900 UTC. Please follow up on the mailing list as well because we do have a lot of statements. Anything else that you need to raise?

I gather probably not. Okay, thanks everyone, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night and have a very good week. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]