

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday the 4<sup>th</sup> of March 2020 at 13:00 UTC. Due to the increased attendance and in order to save time, we will not be doing the roll call. However, all [attendee spots] in the Zoom room as well as on the phone bridge will be noted after the call.

We would like to record the apologies we have received. We have received apologies from Marita Moll, Kaili Kan, Roberto Gaetano, Bill Jouris, Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges, Daniel Nanghaka, Matthias Hudobnik, Ricardo Holmquist, Vrikson Acosta, and from Vanda Scartezini. From staff side we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğan, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar, and I will be doing call management for today's call.

Just a kind reminder before we start, as I mentioned earlier, we have real-time transcription service providers on today's call and I'm going to share the link with you on the Zoom group chat once again. The final reminder is to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes, please. Now, I would like to leave the floor back to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Yeşim, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. We, today, have an agenda which will start with the Expedited PDP Phase 2, and that's, of course, with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg.

---

*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.*

---

Then, we'll have our Subsequent Procedures update with Justine Chew. After that, Jonathan Zuck will take us through the ALAC and At-Large ICANN67 talking points. We'll then have a follow-up discussion on the Middle East and Adjoining Country Strategy with Seun Ojedeji and Satish Babu, one, of course, being AFRALO chair and the other one being APRALO chair.

And then, our usual policy comment updates. You'll notice there are several in comment and currently being drafted, so that's the agenda for today. Are there any amendments or any additional proposals for today's call? I am not seeing any hands up so we can, therefore, go straight to our action items from our last call.

But before I do that, since we're still in the welcoming phase, I should mention the closed captioning which is in place. At the bottom of your screen, you'll see a CC box, so if you're interested you can have that running.

I should also mention that unfortunately, today, we do not have the interpreters because we're the week before the ICANN meeting week and so, traditionally, because there is so much work during that week, interpreters need a little break before that. Today, this call is solely in English and I do apologize for this but we can't, unfortunately, have it any different.

Now, let's go to the agenda action items from last week. They are all complete so they'll be shown on your screen. If anybody has a comment or question about any of these, could they please ask now? Again, I'm not seeing any hands so we can go to agenda item three.

---

That's, of course, our colleagues Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg, who are going to take us through an update for the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase 2. Over to you, Hadia and Alan.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Olivier. If I may start, and then I will leave the floor to Alan. Basically, today I have three things. One is a diagram that you have in front of you. I'll explain what this diagram is. Throughout the report, we say that "disclosure decisions should be automated only where technically and commercially feasible and legally permissible."

And then, there was this question, always: how do we determine the legal permissible part and who will determine this? Of course, in the report, we provide a principle based on which implementation should happen. In thinking about the legal permissibility, I developed this flowchart. This is based on the automation article of the GDPR and the IPO guidance.

What, basically, this diagram says is it's a way to determine the legal permissibility of the automation of the decision making. The first diamond puts forward the question, does the decision have legal or similar significant effect on the data subject? If the answer is no then automation is obviously allowed under GDPR, and thus this case or request could actually be automated.

If it does have some legal or similar significant effect on the data subject then the next question would be, will a human review the automated decision before disclosure? Because if you automate the process and, after you made the decision, or after a machine makes the decision, a

---

human looks at the end result before the decision actually is implemented, then this is allowed under GDPR.

This could actually make us think, “So why not automate everything and then we have a human look at the results?” If the result is a yes then the human will review the decision and, if he thinks that the machine made a good decision, then the disclosure will happen.

That also provides a path for if the machine actually says that the disclosure is not allowed then no human needs to look at it and the result is directly reported to the requestor because if the machine actually does not approve the disclosure of the data then this will tell us no legal or similar significant effects on the subject, and thus the result could be actually disclosed without any human looking at the decision.

Anyway, that puts that part aside, and then go to the chart. “Will a human review the automated decision if for disclosure?” If the answer is no then we have to go through the criteria set by GDPR. That would be if the decision authorized by a union member states “low applicable” to the controller, if the answer is yes, then such a case or such a request could actually be automated and is allowed under GDPR.

It’s also the decision [inaudible] individual’s explicit consent that both are allowed under GDPR, and if the decision is necessary for the entailed performance of a contract, that also is allowed under GDPR.

So if any of these criteria are satisfied then the automation is allowed. That chart was actually an attempt to answer, “How do we determine the legal permissibility of the automation of the decision making?” but there is one new idea in there which is having a human review the authorized

---

decision before the disclosure, which could allow us to automate everything. And then, if the decision is “no, the disclosure is not allowed,” then no human would review. If the decision is yes then a human would look at this decision.

Basically, that’s what it is. The second thing I wanted to talk about today is that ICANN Org shared with the team a question from the European Parliament about the lack of access to WHOIS Internet domain registration data.

Basically, the question published on the 11<sup>th</sup> of February says that the Commission, in its report on the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights, recognized that intellectual property protection calls for effective access to domain name registration through WHOIS protocol and states that ongoing review of the WHOIS in ICANN should be swiftly completed, and that it poses the question to the European Commission, “What specific measure is the Commission planning to take to ensure this?”

And then, the second is that the Commission supports the creation of a centralized model, and the third is, is the Commission planning to provide additional clarification to eliminate misinterpretations that have unnecessarily hampered access to Internet domain registration data, and will it confirm the needs for access to WHOIS as necessarily for the public interest?

And then, finally, the third thing I wanted to talk about is purpose two. During Phase 1, we had identified ICANN’s purposes. We have actually identified six ICANN purposes for processing the data.

---

Purpose number two, which actually spoke to the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet. The purpose also said that this would happen to the disclosure of the data to third parties, while this purpose is not approved by the board. This is because of the European Data Protection Board, the fact that we are conflating purposes.

But also the European Commission, in its letter to the ICANN Board, said that they support the first part of the purpose, which speaks to the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet in relation to ICANN's mission and bylaws, and that they would suggest deleting the other part which says "through disclosure of data."

The question we were actually discussing is, "Do we need this purpose or not?" Well, some were of the view that the other purposes handle all the processing activities and maybe we do not need this purpose. However, looking at the purposes, I'm not sure that the other purposes cover anything related to the security and safety of the Internet.

Also, I don't see any of the other purposes require responding to public or governments' requests. We do have a purpose that says, "Enable communication with the registrant name holder on matters relating to the [budgets of many]." But what if the requestor wants the information but will not actually communicate with the registered name holder? And also, what matters like, for example, accuracy? Well, that falls under the secure and stable Internet but I don't see it falling, maybe, under "other." Maybe it could fall under contractual compliance but it also relates to the safety of the Internet.

---

I was thinking that it is important to have this purpose which speaks to ICANN's core mission, which is the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet. Those are the three things that I wanted to talk about today.

And then, the other fourth thing, we will need to respond, of course, to the public comment for the initial report that was put forward. Currently, we have a template which actually asks if you support enough the recommendation and other suggestions if the recommendation is not getting supported.

My question would be, in addition to this template, would the ALAC like to submit a separate statement? I stop here and I give the floor to Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Just a couple of brief points. In terms of the purpose, I agree with Hadia's analysis. We were told that we should not conflate third-party purposes with ICANN's. That ignores the fact that ICANN does consciously delegate some aspects of its job, that is the security, stability, and resiliency of the database of the DNS, to other parties.

So, although some third parties are doing it purely on their own volition and to meet their own needs, there are other third parties who are doing it, in fact, to meet our needs. They are unpaid by us in general but they are, nevertheless, doing it effectively in support of the ICANN mission. That has never been understood and I still believe that's a really important aspect.

---

The other related part is, as people have pointed out, if we don't have an ICANN purpose then we potentially are in the situation where, going down the road, we'll be told we can't do something that's essential because it wasn't listed as a purpose. The need for having purposes well-defined is you must inform data subjects what their data will be used for.

The other thing I wanted to comment on is the report and our need to have a comment. The deadline is a little under three weeks from now and will not be extended. We really do have to start working on it.

Hadia and I, obviously, will put some opinions in but we need at least a couple of other people who are willing to work on it that are not part of the ePDP team, so looking for other volunteers who are willing to put a good chunk of time and effort into this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. The floor is open, now, for questions and comments from everyone on the call. Thank you for this diagram, it makes it a lot clearer.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess we can move on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Also, we should, in addition to the questions we ask, be looking for volunteers on this call too, given the timing.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought that's what I was asking.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is, I just wanted to reaffirm that. Are there folks that don't have questions but that are interested in participating in the drafting of ALAC comments on this report?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It doesn't look like it at the moment, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. We'll have to go out on the list, as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's right, yeah. I was going to suggest that. Let's send something out on the list. That's an action item, then, to send the request for volunteers to hold the pen on the response to the ePDP report.

And now, we can then move on. Thank you very much, Hadia, and thanks, Alan. We will hear from you next week. And so, we can go to the Subsequent Procedures with Justine Chew and her team. Justine, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Okay. Just to start off with some housekeeping matters, 4.1. There are going to be three sessions of Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group at ICANN67. The SubPro leadership has,

---

basically, given priority towards discussion with GAC members in order to engage the GAC in this PDP.

The topics that have been selected for those three sessions in ICANN67 would be applicant support, closed generics, community applications, global public interest, which actually refers to public interest commitments, and the last one being GAC advice early warning.

Now, based on the work of the small team, we have got a draft scorecard out for applicant support, closed generics, and global public interest. Today, we are tabling the one on community applications so we're in good [inaudible] when it comes to at least looking at the topics that the GAC have prioritized for ICANN67 within SubPro. Okay.

So if you want to follow the progress of work for the small team, you are welcome to click on that link under 4.2. We don't have to go there, Yeşim, but just to let people know that the link at 4.2, the At-Large scorecard topic list, is a list of all the topics.

Again, if people are not aware, the list actually includes the designation of what is proposed to be priority topics: high priority, medium priority, low priority. And also, we have now included a secondary scorecard tracking in terms of version numbers. It makes it easier for people to keep track of which version they should be looking at.

At the same time, the table under 4.4 also has the same list and links to scorecards. These are updated from time to time based on information from the GAC and also new developments from the SubPro Working Group itself.

---

We have received a working copy of the GAC draft scorecard from the GAC focus group, so, in terms of some of the scorecards that the small team have tabled in the past, we are now going back to revisit those scorecards to see whether we can find some answers within the GAC Subsequent Procedures draft scorecard to see if we can find some answers to the questions that we have highlighted as the ones that we would like to pose to the GAC or consult the GAC on.

I must say that we haven't gotten a lot of answers from the scorecard so I think the intersessional work still has a function. I don't know where Yrjö wants to mention anything at all at this point in terms of the intersessional work and, also, the GAC capacity-building workshop that's happening in ICANN67?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Yeah. I have some noise in the background, I hope that this is audible. Yes, there will be 20 minutes of the joint ALAC/GAC meeting or call where we devote it to SubPro. I thank, of course, Justine very much for all these preparations.

The At-Large members, especially members of the small team, are also welcome to participate in the GAC capacity-building event which is ... I don't remember the timing now but it's open for the air. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Yrjö. We can see the timing of it in the chat, later. I wanted to move onto the community application scorecard, just to give people an

---

idea of what are the issues that we're grappling with, and also to, hopefully, include this in appendix C.

I will be proposing to issue an updated version of appendix C, and sharing that with the GAC focus group because the earlier one that we shared with them only had about six scorecards. Now, we have significantly more scorecards available so it would be good to share those with the GAC focus group if there are no objections within this CPWG group.

Okay. Just moving onto community applications, can I have the next slide, please? Okay. In the interest of time, I am just going to zoom in on a couple of things. People are welcome to review this scorecard at a later point, at their own convenience.

Essentially, the key issues would be that CPE, the Community Priority Evaluations, a lot of the rules and procedures were unclear in the last round because much of it, or some of it, at least, came out after the AGB was published and they were subject to a third party DPE provider that was appointed.

Some of this lack of clarity ahead of time, basically, ended up resulting in certain things like lacking in rationales or inconsistent positions when it came to determinations, and also things like, what is the definition of community? How do you assess the elements connected to community? I'll come to that in a little bit down the track.

Also, the last point being there was no appeals process put in place in the last round so there was no opportunity to appeal against any inconsistent or any incorrect, you could argue, determinations by the CPE provider.

---

Moving onto the sections with the four columns. Issue number one is SubPro PDP has concluded that there was, indeed, a lack of transparency and predictability with the CPE process in the last round and that caused problems, so they are going to recommend that the process be more transparent and predictable.

Overall, this is a very high-level recommendation. Now, in terms of details, they're looking at putting more responsibility towards the Implementation Review Team. We're going to have to look at and monitor the work of the IRT to see if there is any desire to put more flesh to the bones, so to speak, when it comes to this recommendation that says, "CPE process must be more transparent/predictable."

Now, if you look at the fourth column on the far right, some of the high-level aspects—if you could just scroll down to the next page—or concerns that we have in terms of the process and the procedure applying would be whether the community has a say in the appointment of the CPE provider.

So in the last round, it was the Economist Intelligence Unit. We don't know whether they are going to be reappointed for the next round. Regardless, the question is, does the community have a say in who gets appointed and how they get appointed? There is also a need for clarity in the process flow, sequence, and timelines. Again, the lack of this clarity caused problems in the last round.

The third point, we need to be able to identify the conflicts of interest on the part of the panelists or evaluators in order to see whether there is some action needed to be taken to get them refused.

---

At this point, just to note that the appointment of the CPE provider will be done by ICANN but the actual panelists or evaluators will be selected by the provider itself because, typically, a provider would have their own list of registered evaluators or panelists. So, we don't actually have the say in appointing the actual panelists or the evaluators who are going to do the determinations. We're only looking, in terms of ICANN's responsibility, just to appoint the CPE provider.

In that respect, it would be important for us to then look at whether there are potential conflicts of interest vis-à-vis the actual panelists and the evaluators. Somebody needs to mute their line. Okay.

The last point being whether we have the ability to influence the CPE guidelines that are going to be adopted for the next round. We move to issue number two. The recommendation is going to come out of this. It looks like it's going to be recommending the adoption of the previous CPE guidelines of the team which was ... Yes?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Justine, just a quick one. Alan has put his hand up. Did you want to take questions page by page or just go through the whole list and then you'll take the questions?

JUSTINE CHEW: I would prefer to go through the entire thing because it could be that lower down may provide an answer to the questions.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's do that, then.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, thank you. As I was saying, it looks like the SubPro Working Group is going to recommend the adoption of the earlier guidelines of 2013 that were developed by EIU but with amendments.

The amendments that we should be focusing on, that the At-Large should be looking towards, would be, you see in the far-right column, things like, how would you deal with the concepts of community membership, and what is relevant, and to allow for flexibility in the interpretation of those when scoring applications?

Specifically, you're looking at delineation. One of the issues that was brought up was that the EIU in the previous round has a clear bias towards structured membership organizations. For example, things like professional and trade communities. The looser community structure, such as linguistic or cultural communities, which don't have card-carrying members fell by the wayside. They didn't get enough recognition by EIU, so that's something that we need to fix.

In terms of nexus, this talks about the data clarity in the approach to identify communities with a reasonable amount of broadness and not to be overridden by the EIU bias-ness.

Again, here, the nexus is basically talking about whether the string has got a reasonable connection to the community being targeted or, on the flip side, whether reasonably that [organized] community would have an option to that string being used in the way that it has been applied for.

---

That brings us to the last point, if you go down to the next page. In terms of opposition, care needs to be taken into considering whether someone doing the application has actually got a relevance to that string, in a sense of whether they have real standing to oppose.

In the previous rounds, there were complaints about obscure opposition, or letters of opposition coming from obscure groups of people whom the EIU took as being significantly relevant in determining the outcome or whether to take on board the opposition or not.

Point number three. This is to do with adopting the utilization of clarifying questions process by the panelists or evaluators, basically encouraging the panelists and evaluators to seek clarification from applicants if they need to.

Point number four talks about recommending for a panel to include any research relied on in making the decision. We advocated for this, and so that's good that it's there.

Point number five. This talks about the appeal. Earlier, I mentioned that CPE determinations in the last round were not appealable because there was no forum for abuse. That has been recognized as a weakness so, moving forward, there will be a recommendation that CPEs will be appealable and it will form part of the accountability framework.

Point number six. This one talks about the fact that, in our comments to the initial report, ALAC had suggested that the CPE panels could be made up of people from the community who had grassroots connections, and possibly even from the At-Large community.



---

Now, this hit a problem because the working group considered that independence issue to be paramount and they wanted the independence to be substantiated through using a third-party professional CPE provider rather than appointing known folks from the community, per se, who may carry certain biases.

This one, we suggested that we could accept this in order to avoid perceived conflict of interest arguments but it really boils down to the question of whether the community has a say in appointing the CPE provider.

Point number seven, a pending issue, is there was a question in the initial report that asked whether there should be any preferential treatment for community applications beyond the ability to participate in this CPE in the context of string contention resolution. There was no consensus to accord such preferential treatment within the SubPro PDP Working Group so there won't be any recommendations moving forward.

We had commented that, apart from CPE, there should be some provision of experts to, at least, assist community applicants, especially from under-served regions and first-time applicants, in helping them prepare the applications. The SubPro Working Group has noted this and will likely address as such in the applicant support program, among other places.

Points eight and nine remain open at this point in time, so that's the extent of the scorecard and I will now take questions. Alan, please.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I put my hand up with relation to the community participating in the selection of the CPE evaluator. Unless ICANN policies have changed significantly with regard to contracting, that is not going to happen. ICANN has some very strict rules about contracting and selection of vendors being done without the potential for being influenced by the community. That is, it must be done as a truly internal employee thing.

I think putting our hopes on the fact that we will be participating in the selection of a vendor, again, based on past experience with similar-type things, it's just not likely to happen. So, unless we have a strong indication that that is actually legally possible within the ICANN framework, I would not put a lot of stake on that.

Personally, I don't believe that the CPE evaluations can be done by community people. It's a level of intensity in work with time constraints that I just don't think is practical to be done by the community. That's my personal opinion.

I think we have to address both of those by setting criteria for the evaluator so that we can try to ensure that whoever is selected does meet our targets, but I don't think we're going to actually have a hand in the review in the applications so I think we need to be practical about that. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Alan. Yes, I agree with you, which is why, in terms of implementation, we should be looking at the high-level aspects of concerns in terms of moving forward with the procedure that is going to be adopted by the CPE provider, whoever that may be. Jonathan?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Justine. Thanks for the detailed discussion. I guess a lot of this comes down to an age-old question of system bias, in a way. Is this designed in such a way that we're biased in favor of CPEs or against? In other words, are we trying to really encourage them, which I think is the At-Large view, or are we really trying to dispense with them? Somehow, enshrining that in the criteria seems important.

One of the things I wanted to ask is whether or not there were case studies that were part of this discussion inside of Subsequent Procedures in terms of applications that were rejected? Has this all been a theoretical discussion or are there individual applications we're looking at and saying, "Here's why this one should have been treated differently," or something like that that could be used for non-theoretical examples that would be built into the criteria that we establish?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. Actual examples, from my memory, we looked at at least one because we have, within the SubPro PDP Working Group, a member who basically championed the .gay application as a community-based application, so a lot of input from the perspective of an applicant for community-based application was provided by this person.

There wasn't a lot of other substantive input from the other members. I think a lot of us were relying on this particular member that I mentioned and probably just adding peripheral points to the issues being discussed.

---

In terms of whether we're pushing for CPE or not, I think that's a moot question because it's going to be used. Nobody has recommended that it be, obviously, abolished. Yes. So in terms of CPE, they will continue, and any applicant who passes CPE will still get priority in terms of contention resolution.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure. Justine, sorry. I didn't mean whether or not the [DCPEA], I just mean, in the selection criteria in almost any framework like this, you're going to establish a tie-breaker bias built into ... Like in the US criminal court system, we say it's better to let 10 guilty people go free than have one innocent person go to jail, or something like that. It's just a system bias.

And so, what I mean is, in the criteria, it's like stressing the fact that we want communities to succeed. This isn't something just put in place where we're really biased in favor of generics, which seems to be what we have as a predominant bias today with the fees and everything else.

I think the At-Large would be interested in building a bias in favor of communities into the criteria. That's what I was trying to get at, if that makes sense.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I see, okay. I'm not sure whether we have that influence. We can look at it, certainly. But just to address some of the aspects around it is, number one, when ICANN appoints a CPE provider, a lot of the people that register with a CPE provider are professionals in that respect. We had to

---

somehow rely on their expertise, in a sense. The issue we have would be, then, things like conflict of interest. How do identify those and how do we manage those?

The second point is that if the set of guidelines that the panelists are supposed to follow ... That's where I talked about the issues of interpretation of the concept community, membership relevance, nexus, designation, that sort of thing, that is how we would build into the guidelines in order to guide the evaluators in making the determinations. I think that's the extent that we could influence.

The third point is now that they are required to provide rationales and explain how they got to the rationale with supporting documentation, this provides a basis for appeals if we feel that an error has been committed and now it is the forum for appeals. I hope that somehow answers what you're trying to get ...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

It does. I'm sorry. It's sort of abstract and I'll think about it more. Does the representative—sorry to dominate a little bit here—that was on the panel from .gay believe that with these changes that application would have qualified?

JUSTINE CHEW:

That's hard to say because it's a hypothetical question.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

What have they expressed?

JUSTINE CHEW: They have expressed a lot of these things that are highlighted in page three and four, which is to do with the guidelines, per se. What I mentioned before in the interpretation of community membership, relevance, delineation, nexus, and opposition, those are key points that these particular members actually raised as problem areas that occurred in the last round that should be reviewed in the CPE guidelines in order to, at least, alleviate a repeat of these problems for the next round.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great. Thanks, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Yrjö?

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah. I just want to remind everybody that a few years back the council of Europe did a report on the community CPE, how it worked in the last round. It was heavily critical, actually, of what would happen. Also, critical of the performance of the Economist Intelligence Unit, so it might be good ... This actually was a subject for discussion between the GAC and the ALAC in the early days of our cooperation. I'll try to find that report and post it somewhere so that whoever wants can take a look. Thank you.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Yrjö, actually, the working group did look at that report. I believe that some of the criticisms from that report are also addressed in points raised by the .gay applicant, if not all. Thank you. Alan, you still have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I have my hand up again. I was just going to comment on Jonathan's statement that we need to have a bias toward community as opposed to generic TLDs. I think that's one of the things we got right in this round, that we do have a community priority and that is if you're deemed to be community you do have priority, so I think we got that one right.

We messed up the criteria for deciding whether it's a community or not but I think the bias was there and I think that's one of the things we need to maintain. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. I don't see any other hands up so I presume we can move on. I will look at, maybe, tweaking the first point that Alan made in terms of revising this scorecard. If there are no objections I would like to include this in the next version of appendix C to be shared with the GAC focus group. That would include, if you look at 4.4. and the agenda item, all of the available scorecards to date, except for geo names. Hearing no opposition, I believe we should proceed that way. All right, then I'll hand the floor back to Olivier. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Justine. Thanks again for all your work, as per every week. That is great progress. Let's hope that we get a bit more take-up on the issues that you're sharing with us every week.

Now, let's move on and go to Jonathan Zuck again. Here, we're going to be thinking about the At-Large ICANN67 talking points. Over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi. Thanks. I just wanted to briefly have a discussion with all of you about what a talking points document might look like, what we should include, and what the broad strokes talking points would be for the meeting.

As in the past, we'll have a paragraph about what the subject is and what the At-Large main points/main objectives are on that particular topic.

In looking through the schedule as it has shaken out in this virtual ICANN, these are the areas that I saw worthy of inclusion in such a document: the DNS abuse, because always; PIR is going to be one of the very first discussions; the Subsequent Procedures work that Justine just covered, ePDP, and then the reviews are things that seems like they're worthwhile.

I'm interested, initially, if anybody has commentary on this list about whether or not there's something here that isn't likely to be discussed publicly and that you shouldn't bother with, and then the other is, is there something that we expect discussion on that I have overlooked?  
Abdulkarim.



---

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay, thank you very much. I wanted to ask you the importance of the talking points, now that we have many more to mix in. That's my point. I was thinking the main point for the talking point, or the main reason why we had the talking points was that we'll have discussions with people in the corridors and things like that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's a great question, Abdulkarim. I think the issue is having talking points for any opportunity to speak, and one of those is definitely in the corridors, for sure, but the other is that we're hoping that At-Large participants in this virtual meeting will decide to show up virtually for these meetings that are taking place, the Subsequent Procedures meetings, the board open discussion on PIR, things like that.

And so, there will be opportunities to interject into those discussions, at least in theory. And so, this is about being prepared to do that. That's why I ask if people think, "Hey, this topic is probably not going to be discussed in an interactive way and we should remove it from the talking points." If there is something else that we think will be discussed in an interactive way in this modified, contracted schedule that I should add to the talking points then we would do that, as well. I hope that makes sense. León.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Hi, Jon. Just in regard to the PIR discussion I wanted to ask that you keep in mind that this is an ongoing decisional process within ICANN. It might come to you raising questions that we, as a board, may not be able to provide answers at this moment.

---

So just to highlight this, to flag this to you all, and ask for your understanding as, again, this is an ongoing process. Nevertheless, your feedback is highly appreciated and we do expect to receive your feedback in an opportunity that this shows up. Bearing this in mind, I would thank you in advance for your understanding and for bearing with us while they're discussing this issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

León, let me just turn that back around on you, on the PIR issue. That is one of the very first open, public forums discussions, if I understand correctly. What do you imagine the flow of that conversation is going to be?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ:

I imagine the flow of the conversation being gathering feedback from all of you in the community and, of course, maybe providing a general sense of where we are at the moment and, of course, pretty much gathering your thoughts and input on the publicly available information and the circumstances that have been put forward by the parties in the transaction.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So you imagine that it's probably going to be mostly listening on the part of the board and speech making on the part of the community?

---

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Absolutely. It's going to be, pretty much, listening from the board side and speaking from the community side.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so we shouldn't phrase things as questions, we should just try to reaffirm our points and give our reactions to recent developments, then?

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ: Exactly. That's the message that I was trying to convey.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, perfect. Thank you. Any other inputs on this list, something that's there that doesn't need to be or something that should be that isn't there? Okay. Next slide, then. DNS abuse is going to be a frequent conversation in a lot of different fora. Oh, Sébastien. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am sorry, I have to leave for the other call. Just a question about review. I don't know exactly what you have in mind but, as a matter of fact, that is one of the topics of ATRT3 and, as you know, or maybe not, the meeting was canceled or transformed from face-to-face to a virtual meeting. The ATRT3 meeting, face-to-face, was canceled, and that's replaced by a virtual meeting on those days.

Therefore, the work we wanted to have done before the meeting will not be done. We don't know yet when we will be able to finalize our work but this means that it could be discussed with no problem from my point of

---

view. Just to let you know that it's still a work going on within the ATRT3. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sébastien. That's important feedback. I wasn't sure whether or not the reviews ... Because there were [inaudible] meetings that were coming up regarding the reviews, whether or not they were going to be discussed in some forum within ICANN67.

The only thing that came to mind was one of the public forums about reaffirming things, and it may be early to be reaffirming things with the board. It's possible that the reviews shouldn't be a part of these talking points if they're not really going to be a part of the conversation at ICANN67.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

That, I can't tell you, Jonathan. I don't know what other parts of ICANN want, can do, or will do. I know that this topic is a part of the discussion, for example, with the SSR2 review because they have the document for discussion. It may be that it came there. I just want to caution you that the important work done within ATRT3 is not finished and it will need to have some more weeks to be finalized.

I guess it would be a better time to have this discussion after we release those reports but, once again, it's my own, personal point of view about that and I have not all of the information about what is happening during ICANN67. Thank you, and sorry, I have to leave to go to Auction Proceeds now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. Gordon.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Thanks, Jonathan. I have looked at the board reviews from a slightly different standpoint, and that is that the subjects that are used and their timing, and everything else, is part of this multi-stakeholder model evolution. That, I thought, was what we had in mind there. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I mean, to be honest, I don't entirely know what I had in mind or what type of conversations would be going on on that topic. When we get to it I'll talk about what jumped out at me, which is this disconnect between the staff reports and the version two and three of reviews on the issue on implementation.

That seems to be something that is a stand-out across a number of different review teams. That feels like a relevant issue to bring up with the board. But again, I welcome feedback. That's just me talking and reacting toward the conversations that I feel like we've been having somewhat repeatedly.

And so, that general issue seems important. And then, also, the stress on moving forward with the ATRT recommendations on prioritization as soon as possible because some of these recommendations have very high priority, especially in the SSR2 report, etc.

---

So, those two things felt like things that might be worthy of board discussion but, again, I welcome feedback from León on that and from all of you. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Just to say, on that specific topic, I consider that—once again, it’s personally—ATRT is on top of all that. If you look to the bylaws, it’s the ATRT who is supposed to be on top of the others. I will not say “on top,” but taking care of the other reviews and look to the other review, and what the board is doing, and how it’s working.

Therefore, I consider that the place to be discussed [after] people to be discussed [as it’s with] ATRT3 before to have the discussion with the board. The discussion with the board will be useful when ATRT3 will have released a final report, and it was supposed to be done for the 5<sup>th</sup> of April but, for obvious reasons, it will not be, I guess. Once again, I really think that it must go through the ATRT before going to any discussion with the board. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Sébastien. Yeah. We don’t need to dwell on this too long but do you include in that the notion that there’s a disconnect between staff reports on things being implemented and review team reports on implementation? Do you feel like that conversation should be put off as well? Okay.

---

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. It's something important and it's where there are recommendations in the ATRT3 report, the one who was discussed with the community, and hopefully in the final one. Therefore, yeah, I think all that is taken into account and we in ATRT3 try to make some proposal on how to solve that. We talk about priority, we talked about the differences between the view from ICANN Org and from the review teams, and so on. I guess it will be a better time to discuss that when we will have the final report of ATRT3. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, that makes sense. Thanks, Sébastien. Thanks, Cheryl, for backing Sébastien up in the comments. Gordon, that's an old hand?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Sorry about that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. All right. DNS abuse. Oh, sorry. Judith, I was about to remove reviews on the talking points list. Can you tell me how you came away with a different conclusion?

JUSTINE CHEW: I think you're referring to me, not Judith.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, Justine. Yeah, that's what I meant. I apologize.

---

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. Well, the way I see it, the talking points are not hazardous to the board, per se. They are things that we feel, as At-Large, are important. Leaving reviews on the list is not necessarily a bad thing, we just have to not dwell on it too much and focus our attention on making it known that we find certain—like the ATRT and SSR2—reviews to be of importance and should be taken into serious consideration. That’s all.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, yeah. Maybe we can keep it general. The question is venue, right, and where will the opportunities be to speak to these talking points? I guess that’s the conversation we’re having, and maybe it’s in our discussions with the GAC or something like that, rather than our discussions with the board as I had originally thought.

Okay. Thanks, folks. DNS abuse, number on issue for individual end users. Any new round must wait for substantial reform on mechanisms for DNS abuse mitigation. We recommend that these thresholds for domains, holistic tools for contract compliance, research into machine learning, increased friction for bulk registrations and decreased friction for access to registrant data, which is, again, related to the ePDP work that Alan and Hadia have been doing. That’s the general overall DNS abuse topics and that’s going to come up in a lot of different sessions, for sure. Next slide.

On PIR, I think we applaud PIR’s move to open its contract for public interest commitments. There has been some discussion about the efficacy of PICs on our list but I believe there is a rough consensus—while we haven't done a consensus call—when it has come up that we want



---

PICs to continue and that we just want them to be better enforced, but that as a mechanism we think that they're important.

And so, therefore, we applaud the use of that mechanism as a way to build things into the contract that can survive transactions across ownership or across contractors for the .org domain.

We think that these PICs need to go further than they did because they're limited right now, frankly, to privacy and free speech. And so, we're excited about both of those things but we are still very concerned about how the board composition of PIR ... We're interested in further DNS abuse commitments as we made in our [case], in terms of DNS abuse threshold and implementation of additional tools. Glenn, you said there was something that came up in a recent webinar on DNS abuse. Is that something you can summarize quickly?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yeah. There was a one-hour session with Grogan and Brian. Well, Brian's with PIR and Grogan, former ICANN staffer, who's the legal counsel now of Ethos. They actually talked about the strategy that PIR has on DNS abuse, so Brian provided an overview on that yesterday.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. PIR were the ones who originally developed the framework that was signed by, initially, like 11 contracted parties and now, I think, there are 48 of them that are signed on. Was it just a summary of that framework or is it something new, new commitments that they're making?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. Sorry. He alluded to new commitments but, unfortunately, his link in the discussion yesterday was faulty so I reached out to Brian to get more details on it so I should have ... I'll send you some details on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, perfect. Thank you. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Towards PICs, on this proposal regarding PICs, the ALAC is on record for pointing out the weakness in the enforcement of PICs. Is this something that we're still aware of and having still a [watching great fondness]? Because the concern here, if we applaud the PIR move to PICs, that these are not enforceable, are we not effectively applauding something that is going to be weaker than the original commitments that were there?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Thanks, Olivier. I think it's not a completely clear-cut discussion but my sense of the flow, if you will, in the discussions we had about PIC is that, yes, we were disappointed in how they were enforced but we were still believers in them, and that there were in fact cases where PICs were adhered to, etc.

And so, we're still fans of PICs. And so, the comment that we've put out, we want them to still exist, we just want them to be enforced. And so, we had to figure out what that looks like. Part of it is problems with the PIC

---

DRP and standing that, for example, the At-Large had as a third party to participate in the DRP process, for example.

So I think there are some specific recommendations, as León said, and I can try to delve into that a little bit more in the talking points, about PICs generally. But I believe that we still believe that PICs are the best mechanism there is in a contract to enshrine behavior that has been informal thus far. It's sort of the best thing there is, and so we need to make it better, I think is the way we're putting it.

Eduardo, I see you taking "applaud" out, there. I guess what I mean is that the willingness to open the contract is what we're applauding and that we're glad that they're making that move to enshrine commitments into the contract and that we just want them to go further. That's what I meant about applauding, that we believe that that's the mechanism that should be used going forward, changes to the contract.

I'll look at some PIC enforcement issues, as well. I think we consider that to be an overarching issue for ccTLDs generally, and especially for a new round, and not specific to .org, but we can include some PIC talking points, as well. Olivier, that's your old hand, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a follow-up, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay then. Go ahead.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Historically, yes, one of the concerns, I think, that has been voiced many times and that was included in some discussions with the ICANN Board were to do with the enforceability of the PICs and the strength of those PICs. There was a time when there was a mish-mash and—how should I call it?—complicated explanations provided to us by some board members regarding some PICs being the voluntary PICs and the mandatory PICs.

I think that we really need to clear this one out because, of course, if PIR comes up with a set of PICs and then down the line we're suddenly told, "Well, these are just voluntary PICs. They're the same as the mandatory PICs"—I haven't got the exact section numbers but it all depends on what part of the section it is, etc.—then, effectively, we're being given assurances that are not worth much.

We need to make sure, and I emphasize this. I know I'm repeating myself but it really is for everything. Not only with this specific contract but, of course, with all of the contracts. It's going to be something that we really need to take ... Since DNS abuse is one of our main campaigns we need to make sure that this is also part of that main campaign. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. I think that's a great point. I think that part of the issue is that contract compliance is not a question of voluntary versus mandatory PICs. I think it has to do with what's considered within ICANN's remits to enforce.

In other words, if one of these PICs involves some sort of content-based commitment, for example, and they failed to adhere to it, is it still within

---

ICANN contract compliance's remit to enforce a PIC on an area that's explicitly outside of ICANN's remit? I think that's the issue, more so than voluntary versus mandatory.

I'll look into this but anybody that has ideas or things to point to ... Because I think some of the At-Large comments on PICs might predate me, but that's my understanding of one of the key issues from contract compliance standpoint. They don't want to get involved too deeply in enforcing behavior that is in and of itself outside of the DNS.

We'll try to flesh this out further, Eduardo, but I recommend people send me things that seem relevant and I'll try to flesh things out as I turn this into a document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: One last word from me, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks. I think you put your finger on a very important thing here because if we do have, indeed, all of the points that were originally in the organizing paperwork of that organization, or PIR, then move it to the PICs, then things like board membership by non-profits or enshrined focus on non-profits and individual registrants is stuff that will never be enforced by ICANN Compliance, as you very rightly said, which effectively means that they could write anything in there and it's just not going to

---

be enforced by anybody and we're, then, really looking at going backwards rather than forwards. Thanks for pointing this out in that we indeed need to look further into this very carefully, with a fine-toothed comb. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. It's going to be tough. Again, the PCI DRP is the other thing that's available, and so part of it might have to do with standing and the ability for third parties to participate in that process because, as Alan has pointed out on the call with PIR, absent a showing of specific harm you don't have standing for filing a PIC DRP.

And so, that may be something that we need some reform around, as well, because that would be the mechanism for the community to enforce commitments outside of contract compliance's remit.

Okay. Thanks, folks. I'll try to flesh this out a little bit more and I'll try to find some positive things to say about what they're doing because I want to encourage what they're doing and then continue forward.

Thanks. Next slide. This is a very big topic and I don't know whether to build this out with the work that is already in the scorecards or, really, just to refer to them. Some generalized talking points that we've had in Subsequent Procedures is that there is no rush for a new round; have to wait on substantial reform to DNS abuse enforcement frameworks and mitigation frameworks, and the completion of the SSAC studies that are taking place, NCAP and others.

---

We have a focus on communities, that we want to see more communities succeed in—this is my understanding—being defined as communities and gaining access to that priority evaluation. There was something related. The geo name priority, again, we haven't completely wrapped our heads around this but I think as a general idea we'd like communities to be given some priority over geographic names, as well.

A focus on underserved regions, and so applicant support is something that's important to us. We think there are still discussions to be had about geo names despite the great work of Work Track 5. I think there is still consensus within the At-Large to ... While we haven't yet put meat on the bones, there is still appetite within At-Large to push for more than was in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook on geographic names. Questions or comments about these? Okay. Next slide.

The ePDP, I don't know. I guess I should ask Alan and Hadia, if either or both of them are still on the call, whether they believe there will be a form in which to bring these points up or if there's anything that's worth bringing up with the board, for example; sort of the same question as there was about reviews.

We recognize that DNS abuse prevention is challenging now because of the current regime where WHOIS has largely gone dark, and that that's had actual impact on reputational databases and other research, and law enforcement.

Data access by researchers and law enforcement is a priority and we support automation where possible. I guess I can add "and legal" because

---

Hadia kept saying that in her presentation. If there are other high-level points, or better ones, I'd love to hear from Hadia and Alan on that.

Hadia, I guess my quick question for you is, do you believe, taking a look at the schedule, that there's a good place for people to be making these points in the new schedule in the virtual meeting? Yeah, Hadia. Please, go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

I'm not sure if we would time or not but the topics seem to the point. DNS abuse prevention challenge, though, that's actually a fact, and data access by researchers and law enforcement by researchers, currently we have nothing that covers this point. And "support automation where possible," I would leave "where possible" as is because you've been talking about technical possibility, commercial possibility, legal possibility, so "possible" covers everything. So yes, I think those points are very good. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And Hadia, do you think, looking at the schedule, that there will be a good opportunity to make these points?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

I'm not sure. I need to look again at the schedule. I'm not sure.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, well if you would, take a look and let me know. Sébastien has asked a question in the chat about one of the holdover issues from Phase 1 and whether or not these are fights we're still fighting. For example, legal and non-legal entities.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess the other one was geographic differentiation, yeah.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Geographic differentiation. [inaudible], yeah. Those are priority two items and we are still discussing them, and how much of these we are going to be able to finalize is just unclear now. Maybe ten days or a week from now we can actually know where we stand.

So yeah, we are still discussing individual natural versus legal. We are going to pose questions to Bird & Bird in this regard. Also, I think ICANN Org has circulated a survey that also relates to the differentiation. Nothing of this is yet completed, and, priority two, ICANN says it is not clear that we will be able to address all priority two items during this phase and that we will be able to actually reach conclusions with regard to those items.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Thanks, Hadia. I appreciate that a lot. Do get back to me with ideas for—after looking at the schedule—where we might ask At-Large participants to join the meeting and raise their hand and make some of these points. If you see instances of that and opportunities for that, please let me know in e-mail because that’s kind of what drives this process. We’ll be doing a presentation.

Just to remind everybody, we begin every ICANN meeting now with a presentation on, “Here’s what’s coming up, here are the meetings, here is where you have the opportunity to make these points,” so however explicit we can make that, the better. Thanks, Hadia.

Okay. Next slide. This is what I had in terms of talking points on this, that both ATRT3 and SSRT2 highlight the implementation disconnect. And so, this is a serious issue that’s being addressed by ATRT3. We broadly support recommendations of both, as well as the CCTRT; high importance for SSRT and CCTRT recommendations now. We need to get that prioritization framework in place sooner rather than later so that some of these recommendations can be more fully implemented.

So that’s where I was on the review talking points. Again, I guess the question will be whether or not there’s a venue for raising them. But as Justine said, we can potentially include this as more a background in case conversations come up in meetings but for the most part, we’re waiting on these, I believe. Hadia, that’s an old hand, right? Yeah. Okay, great. Any questions or comments? Okay. Next slide. That might be it.

[YEŞİM NAZLAR:]

Jonathan? That was the last slide.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, thank God. Okay. All right, folks. Oh, Sébastien. Please, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I know that Justine is asking that we keep that. If we have to put something about reviews, I guess other points are important; how we want to organize a review in the future, whether it was in our proposal, the systemic review. Here, we are taking one angle. It's the recommendation how they will be taking care.

Once again, all that will be included in the ATRT3 report and the question of having ... Sorry, I was in two calls. Sorry, trying to find my way. What is important is that we will have those discussions within the ATRT3 and to the ATRT3 you have to discuss it. You have four members of the team and the ones who are working hard, and I will say even others and the others.

I am not sure that we need to push that to the board. I don't think it's the right place and the right moment for that. Of course, about the SSR2, CCT, yes, but that is two specific reviews and not the reviews in general. Thank you. Sorry for the difficulty for me to speak.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Thanks, Sébastien. Any other comments on those? All right. Back to you, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. We are running out of time, as we usually do, but we can swiftly go to the discussion about the Middle East and Adjoining Country Strategy with Seun Ojedeji and Satish Babu. I understand both of them are standing by. Have we lost them?

SATISH BABU: I'm here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. Welcome, Satish.

SATISH BABU: Yeah. Would Seun like to go first? Okay. I don't hear him so I'll start. We learned from the last CPWG minutes that the recommendation that the APRALO and AFRALO do a joint feedback with the public comments. In the last APRALO call, we discussed this method and we had invited [inaudible] to come in and speak to us.

We [booked] the meeting and what we have now decided is that we do have a bunch of active volunteers from the Middle East in APRALO so we are going to put out a call for volunteers for this process. Seun has also suggested, from his side, a similar process. What I'd like to hear from the CPWG is, is there any particular way you recommend [inaudible]? Is there any [inaudible] that you would like to inform us before we start this process? That's from my side. Over to you, Seun.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Satish. As you might know, last week there was a question as to whether the ALAC should speak about this. I guess the only thing, really, is that since this is a topic that relates primarily to a specific region of the world some members have said that they couldn't comment on the topic because they had no knowledge of it and, especially culturally speaking, did not know or could not form an informed opinion on this topic. Therefore, punting it over to the RALOs who are physically closer to the action on these topics was a potential answer. That's where we are. I see Seun Ojedeji has put his hand up. Maybe he can add a few points to this.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you. Yeah. I mean, it's a good idea to develop [inaudible]. I think it's good that this idea came up. Thanks to whoever suggested it. Naturally, [inaudible] Satish, we discussed on the same thread on what are the process we might actually go in trying to put this statement together. I think we have about a month, if I'm correct, and we need to just gain the traction to get out.

The suggestion is to probably get a drafting team and then the drafting team comes with an initial draft, the drafting team comprising of members from APRALO and AFRALO. Yeah, they'll come with their draft, and then we'll share with the two RALOs.

I don't think I need to go through ALAC. Is the CPWG expecting to receive anything from that? Well, I think the ccTLDs can actually contribute to it from the Wiki page stuff. But of course, I'm not sure. They'd need to go for any approval at the ALAC level. That's it. Thanks.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Seun, and thanks for raising this. I think one of the concerns was that if it's an ALAC advice it will have to be [inaudible] on by the ALAC. Now, historically we have had such very regionalized topics and I recall a few years ago that some members of the ALAC didn't feel like they could vote yes or no so they just abstained for this specific topic.

The problem, of course, with the way that we vote is if there are abstentions, these count as "no" votes. This is where they would make more sense to just get those closer to the action to support it. I think that getting the RALOs to fully support what they're doing is great. I take your point that you're asking the members of the CPWG to comment on this and that's, of course, great. This is open for comments for everyone. It's just down to having the right support in your respective RALOs. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Satish, Seun, and Olivier. Seun, it's a good idea that you're thinking to shoot an e-mail to AFRALO and ask for [directors]. I think, though, that we need to make the process really simple so maybe just sending out an e-mail asking for [addresses] and then using the existing Wiki page to develop the statement.

My suggestion would be not to use the Wiki page only for the comments of the CPWG members but also to use it in the development of the statement itself as all the other statements are being developed. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Hadia. Satish Babu.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Hadia, and thanks, Olivier. I completely agree that we should make it as simple as possible, particularly because the people who may volunteer may be newcomers who would like to participate in the process. We would go by the simplest way to do this [perhaps with the CPWG Wiki help]. We will take help from staff to figure out which is the simplest manner to do this. Thanks for this suggestion, Hadia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Satish. I guess that we'll just leave that in the capable hands of Satish and Seun and their RALOs. As you mentioned, we still have time to address this and we can, therefore, move onto the next part of our agenda. That's the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. Actually, we're just going to be very brief since we're running a little over time and go right to Laurin Weissinger, who is planning to provide some comments on the draft proposal for NextGen@ ICANN program. I'll turn it over to you, Laurin. Thanks so much.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hi, everyone. I'll try to be extremely quick. I believe Glenn is on the call as well so please add your comments that I might miss. Essentially, we've been focusing on the NextGen program improvement comments. I will

---

give you a quick overview of the gist of what we're trying to do here. Time is limited and this will be pretty long so I'll just give an update and we'll probably have to do this on the next call.

Essentially, our push right now is to say the program needs to be made more serious. We recognize, for example, that attending one meeting, like most people will just be lost on the first one. The presentations that come out of people's research often has little to do with ICANN. It's hard for the students to pitch them because they've never been to ICANN, and so on.

We're saying we have to give some comments on weaving through this program in a way that the students can actually engage properly, actually have the opportunity to learn about ICANN, and realize the potential. On a call yesterday, the idea was really, "Okay, value has to be going both ways. The students have to contribute something but also the community needs to act in a way that they can provide value to these students and help them to do something within the community."

I think this is a quick overview and it requires a longer discussion which we'll probably have to put off until the next meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Laurin. I'm not seeing any hands. Jonathan? Do you wish to take up any other points in this, Jonathan and Evin?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I do not.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thanks, everyone. As you heard, we are running out of time. There are still some comments and processes in place until the closing date. I'll just draw your attention to the comments and drafting stages of all of these that are in the agenda. With this, we can move to agenda item number eight. That's the AOB. Of course, as you heard earlier on this call, there is some discussion about At-Large in DNS abuse, our main topic.

Is there anything else that anybody wishes to discuss briefly on this call? I am not seeing any hands up. Wow, that's going rather fast now, suddenly. I do realize we are 15 minutes over time. When is our next meeting, bearing in mind that next week is going to be the ICANN week? Of course, not in Cancún but we'll all be on our computers, laptops, etc., phones, for an extended amount of time. Are we going to be looking at having enough time for a standard CPWG call or are we not? Big question. In fact, I should have asked Jonathan before we started this call.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think that we have space in the schedule to do that. I think we want folks to participate as much as possible in the meetings that are going on in the coming week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Jonathan. So next week, we have a suspension.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's the week after. Yep.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Suspension in our calls until the week after. We'll have a follow-up. So, the week of the 16<sup>th</sup> of March. With a strict rotation of calls, where does that take us, Yeşim?

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thank you, Olivier. Actually, we have two options. The first option is, if we would like to hold the next call right after the ICANN meeting, we can hold it on Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> of March. Remember, we will not have interpretation so it will be similar with today's call. However, if we would like to have interpretation then we need to postpone it one more week and we can hold it on the 25<sup>th</sup> of March. As per the rotation, it needs to be at 19:00 UTC for both of the weeks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Yeşim. The difficulty we have is that having two weeks off will definitely be a main problem because we have some deadlines before that. The 18<sup>th</sup>, we'll have to do the same, again with the apologies to those people who rely on interpretation. We haven't got any choice on this one, unfortunately, with the deadlines being what they are.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The 18<sup>th</sup> of March is the next one. Yep?

---

YEŞİM NAZLAR: If I may, we will be requesting a real-time transcription service so I think it will be useful, as well, when we don't have the interpretation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good. As long as that works, that will be great.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Yeah. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Or should I say that will be better? Not great, better, Okay. Thanks. What would be the time then, if you look at the rotation? So we had 13:00 UTC so on the 18<sup>th</sup> the next time would be ...?

YEŞİM NAZLAR: 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 19:00 UTC, so be it. Thanks, everyone, for being on this call, and thanks to both participants but also people that have made presentations and things. Have a very good ICANN week. We start in a few days' time. I hope we'll see many of you on the calls engaging in very useful, very interesting discussion as per usual. With this, have a very good morning, or afternoon, evening, or night.

---

YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**