

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call, taking place on Wednesday, the 25th of March, 2020, at 13:00 UTC.

Due to the increase in attendance and in order to save time, we will not be doing then roll call. However, all attending, both in the Zoom room as well as the phone bridge, will be noted after the call.

However, we would like to note the apologies we have received. We have received apologies from Kaili Kan and Maureen Hilyard.

As you know, we have French and Spanish interpretation for today's call. Our interpreters on the Spanish channel are Lilian and David. Our French interpreters are Isabelle and Camila.

From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogan, Herb Waye, and myself, Yesim Nazlar. I'll also be doing call management for today's call.

Just a kind reminder. As you know, we have real-time transcription provided for the CPWG calls. I'm just going to share the link with you on the Zoom chat.

Now, just one final reminder to state your name before speaking, not only for the interpretation but also for the transcription purpose as well, please.

Now I'll leave the floor back to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

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.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. And a very special welcome back to your interpreters—Lilian, David, Isabelle, and Camila—who were not on the call last week due to travel issues, of course. Now they're back in action. So we have interpreted calls again.

Our agenda today is slightly rejigged, but in fact we might change it again due to just a few operational issues with some people needing to leave earlier. We'll first have then adoption of the agenda, as we currently are doing. After the action items, the proposal is to move back Agenda Item 5 (EPDP Phase 2 update with Hadia and Alan) ... forward. They have indicated they have a very small item to bring forth to us.

Immediately after that, we would probably have to pick the item in the policy comment update that deals with the draft [proposal] for the NextGen-at-ICANN Program improvements with Laurin Weissinger. After this, we'll either continue on the policy, if we haven't got the right person for the SubPro updates, or we'll move over to the SubPro updates with Justine Chew.

Finally, we'll be into Any Other Business. Some of the other topics that were listed in what we would need to do this week have been moved to next week because they were deemed not to be time-critical. At the same time, we're just so pressed for time for some of the other topics that we'll touch on today.

Any comments or questions? Changes to the agenda?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So is travel moved again? Because I have to leave before 14:00 for another call. For Auction Proceeds.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith. I think that, because it has a deadline of the 13th of April, it might be an idea to move it backwards. I don't know how many slides you have, but I'm a little concerned that we'll just be a bit over the limit if we're not careful. If that's okay with you, we still have plenty of time for those.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay, that's fine. So I will move again.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Again, yes. Apologies for this. But it's just we're working with as much as we can.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's my fault that [the time] has been moved, but that's fine.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If we have spare time, we'll slot you on.

Any other comments?

I'm not seeing any other hands up.

Let's get going then, please. We now have our action items from last week. There are a couple of action items that are left. One of them is for Cheryl to present on the PDP 3.0. That will be in the next meeting. Yes, we promised at some point that she's going to be able to talk to us about PDP 3.0. This week is a little tight. The other one was for Jonathan and Evin to finalize ALAC responses to the ICANN Board understanding of the ALAC advice on DNS abuse.

Jonathan and Evin, I understand that's in hand still?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, it is still in hand. We've just got a couple more of their questions to answer. We're coordinating with a couple of other people—DNS abuse experts—to get them clarified. So we should have that done in the next couple of days.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you so much, Jonathan. That's very helpful. Thank you. I'm not seeing any other hands up. No further comments from anyone.

So that's the action items. It's good to see a good set of action items that are actually picked. I really thank everyone who's being very diligent with following up on their action items.

Next is therefore jumping to Agenda Item #5 – the Expedited PDP Phase 2 update—with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. I believe it's Alan who's going to take the floor on this one.

And Alan will have to unmute before he speaks, of course, as we know.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I hate this. Perhaps we can ask staff to try to unmute people you introduce so they don't have to remember to do it because some of us can't.

There's one issue that is of import today. The EPDP is issuing an addendum the final report/draft report, which there'll be a separate comment period on. The addendum makes a number of changes of things we've decided and takes all of the items that we have not finished and do not believe we will finish by June 1st at this point and essentially tosses them back to the GNSO to say, "Figure out what you're going to do with them, but they're not part our PDP anymore, though."

One of those is then legal versus natural question. The Business Constituency has essentially said they cannot live with that. The question is, do we want to say the same thing. We spent a good hour-and-a-half on this discussion yesterday, where we were planning a few minutes on it. So it has occupied significant time already and will be back on the agenda on Thursday, I believe. I have said that I do not believe the legal versus natural is an SSAD question and therefore we should not hold up issuing the addendum, which was supposed to be yesterday and we're now hoping to issue tomorrow. But the PDP should

not adjourn, should not stop, before we address it, even if we have to go past June. By the way, “past June” implies we don’t have our Chair anymore.

So I believe we cannot just toss it back to the GNSO. If we toss it back to the GNSO, at best they will have to restart or create a new PDP on it. It’s adding essentially a year or possibly multiple years. It’s an issue that we have recently gotten legal opinions on but have not looked at.

So my position, I believe, is we need to push to not abandon the legal versus natural in this PDP, but it should not alter the SSAD report delivery date.

I want to know to what extent to I have support from this group or not.

Olivier, I see your hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. So are you basically saying that the EPDP could finish without the legal versus natural thing being dealt with, and therefore it would tick the box on saying, “Okay. EDPD? Done. This stuff we kick until later”?

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s correct. The GNSO may choose to ignore it completely. It may choose to take some action. It’s clearly policy action and will require a PDP or something comparable to address.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I consider this one of the fundamental issues that the EPDP had to deal with, so it'd be an epic fail not to have done so. It's also one of the ways in which both the temp spec and whatever comes out of the EPDP goes beyond what's legally required, goes beyond GDPR, and creates an obstacle that has no legal basis.

That said, I think, Alan, you're middle approach of getting the SSAD report out while not abandoning this and not saying that it's ... yeah. Whatever you ... I don't need to say what you said. You said it better.

But, in any case, unless we truly need the leverage of the SSAD report to get anything other than worst possible resolution, it's more important to get the SSAD report out. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to be clear, yes, saying, "Let's delay this addendum," which, for a number of reasons, probably delays the SSAD by six months-plus because of other issues, would probably give us more leverage. But I don't believe that is what we should be doing.

Are you handling the queue, Olivier, or should I?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can certainly handle it [inaudible]. Next is Matthias Hudobnik.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Hello. Alan, I have just one question. [What if actually the argument of the business core constituency to do it like they are supposed to do? But, from a legal point of view, I think it was the hardest thing to solve—legal versus natural policy issues—and it also it's a very important thing under the GDPR because normally our legal persons are not falling under the applicability. Only there's the]—

ALAN GREENBERG: I can't hear you well enough. Olivier, did you hear him well enough to repeat it?

Did anyone hear him well enough to repeat it?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I heard the beginning but not the end. Matthias, could you please a bit louder, a bit closer to the mic? Thanks.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Okay, sorry. Is it better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: A lot better.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Okay. My first question was, what is actually the argumentation of the business [core constituency]? [Like] they are presuming to do it now? My second question would be, if I'm correctly aware of it, the main problem or one of the main problems that the whole EPDP process was distinguishing between legal versus natural persons? Because it was a very important question related to the GDPR because legal persons are only falling under this [inaudible] if they are uniquely identifiable. That's why I was curious.

ALAN GREENBERG: The temporary spec allowed contracted parties to redact information of natural persons and legal persons.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll be very quick. We're very short of time. Because the current WHOIS information does not have a clear statement of whether you are legal or natural, the contracted parties have said this is too difficult to do, too risky to do. The temporary spec allowed them to opt out, and the current PDP recommendation from Phase 1 also allowed them to opt out. The issue was deferred from Phase 1 to Phase 2. The Business Constituency's position and our position in general has been: We should not defer it [any past ...]. It's part of Phase 1, which was deferred to Phase 2. We should do it.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: So that's why you were arguing to find a way in the middle, not saying [inaudible] but still keeping track of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're saying don't delay the SSAD but we have to have the discussion. That doesn't mean we win the discussion but we have to have the discussion.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Okay. I [see that].

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Very quickly, I support your position. I think that this is really an important issue. Don't hold up the SSAD but, by all means, this is just going to be deferred forever. Really, the discussion needs to be had. So you've got my support. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible]—

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it looks like we're done. Back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I'm not seeing any other hands at present. You've only got support for pushing for legal versus natural, and I'm pushing for your proposal so far. I also note on the chat as well that there is support from the people that are taking part in that.

If anybody objects, by the way, and has a different view, please speak up now.

Going once ... going twice ... okay. Anything else, Alan? That's it?

[Then he's] going to hate it because he's speaking to himself again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Nothing else that we have to do today. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Thanks very much.

Let's then move on. Now, Justine, has Christopher made it yet, or ...

JUSTINE CHEW: I don't see him on the call, so I've asked staff to try and reach out to him. I also sent him an e-mail, wondering where he is, but I haven't received a reply yet. So I think perhaps—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Then let's rejig things in the meantime. We'll buy a little more time by going to Agenda Item #4. There is a specific topic there (I'm not sure who's speaking): Draft proposal for NextGen At ICANN Program improvements. Really that's in Jonathan's section, so, Jonathan, over to you to introduce, I guess, Laurin—a follow-up on what he's been doing on this topic. Deadline is the 31st of March.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Ladies and gentlemen: Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you for this. I sent over the slides. I'm sure they will appear momentarily. Before they do, this has been work by Joanna, Glenn, and myself. Most of them are on the call. I will go through essentially give a quick overview, and then they can jump in with whatever I missed or that needs explanation.

If I had my slides, that would be great. Please jump to Findings. I'll just start in the interest of time. Our findings include that very few people actually stay involved after attending NextGen. So we are aware of less than five individuals from ICANN where we stood. Then, in Internet governance more generally, we have roughly ten, probably less.

When it comes to selecting the NextGen—two of the people on the drafting team have been doing this—it is pretty difficult to actually select the information that's particularly useful. Then, once NextGen joins the meeting, they have to do these presentations. They're not contributing much in their current form. They're not aimed at ICANN in

a lot of cases, which makes sense, because people have never been there before, etc., etc. So instead they take time and cause stress for the NextGen participants and contribute to a more general issue, which is that they're closeted away from the community.

I can speak to, as I have been a NextGen and a NextGen Ambassador, that I've seen this happen. People are often lost. There's a considerable learning process when joining your first meeting, no matter if you have been prepared by webinars or not. This one-off meeting [inaudible] makes it really difficult for NextGen to meaningfully engage because essentially they're lost for a week and then their attendance is over and that's it.

So we essentially say the program does not seem to be working very well for either side.

Our recommendation/issue to tackle. We're talking about consolidating the NextGen Program with the Fellowship Program—give them some shared sessions, have the NextGen interact with Fellows, who are usually still somewhat junior but are more experienced. We want the application process to change so that we can identify [under] our presenters and indigenous communities on the one hand and, on the other hand, find people with identified subject interests that fit ICNAN descriptions. We're thinking about making this independent of the region for highly specialized people—so, if we have PhD students, for example. Mentors, we feel, should be selected by similar criteria we have for the Fellowship Program to make sure that there is someone available who can actually help the NextGen.

Other issues to tackle. Slide 4. We would like to see the program be revamped considerably. One thing we're discussing is to make selection harder, obviously, but then have more than one meeting attended because it simply doesn't work to be thrown in to one meeting and then engage.

Yes, Holly, it's just in the chat. If you could change to Slide 4, please. We're thinking about if it is feasible to establish relationships with corresponding [GSEs], have [inaudible] regional events—something like to essentially make use of the NextGen and give them some opportunity to engage. [Manage our webinars or delete] is important even if we cannot give you everything you need from ICANN meetings. We need better clarification of what is expected from a NextGen, and we need to make this whole learning process more fun for them as well.

To essentially give a quick summary again, right now this program gives people a one-off, one-shot attendance. The first meeting is usually very hard for NextGen and the community to leverage, and then they disappear. So we believe there has to be significant changes to the program, including better selection and actually giving NextGen more time to actually engage. That means we have to obviously select people well so that we're not wasting this moment.

That would be it. Joanna and Glenn, please jump in.

Okay. I'm just hearing from Glenn. He thinks this is enough, considering the time restrictions we have.

If anyone has questions or comments, please let us know, either right now or via other systems.

Okay. I'm not hearing anything, so I think we can take this as that people are generally happy with what I have just said.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Laurin, I think Jonathan might be muted. We've actually got a queue here with Justine, Matthias, and Holly. Let's start with Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I was going to ask who's chairing this session. Anyway, I had a question regarding the recommendation to consolidate the NextGen Program with the Fellowship Program. You're talking about just shared sessions and nothing to do with the outreach for both of the programs.

So, in terms of practicalities, how candidates are selected and funded would still remain the same. It's just that, when they arrive at the actual meetings, they would have joint sessions. Is that correct?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This would be one way, I think, to have these sessions come together. At least when I was a NextGen—I'm not sure how it is now because this was years ago—Fellowship sessions and NextGen sessions were broken up. I fondly remember missing out on some of the DNS security sessions because I had NextGen sessions. For the Fellowship, there—

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry, Laurin.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: ... So we can connect those.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sorry. That wasn't my question. Laurin. I was mainly referring to ... You're just talking about consolidating the program—[on fight] for both programs—but nothing to do with how the candidates are actually selected and funded? Correct?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes. Essentially, the funding and the selection is pretty different right now. I'm not sure it would make sense because these are pretty different people and there are different concerns in how to select them.

JUSTINE CHEW: Very good. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Matthias Hudobnik.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Hello. I have one question related to the selection process. Since I was also on the selection panel, I know how it works. I think it's already quite a selective program. I would be curious to hear how you want to improve. I think it's a good idea to improve something, but my question would be, what are you plans?

I also like the link or the connection with the Fellow Program, but here again I think the programs have a different coat. NextGens are more or yes younger people from universities under 30. They are obviously not very involved in the community rather than the Fellow Program, where you really need to show that you're already engaged in Internet Governance and also in ICANN-related topics. But I think, at the end, it could be very fruitful for both of them. So I think the idea is good, but I would interested also on what are the concrete plans about these two things. Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Hi, Matthias. In regards to the selection process, we have been mainly discussing that some of the students that go into NextGen are already highly specialized. So this is one thing where we'd like to see a bit more work so that we actually try to fit the NextGen into what's going on.

I can speak to my experience very quickly, which was that you have some people who are outstanding and then you have a lot of questions marks—at least what I looked at. We just felt that giving them a bit more freedom in how to do the application and [lead] the question a little bit more so we have something like .. A CV would have been useful for me in the last selection process.

But it's something we can discuss. The comment is still. Please just jump on the document.

Now I think I—oh, yes. And the other one. Fellowship plus NextGen. Essentially, we just feel it is quite useful because Fellowship participants are still pretty junior, so they can give some good tips to NextGen

participants, for example. We're not talking about making the program one again. It's more about trying to include the NextGen participants somewhere so that they have a better chance of actually getting involved.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I'm seeing a lot of people in the queue. I'm going to close the queue. At the moment, we have Holly Raiche—well, Holly has just spoken. We've got Alfredo Calderon, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Hadia Elminiawi, and finally Heidi Ullrich. And—oh, God. There's even—yeah. So at least keep your intervention short, and also, Laurin, please keep your responses short as well. Otherwise we'll spend too much time on this. Let's go to Alfredo Calderon.

ALFREDO CALDERSON: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Very well indeed. Go ahead.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Okay. As a member of the Fellowship selection committee and looking at the NextGen process, I believe that we should integrate both because it makes sense to have the 18-to-30 people involved in the sessions that the Fellowship has.

And there's a question that I do have for Laurin. The NextGen people that are selected—aren't they more research-oriented in terms of Internet governance? That's my question, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sometimes they are. Sometimes they're not. It depends a lot on region. In one region, for example, you might have close to no applications. In other regions, you might have hundreds. So you can pick very well. There is sometimes a focus, and sometimes there isn't, because it depends on who's essentially applying in that specific round for that specific meeting.

ALFREDO CALDERON: If I may have a follow-up question, I think that you're saying that the criteria for selection the NextGen individuals is as clear as it should be.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I will put my opinion here. I think it definitely can be improved. Other people might disagree. But my main point is that, if you are in Region A—I don't want to pick out anybody here—you get, for the applications, [inaudible] when you get [200.] So you just have your people to select from in some cases.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Thank you, Laurin, for this work. Thank you to all those who worked with you. It is a good work, but I have a concern about discussing this issue here. We are in the CPWG, which is a group where we discuss DNS policy issues. Is this part of the DNS policy issues? I don't think so. So I don't want to replace everything happening in ALAC to come and be discussed here in the CPWG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Tijani. I'll just step in here. I think it doesn't hurt that we discuss it here. It would definitely be important for Laurin to also take it to our outreach and engagement working group. I hope that he has and that there's been some feedback there.

The concern I have, Tijani, is that this call has been sent around on the mailing list with a Google Doc, so people in the At-Large community that are involved not in policy but in those topics primarily do not seem to have stepped forward very much in commenting on the document. Now it's kind of moving. So I guess we still have time until the end of this public consultation. This is just one of the many avenues by which the statement is being built. We're just making use of the fact that we have a regular call here on policy, so we're able also to discuss it here.

But thanks. I recognize what you're saying. Hadia Elminiawi?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. Matthias has said that you have some outstanding participants. This is really good to hear: that good participants are interested in being part of this community.

My question is, what do we do to keep those people involved in the correct areas for them where they can actually add and have an impact? Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I will try to address, actually, the last comment. [inaudible] one go because I think it fits. We do have two people on this call who actually were NextGen and are now helping with policy. I don't think either of them would if they hadn't had that experience. So there is an impact.

In terms of retaining, we're still discussing this, and we're happy for everyone to join in. One of the key issues, we believe, is that you're thrown into the cold water. You get an ICANN meeting. By the time you have some idea of what's going on, it's over. So this is really where we're trying to go and say, look, there's needs to be systems in place to make sure these people stay involved.

Some stuff is floating in the document. Again, please go over and have a look and comment and give us your ideas.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Laurin. Next is Heidi Ullrich.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, Olivier. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well indeed.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Laurin, thank you very much, and Joanna and Glenn, for this. I wanted to ask to what extent you saw the NextGen program being included in any kind of upcoming At-Large academic engagement program that I know that Maureen would like to see start to be developed. This might be a question for Joanna.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: This is ...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I'll just do it because I'm unmuted already. This is something we're discussing a lot and where we see ALAC to be a natural place for a lot of NextGen to go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Joanna Kulesza also has her hand up.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just briefly to address Heidi's question—thank you for that question—but also to address Tijani's comment, we welcome the opportunity to present this feedback here during the policy working group because getting approved will provide the background for outreach and capacity-building that is focus on getting academic engagement. So [if] the policy group is okay with At-Large being fueled with young academics, as referred to in that document, there will be further steps taken. As Heidi indicated, we are working on an academic engagement plan. There are events being organized. We want to have a more coherent [inaudible] policy around getting young academics involved. The NextGen resource, the NextGen pool, is the perfect location for us to start that work.

So, in that sense, we welcome the opportunity to present those thoughts here. If those thoughts get approved, I personally would be happy to lead that work [on] outreach and engagement and capacity-building. So that is to address Tijani's comment and Heidi's question. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. I think we've exhausted the queue now. So thank you for this, Laurin.

Now, not seeing other hands up—well, there are two hands, but I believe these are old hands. Matthias and Tijani, are these outstanding, or ...

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Sorry. It was an old hand. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthias. Now, I've just checked, and Christopher Wilkinson appears to have joined the meeting now. As you know, we've had to move things around a bit because a number of people need to leave in 15 minutes' time, so we are now jumping back to Agenda Item #3. That's the Subsequent Procedures. We have 30 minutes on this, and then we'll have the remaining amount of time after that on the policy comment updates, excluding the draft proposal for NextGen. Let's try and make it in 25 minutes or less than 30. Justine and Christopher Wilkinson, you have the floor.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Just by way of a brief 30-second introduction, we, a small team, has been quite diligent in trying to package compacted information to be delivered at CPWG calls. We've always had time challenges. Therefore, we always get restricted in terms of specificity.

Having said that, two weeks ago I presented on community application scorecards. I mentioned that there was a need to review the CPE guidelines that were used in the 2012 round that were drafted by the

then-appointed CPE provider/Economist Intelligence Unit as a way of moving forward with SubPro in the topic of community applications.

Today we have Christopher Wilkinson to talk to us a little bit about the CPE guidelines. We're going to raise some concerns and possibly some recommendations on how to improve on this for the next round. So I will hand the floor to Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Thank you, Justine. Thank you, Oliver. I think you can hear me. Well, first of all, by way of not exactly an apology but an explanation, this issue has escalated over the last 48 hours. What started as a small personal comment to the small group resulted in a request to lead a ten-minute session now on the basis of which I did propose the slides which you're about to see. Somehow or another, the ten-minute session has escalated into a 30-minute session. I confess that the issue is larger than ten minutes. It's certainly larger than my personal experience and opinion on this matter. But I think we've got a starting point, and I'm quite sure that At-Large leadership will be able to follow up in a more not exactly leisurely but more comprehensive approach this question in the near future.

The story has a long history. I must confess that, in 2012/2013, I was personally working much more on questions of competition policy and my opposition to the vertical integration proposals. At the time, I was not involved with the community applications, but fortunately I think Olivier and Alan, who are on this call, did have direct hands-on

experience of the community applications policy and its implementation in those days.

I was aware that this was not going quite right. I've indicated that, to the best of my knowledge, there were few applications which were approved. I see this in the general context of a shift in opinion and action in ICANN and particularly in the GNSO away from the public service interests, away from not-for-profit TLDs, and back to this shift in the political environment, which may prove to be inimical and difficult for community applications, whereby, in my view, these community applications and the procedures and resources associated should be primarily directed towards Civil Society interests at the national, local, and regional level. If anything, the preconditions for the policy today are equally if not more difficult than they were in 2012/2013.

Let me look at the next slide. In my view, a successful community applications program would depend on considerable efforts in outreach and information of interested parties. I think the At-Large Structure and particularly the ALS—the At-Large Structures at a local and national level—should be an integral part of the outreach and information strategy.

“Predictability” is a good word, but we have to be careful with it because, in the context of the PDP and, more generally in the GNSO, in my experience, predictability applies only to the applicants, whereas I think, as soon as you touch the scope for Civil Society interests in the Internet and particularly in top-level domains, we should be thinking about predictability on a wider scale.

I know there's a discussion going on about what kind of applicant support should be made available. Here again it's not my point of expertise, but I believe that financial/technical assistance for new entrants will prove to be necessary for so-called middle range applicants. As a practical matter, I've seen a few top-level domains successfully introduced. One does need to have financial resources throughout the application and the implementation cycles. Almost by definition, the community applications will not have ready access to risk capital or to equity.

Let me look at the next slide. No, apparently not—ah, yes. As you will have gathered, I'm really skeptical [but] not opposed to the idea that ICANN can outsource and delegate responsibility for the decisions in this area and often in others to so-called independent third parties. I question the merits of this kind of passing of the buck. When you read through the guidelines, which initially I thought had been written by ICANN—I was amazed to discover that the guidelines had actually been invited [to be] written for themselves by the Economist Intelligence Unit.

But there's a sense of a [inaudible], and quite complex and significant issues are reduced to a few-digits—single digits—evaluations of each of the criteria and considerations. I think this is not sufficiently respectful of effort and requirements of the applicants. I would like to see this done in a completely different way. The evaluators should be identifiable. I think that they should be pro bono, perhaps with the normal ICANN expenses for necessarily travel, if any, but completely orthogonal to the idea that an external company could do this worldwide, and, As far as I could see in the previous round, almost

completely independently of any significant oversight. That needs to be corrected.

As a footnote, allow me to say this. I have great respect and indeed interest in the activities of the Economist Intelligence Unit, but they should stick to their last, and they do it very well. But I don't see how they could transform their normal economic intelligence into a plausible evaluation of Civil Society and community applications at the ground level in many countries. It's just not what they do. I think the results of the 2013 evaluations tended to confirm that this was not the way to go. I'm sure that there would be a significant debate among us and within ICANN about alternatives. I don't intend to launch into that at this stage personally. I think we have, among our midst, considerable amounts of expertise and experience that could be relevant.

Also, if I would say something about the structure of At-Large itself, the At-Large Structures at a local and national level don't seem to have much of an opportunity to participate in any of these kinds of activities, whereas they are probably the best source of practical advice. Personally, in those days, I was representing an At-Large Structure in Belgium. I have no recollection of every receiving any information about the community applications program from ICANN at all. This goes back to the assumption in those days in ICANN that somehow or another the staff and the Board could absolve themselves of political responsibility for the choices that are being made by assigning/delegating all the work and the decisions to so-called independent third parties. I think that's a very bad idea.

In conclusion, I think we have one last slide lurking somewhere at the bottom of the screen. Ah, yes. [Bingo]. I would like to see ICANN playing a full and permanent role in the implementation of the decisions in these areas. I think that At-Large could provide oversight and advice. I think the procedures should be as transparent as possible. I would not accept a single external entity. I think there are plenty of people who would be capable of participating in the professional evaluation of applications, but it should be based on their qualifications and local knowledge and be identifiable and accountable. At-Large has a role both in the recruitment and appointment of evaluators.

There's a footnote. As far as I can see, it didn't work in a plausible way last time. I really think that the Economist Intelligence Unit's digital scoring methods in their guidelines really should be abandoned, and something more subtle, more sympathetic, more practical will have to be developed. Otherwise, I doubt if the community applications would do much better next time as they did last time. But we shall see.

Justine and Olivier, that's enough for my introduction to this topic. I'm aware that I've been a little bit iconoclastic regarding certain [inaudible] of ICANN practice in these kinds of areas. But I think we need to look at this from the bottom-up and propose a series of alternatives which would be supported by time and energy and knowledge by members of the At-Large community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. Justine, you can run the queue if you wish.

We'll just get Alan Greenberg first.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I've got to leave very shortly, so I'll try to be—there's an echo—brief. I understand that, going way back into the dark, dim past of the New gTLD Program, At-Large advocated that we be part of the process of doing the selections. I'm afraid I disagreed with it then and I disagree with now for a number of reasons.

Number one, it's so far from ICANN's normal business practices that I just don't believe it's going to happen, even if it was good. And I'm not sure it is good. The Economist Intelligence Unit was selected by an open bid as all of their vendors are. There were proposals made. ICANN evaluated them and selected two. There was that one and a backup one. Whether it was a great application or simply the best application, I have no knowledge. But, whatever it was, this time around there would be a new solicitation of vendors and a new process. So I don't think we need to agonize over whether the Economist Intelligence Unit was good or not because the process will be replicated again, and potentially [by] a different vendor.

I don't believe that we have the accountability to make sure we deliver things in a timely manner. There may be a lot of applications that are community applications. We have no knowledge of that. I just don't think we can commit to doing it.

Moreover, last time around we were affiliated with a number of the community applications. They were part of our group. We were not disinterested parties. I think we have to be very careful about that.

I believe what we need to do is make sure there is a process in place so, this time around, the evaluation is done properly. That means there must be obviously a vendor selected. I think we should be involved in identifying what the characteristics of that vendor are. We are not going to be allowed to do the selection of the vendor, but we can participate in creating the RFP, as it were. I believe there must be an iterative process in setting up the guidelines, not just written by the vendor and then used, because it was clear, looking at the guidelines that were used last time, there was a focus on business and not on the community part. Their definition of “community” was skewed. So it was known from the beginning that this was not going to meet our needs. I think we have to focus on a practice that is likely to be used within ICANN and make sure it works this time as opposed to putting all our energy in saying we should be doing the evaluation or leading it, which I think is both impractical and not likely to happen, no matter how good an idea it is. Thank you.

I’m afraid I do have to leave shortly. I’ll stay around for a couple of minutes. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Alan. I’m going to put myself in the queue, but we have Holly next.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. I agree with Alan. I don’t think ALAC should be necessarily involved in the process. But, if you look at the criteria to actually pick the organization that selected the applicants, the criteria were just like

any other kind of—what can I say?—consultative firm. There was so little expertise required for anything other than just standard applications—nothing about knowledge of communities, nothing about language skills. Nothing.

So, from my way of thinking, one of the best things we could do—this is where I think I support Alan—is to have a really hard look at the actual process of selecting a selector and insist on far more specific and far more broadly-drawn criteria because the ones that were in place last time were pathetic. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Holly. Marita, you're next.

MARITA MOLL:

Hi. Backing up Alan and Holly, I agree that it's not really probably a good job for us to be doing that particular work, but we really need to have some kind of input on this: the qualifications of a group that would be selected. Have someone—some people from our team—on the team that writes the RFC, and possibly also on the team that makes the choice that makes the choice of group that is chosen. That's already [inaudible] recognized. So I think we can make a good case for that. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Marita. I'm sorry that somebody thinks that this topic is boring. I heard a yawn in the background.

Just to end this particular exercise, ALAC in the past and At-Large in the past have always advocated for community participation in the panels that do the evaluation. I too am in support of what Alan and Holly and Marita have said. That is not necessarily a practical thing for us to keep advocating, although the principle of it is correct.

Also, in terms of the independence point, which Alan has mentioned, because we are closely related to possibly the community applicants, there is a lack of independence, so to speak. So that is questionable[:] if we're going to be sitting on the panel that evaluates applications.

What I have actually done—I would ask my colleagues in the SubPro PDP Working Group to back me up—is I have asked for greater transparency through ICANN processes and also greater opportunities for participation by the community in the actual selection process of providers. Of course, now we're focusing on CPE evaluators in terms of looking at what criteria ICANN is looking to select the provider with, and, also, throughout the process of the call for expressions of interest, the short-list of candidates. We would like to have more community participation and transparency in the process all the way through.

So that's something that I already raised in the PDP. It needs more support if we're going to be able to make it happen. Thank you.

I see Alan's hand up again. Maybe we should just cut the queue off there. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just a very brief comment. Having gone through this process before, since the Board will be involved at this level, maybe there's a chance for a change. But, in the past, ICANN has been adamant that procurements be done purely by staff with virtually no involvement—certainly no involvement to see the whole applications or things like. We might be able to see expurgated ones, but ICANN has really been adamant that the procurement process must be independent and can't be influenced by organizations such as ours. So that has been a very strong position. I don't know to what extent we can alter that. So keep that in mind when we make any recommendations. Thank you.

I've got to leave now. Thank you, all.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure. Thanks, Alan, for that intervention. Yes, I agree. It doesn't mean we should stop trying because I think we may be able to get a vote in.

Also, in terms of—what was I going to say? Ah, yes—a proper review of the current guidelines, we should look at tweaking the elements within it, like what I mentioned before, two weeks ago: nexus and linkages and those sort of things. So we need to actually look at it properly and see if we can come up with specific changes to the guidelines. Otherwise, it will just be a general overall statement which people can't interpret and can't do anything with.

Christopher, last comment from you, and then we'll end the SubPro agenda.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Justine. Allow me to thank the participants for their constructive comments and criticism of the alternatives that we have on the table. All I would like to say at this juncture that it seems to me that the balance of opinion on this call is sufficiently leanings towards the position that I've outlined as opposed to maintaining the status quo. But I accept that—well, first of all, as I said at the beginning, I've come into this on spec. There is expertise and experience among our members which merit exploitation, use, and respect.

So I look further to the further discussions and seeking a more effective solution from the point of view of Civil Society community applications around the world. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Christopher. Sorry, Olivier. I'll just take another 30 seconds if you don't mind. I'm seeing in the chat a suggestion for a single-issue call on these CPE guidelines to see if we can come up with constructive, specific changes to the guideline text.

I'm wondering if anybody has objections to that or if people think that is not a good idea.

Yes, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Justine. I think that there are many such single-issue topics which are important for our community to discuss. Of course, we don't have to produce something for tomorrow. We need to produce things as we go along.

What I was going to suggest is that we do have a series—I think we mentioned it in the past—of single-issue calls. If you could highlight every time there is an issue such as this one and we then say, “Oh, we need a single issue call to beat this one further,” then ask for it. Then we can basically work out how many topics would need single-issue calls and when we schedule those so we don’t overburden volunteers with too many single-issue calls. Sometimes we might even take a double-issue call—two issues touched on in one call, let’s say. Then at least we’ve got some planning and we’ve got answers—the kind of answers you need to have when we will come to the crunch of requiring responses for these things.

Does that work?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes, absolutely. Thank you, Olivier. That works for me. Okay, we will look at scheduling a single-issue call on CPE and CPE guidelines.

We still need to come back on a single-issue call for geo-names. We haven’t finished with that topic, but I’m still waiting on some background information in order to be able to come back to the geo-names topic.

The third topic that I have in mind for a single-issue call would be public interest commitments and DNS abuse. So I think that’s something we should look at scheduling as well. I’m quite happy to run that session.

Over to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Justine. Well done. You've stuck to the 30-minute allocation. Thank you, both you and Christopher, for pushing on these issues.

We now move swiftly to our next agenda item. That's #4: Policy comment updates. Put your hands together for Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks very much, Olivier. Just running through the latest updates, recently ratified by the ALAC: You'll see on the agenda, as well as the screen, that the most recent statement ratified was the SSR2 review team draft report. The executive summary is on its way. It was just ratified yesterday. Also submitted: There was an external public comment proceeding with the PIR, and the ALAC submitted a statement on behalf of the At-Large community to the Public Interest Registry regarding the issue of ISOC-PIR. It was in survey format. There's a workspace also for this, so everyone can see the statement that was submitted. It was also ratified by the ALAC.

Related to this is the recent letter from Maarten Botterman regarding the ALAC advice to the Board on the ISOC-PIR issue. This was sent just this past Friday, the 20th of March. So you can also see this on the agenda for reference.

Also—this is from last week—an executive summary is on its way for the FY '21-'25 operating financial plan and budget.

Next[: our] public comments for decision. Usually the At-Large do not common on the root-zone label generation rules, but there are two out regarding Chinese and Bangla script. Those are closing at the end of April.

There's a new public comment on the Phase 1 initial report of the review of all rights protection mechanisms in all gTLDs policy development process. This also closed at the end of April.

So those are to be decided. If At-Large or CPWG would like to comment on those

Regarding current statements, Laurin, of course, presented on NextGen, so that will be circulated for comment on the Google Doc link.

Currently undergoing ALAC ratification vote is the EPDP 2 public comment for ALAC statement. That will close later this week. There was a single-issue call last Friday with the drafting team volunteers. Thank you all very much for that. It was submitted as a Google survey form to ICANN public comment.

Moving to the Name Collision Analysis Project (NCAP) Study 1, Justine and Greg have provided a draft statement which is posted to the At-Large workspace. It was already circulated for comment last week. This is closing on the 31st of March. So, if you have any feedback or comments, please do comment on the workspace.

Finally, there is the Middle East and Adjoining Countries (MEAC) strategy 2021-2025. We are assembling some volunteers from both the AFRALO and APRALO regions on this. This closes in April. We could

potentially discuss this now, but we're working on assembling a drafting team and getting a Google Doc started for them.

Finally, we'll move to Judith, if she's still on the call, to discuss the revised community travel support guidelines. So I'll turn it over to Judith. Thanks so much.

Huh. Maybe she's not on the call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evin, Judith mentioned earlier that she had to be on another call, so we moved her to next week.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. I see her in the room, but okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, she's only listening in the room, but she's already on another call. So we can focus on the other two topics.

EVIN ERDOGDU: All right. I'm not sure if anyone from the MEAC strategy is on the call, if they like to discuss this. If not, perhaps next week as well. Or if anyone would like to volunteer for the Phase 1 initial report public comment that just opened. Those are the only two items. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evin, there's also the NCAP, I believe, which I think is the ...

EVIN ERDOGDU: Oh, yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Now, for the NCAP, Justine and Greg are both here. For the next one, I think I saw Raymond Mamattah a bit earlier. I'm not sure whether we would be able to speak or not to this. But let's try and see with the Name Collision Analysis Project.

JUSTINE CHEW: Sure. I can speak to that because I actually drafted the statement. It is actually a very short statement. It's about two lines, if I remember correctly. Or maybe three.

But, in any case, Study 1 has concluded. The output is the report. Basically, if you look at the screen now, you can see the two goals—Goal 1 and Goal 2—for this particular report. I have studied the report, and I believe it meets the two goals and also addresses the five bullet points below the two goals. So I think it's just a matter of thanking the relevant parties—OCTO, NCAP, and SSAC—and the discussion group for the work that's been undertaken so far to produce this report.

The pending question that I would ask would be, where does this lead to in terms of Goal #3, which is not listed here, per se, but is captured in the request for proposal, or at least the project plan for Study 1? Will that be a decision for whether the NCAP project actually goes on to Study 2 or not? And when would that decision be made?

Now, in terms of the actual decision, I think it's subject to the output of this report or output of these two goals, which is this report. So I think it has to go through the public comment process before the next step can be taken to determine whether this NCAP will actually go to Study 2.

So the statement that I've drafted basically just talks about that in very brief terms.

I don't know if Greg wants to add anything, but I think it's fine. If anybody wants to make a comment, then, by all means, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Greg Shatan?

JUSTINE CHEW: Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I support what Justine has said. This was essentially a fact-gathering exercise. Unless in our review we notice something that went horribly wrong or something that was missing—it's often harder to find something that's missing than something that's there that shouldn't be there—it looks like it was a well-performed exercise. The real point in making, in essence, any comment as well, other than support, is to make sure that essentially the third criteria, which is the only which is forward-looking, is appropriately dealt with. For that reason, there's no

reason to go at length to be prolix or wordy or redundant or any of those other things. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sorry. I forgot to add one thing, which would be the report. The Study 1 report is actually an excellent primer for newbies to the topic of name collisions. So, if you're interested in picking up on name collisions, have a look at the report. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Justine. I guess one of the things that would be worth us doing is going back to the top of Evin's report about the new comments and make affirmative decisions about the areas in which we're going to comment and not comment as opposed to default decisions. So I'm wondering if we could go back to Evin's early part of her presentation with the new comments.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. These right here. Thank you. I don't want to just blow past this if anybody objects. If there is anybody that believes that we ought to be commenting on the root-zone label generation rules for Chinese or Bangla script?

Okay, excellent. I think we are interested in the review of rights protection mechanisms. Is there anybody that—oh, Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Of course, as to do with the label generations, whether Chinese, Bangla, or other scripts, in general what we've done is to forward this request to our IDN Working Group that could or could not comment on it. The majority of time, the ALAC has not commented on any of these label generation rules.

That being said, there have been—I'm just doing from memory—one or two occasions where there was an issue with the label generation rules that the IDN Working Group made an off-the-hand statement on specific topics. It's also worth noting that many of our members who are in the IDN Working Group and At-Large Structures are inherently involved in the work of the IDN work and label generation rules work that ICANN is performing.

So I wanted to recognize them at the same time. It's not because this community doesn't comment that it doesn't actually get directly involved with generating these things. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Is anyone from the IDN Working Group on the call?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. [inaudible] Satish.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yes. We have Satish and Bill Jouris.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Do you folks accept this forwarding? We'll take a look at these to see if there's anything that deserves the attention of the larger group?

SATISH BABU: Yeah. We can take a look at this. As of now, we feel that there is no need for a response from us. But we can certainly take a look again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, Satish. Thank you very much. One the Phase 1 initial report on rights protection mechanisms, we need a volunteer to come back to the group with an outline of proposed talking points for [something], to make a presentation. So it's not a drafting exercise yet but a thinking exercise. Are there one or two people willing to take that on: to come back on to a call, having read this report, and making recommendations about what kind of points we should make in a public comment?

Uh-oh. There's too many volunteers at once.

Greg, why isn't your hand up?

GREG SHATAN: Sorry. My hand was about to go up but I was distracted by being my wife's IT support.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I see. That happens. So, again, it's a minimalist task up front. It's just to read it and figure out the key points and where you think there's an end-user interest and what points we should make.

Are you able to take that on?

GREG SHATAN: I'm happy to take the first cut and report back to the group. Obviously using an end user/individual Internet user large scalpel, rather than [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly.

GREG SHATAN: So I might have [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perspective. Exactly.

All right. If anyone else is interested in this and reads it, coordinate with Greg. We're going to expect a presentation back from Greg in the not-too-distant future on what he thinks would be the appropriate points for the At-Large to make.

Is next week too soon, Mr. Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: I think it will be okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see Marita has offered to work with you as well.

GREG SHATAN: [inaudible] and I don't want to lose a [inaudible] on ...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. You're fading in and out.

Okay, we may have lost Greg, but that's okay. Thanks, Greg and Marita. Thanks, Marita, for stepping up to help with Greg. Again, don't over-job this. For next week, just come back with a small presentation on what it is you think are the points that we ought to make. Thanks a lot.

That may be it for the policy comment updates, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Actually, while you were running this part, I've been in touch with Judith Hellerstein on the revised community travel support guidelines. She mentioned that she was involved in this, and also Sebastien Bachollet and Alan Greenberg. But all of them, of course, at the moment are on other calls, so it's good that we move it until next week.

Secondly, I've also been in touch with Raymond Mamattah, who is from AFRALO. He has advised me that he's working with Dr. T.V. Gopal from APRALO. Now, if you remember, last week or a couple weeks ago we wondered whether the ALAC should comment on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries strategy 2021-2025, and the recommendation was to try and see if the RALOs could work together. I'm so delighted to see that not only are the two RALOs working together on a statement but also we have people who are not the usual suspects that have taken on the task to move forward on this. That's a great way to include and get more people involved and do some great work in this community. So thank you very much again.

I am not seeing any further hands up. Let's go to the next agenda item, unless I've completely forgotten something on the agenda, which will, at that point, set us back. We're now going into Any Other Business.

I open the floor for any comments or questions on Any Other Business.

No—

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Olivier? Oh, sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

... other comments? Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry. I didn't see any hands up so I barged in. We do need to pick the issue of geo-names—somebody's microphone is one—at some point before too long if we want to re-intervene into this topic, especially since we do have some issues on the scorecards that surround this. I'd be interested in having more than eleven people take the geo-names survey. I was really hoping to push that out to the RALOs and get some real feedback.

The idea behind the geo-names survey was to suss out people's perspective on this in the same way the Myers-Briggs test does: by asking scenario-based questions. But, if people are finding that too difficult, I can try to lead a conversation based on what I believe the key questions are because, at this point, we have not formed a consensus as a group about geo-names, but there is a significant amount of interest in seeing a change to policy in this area. So I just wanted to make sure that we didn't let it fall through the cracks. If the survey is not the way, I'll try to construct a matrix or something to lead a discussion about it. I just know that our freeform discussion face to face wasn't effective. So that was the reason for the survey. But I can try to find another way to lead the conversation if people are finding the survey overwhelming or something like that. We definitely need to get an understanding of where people stand on this issue if we're going to try to have further input and before we finalize those scorecards.

Questions or thoughts on this? Can we get the geo-names survey out to more people and try to get answers to understand what people's priorities are on this issue?

So we'll circulate it again. Evin may even be able to post a link to it here, but we'll also put it out there on the e-mail. Let's make a push, please, to get people to fill that out. Then maybe we can use that as a basis for discussion. Justine is really waiting on the results of that survey or a discussion before we go further on the geo-names scorecards. Thanks, folks. Thank you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. No other hands up. So we're moving on to Agenda Item 7 and the last agenda item: Next meeting. When is that to take place?

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, Olivier. I'm just trying to confer with my colleagues because, looking at my calendar, I see that we normally have the AFRALO monthly call on the first Wednesday of the month. However, I see that my colleague has booked it for the following week.

So I may please get back to you regarding this after the call? I do not want to cause any misunderstanding. I would like to first confirm with my colleagues.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Yesim.

YESIM NAZLAR: There might be a clash. That's why. Sorry for that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. I've just noticed that—I believe usually ... Is it 18:00 that we look at? 18:00 UTC? Or no? We have—

YESIM NAZLAR: 18:30 for AFRALO, but, as you know, our call should be at 19:00 UTC. So, if we are going to hold the AFRALO monthly call next Wednesday, the first of April, then I may suggest—hmm—16:00 UTC or 17:00 UTC. But, if the AFRALO monthly call is moved to the other week—the 8th of April—then we can hold our CPWG at its regular time, which is a 19:00UTC call. Let me please double-check and then get back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Yesim. So that next call time will be in the—I was going to say in the post. It's not in the post. It's going to be in your e-mail.

With this, it's quite incredible today. We're only four minutes late beyond the half-an-hour mark. Thanks to everyone for having participated. Stay safe wherever you are. It's a weird time that we're living in. At the same time, it's great to see so many people on the call, which means the world keeps on turning while we have those challenges in our respective parts of the world. So stay healthy. Stay home as well, I would say, even if you're in place that is not confined. It's probably great to stay home and help with not only your health but also help everyone else around you because you might be a carrier of

this terrible COVID-19 thing. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night. See you on the Internet. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]