
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday the 1st of April 2020 at 20:00 UTC.

Due to the increased number of attendees and in order to save time, we will not be doing a roll call. However, all attendees from both Zoom and the audio bridge will be noted after the call.

We have received apologies from Shreedeeep Rayamajhi and Joanna Kulesza. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Herb Waye, Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management. Our Spanish interpreters for today are David and Marina, and our French interpreters are Aurelie and Camila.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channel. Also, a friendly reminder to please keep your lines muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Also, we do have RTT on this call and I will be putting the link in the chat periodically if you guys would like to follow along.

With that, thank you very much, I hand the call over to you now, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Claudia. Welcome to this week's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. I'm extremely excited because this week, after the action items, we're going to have a presentation by

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.

Cheryl on the PDP 3.0, and this is something we've pushed back a number of weeks due to other work that we've had on our table. So finally, the long awaited presentation is going to be there and we'll have 20 minutes on this.

After that, we'll have the EPDP phase two update from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg, and after this, we'll have SubPro updates with Justine Chew and her small team. immediately after that, the policy comment updates, with today, focus on two specific policy comments. One is the middle eastern and adjoining countries strategy and we'll have Dr. T.V. Gopal speaking to us about this. And afterwards, we'll have the revised community travel support guideline with Judith Hellerstein on the call who'll be taking us through this.

So that's today's agenda. Is there any change or are there any amendments, or indeed, Any Other Business that you'd like to add to the agenda that is currently on your screen?

I am not seeing any hands up, so it looks like the agenda is adopted as it currently is on the screen, and we can swiftly move on—noticing that some people have to leave early—that the action items are all complete but three to remain. One is to do with the SubPro single issue calls, and Justine has submitted to both Jonathan and I a list of potential calls that will be needed for single issue and how the other topics will be handled during our regular Consolidated Policy Working Group calls. So I guess that's on its way, it just needs to be finalized.

Judith will speak to us about the travel guidelines, so that will be ticked as well, and this third one, the phase one initial report on the review of

all rights protection mechanisms in all gTLD policy development process—yes, this short name—needs a volunteer to show the outline to the CPWG on next week’s call. I think that we might not have time for that. Well, hopefully if we go through, we’ll have a bit of time, but I’m not sure—I certainly haven’t seen a presentation arrive on this one. But let’s see if we reach that. That’s of course at the end of our policy section. Are there any comments or questions on the action item?

Yes, there is a hand up from Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL:

Hello. I just wanted to note that I am on the list to help Greg Shatan out with the all rights protection mechanisms, but I haven’t been able to get in touch with Greg and I do hope that everything is okay there. I know he lives in New York. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this point, Marita. If I could just check—this is coming a bit later—could I ask the staff to see if they can get a hold of Greg? It’s very unusual not to see him on the call. He might be busy in other things. I do note throughout the week I’ve had some e-mails back and forth with Greg, so he is around, but maybe today he might be a little delayed. We’ll see. Staff will reach out to him. Thanks for pointing this out, Marita.

So I’m not seeing any other hands up or points to be made on the action items, and that actually probably means that you’re all waiting to see

this presentation on the PDP, policy development process version 3.0, and for this, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Olivier. I hope you haven't [beat this all up] too much. It's a 181-page document with a 32-page slide deck addition as an annex, and in 20 minutes, I'm just going to take on a couple of the high points and holidays that are particularly reflective to what I believe at least the At-Large community and the ALAC need to notice about the now new and in place PDP 3.0. Next slide, please.

There is more detail in each of these slides than I'm going to be reading or other than referring to in our interchange today. That's because I want you to be able to use this as a reference as well. On the agenda, please note I did get staff to link the PDP 3.0 final report, and quite seriously, if you are intending on becoming involved in a future PDP process in the GNSO, I strongly advise you to read through it, and I am happy to take individual questions or do another small group activity or ICANN Learn or anything. But you do need to be aware of this because these are the new rules.

Now, these rules are not alone. They go hand in glove with the recently updated but still yet to be modified GNSO procedures and guidelines for policy development processes. And throughout the document, and occasionally in today's presentation, you'll see a cross-reference to that guidelines document, and the guidelines themselves will be up to I think about version four when after these new PDP 3.0 procedures are fully in place and implemented, that a couple of things need to be taken stock

of and then some modifications made to those guidelines. And in the report, the specificity on all of that is detailed in agonizing detail in some cases.

So let's have a quick look at the why, the who and the how. Why? That goes back to a staff paper that was presented to the GNSO council at its strategic planning session in 2018. It was looking at and trying to identify opportunities to improve the way that PDPs were functioning, were running and on how long they were running, how much conflict with volunteer time was going on, how the council was able to better manage the PDP process—because of course, the GNSO council is the manager of the GNSO PDP process even though the work is done within a chartered PDP working group.

So from this staff paper, again later in May, there was a significant modification to it and I've got links to that both in the presentation and also in the full report. And if you want to go over the history, you're more than welcome to. But basically, it boils down to looking at the ways working group dynamics could be improved, working group leadership could be more effectively facilitated, supported, trained and given clear responsibilities, roles and requirements, looking at how complex some of these subject matters were—in other words, they were taking too big a scope with too wide ranging a set of criteria that they were supposed to be looking at, how people build consensus in these PDP processes, and of course, the manager role of the council.

Then it became the who, and that was the work of the GNSO council. All of the work done to date—with obviously some interaction between the GNSO constituencies in council and GNSO itself and the wider

community has been done, and you should be pleased to know that work such as the ALAC and GAC—and SSAC indeed—comments that were sought when the council reached out to [inaudible] ACs and SOs regarding its PDP 3.0 proposal. All of that was taken and analyzed and you can see in a side by side comparison everything that we commented on and how the PDP 3.0 small team did or did not take to, respond, or include our comments in the final report. So that's also part of the report, and I think that's a great piece of transparency. So well done. But it was the work of the council, and I've given you dates and details about how that all happened.

Now, what's going to be happening from now on—that's sort of the how—future charter drafting teams—and at the beginning of every GNSO PDP process is a charter drafting team and it has a template which has been modified that it will follow. If you've been involved in the drafting of charters before, please be advised it is a new template. Not brand-new, but deeply modified to fit in with the new 3.0 guidelines.

These improvements, once they're fully implemented, the council will be reviewing, and then the updates to the GNSO operating procedures and of course the guidelines for the PDPs will be made. You also need to note a couple of items and their matters that [in the main,] the council will come back to. But they're all listed. Next slide, please.

I am not going to read through all of this. The important bits are in large font and colored, but all of the gory details are there for your study at a later date. Basically, the council adopted the proposed improvement

plan back in 2018 as the aspects that they believed they would be looking at and trying to create this newer version of the PDP process.

In the original paper, there were some 17 particular improvements that were proposed, 14 of which got the full support of council, and they are detailed in that first column. 12 months from the original proposed paper, the adoption actually occurred later in 2018.

In January 2019, which was the following council strategic plan three-day exercise in Los Angeles, it was resolved that a small team of councilors—and it is all detailed in the report—will be put together to further the project. They convened in the Kobe meeting and it is their work that has been put out to council and the community in batches between now with the adoption and the 2019 start of the deeply engaged implementation planning.

Then on February 20th, just in case you missed all of my announcements and everything else, the final report was fully adopted with one thing worthy of noting. One of the very important pieces of improvement is the creation of what's called a playbook. A consensus playbook is a guideline document which has been created by an external professional consultancy firm that's well known. The vendor is the Consensus Building Institute, the CBI. They have interviewed widely across experienced working group leaders and other leaders within the ICANN community. They are, last time I checked, near finalized, but there is still some additional polishing on the final documentation.

But what's important is this is meant to be an ICANN-wide, not just a GNSO PDP playbook. So we will all be benefiting from this piece of work

which is yet to be continued. Next slide, please. Yeah, CBI is well known and they do wonderful work.

Okay, overall, the purpose here was to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of PDPs. And before someone tells me, yes, I know, in the final report, on the front cover, there is actually a typo and they haven't spelled the title right. I don't know that anyone else has noticed, but I'm constantly having a little smile every time I read it. It's my personal pleasure. So don't tell them or they'll change it and then I can't smile anymore.

Anyway, the focus was to look at some key outcomes, particularly regarding the time limits of policy development process, how now with more detailed work planning and extensive project management practices and principles and tools, along with regular reporting and regular risk assessment on the progress of every PDP and any resources being used by the PDP. And by regular, I mean monthly reporting to the council, and clearly specified skills and experience criteria not only for leadership within a PDP and those [inaudible] roles and responsibilities such as the GNSO council liaison to a PDP process. They're no longer decorative, they have a very active role. But also some membership. There are specific skills and experience criteria for membership as well, and very clearly articulated roles and responsibilities for all involved, and that is the members, participants, leadership, liaisons, and indeed the council themselves. So this whole process is a full, complete and I would like to suggest, in the main, very effective overhaul of the process.

What's going to be interesting to us is highlighted on the right hand side of this slide, and I've kind of put them in a priority order. The alternative working group models, you've heard me mention before, this is critical. We commented on it, but this is the critical part. I've just dropped out of the Zoom room, but I'm still going to run with my own local copy so when I pop back into Zoom, hopefully all will be well in the world.

We'll have a brief look in more detail at the working group models. Then we have—and this is particularly important—the terms of participation for working group members. That's a brand new thing, and ladies and gentlemen, it means everyone involved as a member or a participant in a working group in future will literally be signing up to this document, and it is reviewed and you can be removed if you fail to live up to that undertaking. So this is a very critical piece for us to understand.

The next most critical piece in my view is the criteria for joining working group after formation or rechartering. This is something that has been both a pleasure and a problem in the past, and this is going to affect our small details. And then the three others that I'll just touch on towards the end of my time will be the enforced deadlines to ensure bite-sized pieces of work for adding and improvement, the ability to terminate a working group even if no consensus has been reached, and of course, I've already mentioned the consensus playbook. Next, let's have a look at these improvements and just go to the next slide now. Thank you. Great.

Here's in detail—but nevertheless simplified for you—the three types of models that in future a PDP will be choosing to follow as it is being charted. So the council will decide in this pre-chartering creation of a

PDP working group what model is going to be suitable for meeting the scope and criteria of this piece of work that they're going to undertake.

The open model is pretty much in parity with what we've been used to with PDP 2.0, but there can be an upper limit on the number of members which may be set, and everyone, in addition to completing a GNSO statement of interest, now have to agree to the statement of participation. And I'll dig into that in the next slide.

Then there is a representative model, and the best way to think about that is pretty much the way that the EPDP has been designed where you have the current EPDP [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: If I can interrupt, I think the slides are not in sync. We're still on the one saying improvement.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I don't know why. Thank you very much. I'm actually using a local copy. Thanks for that, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, we're now on a slide saying "Open model, representative model" and so forth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. That's the one we should be on. So then the representative model is the one that Alan and Hadia [are deeply entrenched with.]

We've got appointed members, alternatives, and they've been allocated to the supporting organizations and advisory committees.

Then you have a hybrid model which is a mix. And here, what you probably should notice in the hybrid model is that participants and participants are able to not engage in a purely representative model, only members can engage in a representative model. In a hybrid model, participants can engage, so the role of observer will not be quite so separate it we go for a hybrid model.

But in the hybrid model, only members will be contributing to any consensus. On the right-hand side, you will see a little bit of gory detail about each of those models that I think is important for us to be aware of.

Now, if we can move to the next slide, I wanted you to have a clear understanding of this statement of participation, and I've put up a little image here which is [you're taking an oath.] You are going to be making a [inaudible] an undertaking that every member is going to be making their best efforts to regularly attend all scheduled meetings and to take assignments during the course of the work seriously. There's a whole lot of other things. Alan and Hadia are familiar with it because it's pretty much what they had to fill out. But these are now binding on all future PDP working group members or participants. Basically, unless you're an observer, you're signing up to this.

And you will find what is important about this is that if there is an issue with a member's attendance or a member's collaboration and cooperation. These statements of participation are enforceable and the

working group leadership and the GNSO council has the authority to restrict member participation in the event of noncompliance. It is a huge change. I personally think it's a good thing, but it's a big difference that we all need to be aware of. And we can go into a lot more about that at some other time. Next slide, please. because there's a lot to cover and a little bit of time to do it with.

What we see here is, again, more text than I'm going to go through, but I've gone into relatively light—there's a lot more detail in the final report, but here are a few important things regarding when and if people can join a working group, even if it is an open model from now on, and certainly if it's a representative model or a hybrid. But whether or not new members can even join is now slightly different. Currently, the GNSO working group guidelines do not limit the number of members or when people can join.

Basically, as long as a new member—sorry about the spelling error there. Perhaps new members is a Freudian slip. Bleeting and crying out for attention as they sometimes do—as long as they get up to speed and don't—unless the working group and the chair agree—reopen closed topics. And normally, the only reason for a closed topic to be reopened with a new member would be if they brought new information with them.

From now on, none of that is a given. It will depend on the working group model chosen, the particulars within the charter, and if the GNSO supports the addition in the charter or at the time of new members. It'll also depend on the working group leadership and indeed the views of the plenary. So all members, whenever they join, are expected to agree

to the statement of participation still, but you may not be able to have new members join a working group in future, not only based on the charter and type of model but also where the group is in its work. So if it's towards the end, if it's ready to give its final report, all of these sorts of things which are listed on the left-hand side will influence and effect the ability for new members to join. Next slide, please.

Also—and this is important for us to note—in future, the scoping and original design resulting usually from a normal PDP out of an issue report where particular things for work are identified, they're going to be much more along the lines of what we are familiar with with the smart style of scoping. There will be very strong enforcement of workplans and workplan deadlines. As I said, this goes back to regularized monthly and very detailed reporting on all aspects of PDP process to the GNSO council.

Consensus is going to be very much key. There's a lot of new work in this PDP 3.0 about how consensus is measured, about how consensus is built, about how consensus is going to be developed, and most importantly, if consensus cannot be reached in the opinions of the leadership of the working group or of the council, even before a final report has been issued, a PDP can be terminated. And don't forget this new consensus table is going to be important across all of our work in consensus, including PDP 3.0.

Next, here is just a bit of a flowchart to remind you how things start with an issue report—unless it is an expedited policy development process which means it does not have an issue report that starts it—how things are scoped, how the chartering follows on the initial scoping.

The charter must have the scope mission and expected deliverables clearly explained, then the usual initial and final reporting going on, and then things are finally received by council. That's just the flow. Next slide, please.

Just in case you're not clear and you like to have flow charts in different shapes, here are the opportunities for ALAC and At-Large to feed in. obviously, we can still feed in directly to council in consultations, community consultations, request for an AC/SO input or public comments, but we can also, depending on the model chosen, have direct or less direct input to PDPs and EPDPs. Next slide, please.

That's an awful lot to digest. Full report is recommended. Happy to take any questions on notice or now. That's up to you, but I'm also available for follow-up. Back to you. Thank you, Olivier, and I'm sorry to take 60 seconds over my allocated time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. Thank you very much, Cheryl. We do have a couple of hands up, so let's go quickly to them. First is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Two very brief comments. The first one is on the rules for new members joining. Just looking at the experience within the EPDP of—although the EPDP had some rules saying if you're going to join partway through you have to certify that you've listened to every other call and read every e-mail or something to that effect, that clearly is not practical in a group that's been going on for a year and a half.

At the same time, it is not going to be practical in a model where people are appointed by the AC/SOs to say if one person has to leave because they're sick or they die or whatever it is, or their work simply doesn't allow it, that that group not be represented anymore. So I'm predicting that that's going to have to be implemented somewhat flexibly or there will be significant problems.

The other comment is on the consensus playbook. I look forward to seeing it, but although what I understand from your saying is it has been designed for use by parts of groups other than the GNSO, given that each working group must decide its own working methods and the definitions of consensus in different parts of ICANN are very different from the GNSO, I look forward to seeing just how that's going to play out. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. If I can just react to those two points, the PDP 3.0 design, I believe, has made some attempts to allow the appropriate flexibility and yet keep the tight controls that'll help us with effectiveness and efficiency. From what you're describing with new members joining, there is the flexibility that sits ultimately with council, and it does in the report pull out the exceptions which will exist, for example when in a representative model an AC or an SO needs to have its seat filled. But in general, that's why it's designed to look at when as well as how new members can be brought in.

Regarding the playbook, yes, I couldn't agree with you more. It will be very interesting to read it and see how they approach it, but the

definitions of consensus for PDPs within a GNSO construct are still quite definitely specified and they're reiterated and in fact reinforced in the PDP 3.0 model. So from a PDP GNSO perspective, we should know what we're talking about in consensus. Who's next?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I'd like to start with general principles, which is that participation in the working group is where most of the decisions are made. It's always hard to influence an outcome just through public comment. So I would have thought that it is important to be able to participate. But what I see—and Cheryl, you can comment on this, but I see potential roadblocks.

First of all, the test of participants' qualifications. I also see the statement of participation. I see roadblocks that make it potentially very difficult to participate in a working group. It looks as if the rules are narrowing down who can participate, and quite honestly, if you look at the review of GNSO a couple of years ago, they were supposed to be broadening out who can participate.

So while I understand the need to streamline a process, my fear—and I haven't read the report—is these look like rules to make it a far more efficient process but far less participative. And I think that's a shame. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Holly, and I think you'll find what you've just outlined is something I've been yelling from the ramparts about since January 2018. Next, please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hello. Good evening, everybody. Olivier, I take it that Cheryl is acting as a rapporteur and not as a defense. I think it's most important that we should understand what this activity has been going on for. But I do not think that senior members of the At-Large should be endorsing it.

My personal experience is that if everything that Cheryl has described is taking place, that we're dealing with a serious rearguard action and that a number of GNSO participants really don't like this, and entrenching themselves in a GNSO policy and activity which to my mind predates the transition which we participated in a couple of years ago.

Look, let's be blunt. We are, I'm afraid to say, dealing with a GNSO which is increasingly behaving as an economic cartel. It is dominated by the contracted parties and the intellectual property interests. And if ICANN is to survive as a serious regulator of its responsibilities across all interested parties, this has to be resisted.

From that point of view, it is extremely risky to have a statement of participation which in effect gives the GNSO powers to reject and block non-contracted parties' participation.

I will look into this in greater detail in due course, but I would like to be on the record saying that this is extremely important, that if GNSO goes in this direction, it must have a guaranteed participation by the non-GNSO AC/SOs and that they should be fully funded in their participation. Otherwise, I regret to say we're dealing with a cartel and the participation by At-Large is a spectator sport.

I could go on for longer, Olivier, but I'm quite sure [that you think] I've said enough.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Christopher. Yes, we have two more people in the queue: Justine Chew and Greg Shatan. I'll close the queue after Greg because we do have other topics to discuss. And of course, this one is just the beginning of our discussion on the PDP 3.0. There'll no doubt be some further discussions on this. So it's not the alpha and the omega of the topic on today's call. Cheryl, did you wish to comment on Christopher's points?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, well, Christopher's made a statement and that's his statement, but I just wanted to assure you all that what I presented you with is the facts. They're the facts that are now in situ and procedures that we will be operating on for the foreseeable future. Nothing more, nothing less. Can we go to Justine now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's go to Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I had two questions, if I may, just building up on some things that other people have said. On the point that Holly has raised and also Christopher just now, and also Cheryl, you said before— if I go back a little bit, ALAC had responded to a call for comments on the draft of the PDP 3.0 framework. We did express concerns about restricting of participation, and you said, Cheryl, that GNSO council had looked into and analyzed all the comments, so I wanted to ask—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, the report goes through literally in absolute detail, so everything we've said is responded to in the report.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Right. So we need to go and have a look at the report to see the reaction to our comments.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. Thank you. The second question, if I may, is just putting on my hat as a FBSC member, for the representative mode, and I suppose the hybrid open and representative model moving ahead, does that mean that, like in the case of where ALAC appoints or nominates members and alternates to be appointed onto a PDP working group, the nthat

means the responsibility of funding those members and alternates fall onto ALAC, or is the budget part of the GNSO's side of things? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

The question of budget is not one that was specifically analyzed within the PDP 3.0 [design] development, but in general, the base or core costs of a PDP are borne by the GNSO budget, but when you have things like face-to-face meetings, they may—or may not—be picking up the tab. Right now, the only experience of the representative model—and note, in all of these models, the cadence and commitment to being involved and being involved at the level that the statement of participation will require is much higher than the one hour for a week type things that some PDPs have done in the past. You are looking at significant commitments of time, and indeed, appointments or representatives would need to be appointed by an AC or an SO, and it is recommended that they are in fact appointed using some process which will allow the membership criteria and skill set to be checked and ratified, and the paper does suggest some form of standing committee—which obviously ALAC already has—would be useful there.

but what always must happen is if a face-to-face meeting is held, if budget is not allowing our representatives to go—and as based on the EPDP, it should do, but I can't say that it's a statement in the 3.0 report, so it's an unknown—they will obviously need to provide appropriate remote participation. But as it stands right now, it would be picked up by the PDP budget. But that's as it stands right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. I thought I was going to get the opportunity to agree with almost everything, or everything, that Christopher was going to say, but then I didn't. First, of course, importantly, as Cheryl points out, this horse has left the barn and been saddled, so at this point the issue is observing how it works. And if it works in a way that disenfranchises or minimizes At-Large participation or participation from non-GNSO members generally or even from [inaudible] members of GNSO groups—every group has its contrarians, and if a process that's too careful within an SG or C could end up eliminating useful voices that are not the party line from a given group.

The other thing, just in terms of how the GNSO operates—and not to haul us off in that direction, but if it is a cartel, it's the cartel of the contracted parties finding whatever ally they need to find to just seal off any action by everybody else. In the EPDP, that appears to be generally the role of the NCSG, and given it has roughly three times the power of the IPC, the idea that the IPC is somehow cartelizing with the contracted parties borders on hilarity. It was one of those things that you wish was true if you're wearing your IPC hat, but it's most decidedly not true.

But in any case, the issue too is, again, as we saw in the EPDP, is even if there's a voice for the At-Large in the working group, once it gets to the council and our voice no longer sits at the table, whatever the decisions of the GNSO members within the group tends to predominate. So I

think there are some real future pitfalls in this and in the representative model. I think this is also a reaction to what I was calling the big three—until one of them got shot behind the barn—of the RPMs and subsequent procedures and registration data systems, all of which had well over 100 members and which were very unwieldy, but this is perhaps an overreaction and also somewhat of a rearguard action to keep the trade organization aspect of ICANN alive. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may. I've already missed my subsequent procedures PDP leadership call, which was running, as usual, in competition with this meeting. It's either the leadership or there actual overlap with the plenary, so I don't need to rush off, Olivier. But I would encourage you all to look closely at the small team and the makeup of the small team who did the work for this PDP 3.0, and perhaps those [bent] towards analysis would like to go back and look at how many [haves had] been deeply engaged either in PDPs or more particularly have been leadership of PDPs from that group. Just an interesting analysis which somebody might enjoy doing. Happy to take Alan's question if you want to give time to it. If not, Olivier, I'm settled.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Cheryl. What we're going to do is to give Alan the floor, and any time he takes for this question, he's going to have to take out of his EPDP section next. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. In this case I don't want an answer because I don't want to take more time out, but I have two comments. One is I agree with Greg that a lot of this is overreaction to particular PDP problems, but as someone said, the horse has left the barn and there's no point debating that. It is what it is.

In terms of Justine's comment on funding, just a note on how the EPDP has been implemented, the At-Large essentially is potentially penalized because our two members attend most of the meetings and therefore our alternates have not had much live experience. The rules they have used is if the EPDP meets at ICANN meetings, if any of the people, alternates or primaries, are funded, then the EPDP will not fund them.

So in my case, if I was not funded to go to an ICANN meeting already, I would not be funded because in our particular case, the alternates are funded for other reasons.

So just a note that being diligent and going to all the meetings has some negative sides to it also. Thank you. And no answers necessary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Alan. And I therefore give the floor back to you and to Hadia Elminiawi for the EPDP phase two update.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And I will turn it over to Hadia who has a short presentation and then I have two particular specific issues to raise, one of which is covered in the presentations and the other one is not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And just before you do that, I do have to thank Cheryl for the slides and to also ask whether it would be possible to continue this discussion about PDP 3.0 on the e-mail mailing list, and possibly in a future call.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly fine by me. As any of you who listen to me and actually hear what I say, I have been speaking about this since January 2018, so I'm not going to lose interest. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Over to Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. I'll be really quick. Could we have the next slide, please? I'll be talking today about the addendum and the recommendations and conclusions included in it, the next steps. Next slide, please.

This addendum is an addendum to the initial report of the temporary specification for the gTLD registration data [phase two.] Addendum includes recommendations and conclusions for priority two items, and we have eight recommendations and conclusions. Next slide, please.

The first is with regards to recommendation number 20, and it's with regards to the display of information of affiliated versus accredited privacy proxy providers. Where data associated with a natural person is

[met,] the response to a registration data directory service query must include the full RDDS data of the accredited privacy proxy service. Next slide, please.

So legal versus natural, since there is a persistent divergence of opinion on if and how to address this topic within the EPDP, the team will consult the GNSO council on potential next steps. So we're not doing anything with regards to that. Next slide, please.

The city field continues to be redacted just as in phase one. Next slide, please.

The next slide is with regards to recommendation 21, data retention. Registrars are required to retain only those data elements deemed necessary for the purposes of the transfer dispute resolution policy for a period of 15 months following the life of the registration, plus three months to implement the deletion, so that brings it to 18 months following the life of the registration. Next slide, please.

It's the OCTO purpose, and we have agreed that currently, there is no need for such a purpose. However, in the future, there's nothing that would actually prevent ICANN from proposing a purpose if they need that, and also, I note that we have included purpose two which potentially could cover that purpose if required. Next slide, please.

Feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized e-mail address. The EPDP team received legal guidance that this would lead to the publication [of some] personal data and therefore it is not feasible under GDPR. Next slide, please.

Accuracy and WHOIS accuracy reporting system. The GNSO has deemed this within scope, but the EPDP team will not be working on it. The GNSO council is expected to form a scoping team to further explore the issues in relation to accuracy and [inaudible] system in order to inform the next steps. Next slide, please.

It's with regards to purpose two and this purpose is to be added to ICANN purposes of phase one. The purpose is to contribute to the maintenance of the security, stability and resiliency-of the domain name system in accordance with the ICANN mission, and this is actually the purpose as recommended by the European Commission. Next slide, please.

So conclusions and next steps, the public comment period will be open for 40 days until the 5th of May, and the EPDP team is expected to review the comments and accordingly update the final report to include priority two items.

So I'll stop here and I'll hand it to Alan who has two important items to talk about: legal versus natural and the evolution of the standardized system for access.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Hadia. Actually, why don't we take any questions on the general positions before we go on to mine?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. I'm open to any questions. So basically, those are eight recommendations—two recommendations and six conclusions—with regards to [priority two items.]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not seeing any hands up, so perhaps you might wish to continue whilst people formulate their questions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. if we can go back to slide number five, the legal-natural one, that's one which I have significant problems with. You may remember that the preliminary specification did include a discussion of legal-natural and explicitly sent it to the EPDP. The EPDP phase one did not address the issue fully and said, "But we will address it in phase two." The EPDP is at this point effectively saying in the addendum report that we will go back to the GNSO on this one and discuss it with them, but the almost certain outcome is we will not take any decision on legal versus natural, we will toss it back to the GNSO to decide at some future date if it will do anything at all, and if so, how will it do it. That is in the form of some PDP or some other type of policy action.

That essentially defers the issue for a very long time. Now, you'll recall that right now we are redacting information on legal entities because for a variety of reasons, that is up to the contracted parties, but many have decided that it's just too difficult. So essentially, we're taking one of these really critical issues which has hidden a lot of information which under GDPR does not need to be hidden, and is saying it's okay and we're probably not going to look at it for a good amount of time, if ever.

And I really don't consider that acceptable, and I guess I'd like some feedback on that from the rest of the group.

If we can go to slide ten—that is the one on accuracy—accuracy is a similar one that, again, it's something that I believe we should have looked at. It's not quite as clear because it wasn't identified clearly in the temporary specification, so it's a little bit more vague, but again, we're deferring it and it may or may not be looked at sometime in the future, which I consider unfortunate.

The last item I wanted to raise is you will recall that the whole concept of the SSAD, the system for access and disclosure, we spent an infinite amount of time throughout phase two talking about it, and we finally came to closure by saying we had an SSAD which can make automated decisions. We are only specifying two specific types in two very limited cases in the report, but we have said it will evolve or it can evolve.

We are now getting significant pushback from the contracted parties to say—not only the contracted parties but also from NCSG—that to add new use cases is changing the policy, and therefore it would have to be done through some form of future PDP.

Now, the way I read that, I believed we are setting a policy which says it can evolve, and we can discuss the cases later. Now we're hearing from some people that this evolution can only happen through a PDP. Well, a PDP sets policy in ICANN, and a PDP can fit any policy. So an evolution which can only happen through another PDP is not evolution at all. It's absolutely locked in in policy. And yes, a PDP at some future date might

make a change and it might take away those two use cases or it might add others. We don't know.

So essentially, there's significant pushback within the EPDP to say that this evolution really will not happen. And in my mind, that puts us in a position where what we agreed on is no longer what is being presented. And tentatively, we may want to withdraw from the consensus on it because it is not an evolving model anymore if the only way to evolve is through a PDP.

And I guess I'd like a little bit of feedback on that, because if we take that kind of position and state it, [I don't believe we want to state it] that it's me saying it or Hadia saying it, but is this something that the group will stand behind?

So we're talking of two things: the legal versus natural being deferred to sometime in the future, and the potential for evolution only happening if the GNSO decides to charter a PDP sometime in the future. Those are the two questions, and I'd like to know to what extent are my feelings supported by others and if something we can present as an ALAC or certainly an At-Large interim position even though it's not one that the ALAC has voted on. I see we have a bunch of hands. Olivier, I'll let you run the time, and if we run out of time, then so be it. People can give their comments in e-mail.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. We've already run out of time, but I see three people in the queue. Let's keep those three people in the queue, and then anybody else wishes to comment, they'll have to do it by e-mail. Greg

Shatan is first. And maybe we could take all three comments and then you can respond afterwards to all three comments. So have a pen and paper ready to take on the three comments. Let's start with Greg Shatan, please.

GREG SHATAN:

I am in complete agreement with you, Alan, and probably would express myself even more strongly than you. I think that the legal versus natural conclusion that was reached is an epic fail and a good example of the cartelization, or at least the politicization of the GNSO and its operations.

More importantly, it's premature. There's a public comment out now deciding while a public comment is out that you've already reached an impasse and that nothing the public comment could tell you could change anybody's mind to my mind is a fundamental insult to the multi-stakeholder model and the policy development process, and to the public comment system in particular. So I think this is just rotten. This is an essential charter item, and the issue of course is the law does not require legal person information to be masked or deleted or treated like natural person information, but yet certain people like it that way for a different reason, that it's economically better for the contracted parties and it's philosophically aligned with the privacy maximalist views of the NCSG.

And NCSG—I think it was Amr in particular—admitted that this is a policy issue. They like this as a policy result. They're not even arguing anymore that it's legally required and just decided that this is a good

boat for the policy to ship out on. And similarly with the accuracy. I won't go on at any more length, but I agree with everything you said as well. And I do think that this is a consent of which we should not be a part of. Last time, we kind of rattled our sabre that we didn't like it very much but we were going along to get along, and I don't think in the end we got anything for that.

And especially given what we said earlier about how we lose our voice when it gets to the council table, we can't muffle our voice in the policy development process. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Olivier, I know you said hold it, but if I may, because I don't want other people to repeat these issues. To be clear, this is an addendum to the report. It is subject to public comment. We have explicitly been told if we don't like what is written, put it in our public comment. So the fact that there will be two outstanding public comments on this which will be considered does not mean that the EPDP won't change because of the public comment submitted. I think it's unlikely it will, but this is still subject to public comment. So the insult that we're making a decision ahead of time I don't really think applies. So let's not worry about that part. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Alan. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, just very briefly, I think we have to say, look, even though this public comment is still open, we should make a very strong case that the issues that were identified ought to all be addressed before we actually shut this whole process down, and that includes the accuracy issue and it includes the legal and natural.

So maybe the overall comment, the issues that are outstanding should be resolved before we actually close this process forever.

ALAN GREENBERG: Presumably we will say that strongly in our comment.

HOLLY RAICHE: I hope so. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thanks, Holly. Next is Alberto Soto closing the line.

ALBERTO SOTO: I am in a very small town with Internet that is not functioning really nicely. With respect to the legal and natural person, this concept is very clear all around the world. A physical individual is one person. There may be partnerships, but basically, it's a physical individual, it's a person, and a legal person needs to apply with a lot of paperwork.

Lito Ibarra and I had discussed this, I think, in Montréal, and I suggested that any identification that needs to be made because of suppliers, etc., should be made using digital signature and which does not leave any

definitions aside. ICANN cannot have its own definition for the interests of one of the parties. And in response to Alan, we can have a look at this later on, maybe by e-mail. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, one quick comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please go ahead, Alan, and then we need to move on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. On the legal/natural, the rationale—Greg was right, for the NCSG, may be philosophy. For the contracted parties, their rationale is very simple: there is no indication in the WHOIS record now of legal versus natural that can be used reliably. There's an organization field which has been used many times for many things, and there is no assurance right now that even a legal entity's WHOIS record does not have natural persons' information in it such as e-mail addresses.

So the crux of the issue from the contracted parties is that we can't tell if there's anything confidential, anything legal. We can't tell if it is a legal entity and we can't tell if the contents are all legal entities' stuff. Therefore, we're going to play it safe. That becomes the real issue. And of course, there is a lack of interest in having to review 100 million domain name registrations and try to make them right. Thank you. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan, and we look forward to continuing the discussion on the mailing list. And obviously, this is going to come to a public comment so there's going to be some input required for that. Now, SubPro updates. Justine Chew, you've got ten minutes. I would be really grateful if you could be a little bit less than ten minutes. I know you've got a proposal for us, so let's go over to Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I will try to finish in five minutes if I can. Next slide, please. Slide number two is a diagram, the flowchart of the steps that we're taking towards the ALAC submission of a statement in response to public comment. The chart's been up for a couple of months. The only bits I've added is the bits in red, which is the approach that we're proposing to take. When I say we, of course, it's a small team that we are proposing to take from here on up to about July 2020, [about that time,] and the public comment process is due to start on the 23rd of July as far as we know at this point in time. Next slide, please.

So the approach that we've taken so far is focused mainly on anticipating what the recommendations were going to be coming out of the SubPro PDP working group. You see that in the nature of the draft scorecards that we've been producing. Also, now that we've gone into [inaudible] a bit more, the SubPro PDP working group has actually progressed in terms of better framing its draft final report. So we're getting a better sense of how the final report is going to look like and now we've moved on to structuring the report in four part, which is part A, B, C and D listed on the screen. So we have more concrete information to work with.

Of course, the challenge in terms of part A to part D is the PDP working group is still refining the text within these four parts, so there could be some adjustments and changes along the way. That's something that we have to grapple with anyway. And as of the 23rd of March, the draft SubPro final report is due to publish on the 23rd. I mentioned that earlier, just now. On the 23rd of July, and the public comment period is expected to take place between the 23rd of July and the 1st of September.

So given that scenario, that gives At-Large basically just under five months to do three things. One is to develop positions and build consensus to the different areas of SubPro, and then that would lead us into drafting and submitting an ALAC statement to the public comment process, and the third goal would be concurrently to draft or provide inputs into [a piece of advice] that's going to the board where we see that's necessary.

Moving on to the last slide, the approach that we are going to be—the approach that we're proposing now is to do those three things that I mentioned earlier via a series of presentations during CPWG call and also single-issue calls.

So the focus remains on the identified high-priority and medium-priority topics for At-Large. You see that under item 5.2 I believe it is on the agenda. that has been presented and updated on a weekly basis. That shows you a list of all the topics that are within SubPro, also the topics that have been marked as high priority and medium priority for At-Large and also the progress and the score cards that we've been developing for comment.

Now, in terms of the juggling of the CPWG presentations and just also the single issue calls, you see that the difference in terms of presentations during CPWG calls would be to tackle the more straightforward topics, especially those that exhibit low divergence from current ALAC positions. [So I mean to say that if the] recommendations fall in line with what ALAC has recommended before, then it's just a question of ticking off the list, so to speak. And we would probably use the existing draft score card as a basis, and the main goal would be to focus on consensus building. So as I said, if everything looks okay, then there shouldn't be any problem for At-Large to arrive at consensus to either support or not support, as the case may be.

We will try to address any outstanding issues at a minimum level, and the expected outcome will be to settle the score cards and identify any points or advice to the board. Contrastingly, with the single-issue calls, those are needed to tackle more complicated and/or related topics, especially those that [inaudible] significant divergence from current ALAC position.

So obviously, if the SubPro recommendations, a large number of them are against what ALAC has suggested before, then we need to do something about that or we need to decide whether to do something about that. The focus then would be on position development. Again, we could be addressing many outstanding issues, and the expected goal there would be to derive any specific actions that would lead us to settling the score card and also identifying points for advice to the board.

Now, I have posted a very short list of tentative schedule of scope. This is something that I'm still sort of waiting on input from the small team, so that's why I put as tentative, but I'd like to try and kickstart the process if we can. So next week, we're looking at doing a presentation on applicant support during the CPWG call, and then as you see going through the list, the weeks moving forward would be looking at the CPE guidelines review and then universal acceptance and IDNs, and the two big ones would be the registry commitments, which is PICs, if you're more familiar with the term of PICs, and the second major topic would be the DNS abuse mitigation, which I'm suggesting that it be tied to the base are yes agreement and contractual compliance topics. And then it goes into [inaudible] and so forth.

But the idea is to try and schedule something every week or maybe on occasions a presentation during CPWG call as well as single issue call, because we have quite a long list of topics to get through even though they're high priority, we're looking at about 20 plus. So we need to try and schedule one every week in order to take us up to the public comment process, and the idea is when we hit that public comment process, then we can hopefully concentrate on just drafting the statement itself. So I'll leave it at that. If there's any questions, I'm happy to answer. Otherwise, we could move on to the next agenda item. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Justine. We have two hands up. Let's go through the queue quickly, please. Holly and Alberto. Holly, is that a new hand?

HOLLY RAICHE: Old hand, sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. And I think Alberto Soto's hand was also a hand from the previous discussion. So Justine, you have the floor just for closing words. We do need to move on.

JUSTINE CHEW: Great. Thank you. I just wanted to add, for purposes of the CPWG presentations on single-issue calls, the small team is going to try and come up with preparatory materials. But in the meantime, it would be really good if participants can have a look at the draft scorecards as a way of getting familiar with the issues. And as and when the call for meeting goes out or meeting reminder goes out, we'll try to have an agenda up as well so that we can post the preparatory materials. It's important that people come prepared to discuss or raise questions at these presentations and single-issue calls so that we don't have to spend too much time on background material. So please, I'm asking cooperation from all participants. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Justine, and thanks for the advanced notice on this. I can only see some positive feedback in the chat at the moment, so with no objections to this process moving forward, you are probably about—well, we can have an action item that will proceed forward with the plan as you've described it.

Let's go to our policy comments updates. Jonathan had to go to an ATRT meeting, another call, but Evin Erdogan is going to take us through this and we have two policy comments, each one having about ten minutes, I think, to be presented.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I need to go first.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. [Thank you, Judith.]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's first check Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. Thank you, Judith. Yeah, just to confirm, we'll skip through the main update this week, and we have two presentations, one by Judith and one by Dr. Gopal. Since Judith has a time constraint, let's please go to her presentation first on the draft community travel guidelines. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Can someone put them up? Thank you. Okay, so as we all know, with travel support, there's been a lot of changes. There's a public comment period. I know we many to have meetings this year, but we still need to have the public comment period.

So in the past, there was another one that was in the past where we put in a lot of changes, At-Large along with others, and while we got many of our changes, many of the ones we didn't get, and travel support added some other ones.

So I'll quickly go over ones that they didn't do. We had asked for reimbursements for visa to be capped at the actual amount of the cost of the visa, and they said no. Just \$200. We had asked for wire transfer fees to be actual cost, and they said no. Only \$25. Next slide, please.

So some of the new changes they added in besides those are they're saying no more cash transactions, we can only do ones that people have bank accounts for. So these are the changes that they've put in, and they have to get special arrangements made, they can do that and work with staff and travel support to do it, but otherwise, no cash.

They also said they're not supporting Internet access, so whatever the hotels or whatever you have there, that's all you're getting. There was a statement about some people putting in false travel. I think we can squeeze by this one. Next slide, please.

So here's another big issue. I don't really understand this at all. They are saying—and I think we want to push back on this a lot—that if two supported travelers share a room, that the other one loses the room and that the second person has to pay a second occupancy. So that means if two supported travelers share a room or if [one's supported but we share] a room with someone else, not only do they have to pay for the second person in the room, they have to pay for breakfast also, and all the other charges.

And I don't understand this. We're trying to economize and save [inaudible] but they're trying to have these different other things, and I think this is something we want to push back on because then we'll end up having to pay fees.

They're talking here [about] new deadlines which we all know about, that they're now doing it 120 days in advance and that if we don't do that in advance, that the person will be dropped. Next slide, please.

So here's a new thing in here. If a traveler is late or comes in and they miss two days, their whole support is cancelled, and not only that, the AC or the RALO is charged for that and ICANN can no longer accommodate travelers who miss any part of the flights either because of their mistake or something else.

They also now have a new policy saying that if they give you an early flight and you come in before 8:00 AM, that they'll pay for early arrival. Thanks so much. Next slide, please.

Yeah, so here's another issue which we had a lot of issues a while ago. They said they'll only pay for major airports, and the major airport could be far away from the traveler's home. I think we need to state that it should be from the traveler's home. There's no excuse [for—or they should] pay for a small domestic flight to the larger airport. There's no excuse for making travelers take a local bus with all their luggage to reach the airport that they deem essential.

Another change is that as we know, we're no longer allowed to do self-arranged travel even with—they're not granting approval, and the costs

of that, they've taken out all references to a maximum allowable [fairs.]
Next slide, please.

They say here forced overnight delays, these are delays if you have to stay overnight for any reason because of your travel, before asking the travel agent, you must first try to get the airline to pay for it. Before, it was easier; we could just ask Travel and they would take care of everything. And now Travel is saying, no, you have to first make sure your airline won't do it.

The voluntary compensation thing is if you're bumped, you [can't] take a bump because otherwise you could lose your whole supported travel. And then again, [of course,] expenses. I think there's one more slide. No, that's it.

So these are some of the major points in here, and I know I have some questions. And also know that they won't allow for any insurance to be paid or medical insurance, it has to be only the traveler's responsibility. So it's just like although we may not have travel, but we do need to put in a response to the request because it's due on April 13th and so I want to take questions on this. I know there's a couple of questions in the chat. So that's—but I would just to see—and I guess we have no hands up, but what do people feel on—did I hit all the things that are most important? [Or what others] Alan, you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. It wasn't clear to me as you were going over these things with new additions whether you were objecting to all of them or just reporting on them. From my perspective, some of the things that are

new are not unreasonable. So I guess I'd like some clarity if you're suggesting that you're going to be giving comments on these saying they shouldn't do it, or you were just reporting to us what the changes were.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I was reporting what the changes were, and then where I had an actual comment, I tried to make that clear in the slides the things that I thought we should comment on, like the shared rooms, the visas, and the forced travel not paying for domestic flights to larger airports.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. As an example, the shared rooms, since they're saying if a traveler doesn't use their room, the organization [get to] reallocate it. So they're not saying they're not going to pay for a room, they're saying you can give it to someone else. So the shared fees are an additional cost there that they would either have to bear or ask the traveler to bear. That's one I don't find—

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: My example for that is oftentimes, what happens is Glenn and Joan—Joan is in another constituency, [you have a room.] It could happen to us, but in that case, Joan is able to give up her room to someone else. But now, say we happen to have—okay, so here's an example. Sébastien, and say, Sébastien's wife gets elected and they're both having a room together. They want to give up one of their rooms to

someone else, but if they do, they have to pay an extra fee [for the second in the room] and they have to pay an extra fee for breakfast.

So it looks like—then they—or be illegal. And I think it's better to pay a little payment so that the room could be used for someone else. But that's on that issue. Maybe that's clear to you now. Holly?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not, but I'll follow up in writing.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Thanks. I'm just rushing because we don't have time.

HOLLY RAICHE: The things that worry me, first of all, are the arrangements about having to have a bank account when in many cases that's not easy. I agree with you, I think that the visa cost, you should be compensated for whatever it cost you to get the visa. And that may be very expensive, so I think that's wrong to set a cap on that. And I also agree with you on the air flight. If there's a commercial airline near you, you shouldn't have to travel for hours to get to a major one. So those are the major ones that I think particularly are wrong. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Yeah. And I know Marita, you have your issue on the medical insurances. I'm happy to bring that up on the issues, but it wasn't even addressed in there. But we can address it. It wasn't listed at all on the

document so I didn't put it in. And we have had instances where people didn't have bank accounts or couldn't [done anything,] and staff was able to work out things. So maybe staff could do that again. But it makes it very difficult. And maybe—is Heidi here? I know Heidi was helpful in doing it before. So, Heidi, is there some way, or before we comment on this too, is staff allowed any leeway in working out special arrangements, or does this make it even harder for you?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi, Judith. I think that as usual, you need to go [speak with] Constituency Travel to have these arrangements. If there is something that you're not hearing back from them and the meeting is getting closer, then we can help get that communication going, but I don't think that At-Large staff have any ability to give special treatment to travelers, no. That is all through these guidelines and you need to go through Joseph and his team. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Okay. Thanks. So yeah, we may want to make this an issue. So in the slides, let me know. I've highlighted in bold certain issues that I think we should discuss.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Judith, I'm afraid I need to step in because we've got one more consultation to look at. But you've got quite a lot of input in the chat already, a number of people have now put things in the chat, and what I would suggest is that they also write their input on the Wiki page that I

gather this presentation that you had will be on the Wiki page and then they can add this over on the Wiki page. There's plenty of things. But so far, I see support for the points you've made.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Great. Staff, can you put the presentation on the Wiki page? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thanks so much for this, Judith. It's been really helpful. And now, we do have a slight short extension for the interpretation, I hope, and we've got Dr. Gopal who is with us. Gopal provided us the details that it would take just a little while to go through there. So welcome, Dr. Gopal, and this is about the Middle Eastern and Adjoining Countries Strategy, a work by both APRALO and AFRALO. Over to you, Dr. Gopal.

T.V. GOPAL: That's right. It is my pleasure going through the documents and going through all the presentations. There may be an overlap, and since most of us are aware of all these terminology, I will go to the next slide.

[inaudible] four major topics that were chosen by MEAC. [inaudible] working group may include these terms. The mnemonic quality of the domain names is a practical necessity. It cannot be simply rhyming [and jiving] with many things. MEAC should strive to diversify the location of root nameservers. All root nameservers cannot be located in the same place. It's a security concern. DNSSEC has its own limitations. We need to have a policy and technical level preparedness. Monitoring performance and traffic flows need to be included. There must be some

mechanism in which we should sense how the performance is and how the traffic flows are happening. Next slide, please.

Universal open standards need to be mentioned in governance. Innovation at the edges is a better [bet.] Deliverance of the apps [inaudible] devices that are connecting rather than the various other interior components of the ICANN. ICANN's role and remit is clear. Governance over DNS is part, but not all [inaudible] Internet. It's only a limited scope, so we need to make sure that some edge devices are specifically included in the governance. How to word this? My senior colleagues may be better in AFRALO, they have been doing it for ages. So the wording is nice to go through them. These are some parts maybe included. Next slide, please.

Yeah, technology focus has always paid off on a longer run. We need to have some way of ensuring [that our CTO] who is mentioned in our earlier presentations is also explicitly identified as a stakeholder. How to add generic TLD—I emailed a comment on it, we can skip to the next slide, please.

We should have a rate of induction of gTLDs and the [number upper bound] in the region is my suggestion. I'm concerned about the earlier experience with .com and how we have made several fiascos. It's difficult in countries like India where we [inaudible] and it doesn't deliver and we don't have a recovery path.

Continuing an increased attention to internationalization, that's a geopolitics concern. So my concern is the navigation [inaudible] global convenient access to reach human knowledge and [plenty of things

happening even now] with all the so-called regulatory mechanisms and geopolitics in every country, plenty of data crosses the boundaries. We don't have any serious control on that. So therefore, the wording must be in a manner where we don't blame technology. That would simply be scapegoating. [Tech precipitates on other three aspects,] security, unique identifiers, [inaudible].

The exact wording will have to evolve. These are the parts. I'm done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dr. Gopal. I'm just waiting to see if there are any hands up for questions or comment. And I'm not noting any on the call. So just to have people understand, this is a joint comment by APRALO and AFRALO, and so you worked with your colleagues on this. The closing of this public consultation is still quite some time until now. We're speaking about another couple of weeks if I understand correctly. So please, if you have any comments or questions even after this call, just make the comments on the Wiki page.

Oh, no, I'm seeing the public comment closes the 3rd of April. Is that correct?

T.V. GOPAL: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, dear. Okay. So that's the very last moment. I guess the action item will be to find out from APRALO and AFRALO how this will be submitted.

Is this undergoing some kind of ratification, or what are the next steps on this?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Olivier, I know Heidi is on the call too, but this was discussed earlier today and it will be submitted as an AFRALO statement. And technically, we don't think it requires the ALAC ratification, but we're checking on that as it stands and we'll update.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Evin. Yeah, I wanted to put that on the record and be sure that we're clear on the process. Thank you. Abdulkarim Oloyede, I see your hand up.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I just wanted to seek clarification from Evin because I think what we agreed on earlier today was that it should be an ALAC statement because I'm not sure if [inaudible] so I don't understand how it's going to be [inaudible] from AFRALO. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Olivier, if I may.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks. As Olivier noted on prior calls as well, RALOs in the past have submitted comments, their own statements to public comment. Individuals can submit statements to public comment so there's no restriction. It doesn't have to always be an ALAC statement. But we'll follow up in terms of how the ALAC responds to this statement, but it can definitely be submitted just as an AFRALO-APRALO statement. Thanks. So I'll share an update soon. Thanks, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay. Thank you. No problem at all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Evin. Thanks for the presentation, Dr. Gopal, and as you all know, there's still one more topic in there and that's the phase one initial report on the review of rights protection mechanisms, but that still has a long deadline, so that will be dealt with next week. And we are completely out of time. The interpreters have agreed to 15 extra minutes, so we have one more minute, I guess, to go into Any Other Business. Just before that, Evin, is there anything in policy that we need to be aware of?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. Just a note. Please, everyone, take the At-Large geo name survey. We've decided to give it a deadline of end of this month so that some consensus can be identified, and especially everyone who's very engaged on the CPWG, it'd be great to have your

feedback. So I'll send that around again, and please do take it if you haven't already. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evin. Any other Any Other Business? Seeing no hands up, we just need to think about when our next meeting will be. I suppose next Wednesday might be a good time, so the 8th of April. But at what time will it be?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, Olivier. The next rotation is 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 13:00 UTC on the 8th of April.

[T.V. GOPAL:] Okay. That's around evening. Okay. That's fine. 13:00 UTC. How do you fix the times? Is there some protocol?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's a straight rotation. So it's either 13:00 UTC or 20:00, or—can't remember the third one, but we're alternating between those two [currently.]

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It was 19:00.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perhaps 19:00. Thank you very much, everyone. This has been a very interesting call, and yeah, we still have plenty of work on our desk. Thanks to the interpreters for having spent an extra 15 minutes with you. Thanks to all of you, and of course, to all presenters. And please follow up on the mailing list, and also, answer that real-time survey e-mail that you're going to receive after this call to see if this was helpful for you. It's good to get the feedback on this. And with that, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night, whether you're confined at home or whether you're finding a way to get out and get a bit of fresh air. Have a great week, and see you next week. Bye.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Bye all.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining the call. We've now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]