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Welcome to the CPWG call.

2020‑04‑29 Consolidated Policy Working Group Call

[this meeting is being recorded]

>> CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the consolidated policy working group call on Wednesday 29th of April at 2030 UTC.

To the number of attendees and in order to save time we will not do roll call all of the attendees from the Zoom room and phone bridge we would note on the call.

We received apologies from Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Alberto Soto, Priyatosh Jana, Glenn McKnight, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Tijani Ben Jemma, Javier Rua‑Jovet, Humberto Carrasco, Eduardo Diaz

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, Melissa Peters Allgood, and myself Claudia Ruiz on call management.

As you know, are we do have Spanish and French interpretation on the call. Our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and David. And our French interpreters Claire and Camilla.

We also have realtime translation and I am putting the link in the chat right now. So you guys follow along if you like. One last reminder, please keep your minds muted when not speaking to prevent background noise. With this I turn the call over to you Olivier.

Thank you.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Claudia, good morning, good a are noon good evening everyone on this action packed may be not action but certainly packed consolidated working group call.

It's a packed agenda with subsequent procedure updates from Justine Chew and had her small team. there's two presentations there. One on consensus avenue I rememberrations and one on consensus building. so it's going to be an interesting 30 minutes with her. If after that, we will have another 30 minutes that will be taken by Hadia and Alan to speak to us about the expedited policy development process. Phase 2. Phase 2 updates. And it's the SSAD evolution. And then finally we have the policy comment you want dates with Jonathan and Evin. And there again is also a presentation from Greg Shatan and Marita and all GTLD working group phase one initial report many if another short title, glad to note. And another policy comments update that are there.

It's worth noting that the ICANN Africa region plan for fiscal years for 2021 to 2025 will be dealt with next week. We are hoping to be able the on have it next week. That's because today's call has so many other presentations with our shorter notice, we had to prioritize things. And that's fine, because we had the Africa regional plan is due in before the 27th of may May. Much later on.

Any comments or questions or amendments opposed to the minutes of the agenda. Justine Chew.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: You just in the interest of it being a packed agenda. I'm happy to defer item 3.1 to next week and just deal with 3.2 because of time ‑‑ potential time sensitivity issue perform thanks.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Justine. My fault, I didn't read the chat. I should have.

Let's do that then. Just have 3.2 and I'll tell you what, are if we have time at the end of the call, we can fit 3.11 in, that's okay with you, we can do it this way, split it. Start with 3.2 first. That's 15 minutes. And then we will have the expedited PDP, the policy and then if there's more time we can do 3.1, is that okay?

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, absolutely. Thanks.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you.

Okay, so I'm not seeing any other hands up. So just to summarize, we will split agenda item 3 into 2. 3.2 will takes place very soon. And then if we have more time at the end of the cool, that doesn't mean that we will take all of the time, but we will have some time another the end of the call we will do 3.11 at the end of the call.

With this the agenda is adopted. So we can swiftly, very swiftly move to the action items.

Which are so exciting. Then again with today's confinement measures, you never know it might be very exciting. One is the ICANN regional plan for fiscal years, we are said we are moving The other is the support to team to schedule a single issue call on At‑Large Geo Names survey with ininterpreter atation. I'm not seeing mess I am on the call. I'm not sure who is able to alert us to whether this is on the way perhaps Jonathan Zuck knows? Or indeed any other stuff.

>> Olivier, in case Jonathan can't comment I followed up with Justine and Jonathan and Yesime we are going to wait until the official deadline of the survey which is tomorrow. And, also, after the 4th of May Webinar that Jonathan is presenting on. So probably within the first or second week of May. It's in approximate thanks [Evin]

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for that Evin. Please update the action items so we know it's for the week of May. First or second week. Next in the could you is Holly Raiche.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: There's drafting for PPI strategic plan was really 2309 so much drafting it was looking and seeing if people have a comment. I read the plan it's essentially motherhood statements with some detail many maybe we will hold it over until next time. I personally think ALAC should have a huge interest in PTI generally. But I'm not sure that is had shared. I will I would like a bit of feedback and maybe I'll do a presentation neck week whether or not e we want the respond to the strategic plan. If so along what lines. There's not a lot in the strategic plan that doesn't feel obvious and tank frankly a little motherhoody. I don't know where you want to go from there.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly, it sounds lake great plan. The deadline for this is 23 first of union June. We have plenty of time. The ALAC has the make a decision on this one. So yes, sure thank you with come back to PPWG next week is a short couple of slides owe this, this will be helpful.

CPWG.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm seeing another couple of people this the cue. First Christopher fill con sin.

Christopher Wilkinson for the record I want to stress there's a lot to be discuss about geographical names and it's high time At‑Large began that discussion which we have not really had to date. And there are a lot of aspects that are not covered by the Geo Names survey. I was disappointed by the Geo Names survey. Which did not address many of the political and economic aspects of this issue.

I just want to make clear, if we have a single use call on geographic names, it shouldn't be limited to the Geo Name survey. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks to this Christopher. I think that the Geo Names survey will serve as the starting point then there will be a big dough bait about the topic. Looking forward to this one.

Next is recard owe Holmquist.

>> ROB HOGGARTH: P.

>> Roberto: Question about Holly's comment. There's two days the PPI will be discussed upon the OSDC not the end year.

That's a question for you Olivier.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: To such for this Ricardo. That's one to be wonder about actually. It's a strategic plan and draft ETI. I think we have to take this, let's take this after the call. It's another within of the questions as to whether it's policy or whether it is finance and budget. Some do see the PTI as being very political and policy oriented. So, are lets, if we can pick this up with you afterwards, we as in this Jonathan, Evin and I and you, that will be helpful. Then we will know where to put it.

But thank you. Thank you for pointing this out. Thank you.

I'm not seeing any other hands. And yeah, I note also from Holly. She was also thinking about this. So, let's then move on. And I do apologize for the uncertainty about where we slot things. It's still early days to develop some kind of protocol, so as to be able to send things to the finance budget subcommittee, the finance team or the policy team.

But we will work it out in this time. Bear with us. Now let's move to the subsequent procedures and for this we have Justine Chew who has again come up with a fantastic presentation. As we mentioned earlier she's going to focus initially on 3.2 consensus building. I should turn over to the floor to Justine.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you Olivier, I believe it should be the other presentation, not this one. The one ‑‑ yes, that's the one.

To be honest I hadn't ‑‑ I hasn't anticipated I would present on two topics today. It was something that I wanted to pick up later on. but, because there's a opportunity to propose text changes to the recommendations and, also, the rationale I suppose that opportunity expires tomorrow, I thought I might put this forward today. So this group the see if there's any urgent action that I need to take in respect on if this opportunity to propose text changes.

The reason why I said I hasn't planned on picking these two topics up today Ali ais because they are neither here nor there. And I really wanted the try to connect contractual compliance on larger scale. To what's the question of matrix and can also you know, monitoring of public interest comments. Those are the things.

But never mind, having said that. Let's go through what the issues are for TLD and contractual compliance.

So next slide.

Quite limited. This is going to be quite short, I suspect.

There's basically 3 questions that are of importance in terms of TLDs rollout. Which are listed in the box on the left. I wanted to say that we ALAC At‑Large hasn't actually commented extensively, not at all on, on this topic either in committee comment 2 or even the SubPro initial report.

For what reason, I'm not going to dwell on that, but the reason I put it back on the agenda today because there's some link to the issue of squatting in warehousing that we may want to consider taking up or doing something about I suppose.

Okay, so in terms of contractual compliance, it's a more limited question because we are looking at not the enforcement aspect of contractual compliance, but whether the ‑‑ if I put it simply, when the base registry agreement has included in it all of the necessary terms and conditions and provisions that allow contractual compliance to do what it needs to do. As underlined in this slide. Whether the base registry agreement satisfies the requirement for clear, compliance and sanction process that could lead to contract termination which is then enforced by contractor compliance department.

There's additional element to the recommendation that we have to look at. Which is that we are going to urge contractual compliance department the.

More on the activities and nature of complaints handled.

Which is sort of, well didn't really cover entirely what we have said in the past two ALAC statement which I can draw your attention to the second built on the bottom right. Which we said it is clear to us that anything that is already included by way of framework, which is what we are referring to as things like section 3 representations and warranties. Much the spec 11 PIC. Whether it's mandatory or voluntary. the community commitments put into spec 12. Those are already clear in terms of their provisions with them in the base registry agreement. It is anything that is outside of those things, which constitute other representations or commitments. Which the applicant may offer. That's a question that we are grappling here with. We are saying that those things should also be included in the RA somehow. Especially if they are offering benefits to Internet end users. To ensure that they are enforceable and that contractor compliance should be monitoring these and enforcing these as well.

Now move to the next slide that goes into the actual recommendation itself. For the SubPro PDP rollout it's the in the form of affirmation which is to affirm the fact that TDL string an applicant for TLD string should be allowed a fixed timeframe to to do a TLD rollout which in effect is in other words, used in better comments okay.

And there are time frames for which the successful applicant is deemed to be ‑‑ or be given to actually do the rollout or to use the TLD source to people academic speak.

So the time frames are actually listed in the left bar under the boxed bullets. All right, so those are quite clear. And those were actually implemented for the 2012 round. And can we are seeing fit to say that these should be retain for the next round.

Okay.

The slight question or complication that we are looking at now is there was some questions around what do we mean by use. Okay, and there wasn't consensus within the SubPro working group as to how ‑‑ whether to redefine the term use of a TLD. So the existing definition is for use is that it is delegation into the root and meeting of all other contractual comments with respect to the required content.

Okay, so there wasn't a concentus as I said, to review or to revise this definition of use. And the gist of it is that the because of this also a belief that maintaining the existing root strikes a right balance between establishing appropriate requirements. While giving the abcan't some flexibility in terms of asking for extra time, if needed to rollout gTLD. Okay. So unless there's some concerns about this, I'd like to move on to the next slide. Which has more interesting questions for us, I think much which is that one of the new issues or listed as a new issue in the draft report is pertaining to squatting or warehousing of TLDs we discussed this in SubPro working group as to whether there's a need for adjustments to be made to adjustments to TLD or there should be additional measures to existing or warousing or squatting of existing TLDs. The many the pros and cons were discussed into two subboxes. And the question I have for this group is whether this particular stance that the subproperty P working group is taking, in fact ignores in commerce any points that was identified in the CCT review. Pertaining to squatting or and or warehousing. And if so, and whether this concerns are significant enough or well defined enough or At‑Large to take up and do anything about, per se.

Okay that's a question that I would like the post to this group. Especially those that are intimately involved with the CCT‑RT review process.

In terms of whether, you know, text changes is contemplated out of this discussion, that's something that we ‑‑ that I need to I suppose work out. Because as I said the timeline for proposing text changes is tomorrow. Of course there's still opportunity to comment on it during the public comment process. It's not fatal if you don't make the date line for tomorrow.

Okay, so I see two hands. If I could just take comments or questions from Christopher then Holly. Christopher, go ahead please.

>> Christopher Wilkinson: Thank you Christine. I have unmuted the host seems to have tried to mute me twice. So here we are.

Yes, I think this is an issue. We have by all accounts more than 800 new gTLDs. I hesitate to draw in my personal experience, because I could count the number of new gTLDs that I every encountered on the web on the fingers of one hand.

What the others are doing, I know nothing about.

But I believe this was an issue when CCT. But my main question from the point of view of users, present and future is that this is a way of warehousing and squatting on TLDs is a way of neutralizing access to otherwise generic interpreters, which are in common use in various languages, present particularly in English.

If we let go the idea that it's okay to squat and warehouse TLDs, what this does to the Internet and in the future, in the idea in languages, I hesitate to speculate. But I think there's a problem here which is not been fully addressed and I hope that at least in terms of raising a question, another concerns of we raise this question effectively in our comments.

Thank you.

>> Okay, Holly?

>> HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to confer many Jonathan's hand wasn't up so I put mine up. This is Aurelie part of the DNS abuse campaign. A big issue in had the CCT, but I think we will listen to the former chair of the CCT first.

>> Thanks Holly Jonathan go ahead.

>> JONATHAN ZUCK: I might be squatting and warehousing of TLDs are you talking about a top level domain and applying to are a top level string and holding it for future use in terms of selling it? Or are you talking about squatting on second level strings within the TLD part of your question per.

>> Part of your question in squatting and us auto for future, there's a discussion when that is considered as squatting or warehousing. You brought up a thing about parking in the chat. I think that's also related. Only top level.

>> JONATHAN ZUCK: I can confess, I have no recollection of discussing the warehousing on if top level domains in this CCT. So if everyone else remembers that we addressed that, I apologize, I need to go bahing and can review that. Much instead, we talked about parking and it's effect on competition analysis and choice. and that was all about second level domains within the new TLDs. But the idea of warehousing top level domains, I don't think its something the CCT addressed.

Josh right.

>> JONATHAN ZUCK: There's not an issue. If it might be something At‑Large as Christopher said but it's not relating to the CCT Josh that's good to know, that answers one of my questions.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Then the other question still remains is there something of concern to At‑Large at top level for us to do anything about? And if show, it may be something that we want to pick up in had the public comment period rather than for tomorrow okay?

So that's something to think about. If this components is that, then by all means, Abdul cream.

>> Abdul cream: Yeah, thank you very much. I wanted to have information because I'm from the entry point of view, one thing I realized is most times when you see that these have been warehoused it's probably more for commercial business. And because of commercialization of the Internet which I think is a payment problem from the end use ear's point on of view, I think its something we need to make a comment about. Because I see it as a potential problem.

Thank you.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Again, just to reiterate, the immediate task that I'm looking into is whether there should be any changes to the text of the recommendation. Not answering it in more complete terms. The answering in more complete terms is something that we can take up on the public comment process which comes later.

So unless people think we need to make comments immediately pertaining to the recommendation itself or the text of the recommendation then everything else we can leave until later, I think.

Christopher you're next.

>> Christopher will con sin: I'm amazed Jonathan this was and is a mainly issue. And if CCT chose not to discuss or review or comment on the creation of speculative portfolios of TLDs top level domain, that's a great pity.

I was a candidate to join the CCT and my application was not retain by ALAC. That being said, a few registrars have apparently successfully registered scores of TLDs. And I think the staff owe it to At‑Large to tell us exactly how these large numbers of TLDs, many of which I already indicated are almost completely unknown on the Internet. How these have been created, why they were created and how they have been used.

Because 10 years later, are it seems to be still an issue. As a footnote, I would say that the world has slowed down. Not of nip's volition. But.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Can I interject Christopher when I said again, we are not going to discuss the substance of anything that we want to comment on. That is something we can take up later on. The purpose that I'm trying to get at, do we need to make any changes to the text of the recreation that something I'm trying to get at for tomorrow. In terms of anything else, yes, please think about it we can discuss it on the list. But I want to push along the superficial question, if I can put it that way. So we can get through other things.

Is that all right?

>> Christopher okay.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: You can put your compts in the chat. I want to give other people a chance to.

>> Christopher: To save time, looking at the text I think we just have to say with deep regret the working group did not produce agreements for definitions on squatting and warehousing. Let us bear in mind that the working group had an advantage, an interest in not agreeing on things if they thought that 2012 text would be add advantage us on for their purposes.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: You keep on saying you need to change the wording in the recommendation but the slide that the on the screen says there's no recommendations. Many can you clarify?

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Yes, correct, you're right. I should have corrected myself too.

The reason why there's no recommendation is because there was no consensus within the working group pertaining to the definition of use of TLDs. In that sense some people thought that squatting and warehousing weren't an issue that needs to be addressed. There were other people that thought it was. But again there was no conclusion as to how to, whether on the agreed path to move forward. That's why this is under new issues and there's no recommendations. So yes, I will withdraw my comment about changing text on the recommendation. Okay.

Yeah.

Sorry about that. So, okay. Can I have Greg next please?

>> GREG SHATAN: Thanks crop funding there's any need to change what is in the report I don't believe this is a problem. I don't believe I'll convince Christopher it's not a problem. I don't believe Christopher will convince me it is a problem. Especially here and now, can and is a case of the example of what is in the text does disagreement with it. The this is an accurate reflection of where the group is. And therefore there be know point to changing the text, because in any case we would just have this conversation all over again. To no good resolve in the working group. Thank you.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Good point Greg. Marita. I'll cut off at Alan.

>> Marita Moll: There's no definition of use. The terms squalling and warehousing we cannot talk about them because they don't mean thinking. This is all null conversations until it's definition of use.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Just to clarify Marita there's a an interesting definition of use. The question is whether there should be any change to the definition. Go back to the earlier slide that I posted the existing definition of use.

Alan.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Can we go back to that slide please?

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Slide number 3.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Namely the delegation of the root and meeting all other commitments with respect to required content.

There are clearly many TLDs that have effectively no content on it. It's used has one home page and says we are going to use this some day.

Clearly that meets the definition of use. It does not meet the perception of use by many people.

There are many TLDs that are in this state.

However the rules of the PDP say if we can't come to an agreement we don't change anything. And we are clearly in the a position where we want come to an agreement. However people feel very, very strongly about this as clearly shown by the amount if on time we spent on it in this meeting alone. Not in the SubPro PDP.

So I believe what needs to be done in this report is make it really clear that this is an issue where there are strong feelings but we have not come to ‑‑ come to an ability to define it one way or another. And if if people believe we need to address it, then they need to make a proposal that perhaps could be accepted by the larger group.

So you know, we can't change the wording, there's no wording. But what we have clearly said, is there are strong feelings and there's a lot on people that feel there must be changes. Therefore what we need coming out of to the comment period is proposal how to address this. Thank you.

>> JUSTINE CHEW: Okay, what I'm hearing is there's nothing to do for tomorrow. And if people disagree with that, they can take it up with me.

Can I move on to the next slide please.

Which is slide number 5.

Again, this is something that has no recommendation. But I have lesser concerns about this pertaining to sunrise registration phase. So, in the interest of time, I think we should skip over this. And look at contractual compliance. If very briefly.

Okay, now again, contractual compliance in this context is very limited. It's pertaining, I repeat again, it's pertaining to whether we believe that the base RA base registry agreement already has sufficient brought framework in terms of terms and conditions that would allow contractual compliance to do what it needs to do and enforce. But we are not going into what it enforces or how it enforces.

Okay?

So, the way I see it, it's quite simple really. The existing agreements do not have ‑‑ that's something we can take up under the topic on if base registry. Many I actually want to tie all of this together with the concept of metrics and PIC. If that's a discussion for later on. I'm planning to do maybe back to back discussions on single issue calls.

So I'm not going ‑‑ we are not touching on those kind of in‑depth arguments or questions. It is ‑‑ this is just about whether the‑wee believe the base registry agreements have sufficient text in it to allow them to do what this need to do.

Skim to the recommendation 2 per se. Does anyone have issue with the text of this recommendation?

The if I can read it out. It says contractual compliance should publish more data on the activities of the department. And the nature of the complaints handled. But it should not publish specific information about any compliance against compliance action against a registry operation unless the alleged violation is against a clear violation of contract. Also the to date that ICANN compliance provides summary statistics on the number of cases open. Again rely tight case is can how long it takes to close. It also says that more information must be published on the context compliance issue and whether it was closed due to action taken by the registry operator many, many or whether it was closed due to a finding that RO was never out of compliance.

Okay, so if I can just go to show a couple of things on the next two slides.

About what prove viewing, what ICANN contractual compliance actually collects. Again, we are not getting into that. This is just a preview of what we might take up in the conversation, the single issue call.

But this screen shows there's a portal that contractor compliance compliance uses at the moment to display all of the data they are collecting and all of the monitoring they are doing.

On the right‑hand side you see the URL for this, the portal. So please feel free to go have a look at when they are doing, in the terms of data collection and monitoring. So you can provide any comments where we actually discuss the issue in single issue topics.

The next slide shows you the dashboard for data pertaining to registries and registrars.

Okay, Holly I think I'm reading your chat ‑‑ your question in the chat. I think that could be part of the discussion that we can have in base registry agreement. More specifics into what ICANN implies e compliance could be or should be doing.

Right, yes. What is the question? That's good point.

So that's why I said, I wasn't prepared to actually do this topics as it is. But because there's a opportunity to make any text changes to recommendations, are I thought I might bring it up now. It seems my attempt is kind of backfiring on me, so I apologize on that many if if I just raise the new issues on contractual compliance on the last slide.

There is some questions outstanding pertaining to things like abusive pricing for premium domains. And, also, use of reserve names to sunrise and operating launch programs at differed teary from what ICANN had approved. There was no agreement as to how this should be tackled. So there was no recommendation put forward on these topics.

So, I think over all there may not be any real need to do anything for tomorrow, per se. But I would definitely try to take up the larger more important questions through the discussion in the single issue topic on things like PICs metrics and moving into the changes for base registry agreement and anything else that contractual compliance should be the doing the same.

Okay, yes I think I've taken up enough time. So I will go back and look at to the chat and see if there's any pro action I need to take for tomorrow. Failing that, then yeah, let's take it up at a later date.

Thank you.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Justine. This is again a very, very interesting topic that you have brought forward. I'm is not sure we will have time for the second deck of slides today, but let's see how the rest of the call goes.

And so, we can continue. I was just going to mention for anyone that is interested in all these topics this of course goes into the SubPro updates workspace that is linked to the agenda just under the agenda item number. It has SubPros workspace. All of these presentations will eventually end you there. Right, expedited PDP. The face to debate with Hadia and Alan. We have a sad orangey color thing and a less sad green issue thing. Which one starts first?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Staff is all knowing and they put up the right one.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Over to you.

>> Hadia em[this is Hadia the addendum to the E PDP phase 2 report many next slide.

So, we will have a quick introduction. Then our comments on the recommendations and the discussion.

Next exclude please.

So, the EPDP team divided it's work into priority 12 and priority 2 items. Priority 1 was concerned with a system for access/disclosure for non‑public registration data and for that we had the initial report released in this February. And we already commented on it. And apparently the team is analyzing the comments in order to put it in the initiative report. And priority 2 items discussed items that we are going to refer to now.

So, the addendum basically addresses when things recommendations with regard to those 8 items. If we could have the next slide please.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: just a quick note there's changes from what Hadia has on the Wiki. They say a very dynamic environment we are working in now.

>> HADIA ELMINIAWI: What we have now is not on the Wiki. The Wiki page will be updated. We have received some comments, and from Sebastien and Matthew. and again, the comment on the Wiki will be updated accordingly.

So the first recommendation with regard of displaying of information of affiliated versus accredited privacy iy proxy provides. So we grading to the recommendation that is the domain registration is done through an accredited privacy proxy provider.

Data must not be redacted. However we do have to comments. First from the way the recommendations is written, it might be understood that masking on if the privacy profit service would be a you loud if the registrant is a legal person. And certainly that is not the intent behind the recommendation. The other comment is with regard to the privacy and proxy serves accreditation issue. PDP implementation. Which has been halted pending EDPD outputs. Where we would like the note that the implementation must be completed with urgency.

So, that's our comments with regard to the first recommendation.

If we could have the next slide please.

Okay, so the next one is with regard to the city field redaction and data retention. We agreed to those two recommendations where the city field remains redacted and the data rehe tension is 15 months. And they we have 3 months for implementation. Which makes it a total of 18 months following the life of the registration.

If we could have the next slide please.

So the OCTO purpose. And currently we see now we see no reason for having an OCTO purpose. Because we now have ICANN purpose number 2 which speaks to ICANN's mission to maintaining a secure and stable and resilient DNS environment. And we think that this purpose could be covered through ICANN purpose number 2 #. When required. I see Alan's hand up. Alan do you want the say something? [22.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: No, that's once you finish.

>> HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you. Next slide please.

So feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform and annomynizedded email addresses. We don't agree to this recommendation. We don't agree to annomynizedded email address. The EDPD recommended it. But the symmetric is not used for multiple registrations for the content of all domain domain registrations. The string is used for would not allow for the identification of the data subject.

So we actually believe that bird and bird did not understand what we were asking for. And we note also that bird and bird did note that item number 9 of its memo that significant benefits to using annomynizedded addresses.

And so that's why we do not agree to this recommendation.

If we could have the next slide please.

Accuracy and conclusion accuracy reporting Whois.

We don't agree to what this recommendation concluded to. And the reason is that we currently have a recommendation from bird and bird which we received on April 9thst and that is after this addendum was put out for public comment. And the memo includes many items that address accuracy from for example it does say that accuracy is determined in relation to the interest of both, the data subject, and as well as the data controller. If which in our case is ICANN is and contracted parties. And many other recommend ‑‑ many other advices in the memo that relate to accuracy and could help us in issuing a recommendation in this regard.

So, well accuracy has not been determined out of scope, but it has been determined not on the fast track or note as requirement for the delivery of the report. We still do see it it is possible to put out some recommendations in relation to accuracy. Especially that we do have new information in this regard.

And, also, we at EDPD phase 1 the report did commit to covering this issue. And that was one of the main reasons for us supporting the report of phase 1.

If we can have the ‑‑ yeah.

So, and that's purpose 2. And we agree and on having purpose 2. So, that recommendation as written actually was provided in the European data protection board letter to the ICANN board. And we fully supported and it basically puts a purpose before I can guaranteeing related to its application.

There's recommendation I think that we have next slide please.

Okay, so I think there's a slide missing. And this one is in relaying 20 legal versus natural.

The distinction between legal versus natural persons. And the recommendation says that there's a persistent divergence of opinion on if how to address this topic. And that's the EDPD will consult with the GNTO count on potential next steps. However on April 9th I received bird and bird related to accuracy and legal versus natural.

One on if the concerns the contracted parties had in relation to not having the personal information of legal person's public is that registrants might wrongfully identify themselves. Which could lead to the personal information of natural percent being published.

The memo addresses issue by saying dependent very figures measures that could identify miss label regular straints, would be considered reasonable. And we also have some previous advisers that addressing a regular straints as near as possible to help avoid mistake in making the ‑‑ consequences. Those are all potential and measures that we can contracted parties can taken also ICANN's Org survey in relation to the feasibility and pulse examples of industries that have successfully implemented the differentiation and the various risks as associated with it. It's due in May.

So, are we are of the view that we currently have answers to some of the concerns raised in relation to differentiated between natural and legal persons personal information material. And we will have more information shortly from the survey conducted by ICANN. We know that some registries are already making this distinction including some European CCTLDs from ‑‑ that's what we do not support actually deferring the issue to GNSO. We do have legal add you vice that we can rely on.

And in making a recommendation. And we will have more information to related the practical implementation soon. So, we find it awaste, you know, to at this point just defer it because we do not want to look into the information that we have. Or make use of it.

So, that's basically our comments on the 8 recommendations and I stop here and give the floor to Alan and open it for discussion as well after that.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Couple of points. There is nothing in this response which is different from things that we have said multiple times before. So we are really don't ‑‑ I hope we don't need to debate the substance to any great extent. Because these are all positions we have taken and taken strongly before.

The ‑‑ we agreed to the phase 1 report. To alarge extent because these issues were going to be addressed in phase 2. They were supposed to have been addressed in phase 1. We ran it on if time. That remember was very time constraint because of tech rather specification was lapsing after a year. So we are competingly time constraint then and we decided to defer these to phase 2. But that deferral was a significant commitment on the part of the EDPD. And allowed us to accept what was done before. So now all we are saying is you can't punt it forward again to almost never. In other words, send it to the GNSO and if they decide at some point in the future to overlook it, they may. That's really all we are saying here many if the second point to mention is we have been in extensive talks from people from the GAC. They are likely to make a very strong statement that is pretty well 100% aligned with what we are talking about.

We believe they may get their statement done in enough tomb that we may be asked whether the ALAC supports it or not.

How we would make that decision given that the submission date is next Tuesday before our next CPWG meeting is not quite clear. But I will be talking to Maureen about seeing if we can fast track something before the ALAC. If indeed they finish their statement. At this point we are very much aligned with the GAC on all of these points. And I have also asked, sent a request to the S sack to understand their position. If not got a response from that yet. So I can't really speak to that at all.

Thank you.

Holly has her hand up.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: A question, if we already agreed on the positions,s why can't you circulate the GAC statement. And with each point they make simply indicate that ALAC has supported this in the following circumstances.

Just if anybody then desense from 245, there's a opportunity to do so. But it would mean that what we are doing is reaif you remembering what we already said that you have the emails from everybody to do that.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly we can't circulate the GAC statement until the GAC signs off on it.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, all right.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: And I don't have have permission to circulate that draft we have seen. I'm hoping to get a final statement by tomorrow. The GAC may or may not have that done. And at that point we will certainly circulate it once it's final and see if we can figure out a way is that we can before the deadline affirm that we support it or if that's not possible, we can always submit something very soon afterwards, saying we support it. It would be nicer to get it integrated into their statement ifen deed they are in position to make the statement soon enough. It's a little out of or control, I'm giving everyone a heads up, that it may go that way.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: I appreciate that. If you circulate their statement, could you not simply in circulating it simply say we have agreed ‑‑

>> ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, we will ask the chair of the ALAC the support we are looking for. If this group is proxy for the ALAC at this point. And if we can do it, we certainly will.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

>> HADIA ELMINIAWI: This is the position we recently had and then we had new information and legal advice and up coming information coming. For example in the memo provided by bird and birds in the April, they do say definitely that the principal, the accuracy principal depends on the complaint with the accuracy principal depends on the circumstances. They do provide a table that provides the measure that should be taken and level of a assurance testified e associated with it. And they say a combination of measures would provide a more appropriate level of accuracy. So what I mean here that we do have now substance that we can actually put out some recommendations based on. It would be a waste not to do so.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, we are going the run out of time and there's another presentation that has to go out, has to be looked at today. With regard to just even's comment, I don't think there's any question we are going to subsubmit our statement. You will see it later on today on the Wiki. But we may also, if it's possible. Support the GAC statement. Assuming there's no conflicts between them. And until we see a final. We don't know for sure.

So as soon as you get a message saying the new version is on the Wiki take a look at it. If you have new comments or substance or wording, let us know.

I see no more hands. Therefore let's go on to the second presentation.

This up with is F SSAD revolution. It's the mechanicnism the process by which third parties can submit requests for data that is otherwise redacted.

Currently the F SSAD will in most cases simply refer on to the quest to the registrar owe registry and will log things. We will have a record of whether a registrar is answering or not answering or answering quickly. But very little on automation and quick turn around. It's presumed that most registrars won't have any automation to begin with. Larger ones may develop automation as we proceed.

Neck presentation.

Thank you.

Is that the first slide? No that's the first substance slide, that's fine.

What is currently being proposed this is in a small group that hasn't go to the full EPP yet. Those following the mailing list will not have seen any traffic on this. What is currently going to be proposedded is to use a mechanism within the GNSO called the GNSO guidance process. And here's a quote from the main GNSO policy manager on the GGP it's on the council when there's a request for input related to gTLDs and note existing policy or one we implemented.

And it's identified by the GNSO count it would benefit from guidance.

If we are asked for stuff, this is a mechanism we can use to try to get some answers to someone.

Next slide.

Now, it's initiated by the GNSO. It is task oriented. So, the group will be given some sort of chart I and given responsibility by looking at something many there will be a final report. There will be the normal draft reports that will go out for public comment eventually there will be a final report. The GNSO has to approve that final report. Like a PDP report by a super majority. And we will gobo into that in a minute. And after that, it would go to someone. It might go for board action or some other part of ICANN depending exactly what the question is. Then terminates. That's the GGP that is in the manual in the GNSO manual.

Now there's a few problems with that, first of all there's 2340 way to compel 2 GNSO is so charter a GGP. They have to decide and to charter and there's no way to compelled the organs to did that. In theory the GNSO can can say and we have not chartered a GGP and it's not likely the GNSO would float the intent of the EDPD can do that. That's probably a paper tiger problem perform the next problem however is much more real. Any recommendations that come out if on the GGP, it is designed to have a final report then terminate.

Now, you ‑‑ many of you will recall the situation with the CCWG on Internet governance where the GNSO according to the standard CCWG rules that were written a few years ago. A CCWG must have a final report and end point. A target then it quits and the con it CCWG here we proposing a GGP do exactly that that. So the question is, will the GNSO be willing to modify or violate it's own rules and have this as an ongoing group. That remains to be seen.

Next issue is the composition. It's being recommended, actually I think I have another slide on this in detail. I don't go into detail. It's been recommended that the composition of the GGDP basically model the composition of the EDPP. That has potentially of becoming an unwieldily group that can't make decisions. Lastly in GNSO and any recommendations coming and out of it any of the fault multiple final reports must be by majority.

So the mandate is will the GNSO be able to modify it's own rules and have multiple ‑‑ this being an ongoing process and multiple reports.

Even if they do, the process is long because once you have the whole concept of let's issue a preliminary draft report, get public comments on it, evaluate it. We are talking about a process that is many months or perhaps a year long. That's not the nimble process that some of us envisioned to be able to modify the behavior of the SSAD as we are monitoring.

Next slide.

The composition. If we reflect on the composition of the EPDP which has # people from some groups. 2 people from others. 3 from others. If you look at common denominators, the only way to model that [6] balance exactly is to keep a group the same size. That is have a group of 20 odd people with as we have now, 6 members from the NCSG, 3 from registries, 3 from registrars, 2 from ALAC. That's a group that I think is almost impossible to manage and will make it very have I difficult to come to an agreement on almost anything. Next slide. I'm giving my opinions. Recommendations have to be approved by GNSO. The super majority. The definition of super majority is two‑thirds of both houses or three‑quarters of one and greater than 50% of another.

That means that one stakeholder group plus 1 other person in that house. So for instance, the NCSG plus the nom com pointy or the NCSG plus one of the non‑commercial of the commercial people which could be the ISPCP, can veto.

Now, in theory the GNSO council is only managing the process and not voting on the substance. But the reality is, that many counselors vote on whether they believe this should happen or not.

And we have never had a GGP by the way, that will be the first time we ever have one of these. Being able to be vetoed effectively by one stakeholder group plus 1 is something we may ensure that we never ever have progress. That's the last slide.

So the question that I've been asked right now, I'm a member of the small group is can we live with this?

Not is it optimal, but can we live with it or have this something that the ALAC cannot except because of these problems. That's the question I'll be asked to answer this Friday.

What's my answer? I see a hand. Holly.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: I guess my question is, how do you feel about that? Would you be happy for us to say, well it's really a crap situation but go ahead? Or would you say I would like to pour comment on my feet and want support to do that.

I'd like to hear from you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Well, this final report will go out by the first of June. Or close to it.

Period.

And by the way staff has been charged with coming back and saying are there any other alternatives that staff consider viable. I'm not specking any, but they may surprise us and come up with some other alternatives. I suggested it should be a group more akin to the customer standing committee. Is that is a small group of people including both those that were involved in running the thing, the contracted parties, ICANN and the customers of it. And you know that be a small nimble group that has been essentially rejected by all parties at this point. The real situation is, are if we cannot come to an agreement on something, we will end up with an SSAD with no evolution.

>> HOLLY RAICHE: Oh.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: The question might be either we accept this with all of its faults or all of our beliefs that it may never evolve because of how it's structured or we end up with nothing at all, which I suppose which is worse. I see Christopher, Bill and Greg. Olivier, I know you have other things on the agenda. We have 12 minutes away are the the end of the meeting.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks Alan you have minus 5 minutes at the moment.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Will the commenters please take that into account. We have 3 people then close the cue. Much Christopher as concise as you can be.

>> Christopher: One I agree with Holly. Two, I disagree to the extent at which MSNBC Dick takes to the rest of ICANN including the other SOACs what policy should be.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Can each of you please answer the question. If the result is that if we don't except this, we have no evolution at all.

That's the choice we may have. And the question is, which did we prefer?

Bill or Christopher if you want the answers that.

>> Christopher: I would say don't accept it. It has to come back to another review. But I don't buy what we have got in front of us.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Okay thank you Bill.

>> CLAUDIA RUIZ: I don't think we can accept a design that essentially says a single stakeholder group with veto any kind of motion. If we can't get it ‑‑ if we don't have a design that gets us out of that, we need to go back to the drawing board many if thank you [bill Joures]

>> GREG SHATAN: That's actually the design of the GNSO council. Not the design if on the GGDP. But in any case, enough said about that.

I think that there are two bad choices here. If the better bad choice is to move forward with the GGDP but indicate if the GDDP doesn't work it has to pivot to something that will.

I'm very pessimistic about the idea that a standing GGDP will be acceptable to anybody. But, are this at least kind of buys time and it's to try to find a solution thanks.

El Greg if I were to ask a quick question what is the trigger to say it's not working is it to say it doesn't work or the GNSO doesn't approve them or something else [Alan]

>> GREG SHATAN: It's whether or not it gets off the ground first or whether it's acceptable. If in fact the GGDP is chartered it's supposed to be quicker than a EDPD that it's supposed to object monitored many we go with that. Many my concern is it won't be accessible the same as CCWG wasn't acceptable without an end date. I think.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I'm more worried it may get work done, but that work won't be approved because of the veto capability.

All right I think I have somewhere to go, back to you Olivier.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. We are running out of time. We will go swiftly into the policy comments with Evin and Jonathan.

>> EVIN ERDOGDU: I will run through quickly it's noted we are running short on time. Recently ratified by the ALAC and travel guidelines and Middle East adjoining countries strategies 2021 and 2025 both are brief on the agendas. There's no open for decision but two current statements and development by I lack having led fines coming up real soon first is phase one initial support of all rights technical and gTLDs policy closes on the fourth of May and the volunteers Greg Shatan can meter afoal has had a presentation to the report. And the addendum to the initial report of the analysis process and specification for detailed registration data. And team phase 2 and Hadia and Alan has been discussing this in detail and this closes on the 5th of May and there's a statement draft posted to it s workspace. There will be a presentation next week on the ALFRALO African plans for 2021‑2025. And noted earlier in call draft PTI of FY 21‑24 strategic plan may not be discussed with the budget committee.

So I'll turn it over to Greg and Marita first to deliver the presentation. Unless Jonathan has comments. Thank you very much.

>> JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's go ahead.

>> GREG SHATAN: I'm left with the unenviable having a 25 slide deck and 7 minutes to present it in.

I suggest instead of going through slide but slide, I'd let you know what the overarching principles that were used to answer the recommendations to respond to recommendations are.

As discussed before, it's the primary way to respond is just by multiple choice. So if you go the slide 2 please.

You choose one of the above.

So, are the overarching principles used or I used and Marita did not object to, first, that where there are things that are really of no interest to end users and we are essentially kind of inside baseball technical stuff or just kind of part of the never ending battle between the different viewpoints just said that there was not sufficient end user concern, no opinion. That would end up with a no opinion answer.

Where there was a general support for status quo, because things were working as intended, my feeling is that ALAC At‑Large is one of the key pillars of keepers of the multi‑stakeholder process and the policies by which they are produced should support those policies that are working and that are not ‑‑ that are being supported by the group for which no change in status quo is seen.

More specific authority, where there were issues that stay consistent. There were several recommendations we go quickly to slide 3. We are recommending support here because it's consistent with EPDP phase 1 recommendations. And therefore we should support that kind of general consistency.

Going to the next slide, same thing with the first recommendation number 2. On number 3, this is a principle that answers a number of questions, I believe and we believe it's important for multiple can languages, native languages, other than English or languages of proficiency other than English need to be accommodated and on a equal playing field wherever, if possible.

All English all the time is not the rule. But there's ways the group is is looking to expand that.

So for instance, this is supportive rule to translate the complaint into the predominant language of the respondent at the cost of the provider. So that's has been that ‑‑ that seems to be significantly something we should approve of.

On northbound 5, next slide please.

This is generally a recreation that is consistent with principles of accountability. It asks for more reliance on metrics. And provides more ability to seek redress. And in this case, looking for an avenue for parties to file complaints of non‑compliance concerns. In this case it seems we should support it and these are policy principles that are consistent with our overview.

Next slide, the first part is merely a process improvement to keep contact details up‑to‑date. Not personal details of ‑‑ but rather the details of the contacts of the registries, registrars you as providers. Believe it or not they don't always know where to find each other.

The second part is the question for registry operators so we don't have to answer, thank God.

Next slide number 7. Here again, there's one discussion point here. We can stop here.

Again he's are he had care materials. I think we should be in favor of that. They asked for some ‑‑ this helps people who would not have the assistance of council. To navigate this process better.

So we should be on slide 7. We are.

Good.

The they ask questions in this the background. Clearly content should be readily accessible. And they should look to collaborate with individuals, organizations and end users in this providing and working on these things.

There's a question who shear bay the cost?

I frankly am not sure. Much one is it should be the URS provides. Another would be to have some other method. If there's any thoughts on that, I would love to hear them. If not on the list translation into the minimum ‑‑ as many languages as possible is good for us as well. Slide 8.

Here again, this was something discussed a lot. Examiners should provide enough of a rationale to show how they reached their decision. Accountability and transparency so we should support that.

Next exclude, here's the both of 8 and 5 no opinion too technical. Not for us.

Owe URS number 9. This is again guidance on on language issues. And consistent with our principles of using primary languages and not just forcing English on everyone.

Recommendation number 10th is more of the same. And also using the community to provide information and guidance.

Next slide please.

Sorry. Somebody trying the on get me to another meeting.

Number 7 not ‑‑ no opinion. Number 8, not for us. Number 9 no opinion. 10th no opinion. Next exclude. How is that for speed.

One recommend age on the trait market clearing house. The basic recommendation here is no change. And I think we should support that recommendation. A lot of fascinating concepts discussed here. But it's not going to go anywhere any way. So we should just support.

Next. So sunrise this is a group I was the dash that I chaired. So next slide please.

Get to the pretty sunrise.

There we are.

Here's sun rise recommendation status quo. All of the way down the line on this slide. There was no real support for any change we should support. This works well enough. Not that everyone loves it but nobody hates it more than other people.

Next slide please.

Here again, current status quo was held for 5 and 6. On number 3 there was process improvements if improvements. Basically issues of how things were drafted when they were drafted. It caused some odd issues that just needed to be resolved. They are good process improvements. So I support supporting them. Number 8 is again no change. And worth supporting.

Next slide.

I don't think we have any reason to answer either of these questions.

So, we don't have answers for them. So next slide please.

This is a bunch if on stuff for registry operators.

Next slide is also for registry operators. Next slide please.

And so here we are, this is also a does not apply to us. We can take the next slide as well.

And these are ‑‑ this is recommendation number 1 on trademark claims. The notices that go out to people on how to register how they may be regular tig someone else trademark. It's scary language. We want it to be more readable and and more informational and less scary. That's all worth supporting. And this got support from the broad hest spectrum of the group.

So certainly we should be in support.

That's one thing that everybody agreed on, that's the couple by areport of the entire.

So next is number 2 goes to principles of using languages other than English. All good for us.

Number 3, technical, no need weigh in.

Number 4 is just generally the principles here of the timing. Are working as tendnd and he can with support those as working policy.

Next slide please. Same thing on both of these.

Things are working, are we should support things that work that aren't just highly technical which I did avoid. Next slide please.

Here are two technical issues not worth even considering. You know, weighing in the there. Next slide here.

This is without getting into this, the PDPRP rules about challenging whether an actual challenging how complaints could be made much again it's a process improvement that people realized over time just needed to be made. Not controversial in the group as far as I remember so we should support a good props improvement.

Now slightly more interests stuff that's are overarching charter questions.

First question is whether the RPMs collectively fulfill their objectives providing trademark with squatter and ora uses of their trademarks.

That's the next slide please sorry.

This slide, so my other proposed response is that they have been sufficient to meet their objectives. There's no need for newer additional mechanisms or changes beyond those proposed by the working group.

I think this fits with our primary concern. We are preventing various forms of DNS abuse and safety on the Internet and you know these are adequate the meet these concerns.

On the next point, the ‑‑ so the general overarching question, number 2 A relating to the URS. Really should these be consensus policies to all of the other ‑‑ so, they are mic applicable to nearly all of the besides dot net can .com my view it should be ‑‑ we are only talking URS not talking complaints that's pandora's box. I'm not sure what exactly ALAC view has been on the past in accepting the 20 # 13 registry agreement where the De Facto made the policy if not consensus policy. That's where we need some input here this. Then next slide please. Almost the last slide. What are the transitional issues many we don't really ‑‑ on adding URSs consensus policy. Should not raise sufficient transitional issues. Next on two questions I thought were not answerable or not worth spending type on.

Number 187 this is one where we could spend forever do the RPMs adequately address registrant protections like freedom of expression and fair use. We canned not develop a truly coherent narrative if they do on are don't. How do we deal with that? It would take months to answer this in any coherent fashion on what works and what doesn't. I suggest jut not answering it.

Next question is whether the recent Wong work or ICANN to human policy consideration is that relevant to RPNs? My answer there is general matter incorporating consideration is relevant to all ICANN policies including RPM, the question of how that should be taken into account with all of the RPMs is beyond the scope of these responses and deserving of its processes. Other than CCWP working party that NCS CCWG runs. That's out of scope here.

Last question, how can cost be lowered so end users can easily access RPMs.

Well you look at this as trying to help mall trademark owners. Those from developing economies where $1500 is a truly significant amount of money.

So, obviously there can be financial support through subsidies and there's also non‑financial reports some being considered in this like more translation, translation services better educational materials. Model submissions, help lines and chats can even pro bono legal representation.

So I think those are practical ways that cost can effectively or barriers can effectively be removed. Next slide please.

So, are that's the 15 minute tour through 26 slides.

Any hands?

Somebody else can run the cue that would be helpful to me.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I'm the only hand up.

>> ANNA LOUP: Go ahead.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Quick question. This is a dense presentation I didn't read all of the words. There were a whole bunch of things deferred to the rights protection group to look at. They are small items but they need to be fixed. Things like the UDRP made reference to who is fields which don't exist anymore following the EDPD. The fact that with thick registries, the registry has information that may be useful. But the URS open talks about going to registrars.

Did the group lack at those? And did I miss them? Or is it something you are going to do at a later if a easy to cleanup the various things that just need to be cleaned up.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We looked at a number of things. We have UDRP in phase 2. Things quellly accessible to UDRP were cubbed to phase 2.

>> KLAUS STOLL: You are not for getting them.

>> GREG SHATAN: No we put a pin in them.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: That's all I wanted to know. Thank you.

I don't know what happened to Olivier, I see no other hands perform.

>> JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm trying to say he usually you runs this part.

>> GREG SHATAN: I'll turned it back to JZ and Beyonce.

>> JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Greg for this presentation. There's a lot to unpack here. But I think you have made a good effort at trying to figure out what the end user applicable things are. Part of the problem also is it makes reference to end users in the contact of registrants which I think is also a difficult thing for us as well. Because we often make that distinction. But I think we probably need to continue on with the changes that ‑‑ with the answers you provided. We have got a find a way to get discussion going within the At‑Large before comment periods begin. Because this is a crazy way to discuss this. So, we are not going to resolve that on this call. But thank you for your presentation Greg.

Do we need to discuss the addendum to the initial report in the policy development process? Alan?

Maybe Hadia can take this.

>> HADIA ELMINIAWI: I'm still here. Can you repeat the question?

>> JONATHAN ZUCK: Do wee need to go over the addendum to the initial reports.

>> HADIA ELMINIAWI: We already have a presentation, right?

Yeah, we already had 2 denied you mean. Basically right now we have the become the ALAC comment on the Wiki page. However what is there is going to be updated. So on what we presented today is not what you can see on the Wiki page now. We received comments from Sebastien can Matthew. And we will be updating and in addition to Alan's contact with the GAC. And we will update the Wiki page to reflect that. But it is basically what we presently today. Thank you.

>> JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Hadia. I think we are going to have to push the regional plan and even figure out if this is the right home for that. And draft PTI strategic plan is out in the future as well. Olivia back to you for any other business.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jonathan and Olivia Crepin Le blond speaking and to all of the presenters today, a lot of material on today's call. I'm surprised we are only 15 minutes late on closing. But we are now in any other business with a couple of things. First office the reminder on if the PDP 3.0 initiative. If can just so you all have a look at the consensus playbook that can be downloaded from the link in the agenda. Then today is the last day tore to At‑Large Geo Name survey. Need we mention it again. If you haven't taken it, please take it.

Any other comments or any other business?

I am not seeing any hands up. So, we just have to ask when it will our next call be? I presume it will be next Wednesday and by strict rotation, when the next time?

>> CLAUDIA RUIZ: Next time is 1300 UTC.

>> OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: 1300 UTC thank you very much for this Claudia. You have another week to mill over the things that have been discussed and follow up on the mailing list and can contribute on the respective Wiki pages we have there. Stay well everyone. This is an amazing call and big thanks to our interpreters that had to say a lot today in very technical stuff. And kudos to them you be well done team. Have a very good morning, afternoon or evening or night. Goodbye.

>> CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you everyone for attending the call. Have a great rest of the day. Thank you