

---

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working group call, taking place on Wednesday, the 12<sup>th</sup> of August, 2020, at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing the roll call due to the increased number of attendees, as well as for the sake of time. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room, as well as on the phone bridge, will be recorded after the call.

We have received apologies from Alfredo Calderon, Justine Chew, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Matthias Hudobnik, Vanda Scartezini, Javier Rua-Jovet, Alberto Soto, and from Humberto Carrasco.

From staff side, we have Evin Erdogan, Herb Waye, and myself, Yesim Nazlar, on call management.

Our interpreters today are Claudia and Marina, on the Spanish channel, and Claire and Camila on the French channel.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please.

One final reminder: as usual, [there'll] be real-time transcription service. I'm going to post the link here in the Zoom chat. Please do check the service.

Now I would like to leave the floor over to Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Over to you, Olivier.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call, which is going to be a little different today. We've got a slightly differing agenda from our usual items.

First, of course, we'll have our action items from the last week, but then Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi will be speaking to us about the Expedited PDP Phase 2 update—specifically an ALAC statement addendum. They have about ten minutes, maybe a little more, depending on how many we are to submit.

After that, we will not be having Justine Chew, who is off this week. Hence, the zero minutes allocated to the Subsequent Procedures. That being said, if anybody has to raise something on the Subsequent Procedures, please let us know now., then we'll add this to the agenda. Otherwise, we'll be seeing Justine again next week and continuing with the whole schedule—the small team workplan schedule of issues and topics.

Jonathan Zuck will then take us through an introduction of the CPWG issue evaluation pipeline—something that's in the pipeline. So you'll find this out shortly. Afterwards, of course, is the public comments updates with, again, Jonathan and Evin.

Any Other Business. Is there any other business?

I am not seeing any hands up, so the agenda is adopted as currently displayed on the screen. We can therefore swiftly move on to our action items. The only that's of note is the one that Alan Greenberg made a

---

request to submit an addendum to the ALAC statement on the EPDP, and that's what we'll be speaking about next. So I think that we shouldn't waste any time on that. Not seeing any hands for anyone to comment on these action items, we can swiftly then welcome Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg for the ALAC statement addendum for the EPDP Phase 2. Over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I see the slide is up. You—next slide, please. Just to summarize, the ALAC has already submitted a statement that was discussed in this group and unanimously approved by the ALAC. Basically, we are saying that, despite the year-plus of work, if we implement the recommendations as written and as currently interpreted—"interpreted" is based on a very vague interpretation of some of them—it is simply not going to be acceptable. Although not having an SSAD which might be the outcome is not a good thing, having one that is very broken with no real chance of fixing and that the GNSO is not likely going to have the taste to charter another PDP in the near future to do this just didn't look like a good way to go forward.

Next slide, please. We discussed last week what we should do now in light of the statements that have been submitted by other groups. Their recommendation last week was very much to submit an addendum/submit an additional comment, not to try to revise and not to ignore it either. As a result, I have put together a very brief statement. I'd like to take a look at it right now.

---

Now, the background right now is that the SSAC has submitted a set of consensus levels for the recommendation, as have all groups, and a short e-mail but have not issued a formal statement. Typically, with the SSAC, if it issues a formal statement, it will be in the form of a formal SSAC document. It is not clear whether they're going to do that or not. The GAC has also just submitted consensus levels and is currently actively working on a statement. We haven't seen a draft yet. I'm expecting to see a draft sometime in the next week or so, but at this point, all we have is the consensus levels.

Next slide, please. If you can make that a little bit larger, that might help some people. The document was also sent to the CPWG list last night, so each of you should have a copy in your own inbox. But I will quickly read it out. It's not very long.

"The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to submit this addendum to the statement that—that "it" submitted; there's a typo—on the 29<sup>th</sup> of September—should be 29<sup>th</sup> of August—2020." You can see I did this moderately late at night. "Since that time, the ALAC, along with its EPDP team, has had the opportunity to review and discuss statements submitted by the BC/IPC and the consensus positions submitted by the GAC and SSAC, along with those submitted by other EPDP members. Although the ALAC and the BC, IPC, GAC, and SSAC each took a somewhat different approach to addressing our positions in respect to the report, the ALAC is in general agreement with the positions taken by the SSAC, GAC, GAC, and IPC/BC statements and consensus positions." That third paragraph was the essence of what was discussed last week, and that's the wording that we ended up with.

---

“Dissenting on the outcomes of what has been over a year of extremely difficult debate is not something the ALAC has taken lightly.” Now, this last paragraph was added because there have been some strong comments by a number of parties saying we’re doing this in bad faith. “Dissenting on the outcomes of what has been over a year of extremely difficult debate is not something the ALAC has taken lightly, but proceeding without identifying the issues that we believe are critical to the success of the SSAD plagues a system that will not meet the needs of users of the SSAD with little opportunity to significantly correct these problems going forward. We hope the GNSO and, if applicable, the Board will take this into consideration as this process moves forward.”

I see we have hands from Hadia, who I would appreciate comments from. As I mentioned, I did this late at night. Hadia has not had a chance to see it yet, at least not to comment on it yet, so I think Hadia, and then we have Holly and Olivier. Please go ahead, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Alan. Yes, I did definitely read it before, and I agree with it. So I’m actually not going to comment on the addendum because it is very much in line with what we have always agreed to. But it’s just in relation to the SSAC. As you rightfully said, they have only submitted a consensus level. However, they did say in the e-mail that they would provide a minority statement that will include where each statement falls short of achieving their support, even if the intent was aligned with addressing their concerns, and that the minority statement will also contain concerns about some of the other recommendations that they [can] support, as well as their overall concerns with issues that

---

remained unaddressed that the EPDP was originally chartered to handle. I assume definitely those are the same topics that we have referred to. So, yes, we haven't seen any minority statement yet by the SSAC. However, if there is to be a minority statement, it should also, according to their e-mail, contain these topics that have not been addressed from Phase 1. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Hadia. I guess I misremembered that it said that. Clearly, Paragraph 3 will be reworded as any new statements get issues. Hopefully, there will be new statements issued. So this won't go formally to the ALAC for approval until we actually have seen any statements and can make sure we actually do support them. There's always the potential that we may not support something. But, at this point, the writing on the wall is it's likely that we will support the intent of the next two statements that come.

Holly, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Alan. I do support the statement. Probably following on from Hadia, the SSAC 111, if I remember that number correctly, was really almost scathing in their response to the outcomes. So I would be really surprised if they don't say something fairly strong. I'd wait for their statement if that's at all possible because I expect that they're going to not be very happy at all. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly. My discussions with the GAC are such that their hope is to have a statement in time for other groups to review it and comment if appropriate. So that's certainly their intent. Whether they'll make good on that remains to be seen, but my expectation is we will see the GAC one in time to make comments. And on the SSAC, I can't speak on the timing.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Third paragraph. On the sentence starting with, "Although the ALAC and the BC and the different [SO and] ACs each took a somewhat different approach to addressing our positions," I suggest "their positions," because the others are not [addressing] the ALAC positions. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some people were, but thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. I have read that, as is often the case, other constituencies seem to be reading between the lines and saying, "The ALAC is saying lots of things that the ALAC hasn't specifically said," but there you go. I should say I'm rather disappointed to see this sort of thing being put on a public discussion mailing list, especially when the people [inaudible]. It's very disappointing.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, remember that these are all opinions of the individuals. Let's make sure we have the context right.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It just wasn't very nice. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: No it wasn't. I see no more hands. We may give you a few minutes back, Olivier.

All right. On this statement, I'll obviously clean up the grammar and stuff like that and resend it. At this point, pending comments from ALAC members who may not be on this, we'll say that this statement will be the general form of how we're going to go forward and modify it as other statements come out, and of course modify it significantly if the statements in fact are things we don't agree with. But I'm not really expecting that.

All right. No more hands. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I do have one more question, which is, what happens after that in the process? So this then all goes to the GNSO?

ALAN GREENBERG: This goes to the GNSO. The meeting is, I don't know, the second week or so of September, or maybe a little bit earlier. The GNSO will have to vote on this. I would not be surprised if some group asks for a deferral



---

to go into the next meeting. If they're in a real rush, they may schedule an emergency meeting. Assuming the GNSO approves some or all of this report, then it goes to the Board.

Now, the GNSO has a history. One second. Is Cheryl on the call?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl has sent her apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl is not on the call. Okay. My recollection, certainly in my time as GNSO liaison, I don't think the GNSO ever approved a recommendation that did not have consensus support. There's no rule against it. So, if there is some opposition or, in fact, disagreement—that is, there was not a consensus at all on the recommendation—in the past they have not approved such a recommendation. There's nothing forbidding them from doing it. So the GNSO is going to be in an interesting position at this point. They have been told that all of [their] recommendations related to the SSAD are a group, and one should not be approved without the other. On the other hand, they have divergence in at least one recommendation and close to divergence in several recommendations.

One could also question whether the consensus level deemed to be there by the Acting Chair is correct. We have a number of recommendations where, I think, four groups have disagreed, and five have agreed with it, and they're deemed to be strong support. Strong support's definition is that most of the group supports it. Now, if you

---

simply count group numbers, five out of nine is not most. It's a majority, but it's not most. On the other hand, there are some people within the group who believe that some groups should have more weight than other groups—particularly, the GNSO Stakeholder Group should have more weight than a single constituency within a stakeholder group.

So the level of consensus could be debated. Even if it's not debated, there certainly is not a strong consensus for some of the recommendations. Whether the GNSO will approve any of them with some divergence is not clear. They could go ahead and approve the whole report, regardless of the consensus levels deemed by the Board. The Board obviously would consider whether it would approve it from a different light if the GNSO does that. So that's going forward. Then you could ask, "What happens if this doesn't go forward? What do we do next?" Well, we're left with the status quo. Lots of unknowns.

I see we have more hands. Olivier, I don't know how much time we have. We have Christopher and Hadia and Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Let's just go through these hands, Alan, and then we can move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Christopher?

---

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. Good afternoon. We've just had a rainstorm in Belgium to break the drought. Thank God.

Alan, as you know, I appreciate the work that you've done on this, but I'm struck by the irony that, on the one hand, when we look at the New gTLD Program, the PDP is setting up a spirit of organization which is going to be multi-stakeholder, including SOs and ACs, but the GNSO has the right to disapprove the recommendations of the SPIRIT group.

Now, if we look at what you have just said, does the GNSO have the power and the will to override/to deny the positions of some of their constituents? Because, insofar as the whole process was to make sure that the contracted parties can continue to do business compatible with the GDPR without getting fined, if you can't reach an agreement along the lines that you have recommended, what was the point of the exercise? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Those are all good questions. What the GNSO does is going to be what the GNSO does—GNSO Council we're talking about, not the GNSO proper—and I'm not about to predict that. I will note a supermajority is required to pass a PDP recommendation onto the Board. So the Board has a difficult time refusing it because, if the GNSO recommends it with a supermajority, the Board must reject with a supermajority to reject it.

That being said, there are three stakeholder groups—three-quarters of the GNSO, if you exclude the NomCom appointees—who support the general recommendations, with a few very minor exceptions. Therefore, there are enough votes in the GNSO to accept this report based on their

---

personal positions. However, the GNSO is supposed to be managing the process—the GNSO Council—and not necessarily voting on it based on their positions on the content.

Therefore, that's a question. Will the GNSO Council pass it or not? I don't know. It could go both ways. Precedence says they will not approve something if it doesn't have consensus, but there's no rule about that. We'll see how it goes forward. It's not different than the governments that we appoint in all or most of our countries. We elect governments, and they sometimes take positions that the citizens don't agree with. If there had been a plebiscite, they may fail, but governments are allowed to do that once elected. We have the same situation with both the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board, of course, is overseen by the Empowered Community. Whether the Empowered Community, in all its diversity, would object is a different issue altogether.

Hadia, please?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Alan. I raised my hand, actually, to go back to the point that you mentioned in relation to the consensus levels because this is very important. The consensus level declared by the Chair in relation to some of the recommendations—particularly, I think, [2]—where it said strong support ... And we had five groups not actually supporting the recommendations. So that level of consensus is actually debatable, right? So you have the SSAC, the ALAC, the GAC, the IPC, and the BC, for example, not supporting Recommendation #18 in relation to the

---

mechanism for the involvement of the system. That recommendation particularly is very important and was one of the reasons that all of these groups—the SSAC, the ALAC, the GAC, the IPC, and the BC—agreed to the SSAC model: we thought that there would be a path forward for the system to improve. So even if all the other recommendations are approved, and this one is not, this is crucial. This goes back to the point where it said in the report that the recommendation is one package because it's an operating model. You cannot just take part of it and say that it will remain the same. It won't.

So, again, yes, the consensus level is very important. Also, I don't think it's possible at all to agree to some of the recommendations and leave out one of the crucial ones that were the reason for the agreement of the group to the model.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Hadia. For the record, 18 on evolution was supported by five groups. The SSAC did not disagree on 18. But all of that being said is correct, but it's now up to the GNSO Council to make their judgement call. We know what precedence says. We know what the overall general intent says—that, if a working group doesn't have consensus, the GNSO probably should approve it—but that's a GNSO Council call at this point. Some of us are eagerly awaiting, listening to the debate, and seeing how the proceed. These meetings are being held open, so you can listen to it as it's going on. I certainly will be, presuming no conflict. I hope others will, too.

Olivier, do you still want to get in?

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No thank you, Alan. I've put my hand down.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Then we have no more hands, and I'll turn back to you again.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan and Hadia. Thanks for all your work on this. We look forward to seeing the rest of it when the process continues.

Now, the second part of this agenda item was, of course, the Subsequent Procedures. As I mentioned earlier, Justine Chew is not with us. Does anybody has to raise anything on this, or could it just wait for next week? Hint from me, as perhaps we should just move on and give us a little bit more time on a little bit of a strategic issue, really, [and] an evolution of the working group and our work processes. That's the introduction to the CPWG issue evaluation pipeline trying to be a bit more proactive in things, rather than always being running after every statements and sometimes even running after statements that have little to do with end-user issues. For this, we have Jonathan Zuck, so, Jonathan, the floor is yours.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Thanks, everyone. This is a very early draft proposal because, as Olivier mentioned, one of the aspirations of the CPWG—this has been to get started on issue evaluation and position development sooner/earlier in the processes—has started to take shape in some

---

measure because we're building a course on At-Large volunteer participation in the ICANN policy development process. So what does that look like? What it has been in large measure is waiting until the end [for] a call for public comment or something like that. There's been plenty of exceptions and everything like that. I'm not trying to step on anybody's toes who's had some different experience in the past, so I hope I can preempt all of that. But, generally speaking, how these meetings go is, "Here are the open public comments," and then we're scrambling to identify somebody that's willing to go through and become sufficiently familiar with a topic that they come back to us with talking points on. Even then, we hardly have time for that, so then they come back with a draft, and no one reads the draft because we never really discussed the topics points, and it shuffles on through because of the short timeframe.

So the idea here is to more systematically identify things that are coming up in the pipeline, so to speak, and get engaged as a work group on defining what our positions will be—at least our initial positions—on an issue early on in order to facilitate a coordinated participation in the policy development process from the outset so that, when the time comes to comment on it, for example, we've already been evangelists for our position inside of the working group, we already have people that are spun up, as Alan and Hadia are, on the EPDP, for example, so we're able to have much more intelligent conversations about what we're trying to do in a calmer environment than scrambling to meet the deadline of an open public comment period.

Many of you have seen this funnel before. It's gone through some iterations, etc. The idea is that there is an issue funnel. So there would

---

be an issue presentation, which would be by ICANN staff, potentially, and outside experts, or inside experts. If we have somebody who's an expert in a particular topic, then they would give the presentation. Or it could be just a volunteer who is trying to raise an issue inside the community that they believe that ICANN needs to deal with.

We then asked the question about whether there's a unique end-user perspective. Is there something for us to add to the debate that would otherwise be left out of the discussion, which is the impact on individual end users? Then we asked the question, is it within the ICANN remit? So this is more often the case probably from our homegrown issues than it will from the ones that come to us from inside ICANN. But with each of these questions, the funnel gets smaller.

So the idea is—what we're really trying to do—to hone down the things where we can deliver the most value and the most leverage of the limited volunteers that we have to bring to the table because, unlike the majority of the ICANN community, we are in fact volunteers. We would assign a champion to that issue and then develop a position on the issue. So we have another process that we talked about which is our position development process. That's what we would go into from here. I don't think I have that slide, but I've shown it before. This is just about the issue funnel itself.

Next slide, please. There would be basically an issue overview that somebody would provide. This is meant to be a template for the presentation that someone would give at that point at the point of the pyramid: a summary of the issue, a summary of past positions that were taken by the At-Large, if any, because that, while not constraining us,



---

should help inform us about whether or not we've identified an individual end user perspective in the past and what has that has been, and also likely allies to the At-Large interests. In other words, what else is going on politically in the organization that we should be aware of in regards to that issue?

Next slide. The second slide, if you will, in that presentation will be individual end-user considerations or impact. Then there would be a list of the top considerations that the presenter believes justifies the take-up of this issue by the CPWG.

Next slide. So the whole idea is that the issue status will affect how we operate on the issue. So this is meant to be the stages—again, I welcome any feedback on this, etc., because it's just a very first draft—an issue goes through inside of ICANN policy development. It's a new issue. There's an issue brief that comes out from the staff. There's a policy development process, more stuff generated by the GNSO. But there are some other ways as well. There's a public comment by the PDP working group, then there's the GNSO approval process, then there's a Board-initiated public comment, and then, if it's adopted, there's an implementation advisory committee or some sort of implementation organization that's formed to put the new recommendations in place. So those are the phases that an issue goes through.

What would happen is that, depending on where it was, we would have a slightly different process. We're going to try to make more use of the polling capabilities, as we've been doing incrementally within the Zoom, so that we have documentation of the temperature of the room, if you

---

will, for the CPWG on a particular issue. So the CPWG doesn't in fact have any power. It just advises the ALAC. So these aren't formal votes that are meaningful, but the more that we're able to document them, the more we're able to deliver a clear consensus position in our advice to the ALAC. So we have a discussion and then, after the discussion, we would have a poll on whether to initiate the position development process. So after something had made it to the funnel, we would have a poll for whether or not to initiate the position development process. If the answer is yes, then we identify a champion and we proceed to position development. And if it's no, then we move on. And we can move on early on in the discussion. There are plenty of things we can discuss in ICANN that have only a peripheral or indirect on individual end users, or the interest of individual end users are completely duplicative of every other member of the ICANN community. So our process of just being supportive of the work of others is different than when we're trying to go in hardcore, like we are with Subsequent Procedures and the EPDP, and forge our own path in the policy development process.

Next slide, please. So, if it's a new issue, the questions we ask is, is a staff issue brief necessary? Has the GNSO also considered this issue? If yes, what happened? If no, why not? Then we would do a poll of CPWG on whether to recommend that the ALAC request the staff do an issue brief. That is one of the things that the ALAC is capable of doing: forcing the hand of the organization a little bit and getting the staff to do an issue report on a particular issue. So that would be the very first phase that could come out of an issue that was presented. This would be generally because one of us stood up and said, "Wow, this really needs

---

to be something ICANN is paying better attention to and hasn't been." That's what I mean by "new," if that makes sense.

Next slide. If the current issue status is that there's already been an issue brief or issue report, then we ask the questions of, have end-user issues been raised? Is a PDP likely? If the answer is yet, who should we get to represent us in the PDP? If there's not a PDP, then why isn't there? If end-user issues have been raised, then the poll at that point is, do we form a small team? This is a little bit of an amorphous concept, but it's much like we did for the Subsequent Procedures work, where we tried to create a pool of folks that will follow the issue through its life cycle to the extent possible and not rely on the people that we've identified to represent us on the working group itself.

Again, we haven't formalized this, but we do have a couple of different examples. We have the EPDP, where our two representatives that had to put in all those hours in meetings and calls, etc., also were our primary small team in terms of developing the expertise for that participation [in] the development of what our position should be, etc. It probably makes sense to have a small team that's not quite that small so that there can be some support provided for the folks that we identify as the representatives. And thanks to Alan. I know [it's an issue] report. I think, when I wrote this ... That's why I've been correcting myself as we go along. So we do [uphold]. We form a small team about that issue.

Next slide. PDP formation. We identify a small team of champions. Can we participate? If yes, identify participants. If no, begin composing advice to the working group. Under PDP 3.0, we haven't completely

---

figured it out, but there may be instances in which we're not invited to participate. So we're going to need to find a way to participate anyway, for lack of a better term. So we'd end up working forward in that way.

Next slide. So this issue status, which is the one with which we're most familiar, is the initial call for public comment that is generated by the working group. So questions would ask ourselves in this context is, did we participate in the working group? If the answer is yes, what's the status of our positions? How did they fare within that work? If no, then we need to get an update from someone on the working group or an expert in it in order to bring us up to date as to where things stand within the work group vis-à-vis the positions that we've taken. There'd be a poll: were end-user interests sufficiently protected or represented? "Represented" is such an active verb, but were end-user interests undermined, etc.? We'll come up with the best terminology for this, but we'll make a decision inside the CPWG. If the interests were sufficiently addressed and the answer is yes, we would move on or just draft a support-level comment: "Hey, we agree. This is great work by the working group. Keep doing what you're doing." If no, then we move on to identify drafters to draft our position and our public comment into the public comment process.

Next slide. I don't know whether this is a great status or not. Again, this is a strawman/first draft here. If the issue status is final publication of the report, we would have some kind of an issue update and, again, ask the question, what's the status of our positions? We'd still ask the question, were end-user interests addressed? If yes, we move on or draft some sort of support memo. Otherwise, we identify drafters or arm our GNSO liaison—whatever the process will be at that moment—

---

to give advice to the GNSO/GNSO Council from the At-Large based on our feelings about where this document ended up that's about to be voted on by the GNSO Council—the position we're in right now with SSAD.

Next slide. If the issue status is a Board public comment, again, we ask the questions, were end-user interests addressed? If yes, we move on and draft support. If no, we identify drafters to create advice to the Board. So this is another outlet for us—the one that we're formally created to do, but it's just now one of the ways that we communicate. We identify drafters and we submit suggested advice for the ALAC to submit to the Board.

Next slide, please. Finally, if the issue status is implementation, we ask ourselves the question, after discussion, are individual end-user interests at stake in the implementation itself? I think this is going to be the case in the Subsequent Procedures work more than almost any other, which I, if a lot of things have been pushed to implementation, do we need to participate directly on that implementation effort in order to do our best to represent the interests of individual end users as part of then implementation? So a lot of that has to do with what got resolved in the working group versus what was pushed to the implementation. If there are not individual end user's interests at stake, then we move on. If yes, then we identify participants in the implementation team that we draft to participate.

Next slide. That may be it. Yeah. So I think that's it. So that's the first draft of looking at how an issue pipeline through the CPWG might look and how we might operate at different phases of the project, again, the

---

idea being formalizing our process at different stages and earlier so that we are engaged in developing our positions long before we're being asked to represent those positions, either in writing or personally. It's designed to address a couple of different things. One is just sending people in, unprepared and unsupported, into a working group without having done the work up front to arm them with what our positions are and what the particular individual end user interests are that they ought to be trying to represent in that working group. The other thing it's meant to address is this phenomena of a scrambling at the last minute to both come up with a position and comment on a report that's already been created when people are least interested in getting advice on how to update it. So this would be an issue pipeline to the CPWG.

I'm happy to open it up for discussion on this first draft.

Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I was going to just ask, when it comes down to newcomers and people who are new to policy and want to get involved, how do they fit in this pipeline—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Olivier. Can I be put on the list, please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hello?

---

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Olivier. Can I be put on the list, please?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, yes. Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sebastien wants to be in the queue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, starting again, when it comes down newcomers and so on, does this pipeline help them in being able to get involved more easily and so on? How can we have it this way?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, I think that's a great question. I'll be honest: I haven't even thought about it. But I would suggest, just on the spot here, not having thought about it, that a pipeline like that really facilitates better participation by newcomers because it's not under pressure. In other words, if you've never done anything, and the only option available to you is to be a drafter of a public comment, that feels like pretty high stakes. I think you're less inclined to volunteer to be the one drafting a public comment at the end of an issue lifecycle than you are to be able to participate early on in the discussions about what our positions should be while the stakes are still low. While the position is still in its infancy, so to speak, it's a great time for the participation of—I could

---

carry out that metaphor—newborns. But the point is that I think that this offers a lot of points of entry, if you will, into an issue, and that newcomers and all volunteers could make a choice either based on their available time or their experience or their expertise or their interest level to participate in one or more of those phases of an issue lifecycle.

So I think it would only benefit newcomers to take the pressure of a public comment off and start the process earlier. I hope that answers your question.

Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

It's almost a follow-on from Olivier. We have a whole lot of back catalogue of a lot of webinars on issues. Also, Ariel, if anybody remembers her, did a terrific job in our policy phase. So we have a huge library of statements we've made. So have you thought of maybe spending five or ten minutes on a CPWG call just to say, "This is an issue that we used to worry about"—or it's maybe dormant now—"Here's some resources, and this is what we [said]"? Just because there's so much out there that we've already done and thought about, and it would be a shame not to use it. Just a thought. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Holly. I'd have to wrap my arms around the idea of just presenting that in the abstract. I think it was fully my intention with this draft proposal to avail ourselves of those resources as we evaluate an issue. This came up because we were meant to have a [light] CPWG call,



---

so we had discussions with Evin about actually discussing some things that are on the upcoming public comments page as an opportunity to get engaged in these things earlier. So this was an attempt to take that and run with it and actually look at the different phases that exist. So, every time that we're discussing whether or not to take up an issue, I think by definition we would want to go back and look at whether or not it's an issue that we had spoken to in the past. I'd have to give more thought to whether or not it's worth doing a discussion in the abstract about, "Here's all the positions we've taken," because there's so many of them. But certainly that resource would be the first place we go to understand whether we ought to get engaged in an issue in the first place. I hope that makes sense.

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Two comments.

Number one, at the beginning you talk about the ALAC requesting an issue report; if we see an issue that hasn't been addressed. Just a historical note. We've done that twice, but we did that in 2007/2008. The chances of doing that again are probably not very large just because of the nature of how ICANN has changed over the years.

The second, related to that, however, is, if we were ever to do that again, there's a significant process that would have to be followed, not a formal process but an informal process of talking to other groups, getting by ... It's not a matter of just dropping it on the table because the GNSO Council has to decide whether to do it or not. We don't have

---

a unilateral ability to demand an issue report. So there's a large political and process thing that would have to along with that. But, on top of that, it's not very likely to happen for a whole bunch of reasons. So I would not put a focus on that one. It's something that could happen. It's certainly worthy of a footnote, but I wouldn't set people's expectations that this is some path that we're likely to follow on a regular basis going forward.

The second one is the concept of that we only look at things that are of direct impact to end users. In fact, if you look at how ALAC and its representatives have spent their time over the last few years, on a large number of the things that we focused on—Subsequent Procedures is a good example—the issue itself may not be imminently important to end users, but the credibility of ICANN and ensuring that ICANN does something that doesn't destroy it and doesn't hurt its image is of great important. The whole accountability process was one that we participated in very heavily for that kind of reason in that At-Large and users have a seat within ICANN. We don't have a seat in the ITU. Making sure that ICANN is respected and is an organization that can function within the global Internet governance realm is really important to us. So it's important to look at it not just as “Is there a user impact on the particular item?” but as “Is this important to users in a global sense?” Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. That's probably something to talk about further and expand that discussion and really try to come up with some criteria. I think, at the same time, there are plenty of issues that we have

---

commented on in the past where we didn't specifically add value to the standpoint of providing an end user perspective. In other words, we're not attorneys, so the idea isn't, "Hey, we have smart people, too. Let's get those smart people also engaged in this conversation that is going on in the community." I think our power as an organization stems from us bringing a perspective to the issue as opposed to just being two more smart people to throw into the mix to discuss an issue.

So, yes, there's going to be issues where we're going to say, "This is just too important not to participate in because the future of ICANN is at stake," etc. There's no question that's the case. To some extent, some of that may come out of the Finance and Budget Working Group that we've now formed as well that's involved more with things like the At-Large relationship with the organization. I think, for example, the decision to get engaged in the accountability discussion would probably today not come out of the CPWG but would come out of the OFBWG. It probably wouldn't come out of the CPWG—so part of the [inaudible] of the distinction between those two groups.

But the other is I think that, with our limited volunteers, etc., and limited bandwidth, we ought to choose our battles, when we have a perspective to bring that would otherwise not be brought to the discussion. So that should be the rule. There can be exceptions, but I guess I'm suggesting, at least—I'm not trying to impose my will—that we have a filter that says, "Do we have a unique perspective to bring to this discussion?" That's what that question is about.

But thanks, Alan. I think we should discuss it further for sure.

---

Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you. Thank you, Alan, for clarifying the issue report thing because I've been around for a few years, maybe five, and I've never seen one and I was wondering what that was. Now I realize that it's a rarity and not something that you do on an ad hoc basis. So, yeah, that's interesting.

But, that being said, maybe there's a less formal issue report thing that could be produced just by our own staff reporting things or clarifying. I don't know whether we can use a little more of our backend power to help people get their head around some of these issues because they're very, very complex. So maybe there's something there that we could do. It's a great plan, but we need a lot of boots on the ground to really pull that plan through. And there would have to be a lot of experienced boots on the ground. So I think we do pretty well, but, yeah, that's something that can concerns me: whether or not we're able to implement at such an ideal level the kind of route that you're proposing.

The other thing I wanted to bring up was the issue about representation in working groups. Now, unless you're formally a liaison, when you're in a working group like SubPro you're basically not actually representing anyone. You're there on your own, though you will have identified with a particular group. I took a look at this one [in] Work Track 5 because I was puzzled about who was there. I looked at all the people who were in that work track and registered for the group to see who they were

---

affiliated with. There were quite a few people affiliated with At-Large, but very few of the people actually became part of the discussion process. So that's another thing that needs to be clarified because the way you described sounded like, if you're on that group, you're representing At-Large, and that doesn't seem to be the case. That's it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Marita. There was a lot there. On your first question about whether or not all the boots [will be] on the ground that'll be necessary to be implement this route, I think that's a valid point. But, at the same time, I think, if we get engaged earlier in thinking about things, then each stage will be less burdensome than it currently is.

On the issue of participation of working groups, I think, again, it's my non-subtle aspiration that, in fact, the At-Large participants [and] working groups are representing, to the extent possible, consensus positions of the At-Large in doing their work inside the working group.

So, if we look at the process we just went through with the EPDP, we had conversation with Alan and Hadia at the outset in terms of, what are the interests individual end users, and are they in this case potentially in conflict with the interests of registrant end users? And where should we come on there? Are the interest of registrant end users sufficiently represented by the NCSG and perhaps accidentally by the contracted parties? This is really the voice that needs to be heard. Inside of the EPDP, so we should move forward, representing these things. We then heard status reports from our representative onto that

---

working group about how it was going and where end user interests were coming up and how they were being addressed and what the challenges were and “Here’s how we think we’ll try to tackle this or what we’ll try to propose within the working group. What do you guys think about that?” That kind of iterative process, I think, is an important and powerful one. The idea is not just to throw individuals around the organization because, again, everyone else in that working group is there to represent a specific interest. The people that are there from the Intellectual Property Constituency are there to represent the Intellectual Property Constituency. Make no mistake about it. The Business Constituency, the contracted parties, etc. ... The other people in that work group are not there to give their personal opinion. They are in fact there to represent very specific interests. I think it behooves, where possible, to treat this in a similar way. So it’s not always the case, but I would suggest, Marita, that that’s a problem, that’s a challenge, that we want to address.

Alan requested to jump in the queue. Christopher, I hope that’s okay. I’m going to let him because he’s got to get off the call. But you haven’t been forgotten. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. A number of brief comments. In terms of the issue report, there are lots of issue reports. Every PDP has an issue report. I was talking about issue reports requested by the ALAC, which is where there is rarity.

---

In terms of how many issues which will come up which are important to ALAC but not necessarily of direct interest to end users, I think you'll find that the majority of things we spend lots of time on in fact fall into that category. So be careful not to minimize it. This is a complex world we live in, and trying to simplify it too much is [not] fine. Now, you and I may understand the subtleties, but we have to be careful not to present too simplistic a picture to people coming in because then we end up not following our own words. So just a little bit of caution going forward. Thank you. And I'm sorry I have to leave now.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. Yeah, this is just the start of the conversation because we had some time on the call and we were hoping to jump in some issues early. So it's an attempt to put together a strawman for doing that.

Christopher, we've saved the best for last. Go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:

Thank you for that oblique compliment. Thank you, Jonathan. Look, if we had had this excellent proposal for the procedure and process of At-Large work three to four years ago, notably regarding privacy and geographical names, we would not be in the present circumstance. So I support it but from experience where this has become increasingly difficult to establish the user interests and indeed the ALAC voice in ICANN because it's been too little, too late.

---

That being said, and as a student of the English language, I do not agree that the At-Large approach to SubPro has been a scramble. But that's just a footnote.

Looking to the future, I would focus on two heterodox-but-I-think-important issues for individual users. The first is the current trend towards basically hat has been described in the press as splitting the Internet on the basis of political incompatibility, notably between the United States and China, about social media. If this gets worse, at some point somebody is going to be proposing splitting the root. I think we should be extremely sensitive to the risks of that from the point of view of individual users of the Internet globally.

Another issue which occurs to me frequently is: are the user interests associated with the mobile Internet in countries—for the sake example, “large” countries in Africa that I am quite familiar with—where there's no other infrastructure to the Internet but the mobile phone system? We need to find people, members of At-Large, who are prepared to devote some time to monitoring how this particular sector—it's large and growing—of the Internet affects individual users.

But I would also, in relation to some of the discussion that we've just had, mention that there's some boundary conditions here. One is the classic implementation of competition policy as usually understood in Europe and indeed in the United States. We should be making it very clear that the only boundary, the only bulwark, that GNSO has against being declared an international cartel is participation of At-Large. That's why we're there. Multi-stakeholderism is being grossly biased towards what I've described as the incumbents. In the SubPro, there have been a



---

raft of issues where it has been incumbent issue interests which have prevailed against the interests of newcomers. We are the guarantor—I think Alan said the same in effect just now—of ICANN’s credibility as a steward of fair international competition and user interests in the Internet domain name system, and we should not treat that lightly. That’s our main purpose. Otherwise, the multi-stakeholder project will become not credible. Sooner or later, there will be a problem because, over and over again, we have seen—this comes back to the GNSO idea of their view of consensus—counting heads. This is the same as Marita’s comment about boots on the ground. As long as [new] heads are being counted to the point that, over and over again, you are told there’s a consensus against what you’re suggesting—I’m very interested to see how we manage when the brilliant work that Justine and her colleagues have been producing. When that hits the GNSO, somebody will just say, “That’s very interesting, but there’s a consensus against that. By the way,[the] At-Large co-lead has been complicit.” Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Christopher. Again, a lot to unpack there. I’m glad you agree with the process [in] principle. I didn’t mean to demean anybody’s work on any work group thus far. I was just saying that, generally speaking, we tend to tackle issues when a first public comment comes out and we want to engage earlier. I think Subsequent Procedures is another good example of how we’re operating as we’ve gotten reports from Work Track 5 as it was going along, etc., and all these reports from Christine. So—

---

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: [inaudible] examples of [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly. So, again, everybody has got to just take a breath and not take personally anything that I'm saying. I'm trying to propose a structure for us to have an issue pipeline and develop positions in advance, as you suggest, so that we wouldn't be in the position that we find ourselves in sometimes as well today.

Sebastien, you've been waiting patiently. Thank you very much. I wanted to give you the floor if you're still on the phone.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Unfortunately, I was [riding.] Therefore, I don't see your presentation.

I have a few items to raise. The first one is that, no, we don't start work when the report was published by a working group because very often we—when I say “we,” it's At-Large or ALAC—have participants in those working groups. The question is how what we do what was done for the EPDP discussion when it's going on.

The second point is that, even if I was very happy with both Alan and Hadia doing both work to be members of the EPDP and to be the ones writing the point of view of At-Large, I think we need, for a question of diversity, new eyes. We need to find a way to have other people writing for At-Large's point of view—a comment on whatever, a document we want to publish—and not the one member of the group. It's what I tried

---

to do for ATRT3. I helped, but I was not the writer. I was not the penholder. I think it's important.

The third point is that we need to take into account that we are supposed to help the organization of end users within ICANN to take positions. I don't think we need to have this working group taking a point of view on only ALAC taking a point of view. Yes, at the end it's ALAC that will vote. But what would be important is to be sure that we are the voice from end users, both from ALSes/individuals, and taking into account the RALO. I would add to your point that maybe the way to work for this group is to help the RALO to be more efficient in taking a position. I am not sure that we will always be in agreement in all the regions on every topic.

The last point—I have many others—is that we need to be very careful about the way we want to interact with others and how we want to work within At-Large. If we do something in the CPWG, I hope the same type of work will be done with the OBF Working Group because it's, for the moment, is the same type of topics we are doing in the same place, but now we have two places to do it. But, if we want to be careful for us to understand how we work, it must be the same type of thing. Really, take into account the fact that we are on the top of the [pyramid]. All we are is at the end of the bottom-up system. Also, take into account the fact that, sometimes, we need to react just because it's a multi-stakeholder organization and not just because we are the voice of the end users. We may be wishing to support others because, if we don't support them, there will be no way for them to go ahead. It will be a shame for the multi-stakeholder system.

---

I'll stop here. Sorry, but I think it's an important topic we need to have time to discuss again. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sebastien. Again, this is meant to be to provide some structure and an impetus, if you will, for us to get engaged earlier to specifically designate work group participants that are there to represent the At-Large as opposed to individuals that are representing their own perspective. There's nothing in this that would prevent individuals from participating in the group they wanted to. They just wouldn't be doing so on behalf of At-Large. There's nothing that would prevent RALOs from designating participants in working groups. They just wouldn't be doing so on behalf of all of At-Large. They'd be doing so on behalf of that RALO. So—

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

That's where we disagree completely.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

None of this is going to prevent anyone from participating In anything. Instead, it's about making sure that they do participate and that, where the interest individual end users are particularly acute, we have a rigorous process to develop a position and to help and support our representatives of that work group to evangelize that position as the issue progresses through the pipeline.

---

I hope that makes sense. We will continue to develop this. I'll try to incorporate some of the suggestions that have come along, but for now, thanks for the discussion. I will turn it back over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If I haven't put you to sleep, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You have not, but it looks as though somebody has put Adigo on. Is anybody on the Adigo line currently being able to [inaudible]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, maybe, instead of passing it Olivier, I will pass it to Evin to give the introduction to the policy comment updates. Evin, over to you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Jonathan. I just shared in the chat a link to the ICANN upcoming public comment proceedings page. As Jonathan and Olivier noted, we have a slightly different format. For this week, it was a good opportunity to try it out since there are currently no open public comment proceedings and no current ALAC statements being developed beyond what Alan and Hadia have just presented regarding EPDP.

---

By the way, I note Olivier is saying that the Adigo line was muted, but maybe, if we get him back on, he can say a few words.

But in the meantime, I'll just introduce this new section on our agenda with a note that these topics and dates presented are informed predictions of when certain proceedings are expected to be open. But they shouldn't be relied upon as specific date/announcements. This is just a general idea of what ICANN has in the pipeline for public comment proceedings.

Looking ahead, you can see the different tabs for each month. Currently in August, we're already about halfway through. There are six public comments that are on the table that could open. For September, there are three. If you click on September, you'll see those three. October: one. November: one. December: two. So those are the current topics in the pipeline. So we have a total of about 13 carrying us through the end of this year, including over the AGM coming up, so it might be most efficient to focus on the current and maybe the next months. There are nine at this stage.

So we can just present these topics here, discuss whether or not ... Holly has suggested earlier bringing a previous ALAC statement on certain topics. Also, we can see if these public comments are related to either policy, the CPWG, or the Operations Finance and Budget Working Group for more process-oriented public comments. So we can either prepare notes about these presentations. We can even have staff members maybe provide a few comments on them. The idea is to get ahead of the public comments proceeding and start to develop the end user perspective on these topics.

---

With that, I don't know, Jonathan, if we maybe we should just go through each of these broadly, if I should just read them off, or if maybe we have a different presentation for next week on showing whether or not ALAC has commented on these topics before. Not sure how you want to proceed with going over these, but—

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evin. I think my preference, because they are in the future, is to get into our process sooner rather than later. So I think, ideally with each of these, there'd be a short discussion that says, "These are the things we've commented on before. These are what might be the end user interests that are engaged," and make that the introduction to the topics. Obviously, the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures final draft recommendations is something that we're already on top of.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

But something like retirement of ccTLDs could have a critical impact on end users, etc. So we should just try to look at what we said in the past and then have a discussion about each from an informed standpoint. I think it would be the best way to proceed. But I appreciate you compiling these and bringing them into the agenda. I think it's a great first step in getting this pipeline going. But, if we can, let's go over them next week with the information in hand about each, if we could.

---

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. That sounds of great. Of course, the information is there, so if the participants on this call or in this working group are already interested in the topic or have comments, of course they're welcome to share as well. Thanks. Back over to you, Jonathan or Olivier, if he's unmuted now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It was important to Olivier to point out that it wasn't just him that was muted. It wasn't a personal attack on him, but instead all of Adigo was muted. So hopefully we've cleared that up.

Olivier, I turn the microphone back to you, which is hopefully operational.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I hope I can be heard. I have started the inquiries. We will find the culprit. That being said, until we find them, whoever did it must fear the future. No, we're just going to Any Other Business now.

I'm not seeing any hands up. Before we close, I just wanted to remind you of a number of features that we have on our agenda. First, there's all these resources at the bottom of the agenda. The Subsequent Procedures scorecards. Often people say, "Where do I find those?" Well, look, you've got links to each and everyone one of them down there. So, if after this call you've got a bit of time, then, yeah, keep on reading. It's got a lot of information there.



---

Also, at the beginning of the agenda, all the way up, you've got At-Large policy resources. That's got links to all of the different policy resources, including the multi-stakeholder advice development graphic, how it all works and things, and there's also the Expedited PDP resources up there.

So this agenda contains a wealth of information to send you to the different component parts that we're currently on, the different topics that we're working on. Of course, the agenda is available in English, Spanish, and French.

Having wasted a little bit of time, we still have plenty of time until the end of this call, but maybe we could save it on this occasion. Therefore, we could—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, I see, Jonathan, you've put your hand up. Great. Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I did. Rather than let everybody go early—I'm just not that kind of work group leader—I wanted to go ahead and just in freeform mention that the ICANN69 planning committee has begun its work. Part of that work is to determine what sessions that we want to have at ICANN69, both in terms of making recommendations for plenary sessions. Those recommendations are due tomorrow, so, if you have an idea for a

---

plenary session that you'd like to see—in other words, something that's basically organized by ICANN and involved folks from around the community—then speak up very quickly or e-mail me directly very quickly what that idea is.

But we have a little more time to consider issues that we might want to have ... I guess I can think of a couple of different types of meetings. One is some of the things we've done where they're policy discussions that we're initiating but they're intended for community participation and consumptions, like the DNS abuse sessions, where we brought people from around the community to be on a panel and we had a discussion. But the other kinds of meetings that we could have would be because we want to have a discussion ourselves. For example, the last time we had a face-to-face meeting, we had a discussion about geo-names, for example, and tried to brainstorm on what our positions might be.

So those are things are coming up, and I wanted, even if you're not on the ICANN69 planning committee call, alert you to the fact that those conversations are happening right now, even though these meetings aren't until October. So, if you have an idea, if you want to raise it quickly here, you may, but otherwise shoot me an idea either for a plenary or for an At-Large community session or an At-Large internal session that we might want to have during ICANN69. So that was my Any Other Business that I thought I'd raise here. I'm happy to take comments or suggestions right now, but otherwise send me a quick note if you have an idea. Thanks.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. Are there any questions or comments?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I can.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please, go ahead, Sebastien. You have the floor. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's seems that we were—you and me and others—not able to speak earlier. I just wanted to express, on the conclusion made by Jonathan on the previous point, my disagreement, to be short. We need to have this discussion. I am not sure that the way you, Jonathan[said—present] At-Large, ALAC, and the RALOs[—] is the right one. I used to be a different place in this organization, and I really feel that where we need to go is how we improve the participation of the RALO and not the reverse. Therefore, I hope that we will have time to discuss the issue on how we want to organize the work because I think RALOs must be at the core and not at the [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Sebastien. I'm sure there'll be opportunities to follow up on that in the next calls.

Amrita Choudhury?

---

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you. I just had a suggestion regarding Jonathan's comment on having [proper] sessions for the next ICANN meeting. While there would be policy discussions, I guess, to have more engagement between the RALOs, there could be a session [inaudible] as in one particular individual from each RALO, not from the leadership, who have participated in some ICANN policy discussion or policy forum or done something related to ICANN showcase and then there'll be a discussion. It could be more of an open-house discussion wherein one from each region presents something, which we have done. This could perhaps help to motivate others also to participate rather than have the same suspects commenting and doing a greeting because the idea is also to enhance engagements. These are just rough eyes. However, if it interests the community, it would be perhaps worked on.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Amrita. I think that's a terrific idea. This is not the policy forum, so we don't need to be as focused on policy issues per se.

Another thing that we want to try to do at the next ICANN meeting is have more participation generally because we have such great turnouts but these people end up being passive. So we need to make a distinction between a webinar versus a national meeting. So we have intentions to try and do breakouts, using the breakout room feature of Zoom, during ICANN69 as well. So that's another thing to think about in terms of recommendations for meetings that we might want to have during ICANN: that we can make use of the breakout feature for brainstorming and things like that as well. I'll try to carry your recommendation for a session. Somebody needs to mute their line

---

because I'm listening to them type. I'll carry your recommendation to the ICANN69 planning committee. Thank for it, Amrita.

All right. Now, back to you, Olivier. I'm done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jonathan. With no further hands up, there's no further business. Therefore, it's time to find out when will our next meeting take place.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thanks so much, Olivier. Looking at next week, our call will be on Wednesday, the 19<sup>th</sup> of August, at 19:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Yesim. Is there any obvious clash? I believe there isn't. I can't see anything on the calendar at the moment. So 19:00 UTC next week.

Thank very much to our captioner, to the interpreters, and of course to our wonderful staff who have managed to run yet another smooth meeting. Thanks of course to everyone who has taken part on this call. For those of you who are taking holidays, have a great time. For those of you that are working, have a great time, too. Until then, see you next week. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night. Goodbye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**