CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the OFB Working Group Recommendation Prioritization Sub-Group Call of Wednesday the 31st of March 2021 at 15:00 UTC.
	On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonathan Zuck, and Sébastien Bachollet. From staff we have Heidi Ulrich and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.
	Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state your name when taking the floor for the transcription purposes. Thank you very much.
	And with this, I hand the call over to you, Cheryl.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Thank you very much, Claudia. A small but important group today. And we'll be doing a rinse and repeat on the continuation of the CCTRT Recommendation Prioritization. And thanks very much for Jonathan and Sébastien being here.
	We've got some apologies, of course, including from some of our regulars. But I'm sure we'll be able to continue with work that they can then review in the comfort of their own availability.
	So with that, let's have a quick look now at the action items for the previous meetings which I believe will be not terribly numerous to look at. So, there's one here that says, Jonathan and then Cheryl, to lines 18 and 19 to the upper section of the sheet. I think that's actually more of a

reminder of where we're starting and less of an action item, so let's dive back into the … We can tick that off assuming we have started, and we'll continue on. So, that can get ticked off now.

And we can dive in at the line 18 which I think is where we left off. I think there's a [inaudible] [moment] to put there as well at the end of this call.

So, Jonathan, the floor is yours.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. We just need to find our way back to the CCTRT.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: CCTRT?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please tab across, darling. Yes. You're in Work Stream 2. That's why it's confusing. Claudia, just take the next tab. CCTRT tab.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's the one.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [And now to 18.] Yay, perfection. It's 28 by the look of it. Okay, so we're not quite sure why 18 and 19 were pulled out. You might need to think about that, Jonathan. Anyway, let's get on with this part of the job.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, so what's next? Where do we think we are? Medium priority … So, we went through the pricing things last time, I guess—right—and made them a low priority. Yeah. So, I guess we're at 28. Is that right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Seems to be where we highlighted, yes. It just makes it confusing because I now don't understand what that action item was on either of us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Me either. I guess we could look at 18 and 19 to see what they are. Maybe if we saw them again, that might give us some clarity if it's worth popping up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And [it] doesn't help at all.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh. Well, was this because we had the session coming up on applicant support?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It may have been. Can we just scroll a little bit across so we can see the comments? Thank you. Okay. We've had that. All right. Let's revisit this. I know Sébastien was also in that session. Did we hear anything in the applicant support discussion?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It was a very difficult session. Despite my best efforts, it was difficult to keep people's eyes forward. People really, really want to revisit the 2012, and immediately started proposing what they consider to be improvements to the program rather than setting objectives for the program.

But we did ask a question toward the end about an either/or scenario as far as whether people would prefer a few successful applicants or a more successful sort of widespread, measurable outreach program. And the overwhelming response seemed to be for successful applicants.

So, in that sense there's … Given the informal polling … But I suspect that would be reflected in the community generally that it would argue for a much more targeted or sectoral outreach program. I don't know how to map that to these priority…

I don't know how to map that. I think it's a high priority. I think we set 18 to high and that it's [still] something active that needs to happen. It's a high priority for the ALAC, and it's something we need to do before we can design the program.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If we leave it set as is, it's not actually talking to the feedback we go on that localization and specificity of targeting. But I'm not sure that that's a problem because if it sufficiently highly prioritized and it does get more wholesale ICANN-wide support, then we will have the opportunity to bring those points in. So, I guess I'm comfortable enough leaving them at that high level. And I don't mind whether it's medium and high or high-high. I guess the only argument for the medium would be that it's not just the Global South that we would necessarily be focused on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. The terminology change to "underserved regions," I think, at this point. Right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, it's "underserved communities" as well, so you can be in a developed country but be in a niche area of interest which just doesn't have the resourcing and background [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I don't know how best to handle this. I mean, I'm perfectly happy seeing 18 edited with that update. It's one of those terms for which people all have different definitions. I'm not sure that the CCTRT was focused on the Global South as much as just trying to find a way to suggest what the priorities were. I'm happy to have that updated.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: How about rather than play with the recommendations which are as they're writ, how about we annotate in the columns we've got control over to say, "Noting the specific recommendations out of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group on this issue …"?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And that way we can pick up on that specificity that we were talking about, not just Global South but others.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, we're putting that in Column F at this point?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I think so. That might work. And then for the Revisit Applicant Support Program in 19, if we …

Sébastien, here I really value your input. Should we be mentioning "Subject to availability of various resources, this has high support"? Or, "It has high support, noting there may be limitations in various resources"?

I think you made the point, Sébastien, because it having been in the Finance and Budget Sub-committee at the Board at the time, it was kind of piloted with, "Here's an amount of cash. Don't spend more than

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: that." And we're not sure what the basis may be in the future. Have I done justice to that, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I think so, Cheryl. Yeah, definitely.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. And welcome, Alan. All right. Let's leave it to that, just noting the resources—that revisiting is a high priority, but they're subject to the relevant resources. Not just money. It's also, as Jonathan pointed out in the presentation, it is the access to the non-financial aspects of ICANN support that are also vital to a successful set of outcomes, if we ever have some way of measuring them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And might include support beyond the application process, too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Maybe we can add to the relevant resources that, yes, it's for the applicant support by decrease of the cost of the application for ICANN, but it's also pro bono possible support, and it's also, after allocation of the TLD, possible decrease of the cost. That's the three elements, I think. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good point. We might as well annotate them there. I think that's good. And if you need to … If you'd be so kind, Sébastien, if you could just, for the ease of staff, just type that into chat so that they can just copy and paste into that cell because you [inaudible].

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Can I do it directly on the [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Of course you can if you're in the document. Oh, yes. I see you are. You are in the document. Go for it, my friend. That's fine.

All right. Welcome, Judith. And let's move down to 28 now. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. So, I feel like the CCTRT wasn't able to really draw any particular conclusions about parked domains. The percentage of them seem to be fairly comparable to that in the legacy domains. And understanding parked domains, we did a study on them, but making a value judgment one way or the other on parked domains proved fairly difficult. So, I don't know. I think, as an activity, this might end up being a little priority for the ALAC even though I put medium.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've got to say from my personal point of view, I think low with a high difficulty might be the way forward. Does anyone else have any objections to us dropping that to low?

ALAN GREENBERG: The only comment I have is [that] it's the kind of thing that if someone comes up with methodology to not necessarily definitively identify why something is parked, but to better put things into groups, that could be really useful information. So, I'm reluctant to say low priority because it is something that's important if we can figure out how to do it better than we are right now. I'm not quite sure how to say that. I'm trying to capture what Jonathan said—that it was [inaudible] important, but we couldn't figure out how to do it yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I guess I'm going to push back and say if everything gets to be high priority, then the prioritization exercise is moot because everyone says everything's important and nothing gets culled.

ALAN GREENBERG: No one said it was high. I'm just saying not saying [not low.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: It could be medium. I guess, the issue is that there's just so much tied up in the whole secondary markets question. There's been some more recent study on a couple of studies that we've seen circulated, but it's definitely not an N/A. Right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, no.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I guess we're prioritizing it based on our ability and our perception of our ability for the community to grapple with it, I think. As opposed to how much we care about it because, in theory, we do care. Especially if parked domains are a high source of abuse, for example. We just haven't been able to wrap our arms around it successfully yet.

So, I don't know. It could stay medium. I agree that it can't be high because I think we don't know what we're asking for yet.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Judith, do you want to weigh in here?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, I didn't know what the … I think I agree with … The issue of the parked domains is that we won't know … There are a lot of domains that are parked, and it just … I think it's hard to know what's going to happen with them. I think that's what the issue is, that we won't know what's going to happen with parked domains because there's so …

There are like hundreds and hundreds of them that are parked on one site, and what do we … You know, it's hard to know when they're going to be active. They could be active, but I don't know what the …

So, I wouldn't say it's a high. I mean, I would say low. I also would say low because I don't know what … It's going to be a very high level of difficulty to get information for these. I don't know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks for that because my natural inclination is towards low over medium, but Alan was suggesting that maybe it should be sitting in the medium still. And Judith, to me … It's almost a bit like splitting hairs here, so I'm not going to die in a ditch one way or the other.

I actually think because of the degree of difficulty, it's not going to get to get to be a high priority in competition with all the other things. It will be an important priority when it gets around to be gotten to. Do you know what I mean? It's not as if it's going to disappear as an issue, but as you said, Jonathan, there are studies still being done. There is work continuing on. I just don't think we're ready yet. Does that make sense? And does making it medium mean we're likely to get more ready?

Alan? Unmute, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I muted myself instead of unmuting. I'm not going to die in a ditch over this one either. I just think that some sort of comment is there saying the priority we're setting is linked to the difficulty. And if we can come up with methodology, then it could become much more

important. And I don't know how to phrase that within our constraints, so I'll leave it to you. But I just think the two are linked more than it's implied by the two separate what could be orthogonal ratings.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I see what you're concerned about. So, Jonathan, I'm going to let …I think you're the one to make the call on this. Low or medium, flip a coin. Just [take a spot].

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess the fact that the CCTRT was focused on the impact of the New gTLD Program, as opposed to the legacy, and that the percentages didn't change significantly would suggest that this is a problem that falls outside of the CCTRT remit in some respects. Right? And so, I guess that inclines me toward low.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, sold. Right. Moving on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I took a quick look at Sébastien's 19F. I think it looks good. I think that there might still be ongoing conversations about after-application support beyond just costs. And I don't know what that means. It might be in the form of auction proceeds expenditures or something like that where we're actually trying to help get an applicant up and running.

There was talk of a foundation and things like that. [So, it's] the only thing I would try to ... We can drop one of the [S's] from resources, but then besides that, it's not just recurring ICANN …

It's not a cost discount as much as it is potentially startup costs or infrastructure costs or something like that. I don't know what will end up looking like.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, Jonathan, I think that's a really … It's a really important point, and we know the applicant support is a big-ticket item from the At-Large perspective.

So, can we do an AI to take that cell, that 19F, and can you just have a little work with that and maybe modify it just slightly just to add to what Sébastien said picking up on what you just outlined?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Sure, Cheryl, I can do that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, great. Which means we're back to —

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. I think it's basically there, though.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, yeah. Just a tweak. So 29.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, yeah, there was a number of suggestions around surveys. I think surveys continue to be a high priority for the At-Large with or without the recommendations from the CCT. Even the Contracted Party House, when they're trolling our sessions during ICANN meetings suggest that we should be doing more to understand the impulses and needs of end users. And we actually submitted an AVR related to a survey.

So, I suggest we continue to leave these as high priorities because I think that should be one of the things the At-Large is doing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I like data-driven decisions, so you'll always get support for properly designed and meaningful surveys from me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Note that terminology of "properly designed and meaningful." Why high cost, though?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, because doing an end user survey that's global is expensive.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ah, yes, but it doesn't state "global" anywhere in either the recommendation … It could be sectoral. It could be much less cost. So, I guess the only thing I queried there was why the high cost. Why could it not be manageable costs?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess so. I mean, I think cost is probably the fundamental barrier that we face as a community to doing these surveys with any greater frequency. I feel like we … We spent a half a million bucks doing this pair of surveys that we did for the CCTRT, for example. So, that just feels expensive and that will, in fact, be what …

Heidi asked the level of difficulty. I don't think the difficulty's particularly high if we have the resources to do it. I think there's a process to go through and that we need the help. We put this out in the AVR which was about getting help from survey professionals in even designing the survey that we put out there. But the fact is, we don't want a self-selected survey because this isn't about doing a Survey Monkey. This is about people who are pros going out and doing random surveys.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, in that case, let's say that the cost, if we respond to the level of difficulty … It should be low difficulty if utilizing professional survey expertise. And note there may be and associated high cost with such. And that way, it makes sense of [why a high cost is said].

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not editing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not either. Do you want me in the document? Is that the easiest way without making an AI?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Whatever works.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Heidi or Sébastien, can you throw a link to the document into the chat? Yeah, sorry. Go ahead, Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Jonathan, I'm editing. I don't know why you're not … You should be able to see it if you … Claudia, could you scroll to Column F? Not sure why you're not seeing …

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's probably the screen share. If you do a …

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you're editing, that's fine, Heidi. We just didn't want to not capture things. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: What cell are you in, Heidi?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Should be 28F, I guess.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Should be.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. I'm in line 29E, but I can move it to F.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It can be E or F, actually because the low difficulty needs to be in E. All right, Heidi, if you're capturing, that's the important part. That's [fine].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can move on as long as we know that someone's grabbing this information. Thank you very much for that, Heidi. I appreciate it.

Okay. And obviously still high because it is—or should it be medium? let's open that up for a brief—does anyone want to argue it down to medium? Just because [it's metrics passions doesn't mean we'll all agree.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: And it's probably the same comment, Heidi, for the 29 through 31 as well.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: All right. Let's just copy and paste those down to 31 and start now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. This is Column F now. Right?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Heidi. I think that's just because that's where we've been putting the explanation of our [hard] choices.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Once we've gone through this, we'll have to go in and just double check because we haven't captured everything in E all the way through. But we should get what is missing in E out of what is written in F when that's the case. If that makes sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we have explanations in F, can I put one in for the parked data one?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Of course, you can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Go for it, man.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, JZ, 32.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. So, I think that is something we've continued to suggest, and I put high difficulty simply because there's always pushback on recommendations that involve contract modifications because it requires two parties agree to that modification. But it has been done. I think, with sufficient community pressure, it can be done again. So, I

don't know whether it should really be done as high difficulty. Maybe it's medium difficulty.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Moderate.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. My personal feeling is more in that medium to moderate.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's about willingness to do it, I think.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just bring some screws.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Mm-hmm. Oh, sorry. It's still a high priority. It's just a medium difficulty over there in Column E.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, that would be E. Where it says "high difficulty," it's medium priority, medium difficulty. Okay.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: 33, I think, continues to be a high priority and should probably just be, again, change to medium difficulty so we're not seething too much about the difficulty-ness of this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And could the same be said for 34 as well, then?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It could.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. "WHOIS Review Team to determine"? [There we go.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I don't know if that's ... does that become an N/A at this point?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would have thought so. Alan, do you want to weigh in on that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I feel that's probably been taken up by others.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I would have thought so. Yes. Why are we giving it to the order of the British Empire, though? I didn't understand what …

And it's not medium. It's not applicable. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And Cheryl, what was the priority and difficulty?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's been done by the RDS. It's been done.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I feel like it's … More happening as part of the EPDP process than anything else. Right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Say that again. I'm not …

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's been done. It says, "In order to review the upcoming WHOIS Review Team"—what you ran, Alan—"is to determine whether additional steps are needed to be …" Blah, blah, blah. And then events have overtaken it, and it's work being done.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess, Alan, the question is, is it still something the At-Large needs to be pressing through the prism of the CCTRT recommendations? Or has the nature of this question changed?

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It shifted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the WHOIS Review Team that I ran said it was really important. The Board has chosen to ignore that so far. I don't—in the EPDP, we are continuing to press that it's exceedingly important, so if you're saying someone else is saying it's important so the CCT doesn't have to, that's fine. At-Large is certainly, at this point, still pressing very heavily for it. Whether we do it through CCT Review Team, or the WHOIS Review Team which is semi-dead, or through EPDP, I don't really think matters. But maybe we need to be consistent.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I don't know the answer to that either. And perhaps Cheryl and Sébastien can kind of speak to how this exercise fits into the overall prioritization because it will oftentimes … Because it's the same thing with SSR2, with the overlap and stuff like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's been overtaken by other ongoing activities, so if we're going to say anything in E, it will be "being overtaken or undertaken by other ongoing activities."

EN

ALAN GREENBERG:	I can accept "undertaken". "Overtaken," I wouldn't. But "undertaken" I can accept.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay. Well, let's make that the note, then.

ALAN GREENBERG:	It's been reiterated by other activities.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:	If I may. I think what is important is if we can point to where it is, like that we can join the two and say if it's taken by another group, then if we can say it's A, B, C alpha, beta, gamma of this group will be easier for everybody to work on. But if we can't just say that it's undertaken/overtaken/taken by another group.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Well, it's certainly still in an unanswered RDS Review Team recommendation, and it is an item on the GNSO to look at it in some future activity, if I remember correctly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	So, let's say that we just note that.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. And it's a subject that is still being discussed even though it's off the table in the EPDP.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, are you in the document?

ALAN GREENBERG: I am in the document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Could you type succinctly what you just said there, please, so that it is linked?

ALAN GREENBERG: I suppose I could if I go to the right line number.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That would be 38E, please, so that it is linked when we've given [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's 35.

ALAN GREENBERG: 38 or 35? Is what I'm looking at.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 35?

HEIDI ULLRICH: 35, yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry. Well, it's my inability to see straight at this time of night after the week I've had, which doesn't surprise me. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: My inability to see straight at this time of day. Oh, someone else is typing in it. An anonymous iguana is typing. Who am I to take over from an anonymous iguana?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. As long as you're happy with it, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you want me to … Well, I think Sébastien wanted more clarity, so I can add the specifics of where it is being undertaken.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Alan, I captured everything except one of the groups, the second group that you mentioned. RDS Review Team, then you said another team, and then you said EPDP.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	But he'll make more depth and color in that, and that's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG:	I will put something in there.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Because we need you to concentrate on the next cell now because we're moving on. 36. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm trying to read this. I think this continues to be a high priority for the At-Large. And it's a high difficulty because it involves the Contracted Party House and compliance.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Okay. Is it high difficulty? I don't know. Help me understand why it's a high difficulty.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not saying it should be. I'm just saying it's a high-friction recommendation. And maybe that's the wrong measure to use.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It shouldn't be difficult to have discourse and come to some form of way forward. It shouldn't be a high difficulty, in my humble view. I understand that it is, as you say, high friction. And it may be ...

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, maybe it seems high difficulty to medium difficulty, but it remains a high priority for us, I think.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, okay. Does anybody want to argue differently. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: The difficulty has gone down because ICANN now seems willing, and contracted parties seem willing to even consider it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

ALAN GREENBERG: When both of them were not willing to consider at all, it was a super high priority.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Super high difficulty. Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We are looking at current times. Welcome, Olivier. Nice to have you here.

                        So, all right. Let's make it high priority, medium difficulty. Because there is the psychology of, well, if it's a choice between doing a medium difficulty and a high difficulty thing, naturally people tend towards the medium difficulty to be done. So, let's play our cards cleverly here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And change it to medium. [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Great. Moving on. 37.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, yes, I think that this sort of falls in that category, as well, that there's some complexity associated with doing this analysis. But it still makes sense to look at these highly regulated sectors to see whether or not the restrictions that are put in place haven't proved the level of abuse in those areas—whether the highly restricted string requirements are actually being followed, etc.

                        Again, I don't know that it's high difficulty. It's probably high cost.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I can understand that it could be considerable cost, but I would think it's actually a low difficulty.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. That's probably true.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And, Olivier, I trust your emergency business was safely and usefully dealt with. Never like to think of people having to be dragged away to deal with emergency businesses of any kind.

So, we now need to change E on line 37 to indicate a high priority, low difficulty. But note that there may be considerable cost.

I'm assuming Heidi has captured that. Moving on, Jonathan, to 38.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, I've captured that in column F. Or should I put that in column E?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We will sort it out later. Let's just … I'm really pushing to get us through as much as we can. You may have noticed that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And I think this is, again, the same. God, we got so much pushback from the Board on these things that we did these recommendations are so mealy-mouthed. But getting more data out of—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Surely that's low.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Pardon me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Surely that should be low difficulty.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I think that's probably right.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: High priority, low difficulty again. Invoicing deadlines, I certainly can relate to. I have ancient memories of those sorts of exciting moments. It's usually when the computer fails or the router stops working or something.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I think the trademark community is not unimportant by any means to the At-Large, but it's not our highest priority.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, is it really medium or low?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I don't know because our interest in the trademark community is coincidental in a way, which is that we're less concerned about trademarks but we're concerned about fraud and malware that have a high correlation to infringing sites. So, trademark violations, in the consumer protection standpoint, equate to fraud in most instances. And that, we do care about. So, I guess that's why I have it as a medium.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It all feels a little bit arbitrary. Right? But I was trying to find some middle ground, so to speak. And that's medium.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. All right. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: It'll confirm to the NCSG that we're in the pocket of the trademark people, which confirms to me that medium is the right answer.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: An interesting litmus test, Alan. Thank you for sharing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you mean that medium will do that or high would do that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, medium be sufficient.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He just wants it done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Zero is the only thing that would convince them otherwise, and they wouldn't be convinced anyway.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I'm just venting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: He's had a long day. Yeah, it's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I've had a long life.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Gives you some right. Look at that. What's next? Yay!

JONATHAN ZUCK: That may be it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Applause all around. Okay. So, what we need to do now, in between now and our next meeting … And Jonathan, if I can ask you to have a read-over and make sure what's been said. When you're in doing that little AI in that cell, just have a read-over and make sure we've captured—nothing [jars] out of that we missed or misconstrued anything.

Then we'll go in and mop up column E once we're happy. And that will be in a form that, at least for this section of the work, we can report to the OFB that we have moved through both … [We're] aware of the Work Stream 2 which were the ones that the rest of the ICANN community were focusing on. But we have already now preloaded work on both the RDS and CCTRT.

And that we will be moving on, then, I assume, next to the SSR2, which I think is timely because it's at top of mind for a whole lot of very good reasons, including the public comment.

So, to that end, I would suggest that in our next meeting, we make sure that we've invited any or all of the ALAC, At-Large representatives on SSR2 to join us to give us their take on those recommendations that they've made.

No, can we just go across to the SSR2 tab, please, Claudia?

ALAN GREENBERG: Before you do that, I put a note in the rationale for that last item, by the way.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Appreciate that. Okay. So, if we go down to the very end of the long list. Back, back, back up. All right. Here we go. If we're looking at 32, some of those should be almost clustered together, I guess. So, they should be … What we say on one, we're likely to say on the other.

I just wanted to get your feedback on what type of commitment should we be asking our briefers, our leads from SSR2 to perhaps make with us? I'm thinking that if we can introduce them to the concept of what we're doing and get started in our next meeting—which doesn't have to be next week; I think we're ahead of the game enough that it could go in a longer cadence now—I'm thinking we might be able to do this in …

And just gently scroll up, Claudia, so we can refresh ourselves as we go up. We might be able to do this in two meetings. Am I being … Am I a dreamer? Is this just my utopian dream here or what? Open for your comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: It depends on to what extent we do our homework and we understand what these things are talking about prior to the briefing. If we're going to depend on a description from one of our members on each one, it's going to take forever.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Some things we've actually been deeply engaged with.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: When I look through here, and because we're looking at the review paper itself at the same time, I was trying to be hopeful that we might be able to get this to …

Heidi, so when you reach out to them, say that the first thing they join, we'll be looking at the tool we're using and what information and guidance we would like to have from them in our use of this as we use this tool from their specific recommendations, and that we are hopeful that this should take no more than perhaps—let's leave a little loose— two meetings. Now, if it's going to be two and a half, so be it.

ALAN GREENBERG: It would be really helpful if we included in this dialogue how they were assessed by the review team, also.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, that's the sort of briefing we should be getting from them, so I would say that the first half of our next meeting—

ALAN GREENBERG: But isn't that in the report?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry?

ALAN GREENBERG: Isn't it in the report that they produced?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, all I'm suggesting is an add-on to the text or another column, whichever we want, that tells us that ahead of time.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Alan. I have neither the time, the energy, or the inclination to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, forget it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The last time it was done by yourself and Jonathan—because you guys are in the fold—I'm loathed to ask them to do that. But certainly, I guess we could. Do you see what I mean?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just because I'm not keen doesn't mean it can't be done. I'm not the only person here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Never mind. I withdraw the suggestion. I'm just trying to save ourselves time and increase our understanding.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh. Okay, Alan. Sébastien, please go ahead. Alan [felt] my jaded attitude.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Cheryl. Just to know when—and even if for you and me it will be quite, I guess, easy—but when you want to do the ATRT because it's ready from now, a long time. Then if more time passes, the more I forget about it.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Sébastien. I doubt you will forget about it, my friend. But I think that would take … It's probably after the SSR2, so we'll be looking at moving into that in the May period. I won't say exactly when in May, but it might be the beginning of May. It might be the middle of May.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. But if, for any reason, there is a hole and you need something to be filled in, don't forget about ATRT. I am sure you will not. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We won't. And we've actually got … It we just look now quickly at, I think, Heidi's got her action item in the material to do her reaching out for the SSR2, in preparation for our next couple of calls. Just quickly, Claudia, if you can open up the ATRT tab.

What might be useful is, as Alan suggested, for SSR2—and I said I have neither the time, the inclination, or the energy to do it. We've got our summaries of our recommendations. Of course, blessedly, we also only have a few recommendations and they're quite well articulated. I don't think we need more annotation in this until we go through and look at the levels. But if you do, then there's time for you to start getting ahead of the game on that. But once we open this one up, will also be inviting and reminding Daniel and Vanda that they should be joining us for this discussion. Okay?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Cheryl, yes. I just want to be clear with everybody. We have the name of the recommendation. We have the summary of the

recommendation. We have the priority from ATRT3 in column C. In Column D, I add a comment or the action, if it's called like that, by the Board. And I put some suggestions for ALAC in the F. I have added some comments. And it's open for comments for everybody, of course.

And the little difference between what at ATRT3 team did and what the Board has done is that they split the recommendation in different parts. It's where you see for Recommendation 3—3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. And for others, more split even. And I tried to take into account the numbering from the Board. And as you will see, the numbering of the recommendations is not the same of the numbering within the report. But that's okay. We can work with that. But it was just to show you, to give you all information on what it is on the document. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Sébastien. And as I say, looking at all of this, I don't think there's any doubt that you will be somehow forgetting anything because the [aid] memoires are all there. So, she'll be fine when we get to it, I'm sure.

Okay, so our next meeting, ladies and gentlemen. Would you like to meet in two weeks' time? In three weeks' time? What sort of cadence do you want to run now? Because we're not [inaudible].

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Well, there's a Doodle out.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: There's a Doodle out about when our next meeting was going to be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there? I haven't seen it. But then, I've been in meetings and not reading e-mails. What options are in Doodle?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: What was the Doodle? Was it then about the full working meeting and not the other one? Oh, thanks, Heidi. I got confused. It was about the full meeting.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's all right. We can report at the next meeting, whenever they decide to have it, that we've got them ahead of the game and that there's plenty of material for whoever goes into these prioritization meetings to work with now.

EN

But I'm unsure that we need to have a great, weekly frequency or even necessarily a fortnightly frequency. So, what is the will of you all? Do you want to now meet … I think once a month is probably too long. Do you want to stretch it out three weeks? Do you want to stick to two weeks? What would do you want to do? And as long as they're not at 2:00 AM all the time, that will be great.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess I would prefer two weeks. I think if we can. Sorry, to get rid of that, it would be great, also.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. So, if we can set a cadence and put it in our calendar as repeating, Claudia, we need to set it up on a on a two-week rotation now. I am going to find this time, other than when it already is associated closely with another meeting such as the CPWG. So, when the CPWG meets at its God-awful time, then an equally God-awful time for this meeting doesn't wrinkle me as much. Does that make sense to you, Claudia? So, if we could look at a rotation that complements the cruelty that CPWG consistently imposes on anyone in the Asia Pacific area, then we might leave that in your capable hands and see what we can do after that. Okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just note that for the next couple of meetings, we're going to want SSR people there, so their timing may need to be considered.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, their timing will range around the UTC—what is it—plus or minus 3-ish at this stage. I think all the countries they're from are wavering around either summertime in Europe now or the Africa zones.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't say it was for middle of their night. I just said we need to accommodate them. They may have other commitments. Especially Laurin who we think—who is probably the most essential one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's why Heidi's reaching out to them. So, between her and Claudia, we will certainly accommodate them. And if it is that they have very limited times, Claudia, then I'll just bitch and moan in my usual manner. And that's okay. You've all heard it before. And then we'll get into a cadence again.

Alright, so I think we're set up now for our next steps. We'll make a brief report on our progress at the CPWG meeting. We've got our action items to get deeply into SSR2 in the next two, if not two and a half, meetings. And then ATRT3 will be the next cab off the rank.

I guess the only other thing we might note is that we have not perhaps made as much use of our time in between calls as we could have done. And perhaps it could be example of what the ATRT3 preparation shows us. We might want to reach out to Marika—not Marika. I've just had a mental blank. MSM, our shepherd for multistakeholder model.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Marita.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Canadian woman. Marita. I knew Marika was wrong. Thank you. We might want to reach out to Marita and just socialize her with this page and see if she wants to get a little bit of homework done on it in advance.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Yeah. I was going to suggest that, too.
CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:	Yeah. So, we we'll take that as an action item. Heidi and I will reach out to Marita and perhaps take a moment to bring her through the document [or send it to her] anyway. And with that, that's our time done. And I want to thank you all for, I think, being highly productive today. So with that, goodbye and thanks a lot.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, everyone.
JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:	Thanks, everyone. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]