
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group Call on Wednesday the 5th of May 2021 at 20:30 UTC. Due to the increased number of attendees and in order to save time, we will not be doing a roll call. However, all attendees, both in the Zoom room as well as on the Phone Bridge, will be noted after the call. I would, however, like to note our apologies. We have received apologies from Priyatosh Jana, Carlos Raúl Gutierrez, Dave Kissoondoyal.

And we also have Spanish and French interpretation on today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are David and Veronica. Our French interpreters are Claire and Jacques. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğdu, Melissa Peters Allgood, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

I would also like to note that we have real-time transcribing provided for today's call. I will be sharing a link in the chat in a moment.

And before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking not only for the transcription purposes, but also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels; and to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise; and to please speak slowly to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you very much.

And with this, I turn the call 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 CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. This week's call is going to have a special appearance by Melissa Peters Allgood who will speak to us about the GNSO Policy Development Process to review the Transfer Policy. She has a presentation for us. She actually is the with the ICANN ... She's an ICANN Conflict Resolution Specialist, but she'll be speaking to us regarding this PDP, as it's something that is starting up at the moment. And we've got our ALAC members, alternates, and observers that have been designated to take part in this PDP.

After that, Marita Moll will take us through the ICANN71 plenary topic proposal with some proposals being set. And we'll have to adopt these because the proposals are due today at 23:59 UTC. So, that needs to be resolved today.

The work group updates will then follow with Yrjö Länsipuro speaking to us about the IGO (Intergovernmental Organization) Curative Rights Working Track. And then there will be an appearance from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg speaking to us about the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification or gTLD registration data.

After that, the policy comment updates will be led by Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu. There are a couple of policy comments in the pipeline. And finally, we'll have Any Other Business.

So, at this point I should ask whether there are any proposed amendments or additions to be made to the agenda. Always giving a few seconds for people to react. I'm not seeing any hands up, nor am I

seeing anything in the chat. So, the agenda is adopted as it currently is on your screen. And that means that we can proceed to the next part which is the action items from our call on the 28th of April. One action item remains, and that's for Greg Shatan to present consensus points and the ALAC statement on GNSO Rights Protection Mechanisms during the next CPWG meeting.

It looks as though we are not going to have the time today, and we haven't had ... We're not scheduling Greg on this, so this will have to take place during the next call of the Consolidated Policy Working Group—the one next week which will be just a week and a half away from the closing date. But we expect quite a complete paper on this—or should I say quite a comprehensive piece from Greg on this.

Any comments or questions on any of the points developed here on this action items page? Again, no hands up means we can proceed forward. Thank you, everyone.

So, now we are moving to agenda item #3, and I'm excited to hear and to see Melissa Peters Allgood who will be speaking to us about this GNSO Policy Development Process to review the Transfer Policy. Bearing in mind, the ALAC has selected a number of members and I should recognize them. I think that they are all on the call today with two ALAC members that will be the main participants in the PDP. That's Danielle Nanghaka from Uganda Steinar Grotterod from Norway.

There will be two alternates that can take their space when they are unable to attend a meeting or attend a specific call. And that's Raymond Mamattah from Ghana and Lutz Donnerhacke from Germany. And there

are four ALAC observers who will be following closely what's going on in that PDP. And that's Chokri Ben Romdhane from Tunisia, Hans Bathija from Canada, K. Mohan Raidu from India, Sivasubramanian Muthsuamy from India. So, thank you very much for having stepped forward to take on an active participation in this PDP.

And I should now hand the floor over to Melissa Peters Allgood. Melissa, it's all yours. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Thank you, Olivier. I see Christopher Wilkinson has his hand up. So, before I start talking, I thought maybe I would pass it to him if that's all right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That is fine. Yes, Melissa. Thank you for having noticed this. I was reading the agenda, so I didn't see that. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you very much, Melissa. Forgive me for jumping in straight away. I think this is an excellent initiative, and I very much appreciate the efforts that the volunteers for this to represent a large will undertake.

My point is different. All the other SO/ACs also of identifying their delegates to this PDP? And is there a balanced representation? Because I'm coming to the pen after the, frankly, awful experience of the SubPro PDP. I'm coming to the opinion that it would be a very good idea for all the SO/ACs to nominate a quota of their representatives to each PDP in

order to exclude the option in the future of blocking or imposing outcomes purely and simply by numbers on the call.

Sorry to intervene on that basis, but I think the precedent and the example that At-Large is offering in this context is excellent. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Christopher, I appreciate that intervention. And I went ahead in the chat and posted the link to the Wiki space for this working group. Many of us sat on the prep week call that was led by some GNSO policy team folks, Caitlin and Emily, and they described the way that the Council had decided to craft the representation leaning towards ... It does lean more heavily into some of the contracted parties, largely because of the nature of the issues at hand. So, I went ahead and put the link in the chat.

What I was going to talk about today is actually kind of the next step from that webinar that I led for some of you a few weeks ago. But before I do that, Cheryl, would you like to just jump on and share your points before I get going on some of the nuts and bolts of what this is going to look like and why it matters to this particular working group?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Certainly, Melissa, and specifically here, at this a point in our conversation, responding as the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council. So, I've been privy to the charter [of the design] of this particular PDP. So, Christopher, well aware of your points. But rest assured that after PDP 3.0, which of course wasn't even born until well after the currently

ending Rights Protection Mechanisms and Subsequent Procedures PDP as being goliath ones recently were halfway through. So, they weren't subject to these rules. But the new design option does allow at least three different models for any PDP going forward with the GNSO.

And at least two of those designs allow a very specific and public and transparent balance, just as you are requesting. And that is exactly what this one is designed for. So, it is two representatives at the table from the SOs—sorry, from the ACs. There is a different balance coming out of the GNSO constituencies, but it's all published and it's all designed to make sure that there is a known number of seats at the table occupied.

I think that's pretty much covered it, Melissa. But it doesn't mean that it's the way going forward for all PDPs. It's all designed specific, fit for purpose for each PDP for now on. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: I appreciate that, Cheryl—that intervention. Christopher, does that answer your question?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Basically, yes. I wonder. There's an English expression, "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." Let's see what happens. I've noted that, from somewhere, deus ex machina, and I wonder whether it's the Board itself or the GNSO, or simply public opinion in the non-GNSO SO/ACs that precipitated this change. But I think it's welcome. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Thank you. And I think that what I want to share with you today is really practical implementation of some of these PDP 3.0 improvements and the evolution of the model that we've been navigating. So, about a month ago, you guys did me the honor of allowing me to spend some time in your world, and I did a presentation on utilizing some of the tools within the consensus playbook to be more effective advocates for your end users in the GNSO space—just some tips and tools and ideas.

And it really got me thinking about this particular upcoming PDP because, obviously, as many of , the charter came out of the GNSO Council with this being the representative model that we're talking about right here. And the language of the charter mirrors the same language that Hadia and Alan have been on their journey and the PDP with. And that is, it says, "Members are required to represent the formal position of their appointing organization, not individual views or positions."

And so that really got me thinking about, how does your world cultivate your formal position? Also, part of what is going into this PDP are some of the other project management improvements that have come out of PDP 3.0 which we'll talk about in a minute. But first, with this representative model, it got me thinking about how would you guys cultivate those opinions? What are some ideas?

So, I started having these dialogues, first with the GNSO team that's going to be supporting this PDP. And then I reached out to your At-Large team and they were lovely and brought me into the fold with some of your ALAC leadership to start having these conversations. And so, I'm here today to lay the framework for you. Give you some information and

then some food for thought to see what direction your committee wants to go with this.

So, what we know about the Transfer Policy Review is that it's going to be in two phases. There's going to be a 1A and a 1B. The goal is that the entire PDP, both sub-parts, is complete in 18 months. And so, what that means is that it's going to go fast. Again, the representative model means that you guys have two reps and two alternates. And so, the goal of that model, for those of you that aren't familiar, is that you send those people into that GNSO PDP representing what you guys have found to be your consensus formal position. So, sometimes those reps will agree with that position. That will be their own lens. And sometimes it won't be, but you have to then find a way to arm them with what that consensus position is, which is where this particular working group the CPWG becomes so relevant.

And a bit more, just briefly, about the nature of the rep versus the alternate. So, the way that it works is like, for instance, Daniel is going to be one of your reps. Congratulations, Daniel. And in the event that Daniel can't attend a meeting, Raymond, perhaps—another one of your alternates—would step into Daniel's shoes, and he would be the rep for that meeting. So, this is a heavy lift on your reps and alternates because they all have to stay current and up to speed with what is happening—the decisions that are being made. And I'm sure that you would all agree that 18 months is going to go pretty quickly.

So, the question for this committee is how do you arm your reps and your alternate with the consensus position? How do we get that formalized and solidified? And so, these are the conversations that I

started with some of your leadership. Of course, my recommendation was that those consensus conversations happen here because then you could cultivate this group of observers.

Also, congratulations to be observers. I don't have that list in front of me right now. But those could be people that could also be active in the PDP, could understand what was going on and be another way to bring this committee, the CPWG, information about what is happening in the GNSO PDP so that that lift is just not on your reps. Because the big shift with the representative model is that it's no longer that someone sits in the PDP and they're coming in and they're giving you guys an update keeping you up to speed with what's happening. They're in the PDP representing their own interests, and then when it really becomes crunch time is when you guys as a community, perhaps, are having to solidify your comments, navigate final consensus calls. Those types of things.

This is different because, while we don't know how many questions and sub-questions for sure the PDP is going to be broken down into, we will know that shortly. They're set to meet here in the next few weeks. But what we do know is that they're going to utilize this project management structure and format. So that means that whatever the committee decides—let's say they decide they have 3 questions and 10 sub-questions—the reality of this format is that questions are going to close. Issues are going to close. And they're not going to reopen.

At the very end, they'll make sure that all of the pieces of the puzzle fit together. That's the way that I think about it, having maybe 3 questions and 7 sub-questions. You have consensus positions on all of them at the

end. You take this step back and you look at them and you say, “Do all the puzzle pieces fit together?”

But they're not going to reopen those issues, so if you don't arrive at a consensus position on Topic #2, your end user voice might not ever be heard on that issue because it's not going to reopen. So that's, again, why it's so important that everybody is actively involved and why I made the suggestion of utilizing observers to really keep this committee up to speed so all of you as members know what's going on and you're armed with the information to cultivate your own opinions. Because your opinions on Topic #3 in this PDP are then going to be navigated into a consensus position that your reps and alternates will then take to the GNSO Working Group.

So, I will tell you this. The great news with this project management framework and the collaboration that your Org team is doing behind the scenes with the At-Large team and the GNSO team, they're going to ... However, the PDP—the Transfer Policy Review PDP—decides to tackle these questions, they're going to be put into this project management framework. And then, with your teams collaborating behind the scenes, they're going to be able to back into these deadlines for you.

Now, I know you have people ... Many people on this call have been working group chairs and been in leadership positions, and you'll understand. There can be a little fluidity to deadlines, but at the end of the day, there are going to be these interim deadlines. And so, hopefully we can map out a schedule. I'm very confident of this. Berry's spreadsheet is a real work of art. We can map out the deadlines, the intermediate deadline, to make sure that all of you have enough time to

get your arms wrapped around whatever the issue may be, and then subsequently arrive at a consensus position.

And so, really, the key in all of this—I apologize, I'm looking at my notes— is that your reps and your alternate timely know your formal positions so they can properly advocate those in the GNSO Working Group. It's also important, any of you who are particularly interested in the topic ... And in a different call, Jonathan made a great point that this is something tangible that impacts end users. Right? Those of you that are interested, I really encourage you to be actively involved in the CPWG so you really can get your voice and your input and your thoughts included in these deliberations.

And I think that that's largely it. So, it is a bit of a shift in a way of doing business. I think it's going to be a learning experience for everyone. I hope you guys are excited about it. I think that, while I don't have a GNSO Council crystal ball in any way, shape, or form, I do think this model is evolving—this representative model. And I do think, while it might change somewhat, in theory we're going to see more of this, at least in the short term.

So, I encourage you guys to work on getting the infrastructure in place that works for you to really make sure that your voice is at the table and that it's an active part of the deliberation. And really, that's it.

I haven't been reading the chat. Okay. It doesn't look like there's anything in there. Does anybody have any questions?

A question about webinars. I honestly don't know. I would actually toss that to your leadership. There's none that I know of, but oftentimes ... I'm not the authority on much around here.

Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Melissa. And thanks for joining the call. This representational model is something that we've been grappling with in parallel—and nothing to do with the GNSO—and trying to figure out the degree to which we should be trying to espouse consensus positions across multiple flora inside of ICANN because we'll have more influence that way. So, it's not even related to the PDP 3.0 work.

I think that where things are complicated to some extent is a few areas. One is, when a decision is made that the composition of a work group is fixed based on who will be most influenced by the outcome of the PDP, you're still setting up a situation that may feel imbalanced to the participants of that work group. And so because, in this case, the registrars will be left holding the implementation bag and whatever is decided, they're not necessarily more impacted than all of the registrants that are going to have to exercise the system that's put in place. And so, that's one complication.

And the other is that I think that there was pushback. And Alan and Hadia might be able to provide more color here. But during the EPDP on the GDPR compliance, there was this pushback of, "Well, you were in the meetings. We decided. Why are you giving counter advice now?"

Why are you pretending like you weren't in the room?" Or something like that.

And the truth of the matter is that our nature as an advisory committee is such that, if we're unable to sway a working group, we're still in a position to give advice that may be contrary to what was the voted consensus of a working group. And so, preventing this process through all its formality from suggesting that, necessarily, that same level of representational advocacy is going to come out of the work group as goes into it, I think is something that we need to be aware of as we go along.

So, if our representative says the same thing over and over and over again and just gets outvoted, I don't think it's going to be reasonable to assume that they're going to decide, "Well, it was the decision as a group, so I now agree with the group" in that context. That's different than the At-Large consensus, and so I think that's something that I think is going to take some getting used to. If there's an expectation that, by doing it this way and doing it this formally and closing questions and things like that, that they won't ever come up again, that may be difficult.

But if they're never raised and they're brought up late, I think that's a very different scenario. Right? But if it's something that simply didn't win because of the way that the work group was stacked, I don't expect that that will necessarily lead to silence.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Well, and Jonathan, I certainly am not advocating anyone being silenced in any way, shape, or form. I think that the intention is trying to navigate that balance between ... You know, this is your position, and rightly so. And of course, you guys do come from this kind of two-tier front of really being in the policy work and also having this very important advisory role.

But I think we've all seen working groups where things get relitigated over and over again, and how that drags down the process. So, I think that if I was looking, again in my crystal ball, I think that in practice it lands somewhere in between. Right? No one is saying don't advocate your point. No one is saying you shouldn't continue to object on the record for something that you fundamentally disagree with—at all.

But I do think we've all sat in working groups where conversations just hit a log jam because people are making the same points that have been made, and the groups have worked past. So, I think that a lot of it, then, to navigate those waters really is the skill of your chair.

And so, Roger Carney is going to be the chair of this group. And it's my understanding that he's well known to many of the people that are in the group. So, hopefully, between that and the fact that we are dealing with questions that I think people have been talking about a long time, there's going to be fruitful conversations. I wish I could fix it all, Jonathan, but that's the best I've got for today.

Alan had his hand up. And then I see you, Cheryl, next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Three points. First of all, on the issue that we were just talking about—is the group balanced and how do you handle differences of opinion. This group, I believe—things may turn out differently, but I believe is going to be very, very different from the EPDP, for instance.

The PDP, we went into it knowing there were sides. It wasn't 100% clear who was aligned with who. It would be interesting how that turned out. But there were very clearly two different sides. And there were very, very strong similar positions of those on each side. You know, we're now in the third phase of the EPDP and people aren't giving. There's no compromise. This one is not likely to be the same. Pretty much everyone is there with the same intent. That is to try to make a Transfer Policy that's implementable and works and is safe and secure.

So, there have been a few other PDPs like that before where, literally, everyone is working together to find a solution. This one won't be quite as good as one of the ones I'm thinking about, but I think it's going to be pretty good.

So, the issues we talked about—of how do you handle imbalance and people not listening to you and stuff—are all real. I don't think they're going to be as relevant in this one as they have been in some in the past and some that are still going on.

Jonathan mentioned pushback. We got pushed back in the EPDP, for instance, because we didn't win arguments and then we said it anyway in a minority opinion or a position to the Board. And that's our right to say. We don't have to ... It's not like in some sort of agreement that once a board makes a decision, everyone on the board has to support it.

In many cases, we agreed to things in the EPDP but then, as you mentioned, when we looked at how things all fit together, we agreed to some things with [certain] presumptions and those didn't come true. So be it.

There was pushback of another group because they said things in their minor report which they never said out loud, and that's problematic. And if we have reps that are too meek and mild mannered to say what they want, then that's a problem and something we have to deal with. It's an internal problem, but it's real.

Lastly, you started off with—or earlier, anyway—saying that our representatives are representing the intent of the ALAC and not necessarily their personal opinions. However, they are going to become very quickly the experts in this subject matter with very few exceptions. There are one or two of us old timers who may know something about it, but in general they are going to become the experts. So, their task is very much to relay to the others what they have seen—what's going on—and, to some extent, what they are recommending.

The group may not agree with them, but they are going to become the leaders. And, almost by default, the ALAC positions will likely take on a lot of their personal beliefs. So, that means you'd better pick someone whose personal beliefs are likely to be aligned. Because we have had cases where we've named people who went and said things diametrically opposed to what we believe, and we have to watch out for that. So, interesting game.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: And Alan, I appreciate those interventions because I did fail to say that, yes, your reps and your alternates are going to become the subject matter experts and give you a lot of guidance as a community.

The only thing I really just encourage this group to be aware of as you're navigating that is, for some reason if the consensus of the rest of you, broadly speaking—this end user world—differs for some reason ...

Because it's not like your community is a monolith. Right? There are still different vantage points and lenses through which you all operate. For some reason, if that's different, then those reps really are obligated to support the formal position as the charter lays out, if that makes sense.

Alan, you also brought up a great point that the actual makeup of this PDP sets no precedent moving forward. It is unique to the nature and the questions and the challenges presented in this PDP, so I failed to say that earlier. I'm glad that we circled back to that.

And, hey, I'm so happy to hear that you think that this one's going to have some better collaboration. I think that's awesome. I also think that allows you guys as the CPWG to ... It's a good training ground to figure out what infrastructure is going to work for you guys to support those reps in this type of model because I do think we're going to see it again.

And, Cheryl, thank you so much for waiting so long. The floor is yours.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Not a problem at all, Melissa. Delighted, actually, to follow on from what Alan says. I'm going to build on some of that, actually. Oh, I've got an echo. I'm not sure why. Anyway. Hopefully, you all don't have an echo.

A couple of points I wanted to make. One thing, we've got our reps and our alternates, and we know some or a lot about any or all of them. What we don't know, as a CPWG, is how committed they will be to act in that two-way communication that we're going to find absolutely essential if, as a community, we're going to be successful at having our voice heard [inaudible].

So, there's a couple of things that I thought might be useful. The first cab off the rank is that all of them should avail themselves of whatever training—be that the e-learning scheme or specific assistance from the likes of, gee, this [lake] I've heard about called Melissa. Great expertise in the field here. [There are] so many tricks of the trade that I think they will need to be empowered with.

One that struck me, for example ... And I agree with Alan. I don't think we're in quite the same sort of treacherous waters with this topic. Much more aligned with some stuff that he and I and other ancient fossils were involved with many, many, eons ago. But you still need to be able to be heard and have influence, talking to industry. And this is sort of an empowerment exercise that I think we need to upskill our people with.

So, I think this is very important because one of the things that can happen when sides are drawn—as I know some of you know very well and Melissa keeps trying to help us avoid—is that it gets to be it “us and them” and you stop listening or hearing anything, even valuable stuff, that's coming from the other side. And so, if we can get our people to be empowered, and dare I say trained and upskilled, to be the exact opposite of that—to be the problem solvers, the consensus builders, the shining lights—it's going to do us all reputationally a great deal of good,

and empower them and make, actually, all of the work we do from the CPWG and them as representatives much more effective. And so, I'd really like us to do that.

Holly—who is, in fact, “Internet Australia” because she never changes her name when she logs on with the Internet Australia account—raised a couple of things about webinars. I guess [I'd like to go on micro]. This is this is going to be an awful lot of work moving very fast, and one webinar—unless you're going to have one a week—is not going to cut it. I think what we need to do is try and do a little bit like Justine was doing quite successfully with us in CPWG out towards the end of the SubPro world. It was really a world for some of us. And that was sort of regular updates and dosages.

And so, maybe if Jonathan and Olivier can build into our agendas and programs a regular “toing and froing” where the sharing of information exactly as Hadia and Alan do with EPDP happens, I think, a fixed agenda item. If it's long, we know about what length it is. If it's short or even if there's very little to say, at least there's still an update. And I think that's probably something that will help us do that whole project management thing.

But the other thing is, every one of these representatives and alternates need to know we'll be watching. Because we'll be watching like hawks. This is the first time that this specificity of, “And thou shalt do your very best to represent the consensus view where it exists” ruling has come into play.

We have had great trust or mistrust or good experiences or bad experiences over the whole life of the At-Large advisory committee on this is the past. But this time it is written into the charter, and so fear not. Transcripts will be read. Recordings will be listened to. And we'll raise it CPWG if one of you mucked it up.

Because we'll need to help you learn the difference between your personal opinion and that of the group. And it's as simple as saying, "The group believes this. However, my personal opinion is that." And that's okay. So, you don't have to give up your personal opinions. You just have to make sure people understand.

Let me share one little anecdote. One of the reasons that's built into charters like this is because of the feedback that experienced and practiced chairs and co-chairs and leads and co-leads of excruciatingly detailed PDPs in the past have given back to the GNSO. And it's always been a hassle to listen to someone especially well known and articulate—a good orator—and know that that is, in fact, the voice of the group they've come from or themselves.

And so, when one doesn't know, if you're not sure, some of us in the past have had to check. And that has often been awkward, and that's not the case anymore. It's a requirement. That just a little anecdote. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Thank you for all of that, Cheryl. Alan, is that an old hand? You were still up before Daniel raised his.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. That's a new hand.

MARIE PATTULLO: All right, Alan. Then the floor's yours. After you, then Daniel.

ALAN GREENBERG: You could go to Daniel first, but it was a new hand. Just a couple of very brief points. The concept of representing the group is ... Let's not pretend it's new. I started as a GNSO liaison from the ALAC in 2006, and it was clear that was the rule. Now, to be honest, it's a lot easier because most of the other people didn't have opinions on most of the things that were being discussed. So, I could make them myself and go back and report it, and no one disagreed.

But nevertheless, it's not a new concept. And I spent eight years being careful to say, "This is my opinion," or "This is the group's opinion." The default was the group, not me. Unless I, for some reason, was personally expressing one. And Cheryl has done the same, and that's gone on. And it's the same thing in the EPDP. I had some personal opinions which weren't espoused by ALAC, and it's unfortunate. I had to be quiet on them. And such is life.

The reason I put my hand up, however, was on the issue of alternates. Alternate job ... That's a really difficult job for several reasons. In many cases you're going to find that the members are actually attending most of the time, and it's a real hard job trying to keep up with it. You should

be at the meetings listening, but you never get a chance to talk and you're never allowed to interact on the e-mail list.

And if you're lucky, the alternates and members will meet regularly with each other, preferably once a week or so, and make sure that everyone is up to speed. But it's very, very easy for the alternates to drop out and disappear. And then you're in the awkward position of if they ever have to come into a meeting. they don't know what's going on. They don't know what we were saying, and they don't know what the other people have said before. And they become complete red herrings.

So, on the other hand, if the regular members only can't attend half of the meetings, then you've got to wonder why did they volunteer as the member. On the other hand, it makes the alternate somewhat fit into the process better.

But the alternate ... It's going to be a really difficult job technically and emotionally. And that's something we're going to have to watch carefully. But they should be attending meetings, and that's really easy not to do when you have to be quiet and can't go into the chat and can't do anything else.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Yeah. I think, Alan, you raise an excellent point from the inside because that really is what it's like. So, it's a great issue to flag. It looks like Cheryl's got some ideas. I think that I would encourage this committee to definitely put a pin in that and come to a resolution or a requirement on what that communication is going to look like between your reps and your alternates for all the reasons that Alan just stated.

Daniel—one of your reps—the floor is yours.

DANIEL NANGHAKA:

Yeah. Thank you very much. I'm happy to be an ALAC rep to the PDP. Just from the previous experience, before the PDP 3.0 came out, I was part of the GNSO RDS that was being chaired by [Jacques] [inaudible]. So, we went into situations whereby we took longer time on deliberations. I recall there was a point when we were discussing about the [address system], and we spent approximately around two months trying to discuss the same thing.

I'd like to ask how are we going to be able to handle the respective deliberations that are going to take more than the time that has been stated in the project?

And then, also, regarding how we intend to work, I'll probably also suggest that alternates together with the members will create like [inaudible] meeting schedule whereby we can keep ourselves abreast.

And then because there are points whereby there is need to come up with a decision during the call, how are we going to be able to handle our ALAC position? Because there are many times that we shall find ourselves that when a discussion gets interesting and hard, you will find that instead of putting forward the ALAC position, members begin to put forward their individual positions. And sometimes it can create disagreements. Just like it happened in the EPDP when two members, I think, were trying to discuss about individual status in the registration.

I think all that needs to be taken into consideration to avoid conflict within the room. I think that is something that we could discuss before we dive in too deep into the process. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Thanks, Daniel. I do think you've raised a bunch of issues for this committee to discuss to make decisions to give you and your colleagues clear guidance and expectations as you will be representing their positions.

The only other thing I wanted to say is that, in terms of deliberations and extending time for issues within the Transfer Policy Review PDP, that is really driven by what the group decides, how the group decides to allot time to question—leadership working through that. But you should expect that they're going to push.

The way that EPDP Phase 2A is pushing, I would anticipate—again, my crystal ball. Cheryl, I see your hand; you tell me if I'm wrong. I would expect that they're going to push, so that's why it's so key that everybody is up to speed on the issues—reps and alternate—and you're ready to state the positions, and you're ready to advocate for your community because they will keep pushing.

I mean, Berry who works for Org calls it a crank. Like he just wants to keep cranking and keep cranking to go because 18 months is going to go like that.

Cheryl, the floor is yours. Before I hand it to you, though, I have seen some comments from Roberto and Holly in chat. If you want to put your

hand up and share any of those, any of your sentiments in this conversation, I encourage you to do so.

Cheryl, it's all you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Melissa. This time, putting my hat back on as the ALAC liaison to the GNSO. Just to remind you all just in case you all don't live and breathe these PDPs and of the nuances of it, the new stuff. And a lot has happened that isn't just, oh, a representational model or not. Right?

But the way the GNSO Council manages processes is entirely different than any of you have ever experienced before unless you happen to have been one of the co-chairs of the most recent two PDPs to finish. In other words, if you weren't doing the RDS one or the Subsequent Procedures one.

Because regular updates monthly, a fully accountable planning, a GNSO Council that will hold chairs in and say, "What is going on? Do you have intersessional meetings between months with the chairs? Have various groups [inaudible], have those chairs met together?" It is a much more micromanaged world, and it is incumbent on and designed in the charter as to what the responsibilities of leadership are and how they are to progress the program, not fall into some traps which less experienced or less, perhaps, decisive leadership can perhaps have done in the past.

So, a lot of looking backwards really won't be an issue going forwards. But you will need to know that, and if you believe it's going off track,

you tell us. And there is a process to make sure the GNSO Council deals with it. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Excellent, excellent intervention, Cheryl. And again, what I bring to the table here is really trying to give you guys assurances that on the Org side, we're putting all the different pieces of the puzzle together and we're doing our best to support you in your endeavors. But you're very lucky to have the expertise on this committee. So, I certainly am not trying to attest to be any of that.

Roberto, your hand is up. The floor is yours.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah. Well, I have a bit of very confused thoughts, but I would like to participate to the discussion anyway. I have a little bit of a throat ache, so please excuse me.

I would like to bring an example from the old times. When I was on the Board and I was in charge of the review of the Board and the rebalancing of the old constituencies in a different model. And there was this statement by the contracted parties that is fairly legitimate that says, "We are never going to accept any structure of the GNSO that will hold us accountable and obliged to do things that impact our business." Full stop.

Okay. But that the corollary of this is that ICANN and the GNSO is an organization that is structured with a main purpose to favor the business of the contracted parties. So, that is a bit the problem that ICANN has. If

you want to be somebody that, in a really multistakeholder view, brings together the views of the whole community, you need to give value to positions and concerns that are not tightly connected with financial and commercial concerns about the contracted parties. Because the contracted parties are not the heart of ICANN. The heart of ICANN is the multistakeholder model.

So, the funny thing is that if we are in a working group and then the Stability Advisory Committee says, "Oh, there's a big risk in doing this," but then the contracted parties see this as a great opportunity for their business and they outvote the advice of an advisory council; or for the case of ALAC, if that has a terrible impact on users, but it's good for business.

The fact of providing more weight to certain specific concerns or interests, it really determines the outcome. And I think that this is something that has to be taken into account. Now, I don't have a solution for this, but for sure there's a very difficult position.

We have been, as ALAC, in a very difficult position in bringing forward some issues in the past because, on one hand, we are facing factual, financial, and really objective data from the contracted parties. And we have a different view that is with the value of the Internet. And that has been ... I mean, if we think back other cases, the "long tail", for instance, that we had that was exploited by some registrars. I mean, a lot of cases. For instance, the—I don't know—the "wild card" that was really putting at risk the Internet where there was the widely different position.

And I think that up until now, the Board has been able to more or less act at bringing together these things. But if we want to really put the PDP as the center of this and to make it the real deciding body, well in that case, I think that's something has to be structured in a different way. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Thank you, Roberto. And I think you raise incredibly relevant and interesting and challenging points. You know, my hope is that every PDP helps us get a little bit better. Taking a step back and reflecting on the larger picture and the structures, I think, will be happening in various ways. So, it's a little bit out of the scope of what I am here with, but I certainly appreciate your intervention.

And I wanted to know. Well, first off, is that an old hand, Roberto? Or is that a new one?

ROBERTO GAETANO: No, it's an old one.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: All right. I hope your throat feels better. Greg, I see your hand is up.

GREG SHATAN: Just briefly to follow up on what Roberto has said. I think what the EPDP has taught us, and maybe this is teaching us something about PDP 3.0 generally, it seems to have taught us that if the contracted parties plus

either the NCSG or the CSG can agree on something, that that outweighs all the rest of the stakeholder, constituencies, advisory committees, and the like. And that once that happens in the first phase of a group, the second phase of that group just consists of the contracted parties folding their arms and saying, "So, what are you going to do about it?"

This concerns me, particularly with the so-called representative model because it's only as representative as the waiting that has been put in place. And we're not particularly well-represented in the representative model, so I don't know that we're getting better necessarily. Or, if we're getting better, it's not across the board.

I think there was real concern that not every ... There are things in the EPDP that did not have broad support, and yet somehow became broadly supported through the management process and at the GNSO Council table. And I think that before any other groups get structured along those lines, there's going to need to really be a rethink about what it means to be anything other than the contracted parties and one stakeholder group. Especially, what is the combined weight of the GAC in the ALAC and the SACs?

If you look at the empowered community, each of those groups are weighted equally. But when it comes to policy development, three quarters of one group becomes more than half of—becomes consensus, which should be a super majority, at least. And so, that means that everyone else combined makes up a minority of a not particularly significant amount. That is profoundly troubling for the multistakeholder model.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: I think you make excellent points, Greg. Thank you for sharing. Alan, I saw your hand go up. And then, Christopher, I'm going to let you have the last word. And I apologize to your leadership of this team for taking so much time. After Christopher, we'll hand it back over.

So, Alan, to you, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to follow on to what Greg was saying. The EPDP which is the first real incarnation of PDP 3.0 that we've seen—or it wasn't formally 3.0. But 3.0 was modeled on it, in fact, the other way around.

It was pretty clear at the beginning that the intent was ... Although different groups had a different number of seats, every voice did not have equal weight. In other words, having six voices did not necessarily make you stronger than a group that had two or three voices. It does give you a lot more speaker time, sometimes. And again, sometimes chairs said one person per group and give everyone fair ... Sometimes.

But I will say—and without going into personalities—we had in the EPDP, so far, we have had 1-2-3-4 chairs or acting chairs. And they have been very, very, very—and I'll say "very" few more times—different from each other. And, from my perspective, some have been very fair and balanced, and some have not been. And decisions were made by the chair, and it's up to the chair to decide what the consensus is of the group. That's a lowercase "consensus".

And different chairs have done it very differently, and a lot of it comes down to that. And a lot of it has to do with—where's that chair's allegiance if they weren't wearing the chair hat. And some people take off their original hat well, and some do not.

So, it's a difficult situation, but it can work out okay or it can work out disastrously, depending on the chair and to some extent the tone of the group. But there's no guarantee ahead of time. So, let's hope this one isn't very contentious and doesn't matter. But if it does become contentious, there's no real predicting how it's going to go.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: [Fair.] Thank you, Alan. And for what it's worth, I wish no one would ever take the chair hat off. That is my biggest pet peeve.

Christopher, the last word is yours.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you. I don't actually believe that. I'm sure somebody on this vast debate wants to come in again later.

But three points. First, personally, I totally reject the idea of waiting. as it has been discussed in the last recent part of the debate. Secondly, there's a human aspect of this, especially vis-à-vis volunteers. Unless your point of view and your work and your time is going to really carry weight, the game's worth the candle.

And you won't get figureheads and place men and women just to be there for this or that SO/AC. What they have to say, especially if it's

supported by a consensus of their SO/AC, has to be taken fully into account. And if they're overruled by a false majority in the PDP, they have to have access to the Board.

And finally, Cheryl and others know that I've said this before, and I know that not everybody agrees with me. But if this goes on wrongly, what we've got is a [cutout]. And, personally, I had to disassociate myself from the SubPro PDP Final Report in my two dissenting opinions in order to make quite sure that if this ever goes to court, I am not tarred by the brush of what that PDP did.

When ICANN was established in 1998, I was present in the meeting between the chief executive and the director of the European Commission's competition department where it was stated, and ICANN agreed, that ICANN would be responsible for the terms and conditions of competition in the DNS market. In recent years, Boards have failed that obligation. Thank you.

MELISSA PETERS ALLGOOD: Thank you so much for all of your interventions and all of your points. As Org, we're here to try to help and try to support you in this incredibly complicated challenging world that you live in. And I know that you're all volunteers, so just know that we're here. If I can support you guys in any way, the leadership team knows how to get a hold of me.

Thank you so much for such a robust conversation and allowing me to be a part of it. I'm going to hand it back over. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Melissa. And welcome to the wonderful world of CPWG running over time. But it's great. We've had plenty of input and discussions. And thank you for the explanations that you've provided us today.

Now, we need to move rather swiftly to the next agenda item, and that's Marita Moll with the ICANN71 plenary topic proposal. We just have not very much time until those need to be submitted. Over to you, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Hi, everybody. Can hear me? Yes, I hope. Tell me if you can't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfectly well.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. We're in a completely different ballpark here after that really heavy discussion which could probably go on all night. We've got something a little a little easier here, I think. This is just to let about where we are in a discussion around who holds or what discussion will be happening in the three public sessions at ICANN71.

There have been a number of proposals and this one that I'm presenting to you is a combination of three proposals: two from the GAC and one from ALAC. And it pretty well holds quite a popular position; will probably take up one of the spots because most people seem to be supporting this kind of a discussion. I've been working with Nigel Hickson who is the GAC representative, and we put our proposals

together—two of his and there one that I presented on ALAC behalf. We've come up with the title called ICANN and the Internet Governance Ecosystem. I'll just quickly let you know what the original proposals looked like.

The GAC proposals, one of them was about the role of ICANN in the wider governance area. So, it was really shifting our gaze outside and not an internal gaze. The second one was about how the DNS could evolve to meet the needs and aspirations of the global community in 2025. That's a little bit of both, but more specific to the DNS. If you'll go to the next slide. Can we go to the next slide? Yes.

This is what we've come up with. And if I can just change my view here. What we've come up with is this particular description of a session. "The Internet governance landscape is never static, continually evolving and changing, and ICANN must evolve in step with it." So, in that you see the idea of moving forward and looking at what's going on around us.

In the next part of the description is pretty much an elevator pitch of what I originally proposed, "... ensuring that is unique multistakeholder model remains an effective and inclusive governance model for an increasingly interconnected world." So, that evolves the idea of looking at our multistakeholder model and what needs to happen in order to retain its prominence and in order to remain relevant. A whole lot of the discussion we just had probably fits in there.

And then the description goes on to include the things that the GAC proposed saying, "ICANN also plays a crucial role globally as part of the technical community, and thus as part of the wider Internet governance

ecosystem supporting the DNS. multilingual universal Internet access, equality and inclusion.”

So, it's a big melting pot of stuff. It's about being able to manage evolution on all kinds of different levels. What kind of role ICANN should be playing and what are the expectations around us? What are the threats and opportunities? On to the next slide, please. Yes.

So, the rationale on this was that, “In the proposed session, representatives from various parts of the ICANN community and beyond—”so this would hopefully include people from outside our bubble—”would have an opportunity to exchange views on how they see ICANN adopting and evolving.

The perception is that this would be a similar kind of session as we saw that Jonathan and his group put together in the previous public meeting on the DNS. And basically, it would be a general discussion not a presentation and slide session. And, of course, how this goes is that it's going to be down to who is on that panel. And so, that is what is being proposed tomorrow.

As we speak, Nigel is presenting the same thing to his GAC group. And tomorrow, there will be a meeting that will either determine if this is a go or not. For the other two sessions, there is other stuff being discussed, and I’m not involved in that. This is only for one of the three, and it has a lot of support in the communities.

So, this is what I’m putting forward to you and hoping that it does have the support of the CPWG so that we don't have any issues going forward. Thank you.

Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Marita. I hope everybody can hear me. So, the floor is open for comments and questions now. And, obviously support for Marita's suggestions here. I'm not seeing any hands up, Marita, which is, I guess, pretty good. Usually, such a response—

MARITA MOLL: Right. No news is good news.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Such a response usually is great. If you had a huge queue of people wanting to speak and speaking against it, it would be a bit more challenging for you.

I see that Christopher Wilkinson has put his hand up. So, Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I support this proposal. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Christopher, and—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Yeah, go ahead, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: I saw some more support in the chat. So, thank you. [I guess there's] nothing more to say about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. [inaudible]. Yeah. Thank you very much, Marita.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for looking into this. Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I was just going to say it's a very interesting environment to choose plenary topics. And what's special about plenary topics is only one thing, and that is that they are unconflicted in the schedule. And that's what makes a plenary topic, and that's why everybody gets involved in choosing what they are. There's going to be three of them, and one of them was already predetermined because it's a holdover from the previous meeting, the one on government regulation.

And so, we're really just choosing two. And so, everyone who made a proposal was sort of put in the position of trying to combine with other people so that nobody felt left out of the plenary position. But I think this is a really good synergy with the GAC's proposal, and I think that this will probably be the way the group goes forward.

But even if it isn't, I think that we can support it as an At-Large session that we organize together with the GAC. So, I think ... Let's assume that this is going to take place regardless of how the meeting goes tomorrow. But I believe that it will go our way and that this session will be one of the two plenaries selected.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Over to you, Olivier. I guess we're moving on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Marita. And I note plenty of support for your suggestions in the chat. And I believe the next steps, Marita, are you going to be submitting those, then, to the process? Or what's the next formal step for this so that we know this is on the record?

MARITA MOLL: I will let the staff know that it's officially supported on our end, but I think that some of our people will be at the meeting tomorrow. And we'll be there supporting it there, too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, it's just that I noticed that the plenary topics for proposal are due by 23:59 UTC. I just want to make sure nothing falls between the planks on the floor.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. I see that Heidi's also ... Maybe she has something to say about moving forward here. Are we missing anything?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No, Marita. That was to you, and just for the future. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: No, Heidi. I meant about moving forward with the proposal.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, sorry.

MARITA MOLL: I think what I'm doing is presenting it to ... I'm going to send it off to Rob who was kind of arranging this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah. If you could send that to Carlos and CC Rob.

MARITA MOLL: Carlos?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, because Carlos is the one [inaudible] handling those [inaudible] then Mary Wong are the ones that are working on that.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Thanks, Heidi. I'll do that right after this.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sure. Thank you. Perfect. I'll let [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, everyone. And thank you, Marita. Now, the next thing in our agenda, next action ... Well, the next item is the work group updates. Today, a little bit later than usual. But we'll start first with Yrjö Länsipuro speaking to us about the Intergovernmental Organizations Curative Rights Work Track, a.k.a. IGOWT.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. Thanks to the staff for deciphering this acronym in the headline. So, this work group—or, rather, work track—was set up to solve one narrow problem that remained after the GNSO Council rejected one of the recommendations of the [relevant] PDP, namely what happens if an Intergovernmental Organization wins in a Dispute Resolution Process—UDRP or URS—and the losing registrant wants to go to court? Which is perfectly possible according to the rules as they are now. However, Intergovernmental Organizations have immunity, and if they don't want to waive it, there's no way to take the process to a court as the next and final step.

So, we have been having weekly meetings now since February, and the going has been rather slow. It's hard for some stakeholders to accept that the IGO immunity is a pretty serious matter. It's based on international treaties, and it's not up to us to try to tweak it or somehow

nibble parts of it away. But after last Monday's meeting—as summarized by Chris Disspain, the chair—there is now, as he said, willingness to consider two elements of a possible solution. One, that going into the UDRP, an international organization, doesn't need to agree to submit to a court or mutual jurisdiction.

And two, is also willingness in our group to consider that arbitration would be used, instead, as the next and final instance. Now, willingness to consider is not the same as consensus, but at least it implies that we're now not only talking, but also listening.

Next week we'll return to the question of standing. That is to say, on which basis an IGO can get into the funnel for when UDRP or URS says it doesn't necessarily have a registered trademark. And there are two avenues. There's a list compiled by the GAC a couple of years ago. It could be updated. And there's the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property from 1883 and its famous Article 6ter.

So, these will be discussed next Monday, so stay tuned. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Yrjö. And the floor is open for comments or questions. I'm not seeing any hands up, so thank you for this update, Yrjö, and for this evocative start to your reporting for this session.

The next part of our agenda is the Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for Generic Top-level Domain Registration Data. Another short title that will be reported by Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess I'll go first. We're getting closer to the end just because there's an end-time set. At this point, we are still only talking about guidance. Now, guidance means, "Here are some ideas you may want to think about." It's not as strong as what is often called "best practices" and certainly not nearly as strong as policy, but that's where we are today. And it's not clear we're going to get any farther than that.

At this point, to some extent, we have accepted the fact that we're not going to get policy out of this. And the best we can do is provide some guidance and set up the infrastructure so that if we end up having national legislation or maybe policy at some future time, that we're at least prepared for it. It's not a particularly good situation. That's on the legal/natural issue. The issue on e-mails is probably even more discouraging. So, we are where we are. It doesn't make a lot of sense.

One of the things in the draft document we're looking at is scenarios of how the guidance might be implemented by registrars. And I have suggested, not facetiously, that we include a scenario saying, "The registrar ignores everything and does what they want," which basically is today's status where they don't do anything to differentiate.

And I've had some pushback saying that we shouldn't mention that option, but that's the most likely option for many registrars. And I think we should put it on the table for people who are going to read the interim report and let them judge for themselves.

So, I don't know if Hadia's on the call or not. I think she is.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. Yes, I am. Thank you, Alan, for this update. So, yes, we are now working on the legal vs. natural write-up. And the unique contacts write-up as well. As I mentioned, it's only guidance. However, we are pushing ... Or we actually think that one thing we cannot live with is ... Because we are required, also, to identify what ALAC cannot live with, we think we cannot live with not having [changed] natural and legal persons as a requirement. That's something we think should be required.

And the reason for that is that differentiating between the registrant types, like legal or natural, does not mean that the contracted parties would [publish]. But in order to publish the data, an extra step will be required which is differentiating between the data. [inaudible].

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hadia, I'm sorry but we're—

ALAN GREENBERG: We seem to be losing Hadia.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes. Hadia?

ALAN GREENBERG: She's in the Internet-free zone of northern California, so what do you expect?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Is this better? Okay. Do you hear me better?

ALAN GREENBERG: This very moment we can.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. I will go ahead. So, currently the contracted parties do not want the differentiation between the registrant type to be a requirement, and they say this is not desirable. However, not everything desirable is beneficial, and it's not enough to be desirable or not. But we need to look at to whose benefit this is. And, apparently, if they do differentiate between natural and legal persons, that would only require additional fields on the RDDS which would be set to Legal, Natural, or Undetermined.

And in all cases, contracted parties will need to make changes to the RDDS field. And that is based on recommendations of Phase 2. So, there is not much extra work that would be done in this regard, and it's not putting them at any additional risks. However, the benefits are first of registries and registrars who would like to differentiate. If they differentiate first between the registrant types, that would reduce their liability. And also, the other benefit would be that if they are going to use the SSAD for automatic disclosure, they don't need to look at the included data because they can automatically disclose the data based on the flag.

Also, it could be beneficial in the future [if upcoming] regulations require publication of legal persons' data or put some [requirement or] distinction between the data of those, then having this field [ready and also] having [inaudible] data. So, there are many benefits to [this] distinction, and there are no known downsides to this.

So, this is something we've been discussing, but it's not being accepted. Also, if we look at ICANN's role in serving the public interest, [definitely,] having this field, any of us, at least, now agree that the RDDS data as currently implemented does not serve the public interest, and adding such a field and such a differentiation is in line with what [inaudible].

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hadia, so sorry to interrupt, but we are ... The interpreters are not interpreting you right now because they cannot understand.

HADIA ELMINIAMI: [inaudible].

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Olivier. So sorry for the interruption, but the interpreters have stopped interpreting because they are not able to understand Hadia's audio.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much. I think that we've somehow lost Hadia, and we're probably going to have to move on because we are running rather late today.

But, Heidi, if you can still hear us and you still have a few points to let us know about, please e-mail them to the mailing list.

Oh, she says she's done. Okay, fine. So, thank you for your update. And I wish I could open the floor for comments and questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I do need to get in for a minute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, of course, Alan. You may speak. But then we'll close the queue immediately after you. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. You'll have to forgive Hadia. She's moved from Egypt to the Silicon Valley and, of course, the Internet's not good there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's the problem with a new location.

ALAN GREENBERG: The one problem, one thing that we are at this point being so strong about, and I hope with everyone's agreement—and Hadia alluded to it—is that we are saying that even if contracted parties do not have to and choose not to differentiate between legal and natural—which is like to be the outcome of this PDP at this point, that this will not change—that there must be an RDDS field saying, “Is this a legal

entity—the registrant? A natural entity?” Or it may be empty and not specified.

But we must be prepared for the future where there may be national legislation due to NIS, due to U.S. legislation. There may in fact be a change in policy going forward, perhaps driven by those. And the RDDS has to be prepared for it. So, we're not saying that they have to populate it, but they say the field has to be there and transmitted and put into escrow and so. So, if it is there, that it can be used.

And that we are being very strong about. If anyone has problems with that, then they should let Hadia and me know. But we feel that's a really important issue to future proof the RDDS, even if we're not using the field at the moment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And thanks for both of your updates, Alan and Hadia. We're now running a bit over time, but we have plenty of time to look at the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thanks so much, Olivier. So, I'll briefly just run through the agenda recently ratified by the ALAC. There are none since last week, but there are quite a few upcoming public comment proceedings which you can tap through on the agenda for May and June.

There are currently no public comments open for decision. There were a couple decided upon CPWG and ALAC last week as “no statement.” And there has been, for quite some time, EPDP Phase 2 ICANN Public

Comment that closed at the end of March that's been on the agenda as potential ALAC advice to the ICANN Board. But there's not currently any, I think, activity towards this. So, I could remove it from this public comment table that we have.

Other than that, there is just the ALAC statement and development regarding the GNSO RPM ICANN Public Comment. And I believe Greg is on the call if he would like to make some remarks about this. Otherwise, I will ...

Oh, and I see Alan's comment in the chat. Okay. I'll keep it on there. Thank you very much.

I will turn it over either to Greg or to Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Hey, Greg. You've sent a couple of e-mails around. Is there anything that you want to say that you didn't say in your texts? I guess you've fallen behind a little bit, and so we're going to get something in next couple of days here. Right?

GREG SHATAN:

Yes. Given that we've fallen behind in this meeting about a half an hour, now is not the time for a presentation on something that doesn't exist.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Yes. We've had many presentations on things that don't exist, though. So, nothing to be afraid of. I think that's it, Olivier. Back to you. Back to the agenda. We're quick on this one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. That means that next week, we will have Greg's presentation, just a few days before the closing date of the public comment process.

With this, I think that we can swiftly therefore move to the agenda item that follows after, and that's the Any Other Business part of this call. Whilst you all rake your minds as to what else you'd like to talk about, two reminders.

One is the ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on Subsequent Procedures. The translations have now been posted. I should encourage you to make this known to your RALO leadership so as for these to be transmitted to all the At-Large structures. This is a significant piece of advice, and it's delightful to see it translated in languages. And those can, of course, be used as a showcase to our communities around the world.

Second is the ALAC correspondence regarding the ALAC advice Subsequent Procedures. We had noted that this had not actually been posted to the ICANN correspondence page. Now, the usual process is indeed that it gets posted onto the action item page of the board with regards to any advice that it receives from ALAC, SSAC, GAC, and other advisory committees.

That being said, the significant contributions of the GAC to the process get posted to the ICANN correspondent page. Thus, it felt right to have the ALAC advice also posted there, if only for the amount of publicity that it would get by being on the correspondence page rather than being on a much more obscure location that gets less page views. So, that's the two updates regarding this process.

Is there any other business to talk about today? I am not seeing any hands up. Scrolling madly through the list of participants. Nope. No hands up, so no further comments and discussions. We're not too late, actually, in our agenda today. All we need to do is to find out when our next meeting is going to take place.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Olivier, in keeping with the rotation, we should be back on track for next week, the 12th of May at 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

13:00 UTC. Fantastic. Thank you very much for this. And I note that some people think I have a very, very white face. That's because the lighting here is yellow for some reason, and the camera seems to think that it needs to be white. Thus, I have been absolutely bleached. So, no, I am not a ghost. At least not yet.

And with this, not seeing any further hands up, I guess we can say good-bye for this week. And rest assured that there are going to be sustained discussions in the mailing list.

And I'm not sure whether you have anything else to add, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Not really. Looking forward to the questions and sub-questions that come out of the Transfer Policy Working Group so we can get to work as the CPWG to come up with a roster range of positions, as Melissa had suggested, to send our volunteers into the fray with the most support possible. And, as always, many thanks to our interpreters, our fantastic interpreters, and our real-time text transcriber.

Thank you, everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night wherever you are. Good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]