

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everybody. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday, the 9<sup>th</sup> of May 2018 at 16:00 UTC.

On the call on the English channel today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Beran Dondoh, Sébastien Bachollet, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Kaili Kan, Tatiana Tropina, Bastian Gosling, Jonathan Zuck, Christopher Wilkinson, and Alan Greenberg.

We do not have anybody on the Spanish channel currently.

We have received apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sam Goundar, Heidi Ullrich from staff, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

From staff we have Evin Erdogdu and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management. Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state your name when speaking, not only for transcription purposes but also for our interpreters.

Our interpreters are David and Marina. And with this, I hand it over to you, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Have we missed anyone so far? I just heard somebody say salam alaikum. Was that Hadia? Yes, I think some people need to mute, please, on the call.

I noticed that you also mentioned Tijani Ben Jemaa not being around. It's Ben Jemaa, just to correct the transcript, please.

---

*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.*

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Ben Jemaa. Got it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome, everyone, to this first call of the Consolidated Policy Working Group. Of course, this is just an old friend, isn't it? It's a bunch of other groups that have come together, including the new gTLD Working Group and the ICANN IANA Stewardship Transition which then became ICANN Accountability which then became ICANN Evolution and is now all folded into this group that deals with all of the policy work of At-Large.

So today, we're going to have three different parts to our agenda after a quick welcome from – I guess my welcome is done already, but a welcome from Jonathan, and to let him say a few words as well on how this is all going to work out, hopefully, with three parts.

The first part is about the new gTLD subsequent procedures. There's a PDP update and there's some work going on there, and you'll see there's a link to the GNSO page and the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP home, and there'll be a little discussion on this.

Then after that, there'll be also a discussion, and that's Sébastien Bachollet who asked for this on the CCWG on New gTLD Auction Proceeds. There was an e-mail to the ALAC list about an auction proceeds survey going on at the moment and the deadline is imminent, which I think might be tonight or tomorrow. So it may be a good idea to have a chat on that for about ten minutes.

---

Then we'll have the bulk of our discussions today on the CCWG Accountability final report. You'll notice on the agenda all of the different workstreams there. We're not going to go through each one of the work streams, they're just there for your reference.

The importance here is to look at the overarching issues and whether there are any linking issues between the different component parts of the report, parts that don't work together, parts that work well together, parts that we would like to emphasize one way or the other. So that's today's call. Are there any amendments to this agenda or anything else to add to this, please? I note there are just three minutes for Any Other Business at the end, but we can certainly try and add more things to the agenda in-between.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Olivier, this is –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg, I notice your hand is up, so Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I wanted to spend a minute and talk about how this group came about, because there's some confusion as to what it is and how it's going to work. When the ALAC did a review of all of its working groups a number of months ago, we noted a number of things. First of all, a lot of the policy groups had not been particularly active, largely because of the transition and accountability work that had been going on, but there was certainly an intent to reactivate them.

---

But noted that, probably, there was a not a need for a lot of meetings of the working groups as such. But they would probably do most of their work on mailing lists. On the other hand, when there was a need for a meeting, it probably was because things were at the point of having a public comment or the ALAC taking some action on it, and we probably wanted a wider participation in the meeting than just the hardcore people who were involved in that one subject.

So what we decided on was to have essentially mailing list groups for most of the technical subjects, most of the policy issues, and have a consolidated group under which any teleconferences, webinars and things like that would be held.

There was also a concept that at times, a subject that was unique to one of the subgroups would become of more import to ALAC as a whole and At-Large as a whole, perhaps because of a public comment or something else coming to a head, and at that point, the subject could well be moved on to the general mailing list for wider participation.

In terms of the mechanisms of how it works, there are individual mailing lists for things like gTLDs and registration issues. Those mailing lists automatically are – the union of those mailing lists, the sum total of them, become the CPWG mailing list. Anyone on any of the sublists can send to the CPWG mailing list, and everyone on any of the subgroups receives mail on it. And that works completely automatically.

So you don't actually become a member of the CPWG, but you simply become a member of one of the subgroups and you're implicitly a member. And that's the whole story, but certainly, if there are any

---

questions, I can take them. But hopefully, that's relatively clear. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for these wise words, Alan. So, are there any other comments? I guess we're still on the agenda part. I don't see any other hands than Alan's hand, so I guess we can proceed forward. So the first item on our agenda is really the welcome from the co-chairs. I've already spoken, Alan's already spoken and given us some feedback or some background on how this group has come to be, and I gather you all have to meet Jonathan Zuck, the other co-conspirator in this group.

Jonathan, could you say just a few words on how you – I guess you're going to concentrate on a certain number of parts. I guess most people know you, but a little bit of an idea of how you're going to proceed forward on this, and I guess some of the tasks that we have ahead of us. Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Thanks, Olivier. And I don't necessarily have a concrete answer to those questions. I'm very interested in the policy development process inside of At-Large, and in the context of the review, etc., I think that it's a good time to be looking at what the best pathway or framework is for policy development inside of At-Large. So this group is sort of the beginning of an evolution, I think, in terms of how we ingest things, how we make assignments out for drafting, how we reach conclusions as an overall group and reach consensus so that that consensus can sort of be delivered out via more than just comments but also participation in

---

workgroups and things like that so that we're speaking with a single voice whenever possible. And I think that's the objective, and there's work to be done to figure out what that looks like going forward. But that's what I'm determined to do. Meanwhile, we're winging it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Jonathan. Just a quick question to you, are there any specific work practices that you might wish to sort of bring forth? Having been an inherent active component part of the GNSO for a while, is there anything that you think about contributing? I'm sorry to be putting you on the spot like this, but the question sort of sprung in my mind just now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And this is very amorphous thinking, but right now, the process is kind of many to many, where staff put out something for comment and then people randomly volunteer to draft, and people comment and some people miss it, and then last minute, people are trying to scramble to find consensus on things.

Ideally, I think there'd be a subgroup that takes calls for comments or new policies and puts them through some kind of a filter in terms of whether an end-user perspective would be valuable there, whether the topic that's being raised is part of the mission of ICANN, etc., and being selective, and then trying in a more structured way to say, "Okay, how do we create a little subgroup to come up with a proposal for the rest of the group, present it and try to build consensus in a more driven way

---

rather than in this kind of haphazard way that seems to happen via the wiki?"

So that's what I'm thinking of. Unfortunately, my experience has been with what would be much more homogeneous groups. Working inside the IPC, forming consensus is – or at least was – quite easy. It's not so much anymore after the new gTLDs, but because everybody was there for one reason, etc. So I think that developing an end-user perspective and building consensus around it and then promulgating that perspective throughout ICANN's various processes, whether it's comments or workgroups, I think should be our objective. So I think finding some funnel and way to drive that process rather than sort of passively hoping it'll happen will lead to more participation and a stronger voice for the At-Large.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I note that, Christopher Wilkinson, you have a tick mark next to your name. Is that a hand up, or is that just being in agreement with what Jonathan is saying?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Good afternoon. My WebEx screen is almost completely dead. There's no sound and I have no idea where that tick mark came from. I shall review the screen, but it's nonresponsive. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Alright, thanks. Just checking. Alright, well, thanks for this intro, and let's then go in deep, straight into it. And the first item that is

---

operational, I guess, that is all about policy, is our new gTLD subsequent procedures. There's a PDP that's been going on for quite some time, and it was suggested that there should be some update during this call.

I'm not the best person to provide an update on this, having not followed it so closely. But I guess I should ask for a volunteer to sort of step forward and let us know what exactly is it that we need to be particularly concerned about at this very moment. And perhaps, should I turn to Alan Greenberg for this as a guide? Yes, I can see, Alan, you've put your hand up. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. You're right, the working group has been going on for a while. And for people who may not be familiar with what we're talking about, as you may have heard, ICANN delegated about 1200 or so new gTLDs a little while ago, and the process for what has been called the first round – not technically accurate – is still ongoing but towards its end, and there is strong pressure from parts of the community to do it again, to make more TLDs available. And this is the working group which was charged with formulating the policy to do that, on everything from when would it be done, how often would it be done, and exactly what rules would be used, to what extent would the previous policy and implementation apply, and everything in-between.

The ALAC was very – and At-Large was very – involved in the previous round, especially during the latter parts of the design and then implementation, because we had strong concerns with things like string confusion and a number of other issues. Certainly, the applications from



---

developing regions, applicant support associated with them, community TLDs, what were called categories of TLDs. There were a lot of issues that At-Large was very concerned with, and for good reasons, because they do impact individual users.

And so we're now in the process of formulating a new set of rules – which might be the same or might be very different, and At-Large is not going to be in a strong position to complain about what is decided if we are not very active in formulating that policy. The number of people who are active in the working groups themselves is very small, and we are now at a point where a draft report, an interim report is coming out, and we will be expected to comment on it.

And the report is not so much specific recommendations, but to a large extent includes a very large number of questions and issues that they're looking for comments on. And if we don't put our comments in now and put them in in a very rational way, then we're essentially walking away from the issues, and I don't think we want to do that.

Cheryl may have a few more words to add. Cheryl is one of the co-chairs of the PDP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, are you able to speak? I know that you are on the WebEx now. Oh, and you're back on. Okay, excellent. Cheryl, you have the floor.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I can try and speak. Is it clear? Can anyone hear or understand me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Certainly from the south of France, you're absolutely crystal clear.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's delightful. Thank you. Yes, I've put in the chat that the interim report is going to be expected probably sometime next month, we're hoping. It would be late next month at this point in time. Thank you, Sébastien. I'm pleased you can hear me. It is going to be a very large and extensive report, so not only is it – as Alan said – a report where we will be seeking a lot of input from community, there are questions associated with each of the workpieces, and the workpieces are broken up into work tracks.

We've had four work tracks running for nigh over 18 months now, and we've had a fifth work track running more recently which his specific to geographic names, which many of you will be probably more familiar with than the important work of the other four work tracks. However, the report isn't going to be a Work Track 1, 2, 3, 4 segregated one. It is a topic-based segregated one, because it fits then with the report that was created at the “close” of the 2012 round of new gTLD. So we are working from a charter that means we need to link back with a review

---

of the last round of gTLDs and the Applicant Guidebook associated with it.

There are however expected 200+ pages on that. This is going to be a report that's to be taken seriously. It's probably going to be needed to be carved up in some way and digested in some way, and I think the importance of that activity for this committee – I hope it's not lost on any of you, but certainly, it will be an interesting experiment for us to deploy this new model of the consolidated group.

I don't plan on going into the gory details of any or all of the work tracks. The usual wikis are extensive, and of course, we've got a considerable amount of background material. An interim report is going to be written or is being written in such a way that we hope an inexperienced or new entry person into the topic should be able to get themselves fairly deeply into it without needing to leave the document, which is why the document is as large as it is. This could be a very useful activity for this consolidated group to look into carving up and perhaps effectively interacting with.

But Alan and I would caution you all about carving things up and then just leaving it to just one or two penholders who have been unrelated to or utterly unrelated to the work of the PDP processes, or more importantly, unrelated to finding out what the will of the wider At-Large community is. Because we've certainly had with community consultations on this topic in the past a situation where the CCT review, the questions were carved up, and to be honest, when people asked us in the PDP process, "What did the ALAC or At-Large mean by that?" Alan

---

and I had to say, “Well, we’re buggered if we know. We have no idea what these people were on about when they wrote it.” Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just want to elaborate a little bit on what Cheryl just ended with. The [constant issues] she talked about, we did carve things up. It was a particularly busy time, and probably, we did not focus on the results before we submitted it very well. But in a few cases, not only could Cheryl and I – who were the main participants in the gTLD process – not explain it, but we knew it was exactly counter to recommendations and statements the ALAC had made in the past.

So I think we’re going to have to be very careful. We don’t want to only have the same people drafting things time and time again. On the other hand, we have to make sure that what we’re saying does make sense and is supported by At-Large in a way that is consistent. So how we do this – and I’m not quite sure, and I welcome Jonathan’s involvement to try to make sure that when we have people drafting things, it is something that is going to be widely supported and widely understood by the rest of the community. So we will be talking about that a lot more going forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Are there any further questions or comments on this call and on this topic? I'm not seeing anybody putting their hand up. I

---

have one question, which is that – so we’re expecting this report of 200+ pages. We’ve got an idea, sometime next month. Would it be worth already now looking at the dates at which we should have some kind of a – either webinar or a discussion around this report? Bearing in mind that suddenly this thing comes on our desk and then it takes us two weeks to doodle, find a time to meet and all that stuff and we end up with having three days until the end of the comment period. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Yes, I think we should do that. We probably need multiple ones and we need to first talk about exactly how we’re going to structure it. But there's no question we should be doing our prep ahead of time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Alan. Do you wish to sort of set dates now, or do you want to do it as an action item follow-up?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Not on the fly in this meeting, but yes, we should be doing it sooner rather than later.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks, Alan. So let’s have a follow-up. Let’s have an action item, please. Staff, take note of Alan, Olivier, Jonathan, and Cheryl.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: To work on a – I did list her as well, yes? And Cheryl to work together on a schedule of calls relating to the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Olivier, it's more than a schedule of calls. It's the overall process by which we're going to address this report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Okay, well, that's already just a placeholder.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Olivier, can you – hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, hello.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, I'm sorry. I'm over the phone because I'm actually driving, but can you actually put me as one of the team as well?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sure we can, yes. This is just like scheduling and preparation. But yes, Hadia. No problem. We'll have you listed as well. So add Hadia to this small group, please. And let's now move on. I'm not seeing –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hang on. My hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl has her hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl has her hand up. It was very far, Cheryl, down the list. It's this system that doesn't actually order people in the order of hands up. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just on that topic, wanted to suggest that it might be wise for anyone who's planning on being a penholder in this process to pay particular attention and to make themselves available during – if they're attending the ICANN62 meeting. There will be considerable blocks of time. It is a policy meeting, and there are considerable blocks of time being devoted to the PDP. And it is an ideal opportunity. We're not going to be releasing the interim report until after now ICANN62 because we want to take advantage of upskilling the community and socializing the report. So it would be – dare I say – much smarter for people in ALAC and At-Large who are actually involved and interested in PDP processes and having the voice of At-Large be heard

---

to also be in the rooms that are discussing it during ICANN62. It would be an excellent basis for moving into text response and drafting. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if you look on WebEx and you bring up the attendee list, there's a little word saying, "feedback." If you click that –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I figured that one out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. But you have to click it again because it doesn't keep things up to date necessarily.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for letting me know you have to click it again. I'll see if it works. We'll see.

Alright, well, let's then move on to the next agenda item, and that's the Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds. As you know, the one that was qualified as the first round brought some significant funds to this [inaudible] that is currently held at ICANN headquarters, as we know. Sébastien Bachollet wanted to bring this one forward because there's a discussion currently going on with the survey



---

about the auction proceeds survey. And it was an e-mail that Vanda sent on to the ALAC list, and there were quite a few responses to that. Sébastien, do you want to say a few words? And then we'll open the floor for discussion around this.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Yes, I'd bring up this topic. I am not sure that it's the best group to discuss that, but we start on the ALAC mailing list, and as a matter of fact, we have one and a half hours still left to answer this survey. In fact, one of the reasons I bring that today is that maybe we can have some exchange on that. And I didn't find really an answer on how to answer the survey to the good of the end user in that discussion. And of course, I can answer myself and decide as it just opened for members and participants of the CCWG on Auction Proceeds, but maybe a short discussion here could help us, the five-member and the participants from At-Large to better answer the survey. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sébastien. So the survey itself, what does it ask? Because I'm looking at the link over to the charter, but since of course it's only the members that are likely to answer the survey, what exactly are the

---

options? If you could summarize them in a couple of minutes, that would be helpful.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I guess the best way is to read the mail sent by Vanda to the ALAC. And in fact, there is a question, it's around the possible mechanism to distribute the money. Not to whom we will distribute it but how it will be distributed or who will be in charge of it. And there are four different solutions.

One, it's – if I shorten the discussion, there's a department or an inhouse part of ICANN staff. The other one, it's also a department in the ICANN org but in collaboration with an existing charitable organization. The third one is to create a new structure like ICANN Foundation, and the fourth one is to establish [an entity] that ICANN will use and just oversight but not be in charge of.

The first answer from some people was to have something outside of ICANN org, and I didn't answer myself during this discussion, but I have the impression that with what's happening today, with the shorten of budget, and at the same time with the situation of how to be sure that the multi-stakeholder will be still in use in the solution taken into account, I would prefer to have something inhouse. But that's something we need to discuss. The problem is that we have just one and a half hours to answer, and I am sure that my colleagues have already answered, maybe, to that survey. But I would be happy to have input from all this. Thank you, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. I open the floor for comments and questions, and I see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. First of all, the survey closes 30 minutes after the end of this meeting. So it's a bit late now to start collecting input. Although I appreciate why Vanda send out the message, the survey is aimed at the participants and members, because the issues have been discussed for over the year, and there are some subtleties associated with them which are not intuitively obvious. So it's really hard to do a one short e-mail background to give everyone all of the information. I suspect any of those models that are being proposed could work and any of them could be done really badly. Some would be easier to do badly than others, admittedly.

To put this in perspective though, we're talking about a quarter of a billion dollars, potentially. This is a huge amount of money. It is a golden opportunity for ICANN to do some really good stuff, or really waste a lot of money. And the question is, how do we try to maximize the chances that we do good things and minimize the chance that we are going to just waste the money, or perhaps just have it sit there and not even figure out how to use it at all because we set rules that are so difficult to follow?

So it's a really complex question. There are no guarantees that we understand all of the issues in making the choice, but if we don't make choices, the money will just sit there. So we are going to have to move

---

forward. I tend to support what Sébastien said, actually. Just giving it to an outside foundation is easy. I think although we will still have auditing control over what the money is used for, because there are strong constraints because of the ICANN mission. I don't believe that that would be the right way to do it. I think we need to have more involvement. On the other hand, we don't want to build this kind of structure from scratch. So I think we need to work with partners who have skills in certain areas, and a lot of experience in certain areas doing this kind of work. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Sébastien, I was going to ask, the number of people that are on that working group, how is the count being undertaken at that point? Is it per SO/AC, or is it just per individual that is answering the survey of the individual members of the PDP?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I can answer, it's every people who are members, and we have five members for At-Large, one per region. And anybody could be a participant who are listed in the wiki page of the CCWG on Auction Proceeds can answer the survey. And I just sent you the last sentence we received, and we have until 6:00 UTC to answer the survey.

And I get your point, Alan, and I agree with you. But I was thinking, yes, as we start to have some discussion within ALAC, I wanted to have some public statement, and I think it's important what you have said, Alan, that it's not an easy job to answer the survey and it's why it's done by

---

the member and the participant. But now you get public on that and I support what you say, Alan. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Sébastien. And thanks for bringing this up. And of course, as you know, this has been debated on the At-Large or on the ALAC mailing list, and I don't think that there's been any clear answer as to which one of the possible mechanisms to proceed forward with. But I gather that the participants in the group will be well aware of and will make sure that they do respond, I think that's one of the important things, and continue to take part in this.

Maybe it would be good to establish a watching brief over this. As things start to – it seems that the process starts moving forward in that PDP, and have regular updates about this PDP on auction proceeds, if that's okay with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, just an update. At this point, the plan, the hope is we will have a draft report in the Panama timeframe. So yes, it is moving quickly, and we will have to start gearing up to respond.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Should we list the people that are on that PDP so we can call upon them in future policy calls?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. They're on the wiki, both the formal appointed members who are appointed one per RALO, plus the participants are all listed on the wiki, and their attendance figures are there so we can see who's actually been paying attention.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Let's have an action item, please, to create a page that follows this. So that will be linked to this Consolidated Policy Working Group, and that will have an At-Large home for the gTLD auction proceeds. And we'll be able to then – since we are going to be asked to produce some documents and some answers in the near future, we'll be able to start building things out of that wiki page. Sébastien Bachollet, your hand is still up. And it's down now.

Well, thanks very much, gentlemen. Let's now move to Agenda Item 6. I'm not seeing any other hands, so we can now speak about the big order of the day, and that's the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability Final Report. The Work Stream 2 final report, actually, the end of the end. Or maybe the beginning of a brand-new chapter, who knows.

We've got a whole list of work stream topics here, and as I mentioned a while ago, we are not going to go through each one of these work

---

stream topics. I think we're all – or seasoned participants of these calls are well aware of all of the work that has gone on and the various moments in time where the ALAC and the At-Large community has had a chance to comment and bring input to each one of these subsections.

The problem then goes that it's the first time we actually meet or discuss the overall report as a whole, as in not just human rights or guidelines for good faith or Ombudsman, but the whole thing as one package, and this is where we have to provide an input into a publication or a consultation – sorry, public consultation at the moment. There's a link, actually, from the agenda into the public consultation which, strangely enough, is called CCWG Accountability Work Stream 2 Final Report. And Hadia Elminiawi has been very kind to draft the first draft in this consultation.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I know that this is closing in a couple of days. Yes, we can hear somebody saying hello.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This is closing in a couple of days. The call for comments actually we're saying opens on the 8<sup>th</sup> of May, call for comments close on the 10<sup>th</sup>. That gives an enormous amount of time for us to work on, but we do have a good 40 minutes or so now to discuss this specific – not only just the draft but also if there's anything else that we would like to add to this draft. I note that Sébastien Bachollet has already provided an answer or a comment on Hadia's first draft, and Alan has also added a few more things.

Without me reading what's on the text, maybe I should give the floor to these two gentlemen. And perhaps, should I – before I do this, let Hadia say a few words about the draft. So if you're able to speak, Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, I am. Thank you. I'm driving but I'm able to speak. So I don't have my notes [with me] but I did read the final report as well as the original reports as well, and I did find some minor inconsistencies between the final report and the individual report. However, this is not what we are looking for. We are looking for inconsistencies within the same report, within the recommendations of the same report.

Having said so, I find no reason that the recommendations don't work together. They should work together, unless during the implementation, an overlap is created. Yes, so unless something happens like that during the implementation phase, there is no reason that the recommendations don't work together.



---

I find that the structure of the recommendations or the structure of the report is consistent. However, the way the recommendation – the word usage is not consistent. So I did not write this in the comment, but I would like to say that, for example, when you're listing the recommendations for the diversity, you put the broad item on top and then you list the recommendations that are related to this broad item.

However, if you look at the recommendations regarding another topic, for example the conduct presumed in good faith, you find that they don't list the broad item but they say for example "Recommendations of guidelines related to..." So it's not put in the same way or manner. And I think that it is better to put it in the same way or like the way they did list, for example, the recommendations for the diversity instead of using some different word for each and every report when listing the recommendations. So that's a comment that I did not put in, but I see that it's better to do this way.

Another thing, with regard to the jurisdiction, there was a recommendation – 12.3, I think – and this recommendation is not actually among the recommendations of the subgroup. The final report of the subgroup does not include this recommendation, but it's rather part of the background section.

And also, looking at this recommendation and looking at the substance itself, it talks about some discussions and concerns, and it actually does not mention or say what these discussions or concerns are. So they do give an example, but then they're talking about discussions and concerns without saying what these discussions and concerns are. So I find it very difficult to put in a report, in a final report, to refer to some

---

discussions and concerns and to say that you want to continue working on them without actually stating what these discussions and concerns are. So that's actually something I did not put also in the comment, but I think it's valid.

What I actually put in the report, in the comment, is that the recommendation itself is not consistent with the report itself. [inaudible] it does not have any consistencies with other recommendations in the report, but it's inconsistent with the report itself because it's out of its scope. Because as the groups say, they actually were tasked with some limited topics, and they worked on those topics. So implying that those discussions and concerns were not among them.

I think that's about it, that's what I can think of now. So thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. Very well put together considering you were driving as well at the same time. Just a question. You were mentioning one thing which I didn't quite catch. They don't say the concerns they had or discussions of concern. In what section was that?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It was actually jurisdiction. It was under the jurisdiction part.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, it's jurisdiction.

---

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Let's then look at our list of people queueing up to speak. And first, we have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of comments with respect to Hadia's comments. This process – I don't know where that beeping is coming from. If staff could try to figure it out. This process has been going on for over three years, and I think there's a certain amount of exhaustion in the community. The individual sections of the report were written separately, and there was no attempt to try to reword, rewrite them all to be in a completely consistent format. So I think we have to accept what we have.

In terms of jurisdiction, I'm not an expert on that. We have other people on the call who are, but this was an exceedingly contentious group, and I suspect that one was wordsmithed carefully to walk a very fine line that was not going to cause concerns. So that may be relevant in curious wording that one might find in the report.

However, the reason I raised my hand is my overall comment. All of this work was done – and as I said, it's been done over close to two years now since it started, and I think each of the groups – and I participated in several of them very actively – have done a diligent job of trying to

---

address the question they were given, and I think have made recommendations which overall are quite reasonable.

However, the context in ICANN is changing over time. When we started the accountability work over three years ago, the real issue was, “Can we make ICANN accountable?” I think in light of recent budget discussions and a whole bunch of other things that are going on, there is an increasing concern – certainly I have a very large concern – with ICANN that we are building processes and procedures that are becoming quite onerous, both in terms of the amount of staff effort and resources and money that goes into it, and the drain on volunteer resources, that we’re spending an increasing amount of our time in things that are not the reason we’re here but peripheral to it, but to be transparent while we do it.

And a large number of the recommendations fall into that category, and I fear that even though each of them was made in good faith, the sum total of them are going to be really onerous to implement. And I don’t think we can walk back now and change them, but I think as we go forward and implement them, we are going to have to take a very careful hand – and I say we meaning ICANN staff and the volunteers who are part of the implementation process – not to impose huge loads on the volunteer community and ICANN staff, all of which is for a good reason, but the sum total of it I think is going to be something that may hurt us more than it helps us. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much for these words, Alan. Of course, we're going to create about 12 different new committees, I guess, and have to fill them up with some chairs and vice chairs and everything else. And yes, we've got about 10 years' worth of work. Let's move to –

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if I may follow on, if you just look at the long list of best practices that the ALAC should now be considering once this is approved, and perhaps doing work on many of them, this could keep a lot of people busy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's my point, Alan. Yes. Thanks. And sorry, that was a joke as well at the same time, or a tongue in cheek comment. That's what it's called. Let's go to the next person in the queue, and that's Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hi, everyone. I hope you can hear me well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very well indeed.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much. So I want to comment on these jurisdiction recommendations, which are under number 4.3 and which is referred by Hadia in the report as something that is not kind of clear. And while I would actually personally – I would support this in the ALAC comment,

---

right? But just for the sake to see how much fun this will make, there is a bit of the background here.

So as you might remember, those of you who followed this process from the very beginning, the Jurisdiction group was all in shambles. It was totally in shambles for one simple reason. Some of the people – and especially representative so the GAC – demanded to consider the question of ICANN immunity and the location of ICANN. As the time passed by and we got closer to the deadline for the work completion, so either we complete all the parts of the work or there would be no accountability report and no accountability process, nothing, people had to finally roll up their sleeves and do the work, and so the group agreed that the immunity issues could not be discussed within the Work Stream 2 because they are outside of the ICANN remit. And there was a compromise, because unless this wording was carefully put into these reports, such governments, for example, as Brazil I think with the support of [inaudible] and some others would not have agreed to submit this report at all.

And of course, there was no way to put it frankly that, yes, there was one remaining issue which was ICANN jurisdiction immunity and ICANN relocation, and we are unhappy and we want the discussion to continue. So this is why this part of the report is so kind of amorph and carefully worded, and it looks like it is about nothing. But basically, it is about something, and it is about everything. Because this is about one of the major problems of the group.

And while I do believe that to someone who was not in the thick of it, it might look completely stupid and unrelated, it is one of the essence,

---

one of the substances of that compromise. So while I don't mind actually excluding the recommendation and the public comment to delete the section 4.3, but believe it or not, it will never be deleted, because it was a compromise. It was the wording which the group could agree on, and so Alan is right here, it got there for a reason.

But I also want to make one more comment. I do believe that the main concern right now – and here I am finding myself surprisingly in agreement with Alan Greenberg, which doesn't happen frequently – that was a joke – that implementation is going to be a major issue. We have over 100 recommendations there, and it's going to be a multi-year project. But the problem for me right now is not only funds required for the implementation of volunteer work. For me, the issue is prioritization. So how do we actually detect, how do we actually define which recommendations should require immediate implementation?

And here I come to the topic, for example, of human rights. You know that in the Work Stream 2, the bylaw on human rights was dormant, which meant that the bylaw would wake up and be put into force only when the framework of interpretation is in force. But then the question is, when the framework of interpretation is in force, when the Work Stream 2 report is approved by chartering organizations, and then we have to implement all the human rights concerns immediately, or only after the implementation phase? And if it's the former, if it's immediately after the chartering organization approval, then we really have to react quickly and to prioritize this, because it does have significant implications on how policy process will be carried out and how GAC and ALAC will provide their advice.

---

So implementation is a big issue. Concerning the entire report, I am personally not a big fan of some of the recommendations, but I think there is not much inconsistency, and what we have to think about is mostly how much effort it would require to implement all this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Tatiana. Next in the queue is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, I guess my line is now unmuted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, it is.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Great, thank you very much. Yes. Thank you for all your comments, both Alan and Tatiana, and Hadia, of course. Well done, and I agree almost with everything. That is rare. I think it's important that we stress in our comments that we support that there is a team in charge of the implementation. I know so well when it's not done in subgroups and the decision on how it's implemented, it's either in the hands of staff or at the hand of some board member, and it's not going in the direction of what the community wanted. And it's important to stress that and to be aligned with that or to support the fact that we keep a team of the CCWG on Accountability as to oversight implementation.



---

And it's not totally a joke. I really think that the next cross-community working group must be to decrease the complexity of this organization. It's not the first time you hear me talking about this question, but I think really both how we organize, how staff is organized and the relationship between the three pillars of this ICANN, [inaudible] what it's called now, organization, that means the staff, the board and the community, we may find a way to decrease this complexity. If not, sorry to say that, but ICANN will not survive. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. Are there any other – oh, I can see here. Yrjö Lansipuro is next.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yes. First of all, I'm very happy with the report, except that I share the concerns that Alan expressed. There are 100 recommendations, and we're going to be busy. Or the implementation team will be busy with that. And also sharing the concerns that Sébastien [came up with.] I have only one minor editorial point, and that is in the transparency section 8.2.1, and it wants ICANN to disclose expenditures over \$20,000 a year devoted to "political activities."

Now, this is about [contacts] with governments and all that, but I would just say that the word "political activities," the choice of word is not the best one because much can be read into that. I understand what that means, but somebody who reads these reports may get completely the wrong idea. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Yrjö. That's a very good point that you're making here. In fact, I don't quite know how to reword this. If you can think of a better way to reword it, Yrjö, please either put it in the chat or take the floor again.

I was going to go through the questions that Hadia had mentioned to us earlier, but perhaps we can hand the floor to Hadia first. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. So I want just to comment on what Tatiana said, and I would say that, actually, this 4.3 recommendation under the jurisdiction section is never actually going to be removed. It's going to be removed from the final report, yes, but then attached to the final report are the annexes or attachments which includes the final report of the Jurisdiction subgroup, and there it lies. So it remains there, so it will always be part of the final report, but it's not included in the final report itself, in the recommendations itself. That's one comment.

And then I have also one editorial comment regarding the conduct presumed in good faith. In the final report in the very beginning, in the introduction, it says that the Empowered Community, effective October 1<sup>st</sup> through the decision [of] participants has the right to appoint and remove board members. And actually, the report speaks only about the removal. And the original report also speaks only about the removal. So I don't know why at this point they put the word "appoint." Actually, the report speaks only about the removal.

---

So it's a suggestion just to put, "Has the right to – the bylaws, actually, effective October 1, 2016, grants the multi-stakeholder community powers to the Empowered Community members to remove board members." So that's just an editorial thing, because you might think afterwards that the same things apply on the appointment process, maybe. I don't know. It's just a little bit confusing to put it in there while the report never speaks about the appointment, it only speaks about the removal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. I've seen Sébastien Bachollet having put his hand up. He must have an answer to this. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Olivier. Not an answer to that, but I want just to be sure that after this call, all of what has been said here – and specifically a lot of things by Hadia – is not just going to the garbage. I think it's important – we can't ask people to listen to one and a half hours, and maybe if I can humbly suggest to the chair of this call that we ask staff to take the main ideas who are put to make changes on the report or to raise questions about the report may be important, either we put it in our comment and we send this to the current working group – it's your choice, but I think it's important not to lose all of that, because as I just checked now, there is for the moment no one single comment on the full report. I think the next two days, we'll see some of them, but it's quite strange that everybody waits for the end of this comment period

---

to put eventually some comment. And sorry not to be able to answer the question by Hadia, but I'm sure other people will do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Sébastien. I'm not seeing anybody in the queue at the moment. I was going to go through the –

ALAN GREENBERG: Then you're not looking at it properly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It doesn't show anything. Oh, now you appear. I have to click I don't know how many times on feedback for the things to reorder themselves properly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you have to go through a full cycle for it to refresh.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Every time I have to click on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think there's a person called – let's see, Alan Greenberg. Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, if you click on it until the little angle beside it goes up and then down, you'll get it refreshed. I don't know why they do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: it still doesn't work too well. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, maybe not. If I understood Hadia's question properly, she asked, "Why is the good faith section talking just about removal and not the appointment process?" Did I understand that correctly?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Alan, no, actually, that's not what I was saying. I was saying that the actual report speaks only about the removal and does not speak about the appointment. However, in the final report in the introduction section, they say, "Community effective October – decisional participants have the right to appoint and remove." So they put the word "appoint" in the final report in the introduction part, and I see no reason for putting it, because I see that they should only put the word "remove" and not "appoint."

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Of course they have the right to appoint as well, but we're only talking about – so I said it's only an editorial thing, but of course the decisional participants have the right to appoint as well, but because we are talking about only the removal, I think we should not put the word "appoint" here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, if you could put in the chat or send me a message saying exactly where the introduction says that, I'll look at that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Thanks for this, Hadia. That's very – going through this text with a very fine-tooth comb. That's really good.

Now, going back to your original point, so your earlier point, the first one on the format, diversity format being – the format used in the diversity section being quite well put together and some of the other sections not being so well put together. Is there a view on this call that we should be commenting about this? Does anybody wish to speak out about this? Alan Greenberg, you still have your hand up. You might as well [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, my opinion is it could have been done better. There's no way we're going to go back and rewrite it so it's all a consistent format. I don't think it's worth commenting on.

---

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Any counterpoint by anyone? I'm not seeing anybody putting their hand up, so that's the answer for the first one. So thanks for pointing it out, but yes, I guess people are probably sick enough of this report to make it perfect. And it's going to look a little bit disjointed, unfortunately.

The second point that Hadia made was to do with the jurisdiction point, and I think that we had an answer from Tatiana about this part. The only thing being the point – was it three that was not a recommendation of the subgroup but was taken from the background section instead of being a recommendation of the subgroup? Hadia, did Tatiana respond to this, to your concern on this one? Is that okay?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No. Actually, Tatiana did not refer to this point. She actually said that those were legitimate concerns and discussions that were important to the group. And I totally understand that, but this actual recommendation was never [supposed to be] the recommendation of the subgroup. It's only mentioned in the background section.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the background. Okay. Understood. [inaudible] Tatiana. We've got a queue now, Tatiana and then Alan Greenberg. Tatiana Tropina.

---

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much. So to respond to this question directly, why they are in the background section and not in the recommendations of this report, because apparently the group could not produce any recommendation on the ICANN immunity. And this was exactly the spirit of compromise. This will not go to the recommendation, but it would be reflected and mentioned in the report somehow to reflect the discussions and to make a compromise that would make unhappy people at least kind of at peace with the recommendation. But it's not in the final recommendation for one simple reason, because it does not constitute the recommendation. There is no recommendation about the ICANN immunity.

And there is a danger. If it goes to the recommendation, it would mean that ICANN and community is obliged to discuss immunity. And of course, except a few people, no one wanted this. But not mentioning it in the background report would be really bad for the spirit of compromise, and hence the inconsistency. So this is the reason and this is the direct answer to the question. It shouldn't be in the recommendations. But maybe it shouldn't be in the final report as well, but many people think it should be just because we agreed. I was a part of this group. We, the group agreed to have this kind of clumsy but compromise. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Tatiana. Hadia, does that answer your comment?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yes, it does. Thank you, Olivier.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Alan Greenberg next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Yes, I was going to follow on to Tatiana in saying if it doesn't hurt and it made people happy, then so be it. There were a lot of compromises made, especially in that section. Not the only one, but especially.

I just wanted to comment on Hadia's comment on the good faith. I just looked at the text, and the statement saying the Empowered Community through decisional participants has the right to appoint and remove individual directors is just setting the stage for the next sentence saying, "And when they remove individual directors, such and such applies." So I think it's just setting the stage, it's a stylistic thing. It could have been done different, but I don't think it hurts. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. Now I'm looking through the other points, and so we had an answer on the second point that Hadia had made regarding the concerns that were the unsaid concerns. I still see two people with their hands up, but I believe they've just spoken. Tatiana and Alan, are you both still in the queue?

TATIANA TROPINA: I actually am, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tatiana Tropina, you're the only person with your hand up, you have the floor.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much. With the jurisdiction comment, I forgot to raise a point which hi wanted to raise. I think maybe ALAC wants to comment on the implementation, because the final report says a couple of words about implementation. But honestly, from reading what they say, it is not clear for me how implementation is going to be done. It's like, "Hell yes, we're going to implement it, but we don't know how because it's totally outside the remit of this group."

And while I do believe that maybe it shouldn't be in the report and it shouldn't be [cryptic] of the report, but I do believe that we might want to express concern about implementation and just highlight, you know, to make a statement that we hope that there would be prioritization, that we hope that there would be a good use of resources, that we hope that these recommendations will get into practice that the group or community will decide how to implement it. So just to convey this initial message about implementation, and I think it would be a good wrap-up for the public comment just to mention implementation at the end. So just a suggestion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Tatiana. So there's I guess support that I'm also reading in the chat. Well, there's no lack of support for the prioritization

---

part. However, there seems to be concern about pointing out the inconsistency of some of the sections. So I think we'll – "inconsistency" noted in jurisdiction, maybe we should not proceed forward with something here.

I kind of made a few notes, but they're a bit of a mess at the moment, I admit. So if you did make a point, an important point, and now that you've heard the consensus that we were slowly reaching here, if you could put a summary on the chat, that would be helpful for everyone and certainly helpful for Hadia as she is the main penholder on this topic. And no small topic at all, so quite a challenge here. Are there any other thoughts or concerns? We've heard quite a number of people so far. The floor is still open, we still have another ten minutes if we need it. If we don't, then we might end this call early. Jonathan, I haven't turned over to you for a while. Do you have any concerns or questions? You looked how the proceeds are taking place at the moment. And that's Jonathan [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. I unfortunately am one of the people who didn't think that Work Stream 2 should have happened. I felt Work Stream 1 put a framework in place to allow the normal policy development processes of ICANN to deal with these other issues, that what we needed was just an accountability framework from within which we could work, and I think prioritization becomes essential, because this is an attempt really to kind of boil the ocean and think of every possible aspect of these issues. And I think that that's something doomed to failure. So I think as we comment on this, we ought to be as surgical as possible and see if

---

there are ways that things we feel really strongly about to try to improve upon and not try to boil the ocean in our commentary. Because I think most of this stuff will get resolved through the normal processes of ICANN, and with the ability to engage the Empowered Community where necessary to make reform happen. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. So prioritization is something that we all agree on. Let me throw some question into the arena. Who should make this prioritization? How should this prioritization be decided? Is this a staff matter? Is this a community matter? And how? That's for really anyone who wishes to tackle this. Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: This is a very good question. I hear myself. There is an echo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's two of you on the call.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, okay [inaudible] Olivier, maybe you can mute yourself. I don't know who's producing...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can mute myself, but [inaudible]

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I can hear myself as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND If staff could please check the echo. But in the meantime, Tatiana, please proceed forward.

TATIANA TROPINA: [inaudible] So I do believe that there is a very big issue about prioritization. And as Cheryl knows – she was on the last GNSO call because I asked Thomas Rickert about this. So who is going to prioritize? Who is going to actually come up with the implementation plan? Is it the ICANN org? Is it the community? Who is actually going to put all this forward? And honestly, I don't see the answer to this question, and I honestly don't [inaudible] for example, if for one part of the community, something would be more of a priority for the other part, how are we going to proceed?

So maybe here the role of the ICANN org should be stronger. I really don't know. Because on the other hand, it would be the recommendations to increase accountability or advance accountability of the ICANN org, so why should it be in charge for the implementation of them?

So I see the issues here, and honestly, I do not see the answers. It's a big question, and even talking about this prioritization already seems like boiling the ocean, quoting Jonathan. So the issue is, of course, what kind of point I'm trying to make here. The point I'm trying to make here is that we are producing an elephant, a monster, more than 100

---

recommendations without even a clear idea how we're going to implement them. And maybe we can advise to the Work Stream 2 chairs or groups, the communities, to start already the discussion how the small implementation group or oversight team or whatever would be formed, what would be the first step for the prioritization, what would be the first step for implantation. Because otherwise, it's like looking at it and it's an elephant and hell knows how we're going to cut it into pieces and eat it. So that's my point. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Yes, thank you, Tatiana, and thanks for please not hurting animals. Did I just hear Hadia? Is that Hadia Elminiawi?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, you can jump the queue and then we'll go to the rest of the queue. So Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, so actually, my [thought] on this, a big group should be formed. There is a need for making a big group that actually is composed of the eight subgroups. So it would have members of the eight subgroups. In

---

addition, of course, to staff, ICANN org members, and maybe some other community members as well who are interested in the topic. And this group would set the framework or the cast for the implementation. I think this is like the only way that this could be done. So you have to engage those who actually put the report, and also, you have to engage definitely ICANN org as well and the staff. So that's how I see the way forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. Next is Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Olivier. I hope that we will not hear somebody crying behind me, but maybe. I have an echo now.

Okay, I want to take two points. The first one is we have to be very careful not to mix implementation and prioritization, because when we talk about implementation – and it's a long story and I will not give you the full story, but it's staff who is doing implementation. Therefore, we need a group to oversight the implementation. This group I guess was already discussed. It's supposed to be the three co-chairs and the rapporteurs of the various subgroups.

But regarding the prioritization, I guess we have two options if we want, as a community, to be involved. We can say, "Okay, it's the implementation team who will take care of that," or we need to say that Work Stream 2 cross-community working group will still be alive for the next few months, we give the report, the report is accepted by the

---

chartering organizations and is accepted by the board, and then the next task of this same Work Stream 2 Cross-Community Working Group is in charge of working, let's say in the next six months or before the end of the year, to make prioritization.

It will not be an easy task, but it could be the best way to do that. Yes, a lot of members of this Work Stream 2 were thinking that we are done. It may be the best way. At least it will be the one I will suggest, is to postpone the end of the Work Stream 2 CCWG and to give them the responsibility to set up the priority of the implementation. And then to set up, to do the implementation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Sébastien. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Yes, so Sébastien said part of what I was doing. The organization of the implementation group is already decided, we don't have to recreate it here.

Prioritization I think is going to be a joint effort. And I like Tatiana's description of the elephant. We have built a real monster here, and if we are going to actually implement all of this and track it, we're going to have to grow ICANN staff, because the amount of effort involved in this is not going to be small. And that's why I started off with the statement saying I think we're going to have to take a minimalist hand and do it really carefully.



---

And prioritizing is part of it, but it's not the complete message, and I presume that a combination of the implementation team and perhaps the board even going out for public comment on some of this is the only way we're going to go ahead with it. I would not support setting up yet another organization to oversee this, and I certainly wouldn't support saying the CCWG stays in session for this.

If you looked at the number of conference calls on the subgroups that were cancelled because we couldn't find five people to come to them, there's a message there. And I was one of those – like Jonathan – who said we shouldn't even have Work Stream 2. That clearly did not come to be, and it was never going to come to be, but I think there's a certain amount of exhaustion in the group and we have to put it to rest.

Prioritization will have to be done, and it's going to have to be done on somewhat of an ad hoc basis, I think, and we're going to have to trust the Implementation Review Team to wave red flags at the ACs and SOs if necessary. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Just a quick question. Do you think that maybe the chairs of the chartering organizations could just vote on this? A bit like [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Vote on the priorities?

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you asking them to vote on their own behalf, or consult their organizations?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Consult their organizations.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can do anything. How much time do you want to spend on this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Clearly not much time left on this call, but maybe on another call, who knows. I would think to give the floor –

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I think it would be an absolutely fine idea to put the responsibility on the chairs of the chartering organizations after next November when I'm no longer the chair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We haven't got enough space to have this complete sentence added to our comment, but we'll see what can be done. I was going to give the floor to Christopher Wilkinson because I understand a number of times he was unmuted and he might have wished to say a few words.

---

So Christopher, I believe you've been unmuted now, but your line is echoing a bit.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Olivier. This is really under Any Other Business, but since you've given the floor, I'd just add that under point 4 of the agenda, if we may revert to that for a second, I would be glad to participate in the drafting group for the ALAC comments on the PDP interim report. I've already written quite a lot about this, and my contributions of course will be available for discussion by the drafting group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Christopher. So if staff can add your name to the small group as well, that would be great.

Okay, I'm seeing that we're reaching the end of this official timing. Not sure we have a lot more to say. I know it's very late for Cheryl Langdon-Orr and it's been a pretty long call, and pretty good so far. I would suggest that we break off now and that we look at our notes, and any follow-up can be done on the mailing list. Unless anybody else has to say anything, as in last words. Perhaps I should just give the floor again to Alan if there's anything else we need to have.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I have nothing else to say at this point.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And Hadia Elminiawi –

ALAN GREENBERG: Other than if things go as planned, the ALAC will be voting on whether to accept this report or not in Panama.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent, Alan. Thank you. And Hadia Elminiawi, I understand there are some notes in the chat, and hopefully staff will also be able to help you out with some notes. And if I could be kept in the loop, I might be able to send a few notes too on what else might need to be added to the statement that you're currently holding the pen on. Hadia?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Olivier, Hadia disconnected. We haven't been able to reach her.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Right. Well, we'll follow up after this call then on this. I'd like to thank everyone for a very productive call. I hope it was good for everyone. You can see here next meeting – we've got two minutes to discuss the next meeting, but we've already had an action item regarding the big forthcoming processes being the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP and the auction proceeds having passed us. But certainly, Agenda Item 4, so I don't think we need to discuss this, in which case, is there any other other business? Okay, well, with all this, thanks very much to everyone who has contributed and who's been on the call today. I hope it was helpful. And with this, I can say this call has

---

now ended. Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and good night, everyone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you all. Bye-bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: The call has now been adjourned. Thank you, everybody, for joining the call. Please remember to disconnect your lines. Goodbye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**