CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) call on Wednesday, 25 July 2018, at 19:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Christopher Wilkinson, Gordon Chillcott, Yrjo Lansipuro, Kaili Kan, Nadira Al-Araj, Joel Thayer, Roberto Gaetano, and Sebastien Bachollet.

We have received apologies from Yeşim Nazlar, Satish Babu, Justine Chew, Judith Hellerstein, and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğdu, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name for the transcription purposes. For those on audio only, I would like to remind you to please us *6 to mute and *7 to unmute.

Thank you, and I turn it over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Claudia. Welcome to this call. Today's agenda is going to be quite a full agenda, actually. We'll first discuss the Policy homepage and try to find an ideal design for navigation and promotion of any hot topics.

Then we'll into the Initial Report of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP). Jonathan has put a first

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.

draft that is linked from the agenda, a Google Doc proposal. This is a policy consultation process which looks as though we have plenty of time, but it needs to be addressed as soon as possible because it's a very important track.

Then after that, we'll have a quick discussion on whether we should have a webinar about the expedited PDP (EPDP) on specifications for the GDPR.

Then we'll have a discussion after that – hopefully, we'll still have time – on the actual topic itself of the EPDP input from At-Large and how we're going to be having enough penholders for being able to answer drafts, etc. A particularly important topic here.

We'll continue with Any Other Business. This is where I need to ask if there is any other business to add to this agenda, whilst at the same time also asking whether anybody would like to make any changes or amendments to the agenda.

Seeing no hands, the agenda is adopted as I just described it, and we can swiftly move on to the review of our action items from our last call last week.

There is only one remaining action item, and that's for Jonathan, Alan, and myself to coordinate with Evin and Heidi on assigning Policy Anchors and Policy Champions on a per-RALO basis for important projects and comments.

We're going to be discussing this a little bit now, or later on, regarding penholders. But here it really is to try and get RALOs to have a policy person, a Policy Champion.

I've seen some response from one of the RALOs at least where they have asked whether they could have more than one person because there are so many different topics in policy and it might be a high load on just one person. That's well understood. I just wanted to find out if there was any objection to more than one person per RALO, or is there any reason for the fact that we've said we wanted one anchor per RALO or per project. Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: I thought the idea of having one person is that there's one person responsible. If you start to have lots of people, I think you wind up with like a meeting with too many people. It doesn't allow for the coordination of resources or coordination of responses. I'm leery of having too many people involved to the point where why can't there be one person who just says, "Look, these are the issues. These are the resources we have. What is it that's most important to our RALO? How do we focus on it?" And having some kind of coordination. Otherwise, my concern would be that you'd wind up with just a lot of people and no coordination. I really appreciated the concept of having one person per RALO to encourage the whole RALO without having a lot of people, but that's just my thought and I'm happy to be talked down. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, I'd like to be in the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'll put you in the queue, Jonathan. Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is
                           next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I want to apologize, first of all, for not being contactable
                           during last week's call. I know that people did try and reach out to me,
                           but the telecommunications world just wasn't playing nicely. So I may
                           have missed something.

                           I understand Holly's point, and I hope I understand the intent of the
                           Champion. As a coordination role, that should be quite a fair and
                           reasonable thing to have a single point of contact and to encourage that
                           to be part of the normal RALO world. But I wonder if that is the only
                           intention as opposed to that person being the penholder and creator of
                           input, whether that was clearly flagged when we reached out. Because I
                           would think that whilst a single point of contact for coordination and
                           encouragement is important, to expect that person to be the sole
                           source would be the antithesis of what we would be trying to do, I
                           would have thought.

                           So maybe we didn't communicate the role properly, and that's why the
                           feedback was, "Can we have many?" Because the more the merrier is
                           probably what we need in terms of input into policy from the RALO, but

I believe this is a single point of contact for administration, organization, and efficiency. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Next is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess I'm going to end up being redundant, and I apologize. My father had an expression: "If you have one man's work, get one man to do it. If you have half a man's work, get two." I think that a coordination role is, as Holly said, about responsibility for being a liaison between the RALO and the policy development process. But that role includes identifying penholders and people with expertise for a particular comment. But I think we need an efficient process of actually socializing policy positions and other things with the RALOs and those actually go through a single individual.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I'm not seeing anyone else putting their hand up, so I take it that there is consensus on the responses here that this should be a policy coordinator. At the moment it's written as Policy Anchor and Policy Champion, and that might have led to some confusion in the RALOs as to the nature of the role. So if it's a coordinator, I understand that this group – since I've not heard the opposite – this group wishes to have one per RALO. Maureen Hilyard?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Olivier. Yeah, I have to agree with the idea of a coordinator, basically a coordinator and liaison between the RALOs and individual RALOs and the CPWG. But I guess when it comes to because the CPWG can be covering so many different policy topics, it's going to be a little bit daunting for one person to be able to feed back information. And then maybe some sort of coordination of those within each of the RALOs with the different, I don't know, if you're having your different working groups, that there be people within those working groups who might be able to feed back information through the coordinator? I'm not quite sure how you plan to do this, but we do want to get as many people within the RALOs involved and understanding what is happening within those policy areas. But the liaison role [is good]. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maureen. Next is Nadira Al-Araj.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, Olivier. In fact, that's my second time hearing about the Policy Anchor in the RALOs. In fact, I raised the point at our monthly meeting. I was [inaudible] because it seems it's still not clear the [two] roles. From Holly, she mentions there's somebody to be anchor and then there is a coordination. So I think why the coordination not to be run by the RALO's leadership team? And then you have the anchor of the policy that coordinates between from each RALO to work together. So still the coordination has to be under responsibility of the RALO's leadership. That's my point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nadira. I think I'm hearing the same story but from a different perspective. I can certainly understand that the work of all of the policy work that there has to be channeled through one person to effectively channel everything back and forth might be somehow a little difficult except if that person just has a coordinating role. Then that person will designate people in the RALO for specific tasks for specific policy work that takes place. I can certainly understand that one person will not be able to draft and do things. But the point here is to enhance the communication between the RALOs and this specific working group and any policy work that takes place inside it.

What I will do is I will try and respond to the question that was asked on the mailing list with what I've heard today and explaining the coordination side or exercising the coordination. Not saying that this is going to be where all of the information will go back and forth, but it's the person that effectively gets the trains to run on time. We're not asking that person to drive every train, but we're asking them to make sure that the trains are not lost somewhere in the station.

Okay, I realize we're spending a bit more time on this than we should have, but it's an important point. Thank you for all of your input. Seeing no further hands, let's then please move on to Agenda Item 3. That's the Policy homepage and the ideal design for navigation and promotion of the hot topics.

At present, the policy page has got a lot of information. There's obviously the policy page that is on the At-Large website which is coordinated with the policy page that is on the wiki. But it doesn't actually show what the really hot topics are on there. So I hand the floor

over to Holly Raiche and Jonathan Zuck. I'm not sure who wishes to speak first. Let's start with Holly perhaps. You will see a link to the Consolidated Policy Working Group Website and Wiki Improvements. Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Olivier. I'll just repeat what I said in the previous call. I'm completely neutral as to how we achieve what it is we're trying to do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Holly, [inaudible]. It's Jonathan.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think we have to just start with what – wow, and I'm being talked over. Is that Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, I apologize. You are saying – I don't know. It just occurred to me I don't know why this is on the agenda because we've had this discussion.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Holly was already very articulate. I think we need to take it offline and just work on this problem. It's not a topic of discussion any longer.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I'm comfortable with that. Jonathan, you and I can coordinate.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, so let's take this offline. Exactly. So I apologize for interrupting you, but I didn't want to make you repeat yourself.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan and Holly, thank you very much to both of you. That actually has gotten us to get back on time. We can therefore move to Agenda Item 4, discussing the Initial Report on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process. At the moment, there is a public consultation about the overarching issues and the Work Tracks 1 to 4. There is a link in your agenda to the public comment wiki workspace, but the work has currently taken place with Jonathan Zuck as the penholder. He has put a first draft of his proposed answers on a Google Doc document which actually is a table at the moment. I'm going to hand the floor over to Jonathan to take us through this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, thanks, everyone. If you recall, on the last CPWG call we talked about our methodology going forward for handling large documents and responding to them. The first step of that was to break them into

sections and, for each section, describe it briefly, try to put it through the test about whether or not there's a unique end user perspective to bring to that individual question, and the put out a potential short-form answer to that question or point that would want to be made on behalf of end users. And then that would become the discussion document for some consensus around what our positions would be. And from there, we would recruit penholders for each section.

So what I did was just create a breakdown of this very large document based on some questions that they have in the appendix at the back that they particularly wanted to draw the community's attention to and took a first cut, basically, at identifying those things that might be of particular interest to end users and what that interest might be. It's by no means meant to be definitive or anything but to begin to create a framework for discussion.

So [if] you see it in front in front of you, hopefully you can see the columns are fairly straightforward as to what the purpose of each column is. You can see a little description of the question, what they're getting at. And then if the next column is blank, that was meant to imply that we don't need to respond to that section. But if there's something there, then it means we should reply and it's a possibility of what we might want to say very briefly.

What I wanted to do was just familiarize you with that document, take any questions you have on the structure of it, not the substance of it, because I think that's something that we should give everybody a few days to go through and make comments on. So this is just a process

discussion right now which is, does the document make sense, get questions about it, etc.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Maybe you can manage the queue.]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For those people who – sorry? Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe you can manage the queue for me because I can't see it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely, Jonathan, I'll do that. What I was going to do for those people who are only on audio at present is just to describe the various columns very briefly. The first one being "Section" with a number. The next one being "Subject." The next one being "Outstanding Questions for Comment." The "End-User Concern" is the next column. Then the section from the 2015 report in this particular context. The name of the "Drafter." And then the "Work Track 1," "Work Track 2," "Work Track 3," "Work Track 4," and [why ALAC should care]. These are the different columns that would set some kind of a structure to the overall response in such a public commenting period.

I'll open the queue now and, Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Jonathan, just a question. When I went through all of Appendix C which has got all of the recommendations – and I went through [mentally] by topic – some of the topics, for example, availability, accessibility are covered in some of the different recommendations or the issues we had with PICs. Also, probably has items that were in fact some of the recommendations from different sections [which] would all be relevant to a particular topic.

Do you think your form can deal with what I think is perhaps an idea of concentrating on the topics? Because in previous times, the things that ALAC has talked about have been related to PICs or accessibility or IDNs or whatever. How does that fit with your template? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. I'm not positive. I guess this is a little bit of a strange document in that….

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	As Christopher pointed out at an earlier e-mail, there isn't consensus around it. It's really like a discussion document. There was an appendix that was meant to act as a kind of discussion guide. So that's why I thought that for this particular document rather than imposing our own structure on the comments, that we would structure it around the discussion guide that was provided by the work group.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Okay.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Just for the purpose of this response.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Could I reply?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Yes, please. Go ahead, Holly.
HOLLY RAICHE:	Jonathan, my one comment might be if, for example, "End-User Concern," maybe in that column we have a heading that says accessibility or PICs or something so that it becomes immediately obvious the actual issues of concern that we've identified. Because in doing the response to the whole doc – God help us – it would be nice to be able to say, have an initial paragraph, "These are the things that we have been concerned with in terms of end users for so long…." That

imposes a structure and it means that we can pick out from the various sections those things that are relevant to an issue. So maybe in the "End-User Concern" put a heading that means that we can easily do that. Does that make sense? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, I think so. I don't know what a heading in a column, necessarily what that means so I'll need to parse that a little bit. But it sounds like you want to categorize the questions somehow. So if you have an idea of categories that make sense, I just might make a column for that next to that. So if you shoot me an e-mail with your first thoughts, just a brain dump of what you think those categories are, I'll try to organize around that and then we can go from there.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. First a couple of questions and then a couple of comments. I don't understand what the last five columns are. I'm not quite sure since the PDP has organized as in the annex in the order essentially that

they want, that they're going to analyze the results and they want them grouped, I'm not sure what the relevance is of what Work Track it came from. And I don't know what "should care," how that's different from "End-User Concern." They both sound like, "Why is ALAC involved?" or "Why do we want to talk about it?" Can you first of all explain the last five columns?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, you're right about the Work Track. It probably doesn't matter. And then I think that the reason for that was that if you have them in columns, it becomes more like a database. In other words, we could do a sort on it based on Work Track or a sort on it based on a binary of whether or not ALAC should be concerned or something like that. That's the thinking. This is malleable, but I think it was more about just creating columns to be used to do filtering and sorting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so that's just sort of a 1 or a 0 there, not substance. I guess if the PDP has requested the input in a certain order and it is not Work Track organized, if I remember correctly, then I would not really care which Work Track it came from. It's not as if we have a large contingent of people who worked on Work Track 3 but not Work Track 4 that we could draw upon.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Sure.
ALAN GREENBERG:	That would be nice if that was the case, but we in fact don't have anyone like that.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	So feel free to ignore that column.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, and the last column was again a binary column, should care or shouldn't care?
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yes.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, so it's essentially replicating the why. Okay, I don't see a place where we're going to put substantive answers, so I assume there's yet another column somewhere that I don't see yet.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Well, no. There is a first little piece of what point we might want to make. So it wasn't meant to be where the draft would go but just a way to do topline points to get consensus around them. And then we would hand that section over to a drafter.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. My substantive point is other than the fact that I think we should stick as closely to the way they want the input to make it useful otherwise they're going to have to interpret our data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Agreed.

ALAN GREENBERG: And with regard to Holly's comment, there are a number of things like PICs and user confusion that we talked about in the last round. This is a new game and there are things here which we probably are going to be very interested in that we were completely silent on before. So although we may want to have an archive of what we said before, I don't think we want to necessarily link them because this is a new game and pretty much everything is on the table. Some of the things we're going to say are repeats because no one listened last time. But other things are going to be completely different.

My last comment is this document right now when I went into it, and I don't think I'm particularly privileged, I could change anything. So if this is a document that we're going to give to the community, I think you really want to make sure that everyone just has commenting privileges. You don't want to be in a position where if someone wants to change something, they change it and for all intents and purposes the history is lost of what it said before. So if it's going to be open to the community, it really should be for commenting and not editing.

Okay, thank you. That's all I had.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I thought I had set it just to comments. I'll go back and look at the link that I thought I had [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe you set me as the magic person. I don't know. I certainly could make changes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, I'll check on that. And then the other thing is I agree that we should answer using the structure they provided, for sure. I also agree that we may do new things, but at the same time I think that we should be very selective and not just answer because we think we can come up with something interesting to say. So I'm hoping we can impose some discipline on ourselves to really make sure that we're providing an end user perspective and if we don't have one to bring, we just stay silent.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. Thank you, Jonathan, for this. [You put it] as a strawman, but I think it's an excellent triage tool, and I always appreciate the ability to triage.

I'm torn, of course, as the co-chair from the [whole] PDP in these conversations, but I wanted to say a couple of things. First of all, thank you to all of you in this very important consolidated working group for taking the time and energy to put this on the agenda with the letter, the PDP, still lurking about in the background because we know that there's a huge amount of competition in your energies and your efforts. But we would like to think that there's a bit of longevity in the requirement for making a future round and a future round perhaps to follow as new gTLDs are far more predictable and far more appropriate for not only industry but end user needs.

I wanted to mention in response to Holly and in her linkages to things that have been said in the past, if that's an aide-memoire and an assistance to the drafting of our responses, then I definitely support the from an end user's perspective point of view. I think that's excellent.

Two things. First of all, in our working to date we have already asked and received, this is the PDP has asked and received, for a detailed list of everything said from every part of ICANN on new gTLDs. So we already have a compendium of everything the ALAC has ever formally said because ALAC staff and the leadership team of ALAC have provided us with it. So we don't need to be told that. We already have that and it has been taken into consideration in detail in our deliberations to date. So fear not. We are not acting in a vacuum either. But if you want to use any of that material to consolidate your thinking, obviously that's a great way forward.

I certainly would like to encourage you to not be overly concerned about the Work Tracks. As Alan pointed out, whilst we dealt with the

drinking from the firehose on this topic by laminating it into Work Tracks, that's not how we've done our interim report nor is it how we will be working on the responses to the report and the next step as we go toward the final report. We will be carving up the workload in the PDP differently as a result of this interim report. So don't get overly concerned about the Work Tracks. But if it helps, again, for you to go back and double check on things that happened, that's fine too.

Other than that, I just wanted to just make sure that you all understood we are well aware of every utterance [that has] been formerly printed from every component part of ICANN on new gTLDs and that I certainly would support making [our lives as analysis] of your input as easy as possible.

Now I'll take off my co-chair hat and just be part of the work group. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I'm happy to delete the column on Work Streams if that's causing an undue confusion for people. I think the key here is just to go through the document and see the questions that are asked and think about whether or not – I'll do a little bit of restructuring of the document, but the really important thing is for you to spend some time with it, look at the question, the description, and see if it's something we should respond to and if so, briefly what you think that response

EN

should be. That's really what we want to spend our time on, and we should time box it a little bit – wow. Everybody mute your lines. I think we definitely need to be final on that assessment of what we're going to respond to and what that response is by our next call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. Next is Christopher Wilkinson. Christopher Wilkinson, are you still on the call, or did you drop from the call? Let's go to Alan Greenberg, and we'll get Christopher back online afterwards. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you very much. I won't have much chance to do this, but I will with a pretty fine-toothed comb go through looking at the issues and comment on your analysis of whether this is something of interest to a user.

Now I'll point out, and I've been very active in this PDP, there are lots of things that are of interest. There are lots of things that people probably have opinions on. I think in our ALAC comment, we want to try to restrict it as Jonathan has implied to the things that we representing end users feel are important to be addressed.

As anyone goes through this, you may well find things that you want to have a say on. I think we want to have a mechanism as we're formulating these comments of saying that. Separate from what should the ALAC be saying, we may well find that there are a whole bunch of us who agree to something and we may want to submit a comment that is

not from the ALAC as such but does have some force of being from multiple people. On top of that, some people may see an At-Large connection or a user connection that one other person doesn't see.

So I think it's important to the extent people care about other issues that we try to track them in whatever Google Doc or something that we're going to be working on to try to pull these things together. But I think it's important to differentiate between them unless we can demonstrate a real end user connection to them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think he's mostly agreeing with me. I will try to find a way to add some column that allows people to make a note of personal interest or something like that, that might be compiled later. But with all the work that we have to do, I am firstly very focused on what the ALAC [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just to be clear, I'm agreeing with you 100%, but there may well be commonality and other people may have insights into something that not each other does. So I'd like to capture them but not necessarily that we work on them as a group afterwards.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's try Christopher Wilkinson again. Christopher, you have the floor.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hello. I believe I have unmuted myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, we have an echo.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: First, thank you, Jonathan. The spreadsheet is a really useful tool.

Secondly, at first sight, I'm unclear as to what extent the text is your summary of what the report is asking or to what extent it is your guidance as to what ALAC should be saying about it.

I don't want you to answer that in detail now, but I think maybe using different colors or a different font just to distinguish the summary aspect from the guidance aspect. As you may understand in the light of our long association on other matters, I'm more interested in the second than the first.

[inaudible] has already transpired. It is very difficult to map the text that we've got with this complex 1.2.etc paragraph numbering. It's very difficult to map the text that we've got back to the Work Tracks. I don't disagree with the columns on the Work Tracks, but I think it will prove to be quite difficult to [unpick] it as to who said what.

One byproduct of this editorial – I wasn't going to say an editorial mess – I mean the editorial complexities of this document, the one byproduct

is that there are Work Tracks who have made recommendations that are not consistent with each other. Short of re-reading the whole 300 pages again in its current form, I'm not sure to what extent the co-leads have succeeded in ironing out those inconsistencies.

For instance, there are some Work Tracks who are working definitely on the assumption of a single round for all comers, and there are other Work Tracks which have opened the discussion but I don't think they've made formal recommendations about having distinct smaller rounds in time and in content focusing on different categories of new gTLD applications. Frankly, for what it's worth, an option which I prefer.

Finally, you have seen my initial comments on these matters. I'm aware of the fact that some of them have [cleaved] more to my long experience with the gTLD process since 1996 and do not all necessarily refer to user interests. But I think there are several important user interests that need to be emphasized in the context of this new gTLD round.

And as some of you know, I'm abstaining on this call from any detailed comments on Work Track 5 because the document itself, at the request of myself and other participants, the document basically excludes Work Track 5 until Work Track 5 has done some more work.

So that's where I stand at present. I'm very interested in participating in the follow up to this. And by the way, I will probably in any event make a personal response to the public consultation, and I will of course endeavor to ensure that does not in any substantive matter undermine or contradict ALAC's position. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Christopher. Jonathan, last words on this topic? We do need to move on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Thanks for the time on this. Just to answer Chris' initial question, this document is intended to do both: summarize the questions that are being asked by the PDP working group and have some strawman answers that ALAC might want to make. But I'm not wedded to them in any way.

So it's really just a framework for going in and thinking about the questions they're asking and commenting on it and we'll see if we can get some consensus on what they [inaudible] try to respond to and what that response should be. And if we can, then we pull together a set of drafters on those sections.

So please take then next week to read through this and be thoughtful about whether or not there's a unique end user perspective to bring to that particular question and what you think the answer might be. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Jonathan. So please make use of the mailing list for that. We will address this again next week, so there will be [inaudible] on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, could I get a short comment in on that same subject though?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You get the last words on this topic.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The way I understood what Jonathan said is he has taken a first stab at identifying the issues that he thinks At-Large should be interested in and put a few words as to why or what our position might be. My understanding was over the next week or two other people who care should be going over it and making comments on those saying, "Yes, you're right," "No, this is not something we should be looking at and here's why," or "You forgot this item which really is important to users." So that's certainly what I would like to do once we get commenting ability: go through it and start refining it and ending up with something that we can all support. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's exactly what I said, so I think that's what we want to do. Thanks, folks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Jonathan, should people add their issues to your document then? The Google Doc?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. The point is that the rows should be fixed because it's based on the questions being asked by the PDP. So it's the content of the columns that people be commenting on, which is to look at it and say yes or no this should be something that we should address in the ALAC comment and what that comment should be in one sentence or two.

That's what we want to come away from this by next week's call. I wouldn't even say a week or two. Let's take the next week to just go through this. And if you think that I've left something blank and we really should in the ALAC comments respond to that question, then please note that as well. And if you think I've [inaudible] to respond to that we shouldn't because we'll never reach consensus on it or something like that, then make that comment. So let's make this document as close to final as we can in a week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. I gather the action item is for everyone to add the issues which they think are important to the Google Doc about PDP on Subsequent Procedures.

ALAN GREENBERG: Once he changes the permissions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's true. It should be. Jonathan, indeed, I checked as well and I can also delete the whole lot if I wanted to, so [inaudible] thing to do at the moment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, then give me two hours before you do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't want to delete the whole thing. Definitely not. Holly Raiche, you have the floor quickly, and we need to move on. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Really quickly, just to mention webinar was part of this action item. I think it would be really useful at some point just to get everybody up to speed very quickly. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Thanks for this. Let's then move on please. We only have a good 12 minutes until the end of this call. The next agenda item is very short. It's just a question, a simple yes or no, regarding a potential webinar for preparing the EPDP. Now this is the expedited PDP that's about to take shape. A few, well, maybe a year's life of most of the participants on that. We've got two people that are main contenders to lose a year of their life. There are two more that are bystanders ready to jump in. Of course, we're going to help them all out.

But in order for everyone to be on the same level and to know the history, the whole various tracks that have led us to the current discussion, the proposal is to have a webinar that talks about WHOIS Review Team, RDS PDP, GDPR, Article 29, temporary specifications – the whole ecosystem around the EPDP.

Do people here think that this is a good idea? There was discussion on the ALAC – oh, I already see some green ticks here – there was a discussion on the ALAC and Tijani Ben Jemaa has proposed that he arranges for such a webinar to take place in early August, I think the point was made since we need to have this as soon as possible. I'll open the floor immediately. Alan Greenberg, you are the first one on the trigger.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A webinar is only going to be an hour and a half or so. Even if you have it as talk only without questions, which may be not a bad idea if we're looking at it mainly as a tutorial to file away and for people to listen to afterwards, that's a limited amount of time. So I would restrict it to the temporary specifications, the access model that ICANN has provided, and talk about the accreditation process. Those are the issues that are the unknowns, that are the variables on the table right now, and that's what the PDP is going to be looking at. So I wouldn't try to make it too all-encompassing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Holly, you've put your hand down.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan said what I wanted to say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thank you. So we have a more restricted webinar on only some of these topics. Now I tell you one thing though. I believe that webinars on the other topics have already taken place. So perhaps could we do a little bit of searching in our past webinars and perhaps send an e-mail with the reference to the past webinars on these topics and just restrict the latest webinar then on the temporary specifications and the things that are at hand that Alan just mentioned. Maybe we will do that. Okay, I'm not seeing anybody say no, and I notice that webinars were also run by the APAC. Okay, APRALO perhaps.

Now, "Is this a capacity building webinar or an At-Large briefing webinar? Who is going to organize this?" Interesting. Thank you for your question, Heidi. Alan Greenberg might have an answer for this.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I put my hand up before you asked the question. I'll try to answer it, however. There's lots going on. There have been lots of webinars and lots of sessions on various things. In some cases, they are quickly moving targets. The IPC/BC accreditation model has had several webinars or sessions, whatever you call them. But that's a moving target, and those are the ones that were applicable before, not now.

We're looking at this as a briefing for people who don't really know a lot about it and want to get involved. So I think we're looking at ground-up,

assuming they know what a domain is and hopefully have looked at WHOIS once. If not, we can have one slide that shows them that: what WHOIS used to look like, what it looks like today, and go from there.

Who will do it? I don't think we're going to have a real problem. There's enough of us in the community, and we can draw upon other people as well who are well-versed on these things.

My only concern is twofold. Number one, we want to give enough advance notice of this. We tend to schedule meetings like we did the CPWG meeting on two days' notice. You can't get a lot of people to attend when you do that. We really have to give more notice.

And as important, we really want to give notice to the presenters so they have time to do something coherent and to work with each other to make sure we're not overlapping. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I think that the idea was to have it on the first or second week of August. So perhaps bearing in mind your points, one could look at the week of 9 August, or is that too late already?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I think that's probably – well, the week of the first – I don't know. The week of 9 August – 9 is the Thursday, so I'm not quite sure what calendar you're looking at.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm looking at a French calendar which, obviously, is completely incorrect. Right, let's start again. Let's look at August. The week of 6 August or the week of 13 August. The week of the 6th is a week from now. The week of the 13th is two weeks from now.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're asking me, I would tend to say the end of the week of the 6th is okay. I wouldn't do it any before that because that's not going to give people enough time to prep for it, prep for the presentation or schedule it into their agendas. So I would say some time the 9th and after going into the beginning of the next week is probably a reasonable time. That's my opinion. Other people may disagree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Alan. Should we let Tijani arrange this? And then we can basically get Tijani to speak to us so that we suggest panelists for this. Then it becomes a wider capacity building thing that all of the ALAC and At-Large community can follow. I see green ticks from everyone. Okay, super.

So I know that staff wishes me to say the action item very clearly. "The capacity building webinar working group should be targeted to people who are not highly knowledgeable on the issues but would like to get involved. Presenters should be experts from within At-Large and others as relevant. Sufficient time should be given in the planning of the webinar. Schedule should be 9 August or early in the week of the 13th." Perfect. Let's just also add liaising with Tijani. I'll take it as an action item for me to get Tijani involved on this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I can put this into Any Other Business if you prefer. Just come back to me. It relates to both the EDPD and [inaudible]. Just put me in the to-do list please. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks, Cheryl. Let's go to Number 6. Number 6 on our agenda is, how do we get sufficient numbers of penholders and drafters for the EPDP and for actually all the other upcoming key policy activities. we should have 15 minutes for this. Unfortunately, we're four minutes until the end of this call. Let's get the ball rolling on this.

At the moment, we've got the drafters required for any EPDP input from At-Large that are needed in case we do need to draft things. I think with the hefty schedule of calls and so on, it would be pretty crazy to also ask our representatives to draft their own statements from scratch. So we need that on the one side.

It's also not an answer to say that Jonathan will draft everything. Definitely not. And it's not an answer that Alan or Olivier will draft everything, or Cheryl for that matter. So we need to have more than just one person.

Secondly, there are other things that will take place this year. Of course, the subsequent procedures is not likely to stop happening and all of the other drafting. How do we get steady drafters for all the ALAC policy comment and advice? Can we put together some kind of a list or

something? At least people who are ready to get called upon and perhaps even more regular drafters from some of our At-Large Structures.

The floor is open for comments and questions. Whilst I don't see any hands, I should share a point of what we're doing with EURALO, which is to have a list of the competencies in our ALSes. And I personally get in touch with those people who are competent about a specific topic when there needs to be drafting done. It has worked in a limited way in that we've had some input from some of our At-Large Structures that don't regularly contribute, and that has helped share the load a little bit.

With that said, is it something sustainable in the long run? Well, we're not going to get regular drafters except in some cases when they are particularly interested in a topic. Any thoughts on this please? Jonathan, please, did you wish to maybe comment on that? Have I put everyone to sleep?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, [inaudible] in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We at least have one person that is up, or two people. Holly is awake and can speak. Maureen can only type at this point.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're all trying to save time, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: "Are coordinators the same as Policy Champions?" People who might know what they are talking about, about a certain topic. We are not speaking about coordinators now. We're speaking about penholders. That goes one level further than coordinators. A pool of penholders. People that write the most exciting things, like the drafting team for Game of Thrones. This sort of thing. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to distinguish – and this is the conversation we had at the very beginning – the coordinator is there just as kind of I suppose a traffic cop. [inaudible] of coordinators should be to say, "Okay, let's identify who has what expertise." And it becomes who are the policy experts in this area. I think we have to distinguish between the two. But in terms of your question which was, who actually is going to find the policy experts, isn't that a [inaudible] for the coordinators? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Holly. That's a good point you're making. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks again. Very briefly, one thing that strikes me as a possible opportunity here and will allow us to work at the RALO level but not ignore the ALAC and leadership one and that is those of us who, let's face it, would really like to hand on the mantle of all of this to others – oh, God, I certainly would. In fact, all the gods and goddesses together, I

certainly would. Perhaps we can act in some small way as encouragers or support or peer support to people who want to step up but are not terribly comfortable or secure. So perhaps a formal or informal mechanism of us helping our next generations of penholders through the process might also help too. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. I recall we had a webinar I think on drafting statements and things like that, that we had a while ago, didn't we? Was that something that could be good to repeat again to maybe find the next Shakespeare among our ranks? Or perhaps should we just have a pointer to this webinar? Any thoughts on this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A note from Cheryl that often informal support can make the difference. To draft or not to draft? That is the question. I think we need to move this to our next call or follow up on this to our next call. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Look, we are in a real quandary. Certainly, if you look at the subsequent procedures, there have been relatively few people in our community who have been following these issues. And these issues in some cases are messy. They're tough, and they have a lot

of interrelated moving parts to them. So it's going to be hard to find people to jump in and author authoritative statements. But if someone has an interest in a topic and would like to try to take a stab at it, there are those of us – and I'm one of them and Cheryl is certainly one of them – who can do some briefing and try to explain what the various moving parts are so that we end up with a statement which makes sense in the overall context. So there's help available. There are a few people who may not be in a position to draft statements but have actually attended a lot of the meetings. That's a resource that we can also use.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Should we have a pool, like a database? A pool of penholders on these topics maybe? Starting with people attending this working group? Would that be GDPR compliant, or would that not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably not, but no one is checking right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm letting time go by, the minutes go by as I see some interesting things being drafted, being put in the chat at the moment. Seeing the amount of text that's typed into the chat, you'd think we just have a queue of penholders here.

A big question. Question from Bastiaan: "Once the ball starts rolling on the EPDP members and alternates" – sorry – "Once the ball starts rolling on EPDP and not on the members and alternates, what support would

they appreciate?" Alan, since you're one of the members, what support would you appreciate?

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, sorry, can you say that again? There was a beep-beep just at the critical time. I don't know if everyone is hearing the beep-beeps or just me, but can you repeat what you said?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It must have been me beeping away. "Once the ball starts rolling on the EPDP, what support would our EPDP members and alternates appreciate?"

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me try and have an answer to that, and I'd appreciate answers from the other EPDP people who are on the call. It's going to be a difficult subject to follow. And I suspect the conference calls are going to be rather fast moving. So I think to some extent it is going to be up to the members and participants and any observers who are diligently following it – but I mean diligently. Lots of people sign up but don't go to any calls. But people who are diligently following it to try to frame what are the issues that we want feedback on, probably put some proposed answers, and get feedback as to whether these make sense or not and whether people agree with them or not.

There's not going to be an opportunity for doing bottom-up stuff that we then just feed in because we have to be relevant to what the topics that are actually being discussed. So I think it's going to be us making

sure that people understand what the current issues are, what the topics are that we may be able to bring input on, and frame them properly so people can listen and provide feedback. I don't see any other way of working on it. That's basically how we worked with the IANA transition and accountability. We tried to update people to where we are, what the points of contention are, where do we want to put our stake in the ground, and where do we want to say that's not worth fighting.

That's really what it comes down to: where do we put our focus. It worked really well, especially for the IANA transition and for accountability. Not so much Work Stream 2 but the Work Stream 1 work where there was a lot of different contention as we're expecting there to be on the EPDP.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Alan. There's quite some writing going on at the moment on the chat. I think that I've heard some positive answers to putting together a database. Sorry, let's not call it a database because that immediately puts us in hot waters. Putting together a list of penholders that are ready to dip their toes in the pool.

ALAN GREENBERG: One comment on that. We have someone who [comes] from another part of ICANN who has foolishly decided to get involved with At-Large. If I may finish for a moment, Greg is involved in almost everything in ICANN that's important. And he may not want to put his name on an At-

Large statement, but he's going to be an awful good advisor if he's willing to put any time into it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this, Alan. Greg has already volunteered in the chat. I understand that Justine Chew has also volunteered and several people.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now someone is saying, "Hello." If they could say their name.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is Seun. You better give the call to him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then, Seun Ojedeji, you have the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, sorry. I just wasn't sure that my audio was getting through.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Your audio is perfect. We can listen to you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:	Okay, I'll [inaudible] queue. Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Is that all you wanted to say? You have the floor.
SEUN OJEDEJI:	Oh, okay. All right, thank you, [inaudible]. I think one of the things that we [inaudible] I remember [inaudible] IANA transition [inaudible] transition [inaudible]. Also, [inaudible] to also [inaudible] to flag….
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Seun, can you speak a little louder please? I think you're dropping out a little bit. I can't hear you too well. Speak slightly louder please.
SEUN OJEDEJI:	Can you hear me now?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	A lot better.
SEUN OJEDEJI:	Oh, okay. Yeah, so I was just saying that it would be good that those who are going to be participating in the EPDP to also use the [inaudible] to flag issues or [inaudible] activity [inaudible] we should discuss or we should talk about on the mailing list. I think we should use the mailing list as much as possible like we did during the IANA transition. And [inaudible] possible to reduce the need for a call because [I for one]

[inaudible] recognize that [inaudible] really have a lot of calls [inaudible] number of calls for the EPDP [inaudible]. So I think [inaudible] number of calls at our own level [inaudible] it would be good that we use the list as much as possible and [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun. Any comments on this? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Old hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right, thanks. Yeah, Seun, I think that what you said is fully understood and we definitely will have those members of the EPDP that really can resort to this CPWG to support them in every single way possible. So I'm hoping that communication, as soon as they have a question and so on, communication can take place. We might even – this is another thought – that we might think to have some kind of a Skype chat or something perhaps that we could consider this in the future for this specifically. I note that Sebastien has mentioned a Skype chat in the chat here. Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And I just wanted to [inaudible] from what [inaudible] just put into the chat. One of the things I wanted to mention is that I think it would be extremely helpful for us to have a Skype chat that was devoted to the EDPD that includes all of those who wish to opt in from

the CPWG, in case we don't have enough letters in our lives people, and of course the members and alternates. It is going to be very awkward for the alternates let alone anyone else who is listening in real time to perhaps give support to what is being said or encourage a direction that our members will be taking during the meeting. I mean, they can ignore us, obviously. But it might be quite useful to have that very specific topic specific chat so anything that's said in there is only to do with the EPDP. That's one of the things I wanted to mention.

While I've got the microphone, I'll do the other one now as well. Just from the subsequent procedures point of view, we are – popping on my co-chair hat again – we are more than happy to offer ourselves and our leadership team for any sort of outreach and engagement at whatever level, be that ALAC/At-Large type webinars or RALO specific or even ALS specific. So we just need to be asked and we shall turn up. But preferably not in the last week before we close the public comment. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Next is Alan Greenberg. Alan Greenberg? Alan, you might be muted. We're not hearing you. Have we lost Alan Greenberg? That's unusual to lose Alan. Staff, is he still on the call, or has he dropped out?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Olivier, I'm checking with the operator right now. One moment. [inaudible] disconnected. We're redialing him. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Whilst we try and get him back then for the last words of the call, could staff please go through the action items please because I note there are quite a few action items here and so it would be helpful for those people who are not on the Adobe Connect to hear them. Could you please, Heidi or Claudia?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, Evin, are you okay to take them? I'm happy to. I'll just read them from the action items [pod].

EVIN ERDOGDU: Yeah, thanks, Heidi. I'm not in the AC room, so it would be helpful if you [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Evin is not on the AC.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, okay. The first one is: "The CPWG agreed that there should be a single Policy Coordinator. The role of the Policy Coordinator is to ensure RALO contributions in Policy are made."

The second one is: "Members of the CPWG to add the issues which they think are important on the Google DOC about the PDP on Subsequent Procedures. Updates to be presented on next week's CPWG call."

Then there will be an At-Large webinar. The capacity building working group webinar should be "targeted at people who are not highly knowledgeable on the issues but would like to get involved. Presenters should be experts from within At-Large and others as relevant. Sufficient time should be given in the planning of the webinar Schedule should be 9th August or early in the week of the 13th. CPWG leaders to liaise with Tijani Ben Jemaa."

Then the pool of penholders to be developed. So far I have Greg Shatan, Justine Chew, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond. We'll be setting up a wiki page on that.

And finally, I believe this is an action item for staff "to set up an EPDP Skype chat, including At-Large EPDP Members and Alternates and any CPWG member who wishes to join. Chat to be used, especially during EPDP calls."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Heidi, for this. Could I just add regarding the pool of penholders that the wiki page, could we have that behind a login so that we don't have this out in the open? I guess that we're not restricting it in any way, but it's the same sort of login as for the pages that have any personal information such as the travel schedule, etc. Is that doable?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, we'll go ahead and set that up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, thank you. Alan is back so, Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Apparently, the beeping I was hearing was the battery in my mobile headset that I have in the hotel. It was almost out and eventually died completely.

                          I just wanted to make a quick comment, and probably we don't want to go into it here. But when we set up the CPWG, it was set up as a consolidated group covering things like new gTLDs and WHOIS and a number of other issues specifically so that when we have webinars and meetings, people who are not experts on those topics may listen in and learn. But the original mailing list was going to be the one that was going to be used for the subjects.

                          So if we follow that, the EPDP discussion will likely be on the registration issues list, the new gTLD one on the gTLD list. I think, staff, I, Jonathan, and you – "you" being Olivier – need to talk about it and ask, "Does that make any sense now, or do we want to revise that and rethink it?" The original CPWG was not going to have any actual members, just be a composite of the other groups. We now actually have 20 or 30 people who have joined the CPWG as a working group, so we need to think

about that. But we may well want to change that structure and make it more inline with what people think it is. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Thanks for pointing this out. We'll follow up with Jonathan and with staff afterwards. Maybe not immediately after this call but in the next forthcoming days.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr has put in the chat an interesting thing to perhaps when looking at the page of penholders to also have resource people added to that page. So people that obviously are not able to hold the pen or cannot write but want to be listed as being able to do something. No, I mean, it's a joke. But, yeah, resource people are important as well because there are some people that have extensive knowledge. So perhaps a table of competency on that page would be really, really good. "If we do list resources, then please add Cheryl Langdon-Orr to this."

Right, we are 19 minutes past the end of this call. Had we had interpreters, they would have left already. We don't have interpreters with us. I apologize for the late end to this call. Any Other Business? No further business.

The next meeting is due to take place next week. Apologies [inaudible] little confusion with regards to this week. Last week, we had said that we'd have the next meeting at the same time as last week. Unfortunately, it was terrible for some people in our community. We've now found a rotational time which I believe was 19:00 UTC and I can't remember what the other one was. Was it 13:00 UTC or 12:00 UTC?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 13:00.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 13:00 UTC.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 16:00.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 15:00? Okay. So what I suggest is that we apply this rolling timeline, time scale, rolling time, and we'll have the next call next week at 15:00 UTC – 15:00 and 19:00 – so 15:00 next week, next Wednesday I believe. Does that work? 1 August, right?

With this, I'd like to thank everyone here. It has been an excellent call, so thank you. Apologies again that it has taken a bit more time. We'll discuss with Jonathan whether we might need 90 minutes for next week or 60 minutes. But hopefully we can have a better [chair] to make sure we leave on time, we finish on time. I don't know. Anyway, Jonathan, any other word? Anything else you want to [inaudible]?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's a no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No more? Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's quiet. There's nothing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Nothing. Thanks very much, everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night, wherever you are. Take care. Bye-bye.

 [END OF TRANSCRIPTION]