
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This policy working group call on Wednesday the 8th August 2018, at 19:00 UTC. On today's call we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Joel Thayer, Gordon Chillcott, Yrjo Lansipuro, Vanda Scartezini, Jonathan Zuck, Alfredo Calderon, Alan Greenberg, Kaili Kan, Marita Moll, and Nadira Al-Araj. We have apologies from Satish Babu, Alberto Soto, and Justine Chew. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, and Andrea Glandon on call management. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you and over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Welcome everybody to this consolidated policy working group call, we're the 8th of August. The first thing we are going to do is adopt today's agenda, we've got again, a couple of main sections. The first one being the updating and review of the Google Doc, which Jonathan has very kindly put together. Looking at the overarching issues in work tracks 1-4 on the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process, and that's input for the feedback that we should provide, or the input that we should provide in the public comment process. Secondly, we have our colleagues from the expedited PDP, the EPDP that have had, if I understand correctly, two calls since our last meeting. So, they will be able to speak to us about what happened there. On the agenda you will see there is an update, well there's several comments which are

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.

referred in there and of course, we need to start working on this and seeing what we do next and what we have to prepare ourselves for. Is there any other business? Are there any amendments to the agenda from anyone? I am not seeing anybody, no... okay, the agenda is adopted. Now I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr putting her hand up, Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Cheryl for the record. It appears to me that there seems to be some confusion about the purpose of the consolidated policy group, perhaps you and Jonathan should speak to it rather than various of us, myself included, typing into chat so everyone can benefit and it goes to the record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Cheryl. I will have to read that chat perhaps, because it can [inaudible]. Okay, alright.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan. I guess I can speak to a little bit. Eduardo, I have noticed a list of names that are on the Wiki, the list of members, and to be honest I have never even looked at that page, so I only concern myself with people who get on the call and make comments and document. But, this is meant to be a consolidated working group, Eduardo, that includes members of other internal at-large working groups and we're just trying to get a consolidated place to do policy development and drafting of comments and principle development and

things like that, so it's [inaudible] and there's no real filter for people that want to be a part of this, except that you need to speak up to be heard. That's the only... I don't know about the member list Eduardo, and as I said I have never looked at it, I don't really care who is on it. I don't know if you want to add to that Olivier, I mean for me it's who is on the call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Jonathan, it's Olivier speaking. I am just discovering the questions, sorry, I didn't read the chat before starting the call so I wasn't quite sure how that worked. But the list is probably outrageously out of date as I know that several people have asked to be added recently, and as you mentioned because it's three different working groups that are coming together as one big distribution group, it's all interlinked together. Alan Greenberg, you have the floor because you are the architect of this whole intertwining of working groups.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. To repeat what I said in the chat, it's the consolidated working group, policy working group, because it's consolidation of several other policy groups. The gTLD group, the registration issues group, the IANA group which is largely dormant but occasionally wakes up, and maybe we'll have other policy groups. It should have no membership of its own, although, apparently a number of people have subscribed to this list, that we'll address. The Wiki that Eduardo has pointed to us, I have no idea why there are membership lists there to try to track on the Wiki, members of mailing lists, which

may change day by day, I would think is a pretty poor use of staff resources. I am not quite sure why it's there, but I suspect it will disappear at some point so let's not spend anymore agenda time talking about it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Alan, and with no further comments or questions on this topic. The agenda I think is adopted. I see Sebastien has put his hand up. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, this is Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Thank you Olivier and I understand that it's meant to disappear but I just would like that we treat equally all the member in this, and I see written in one place, former ICANN board director selected by at-large and in another place it's not the same. I feel a little bit [inaudible] in this type of work done, I don't know who decides to put this information or not but I am very very concerned. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Sebastien, it's Olivier speaking. So, let's just let staff clean the place up please and you know, according to this, it doesn't look as though we'll be able to have any kind of consolidated list of members and so on, but at the end of the day it is just a mailing list. That is what we're all doing here. Let's then now dig into the policy, that's what we're here for and we'll start with agenda item number 2, that's our action items from our last call that took place last week.

There's only one action item that's still yet to be affected and that's to identify a suitable staff member to provide the EPDP presentation with the CPWG webinar. Heidi, I understand you've got some updates on this, or there's been some discussion going on regarding this?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, thank you Olivier. Hi everyone, this is Heidi. Apologies for the delay on this, there has been internal discussion going on and it continues to go on. I will be having a chat with staff today about this, hoping that we'll have some updates after that call and I'll get back to you on that. We have identified people, we just need to make sure that there are enough people to cover all the topics. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this Heidi, so that's firmly in hand. The other action items have all been affected. So, we've got the EPDP page of resources on our CPWG page, we've got links to the CPWG mailing list and various previous historical statement from the topic, you will have noticed that Evin has sent an email over with details on how to obtain this information. We might see if we need more than this for the time being, but that's just the action item as it is, has been concluded. I don't see any hands, so let's then move to the next part of the agenda, the update on the Google Docs. For this, I must admit that I had a closer look this week at the Google Doc proposal itself, which is effectively the different proposals that Jonathan Zuck has put into sections and subsections and so on, I didn't realize how large this whole thing was, so first I wanted to really thank Jonathan for having conducted this, because that's quite a

thing to start with. I am not quite sure how we're going to be able to respond to these questions, I've reached line number 35 and then found out it was over 200 lines in length, 200 boxes. So, do we need to respond to each one of these, do all of us need to go through all of these? Maybe we can start working on how to share the load, or perhaps focus on specific points. I open the floor for this, but first I would like to let Jonathan say a few words perhaps on how he was envisioning this to move forward and then we can go to Holly and Alan after that. Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Olivier, and thanks everyone for being on the call. I really walked off the beach for the call, I hope everyone will honor my sacrifice with sensitive discussion. I got a little bit of a powerpoint, what I did in the little bit of frustration that [inaudible] give me your comments wherever you want, in text form, in smoke signals, or whatever else. So, I took an attempt at kind of consolidating that had been made, some of which Olivier, questions 1 through 30 that were on the spreadsheet itself, some that were on email from Christopher and Holly, and try to get this to a place where we might have a substantive discussion about things, and so to answer your question Olivier, I think in the end we need to look at all the questions to decide whether or not we're going to... which ones we're going to answer, which I believe will be a fairly small subset, that we think is a place for our unique voice. That was really the initial exercise, which of these questions you think is important for us to weigh in on, as opposed to something we might have an opinion about, and what that position might be that we will take and go from there to getting drafters for just those questions. So, I don't think there's a

situation where we answer all of it, only a subset of them and that's what we were trying to figure out. Before I jump into the slides though, why don't I let Holly and Alan state their piece and then I'll go through the summaries, sort of that I came up with based on the different avenues from which I got to the comments. Go ahead Holly and then Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thanks Jonathan, Holly Raiche for the record. I looked at the list, we've got two weeks now. My suggestion is we first identify the actual issues that matter to us, and the problem, I wouldn't go through number by number, because there are so many, but if we have penholders for each of the issues, then leave it upto the penholder to go through and identify just the number of comments, whether those are questions or recommendations that are relevant, so that what you are doing is saying ultimately, this is what we think and therefore the answers to the following are X, X, and X. If we do it number by number, we will be here until halloween, and I am trying to cut that short. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Jonathan you have the floor, you are running the queue now.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright, I will step in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. A couple of comments and I don't want to talk about process for this whole meeting, but process comes down to part of it. The document that we have right now is somewhat hard to use as you can only see other people's comments, or see if there are any comments by hovering over a box. So, it is very tedious to even find out if someone else thinks that we should be commenting on applicant support or something like that, which is one of the items, I think, Olivier hasn't gotten to yet. So, it's somewhat difficult and I don't understand at all, at this point, how it is that I, who don't plan to hold a pen but have opinions will filter that into the process. So, I haven't gone through the document, I will within the next 24 hours and will try to present it in a way that is useable, both in terms of what we should be commenting on and to the extent that I can do it, a summary of what we should be saying. I am not quite sure the medium how we're supposed to do all this and how we make sure that we're factoring people's ideas in. I appreciate Jonathan taking input in whatever form it came in, but I am little bit worried about the fact that you don't even know someone made a comment on the Google Doc unless you hover one by one over all 223, or whatever the number is, of boxes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan, shall we try Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Alan. Can you hear me? I am speaking but nobody seems to be hearing me. Alright, I was trying to answer Holly's question, thank you. That is the purpose... great, everybody can. I appreciate it. So, the purpose of this slide deck is to just that, is to go and find the comments in whatever form they came in and try to bring them in some [inaudible] so we can have a discussion on substance. That's my attempt to get through this, it is high volume, it is also the case Christopher that we don't plan to answer every question, but we probably are going to submit a document that in fact answers to those questions. I don't think we're going to submit a comment that makes them go back and try to find how things apply to their questions. We've sort of deconstructed here and we'll end up reconstructing I think for our final comment back, even if that... some answers are... the answer for question 50 is the question 30, or something like that. Just to make it as readable as possible for the working group. I am gonna just charge ahead in this, and try to talk about some of the things that came up, okay?

So, these are just little interest slides that we keep saying all these things, we're going to try to figure out which things we want to talk about. Here are some of the things that on which comments were made by the community, whether it was either in an email to me or to the group, or comments in the spreadsheet. Community [inaudible] evaluations, metrics, public interest commitments, applications from outside the US and Europe, universal acceptance, fees and costs, competition, jurisdiction, clarity, accreditation program, and etc. These are sort of the main things and if, sort of, go into individual things, we can see that one of the comments that came back to us that the

definitions of the key terms were [inaudible] now, and two applications that made it through the process. So, that's questions 291 from the annex. So, I guess what I think might make sense is to think about this question and see if we have some consensus for disagreement on whether or not we should address this issue, for example, community [inaudible]. If this something where there's an end user interest that makes sense for us to respond to? Does that make sense, as a way to proceed? So folks have a comment on whether or not we should address... it's been submitted that we should, so I guess my question is whether or not you believe we shouldn't. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think it's mandatory, we have taken the position all along and I believe still take it that we are looking for public interest benefits of this new gTLD program and community priority over those who have lost money, I think is an absolute essential part of it. It's one of the few places in the original program that ICANN and the ICANN board put something which is truly in, what I believe, is in the public interest and I believe we want to support it, because there are those who say we shouldn't have it at all, and moreover I think we want to make it more usable so people can succeed in doing it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Alan. So that has been suggested that, and is there anybody who thinks that we should not... I am going to try to post this as a negative, so that we move through it more quickly. Is there anybody that believes we shouldn't be addressing community priority evaluations in our

comments? Alright, seeing no hands, I am going to assume that we do and make a note of it here. So, then the other thing was a question of metrics that came up quite a bit, having better to find metrics of what success looks like, from an ALAC perspective. This was the question 221, some metrics have been developed and collected, and this was Olivier's comment in the Google Doc, do people agree with? Olivier, do you want to provide some color commentary on this?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks for this Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just to say that the internet technical health indicators are out there, there is also the domain name marketplace health index also, which is out there. These two programs are not being used by ICANN to have better tracking and quite a good collection of metrics that they have started collecting and that they are going to be able to collect over the next few years until the program launch, so really we should be pushing for these to be used so that we're less of a question mark as to how many new domains and what else, you know, if there's a real big demand out there as some people would like us to know, or maybe what type of demand is out there. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Olivier, yes. Probably my next exercise after finally delivering the CPT review will be to spend more time than I have been already in the marketplace health index thing, so there will be some data to refer to. I think the issue is whether or not there's anything specifically we want to identify as end users. But, is there anybody else that has a comment on

this issue of metrics and whether or not we should be talking about them? It sounds like we should be. Holly go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a comment, we did very early in the piece say there should be metrics, that was why we got the consumer trust competition etc, report. It's a useful, if lengthy report but actually shows a lot of confusion and misunderstanding by consumers. So, at the end of the day, that's who we're representing. If we have metrics to say, they really don't know what is going on, and they don't know what the new names are. I think it's secondary but it's a useful way to judge, was the exercise actually achieving what its supposed to, or even understanding what it's supposed to. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Holly. Alan, is that a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It is a new hand. Very briefly, I think the focus here is not on should there be... it's not on should there be metrics, but what should be built into the program to allow us to either create metrics, or measure things, or whatever. That's really the substance here, not after the facts should someone take surveys and look at the data that's readily available. What do we need to build into the program in terms of metrics. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Alan, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just to point out, in answer to Holly mentioning there was some confusion in the CCT review and so on. I think the marketplace health index thing has moved forward quite some bit and there's much less confusion now after countless number of conference calls, the latest announcement with a link to their latest report is now in the chat. I just put it in the chat, thanks. And as to whether we should have ongoing metrics, I really think we should be pushing for that as a community. I think we need to perhaps focus on the metrics that we'd like to see as being, not showstoppers but the one that we think are really important so that they don't get dropped. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great Olivier. Thank you. Alright, Eduardo.

EDUARDO: I am going to take Alan's cue, and going to say that if... when we're looking here is to include the fact that we're going to have some metrics before it goes out, not after the fact and it's for the end users, we should have some metrics of how many community type domains are being applied. It seems very specific to end user, because I don't... from the end user I don't care there are thousands out there, but I probably would care for the ones that are community based, or being supported

by some kind of not for profit organization. It's geared to the end user.
Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, I guess what I am hearing is that part of what we should try to do is come up with some metrics that we want to introduce, that the program has built into, the objectives to hit some of those metrics related to community evaluations and other things, so let's try to do that. Sebastien go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much Jonathan, Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Yes, I agree that we need to have metrics included into the program to allow those that are, not to try to gather the data after the fact. I know that you know already, it was really the purpose of the 2004 round of TLDs and it seems that it's still a discussion, it's quite strange. But in the same time, I think we need not just to consumptuate on the few we care about but also the larger question like, do we know how many new gTLD we can add before internet collapse. It's not just a joke, it's something we need to take care of that because it's part of the problem, we need to be sure that if we had TLDs, it's not to end up with no internet in the future. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Sebastien. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much. Sorry, just reading what you wrote in chat then Jonathan at the same time. Work track 4, spent a great deal of time and I am putting on my PDP co-chair hat now to be clear, a great deal of time interacting with SSAC, the root server operators community to ensure that we all clearly understood that their conservative guidelines, and they are conservative guidelines on the throughput or amount at them, and of additions to the root zone that they felt would not jeopardize the stability of the net, it is well and truly understood and enshrined in future activities and is obviously able to be reviewed from time to time. So, that last concern Sebastien, I think is one that the PDP working group is well and truly aware of, but it certainly does no harm to suggest that it's continuously looked at. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks everyone. I guess I am going to try and [inaudible] a policy where we get to something and if you agree that it's something that we should talk about, don't raise your hand. I don't think we need statement of affirmation, we need statements of detraction. Otherwise, we probably won't get through it. To the extent possible that looks makes sense as something we ought to proceed with, making a statement on and unless you think we have a widely different position on it, we should keep moving forward if we can. I don't mean to be such a disciplinarian but, let's try to [inaudible] through if we can. So, then on the public interest commitments, I think that's a no brainer that the questions on the... of the picks is something that everybody has said that we need to make sure we are engaged and discussing, and I can't imagine it's anything different from that, so I think when we identify a couple of drafters, their first task is going to be coming back with some

bullet points about what we want to do on picks. I'll circulate this powerpoint, sorry it didn't get done before this call, this was first, like a summary of what came in via the comments and could be a starting point for that exercise. I think we're all in agreement that picks are something we are going to comment [inaudible] as Olivier has specified. With that objection, I am going to move on. Okay. One of the issues had to do with where applications were coming from, so there's some variation and opinion on this, about whether or not it's an at-large concern about where applicants are coming from. It seems that most people wanted to have that be part of the discussion inside at-large, so some of you is about to speak? Olivier go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. You know it's an interesting one because we tried so hard, our community tried so hard to put together an applicant program... and applicant support program which at the end of the day, nobody benefited from because we were so concerned about the process, or the possibility of gaining, that we made it way too tight for anyone to be able to benefit from. I do think that we have a moral need to be involved with this, and to mention and to promote this applicant support, maybe refine it, see if any amendments have been carried out to it. I think yes, we need to comment on it. Bearing in mind the fact that we are also aware that it might well be that investing in a registry or putting together a registry for domain names to be sold in part of the world such as Africa, for example, might not be the greatest of business opportunity. It might well be that there are other businesses that people would like to put

together in those parts of the world rather than to deal with domain names. I do think that we need to help those regions. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Two points and a question. Note that if we talk about applicant support, it's not necessarily just financial support, because in some areas it's clear that the costs are not the major issue and if an applicant cannot afford to keep the registry going afterwards, lowering the application fees alone are not really the answer to the problem. I do have a question for Cheryl. I don't recall any real substantive discussion at this point that if there is an applicant support program with money involved, who is going to pay for it? Is that something within our domain, or not our problem?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It isn't our problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that's fine. Thank you. That's it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, thanks Alan. The next thing is [inaudible] universal acceptance, and this has come up a lot, kind of indirectly and in some ways it's something that's not [inaudible] address or not in the interim report of

the subsequent procedures working group. So, I think universal acceptance is something that... there's some consensus in our group that we should address, so I will ask whether or not anybody disagrees with a notion of universal acceptance. It's different than marketing the new gTLD program potential applicants about, you know, getting the internet more prepared for these new types of strings. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Jonathan, thank you. Sebastien Bachollet speaking, but I wanted to speak about the previous topic and I support this one but I wanted to speak. When you have time you come back to me on the previous topic.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is there anybody that disagrees that we should deal with universal acceptance, because if there isn't, I will just let Sebastien go back one. Go ahead Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. First, yes it was not just money issue and Olivier ask if there were else than money and yes, importantly we just get three candidates programs, program and of course, various things were done, really. But, the lot of proposals, well... some proposals was made by lawyers to do [inaudible] work or other things like that. I am always concerned about developing country. Yes, I understand that we would like to have more in the... in Africa and Latin America, but I guess we would like more... I will say not for profit organization who could have, and not always the case, but could have

also problem with the money and they could be in developing country, or in developed country, sorry. My last point and I am sorry Jonathan but please don't choose international word, I don't think it's relevant, it's international, we are a global organization and in this typical point, it will be an organization, it could be a global or local one, a national one, or whatever, and it's misleading the way you write, sorry for that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, Sebastien thank you. That's a fair point. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Jonathan, Tijani speaking. I hear you Olivier regarding the business case and those developing regions. I know that money is not the only issue for applicants needing supporting, but we have to be clear that the business case would not be sold, if we don't do something and I think that [inaudible] something that we have to help those regions to have... at least to handle it, because so far we are almost outside, and this is very important for inclusion, for it is not normal only some regions will be [inaudible] will be doing business from the domain name system, while the others are being [inaudible]. I think that it is very important that we try to make them and the [inaudible] program, if there is an applicant support program it will be done rigorously. Last time, I don't want to repeat what I said several times, but last time we had all those who were against the support inside the group and the lobby very very very strongly, so that we could put very... who do you say... difficult criteria, almost impossible criteria so that no one got

supported. So, I do think that this is something very important, otherwise it will be an internet of rich people and not for the whole world. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Tijani. Again, I am going to stress that we are going to drill into... we could have an entire call on applicant support without question, so we can't operate as if that's this call. Right now we're going to sort of figure out if we have consensus on what we're going to respond to in broad strokes, and then we'll get into more in depth discussions about what we need to say, I guess, on a subsequent call that's specific to that topic. Universal acceptance, I think there's agreement, Alan made a point that we don't know what the programs can do, and I am not sure either, but it sounds like something we want to talk about in some form and try to get movement on in one way or another, and it is raised a little bit in 234, it sounds like there's agreement we should talk about it. One of the issues is fees and costs, the application fee itself. It was raised that we should, essentially talk about this, I guess the question is who thinks that we shouldn't necessarily talk about the fees and costs, obviously an applicant support program may make a change to the fee in a specific case, but this is about overall are the fees too high for applicants and should we get involved in that debate, is really the first question. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I believe that we should get involved in that debate. The real potential problem is that the fees will end up being too low, and we end

up with some applicants applying for very very large numbers of them as speculation and hoping to resell them or something. Or you know, figure out which ones work and which ones don't because of the low costs. I think we want to keep this as a... we are selling and make no bones about it, this is selling, we are selling real estate of the internet which is limited and is a valuable resource and I believe there is no condition of which we should sell it cheap enough so it's a commodity. I believe from the interests of users, we've talked about confusion a lot, we've talked about the fact that a large number of gTLDs do not seem to be bringing any real benefit to our community, or in general to other communities, and I think price is absolutely crucial to what happens in the second successive rounds. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Olivier. And if you've got kids in the background mute your microphone perhaps.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'll be very brief. I have heard someone this week who told me that for brand TLDs, the price should be much higher because, hey... one, they've got the money, two, it's their brand, three, it's a good income for ICANN. So, we definitely need a discussion on this. Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jonathan has muted himself, you can unmute Jonathan. We can't hear you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, I am unmuted. Sorry about that. Can you hear me now?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It sounds like we really get into fees, it sounds like the person with kids in the background has muted their line, so thank you for that. So, then there was some question about competition and concentration in the program and I guess that's another... whether or not it's something that we should get involved in. It is something that Christopher has raised and I believe he has left the call unfortunately. I am curious if people have strong about him getting engaged on the competition question, with respect to the new gTLDs, I'm certainly of mixed minds on it myself, but Tijani, go ahead. Tijani we can't hear you, are you speaking?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Jonathan, who should speak? Me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes please Tijani, it is you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. It was only to support you and say that yes we should be involved in that competition and concentration. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. I am not sure that we should. Just to be clear. Thank you for expressing your interest. Sebastien, go ahead,

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much Jonathan. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I think that [inaudible] it's very broad and the same time your point is more about vertical integration. Even if that's something important, I don't think that we spend time on specifically this question of vertical integration. My concern about the competition and concentration, it's more the one who have enough money to put 300 application and who can beat the small applicants with just one, and eventually the one with just on one for a small not for profit organization, or for community TLD and so on. That's where I think the question of competition and concentration needs to be raised by us, not the question of vertical integration, but the question of how we can support the one who are with less time, money, and knowledge about the program against the one who have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right Sebastien. I think you're right about that and I think that has more to do with community evaluations and applicant support and this is more about making sure that there isn't a concentration of back end providers and things like that. That's a somewhat separate issue. Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, you just said what I was going to say. It's a CPE and community support, and applicant support issue. We are not going to stop rich people from participating and I don't think it's worthy of our time talking about it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Alan. Jurisdiction is one of the issues that...

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I love the way you dismiss my proposal but I am not sure that you answer what I was... if you don't want to have this question raised, we will not put it. But, please don't dismiss my proposal like that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry Sebastien, I was not trying to dismiss it. I thought it was something we already agreed to discuss. If you really think there's something I am missing, go ahead. I think we are all supportive of other people being able to apply. I just don't think that that's what this question is about, that's all. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay, if we will discuss, we will find a way to do it and not spend time now. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks Sebastien. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Jonathan, Olivier speaking. Originally I thought, you know, we might not be interested in this, but looking at some of the sub headings, like the one I have quoted there with regards to the squatting or warehousing of top level domains, which apparently, appears to have already taken place, or might take place in the future, that at the end of the day is going to be a problem for our community because we are likely to see lots of new top level domains being squatted and not much further offering. I am not sure how we can deal with this, I know that as far as competition and trust and so on was promoted, it was the case that 99% of the words in dot com used English dictionary words, it was really hard to find something there. I don't know how we can now go around the whole crowding of the root that might occur if we have 20,000 or 30,000 applications for the next round. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Olivier. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think we can tilt it windmills too much, we cannot stop someone from applying and using the name, using the TLD minimally to satisfy the use requirement. All we can do is make sure the price is high enough that they can't do it too easily. Other than that, I don't think we have the control.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Alan. Okay so a couple of people raised the question of jurisdiction in our community and it's obviously [inaudible] here and Christopher Wilkinson again, had this question in mind. I don't feel strongly that it's something that the at-large has a unique perspective to bring to this discussion, so I'll just take off my chair hat for a second and suggest that I don't think it's a topic for us, but I welcome others who believe that it should be. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe that it's only an issue for us to the extent we choose to incorporate into applicant support. It is virtually impossible to trace corporate holdings to see where people really are, and people can map it pretty easily. It is relevant in applicant support, but that's about all.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Alan, that's true, in that environment... it got a little complicated already. Anything else than jurisdiction that anybody else wants to raise? Maybe jurisdiction in the context of applicant support? Then, the other issue is about clarity in the application process and the term that gets used quite a bit. Sorry Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, sorry. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. In the context of a registrant, jurisdiction of the registry in which you're registering your domain name is actually important, when it comes down to take down notices, if you're going to have some controversial content or content that the country in which the registry is domicile doesn't like what you're doing. We've seen that in dot coms with some sites, you know that have been taken down and so on. I don't know whether we want to look at this, I am sure that the NCSG would be looking at that probably. Actually, I am sure, and probably in the same sentence, which obviously doesn't make sense. They might be looking at that, do we want to look at this? I don't know. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Olivier. I will make a note about it and maybe we will try to find a context for it where we can make a small dent. Greg, the king of jurisdiction, go ahead and speak up.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, yes I saw jurisdiction and I immediately had flashbacks. Greg Shatan for the record. The... another way in which this might be interesting, and this does relate to the work stream 2 jurisdiction malay is that if the recommendation that were made by the work stream come into effect, then registries and registrars will have some greater flexibility in choice of law issues which could then possibly implement their responsibilities and obligations to both registrants and end users. Obviously there's a timing issue here, since that hasn't happened yet,

but it will happen if it happens at all, before the next round or procedure takes place, so in the grand scheme of things, if we're trying to triage a very long report down to, you know, the top 10 or 15 things ALAC should care and respond to, or even the top 30. I don't think this is in it, but nonetheless, I did want to mention that context that there will be some greater relevance to that issue. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Greg for that context of perspective, I still am not convinced that it's worthy of our attention, just because of, as Alan suggestions, picking the windows in which we tilt. I think that you raised a point, but I still am erring away from being... making this one of our key issues, unless somebody really wants to take the pen on it. Alright, so the next issue is about clarity in the application process and this was a big... predictability was a big buzzword inside of the subsequent procedures working group and so you know there's a lot of effort, I think by that working group to improve clarity and predictability for applicants. I know that Christopher, once again, has raised the spectre that predictability has become code for protection from outside forces, for which we are one and limiting interference from the likes of ALAC and the GAC and others, which might slow down the application process and so I think it is probably worthy of some diligence to make sure that predictability doesn't translate into isolation for the application process, because I think we want to maintain the capability to speak up on picks and other issues as they come up in the application process, even if that creates some unpredictability for applicants. I open the floor on this issue of clarity and predictability. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A large number of the clarity and predictability issues that happened in the first round, because we launched too early and perhaps it would have not been possible to have launched too early, because many of the questions that arose, only arose once we actually saw the list of applications. So, hopefully this whole PDP will generate a better clearer process, which will have fewer surprises part way through. The predictability part, however, is also contingent not only what ICANN does, but how it sets up rules for things like panels and stuff like that, where we had seemingly inconsistent results, if you just look at the string confusion panels, for instance, certainly on the community applications, there were seemingly inconsistent results with deciding, how do you decide whether there is a community or not. So, those parts we have to fix and I think we need to comment on those. The parts of unpredictability because we didn't think about it well enough, some of those are going to come up, it's inevitable, and hopefully it will be a lot fewer than there were last time. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Agree Alan. I guess the question is going to be, how many of those are really end user interest, even string confusion etc, is probably something where... I don't know. Maybe we'll want input on what that looks like, but whether or not it's predictable application process is not [inaudible]. What represents string confusion might be something that we care to comment on as that evolves. Olivier go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'll let Alan speak, if he wants to respond to what you've just said.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will be very brief. I think things like string confusion are of interest to us, and predictability because a large, a significant number of the predictability problems were related to community applications and issues like that. I think that making sure the various decision points along the way end up with predictable and repeatable results, and repeatability is really the critical one, and it didn't happen last time. I think we need a comment on that about how important it is. I don't think we need to go into a lot of detail. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Alan. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. There are two things that struck me in there, was the first one, this whole confusion about what the launch of the program was, whether the launch of the program was when the board will say yes, let's go forward with it or whether it's when the first applications are received. The second thing that struck me is there are some, there are several proposals in the whole list of proposals that are there to put a target date by which the program should start. The application should be received, wherever. That really raises some red flags for me, because again, it's a bit like having another expedited PDP at that point. Saying well, our date is this, no matter what happens this is when we need to launch and we know

what happened the first time around and how many issues we were faced with, with the premature signing of the board to proceed forward. So, you know... I think we have our voice to play on this, to try to make sure that this is not going to be as messy as this time around.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Olivier, and one of the questions that came up is, the issue of whether we need subsequent rounds at all, that came up in some of the comments and there's an implicit assumption in the subsequent procedures group that it's going to happen and that it's going to as soon as possible, and I know that certainly it was the at-large position after the round that we're not in any hurry and at the very least we need to get it right before continuing, and I know that that's Alan's perspective, and Alan unless you really are... go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry, just one quick point. It has been accepted that there is going to be another round, when we started this process, you know, there was some people who were saying just open the window and keep it open. There are people who are saying the next round must be predictable, round three, it must be launched in a year after something or another. I don't think we can make that commitment until we know what happens this time around, and I think we need to say that. Thank you. Otherwise, we may end up in a round three which is really stupid and won't be able to control it because we made a firm commitment. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Agree. I think we push back on some of those deadlines for new rounds and things of that sort, for sure. Okay. The accreditation program, this is about whether or not there could be pre-approval for these registry service providers. I think somebody is... we got an echo. Thanks [inaudible], I will try to moderate it harder. The registry [inaudible] pre-approval process would mean that they're audited once by ICANN and not for each application for which they participate. This came up in our comments, I again, would [inaudible] that this is perhaps not something for us to comment on, even though it is an interesting issue. I feel like it's not something of particular interest to the at-large, but I welcome somebody suggesting otherwise. Alan, I am assuming your X, means that you agree in this case, or that you disagree?

ALAN GREENBERG: I am saying that I think this is an issue we don't need to talk about. It does have connection to fees, and that if we have an accreditation program it could lower fees significantly for someone who is applying for 1000 TLDs, but, I don't think we can stop this train if it is going to go forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, alright. Sebastien, go ahead please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, sorry, I agree that to comment on that, I can't start to comment on what Alan said. The question is not just for one TLD, one group of TLD for one applicants with... it's for all of the with the same back end

registry and it could be from various applications. It's where it could decrease the time and the cost of the overall program. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you Sebastien. This next issue that came up in some of the questions has to do with rollout, that some people brought up and whether or not we ought to be trying to advocate in favor of [inaudible] type of rollout of new gTLDs, based on linguistic, geography, etc or just have another open round. Is that something that folks believe that we should try to comment on? I mean maybe it's communities. Holly go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah, really briefly. The only thing that we had was our preference for community applications and possibly IDNs favoring different kinds of communities, that's the only thing that I can think of, and I'm not sure that's really high on our list, maybe it is. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Holly. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think this is worthy of a very short comment, because yes i think we would strongly support IDNs, community applications, I think we'd even accept brand TLDs because they are not harmful, but it would stop the proliferation of huge numbers of other TLDs which we don't see a lot of value in. But, it's a very short comment, it is no chance in

hell that it's going to win and I think it's worth putting a stake in the ground but not a lot of words.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay Alan, noted. Olivier, I got your comment as well and I think I'd agree on the brand as well. Thank you. Okay, this is about whether or not there should be rounds, or if it should be open or done as rounds. I think that talking about it is, probably already agreed to as rounds right now but Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Jonathan, it's Olivier speaking. I had quite a number of discussions in my [inaudible] about this and the gist of the story is you can have all sorts of like, one round, or several rounds, or regular rounds, or whatever. But, the big difference if we have a continuous application process and not rounds, is that there is not going to be any clashing or competing applications for the same string, which if we look at the new rules for the auction processes, since one cannot have private auctions, as far as I understand, and you can only have ICANN accredited auctions, that actually reduces the possibility of an auction to take place, thus reducing the possibility of ICANN being able to cash in on an auction. So, if we look at it from a purely ICANN finance point of view, we would probably be looking at rounds rather than having a continuous application process. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Olivier. This came up a little bit in the CCT, I mean the other flip side is that rounds tend to generate high volumes of applications that we might not otherwise see if we had it open and more continuously, and if you had a window to submit a competing application [inaudible]. But, Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In terms of the auction issue, it is not clear that ICANN has the mechanism to forbid private auctions. How do you recognize a private auction was held, versus a bunch of people simply withdrew. So, it gets into a really messy area. You can also have a continuous window, but you only process them once every six months, or something like that, which would allow to some extent competition. It becomes a real messy area, we don't understand the dynamics of it and I would suggest that we can move strongly in support of rounds until the overall dynamics in this industry, that we understand it a lot more, and that is not how we would have to phrase it. I would say that we strongly object to an open window or continuous applications, until it is understood. Among other things the objection process, it would probably be almost impossible to handle on a continual flow, because there is no way the people who currently look at objections when they come in, in a bunch, can keep an eye on it day by day forever. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Alan. We talked about this already a little bit, and we talked about... allocation for submission limits. Is this something we want to

get engaged in? I am inclined to say no, but if somebody feels strongly we should. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Jonathan. You know this one is a really funny one because we've seen how organizations use separate companies for each application, how in the world is that ever going to be enforced. I think it's total [inaudible] as Greg Shatan mentioned, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks for that. I think we are heading towards no on this particular questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien has his hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I am sorry Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Don't be sorry Jonathan. Sebastien Bachollet. I was just [inaudible]. Do we have somewhere question about place of the [inaudible] application. I don't know if its... my question. But if you remember some US company came to Europe to incorporate how to put some applications in Luxembourg or other places like that. One of the reasons was to allow them to be, if there are some [inaudible] by region to be able to ask, two time or three time, say and not just one. I don't know if there are

some discussion on that, but it could be one point we don't want to consider but I wanted to know if its something discussed today. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Sebastien. It isn't something that we've gone into much detail on as the at-large, and I guess I don't... we have to talk about whether or not it makes sense for us to dip our toe in that pool because that's actually a very difficult enforcement regime that we're trying to control of the geography of applicants and things like that, but it isn't something that we've talked about to date. Kaili, go ahead. Kaili, the floor is yours.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Kaili, we can't hear you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Kaili, I am showing that your mic is unmuted. Please check the mute button on your phone Kaili.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay Kaili, I am going to move ahead. I see your comment in the chat, we don't have enough evidence to do it, so we probably should not take a position. So, unless you are saying something different from that then we will note the comment you made in the chat since we can't hear you at present. Thank you. Alright, then this is, again a little bit, I think repetitive with some of the things we talked about, in terms of

predictability and things like that, that came up in the discussions and I think we have a sense of where the group is on that. So, I am going to try to annotate this document with where we thought we would go and what positions we took on the call, and now that we've had this discussion I would ask that your next to do item is to get to me with your willingness to be a drafter on a particular issue, one of the drafters on a particular issue, because that's what we need to do next, because now we have a sense of the questions that we want to address and what we want to say when we do it. We need somebody to put pen to paper. So please email me your interest in being a drafter and we'll try to work all that out in time for the next call to show the positions we were going to take and which questions you're going to answer and who is going to take crack at drafting them. So, thanks everyone for participating in this process, its the first time we're trying to figure out the way to break up a really big comment like this, so I appreciate all of your patience and we'll work through it and hopefully get it better each time we do it. Thanks for that and Olivier I am going to hand the microphone back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and you might have noticed that there are quite a few... we spent quite a lot of time on this, certainly more than we originally anticipated, but then again this is a very timed process, a very short timing so this was our priority for today's call. We now have 15 minutes left for the next part which should have been 20 minutes, but that's okay. It's the discussion on the... well we can certainly forget about the discussion on the pen holders and so on, but we definitely need an update on what's

happened on the EPDP, and for this we have both Alan Greenberg and I believe Hadia is here as well, isn't she? I don't see her. Then we'll have to ask Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia is here and she has her hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I was looking at the H further down and she's jumped up since she put her hand up. Hadia El Miniawi, welcome and you have the floor. Take us through the next part. Thank you.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Okay, so I [inaudible] about our first two meeting. The first call started with team introductions and I assume that you all saw our statement. [inaudible] the GNSO liaison as the vice-chair of the group. Our concern was that there will be some kinds of interest [inaudible] both liaison and the vice-chair. Alan suggested to be given more time, a few times to consult with the group. As it had, it was agreed that a survey will be sent out to capture the position of each group on the different sections of the temporary specifications, and this is to help [inaudible], which is a triage document. The document basically was suggested to show where we mostly agree and where there are concerns, and... the [inaudible] the first has been the triage document, the second was the initial report which will require consensus. The third deliverable is initial report on a system providing access. On our second call about the survey was sent out and we filled in the survey and in the second call we went with the

survey results, the [inaudible] disagreement was the temporary spec were those with regard to appendix A which speaks to access, there was also a high number of disagreements with regard to section 4.5, which speaks about the process. We actually... our input, we agreed to almost [inaudible]... apart from number 27, which actually, which spoke about publication of additional data field where we felt that we had no strong opinion about that and also number 21, we basically we agreed, 21 we just thought that maybe informing the registrant when [inaudible] is passed to law enforcement agencies or is not necessary to be right. So, that's basically what we did, we also agreed on our first call that we will be having two meetings a week, one on Tuesday and the other Thursday, and that's about it from me and maybe Alan can comment further. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We also made a comment saying that the temporary specification did not distinguish between legal persons and natural persons, and since GDPR is very clearly, only applies to natural persons, we made a statement saying we believe the ultimate ICANN policy should only apply to natural persons and not legal persons. It's not clear how we get there because ICANN and the current WHOIS does not have a way to distinguish, definitively between the two, although there are some methods that could be used to ultimately get there. This particular document was distributed and had to be submitted a couple of days later and it caught us by surprise a little bit, it caught everyone by surprise, it took us significantly more time than we had presumed to fill it out and Hadia thankfully, had gone through it first and I did a second pass and there were no comments from the other team

members. The next one is due on Friday, and we are going to try to give a very narrow window for anyone else to comment on things, but there is a very narrow window on it, there are three more sections in the survey, all of which I believe will be completed by August 19th. So Hadia, am I correct the current deadline for the second one is this Friday? I believe, is that correct or is that changed? I think it was today and it was deferred to Friday. So we're moving pretty quickly, it was interesting, other people put a lot more detailed effort into the first triage, so there were things I didn't even consider commenting on such as the temporary spec says it is effective, it is called the temporary spec and it is effective the 25th May 2018 and people said, well we have to change that. I would have thought that's just a given and it wasn't worthy of explicitly calling out, but some people have looked at this from a far more legalistic and perhaps pedantic point of view than we did, just identifying the real issues that we believed of substance. There is virtual disagreement on almost every issue in the temporary spec, so coming to closure on them is going to be interesting. Some of the differences are minor and some are quite major, so we'll see where this goes. I don't think I have a lot else to report, the calls are all open, anyone can listen in on them if you want to, and the reports and transcripts and things are going out pretty quickly, so to the extent that people are interested in participating please do so, and then we can have perhaps more substantive comments as we go forward. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan, and thanks for this Hadia. It has been an excellent report on the first two calls. I have a couple of questions, not seeing any

other questions at the moment in the chat or with people putting their hand up. First, just a quick comment with regards to [inaudible] having been proposed as a liaison. Wasn't there a line in the charter which said that the co-chair could not be a liaison, co-chair of the GNSO council?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, it's Alan speaker. The charter does say that, and we are looking at a way around it essentially. The real problem is Kurt needs someone who can occasionally chair a meeting, and there's all sorts of administrative work that's associated with this, which if one could share it, would be beneficial. To identify someone else who is already part of the group means you're taking a voice away from one of the groups, to identify someone brand new as a vice chair, you know, adds a level of complexity. So this seemed to be a relatively easy way to finesse it, that requirement in the charter, notwithstanding. There is one process problem with it and one philosophical problem ignoring the words in the charter. The process one is the liaison is the first recourse if you don't agree with the chairs decision, and that implies with a leadership decision and you can't have the liaison deciding on whether his own decision was reasonable or not. So our suggestion was that the GNSO council chair, either appoint someone else to handle this particular role, or take it on herself, and that has been... I believe, she has volunteered to do that. The second part is, if the role is purely running a meeting and doing administrative paperwork, then there is no real problem. If it includes the kind of thing co-chairs, vice chairs, often do, that is essentially deciding on strategy on how to run a meeting to try to get groups to agree with each other and try to cover impasses, then having someone who is deeply involved in one of the groups, not a team

member, but actively involved in that discussion group take that role, is really a conflict. Kurt has, I believe, will come out with a statement saying that no, this is a purely administrative and physical chairing of a meeting and not acting as a strategic leader of the group. With those provisos I don't think we have a real problem, at least I personally don't.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan, it's Olivier speaking. Second thing was to do with the work schedule. I heard that... there were two real main chunks of work, there's the looking at the temp spec and studying the temp spec, temporary specification and there's also this big discussion about the access model. Has there been a consensus on what order this is going to be addressed?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. Yes, to some extent. The absolute deadline for the 25th May 2019 is to replace the temporary spec. Because at that point it disappears and in theory, contracted parties no longer have to follow it. Then we have an issue of they could go their own way if they choose, and moreover compliance does not have a way of enforcing it. So, the part that has to be done by that deadline is replacing the temporary spec. Now there are other aspects of the temporary... things that are mentioned in the temporary spec, such as legal persons, such as access, which has to be a part of a final picture but it doesn't necessarily have to be part of the picture that we have done by that date. So, that implicitly prioritizes things, I think. Essentially it says the issues of access

can come later, now when exactly that will come will depend on how fast we can come to closure on the first issues.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan. Next is Hadia El Miniawi.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Yes, I just want to add something about tackling the access issue. It needs to be tackled after the dating questions are answered. So, although the third way did actually tackle this part, that the report or the actual decision with regard to the access can only be done after answering the [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Hadia. It's Olivier speaking, I still don't see any other hands at the moment. I have another question then, which is the temporary, IPC and BC proposal that was circulated and so on, is this being looked at in any way or is that just purely on the access side and that might be looked at in the future? Anybody willing to answer this? Alan, Hadia? Hadia is typing.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am sorry Olivier, can you ask the question again, I was trying to focus on something else, my apologies.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry Alan, yes Olivier speaking. I was just mentioning that the BC IPC model we have seen being circulated for, I gather it is just for access. Is that already also being looked at, or because it's access and this will happen later, it's not something that's currently on the table.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not something that is currently on the table. I mean, it's work that has been done where no one else has done any, so I have no doubt that it will factor into it. The ICANNs unified access model which essentially is a generalization without a lot of the details, you know, is also clearly going to be very much on the table. But, just so far from what we have to do today.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Alan, Olivier speaking. Now finally, as I do not see any other hands up. Is there anything that Hadia and you require from the ALAC or any input so far from the at-large community, from our working group to prepare for the next call on Friday?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I would say just follow the meeting, listen to the recording and give us your feedback.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan, I do have a question. What mailing list should we be using if we have questions or things that we want to show the community or feed comment. This reasonably belongs on registration issues, and that is the

narrow... the subgroup of the CPWG that is looking at things like WHOIS RDS and EPDP. My preference is to use that list and not to do it widely distributed to everyone who may not have a day to day interest in these things and responding. But that means people should make sure that they are signed up to the registration issues mailing list, if they indeed want to part of this discussion. Maybe we should send a message like that out to the CPWG.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan, it's Olivier speaking. In any way, if somebody posted the registration issue, it goes to the CPWG doesn't it?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, CPWG goes to registration issues, not the other way around.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ah okay, I have become a little confused recently. Because I get three or four instances of the same email coming from all the various mailing lists and I am on all of them.

ALAN GREENBERG: You should only be getting one, rather mailman should send... it may randomly decide which one you get, but it should only send you one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, it might do that. Okay. The other question I had for you was with regards to the Skype chat, there was an action item for a Skype chat to

be created. I understand that there is a Skype chat for EPDP members, and members and participants, how does that work?

ALAN GREENBERG:

There is a Skype chat for the four of us, not heavily used but it is essentially a back channel during the meeting if we have to trade positions or something like that. There is a Skype chat that was set up as a result of the action item out of the CPWG, that is currently the CPWG and a small number of people, anyone who wants to be on that in this group, in this super set group, may participate in that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Fantastic, thanks for this Alan. Olivier speaking. Any other comments or questions for Alan and Hadia? I am not seeing anybody put their hand up, I realize we spent a lot of time on the first part of this call but we went very swiftly through this part, so if there are no further comments or questions we can go to any other business. Just in this, I am not seeing anybody put their hand up either, our next meeting will be next week, same day, so Wednesday. Unfortunately, I am not going to be available so it's Jonathan who will be hosting, running the meeting at the earlier time, since we are swapping between the earlier and the later time. We will no doubt continue with a very similar agenda with the first part on the responses for the subsequent procedures PDP, consultation and the second part being an update on the EPDP. By then, I believe will that be two calls by then that you will have had? One on Friday and one on Monday/Tuesday next week?

ALAN GREENBERG: The calls are not on Friday, there is a deadline on Friday for submission of the document. The calls are on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tuesdays and Thursdays, okay, so we will have had Thursday call tomorrow and the Tuesday call, we look forward to your follow up on this. With this, it is four minutes past the half past mark, so Sebastien writes if he can be invited to the Skype chat for the EPDP for at-large people, yes please. If you wish, if anybody wishes to be on the Skype chat please drop a note over to either staff or Alan, or me and we'll add you to that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am not sure I have the rights to add, why don't we have staff do it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let's let staff do it, and I don't know if I have the rights either, I think I do. Alright, well thanks everyone for this very productive call. It has been very helpful and please follow up on the mailing list because we've got a lot of work going on, even until next Wednesday. Thanks everyone, this call is now ended. Thank you. Bye-bye.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, this concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]