YESIM NAZLAR:	15th of August, 2018, at 13:00 UTC. On our call today, on the English channel, we have Jonathan Zuck, Holly Raiche, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Gordon Chillcott, Alan Greenberg, Sébastien Bachollett, Glenn McKnight, Kaili Kan, Joel Thayer, Bartlett Morgan, Satish Babu, Justine Chew, Alberto Soto, Yrjö Lansipuro, and Marita Moll.

Currently, we don't have anyone on the Spanish channel and no one on the French channel, either.

We have received apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Seun Ojedeji, Alfredo Calderon, Hadia Elminiawi, and Maureen Hilyard.

From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdoğdu; and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. We are expecting Theresa Swineheart, [Trang] [inaudible], and Marika Konings to join us later on the call, as well as per the agenda we had.

We'll have Spanish and French interpretation for today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are Claudia and David. Our French interpreters are Claire and Jacques. I'll be doing the call management for today's call.

Before we start, I would like to remind everyone to state your names before speaking. That's only for the transcription but also for interpretation purposes as well, please. And a kind reminder for those who are on the phone bridge, please don't forget to use *6 to mute your lines and *7 to unmute.

I'm now leaving the floor back to you, Jonathan. Thank you very much.

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.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Yesim. Welcome, everybody, to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call here on August, 15th, 2018. As you'll see over there on the agenda on the right-hand side of the screen, we have a pretty full agenda in terms of what we're going to be trying to discuss here. We're going to do the update on the subsequent procedures comment and do a call for drafters here on this call and most likely e-mail afterwards, an update on the EPDP, Alan Greenberg, follow-up on the discussion of penholders and key policy activities, and discussions with staff on GDPR and EPDP as well that we're looking for in webinar format.

Let's I guess ask if there's anyone that has an amendment to or a question about the agenda. Okay. Seeing no hands up about the agenda, then the outstanding action items from the last call, one of which is a call for drafters associated with the subsequent procedures and the other is creating, getting some Skype chats set up that has already happened. So, we're going to begin the process with a call for drafters on this call, and probably expand it to e-mail into the broader list after this call, but we'd like to get started on it today. So, if you would bring up my slides and let's jump right in. Do I have control, Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, you do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thank you. We've had a number of discussions over the past few weeks. Unfortunately, more of them have had to do with form than function, but we had a substantive conversation last week about the issues that we wanted to address and got through a bunch of slides. So, we're going to try to go through the decisions that got made and identify drafters for the sections on which we had some consensus that we wanted to respond and then go over the remaining sections on which we did not reach consensus and try to reach consensus on whether we were responding and what our position would be on a particular question or set of questions from the subsequent procedures working group.

In our call for drafters, I wanted to talk a little bit about drafting by non-native speakers of English. We talked about this at the last meeting and trying to make some incremental improvements to the ability of non-native speakers to participate in the drafting process and we haven't completely worked out allowing people to draft in their native language and having a translation happen on the way into the Wiki, but I have had a conversation with staff and they've expressed the willingness to take a first edit pass at any comments that are drafted and folks don't want to post them right away until someone's had a chance to look at them.

So, as a first step, if you're willing to take a shot at drafting a section but would like someone to edit your draft before it appears publicly, that mechanism is now available via staff. So, I'm excited about that because folks on this call and also on our broader list that actually do quite a bit of writing in the form of comments and a lot of those comments could just as easily be drafts, but somehow the [stakes] seem different. So, I

just want to encourage folks to go ahead and sign up as a drafter and let's try this experiment with staff taking a first edit pass at comments before they're posted as a draft in the Wiki. Does anybody have a question about that? Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan, it's not a question. Fear not. [inaudible] any concern. I just wanted to have my voice on the record as very supportive about this. I see this as a way of encouraging and nurturing more input which is something we're all very keen to do and something that's essential with this sort of monolithic type work that, for example, the [inaudible] stuff is.

More importantly, I suppose, and [inaudible], I just want to remind you all, it's an absolute [key thing] with some of what we need to implement from our recent ALAC review. So, thank you and well done. Thanks a lot.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. We've all had a lot of experience translating Cheryl's version of English into the King's English, so there's already been some practice. I really do encourage people to sign up as drafters and try this experiment and see if it's helpful because we really want to get more people involved and more voices heard in this drafting process.

So, what we need to do is finalize the list of questions that ALAC plans to comment on and then designate penholders for those sections. Alberto, I see your hand is up. go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:	I am not a native English speaker, so I'm going to collaborate that way. I trust staff and I also trust Cheryl. Thank you.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Alberto. I'm excited to have you as a guinea pig for this new beta-tested program that we're going to have, so welcome aboard. Very excited to have you on as a drafter.

As you can see, these are our two steps here that we need to go through, some of which we accomplished on the last call, some which I'd like to finish on this call if we can. We just have about 45 minutes as we go through this. I know it's a lot and it's difficult for everyone to remain conscious, but let's do our best.

So, the areas that I could perceive from the recording and elsewhere on which we had reached some consensus to comment was on continuing subsequent procedures, universal acceptance, predictability, clarity in the application process, global public interest, and fees. Then, PICs was something about which there was some discussion on the [listserv] about the futility of our commenting, but it seemed to be that we trended towards trying to make some comment on it, even though it was approached with some cynicism.

So, in the continuing subsequent procedures section there was a question about metrics and the answer on this was yes, that we need better-defined metrics [inaudible] looks like from an ALAC perspective. Olivier raised a point on the last call that there were a lot of metrics that were being developed and collected both as a part of the CCT review of

which I am apart and the marketplace indicators project in which I had a hand as well I guess.

So, there are metrics out there and data that's being collected. The question is which are the ones that are of most interest and how would we like to see those metrics moved or measured for subsequent procedures.

So, my question now is, is there someone that's interested in taking a look at the metrics that have come out of the marketplace indicators and making some suggestions for their use as parts of any definition of subsequent procedures or new round?

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, I can't seem to raise my hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think this is a point I made last time, but we need to be specific, not just what metrics will be useful, but what needs to be built into the program with regards to metrics. Some of the things can only be collected after the fact, but if there are things, obligations of a registry or things ICANN should be tracking that it might not otherwise be tracking that will generate metrics is the key, because right now we're not saying how to monitor the program, although we could say that, also, but the real question at this point is what needs to be built into the

program either by action ICANN can take or requirements it puts on perspective registries.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, just to clarify that particular point, you think it's worth us making that point theoretically, since it's a little bit cyclical. We won't be able to make specific recommendations about what needs tracking until we actually see people's voluntary PICs. So it's more the concept of those things need to be [inaudible], right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, for example, if we're measuring abuse, we might put a requirement on a registry that if it gets reports of abuse, it has to keep track of them and report them, but some of the measurements that we're going to use associated with abuse are simply going to be created by third parties after the fact. So, it's not clear that's something that needs to be built into the program. I'm not sure how I can make that any clearer if it's unclear. So, it's not just things that are useful, but things that we need to actually take action on to create at this point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Just a comment and a reminder. When we started with the [inaudible] process, one of the things we [inaudible] looking at the outcomes of consumer trust and consumer competition and so forth.

We made some suggestions about metrics which were not taken up, but if you actually read the original and then the interim report, there is some comment about that and it might be … I might be happy just to have a look and see what was said because there was a suggestion about what is it that we need to measure to actually look at the extent to which this is benefitted consumers generally. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. Are you volunteering, then, to take a look at that?

HOLLY RAICHE: I have written comments for both the original and the interim report. I'll dig them out and put them wherever appropriate. I'll also ask [Evan] because he did a lot of work on what metrics might be useful, some of which were not accepted but it might be worthwhile [inaudible] just have a little package of these are the things that would measure consumer benefit or consumer trust. Happy to do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. I'm happy to have you do that if you would. Many of those metrics that came up as part of that working group found their way into the marketplace [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It should be the exception and not the rule that there's something that was left out altogether.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I guess people are putting in the chat their interest to participate on a particular … I'm trying to figure out the best way to collect this. We'll have the chat transcript. I guess if you would note in the transcript that you're willing to work on a particular issue, we can try to pick that up afterward as well. Unless staff objects, I guess that will be where we'll go to find out who said what about what.

The next issue was universal acceptance and there appears to be universal support, although again, I guess some question as to whether or not what it is that could be done about it. I know Alan raised this issue. I wonder whether or not there's even a potential role potentially with some budget associated with it for the At-Large community in work done in universal acceptance problems since it's something we all agree is a fundamental issue in the new gTLD program. Are there other thoughts on what the community might do and the need for additional effort by community in this regard? And is somebody interested in holding the pen? Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a thought. With this issue, it's all about IDNs. I'm just wondering if we could approach somebody like Edmond Chung because this is really

his bag and see if he's got stuff to say because it's fairly specialized and clearly it's something that—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, it's most definitely not all about IDNs, though, Holly. It's about every single one of those new strings.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, alright.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That doesn't change the value of your recommendation. It might be worth reaching out to Edmond, for example, who's been working on this for a long time. But, the problem is dot-gallery is rejected by most websites as well. It's just legacy validation code in most cases on websites and legacy code is looking for three-letter domains in most cases.

Is there anybody that is interested in working on this issue of universal acceptance? Oh, and don't forget to identify yourself when you speak. I think I'm saying their name, Yesim, before they start speaking, so they figure they don't need to. Is anybody interested on this issue? I can reach out to Edmond and suggest it. I know that Mike [Palage] has been involved quite a bit. He's not part of At-Large, but he's been involved quite a bit in this issue because his representation of dot-bank. It might be worth having him to speak to the group or something to help share ideas as to what might be done, if people think that would be useful.

I'll take it away as a to-do item to reach out to [Palage] to get him to come on to our call and give a little presentation on what's happening in universal acceptance and where additional efforts are necessary. That may help formulate a comment on that. So, we'll hold this particular on in abeyance until after that. I hear a big sigh from somebody. Is that you, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No sign, no sign. Okay. So, predictability. [inaudible] to find. Justine sent around a document with some thoughts as well and raised this issue on how launch should be defined. It sounds like we want to suggest that launch should be defined as when the applications are accepted. Oh, Holly, you've got your hand up. Go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. On predictability, I think there are other issues. The one I was thinking of was for community applications which were given precedence, but when [inaudible] something of community application or not. The definition of [inaudible] so that people who thought they were community found out they weren't. I don't know if that fits there, but I'm just thinking that maybe that's part of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I have it elsewhere in the slides, so it may be one of those things that shows up in two places, like we discussed. It may be a cut-and-paste job on community priority applications for sure. That is another place where we reached consensus that we wanted to talk on this topic for sure.

Issues with the application process was another section in which there was some consensus, issues with application process, more transparency in the process to impacted applicants. Predictability for the applicant shouldn't translate into isolation from outside influence was Chris Wilkinson's point. And [inaudible] regarding ICANN's ability to scale is one of the things that came up on the last call, although that seems to have been something that's been addressed fairly well by SSAC. Is there somebody that wants to tackle some of these issues associated with clarity in the application process? Maybe it's Chris W. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. This is one where I question why are we involved? I mean, clearly, we want clarity for the few applications that we think should actually be deployed, but I'm not quite sure why we're making a comment on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, I think it's a good point and I agree with you personally, taking off my chair hat and giving my personal opinion. It seemed to be something that folks felt strongly about. I guess the one exception is Chris's position on this that he's concerned that predictability equates to immunity from input from the At-Large and GAC and others, so there

might be an issue there. But, I tend to agree with you. But, if other folks feel strongly – it was one of the things said on our last call. People felt strongly about commenting on it.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may follow on—

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] about holding the pen, that will determine that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If I may follow-on, it sounds like the example you gave is we are against predictability and clarity if we feel that may mean they don't listen to us when we make comments. So, if that indeed is one of the rationales, we need to decide which side of the fence we're on in making any comment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's exactly right and it may be a little bit of both. In other words, things like … I guess, Alan, there's a couple of different issues. There's stuff related to predictability of things like string confusion which I guess has an end user component to it and then there's Chris's point. It's possible to be on both sides of the fence, I guess, if we write a comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest that if we don't have someone who's really eager and can say what it is they want to say to make sure we agree with it, that this is one that can drop by the wayside.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, let's make a point to reach out to Chris, then, to see if it's something that he wants to draft something on, at least on his points. Staff, please make a note someplace to reach out to Chris. Okay.

So, another issue of which there seems to be some consensus on the last call was about community prioritization. There was an agreement that it should still exist, but that it was too stringent, that led to limited participation and then those who attempted largely failed. So, who would like to hold the pen on community prioritization? Marita, you said that you're willing to help. So, you're willing to participate on a group working on this issue, but if you feel like you want to give something a start, I think that would be helpful because people really get going once there's something up there to comment on and you're never alone for very long in the At-Large commenting process. So, being a penholder isn't quite as lonely as an activity as it may seem.

So, in the action item and notes, maybe it's Marita volunteers as co-penholder or something like that. Okay. [inaudible]. Maybe we have co-penholders and maybe together with staff to help put something cohesive up onto the Wiki.

HOLLY RAICHE: You got three volunteers.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. That's excellent. Thank you. So, this was a little bit of a discussion that happened on the [listserv] and there seems to be a back and forth on this and some people were more cynical than others about whether or not to work on this and continue to comment on it. But, there seems to be overall consensus that we should continue to have mandatory PICs and voluntary PICs and that we just need to get better at the details of those things. We have hands up. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. I think we can make a good case for mandatory. When you look at the actual questions that were being asked, one of them was should mandatory PICs go through a PDP process and actually form part of the RAA, so you'd have an amended RAA? Because, at the moment, the enforcement of the PICs is through this strange process of PICs dispute resolution process which is not the sort of enforcement process that would be under a contract.

So, given that the mandatory PICs have been added to, spec 11 has been added to. So, not only have they got to put in rules in the new registry about no abuse, but they actually have to test. So, the actual requirements on testing for abuse are stronger and I think we should, at the very least, say, yeah, they should be part of the registry agreement because they're not now [inaudible] enforceable in that weird process.

Voluntary PICs, I guess I'm of two minds. They were, really, so few of the 1930 applications. There were barely 500 that were PICs and if you looked at what people volunteered for, very few of them actually said,

"This is what I'm going to do with the name." I'm not convinced that we should actually support it, although some of the comments said maybe we should see if it will work.

I'd be tempted to say, well, I don't know how that would happen. And I'd be really interested to see what other people think. But, I think that we should say we support the mandatory PICs and we support them being part of a PDP process and be incorporated in the registry agreement. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. First of all, Holly mentioned the RAA and I'm not quite sure where the RAA comes in here.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm sorry, no, registry agreement. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. A couple of things of clarity. First of all, the PIC DRP is not the only way to enforce PICs. The PIC DRP is a dispute process that someone else outside of ICANN can initiate if indeed they are harmed. However, anything within the agreement, including the PICs, the voluntary PICs, are enforceable by compliance and they may not audit them, but based on a complaint, they will enforce them and in fact have on occasion.

Yes, when PICs were first introduced, the DRP was the only way to enforce them, but ICANN backed down very quickly on that. So, that's not the case anymore.

There certainly are PICs that have been used and are very effective. If anyone recalls, a number of years ago, we did a review of all of the sensitive TLDs the GAC identified and put our own evaluation on whether they were problematic or not. There were a number of TLDs there that would have been very problematic in our minds, except there were PICs – or sometimes other mechanisms, but sometimes PICs – that said we will do the following vetting or we'll take the following action and that made the TLD okay, at least in our mind.

So, the PICs have been used effectively. Yes, one particular company said, "And by the way, I may change the PICs when I feel like it after two years, but there were many others that did not say that.

Some people put things in as public interest that we may have not thought would be public interest, but there were other things.

So, in my mind, there is absolutely no question the concept needs to continue or something equivalent to it, and I'm not quite sure what Holly was referring to saying that the mandatory PICs had to be part of a policy development process. That's implicit. Since they were not part of the last Applicant Guidebook at the start, therefore the PICs must be approved by this PDP or they don't exist anymore because we revert back to the Applicant Guidebook. So, we need to make a strong statement that PICs do stay because there are other people saying they shouldn't. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Let me intervene here. One of the questions that are posed that we're supposed to be answering is: should we have the mandatory PICs be part of a policy process? So, you've just answered the way I've answered. But, it's a specific question that was asked and that's why I basically raised it.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may respond, that's exactly what I was saying. There are people saying no, so we need to say yes if we think they're of value.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, that's fine. And that's why I say [inaudible] should say yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, we've restated or consensus from the last call. [inaudible] taking the pen on this? People just clamoring.

HOLLY RAICHE: [inaudible] done stuff.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. This shouldn't be super long. These are just answers to these questions, so it's not like a huge essay in either case.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll be a pen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Holly. I have a feeling that I'll be a catchall, too, at the end, so I'll [inaudible] with you after, but I'll put your name. There was this question about fees. There were folks that – [inaudible] thank you for speaking up. We'll go back to the chat and catch all these out-of-synch comments after the fact and trying to figure out what they were associated with. If you write a comment in the chat volunteering for something, try not to use … Say something like PICs or fees or whatever it is, so that when we're going back to the chat, we can figure out what you were talking about. Thanks. We've captured it in the notes now. But, just as a rule, put the name of the thing you're volunteering for in your comments as well in case we miss it now.

Last week, there was discussion on fees and it was all about making sure fees didn't get any lower. That may be why Alan has his hand up. It's just a question of who would like to hold the pen on this issue of fee reduction. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not sure we came to closure on what our answer is. I put a stake in the ground saying I think fees should stay at the same level, and if there's a surplus, we should use the money for good things and we could define good things if we choose. There are certainly many other people who say it must be cost recovery. That was the policy before. And there were also some comments about a minimum fee. I don't know where we stand on those answers, so yes, we need

	someone to hold the pen, but I'm not sure they have any guidance at this point.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Alan. I thought that people had mostly agreed with you on the last call, with the exception of certain types of TLDs, like communities potentially being an exception or other applicant support, that there might be ways to reduce fees, but the overall fee shouldn't be decreased. There seemed to be consensus on the last call. But, I welcome people to disagree with that assessment now if you disagree, but that was my impression going back over the recording.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. Maybe I was talking too much and I wasn't listening enough.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	So, fees. I see somebody. [Bastian], thank you. I'm going to move on. I was told I didn't moderate hard enough on the last call, so I'm trying to push through.
	Here we are [inaudible] discussion. In other words, we need a go/no go on each of these, and if yes, we need a position and a penholder. One of these is applications assessed in rounds and then there were other questions related to applicant support. One thing we didn't completely reach [inaudible] on is whether or not we thought that we wanted even to comment on whether or not applications should be done in rounds or not. Is there anybody that wants to lead off with a point of view on whether or not we should even be commenting on this? We didn't

reach consensus on this last … Does anybody feel strongly one way or the other? In the absence of one way or the other, feeling strongly that maybe we don't comment? Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think there was strong support and has always been strong support for not making this a continuous thing, which removes the ability of objections to a very large extent, and the ability to reassess how things are going. So, I think we should make a statement A very brief statement perhaps, but a statement that we support continuing rounds until it is obvious and clear that another method will function well and I don't think that's the case right now. There are many people pushing for let's have a round and then open it up or something like that. I don't think we want to support that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. There's actually more than two proposals. There's hybrids, in terms of having just periodic rounds or something that happens continuously that could offer ability, a timeframe for objection, that addresses some of that concern. It's not just binary, the questions that were being asked of the working group. I don't know if Cheryl, if you want to speak up and speak to that concept. Are there other people that agree or disagree with Alan? Please speak up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: To support one way or another would be inappropriate, even if I did take off my PDP co-chair hat at this stage. I think the point Alan raises

can in fact be amplified, should you so desire, by making a preferred action to one of the hybrid or non-contiguous sort of methodologies.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. I wasn't asking you to take a position. I thought you might just want to speak up to clarify what, in fact, the quickly being asked was because it's more of a multiple choice question than a yes or no question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan, I'm encouraging liberal embellishment to make your point clear.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. So, it may be that we make Alan's point about the need for objections and assessment and then maybe associate that with a couple of the hybrid solutions that have been proposed. Alan, I'm going to skip you for a second and go to Gordon just to see if he's agreeing or disagreeing and then come back to you. Gordon, go ahead.

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Thank you, Jonathan. Just one quick point and it comes back to a question Alan asked on another point. As an end user, as somebody on the street, do I care? That's it. We're supposed to be speaking for At-Large. I'm not really sure At-Large gives a darn. Thanks, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Gordon. That's a good point. I think Alan would argue that some of the downstream consequences of program was included. TLDs with high levels of malware associated with them, [inaudible] confusion, etc. So, after that assessment phase, that end users might be impacted by additional strings being added, so that's why we might be interested. But, I'll let Alan speak for himself as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. I was just going to point out that being a penholder in a multiple choice question does not necessarily mean more than saying we should answer with option four or three or B or whatever it is. And we might elaborate, but being a penholder may not be a particularly onerous issue on some of these. I'm just pointing that out.

In answer to Gordon, I'll switch the subject completely to a different part of the world. If you'll note that there are often inventions whose kind has come. You'll find the electric light bulb was invented by three different people independently in different parts of the world within a year of each other because the environment around them simply made it a reasonable invention. That has happened very often in history. The same thing I believe is true in TLDs.

A TLD which nobody applied for in the first round, because the world has changed, may become an obvious one here and will end up with competition and potentially people wanting to operate it as a community TLD or a not-for-profit or something like that. And without rounds, that can't happen because it will be first come. Whoever gets the name in first wins.

For that reason … I mean, there are hybrid ways you could do it, that you could allow continuous applications, but batch the evaluation. But, without at least batching the evaluation, you lose the ability of distinguishing between multiple bids, multiple applications for the same string. And I think that's really important from a user perspective. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Any other comments on this? And I agree completely. This is a very, peculiar in a way, type of public comment in that we don't need to write long essays on these things. We're just answering questions. So, in some cases, it's going to be a single small paragraph or something like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, may I point out what you haven't read is at odds with the second bullet. The two are [inaudible] to each other. Am I still online?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You are. I'm sorry. I'm trying to understand what you just said there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. You can have continuous applications. You can submit your application anytime, but they're going to be evaluated every six months or whatever. So, the red says how are they assessed in rounds, not when can you submit them. So, those two are two things which can coexist. Jonathan, if you're speaking, I can't hear you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Jonathan, you are muted.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, thanks. I muted accidentally. I got out of synch there. So, the next issue was applicant support and what sort of feedback we wanted to give on that. We didn't reach consensus on what we wanted our position to be. [inaudible] consensus that we wanted to talk about it, but not what our position should be on applicant support. So, I want to open that up for discussion a little bit if we can in terms of what people think we might want to say about applicant support. I know that people on the call have opinions about it. I know Avri Doria has an opinion about this. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not sure Avri is allowed to give her opinions here, but I'd welcome them if she did. I think we need to support applicant support both in kind and financial support. I suspect asking for a dedicated round for developing countries is not something we should ask for, partly because there's probably no chance in hell of it happening, and second of all, there are some of us who believe people from developing countries are more astute in not applying and it's not intuitively obvious to me that a dedicated round for developing countries is something that we really want to even encourage.

I understand people would like to see those applications, if they should exist, but I don't think we want to go to unnatural ends to try to force them to exist.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, I agree with you on that and I think it's tough to promote new strings in an area where the take-up of second-level domains hasn't been that strong to date, as well. That may be the bigger issue in a lot of regions. What else do folks think about applicant support?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll note Avri has made a statement in the chat.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That she's supportive of it. I read that, too. Thank you, Alan. Sebastien, please, go ahead. Sorry, Sebastien, we'll try to figure out that beeping. Staff, can you identify where that beeping is coming from?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, we are right now. Apologies for that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: That's okay. I also support applicant [inaudible], but I still feel that the application support can't be just dedicated in one type of country. It's [inaudible] other applications and of the applicants and it would be just [inaudible] that we can bring [inaudible] country to have a TLD. [inaudible]. But, then they could apply for an application support. I think

really we need to be open and not to have this type of already dedicated country where you can apply, because at the end of the day, you know that there are people, organizations, who figure that and who apply in other countries and other regions just for the sake of using the system. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One of the questions I presume is there, but Cheryl can probably confirm or not, is in the last round for the financial support, if you applied for applicant support and didn't get it, your application died. That was to stop people from gaming it and trying for it, saying, "Why not apply? Maybe I'll get it, maybe I won't." Because the rules said your application doesn't proceed at all, people were not inclined to apply for it if they weren't absolutely sure that they could do it. That's one of the reasons the applications may have been so small.

So, the question is, is that something we want to maintain or not? There are others who said there are people who might have benefitted from it, but they weren't [willing] to take the risk. I personally think it is a reasonable impediment. I believe the barrier should be a lot lower for the applicant support than they were, so more people could succeed. And I agree with Sebastien. It shouldn't be limited to a specific, a country with a specific GDP, but you should be able to make the case that you are disadvantaged, the applicants.

I don't see a way around saying that the application dies if you don't make it, even though from an applicant's point of view, that's a really harsh condition. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sebastien, that's a new hand, right?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. I agree with Alan. We need to lower the barrier of people who could apply for the support. When it was done, it was really a different issue. A lot of inputs from the people who were not really supporting the application support and the other was a limit [inaudible] by the board to give to this specific part of the program. That's where we're under. The one who writes the program wanted to close as much as possible things [inaudible]. It's the same thing for application for [community]. But, that's something we need to make an [evaluation] if we can. Thank you.

By the way, I just need to declare that I was board member at that time and I was the board member who would take part of this part of the program when it came to the vote of the board. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. Is there somebody to take this up for taking ownership of this? Obviously, it's something that's going to take some iterations. But, we do need to get these questions answered in the next couple of weeks. Is there somebody that's willing to own this topic of

applicant support and then continue the discussion? Sebastien, you put your hand up again.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Sorry. [inaudible]. I would like to suggest that you still try to find somebody, but we reach out to the three applicants. Two of them are more or less close to At-Large and the certain one was also a board member. He can be helpful if he is willing to say what's happened and what they would like to see as a [change]. It would be one way to start some discussion, and if you need the list, I can give it to you. Thank you. You are muted, Jonathan, I guess.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Sometimes I think I'm turning it on when I'm turning it off. Thanks, Sebastien. Luckily, we had Justine volunteered to hold the pen on the particular questions. There's a set of questions, Justine. Sebastien, do get the names of those applicants to Justine and let's just start, perhaps Justine start a thread on the listserv about what makes sense, so that as quickly as possible [inaudible] strawman up on the Wiki because that seems to generate the most comments from the community is having something to react to. If we don't get volunteers, I'm moving ahead as we go. We'll put a call for volunteers on the listserv to be penholders as well.

So, that is the end of my presentation here. I will just ask the question quickly before we end. Is there anyone that believes there was a set of questions that we had agreed we would comment on that I left out or

that believe we should be commenting on that didn't get discussed in the second half of the presentation? Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't have a specific answer to that. I think at some level we want to remain open to people who are working on this and rereading the overall document. It's a huge document and the number of questions large, so it's quite possible we missed something. So I think we want to remain open to someone raising an issue and making a case for why it is a user-related issue. I don't think we want to close the door completely, but I think we're in moderately good shape at this point.

While I have the floor, I want to point out that the comments are due in in less than three weeks. That means we need an opportunity for a pretty good draft to be posted well, well before that to give people opportunities to say, "I don't agree," or, "I strongly support it," or something like that. So, just a note about the timing going forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. You're exactly right. The folks that have taken these on, I'm asking you to go back and look at the appendix and see the related questions and draft your comments as if they're just answers to those questions. In many instances, it can be yes/no or very short descriptions, but go through those questions as quickly as possible and post something in the Wiki with how we might answer those questions so folks can begin reacting to it. I'll continue to try and [inaudible] on the folks and take up some of these things that didn't get volunteers and maybe put the strawman out there myself, so [inaudible].

So, that is it for this particular part of the agenda. The next agenda item is update on the EPDP. Alan, can I hand the mic over to you?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Can you hear me?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, we do, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Sorry. There's not an awful lot to report. The first phase of the work of the EPDP is to … The term they're using is a triage of the temporary specification. That was a requirement in the charter, to report back to the GNSO Council. Essentially reporting back how much support there is for each clause, paragraph by paragraph, of the temporary specification.

To do that, there are a number of surveys which we're working on the third one right now, the third or four, essentially trying to assess does everyone agree, or if you do not agree with what is in that particular paragraph or set of paragraphs, what do you believe is wrong with it?

The process is turning out to be more complex than we imagined, possibly because we asked the wrong questions. The question that was asked is do you support it? Yes, no. And if no, explain why you don't support it and what you would like to see instead, or no problem with it, and we can go either way.

The problem is there are very few paragraphs in the temporary spec that somebody is not saying, "I have a real problem with this." In some cases, it's a lack of clarification. In some cases, it's just the wording. If there's a date in the temporary spec, that date won't apply, so it's going to have to be changed.

So, we find that people are answering no if they're agreeing in principle but have a specific detail that needs to be clarified. Other people are saying yes and then filling in the box, which they were essentially told not to, but there's no physical prohibition.

So, you may get someone saying yes and someone saying no with exact same intent. In retrospect, we probably should have asked do you agree with the intent of this, and then talk about whether there needs to be detailed changed.

So, it's a process that we'll be on our third meeting talking about today, yesterday. Fourth meeting on Thursday. And we're not quite finished yet. So, we're using a fair amount of time on it. It was required by the charter and perhaps shouldn't have because we're now going to have to go back over each of them and try to determine what we do instead. But, the fact that there is so much disagreement on each clause means this is going to be a slow process, but it also means, to some extent, we haven't talked about the substance yet. Clearly, as people are raising objections to each section, we are talking a little bit about the substance.

So, that's where we are right now. The third survey is due today and the last survey I believe is due on Friday. I'm guessing we're going to go well

into next week finishing the triage and then we'll be going back over it again and trying to identify which paragraphs do we essentially have no problem with and they'll stay the same and then start hammering out details of how do we go forward with the rest of them.

Not a lot more to report. It's a long process. It's tedious. But, there's no other way around it at this point. That's really all I have to say, but I'll be glad to answer any questions. Maybe I'm buying back some time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any questions now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me ask a question. Are there any other people other than Hadia and me who are members who participate in calls, are there other people who are listening to them afterwards? I haven't seen a lot of comments on anything, but there may well be people on the audio channel that have something else they want to add.

I will point out that just having the audio channel has been the subject of significant problems for both alternates and observers and I believe we are going to see a way of getting at least alternates, and perhaps observers, on an Adobe Connect if not the Adobe Connect. There is some push for alternates to be on the standard Adobe Connect so we can use the chat mechanism to communicate, the private chat mechanism to communicate between alternates and members. It's not perfect because there's no private group chat on Adobe Connect. But, some of us are using Skype. Some people within the group do not have

ability to use Skype because of requirements within their own organizations. It looks like we're going to get at least alternates on an Adobe Connect, perhaps the Adobe Connect, and perhaps have another Adobe Connect for observers as well, just so they can see any graphics that we're using. At this point, it hasn't been particularly relevant or at least as important. But, that may well happen in the future. There's a proposal that's supposed to be made almost immediately.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Alan, there [inaudible] questions specifically to EPDP. I just have a look to the presentation even to the leadership, SO/AC leadership, by I guess [inaudible] part where something you are in charge of, so if I am not mistaken, [inaudible] review team. Can you tell us a little bit about that, too, and [inaudible] to the chair also, if he'll allow for this discussion? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I assume the chair will allow it since we have a few minutes before our other speakers arrive.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Indeed.

ALAN GREENBERG:	The answer was if … On that call, I believe Theresa or somebody read out a statement that I had made. Unfortunately, the briefing call for SO/AC leaders was at the same time as the RDS weekly meeting, so there was no way I could attend that and chair the meeting at the same time.

The short answer is we expect to issue a draft report around about the first of September, so we are just finalizing it right now. It will be open for public comment through to the end and a week past the ICANN meeting. We're hoping there will be an engagement session at ICANN to present our recommendations at that point and we hope to, depending on the volume of comments we get, we hope to finalize the report either in December or January and issue a final report.

This is a true draft report in that unlike, for instance, the gTLD interim report where they're asking a lot of questions, although we're certainly asking one or two questions. To a large extent, we are putting our stake in the ground and saying these are the recommendations we're making and people can comment on that. So, we are expecting the final report to not be very far from the draft report, so you should see a good idea of where we're going at that point. And of course, anyone who cares to can look at our Wiki right now and see exactly where we're going because all of the documents have been posted.

But, at this point, we are on target to finish pretty close to the end of this year, possibly a little bit longer, just because we extended … The comment period was due to end at the beginning of October and we decided to keep it open past the ICANN meeting, so that people who heard about it or heard our presentation on our engagement session at

the ICANN meeting still has a week to submit comments if they wish. Sebastien, does that sort of address what you were looking for?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Alan. May I ask you one additional question? It seems that there is some link between the RDS Review Team, the review side, and what is going on with WHOIS [inaudible] EPDP also and with [inaudible] specification. I would like to know how you feel about that and how we, as At-Large, can be involved or how we can take care of that different paths going on on the same topic. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The overlap is not as large as one would imagine because a very significant part of our job is to evaluate the implementation of the recommendations from the last WHOIS review team. I'll talk about the overlap in a minute, but to a large extent, we were presented with the recommendations that were made five or six years ago and reports from ICANN Organization on how they implemented them.

ICANN went into this saying … Essentially with green ticks on all 16 recommendations saying everything was implemented. Our assessment is not quite that rosy and we have found some things that were not fully implemented and we're commenting on it. In some cases, we're just leaving it be. Other cases, we're making follow-on recommendations because of either the lack of full implementation or the world has changed enough at this point that we believe there are other things that need to be considered.

We are also looking at a number of new items, some which were mandated in the … When the AOC words, the Affirmation of Commitments words, were put into the bylaws and some things that we added in ourselves.

Those things, there is some overlap. We had a decision to make at the beginning of the review team as to do we pretend that nothing has happened? We could have said we are commenting on WHOIS, RDS as it stood in July 2017 when we first convened. We came to a very quick conclusion that would be sticking our head in the ground and pretending that things aren't happening.

But, clearly, we are not in a position to evaluate the impact of GDPR and all of the other work going on. Even if we wanted six months or eight months, we still wouldn't be able to really evaluate the impact of that.

So, we are judiciously looking at GDPR as it applies and something making guesses at where it's going. One of the things, for instance, that we are [inaudible] with evaluating by the bylaws is are we safeguarding registrant data? Well, the answer prior to GDPR is, from a point of view of accessibility, everything was accessible so we weren't protecting it at all. Clearly, it's going to be more protected now. Exactly how much more, we can't really say. But, there are other aspects of protecting data which are not necessarily related to GDPR and we're commenting on those also.

So, it's a mixed bag. We are looking at GDPR and the implementation and where we understand the impact, we are factoring that in. In other

places, we're saying the next review team is going to have an interesting job.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions for Alan? Okay, so since we have our speakers, let's jump to item six on our agenda and talk and open it up for staff for the discussion of what is going on with GDPR and EPDP. I don't know who to hand the microphone to. Is it Theresa?

THERESA SWINEHEART: I'm not sure, actually, but I'll take a stab at it. I'm happy to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Take a stab, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHEART: I'll take a stab. Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, everybody. I came in at the tail end of the discussion here and Alan's update as well on both the EPDP and obviously the RDS review. I just wanted to thank Alan, also, for all his work on the RDS review. I know it's been a lot of work underway, and as Jonathan notes, also on the CCT review. Thanks, everybody, for both your leadership on that and all the work.

As I think many of you might be aware, on Monday we held a community leaders call with an overall update on some of the different moving parts with regards to GDPR and also got some questions that had been posed in the chat room.

The webinar and the chat room transcript has been posted. I will make sure to get that into the chat room. So, some of what I'm saying is going to be a repeat of that. Apologies for that.

On the general GDPR work, obviously there's the adoption of the temp spec which is going to the board for renewal on the 21st of August is the anticipation and we don't anticipate any changes to it at this point.

In relation to the other GDPR work outside of EPDP which I know Alan had addressed, and Marika will also touch on, we've received, as you're aware, some communications from the European Data Protection Board and those documents are posted. Some of those provided some additional clarifications to some questions posed and some of the dialogue specifically around the clarification of elements of the law and input that we can use in another iteration of a unified access model which we intend to be posting fairly soon with that.

The objectives with the iterations of the unified access model and the dialogues is really, as you also heard Goran talk about, to get clarification of the [inaudible] of the law and specific questions that has also come up in the community. So, this is an important area of work that's going to be continuing on.

With relation to other community work, obviously we have the RDS review and then we also have the work around the RDAP which many of you may be familiar with. We've also received advice from the GAC and also received advice from SSAC, so all of that is being factored into [inaudible] work and next steps forward.

So, with that, I'm happy to try to take any questions. I'd ask if they could be put into the chat room and [inaudible] come back also with responses to the questions and we would post those for the broader community as well. I'd encourage everybody who hasn't had a chance, when they have an opportunity, to take a look at the webinar that we had conducted on Monday. That will be a regular event and an opportunity for dialogue with community leadership and keeping everybody apprised in addition to obviously the blogs that we're posting and all the updates we're providing on the data privacy page, including correspondence and documents submitted to the GDPR at icann.org.

Maybe with that I can hand it over to Marika or take any follow-ups in relation to this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does anyone have a quick question for Theresa before we hand it over to Marika?

HOLLY RAICHE: No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Then, Marika, take it away. Oh, Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm sorry to be not quick enough to raise my hand. Thank you, Theresa. I don't know how much you can talk about that, but what is the situation

regarding law enforcement or the [inaudible] where ICANN and registrar [inaudible]. Can you tell us a little bit where we are with that and what will be the next steps from the ICANN side? Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Are you referring to the litigation in Germany? Is that the question, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Okay. Actually, Sebastien, if I could just refer you to the webinar on that, John Jeffrey had provided an update on that on the community call. I can follow-up with you on that specific question. We're going to be posting a general FAQ as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perhaps somebody on staff can look up the link for that webinar and post it in the chat while Marika is speaking. Thanks, Sebastien, for your question. Marika, you have the floor.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Hello, everyone, and thank you for inviting me to join you for this call today. I've been asked to talk a little bit about the expedited policy development process on the temporary

specification for gTLD registration data, and I'll do that in the capacity of one of the staff members who is supporting this effort.

I think many of you may already be familiar with this effort and [inaudible] members that are participating in this effort on the call. Nevertheless, I'll provide a little bit of background and then happy to [inaudible] any questions that you may have.

So, the expedited policy development process – and this is the first time the GNSO Council has initiated one, can be initiated in very specific circumstances. Most of the steps of an EPDP are actually very similar to the normal GNSO policy development process (or PDP). The main difference is that some of the initial steps are not required, such as the publication of our preliminary issue report and the associated public comment period that goes with that. In fact, there is an initiation request that outlines the scope of the effort and why it meets the criteria for an EPDP, the proposed mechanism for carrying out the EPDP as well as the method of operation, and in combination with that, there's the EPDP charter that outlines the team composition, the leadership structure, the scope that the EPDP is expected to address, what decision-making methodologies that's expected to apply, what kind of status reporting it's expected to provide. And as well, what mechanisms are in place to address any kind of problems or issue [inaudible].

I think you're all aware the reasons why the GNSO Council initiated an EPDP in this specific circumstance. The adoption of the temporary specification by the ICANN board is to trigger an obligation for the GNSO Council to undertake a policy development process, and in this specific

case, it has to be done within a one-year time period. As such, it was determined that the EPDP would provide the best opportunity to meet the time constraints that are associated with the specific process that has been triggered through the adoption of the temporary specification.

So, what is the mission and scope of the EPDP? [inaudible] simply said, basically, its objective is to confirm or not the temporary specification as a consensus policy at the latest by the 25th of May 2019 and it needs to be [inaudible] by 25th May of 2019 means that by that date, the board would need to have adopted any recommendations coming out of this effort. So, counting back, that takes the actual delivery of a final report by the EPDP team a few months back, as obviously the GNSO Council will need to [inaudible] on it as well before it actually gets submitted to the ICANN board.

The scope also includes a discussion on a standardized access model for non-public registration data, but that conference will only happen once the EPDP team has comprehensively answered a number of gating questions that have been specified in the EPDP team charter [inaudible] primary focus for now is on the temporary specification and looking at its content and the different sections in there. Topics that are not included in the temporary specification as such are out of scope for this specific effort.

So, what you see here on the screen is a very rough timeline as was shared with the EPDP and developed by staff for its fist meeting that took place on the first of August, so you see here that there is a really short timeframe available for the EPDP to conduct its deliberations. It currently foresees delivery of the initial draft initial report by ICANN 63

followed by the publication of that initial report for public comments shortly thereafter. Following that, review of comments, and finalization of the report in a January/February timeframe, following which it will be submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration, and subsequently to the board which may be in combination with a lot of public comment periods.

It is important to point out, I'll just note that, the work that will take place on the access model will only start once the gating questions have been answered, and as such, that timeline is not reflected here in this timeline as it will only be possible to start looking at that timeline at the moment the gating questions have been answered. That could be at the time of the initial report. But, again, that's something that will need to be reviewed at that time and once the group has agreed to consensus on those gating questions.

I think, as you're aware as well, for this effort – and again, based on the timeline available, as well as the specific circumstances of this effort, the GNSO Council decided that a specific composition would be explored for this effort, compared to the [inaudible] working group model that is [inaudible] the other policy development process that are ongoing, which means that each the GNSO and stakeholder group has been assigned a number of members and alternates to be assigned to the team. Similarly, the different advisory committees have also been invited to assign a number of members and alternates, and invitation also went to some other groups to declined to participate at this stage, but obviously there are public comment periods foreseen which means that everyone will have an opportunity to provide input and participate in this effort.

Similarly, a number of liaisons have been assigned to by ICANN Org, one from ICANN Legal and one from GDD. There are two ICANN board liaisons and there is also one GNSO Council liaison who is also serving as the vice chair of this effort. And one independent chair has been designated by the GNSO Council following expressions of interest and that is [inaudible].

For this effort, as well, noting the short timeline that is available and in accordance of making sure that the different positions are adequately represented and heard, members are expected to represent the opinions and views of the group that has assigned them to this effort. And in order to recognize the fact that this is a heavy lift, it's a very short timeline, with a lot of work, the team is currently meeting twice a week for two-hour calls with a lot of preparation that is required and all the materials that need to be reviewed. As such, alternates have been introduced or are available to the team in those cases where a member is not available or absent so that the alternate can step in when needed. As such, alternates are expected to keep up with all relevant deliberations. As I've noted before, the limitation of membership was basically done in recognition of the need to complete this work in a very short timeframe and to be sure to resource the effort in a responsible manner.

That does, of course, not mean that others cannot follow the conversations or be involved. Individuals can still participate as observers. Observers are subscribed to the mailing list with read-only access, so they basically receive all the e-mails but are not able to respond to those or publish on the mailing list. For every meeting, audiocast is available which means you can listen live to the

deliberations of the EPDP. We'll also be introducing, hopefully for the next meeting, livestreaming of the Adobe Connect rooms, which also means that people can actually follow any kind of presentations or materials that are shared in the room as well as the chat that is ongoing. And of course there is always the opportunity to provide input through any calls for comment or input that are put out by the EPDP.

Here, I've provided some additional links where you can find further information as well as how you can sign off if you're interested to following deliberations of the EPDP team. I think that's all the slides I have and happy to take any questions people may have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marika. Are there folks that have questions for Marika? If they can't be answered right away, or even if they are, staff are going to create a Wiki page for the questions that were asked and the answers once they're researched, so that there's a fixed place to see the answers. But, let us know if you have questions right now for either Theresa or Marika on EPDP.

Holly is saying maybe put the links in an e-mail to ALAC. We'll do that. I guess, Holly, we're continuing to try and figure out how to make fixed resources that are easy for people to find. So, [I'll try to do that, do both things].

The next discussion is on the unified access model. I think that I pass the microphone back to Theresa because Trang is not on the call. Is that correct?

THERESA SWINEHEART: Yeah, that's right. She wasn't able to join. As I mentioned at the start, the unified access model had been a topic of discussion obviously at the ICANN meeting in Panama and we received quite a bit of feedback and dialogue around it, and then also received a communication from the European Data Protection Board that addressed some of the different areas and flagged some questions in relation to it.

We anticipate to publish a next iteration of the unified access model fairly soon. I would say probably by early next week is our current plan. This was also reflected in the community webinar earlier this week. [inaudible] for the repeat for anybody.

What we had noticed in relation to the comments received and the input that there's convergence on a couple of areas, including using RDAP as a technical message for providing access and having a strong focus on safeguards in relation to the codes of conduct. But, there are some areas with differing views, including for example, whether authenticated users must provide a legitimate interest for each individual authenticated query, topics around logging requirements and whether a full WHOIS data set must be returned for authenticated queries and who must provide access, mainly a registry, a registrar or both and whether there ought to be fees for access.

So, those are some topics where there were differing views. The next iteration will also pose some questions around those in order to get some clarification around it as well, including from the data protection

authorities in relation to clarification around a law, which will hopefully also help inform the policy discussions around that.

On the temp spec, I know that we had shared also in the agenda and I would really encourage everybody to take a look at that in the FAQs accompanying it. There's quite a very good webinar that goes over the temp spec in great detail and a listing of FAQs that help respond to many of the questions around it that we've received.

As mentioned, the board is going to consider [reaffirming] the temp spec on the 21st of August. Currently, we don't anticipate any changes to it. So, that would be the latest update on that in relation to that. Hopefully, those two updates are helpful for everybody. Back over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess my quick question is one of the things that we have on our plate is sort of ongoing revisions to a unified access accreditation and access model that's been coming out of the BC and IPC. Do we envision a merger of these two efforts at some point, so that we're all commenting on the same thing, so the revision is coming from the BC or Mike [Palage] and from ICANN itself or finding their way into a single thread, or do we imagine that for the near-term, those are going to continue to be independent threads?

THERESA SWINEHEART: I think this is all part of the dialogue on also getting the clarification around what does the applicability of the law look like? So, in looking at

the next iteration of a unified access model, it takes into account many of the different discussions that are coming and the next iteration of course will then look at specifically areas where there's outstanding questions for differing views in order to get the clarification on the law.

I think the important part is the continuous sharing of information. We've received quite a bit of input, including submission of the different models that are under discussion through the GDPR at icann.org and all of those factors are being taken into account.

So, I think as we get clarification of the law and clarification of the applicability in relation to this, these dialogues will be important to keep moving forward and help with the coordination around that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess in the near-term, near the mid-term, we should just continue trying to comment in each of these threads and provide input into all of them.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Yeah. I think the sharing of information and just the sharing of views and ideas I think is really important around this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Other questions for staff before we release them from our grasp here? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much, Jonathan. Theresa, my understanding is that the unified access model is the wide framework of access to non-public data, while in the accreditation model, in the [inaudible] model, according to the [inaudible] but according to the parties that we need access. Am I wrong?

THERESA SWINEHEART:	I'm sorry, Tijani, can you repeat the question and maybe put it into the chat? That would be helpful.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Okay. I said that the unified access model, in my understanding, is the [wide] framework for access to non-public data. Why in the [inaudible] model [inaudible] several accreditation models according to the party which will need access to this data, and [inaudible] should be in the [wide] framework of the unified access model. Am I wrong?

THERESA SWINEHEART:	The accreditation mechanism and the codes of conduct that accompany what would be a legitimate use for a relevant stakeholder, that is part of the discussion under there, yes. But, I'll take your question if you can send it in the chat and we'll also post that again in the FAQ, so we can respond to that for the entire community.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Theresa, and thanks, Tijani. Any other questions?

THERESA SWINEHEART: Jonathan, if I could just ask, it's really useful and very important that as we come out with this next iteration that the community comments. Tijani, for example, to your points, that there's input into this discussion and that there's feedback because it's only as we all work together and receive the comments and receive the input to reflect the different concerns that we can, together, work to get clarification of the applicability of the law, what would work under the law and what wouldn't work under the law and have those questions also in a transparent way provided to the data protection authorities so that we can continue that dialogue and share the clarification with the entire community. It's also important input into any of the policy development work that's coming and any of the work that's underway.

So, I just wanted to pose that additional ask and encouragement, as we continue these discussions to please not be shy about providing input. Working together, we can get the clarification that we need.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. My question or my remark was—

YESIM NAZLAR: Tijani, apologies for interrupting, but you sound very loud and muffled. Could you please move the mic a bit further away from yourself please? Because our interpreters cannot interpret what you're saying.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. It is better now?

YESIM NAZLAR: Actually, it's not. It's still very loud. Maybe you need to decrease your volume as well, and if you could speak just further away from the mic, that would be very much appreciated.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. What I wanted to say, Theresa, is that my remark was a follow-up on your answer to Jonathan's question. That's why I answered this question. But, I am following the unified access model discussion. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thank you, Tijani.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tijani, for your question; and Theresa, for your encouragement. Luckily, there aren't too many shrinking violets here in the At-Large, so it's just a question of figuring out the best [inaudible] if you will for making comments on the various discussions that are going on and avoiding duplication of work as much as possible. That's all I was trying to get to. But, we'll try to continue our feedback on both tracks, for sure.

Any other questions for staff? Okay. Well, thank you very much for coming onto our call, Theresa and Marika. We really appreciate it.

There's obviously a lot going on right now and just general background information is very much appreciated. So, thank you.

THERESA SWINEHEART: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, everybody.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: My question is in the chat now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tijani. I see your question and I think the answer is yes. There could be potentially many accreditation models that go with the access model. I think you're right. Thank you for your question.

Okay, folks. Now we're going to … Once again, if you have further questions, let us know. Let staff know and we will jump back into the … Staff are setting up a Wiki page for any additional questions that come in and the answers that we get back from staff to those questions, so that other people can see the answers, instead of just the people on the call.

Back on item five. What other upcoming discussions there are for which we need penholders and drafters, etc. I don't know, Alan, if this was something you were prepared to discuss. I don't have a list in front of me in terms of other things we have going on. I do know that we do have ongoing comments on the access for non-public data draft, but there are other things that have been announced by staff that we need to decide if we want to respond to, and if so, who is going to be the

penholder. I don't know if that's an easy thing for staff to pull up as a list. But, Alan, I'm going to go ahead and hand the microphone to you for the time being.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. In a general case, we addressed them one by one and send out notices asking for comments or if there's anyone interested on things that are clear that we should be commenting on, we pointedly try to find someone to take responsibility for it. The unified access model and the accreditation models are among those, and at this point, no one has stepped up, so we're just silent on them. That may well be the right answer, but I don't think anyone has put together the analysis to say there is nothing we want to comment on, and to be honest, I'm surprised if we don't want to comment on anything of those.

So, certainly on those two, we are looking for people to step up and do some work. Others we handle on an ad hoc basis as they come and go. I'm not sure. Does that answer the question? Certainly, on the two GDPR related ones, it would be nice if we had someone who's doing a constant watch on those and prepared to comment or draft something and get further comments on it. But, at this point, we haven't responded to any of those in the recent past. That's about all I have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Thanks, Alan. Yes. I guess on the GDPR ones, we need to keep the process going in an iterative fashion. I was, I guess, the penholder on the IPC/BC accreditation and access model comments. I can try to rev those comments for people to take a look at.

Is there anybody that wants to take the pen iteratively on the unified access model?

ALAN GREENBERG: It may well be that things are just chugging along and we don't have anything particularly to say at this point and that's fine. I just want to make sure that we're actually looking at it and trying to consider that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I agree, Alan. We should make an affirmative decision about whether or not to do that. I think [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That requires someone who really understands the issue, and at this point, that narrows it down to just a few people, unfortunately.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. The other thing that we have is some of these others that have been put out individually for which we've not had people speak up. I don't know whether or not we should just operate on omission or if [inaudible] decisions on these calls, which is I think where I was headed in my proposal that I made for the group that we ought to look at these incoming comments and make a decision as a committee whether or not we wanted, whether there was a voice for At-Large and whether or not we wanted to respond. So, there are things like technical use of root zone label generation rules and whether or not that's something that we're concerned about trying to comment on.

It could be that silence is sufficient, but I wonder if it makes sense to raise these issues and give people a chance to make a case for whether or not we need to be commenting on them. Right now, we have a list of comments and we should remove that list, we should narrow that list down if we're making decisions not to comment so they don't keep coming up. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: A lot of these are IDN-related things. Our policy has been for a very long time now that unless someone can come up with a really compelling reason, and no one has in all of the cases we've looked at recently, that we do not comment on the label generation rules for a particular script. That may be of interest to people who may be knowledgeable on it, but that's not an At-Large issue altogether. One could conceive of such a big error that the person involved convinces us we need to make a statement. That hasn't happened yet. So, our norm is, on label generation rules, we do not comment. We give people an opportunity to say yes, but we do not normally comment.

On the ones that crossed the boundaries, an example right now is the recommendation on managing IDN variant rules and variants are a specific issue which have been of interest to us because there are significant user implications and Satish is working on that one right now and I would be surprised if we do not make a comment on that.

For people who don't know, variants are when you have multiple scripts. An example is traditional and modern Chinese script where multiple characters have the same meaning and should you be able to

use them interchangeable. It's almost equivalent, but not quite, to upper and lower case in ASCII characters where we treated them completely equivalently and you can type a domain name in an upper case or lower case and it works. But, the same comparable equivalence in other scripts is something that are called variants and does have implications to users. So, those we comment on.

There's another one that just opened right now on the technical use of root zone label generation rules and we've sent out a notice asking people does anyone have any input on this. If someone wants to speak up, fine, but I don't think we need to go to great pains if the experts we have in IDN don't think we need to comment on it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. So, the question is whether or not anybody else on the call believes that these are things that we should comment on. If not, we should probably take them off of our list so they don't look like to-do lists that have fallen through the cracks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we have sent out messages and they were just sent out yesterday, I think, for the new one on label generation rules. That's one which is relatively brand new. Normally, we will make a formal decision at the next ALAC meeting or a recommendation at the next ALT meeting. There's one of those upcoming. That's normally when we formally decide not to do it. That's a responsibility the ALAC could delegate to this committee, to this working group, assuming the working group is

going to meet on an ongoing basis, to actually take on that responsibility. That's something we could discuss.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess that's what I was suggesting was potentially having … At least making a recommendation about that responsibility. Maybe the ultimate decision is still the ALAC's and it may lead to conversation, but it might be worthwhile to have this committee make recommendations about whether or not we should comment on them.

ALAN GREENBERG: The real question, Jonathan, is once we get over the GDPR, EPDP things, is this group going to be meeting often enough to do that? And that's not clear.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's not entirely clear, but we'll perhaps give it a shot. We don't need to – you and I don't need to just go back and forth [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: No. To be clear, the process is not working all that well now, so anything we can do to improve it is good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. That's what we're trying to figure out. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I think that this working group should take care of discussing [inaudible] At-Large community what will be our position according to what is going on now regarding policy. I think too very important things are going together now and [inaudible] resources to do the work, because we have WT5 team which is now working for which we need to give our point of view because it is really urgent to give our opinion. We have EPDP that is going on and we don't have time to … So we have to focus on those two and also the subsequent procedures work track also. So, those are in my point of view the three areas where we have to focus now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tijani. I'm inclined to agree. I think we're just trying to figure out what our process might look like going forward. We don't need to decide that on this call. I think we're going to, as part of our reform efforts, try to figure out what the best funneling process is for public comments as they become available.

We talked about setting an internal deadline for comments on the access model and on the accreditation model from the [inaudible]. I think I'll take that offline with Evin and we'll just come up with a deadline on it and put it out there. I have a feeling it might be me trying to put these comments out there for that anyway, a strawman for people to review.

Now let me just flip back through the … I think that we are now down to any other business, unless someone on staff wants to raise their hand

and point out something that I've skipped over. Are there folks that have any other business for this call?

Okay. So, we will meet again next week and I'll try to make sense of what we went over here and generate an agenda for next week. But, we'll also follow-up with requests for drafters in an e-mail and get to some of these action items that you see down there in the notes section. Thanks for everyone's participation. Stay sharp. We're going to be working on this subsequent procedures comment process on an ongoing basis and so we'll be setting up some kind of Wiki space for these perhaps by subject area, but I'll try to talk to staff about that and try to get some drafting going. Alright, folks, thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]