ANDREA GLANDON:	We will now officially start the recording of this conference call. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the consolidated policy working group call on Wednesday, the 12th of September, 2018 at 19:00 UTC.
	On today's call we have Alan Greenberg, Alfredo Caulderon, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Ejikeme Egbuogu, Gordon Chillcott, Joel Thayer, John Laprise, Jonathan Zuck, Maureen Hilyard, Nadira Al-Araj, Olivier Crepen-Leblond, Tijani Ben Jemma, Vanda Scartezini, Yrjo Lansipuro. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ejikeme Egbuogu, and myself, Andrea Glandon on call management. We do have noted apologies from Satish Babu, Bastiaan Goslings, Justine Chew who may be joining later, Holly Raiche, and Kaili Kan.
	I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to please keep your phones and microphones when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much. We are now starting this consolidated policy working group call, and another one with, of course, since the last call two EPDP calls that have taken place, so that's what we will look at before we look at the initial report on the subsequent procedures PDP. And, we've moved these two items around.

But before that, we'll start with the unified access [inaudible] and update from Greg Shatan who has drafted some text for this which will benefit us.

Are there any other business, and other topics that we need to add to the agenda as it currently is listed? I'm not seeing anyone putting their hand up, so the agenda is adopted as it currently is on the screen. I wanted to just quickly check, I didn't hear Greg's name being mentioned, is Greg here already?

ANDREA GLANDON: We do not have Greg on the line, no.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to check that, because he is the first one with the unified access model. Let's keep, if you could let me know when he arrives, that would be helpful.

In the meantime, we'll look at the action items, both of them have been completed and so Ejikeme has worked with Greg and Jonathan Zuck on submitting comments with internally assigned deadlines and staff has ensured that the next call doesn't clash with our working 5 call. Hopefully we will be able to continue avoidance of such conflicts, so not much to report on the action items, and since Greg Shatan isn't here yet, what I propose is that we immediately go into the update from the EPDP, the Expedited Policy Development process, which Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi have been following very closely as our main

representatives on that exciting group. I gather that Alan is rearing to go, so I hand the floor over to Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure I'm rearing to go, but I'll go. The EPDP I guess is starting to get interesting; we are now past the stage of the initial triage report of trying to decide where we had agreement from everyone which is actually nowhere. And, we're starting some relatively interesting discussions which are identifying the split between different parts of the group as to what should be included in any future contractual terms, and I guess there are two different issues that we've been discussing sort of intermixed.

One is; there is a section of the EPDP of the rather, temporary specification and Olivier, is there a pointer to the temporary spec on the agenda? If not, there should be, because although it's a relatively complex document, I think it would be really useful if people have access to it when we are talking about it going forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: At the top of the agenda, there are EPDP resources with a link to the EPDP workspace and EPDP background document.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. The whole concept of the temporary specification is interesting, and there was a bit of discussion at the beginning of the EPDP as to why was this called a temporary specification as opposed to a policy, for instance. And, I didn't know the answer at this point, but it

EN

became obvious once I did a little bit of thinking about it. Essentially, what the board approved was changes to the contract, with registrars and registries. And if you look at the registry and registrar contracts, you'll find that there is a body of a contract, and then there are what might be called, "Addendums," but they're called, "Specifications."

So, the registrar's contract, the RA has eight specifications added to it, the registry one has I think twelve or thirteen. So, this was an additional specification, and since it was done on an interim basis, it was a temporary specification, so the name makes complete sense.

But knowing that this in fact is a part of a contract dictated the form of it, so it is a document and it has a few appendices of itself, or added onto it. We're creating a policy which will eventually result in contractual terms, but it's not clear that in a policy there should be something like an appendix. And there's been a significant discussion on the part of the temporary specification of appendix C, which is essentially saying what the registrars and registries, what their rationale and legal reason is for collecting certain data and processing certain data.

And to some extent, it is a recitation of what is in the GDPR, but there are other parts that are different, and there's been some discussion about whether we should have such a thing at all. And, it culminated in the last meeting with a proposal was made by Margie Milam of the business constituency to essentially replace appendix C with a comparable document, with some things the same, some things changed. And there was very strong pushback from other parts of the community to say basically we shouldn't have this at all, because part of

the temporary specification says that if there is an access model to enable some people to get access to parts of some WHOIS elements, that they must adhere to it.

And, there are those who are arguing since we don't have an access model to find right now, so we shouldn't be mentioning it all, and I for one feel very strongly that we need to put in the base agreement that if we ever get the point where we have an access model, it is mandatory that it be used. So, we're starting to get into the really interesting parts.

The other thing that has come up a number of times, and will come up again over the next week or two I think is whether terms such as "Consumer confidence", or "Consumer protection" fit into this document at all. I mean, those are terms that, with one or two exceptions, don't show up in the bylaws; they show up in the bylaws only in respect to the consumer confidence review team that is done in relation to gTLDs.

But it's clear we're going to have to mention law enforcement for example, and I believe that if we are going to have any type of a numerated list, and once we have law enforcement, we are having a list. We must include the parts of the community that we think will ultimately need access as examples.

So, we are looking at the cyber security community, law enforcement, consumer protection, and I believe we must identify those as ones that we will be considering when we get to the access model. To be silent on them is going to be too dangerous I think that they may be excluded

at a later time by people who are trying to severely limit what access anyone may have to WHOIS.

So, that's where we are today. It's a very fast-moving process, and somewhat difficult. There are meetings Tuesdays and Thursdays, and people are rightfully complaining that we are getting documents distributed late at night, in my night, for a meeting that's held at 9:00 the next morning, and since all of us are supposed to be representing our groups and have had an opportunity to discuss or distribute some of these, clearly that's not happening.

And so we're trying to look a little bit further out than just the next meeting. It turns out it's going to be really difficult to do this, and we of course only have about two more weeks left before the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, where we are expected to make significant progress. So, going forward, again, I'll use the word "interesting". Hadia, do you have anything to add?

HADIA EL-MINIAWI: Actually, Alan covered everything. So, as you said, we are currently working those three documents. Once the documents that are the purposes and the registrars, another is a document that deals with other purposes and stakeholders' interests, and the stuff in relation appendix C, which has the title, "Requirement for acceptance," and as Alan mentioned there was a suggest to remove it and I think we are trying to keep it while removing parts of it and maintaining others.

I think that's about it, and I think the next thing now that will be making a lot of work are the purposes, because I'm not sure that until now we

are able to agree on the purposes or even on the way, on how to define the purposes. I think even that we are not able to agree on, so that's about it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I'd forgotten, we're also in parallel working on new documents on two of our members have put together that essentially list the various types of data and identifies why we are collecting it, and who will have a need for accessing it, although we're not talking about the access rules at this point. I see we have a queue, so Eduardo, please?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just a quick question; how do you feel about time length; do you think this is going to end [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no idea. We are supposed to have a draft document for Barcelona, that is really really close. Either we're going to come out of Los Angeles miraculously coming to some agreement or not. If we don't come out of Los Angeles with a reasonable agreement on many of the items if not all, then I think we're going to have a very difficult time meeting our target. If we can come together on something, that may be a different issue. And, I really am not predicting at all. Cheryl? Oh, sorry, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. You mentioned a draft document needing to be ready for Barcelona, what would be the contents? Are you talking here about the full specification or are you talking about just a small subset of things that will need to be presented in the Barcelona meetings?

ALAN GREENBERG: We're talking about a full policy document.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: On all aspects, every specification and access model?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, not the access model. Our target right now is to replace the temporary specification which has an expiry date. And, if we go past May 25th, 2019 without replacing it with something and to replace it with something, it has to have been approved by the GNSO, and approved by the board and subject to public comments. If we don't do that, then it's a free for all, and the registrars may choose to continue honoring the temporary specification even though it's no longer a contractual term, or we may find that some are to perhaps protect themselves are taking a stronger position and will diverge from a common path.

So, if we do not replace it, then it's a free for all at that point. So, the intent is to replace it. The current temporary specification does not have an access model. You can ask a reasonable question of, "How long

can we survive without such a model?" And, that's a good question, but it's not one we're trying to answer today.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: My second question was more procedural, the working group finally work out who could be in the room and who could not, and who could travel and who could not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, because the chair has made a proposal, and there are people who are saying it's wrong, that is that alternates may be allowed to be in the room in Los Angeles, but at this point, that is what is going to happen. Only one person is travel funded, but if someone else is there for whatever reason, then they will be allowed to be in the room, but of course not speak and not be at the table.

In terms of the meetings in Barcelona, I explicitly asked the question, and the answer is; we have put in a request for an open meeting, and at this point it is open unless this group, the EPDP group decides that it is not open, and I doubt that will happen at this point. So, I think from the point of view of the EPDP, only people who are formal members or alternates assuming the rights of members will be allowed to be at the table so to speak and talk, but anyone else I believe will be able to observe. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON ORR: Thanks, Alan. I just want to respond from a DNSO counsel perspective, I'll put on my liaison hat briefly, particularly to Eduardo's concern about

the timeline and the deliverables. Whilst I certainly, like Alan, can't make any predictions, what I can reassure us all of is that the DNSO counsel is keeping a very close eye on what is their work. It is the work of the counsel that this team is doing.

And to that end, we're already talking about the benefits of supplying independent facilitators etcetera, etcetera to make sure in other words that appropriate resourcing is continued to meet the timelines as best as humanly possible. It doesn't mean that there's not going to be aggravations and annoyances, but the counsel is keeping a, let me assure you, very close eye on it. Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no more hands. Then, I thank everyone for their attention, and we'll keep doing this. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan, thank you. I was just going to ask, since this call is really your link to the At-Large community, if there are any points, any of the things, since you did say that there are some questions that are being put forward to you guys with a very short turnover time. Is there anything that you need to know expressly for the next call of the EPDP or the one next, I believe it's on Tuesday, isn't it? Tuesdays and Thursdays.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good question, we're trying to slowly, as there are documents which make some sense to people outside of the initial immediate process,

EN

we're going to be forwarding them to this group, and I guess asking for input to the extent people have it. But at this point, the questions we're asking are all pretty basic.

And ultimately, as we've talked about one of our concerns allied with the GAC and the security people, and to a large extent the business constituency, we want to make sure that whenever this is all stable, those who need access and can justify the access to parts of WHOIS are able to get that, and we're far, far from the point of trying to decide who can get access to what and at what level and through what methodology.

But we're just trying at this point to lay the ground rules to make sure that when we come to these discussions, we don't find we're staring at a brick wall that we can't get over because of some core impediment that was put into the- that we've agreed with but at this point we're trying to keep things as wide open and make sure that doors aren't being shut. And there are certainly efforts within parts of the community to do just that. To presume that we will not be able to justify things, therefore not even allow for it.

And really, those are the battles we're fighting right now, but they're sort of subtle ones, because no one is coming right out and saying, "We're against the security community getting access to data," but we have to make sure that when we come to actually writing the rules, we haven't put some clauses already into the agreement that will preclude that kind of access.

EN

So, the decision points, other than saying we know ultimately that we want to be able to allow certain parts of the community to get access, again, with the appropriate justification and with the appropriate balancing of the privacy rights of the individuals, but we want to make sure those aren't precluded.

At the simplest level, and it's not really a substantive discussion right now, but at the simplest level, if you don't collect the data, then you can't ever give it out to anyone. So, we're trying to make sure that the data is there, and we're putting the core words in to make sure that it will be usable when we finally get to the point of deciding how to do that. That's it I think.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Great, thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, I was having some connection trouble at the time. Just before you move away from the matters of EDPD, I just wanted this group to note that from very biased view, and I listened to both, if not all of the meetings in the live streaming, as you can imagine, many of the voices, the people sitting around the table are silent. That's often the case in these sorts of things. Some are, unfortunately, not silent enough that are hardly contributing to the development of any form of build or consensus.

But I wanted to compliment both Alan and Heidi for what I think are making regular, reliable, appropriate, timely and productive

interventions to what can sometimes be rather odd and challenging and interesting discussions. But I just wanted to you all to recognize, from my very biased view at least, you guys are doing a fabulous job. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you, Alan. Last time that I spoke about data collection, they told me that the GDPR said everything about data collection and we all agree on it, so we are not speaking about it now. And today, you are still speaking about data collection, so what is the real situation now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think anything has changed. At this point, there is no active effort to try to not collect some data. There are, of course, the two elements where there are German court proceedings going on right now, that of admin contact and technical contact. My personal position on these is; it is exceedingly important to have those fields, but they are both optional in terms of whether you want to contribute it.

The only question that we have discussion, we have not had at all that I feel will be the crucial ones on that is; if someone chooses not to provide a technical contact, for instance, what will ultimately be presented if someone asks for that information? So, it becomes a question of; what is the default? Is the default the registrant, and their contact information? Or, is the default blank?

If the default is blank, I think we have a stability problem in the Internet and that I think is a go to the wall question. That is, if all you are allowed to get access to is a technical contact so we can fix problems, then you must assure that there is a technical contact, even if it defaults to the registrant, or in the case of a large corporation, it may be the IT department as opposed to the person in accounting who pays the bills.

So, those are questions we haven't had yet, but I don't think there is any general, I haven't sensed any general desire to say, "Let us not collect some data, at least optionally." That may turn up, I use the collection of data as an example to say, "If we were to not collect data, then you can't give it out," I wasn't using that as an example of a discussion that is active today. But there are, it was just an easier thing to talk about than some of the subtleties of what rationale do we put in. GDPR to a large extent says you can only justify things based on your own need.

But there is a provision in the GDPR, specifically article 61F that says you can consider the needs of others, of third parties. And, a lot of the discussions that we are starting to have and will continue to have hinge around that clause; of to what extent can we even collect data that we do not need, because someone else may need it that is not ICANN? And, that's going to be of some of the really crucial discussions that we have going forward. So, sorry if I gave the impression that we're having debates over collecting a specific item, that is not happening right now. It was just an easy example of the kinds of things that we need to protect against.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Okay, thank you Alan, I understand very well that nothing is agreed on yet, so the discussion will be opened, and I don't know how it will -- no one knows how it can end.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's for sure.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this Alan, thanks for this update. And thanks everyone for their questions, and we look forward to hearing from you next week again. Now, we're in a little bit of a dilemma at the moment, I don't think that Greg has made it yet, so we could go to agenda item number 5, but some of the parties aren't on the call yet, they did say that they were going to join a little later.

And there is an option go to agenda item 6 but follow up discussion and pen holders and drafters specifically with the next steps on just a quick discussion on the public comment next steps on reviews. I'm going to turn to Jonathan, do you think we should go for 6 first then?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. That's sort of an open-ended agenda item there. I mean, it might be useful if Zach can post up on the screen the most recent public comments that have been put out, because part of what I think this

group should do, I'm just going to make a high-level call as to whether or not we want the comments on something in particular. Something just came up this week, and right now I'm drawing a blank on it, but we might want to decide if we want to do a comment on it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so perhaps let's then go to agenda item 6, let's have, I don't know if staff has a copy of it ready for the At-Large policy advise development page that has got a current list of the current public comments, and we can take ten minutes on this, and then we will go back to the subsequent procedures on item 5. I think that might buy us a little bit of time until those people that are still not on the call can join us.

So, the public consultations as present, there is a link in your agenda if you wish to go to that page, there is a link to At-Large policy advise development page, and I will give you the different open policy comments at present.

The first one is the At-Large seeking community feedback on the proposed unified access model, and Greg Shatan has been assigned this, and he has proposed some text in there, and hopefully he will make it to this call and talk to us about it shortly.

The next one is the IPC DC accreditation and access model for non-public data, Jonathan Zuck is drafting something on this. Perhaps Jonathan, you can give us some information on that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. So, we just had comments posted on that, and another draft just based on the latest draft of that that came from the IPCDC and it got approved by the ICANN the people submitted, so those comments, so thanks for folks who took a look at them, and like I said, it's just an incremental draft. So, we just keep commenting as the drafts come out basically, from the IPCDC. I'm sorry, I'm trying to find the one that specifically just came out that I wanted to raise on this call, I am trying to find which one it is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, I'll go through them. I'm not going to go through the one that says the vote, the next one that is in commenting space at the moment, is that space recommendations for managing IDM bearing, talking about domains, Satish Babu has I think drafted something, so there should be some commenting on this. There is one that we need to decide on, the notification of domains protected marks with service. It has a deadline of the 24th of September, and it's currently marked as, "To be confirmed," or, "To be checked." Any idea? Then the next one after that, hearing nobody --

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess the question is whether or not anybody believes that we should respond to that?

OLIVIER-CREPIN LEBLONDE: Yeah, that's the question. I'm not hearing anybody shout out and say, "Yes, please, yes please," so I gather this is probably to remain

EN

unanswered. Now, the one that you might be asking a question about is the initial report and the new detailed subsequent procedures, which of course is what we're working on at the moment. We've got a deadline of 26th of September, so times are starting to get close. Beyond that, the next steps on review --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, that's the big one. Next steps on review is the one that I feel like just got circulated, and so the question is; do we want to speak up on that topic, because it has a pretty high impact on volunteer time and things like that?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I see Cheryl has put her hand up, so let's get Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Olivier.   I'm going to try and encourage you all to make a response to the, not terribly long, paper that's been recently published. It's fairly short order because I think it's early October, isn't? That it's got to be responded in time. It's only, what is it? Four or five pages of document for us to review in terms of the staff report. But, what it's doing is putting up a couple of proposed paths forward, based on what was really not terrible definitive input from the public comments, so we were part of the group that did public comments on those short and long terms here, I would certainly think it would be sensible for us to follow up with a relatively concise reaction.

EN

So, in many ways Jonathan, I would suggest if you all decide to do this, that we just quite literally carve out the proposed pathways forward section, put it in some sort of table form on the Wiki and get our community's reaction to what is effectively a staff paper on proposed pathways forward based on the usual pathetic inputs that they got from the wider ICANN community in the public comments. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for that Cheryl. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not surprisingly, I'm going to agree that we have to respond to this. And, I will volunteer myself as a penholder to the extent anyone would want me to do this, and I would be delighted if we can get input into it, either in the form that Cheryl mentioned, or people simply reading the four-page document and putting some comments on the Wiki, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Jonathan, any follow-up comments? Jonathan Zuck, you might be muted.

ANDREA GLANDON: Jonathan, this is Andrea, it does show that your mic is open.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We might have missed Jonathan. Technical problems sometimes. Okay, I gather that's accepted then Alan, thank you for volunteering. And we can then move to the last two that are listed in the policy development page.

The first one is the proposed EDTLD registration data access protocol profile, the RDAP.   Joanna Collette has volunteered to address something on this. The discussion so far has been that they probably need a bit of help here from some more technically-minded people since it's all about protocols and ITF protocols and so on. I have forwarded the request for public comments to the technical issues, meaning that there hasn't been a response yet. But, we do have until the 13th --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Did you reach a consensus?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And, we're back to Jonathan, yes?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was just wondering; did we reach a consensus that we were commenting on this? I mean, given the technical complexity, I'm not sure I understand user perspective.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks on this. It's Olivier speaking, I don't know, I'm just going on what is written at the moment on there. It might be that we get told, "Look, this is not something that end users would particularly be affected by, because this really is an internal matter on how registries, registrars and ICANN work together on what replaces the WHOIS system. What kind of technology will replace it? I'm not quite sure, but we've got a couple of people in the queue. Gordon Chillcott?

GORDON CHILLCOTT: Thanks, Olivier. I'm agreeing with Jonathan on this; I skim read it, and immediately got myself very interested, but I'm a techie, and that should be kind of a danger signal. I am not sure I see anything that directly affects the end user on this, and as Jonathan said, it is quite technical, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right, thanks for this, Gordon. That's helpful. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I think we have to respond, and the reason we have to respond is; it is exceedingly important that we implement RDAP quickly and effectively so that we can build things like access methods on it. And, so that we can build -- one of the things that we don't talk about at all is the huge difference between RDAP and current WHOIS. Its current WHOIS is 7 bit ASCII, it cannot hold internationalized registration information.

That is; you cannot put in your name or address in a local script in the current WHOIS. And, those are absolutely crucial, so it is very, very important that this get implemented, get implemented as quickly as possible. We've delayed far too long already. I don't think we care about many of the details unless it involves significant delay or unless it cripples some features.

The document that we're commenting on is a dog's breakfast, because it's really implementation plans from the point of view of a number of different groups, and it's not even clear if they work together or they conflict with each other, so I don't think we're going to go into great technical detail, but I think it's really important that we state some end goals in this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, thanks Olivier. And, I agree completely with Alan about the objectives. I guess I didn't see the comment as the appropriate vehicle for that, but I'd be happy to take the pen to say what Alan just said basically in the form of a comment and as a set of objectives that we want to make sure that the technical detail is adhered to, as opposed to having an opinion as At-Large on the technical details themselves.

So, I'd be happy to draw something up, as a flag way comment on RDAP because I think we all agree it needs to get done. I just wasn't sure this was the time to do that, but we can do that. I'm happy to take that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. Joanna has already volunteered, but I think to the extent that she is brand new both to At-Large and to drafting comments, I think she would be delighted to have you as a tutor and guide her along the way.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Super. Thanks. Please, put this on the Wiki and get the ball rolling on this. I note that there is support from John Laprise for this, and there is support also from Hadia, Hadia Elminiawi mentioned she could also help with this, write things up. All right, the last one on our list is the registration directory service WHOIS review. WHOIS to review. That has just come out, the RDS WHOIS review. We had a few people on this review team, really very hard work. At the moment, it's not allocated to anyone, so first question; do we need to comment on this, and second question; is anybody stepping forward to have a closer look at it?

Please don't fight to get in the queue, there will be enough space for everyone. Let me see if I have unmuted my phone? I have.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have unmuted your phone. To the extent that people didn't listen to the first half of your sentence and don't know what to answer to the

second half, would you like to repeat which section you're talking about?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm speaking about the RDS WHOIS review team draft report, so that's the registration directory services review team, and it's effectively the whole review team about WHOIS. Now, of course, what's really confusing people here is that there's this review that is taking place, or that has taken place, whilst at the same time, we had all this party about GDPR and the EPDP and everything going on in parallel, but ICANN Is very good for keeping people busy and doing lots of parallel streams and things, and this one has gotten a significant amount of work, and you have effectively a number of sub-groups that were working there with a number of objectives and so on. I must admit, I haven't read that report yet. It was a large report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, it's Alan, my I jump the queue please?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Please, go ahead Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to say, this is not an important report, it's perfectly written, you can just submit a very brief statement saying you agree with everything, and I think that will be quite sufficient.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, no biases at all, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: To those who don't know, I'm the chair of that review team. So, now I'll be quiet again and let the real queue speak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan for your unbiased view, and now unbiased view from other members, please? Tijani Ben Jemma?

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you very much Olivier. Yes, indeed, I was about to say the same thing you said Alan, because you are the chair of this review team, and we mustered through so we have to say, "Yes, excellent work, thank you very much." No, I am joking, I think we have to comment on it. I don't volunteer because I have a lot of stuff on my table now, but I think we have to comment here, and perhaps I can contribute a little bit on this issue, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tijani. Next is, strangely enough, Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Olivier. I'll put my serious hat on now. The report is not one that I am proud of view of form. It needs a lot of

cleanup before it goes out for the final report, just because it was created by a number of individual groups and someone said it demonstrates the multi-stakeholder model by each report being written at a different label of depth and using a different writing style, so you can tell it was done by a multi-stakeholder group, but seriously, from a point of view of format, it needs cleaning up and that kinds of thing, and it's far too long.

But from a point of view of substance, I think much of it is, we put a lot of work into it and we hope that it will be useful to the community, so I do welcome input and comments to the extent of, "These things seem on target," or, "This seems to be a waste of time." We're looking at a strained community going forward, and there are an infinite number of things one could do in WHOIS to make it better, and of course there are so many unknowns right now with GDPR, that the whole concept of accuracy; does accuracy matter if we can't see the data anymore?

Well, to some extent it matters even more, but how do you measure it? So, to the extent of; is this work that we are recommending be done, is that something that is of value to the community or not? And that's one of the more critical things that we are looking for, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. I gather I have a question that stems from the whole parallelization that one uses; where does this report fit in in the wider EPDP scope now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Part of what we're doing is a post-mortem of the first WHOIS review team and saying, "Did ICANN implement what they were told to implement by the first WHOIS review team?"   And the summary of statistics I think speak volumes that there were 16 recommendations. If you go to the ICANN report on implementation there are 16 big green checkmarks. Our review says only half of them were implemented fully, and so one could ask the question; why is our judgment so different from staff?

And I think that's a really, really important question to ask, and if reviews go forward and the implementation is not done to the satisfaction of a next review team or possibly the last review team, are we getting value for money on this?   I think there's some really important questions that has nothing to do with GDPR, because we're looking purely on what we've done over the last six years.

Going forward, there are some issues with regard to GDPR, some of them are exceedingly relevant. We have done, for the first time, a survey of law enforcement to find out to what extent law enforcement uses WHOIS and try to assess what the impact is going to be from GDPR, and it's not a very rosy-looking picture going forward, so that alone I think has some value.

Compliance issues are something that At-Large has focused on a lot, and we have put a lot of effort into compliance and things like that, so I think there's a lot of relevance. Are there unknowns because of GDPR? You bet. That's where we are.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLONDE: Okay, well thanks for this, Alan, its's helpful. We haven't got a draft here, but it looks as though there will be some need for drafting something. Jonathan Zuck, you're next.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hello, yeah, and I don't want to bog this call down, but part of the answer to that question is that I know the beginning that the CCT review, which hey, we just delivered a final version to the board on Sunday, so that's exciting. But, for the first time there'll be some remnants of the review team that stick around to work with staff on implementation and interpretation and etcetera, to hopefully minimize some of those kinds of discrepancies going forward, so that's at least the initial experiment associated with what has been a kind of at least failure of interpretation if not implementation of reviews to date.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that's like what happened with the RDS WHOIS review team as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do we have anybody that's particularly excited about this report and wants to shepherd a draft?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, I think that what might be happening is, nobody has really read it apart from Alan so far, I'm not even sure if Alan has read it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, Alan has read it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: He has, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Every bloody word.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We do have -- perhaps it would be a good idea if we take a glance at it, and then someone will hopefully step forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: At least read the executive summary, it's short.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Do you want me to jump in, Jonathan? I'm happy to hold.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll I'm going to say is I'm happy to take a look at it and maybe try to reduce it to a couple of slides for the questions that the At-Large might have a particular perspective to bring to the question or something like that. Maybe we can sort of boil it down to some things manageable for our group, if that make sense to folks? Go ahead, Cheryl.

EN

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Jonathan and Olivier. I'm glad I held, because what I was going to say is, this seems to me like an ideal major agenda item for sort of a mini webinar and discussion for one of our future meetings, so I would suggest that we get you guys to when we can plan a nice, healthy block of time and also perhaps advertise it a little bit more widely amongst our At-Large and indeed the rest of the ALAC who are often sadly lacking on these calls.

Some are here I know, but they're not all of them. But it sounds like one of those, bring everyone up to a little bit of speed, and then see even if we can formulate some high-level commentary that can be put into a sort of strong statement or two that might work. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Although sadly they are not on the At-Large agenda yet, I hope they will be really, really soon. This is a hint for anyone that has control of our agenda, there are two webinars scheduled next Monday, the 17th of September presenting the draft report to the community, and I would strongly suggest that if anyone has any interest in this report at all, you attend one of them. The webinars are being given at 15:00 UTC and 21:00 UTC. Time for any community around the world.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: I am putting this on my agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: What was that?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's on Tijani's agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is, but it's not on the At-Large agenda yet, and I will hope it will show up sometime really, really soon.

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let's have an action item please, for these two webinars to be listed on the agenda, and if staff doesn't know when they are taking place, they can ask Alan, I'm sure no doubt you can point to the right timeline, time, location, etcetera. Thank you. I'm mindful of the time, I still see Jonathan and Alan with their hands up, so Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Old hand, sorry.

OLVIER CREPIN-LEBLONDE: Okay, thank you, so we've I believe finished that section, we can now move to section number 5, so let's backtrack over to the review of the Google doc and the initial report of the new gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process. For this we have Jonathan

EN

Zuck, and many, many, many topic hand holders, so over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Again, I just have some slides to try to summarize what we derive from some of these comments, but people should definitely read the comments as they're evolving both in the Google docs spreadsheet and in just seeing some Google doc to see if it makes sense to you in detail, but I'm just trying to do some summarization here. These are the areas that we said that we would speak about.

On the community application, I might ask to speak to this a little bit, there's a couple more points, I just created a slide, but Marita, if you want to give some thoughts on how the comment draft has evolved since last weeks' call, then we can have a short discussion on that. So, Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Okay, Jonathan. I did do quite a bit of work on the community application section, and particularly with respect to the definition. We did have a discussion in a previous call about the definition, and came to the conclusion that not a great deal was needed on the definition, and again, I have to say in the conclusions I came to, that really the community defines itself in 1.2.3.1, you can be a community if you say so, and you have support letters to demonstrate that.

The problem, and you can refine that and put some more words in it, but I don't think it will make a huge amount of difference at this point,

because the community does decide itself. There's some more refined granular stuff when you get down to module 4, of the applicant guidebook where they start to talk about how you accumulate points. That's really the key thing about this and what we need to concentrate on.

So, there is another definition in section 4, and there it talks about the fact that there has to be an awareness and recognition of the community among the members, some understanding of existence and some kind of understanding of longevity. I have thrown in a few questions about what they use, what question about does awareness and recognition have to apply to all of the community or just most of it? Is the policy written that- is there a policy that explains how this works during the evaluation? How long do you have to have been around to prove that you've got the longevity?

These are all questions to which we did not get answered in the last round. So, just want to leave that and see what people's ideas are about this definition, and whether or not there needs to be more of an actual definition. That wouldn't actually constrain people, because that's the danger if you start putting boxes around it, and somebody is not going to be able to fit in. I'll open it up for comments on the [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Marita, I'm going to take presenter's privilege here and jump the queue and then hand it over to Eduardo. I guess my recollection from last week's call, was that we had reached at least a rough consensus is

that we were going to take an end to justify the means if you will, up to this, in that we thought a community party evaluation as important because of the types of projects that might be facilitated, and we wanted to give priority to them.

And so, that had less to do with the definition of a community, which may or may not apply, and more about what sort of string that we've created and how it was implemented. Maybe I'm misremembering, but I thought that that was what we wanted to do, was sort of come up with what would we like the characteristics of the applicant or the applicant's proposal to be in order to receive priority evaluation. That's my recollection from last week, and I didn't know if you had a chance to noodle that notion, and like I said, it's sort of the ends justifying the means as far as EPE's. I'll let you respond, and then I'll go to the queue.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, I would say that that particular thing belongs in another part of this, which is really where you look at what the evaluation team is looking at, what sorts of things they should be evaluating, and how they should be evaluating them, not in the actual first question which talks about the definition, that's all. I would say, everything that you need to actually granulate, that you need to bring forward that you want them to think about, to look at, has to be in that part where the evaluation team is just giving thought to various things. That's where the game is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Eduardo?

EN

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I was going to comment something that is not related to this. Alan is going to comment on this discussion, so please let him go first, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess I'd like an elaboration of that second bullet; recommends three categories of applicants for community aps. I'm struggling with the three sub-categories, and I don't quite know what they're making reference to. When you're talking about registry operator, are you talking about the entity that will sign a contract for the registry, or are you talking about the entity that operates the back-end operation that provides the technical infrastructure for that registry? They're two very different things, and I'm not quite sure of the relevance of whether this is a new start up or not.

The second bullet saying; a registry operator that applies on behalf of the community, well, the community has to apply on its' own behalf I think. Someone else may do the work. So, I'm not quite sure how you're using the term, "Registry operator," which usually is used in terms of defining the back-end operator. I'm not sure, if it's a new registry startup, why does that matter if it's an existing one? So, I'm a little bit confused in the relevance of all of that, and how they should be treated differently. I'm done.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Marita, someone said [inaudible] in terms of me putting bullets together, but I'll let you respond to Alan.
MARITA MOLL:	I'll jump in there. Honestly Alan, I don't know what that is either. Nadira, she was here, and this is one of her things, so she's the one that has to speak to that, because I don't know where that fits in.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah, thank you. Just to be clear, if we're going to have three categories, we need to explain how they were going to be treated differently; there's no point in having categories unless we can identify how they are going to be treated differently, so this is a complete mystery to me, thank you.
NADIRA AL-ARAJ:	May I? This is Nadira speaking. In fact, during our discussion, even something else has been adding to the community application and as a registry also brought up by one of our team members, Abdulkareem mentioned that, so that's what my -- initially I thought I put them together because I think what type of applicants, because I'm not part of the community so this is a new thing, so you have the right to question that.
	But also, one point was raised as a community applicant, but there could be a new registrar who need the expertise for that application, that's why I added a new registry, to come forward of we are talking about the community registry, so community applicants, maybe there is

a new start up to pre-emp this entity. So, especially in developing countries, maybe somebody wants to establish a new registry for community, that's my point. That was my point. And also, as described by Abdulkareem as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, back to you, or you're muted.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, this is Marita once again. I do not know where this would fit in in the questions that we're dealing with. That's all; I haven't gotten fixed on that at all. I don't think it's answering the question that we were asked.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, we'll set it aside. I just went through the draft and was pulling concepts out of the draft that fit into the surface for discussion, but if it doesn't address the specific question, then we'll set it aside for a different section. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I wanted to comment on this. I just have a question that, to me, to find out, I'm not sure where comments are being put, and how we can put comments on it. I looked around, and I cannot find that. And I want to view [inaudible] and readers can comment there, you cannot edit anything. So, where are all the comments located?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, this is a logistical question, so now, it would be great if anyone, let me not personalize this, if you have trouble commenting, please don't wait a week to ask questions about it; send me an e-mail and we'll get Ejikeme to give you editing access to the spreadsheets, you can comment on just the in queue sheet, or you can send an e-mail with your thoughts on comments, it really doesn't matter because we're going to have to bring them together in the end, so any way that you can comment is fine.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, I'm sending mine through e-mail, I have put it in Google Docs, but I want to see the other ones, I don't know where they are. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay great, thank you. Marita, is that a new hand?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah it is, I just wanted to say that that has been a problem, Eduardo. It's been a big problem, especially for people who are working on section 9, it's way down at the bottom and you have to scroll through all the other stuff. I put the recent comments up at the end of this week, I put them just in Google Docs, the easiest one to work with, and to the comments I put in there, there are no other comments.

I am waiting for some other comments to come in, because when that happens, I would see then moving it over to Jonathan's major

EN

spreadsheet. Does that make sense, Jonathan, at all? At some point we're going to have to bring all of this together, where does it end up being housed?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'm inclined not to have people worry too much about where it'll end up. We'll have to draw it together, and Justine's been nice enough to create a template that might be what the response looks like, so it could end up in that document, or something else, but wherever you comment on it, keep access to look at it and to comment on it and drafters should have edging access to both documents I believe, but I would sit down with Justine and Ejikeme and try to set up a definitive e-mail on this, but either place is fine I guess is my point, and we'll draw them together before we try to put a final comment together for overall reactions. Allan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, you cut out, I think you just called on me. I put a link in the chat, it's the page appointed to the main At-Large policy page on this subject, and right at the top of the description is a pointer to the Google Docs, to Justine Chew's Google Doc, and to other things related to it. Or, you can simply comment in the text there.

However, I do take some, I think we need to consider what Eduardo said, that putting your comments one place, not being aware of what other people have said on it, is sort of a dangerous thing to do, because you don't know if other people are arguing the same thing, or

something exactly opposite to what you're saying, so somehow we have got to start bringing closure to this.   Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I agree, it's unfortunate that we have two tracks, but we do now, and just getting people drafting has been my top priority, and so what we're trying to do then is summarize what people are writing, wherever they're writing it is up for discussion then on the call. So, again, right now we have things in two places, I don't have a way to undo that necessarily, so that's the situation we're faced with, and so we will try to pull comments from both of those places, from e-mails etcetera, and try to summarize them for discussion on the call so that they both get covered --

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, my point is as you pointed out; the deadline is starting to loom, so we have to start drawing those together sometime soon so people can see the composite document and then --

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know, but what we need to do is actually discuss the topic. We're spending so much time discussing the logistics, that's what I had the slides, so we can actually discuss the points and we'll move on and we'll try to roll these things together. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I think that it is very useful, and it is mandatory in my point of view to have all the comments in the same place. The At-Large method is to use the Wiki, and have the drafter access to the call adapting, and all the others can use the comment part of the Wiki to give their opinion, so everyone can see all the comments and can see also what was drafted, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tijani. Obviously, the challenge here is that we have a lot of different drafters uploading a lot of different subjects, and so that's why we moved it out of the Wiki and into a separate Google Doc and spreadsheet form, and then we created a new spreadsheet with just the things we thought we would be required, which is a much smaller list. So, that's an attempt to accomplish that, because the Wiki isn't' structured in a way to make it easy to comment on specific parts of the report, at least at this point.

And, Christopher, I saw your comment in the list, but I just saw them today about predictability, and we haven't incorporated them into -- I'm hoping that whoever is drafting on that, I saw them, but I think you're the drafter, and so maybe it's a question of trying to guess what she's written and incorporate it into the proper section in the report. I can try to look to do that after the call.

Okay, any other questions on community?   Marita, is that a new hand?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, if I may, can I just say a few more words about content?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, please.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, I mean, I just talked about the definitions that the main part of what I saw here was the fact that we need to keep on hammering on this. The evaluation team is not represented. This is not something anything any of you don't know already, because I read all of your pre-comments from 2013, and a draft which I hope is fairly complete section on transparency and predictability, mostly transparency, talking about how there has to be some team representation on that team, and how their process have to be marked transparent, and how we have to have background information on the people before, so that you can actually check for conflict of interest and see what kind of materials that they're using in their research, so I hope that that is a little bit of an addition to what has already been said by ALAC on the issue of transparency, but in addition I added the two letters that were sent in 2013 just to boost up the point again that this is something that has to be addressed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Marita, those are very good points. I guess right now there hadn't been too much progress yet on universal acceptance. I don't know, Eduardo if you have more that you want to talk about here, you've had trouble reaching Mike Palage; I'll try to reach out to him. Are there other issues that we want to discuss?

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Can I put in my comment before we go ahead on the community application?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure.

ABDULKARIM AYOPO OLOYEDE: Sorry, I was trying to make a comment before. For the record, this is Abdulkarim Ayopo Oloyede. I am only on bridge and I don't have access to look at the documents now, so on the comments on what Alan said on to clarify some particular words, I'm not sure exactly what it is, and I cannot look at it now, I will look it later and then I will come back to him on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Christopher, go ahead? We can't hear you if you're talking. I saw your note about taking the predictability offline and I'll work with you to be able to find a place to add your comments.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I have unmuted, but you don't hear me. Oh, you do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We do now, we hear you now.

EN

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: There's some latency in the mute button. I was going to say quickly on universal acceptance, we have now, we have in the future a lot more new small registries, and the result of which the integration decision was implemented.   The original proposal was that the small new registration would be allowed to accept registrations directly up to a certain threshold. And what we got was the registrars was by registries.

The browsing and the CTC reports and to my mildly enormous effort that Jonathan and others have managed to get that stuff sorted out finally, but I was disappointed that there was no discussion of vertical integration that I could find, but universal acceptance is a big problem, especially if ICANN maintains the current restrictions on use of registrars, because many of parts of the world and many future registries would not be accepted by registrars would not correspond themselves with respect to the new registries. I just wanted the content be heard on record, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Christopher. Eduardo, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: We have the latest comment that we put out, which is, I'm putting it here in a link, it's more like this; putting the required registers to be universal acceptance is something that I think someone is going to do is going to ask the detail, even if they are not IBMs, new TLDs, they should be able to be universal acceptance, and this is one way of telling them, "If you want to wait to see new TLDs, well, guess what? Make your systems universally acceptable."

I mean, if you had an opportunity to make that happen, or reach for that, now the last bullet here where we say, "It should be required to ensure that their suppliers as well as the registrar also UA ready," that is maybe out of their hands, so we are changing that to say, "They should ensure," or, "They should motivate," I don't remember the word is that we used, "Should take affirmative actions to ensure that their suppliers as well as the registrars are also uni-ready," so it's not a requirement that they should make it, but something, take some action to help them mold this going forward.

And the second bullet, where it says systems should be, second bullet, ready to take on domains and name services and [inaudible] hosts; that wasn't clear, so we change it saying that, "It should be ready for IDM registrations, under IDN and on IDN new gTLDs consistently on name servers and other machines, and be able to manage an e-mail address internationally stationed."

So, basically that's our comment, we got a -- if we go down you will see a comment by Alan, saying that, "If a registry is not applying for an IDN, then they should not apply." But, my point is from the user point of view, we have to start pushing people to change, to be UA ready and we have an opportunity here to make it happen. That's our comment, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eduardo. I mean, obviously, universal acceptance goes well beyond IDN, just has to do with old validation code and websites. I'll try to reach out to Mike, because I feel like we've done a lot of work on this

issue, [inaudible] we ought to bring to the surface and perhaps the three of us can threw it all together to expand on this, it's beyond IDN's. Does anybody have anything that they want to add, or ideas? Sorry, go ahead?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I was going to say that this, based on our conversations with Edmon Chung and Don Hollander and I have tried reaching Mike, maybe my address is wrong, e-mail?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I have a better one.

EDUARDO DIAZ: That's all, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. I guess we're late in the time, so maybe we should take the last few minutes to give the mic to Greg. I will conclude by saying that we'll try to put together a document that kind of summarizes these things and the outstanding question still for discussion. We've got to find a way to get through these more efficiently though, and so the questions on the concept themselves, so I'll maybe try to get these typed out to the drafters.   But Greg, why don't you take the microphone?

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Jonathan. We have just enough time really to introduce this document as most new. Maybe all of you know, there is a unified access model out for comments, there is no firm deadline on when its due, but given the movement of things, it's probably moving pretty quickly and most comments have already gone in, and we don't want the next cycle.

I had this comment, it's kind of drafted from comments and inputs I received from several members of the committee, as well as looking back to prior comments on the interim model, which included several comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry Greg, can everyone please mute their microphones right now? We're hearing lots of rustling. So, make a point of looking at your Adobe Connect and make sure your microphone is muted.

GREG SHATAN: If somebody can do [inaudible] something. So, rushing through the prior comments of ALAC which are very helpful in setting some criteria. Maybe people just don't know how to turn their mics to mute. *Thank you very much.* Who said, "Thank you very much?" We don't want to hear you. Thank you very much.

Okay. So, the latest document, there are 19 questions, but they really ask that overall model, I have provided draft answers to each of them, and draft answers are based on the variety of input, my own views, and anything else that the team -- so, do people know that they're being

heard? It really boggles my mind that people making technology policy can't master something as simple as a mute button. But maybe given their status on the policy making, that shouldn't be a surprise. Anyway, I digress for which I apologize.

So, I think this needs to be read by all. I understand that this is kind of trying to hear a middle path, but also what I saw as kind of the way that comments were going there are some that were obviously kind of directly opposite to each other. And, in that case, I was largely went on everything that I kind of heard and read from ALAC in the past, and contemplating end user suggestion.

I will note that one of the inputs we received from Christopher Wilkinson was also submitted directly to the GDPR inbox, that these are going to be submitted, directly submitted as an individual submission, so Christopher's comments or statement will be seen in the forum by anyone in the comments or review by staff and published.

Nonetheless, I didn't just dismiss Christopher's comments, because they were going to be seen elsewhere, so I've taken into account the crosshair, but again, the balancing act is there in all of these things. So, maybe a couple of things in here that could be seen as controversial, I don't want to highlight any for hope that maybe I'm wrong, and that they're not controversial, but I think in some cases no matter what you've said about a particular topic, it will be controversial because even if there is a consensus on it, there is going to be those that do not join the consensus, or don't like the consensus. So, I think we just kind of need to see where do we go.

EN

Christopher, if you're not in the chat, just refer to that in some way in my introduction. I can't include everybody's comments because then we would be just constantly in opposition to ourselves, so I tried to smooth things out and deflect commenting when there weren't majority. If some of them kind of didn't fit.

But in any case, this is now the group's document to comment on, and I'll turn it back so that I guess Jonathan can talk about what the best ways are to do this. You all have a Word document that you can open in your server generic word processing format. You have a PDF for stability, and it also has been or should be mounted on the E page in an editable text box.

So, it's fairly long and detailed, so I would look more to marginal comments or at least if anybody does any editing, it should be marked editing, suggesting, rather than just changing things and hoping other people notice where the changes are. And I think if there are conceptual points, it's probably better to raise them as points than to deal with them just line editing.

If there's things we actually have to have a dialog on, I would encourage us to try and have the dialog in comments or via e-mail. There has been kind of this battle over the drafters. So, those are kind of my overall introductory comments, and I look forward to everyone else's comments, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Greg, yeah. The typical thing is that people should read the comments, and then make comments on the Wiki page, and that's

where the discussion takes place, so let's all just go forward doing that to try and make comments on Greg's draft, and then it'll be up to you to try and make sense of the comments, and make updates to the draft. So, nobody should be editing the draft directly, don't worry about that.

We've reached the end of the call. Olivier, I don't know if there was other business that we needed to go through before we let the call go? I'll be trying to get with Ejikeme and send out some e-mails in the next day or so here on the subject of procedure stuff.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Jonathan. I think that we've covered all the points that we needed to cover. I do note that, and this is probably my fault, I haven't read an e-mail from Justine Chew that she was not going to be able to make to today's call unfortunately. Justine has been working on the topics that have been, really should be co-drafting with and so on, so there's quite some text in there that she has added.

But as you know, she has e-mailed the working group mailing list about those changes, so we just invite everyone to read through the e-mail and through her updates on the mailing list. And that's pretty much it for today. I guess we can just open to any other business?

I'm not seeing anyone putting their hand up, so as Cheryl says in the chat, "We've made some great progress today. Thanks Jonathan, thanks everyone who has taken part in today's call. The next call will be next week on next Wednesday, and as this is a rotation, I believe it is a rotation, I should just ask Ejikeme Egbuogu when the next call is? She's

also monitoring when the other calls are and if we are likely to see some of a clash somewhere.

EJIKEME EGBUOGU: Hi Olivier, yeah, I think it's at 13:00 UTC, but Andrea or someone from support can confirm, but it is rotating and I believe it'll be at 13:00 UTC next week.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, that's correct, 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Well, thanks everyone, it's been a great call. And, have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night. This call has now ended, thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]