ANDREA GLANDON:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday the 3rd of October 2018 at 17:00 UTC.
	On today's call, we have Olivier Crepin-LeBlond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben-Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Daniel Nanghaka, Alfredo Calderon, Gordon Chillcott, Christopher Wilkinson, Eduardo Diaz, Kaili Kan, Joanna Kulesza, Jonathan Zuck, John Laprise, Alan Greenberg, Yrjo Lansipuro, Sebatien Bachollet, Bastiaan Goslings, and Satish Babu.
	We do have apologies noted from Justine Chew. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu; and myself, Andrea Glandon on call management.
	I would like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes and to please to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. Thank you, and over to you, Olivier.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Andrea. Can you hear me correctly? Because I've had some problems sometimes with London phones.
ANDREA GLANDON:	Yes, you sound good, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. Welcome, everybody, to this new call of the Consolidated Policy Working Group. Today's call is going to be [inaudible] a major item and that major item was the initial report on the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP, the overarching issues in work track one through four, because that has been adopted by the ALAC and the work that has been put together to put this whole thing together really is quite astounding.

The ALAC chair on yesterday's call mentioned it's probably, if not actually is, the longest statement that the ALAC has ever drafted so far. Not only is it longer, it's full of very, very important information. So, real congratulations go to Jonathan Zuck, to Justine Chew as well who had some significant amount of work put in there, and to pretty much everyone else that has been involved in putting this work together. I'm really glad to see so many people in the Consolidated Policy Working Group. We should pat ourselves on the back for a first excellent product coming out.

Let's continue making some great stuff together and let's have a look at the agenda that we have today. That is somehow a little different from the usual. We'll start with the public comment work flow. That's because Jonathan and I had discussed this and perhaps we now need to start going into some kind of a thing where we look at the public comments and then move on to the different topics that are important on the agenda after that.

So, public comment review, then we'll have an update on the EPDP, Expedited PDP. This one is likely to last for a while with Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi, another year at least of fun with this. After that,

EN

we'll have the next steps on the reviews and the RDS WHOIS. That's the Registration Directory Service Review Team draft reports of recommendations. Alan, Jonathan, and Joanna Kolesza will all be able to speak to us on this. Then, we'll have Greg Shatan who is unable to be on the call in the early part of the call but hopefully should be with us in about an hour's time to speak to us about a new version – yes, an updated draft statement – on the unified access model public comment period. Then, any other business. And that's the time when I should ask is there any other business or are there any amendments to be made to this agenda? I'm not seeing any hands up, so the agenda is adopted as it currently is on the screen.

And we can therefore go to our CPWG action items. They've all been done. I don't believe that there's action item that requires an update on this, since we're dealing with some of the updates during our other agenda items. So, if I'm not seeing any hands up, we can swiftly move then to agenda item number three and that's the public comment workflow. I hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck for this. Jonathan, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. This is part of a longer conversation. It's probably not one that will resolve in this call but thought we should start the conversation, which is in the environment of the At-Large review implementation and criticism surrounding the At-Large around comments coming from single individuals rather than from the group as a whole, etc., it begs the question whether some change to our process for developing public comments to order.

Those of you might have seen my presentation on this two meetings ago with the inverted pyramid, but what I'd like to propose and open for discussion on this call is a change to our process. Again, I don't think … This will probably be an ALAC ultimate decision but I just wanted to start the conversation.

A change to our process in which rather than every public comment resulting in a call for drafters by staff, which is what happens now is that when a new public comment or call for public comment is announced, that we bring it up on the CPWG call to put it through kind of an initial filter as to whether or not this is a relevant public comment, what part of the public comment seems to be the most relevant to end users, [inaudible] staff's help in making a short presentation on the issues involved on the CPWG call so that this group can make some intelligent assessment about whether or not there's truly an end user perspective to bring to a particular issue on which a public comment is being solicited, and that it would be only after it passed through this group that we would try to assess what our basic position might be and then make a call for drafters, either from within the CPWG or a broader call for drafters on the Wiki. Maybe that's the point at which the system become similar again.

I think that we want to move away from a system where we just throw these out to the wind and say, hey, if anybody would like to write a draft on this, go for it, because I think that encourages rather than discourages individualism, if you will, in these comments rather than consensus. So, that was my general thesis that I wanted to share.

I think that we want to maybe even insert something into that process when we're developing the position that the At-Large will take. We might want to insert something in the process that involves a communication out to RALOs by the regional leaders so that we're really doing our best to develop consensus around a particular issue, particularly if it's a new one. I mean, if it's an old one and we're just commenting on the specifics of a change to something, etc., then it may not be necessary. But maybe again there might be a call out to regional leaders.

So, my point is to front load the process with work by this group and potentially regional leaders before there's even a call for drafters and I wanted to run that by people and get your feedback. I'll stop there so that I'm not rambling on. Heidi, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: You mean Heidi or?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Holly. Go ahead, sorry, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, I love the idea. And could I add something that I've been asking for for a while, which is what about a webinar or even the GNSO since it was in their review, if you can remember that far back. Why can't the GNSO put on, say, a webinar for a PDP? And that means that when we're actually talking about something, there is a discussion about the issue that everybody can participate in. Just a thought.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Holly, I think that's an excellent idea. It just involves us proposing that somebody else do something than what we do. I think we can go ahead and do that. Let's propose that, but absent that, we can schedule a short presentation by the support staff for that PDP to at least bring us up to date on the issues that are being discussed and the controversies, etc., and to give us a little bit rapid spin-up. But so much the better if it becomes standard form, that it be a webinar preceding a call for public comment. I just mean this is a reform we can enact ourselves without the GNSO's having to make a change in their process.

HOLLY RAICHE: Either way, anything that just let's people know what the issue is about, get them able to ask what the issue is about, before we make the decision. I just think that would be really, really helpful to involve people.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I agree completely. Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Jonathan. I see two people behind me who are probably much more qualified to answer this than I am, but I'm not going to give them my place. I'll still speak.

Two things. It was my understanding that on occasions, maybe not always but on occasions, that the start of a PDP [inaudible] producing an

EN

issues report, there are sometimes some webinars or some sessions which explain to a wider audience what the PDP is about. And also, during a public comment period at the end of a PDP there often are such sessions.

Now, the concern that I have is that we are asking for another part of ICANN to work this out and for more work, specifically for an At-Large audience. I'm not sure that given the timing for some of these things – for example, a public comment period coming up, usually lasts for about a month – we then have enough time for them to create some kind of a presentation for us.

The other thing being that it's very difficult to have such a webinar that is completely neutral in its findings. I'm talking here specifically here at the end of a PDP. But, I'll let the other speak behind me. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier, for your comment Holly's suggestion. I don't know that we can ever have anybody completely be neutral. It's just a question of us understanding what issues got discussed, even, to decide whether or not there's a specific end user perspective to bring to a comment. And then whoever gets tasked with drafting it will have to actually go back and read the output document of that PDP in order to draft the response. But, the question is whether or not we'd be able to [inaudible] resource or an existing webinar to get to a point where we understand whether or not there's an end user perspective that should be brought to bear. Alan, go ahead.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't we let Cheryl go first? I'll go after her.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That could be very dangerous, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Indeed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Cheryl for the record, she says with trepidation. Hopefully, my audio is okay.

I want to deal with this two parts of the discussion so far separately. First of all, on the proposal that Jonathan is socializing with. Firstly, anything that front loads a system where we have wider engagement and the opportunity for more people to be not only engaged in the drafting, because that is part of the recipe, but actually in the discussion and development of opinion, which is often the more time-taking one, I think probably, in my view, one of the essential parts of the recipe. It gets my whole-hearted support.

I also want to say – and Jonathan, because I was asked to attend the ALAC meeting – that part of my [inaudible] on the record about how the sub pro [inaudible] was managed was to say that this model of using the Consolidated Policy Working Group as a [inaudible] for the development of policy input has stood up and done very well [inaudible] test and it certainly, in my view, it's a role that can be expanded.

But, when you look at the [inaudible] that did the best part of penning, you will so often find, certainly in the example I just gave, this goes to some extent to Holly's point, the talent is actually, dare I say, involved in the policy activity we're talking about. Then I want to come back to that again in a second. I still have that utopian dream of actually having people from the At-Large community involved in the policy process and the other parts of ICANN.

So, we get not this hurry up and [inaudible] forward opinion on something, we're also trying to explain. But a slightly even more front-loaded model, dare I say it.

But I wanted to make sure that, Jonathan, in what you're proposing, we use this working group effectively and efficiently but we also remember these will be ALAC's statements and public comments, so we need to ensure that what we are doing early on in your proposed design is giving informed advice to the ALAC on their approval, indication, intentions, of doing a public comment.

Let me tell you why. Not all things are going to actually be demonstrably in the public interest. A lot of them we could argue, for example, quite successfully, that making a statement on the empowered community [inaudible] ALAC had absolutely no real public interest, and therefore, under your model I would have feared ALAC could have [inaudible] that it would discuss empowered community.

That's a bizarre example, but what I'm saying is not all [inaudible], the ALAC needs to get advice from this working group and use that as part of its informed processes. But it's got to have a process whereby it says,

EN

"Thank you, working group," because we are a working group of the ALAC. "We're going to be ready to endorse this and we will be engaged in your process," in our process. But it also needs to be able to create other policy input that may not run through our [text]. I don't see that as an issue that can't be managed. I think it's just an issue that needs to be managed.

Finally, on the webinars, etc., I would be very keen in the actions of everyone not actually being involved in wide scale policy development activity. And remember, not everything is policy development activities as well and it's not all coming out of the GNSO. There are policy inputs required from not only committee [inaudible]. That [made] the public interest. The various reviews, they're not coming [out of] the GNSO. And of course, things might … ccNSO [inaudible] due course for policy public comments from time to time.

So, let's ask for, as Jonathan is suggesting, input rather than [inaudible] provided, and usually they'll be more than happy to provide it. I'm going to stop now, but I like sort of where you're heading, but I just want to make sure we get endorsement from [inaudible] properly lined up. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl, and that was certainly my intention is to have these recommendations do round trips to the ALAC. We might need to design a process to make that efficient, so that it's not … It doesn't end up being a week or something until the next call or whatever. But certainly, these are recommendations to the ALAC. But the idea, bottom line, is to

fundamentally change the current process, whereby anyone can just start drafting a comment on something because the staff has invited them to do so and then we're left trying to decide whether or not that comment is right or accurate, etc., without deciding up front whether we really want to take a position on this or whether it calls for an end user perspective on something.

Again, I think our values and our perspective, not our just raw intelligence that we're just smarter than other people in the community. It's just that we're bringing a particular perspective and [inaudible] some discipline in doing that I think is the key to successful advocacy by the At-Large and the ALAC going forward. That's my personal opinion. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Many things to comment on now. With regard to what you just said about staff sending out a message asking anyone to comment, although I will not deny that has not happened in the past – it has – the messages that are being sent out now should not be saying that. They should be asking whether anyone has some any strong reason why they believe we should comment on it and, if so, put something on the Wiki to explain why they believe it's important.

Some people take that as the mandate to draft something and even ask it to be posted as the first draft, but that is not what we're actually asking now. I hope that's not what we're actually asking now.

The time delay is indeed the problem. I think we are now automatically sending out a message alerting the community to a public comment

without having to wait for a meeting, but it does tend to have to wait for a meeting which may be as long as two or three weeks to actually decide it. Now, the chair may get an opportunity sooner than that to comment but the chair shouldn't be in a position to make a yes/no decision without other input.

I think you've mentioned the process we follow now. We've changed that process about six times over the last year or two years and each time we try something, it doesn't work very well, so I support trying something again. Hopefully, you'll be luckier than I was in the suggestions I and others have made.

I question something Cheryl said. She mentioned we wouldn't have commented on the empowered community and accountability if we were only looking at involvement of users. We very consciously at the time chose to participate in that process very actively because we did believe it was of importance to users, specifically it was of importance to the credibility of ICANN, and if ICANN was not credible, there's a good chance that something else would replace it and it's not clear that users would have a voice there. That was the main reason that we were so active in making sure our voice was heard and making sure the outcome was something we believed was usable.

Cheryl is right, however, that if all we do in this kind of group is try to find someone who is willing to try to get up to speed, it will work for really simple things. It doesn't work for complex things. And we really need to get more people involved in the policy processes and it's not just the GNSO but clearly the GNSO is one of the more complex areas and that's got to be one of our key aims over the next couple of years,

EN

of get more people involved so there are knowledgeable people when something comes up for comment.

To address Holly's statement or request that the GNSO and others hold webinars, there's a lot of those webinars going on already. The GNSO may not do one in any particular case, but in other cases, they do. The RDS review we're going to be talking about a little bit later. We did two webinars on it at times suitable for anyone around the world. In fact, the attendance was exceedingly poor. We had a total of 13 people at the two webinars. But, on the plus side, from our perspective, 9 of those 13 were At-Large people.

So, those things are happening but you actually have to attend them. You can't just ignore them or you have to look at them after the fact. They're all archived and available.

So, there's a lot going on, but I think it is completely reasonable that if a group that is putting something out for public comment does not volunteer to put on a timely webinar, that it's completely reasonable to ask them. I'm not going to debate whether it should be staff doing it or volunteers or some combination of the two. But I think it's completely reasonable.

There will be a public comment coming out eventually on operating standards for specific reviews. There's a webinar on it this week or next week I think. So, if it's an area that interests people, they actually have to attend and participate. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. I'll just agree with you and Cheryl about the need to have people more engaged in the PDPs and other policy discussions that are going on around ICANN in the first place and have some ideas with respect to that and interacting with this group so that we're getting updates from those people along the way, the way that we are now from you and Heidi on the EPDP, so that everybody is … There's some core people that are at least somewhat spun up, and as you say, people that are experts then within the At-Large at the point at which a comment needs to be generated. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. ICANN practices over recent years and months have evolved and where both in cross-community working groups but also in PDPs, there have been the publication of regular updates and regular updates that effectively are performed by staff and provide a good summary of the happenings in the working groups, etc.

That was brought on, I guess, in a certain way due to an overall request and a need for this to happen because there's so much happening at the same time and I think that over years and years – and I'm saying here real years – the CEO has heard from the community that one of the main problems is volunteer overload, and one of the problems with volunteer overload is that there's just so much going on it's very difficult to keep track of everything.

So, this whole communication side to it is probably a real vast improvement. I wonder whether we could not go further then and ask if we were to want some webinars to be – and when you're looking at, for

EN

example, the scheduling of PDPs and the preparation of these, that we could have webinars that are on topic as a matter of principles, not just the occasional thing where it does happen for some PDPs and it doesn't happen for some others, as we've heard from Alan. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I'm just going to jump in. Thanks for that. Two very brief points I wanted to make. One is – and because of low and hard arguments and debates by a whole lot of unrecognized people in previous ATRTs, things like having the predictions on what the public comments are expected to come up – yes, there's always surprises, but there is the forecasting that is done as well, and Jonathan, I'd love us to also frontline even further and start looking at those forecasts, so we can perhaps decide … I'm sorry, I've had C-R-A-P of the last I don't know how many days. Forgive me.

Anyway, the point is we could even take frontloading further back. I'd love to see that happen. And start to put some of our work and indeed, then, some of the outreach and engagement desire that I'm seeing with the webinar discussions, to even the ones that are predicted, the ones that are in the funnel coming through.

Regarding the communications, I still an unconvinced that our wider ALAC – sorry, our wider At-Large community, and dare I say it, some of the ALAC – are even subscribed to all the appropriate communication modalities that ICANN offers, so that they are better informed of opportunities. And I'm not sure how we check on this. I think it's something that Maureen's ALAC better do and the ALAC At-Large

Review Implementation Working Group may in fact be able to put in some of its work as well. [inaudible], sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No need to apologize. Thanks, Cheryl. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, one last thing. Something Cheryl said reminded me that I had been planning to say it. As some of you may know, there is a CPWG list that is not supposed to have actual members. It does right now, due to some miscommunication. There are three other policy lists which people can subscribe to, and if you subscribe to any of those, you're implicitly on the CPWG list.

But, in looking at that, I looked at the membership of the three component lists and I found a surprising number of ALAC members who are not on some of the key lists, and in fact, some of them not on any list, essentially saying they have no interest in any policy issues.

So, there's work to be done. Thank you. I won't be sharing that publicly. I will be sharing that with the ALAC itself, though.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Redacted portion of your testimony, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: GDPR and privacy legislation does not allow us to share certain things publicly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm just kidding. This is what we have going on right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's not just WHOIS that is affected by GDPR.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. As I understand, Alan has therefore created an illegal database. He will be receiving [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The point that he's made is actually very valid and I think now is not the time to discuss it, but if we can clean up those lists. I admit to being on all the lists, so I receive like three, four, five versions of the same e-mail.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, the CPWG list only sends out one, despite how many of the subgroups you're on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But I'm in the other ones as well, so I also receive a copy of each one of the subgroups. If you want, I'll send you the flurry. Anyway, I get to read four versions of the same e-mail. They're probably in my mailer or something.

I think we need to work some kind of a protocol here and I guess that's probably what Jonathan is thinking of, as in, okay, we need to forecast our work better and then have some kind of a process by which we will have more information on one side, and on the other side, as early as possible, some kind of a penholder or group of people that will draft things.

Not everyone – and I think Jonathan mentioned in on the last call. Not all of the public comment processes are extended and it's only because of the extension of those current public comment processes that we've managed to come out with some pretty decent and pretty complete and long submissions that, had the original deadline been kept, we would have been nowhere close to it, unfortunately.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or Justine Chew and I would have had a couple of all-nighters in order to complete the comments on time, perhaps.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. Just on that, Jonathan, it just reminded me, if I may, one of the reasons that [inaudible] together is to allow more input, but it is always going to fall on a few talented individuals in pulling the words part together. I hate to see that, in its vampiric way, sucking all the life out of

EN

our volunteers and I'd love to see at a later point – not now, let's get the basic flows and processes working. But if we can allow some of the process and protocols to build that documentation in a predictive fashion, there would be less risk of those super heroic requirements being called on far too few people. As much as I'd love the outcomes of it, it still isn't fair. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense, Cheryl. I guess, back to Alan's point, eventually we need to really start being more disciplined about making sure that people are either participating on PDPs or other policy development initiatives or are participating as drafters, etc., because that's the whole point for being in the ICANN community.

But one of the barriers to that has been language, so on another call, we'll talk about some possibilities associated with expanding the participation of non-native speakers of English so that that at least becomes less of a barrier to people's participation as drafters. Cheryl, did you put your hand back up or is that your previous comment?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was typing and then it's best just said. Look, first of all, I'm going to absolutely agree with what you just said. But I just wanted to respond to Holly and that is her desire for building the talent pool. [inaudible] we build the talent pool. Some of us have been trying that for 25 years, however, or 20 years in ICANN and further in other parts.

We need to nurture them in the right places. It struck me what she was saying is [inaudible] building the equivalent of the next Gen and Fellowship where they're insular. They're very good in their own space, which is their own space, not wider ICANN. We need to nurture our talent, possible talent, and develop it actually in the puddle of the processes that go on within ICANN and its PDPs and interesting way they're doing things.

Part of that would be, perhaps, to use this working group where you can dip your toe in the water and have your voice heard and maybe work with someone who has done it all before, is more [inaudible], and build your confidence and find that you are actually interested in something like IDNs. I never thought I would be as passionate about internationalized domain names as I ended up being and working very hard in the first ten years in ICANN to happen, as someone who doesn't even speak English properly.

Sometimes, you don't know what you can be passionate about until you find it and we've got to allow that to happen in space and nurture spaces as well. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you for being [inaudible], Cheryl. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Look, we're never going to have more than a modest number of people active in any given event, any given process. It would be foolish to have 49 … I mean, the number of people that we

EN

have active right now in work track 5 because geographic names caught everyone's attention is a little bit ridiculous.

There are so many things people should be active in. We don't want to concentrate them all in one thing and I don't expect any given event to motivate the whole of At-Large or the whole of the ALAC. That's why we have this group and the other groups related to it. It's so we can spread the word and get information to a wider group, wider than those who are actually actively participating.

Now, those who are participating may well be the core of people who write the comments, but it would be really, really nice if when the ALAC votes on a comment they all actually understand what they're voting on. They've all actually thought about it and participated in discussions or at least listened to discussions on that topic. It's not just a matter of rubber-stamping what one person says.

So, there's got to be a whole range of number of people involved in given things. The ALAC rules of procedures say that every ALAC member, and implicitly, every regional leader should be involved in some activities and should take a leadership role in some activities. That doesn't mean you lead in everything, but we do expect people to be more active than just going to the official meetings every month. We're partway there. We're partway there. We're doing much better than we were a few years ago, but there's still a ways to go. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cheryl, is your hand still up or did you put it back up?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Just on that, just to draw attention to the fact that some of this has got [inaudible] in the nexus with other activities that come out of the review implementation working group [inaudible] issues. What Alan just said, also [inaudible] metrics, etc. So, I don't want this group to become all things to all people and all issues. Otherwise, you just drown in the tsunami that will follow. But I do think we also need to recognize where the conduit with another aspect of ALAC and At-Large activity and how we work with that name itself will be an interesting process. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl, and thanks, everyone. We're just starting this conversation and obviously there's a lot of different aspects to it. The one thing I don't want lost is that part of what I think we ought to do is comment on fewer things. Part of this is increasing our talent pool and getting people to participate in more things. But the other thing is being more selective about the PDPs and comments, etc., in which we participate when we think we can identify [inaudible] perspective. So, I think that's going to be part of what we're trying to accomplish as well and I didn't want that funnel aspect to be lost in this conversation.

I've been informed by our call chair, Olivier, that I've overstayed my welcome. So, I'm going to put the microphone back in his hand to continue down the agenda. But, thanks, everyone, for getting this conversation started and I will come up with aspects of this to talk about probably on many future calls. Thanks. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jonathan. You're fired. Next is the update on the EPDP and At-Large. Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. By the way, is Hadia on this call? She's not on Adobe Connect. I guess not. Okay.

I did give a brief summary on the ALAC call yesterday and I will do the same here, perhaps with a little bit more color. There was, as I think all of you know, a three-day face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles last week of the PDP team. It was perhaps the most intensive three-day meeting I have ever participated in. Not so much the long hours. The hours were pretty typical, 8:30 until 6:00 or so. That's common. But just the intensity and focus that it required was quite … I won't say extraordinary, but it was quite very clear. It was a difficult process.

We looked at some of the core issues that we have to resolve if we're going to move forward on the EPDP and replacing the temporary spec and that focuses on some very mundane and dull issues, unfortunately, of exactly what are the processing activities we're talking about. What is the lawful rationale factoring in ICANN's mission and the GDPR regulations for actually doing the carrying out those? Whose purpose is it? Is it a purpose of ICANN, of the contracted parties, or other groups that may be involved in this?

So, they're technical issues. They're not easy to understand and some of them are not intuitive to understand, but we're trying to get closure on these.

We did a moderately good job of that. There still was some questions coming out of it and perhaps a few more questions have surfaced in the aftermath of the meeting, just because people think about things and decide, "No, that's not quite something I can support."

There was an interesting discussion. Goran Marby came in for a little while on the second day and an interesting discussion. Something he said before but has not really attracted the attention I think it should have, of one of ICANN's aims in this process is to try to reduce the liabilities of the contracted parties.

As I think you all know by now, the GDPR comes with some pretty hefty penalties and they're penalties of I think up to 4% of gross income – not net, but actually gross income.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Revenue, not income.

ALAN GREENBERG: Revenue, thank you. And there's also the ability of the privacy commissioners to essentially tell you to stop doing business in some cases. So, these are rather severe penalties and if they were levied on registrars in particular who are probably the most vulnerable, as you may or may not know, the registrar business is a very low margin business. They tend to make money on their add-ons, not on the actual registrations. It's something we can't afford to have happen.

Now, if ICANN can figure out a way to reduce the liability and essentially take on the liability itself … Now, ICANN already has certain liabilities.

You can't ignore that. So, it's not clear we would increase our liability but it would certainly potentially could lower others. That's something we're looking at. And that's something based on the reactions of a number of people at the meeting was not well-understood. We're talking later on today. Sorry about the phone. I'll have to ignore it. We're talking about the unified access model.

Now, one of the things that's not clear in some of these discussions is that the unified access model is not likely to happen if we have to, if we cannot reduce the liability because the unified access model implicitly means that there will be automatic decisions being made in some cases and automatic decisions that the registrars are then liable to for fines and penalties.

So, it's a lot of things intertwined in this. It has to do with us just coming up with words that satisfy the reality of why are we doing RDS WHOIS and there's strong disagreements on that. Some of the most obvious things I would think of, needing contact information to be able to fix the problem is not something that's accepted by everyone and there are certainly people who are trying to absolutely minimize not only the information collected but what we do with that.

So, it's a controversial area. If staff could … There's a summary web page that staff can point to. I hope they have it. Someone put it in the chat yesterday on the ALAC meeting. And there are some documents that I'll be sending out to this group. I haven't quite gotten my act together in doing it yet.

So, we're making progress. We hope to have some sort of report that addresses the core issues of rationales for processing and what kind of processing are we doing, which are the core things that have been identified by the privacy commissioners that ICANN has not done well at this point and we hope to have some level of rapport, either just before or just after Barcelona. I'm guessing after. There's a significant amount of meetings that are scheduled for the Barcelona meeting and that will, of course, be public meetings that I would encourage everyone to attend. That's all I really have. I see we have some questions. Do you want me to run the queue, Olivier, or should I?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, you can certainly proceed forward at this point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Tijani is first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. First of all, I'd like to know how you can reduce the responsibility of the contracted party. What is the means to reduce it? I don't understand how. Second question. Can you please tell us what are the points on which you got consensus and what are the points that you couldn't have consensus in your retreat in Los Angeles? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Alright. The first answer is both hard and easy to answer. The short answer is ICANN is looking at a number of different alternatives that may or may not fly.

One of the main ones is can we be the conduit which actually releases any information to anyone? It may be stored in the registrar or registry but it goes through us. And if by us being the entity that reduces, that actually makes the data available, that may put the liability on us, if indeed there is a claim that we have done improperly. So, that's certainly a method. It may not be the only one, but that's the one we're looking at.

Now, it's not 100% clear that that does reduce the contracted parties liability, or if it does, can we get the data commissioners to, ahead of time, say that it will? That's one of the challenges.

Like in many laws or regulations, they're only tested once it goes to court, once there are challenges to it. Up until then, you don't really know how it's going to be interpreted. So, what they're looking at right now are methodologies that may put ICANN essentially in the middle, and therefore reduce the potential for contracted parties to be held liable.

A similar one, but not quite the same mechanism is for us to set the rules by which something gets released. Even if they release it, we are the ones setting the rules. Now, will that reduce their liability? We don't know, but it's something that's being looked at. That's essentially where we stand.

In terms of what we decided on, I'm not going to be able to give you a definitive list that's going to be very meaningful. For instance, there was a very heated debate over whether for the release of information to third parties – sorry, release of … I'm trying to remember now, sorry. Release of information to third parties – technical contact, information like that – is that an ICANN purpose or is a third party, is it a registrar or registry purpose?

Well, clearly, the contracts require that this be done under the temporary spec, and presumably under any follow-on contract. So, one could construe that since we are requiring it in the contract, it's our purpose. On the other hand, once the registrar, registries sign the agreement, it's their purpose and it's a different clause under GDPR which allows the release of information. It's not because it's a third party who has a right to know. It's because they've been told they have to.

There are several differences in the interpretation. So, that was one of the larger points of contention. I can predict how it's going to come out, but it doesn't really matter.

But these are detailed little things that matter. I'm trying to think of some of the other issues. They're not ones that you would think of as being absolutely crucial. We're not anywhere near the point where we are talking about access. So, we're nowhere near the discussion of who should get access to the information that we are collecting and under what conditions and do they get access to all of it or just a subset of it. We're really, really far away from that, and those I think are going to be the more interesting discussions to have.

Right now, we're just looking at the main infrastructure that allows us to comply with GDPR regulations, not the answers to the specific questions of who can collect data.

We're having a long debate over whether we need technical contacts, for instance, and exactly how do you phrase it to allow someone to submit a technical contact, should they choose, but not require them to and how do you make sure that when someone is looking to fix a problem they have access to a technical contact, even if someone chose not to give one, because clearly, reliability of the Internet is our main reason for being here.

So, the mechanics of doing some of these things, but we're looking at it, for instance, of how do you allow communication with it. It's not saying, "Do you supply an e-mail address?" because you can provide communication in other ways other than via e-mail. There's web forms which keep things completely transparent. There are anonymized e-mail addresses that change daily or hourly, so they're not liable to spam or something like that but still facilitates communication.

So, it's those kinds of things that we're looking at right now and not the ones that normally spur emotional discussions, except among people who are fervent privacy advocates or fervent, have a strong interest in making sure that information is available. And as you would expect, the divides are between the non-commercial people who are looking at privacy issues and human rights issues. The registrars, registries who have an interest in minimizing their work and their liability, and law enforcement, the GAC, the intellectual property and business

EN

constituencies who are trying to make sure they can continue doing business and do it effectively.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I have a follow-up question, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I don't think that the fact that another party gives access to data we reduce the responsibility of registrars because the one who collected the data is the registrar, and in this case, if a customer is a registrant through the registrar, the registrar would be responsible for the access of the data for the registrant. So, I don't know if we manage to reduce the responsibility.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't either, and I can give you an argument why that is not the case. I mean, if I sign an agreement with the registrar saying I promise to obey all the rules and then I violate that agreement, is it their liability or mine? I don't know. And that's what we're investigating. You may be right that there is absolutely no way of reducing the liability, in which case we're going to have a really hard system to build.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

EDUARDO DIAZ: The question I have is in the context of this group, the CPWG and what you said about the EPDP. I'm looking at the next item in the agenda and both items are [inaudible] to what the EPDP is doing in some kind of form. So, my question is are those reviews … Don't they have to wait on the result of the EPDP to review them because they might change? That's my question.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. I missed the very first part. You were a bit muffled. Are you talking about the RDS review?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Let me change my microphone. Hello. Can you hear me better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. That's a little clearer.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. My question is in relation to this group, our group, the CPWG, and the things that you mentioned about the EPDP. If I look at the next item agenda in our meeting, both things that we're going to look at are reviews related to WHOIS.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I understand the question. The answer … I'll talk about that when we get onto WHOIS, on to the RDS review. The answer is, yes, there is overlap. No, there's not a lot of relevant, important overlap from the point of view of what we're doing. I will talk about that a little bit when we get onto the RDS, though.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I guess I'm starting to get rather, I don't know if the right word is confused or baffled as to what the debate is all about. The GDPR, if I understand correctly, relates to natural persons and I'm not quite sure how having an e-mail address for a domain name that says … Well, let's take an example, abuse@godaddy.com or what seemed to be the thing back in the day, postmaster@icann.org, for example, in any way infringes on GDPR.

ALAN GREENBERG: It doesn't.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] postmaster.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, you don't have to make the argument. It doesn't.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, why are we … What's the problem in the EPDP? I don't understand this. Can you explain this, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can certainly explain it. Number one, we have no way of knowing in WHOIS whether something is owned by a natural person or a legal person. So, that's number one. We have never asked the question and the only field that might be considered relevant is organization name

and that is used in so many random ways that it is not a particularly reliable way of determining it. So, that's number one.

Postmaster@godaddy is not personal information. If they, however, had said alan.greenberg@godaddy, that is personal information and there is no particular way to parse an e-mail address to know whether alan.greenberg or pick whatever you want is really a fictitious name. What if my legal name was Abuse Contact? Is abuse.contact@icann.org personal information? Well, it is if that's my name. And there's lots of names in this world that you may not recognize as a name. So, we can't necessarily tell whether something is personal.

Is it personal with enough reason to ignore the fact that it's personal? If GoDaddy, for instance, says that olivier.crepin.leblond is their abuse contact and they have chosen to put that in every WHOIS record that they register a domain name from, is there sufficient reason for saying we don't have to consider it personal information or do we need to get your permission to put that there?

So, from a registrar's point of view, there's lots and lots of questions. ICANN has chosen to say registrars can ignore whether you're a legal person and apply the rules to everyone. I find that problematic. Other people think that's marvelous. So, that's the kind of issue that we're going to be grappling with as we go forward. Some of us say that, well, we need to have a field like that. We need to add a WHOIS field of "are you a legal person or not" and some migration path to get it filled in. Some registrars say "over my dead body will I allow that to happen and create a whole bunch of work for me in that area" so that's a sampling. I'm not sure that answers your question.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: In my view, we are just looking at this in a totally wrong way. We don't want personal information to be there and let's take that every domain name is registered by an actual person. We don't want personal information. At least we can just agree to a standard name that one can send this to. Now, whether it's Father Christmas or whether it's Postmaster or whether it's 12345678910 – well, 67890 maybe – have it as a string that is unlikely to be used by anyone as a natural name, except the most crazy people but we can't quite prevent this and prevent someone from deciding to rename themselves something like this, remembering the kin.com person. At that point, we completely come out of the whole thing of trying to find out whether it's a natural person or not and whether the domain is owned by a natural person or a company. We just have a standard abuse contact that is then applicable for every single domain name out there and it becomes part of the contract. Makes it a lot easier than trying to find the five-legged sheep. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: All you now have to do is get 180 million registrants to agree to that and to change their information to conform.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, Alan, [inaudible] the registrars are basically acting as a gateway, as a lob it over the wall thing, with no rules whatsoever. So, when you want to have a contact now for any domain, you need to just fill in a web form. The web form might be sending thing to the trash can or it

EN

might be actually sending something to any domain that we don't really know. It's just so unpredictable, and to me, that really is a problem when it comes down to the stability of the Internet. Not only that, it so hurts domain names. It will hurt the legitimacy of domain names. I've said enough.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if we do what you're suggesting, what do we do with all the spam that's directed at all those non-personal information names? Solution to one problem, there are registrars who use anonymized e-mail addresses and that anonymized e-mail address changes regularly, daily or perhaps even more frequently. So, if you pick up an address and use it right now, it in theory will go to the right registrant. Two hours later or two days later, it won't work anymore. So, that tries to avoid the spam problem. But then you have a real problem that a lot of the anti-abuse work relies on the same registrant having the same e-mail address. How do you handle that? One thing generates another.

HOLLY RAICHE: Stop. We're not going to solve this [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Holly. That's exactly what I was going to solve this problem here and we're not going to stop the GDPR discussion from happening in ICANN. Let's not debate whether it should happen. It is happening. It's a personal decision on mine and Hadia's part or Holly whether we actually participate in it or waste our own time on it – and I use the

word waste advisably in some cases. But we're not going to solve the problem here. If you want to participate, please, there are 600 pages of transcripts you can read from Los Angeles or you can prefer instead to listen to the 24 hours of mp3s and I will be happy to discuss the details. I see no hands. I have nothing else to say. And I don't think Hadia is on the call. Holly may well have read a lot of the transcripts. She may want to add something to this.

HOLLY RAICHE: No. I said my stuff in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I don't know if Seun is on the call or not. I don't see him. Alright. I'm going to ask are we doing anything … Right now, this call has another 20 minutes to go. Are we doing anything on item number six, unified access model?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We are, but we need to wait for Greg Shatan to make it here and Greg will be arriving …

ALAN GREENBERG: And he's not here yet. Is there anything else you could do—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] got five.

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: What about item five?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was hoping to flip to, to give me five minutes to do something that I have to do right now. If it's not available, I'll talk while I'm doing it. Sorry. I'm doing some cooking and I just need some stirring.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, you can multitask and we can go to agenda item number five and that's the RDS WHOIS Review Team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I will do that. We have just issued the report. As I said, nine [inaudible] At-Large people actually attended the webinar. We have people on this call who can give this talk instead of me. A large part of the review is looking at whether the recommendations out of the first WHOIS review – that was about five or six years ago – were implemented. The short answer is ICANN said they implemented all 16. We said half of them were fully implemented. The other ones were partially implemented. So, we disagree on that. The fact that we disagree is an interesting tidbit of how these reviews are implemented. It's not that they ignored it. The question is did they really follow the full intent as opposed to perhaps the wording? I'll give one or two examples.

So, that's a significant part of it. GDPR really doesn't fall into that because, although GDPR may alter the outcomes of the intent of those, takes for instance, there was a very large focus on accuracy in the first WHOIS review and it's not clear to what extent we're going to be able to measure accuracy.

Right now, for instance, the ICANN staff who are responsible for gauging do we have accuracy problems don't have access to any data. That may vary. That may change with the full implementation, but under the temporary spec, they don't have access.

There were a number of interesting things that are also GDPR-related. For instance, one of the recommendations was put up a WHOIS portal, so you have a definitive one-stop-shop to go and get WHOIS information. ICANN did that and did it pretty well. It's broken now because of GDPR.

For instance, if you have a dot-org, if you are in North America, have a dot-org registered with GoDaddy, if you go to PIR, and since it's a thick registry, the registry is the definitive source for WHOIS information. They have redacted everything with the exception of country and state, I think.

On the other hand, GoDaddy, if you are a North American resident, has not redacted anything. So, if you know enough to go to GoDaddy for the WHOIS information, you get the information. The WHOIS portal, however, is not smart enough to do that, and therefore is significantly broken right now because of GDPR.

So, there is certainly impact, but to a large extent, we're evaluating whether ICANN did their job or not. So, that's pretty free of GDPR.

There are other things that we're looking at. We are not attempting to recommend how ICANN address GDPR. We are not trying to evaluate the impact of it, although in a few cases where the impact is so clear at this point, we do have comments on it.

So, there is GDPR involvement. We did not stick our head in the ground. One of the things we considered and one of the things that was suggested to us is pretend we are looking at the world in June 2017. That is, no GDPR. And that's the only thing we should look at. We chose not to do that. We're looking at the real world as it exists now. It is conceivable that by the time we show our final report at the end of the year, something may have changed enough that we may change some of our conclusions. But, basically, GDPR does not have a major impact on what we're doing. In fact, along the way, we received a suggestion from the board and from ICANN staff that we simply stop working and wait for GDPR to finish. We basically said no and did not believe GDPR was going to significantly impact our work to the extent of stopping us from doing it. So, that's where we sit.

The recommendations that we've made, as an example, one of the recommendations is fix that WHOIS portal so that if there's information available, you produce it. Don't just give the lack of information if information is available.

Another one of the recommendations of the first WHOIS report was basically both do outreach and fix your documentation so people can

understand what's going on. ICANN did a very good job of creating a complete new set of documents and web pages about WHOIS and related topics and created the portal. They didn't, however, try to integrate it with other things on the web, on the website. So, you can go into other parts of the ICANN website and find information which disagrees with what they said in one place.

If you go into a … There's a section on the registrar section of the website which is actually aimed at registrants. Ignore for the moment how the registrant is supposed to know to look there, but it is there. If you go into there, there are some really good videos, but the videos haven't been updated. So, if they're telling you how to do a WHOIS lookup, they tell you to go to [nic.org] which is the predecessor of the WHOIS portal. It has not been depreciated. It's still there. It's still running. And when you go to it, it doesn't say you're in the wrong place, even though it's no longer the place you should be going at this point.

There's lots of stuff. The example I gave on a call yesterday is one of the recommendations was go do outreach with not the usual suspects. Did we do that? No. As far as we can tell, because there's not really any documentation available. So, that's where we are.

The more interesting parts I think are some of the interesting things we turned up. The 2013 RAA Registrar Accreditation Agreement requires registrars to do certain validity checks on contact information. But they are only required to do it when you register a domain or if you transfer a domain. So, if the domain has been registered for ten years, anytime prior to the 2013 RAA and you have not – you may have renewed it, but you did not transfer it to another body or transfer it to a new registrar,

there is no requirement to validate the data. So, we have many, many tens of millions of domain names that have been grandfathered and no one has looked at the accuracy data. It's an example of one of the things we uncovered.

There is an interesting study on law enforcement which does look at, among other things, it looks at how law enforcement uses WHOIS and to what extent it's important and to what extent they're going to be impacted by GDPR and some interesting results there.

So, I'm not going to spend a lot more time. We're getting down to the end of this meeting, but I'll answer any questions if there are any. The document is huge. It's 170 pages long. Really about 70 pages of that are appendices that you could ignore and the executive summary is only about six or seven pages long and another five pages or so for the recommendations. So, I do recommend you look at it. It may be interesting. I don't see any hands. So, in the absence of any, I'm going to turn it back to Olivier. Ah, we have Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Just a question. I trust we're going to respond. What's the timeline for responding to this?

ALAN GREENBERG: The public comment is open until a week after Barcelona. There will be an engagement session in Barcelona. It will be roughly equivalent to what was done on the webinars, so if you went to the webinars, you probably don't want to waste your time on it. If you didn't go to the

webinars, it will be a good opportunity. It's on a Thursday morning at 10:30. Olivier?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a—

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: That will probably help a lot of people if we actually want to provide comment to get that because the webinars were, as usual, 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning for me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We did two of them, one at a moderately favorable time for you. It wasn't 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning.

HOLLY RAICHE: There was a reason that I couldn't. I'd be really interested in attending.

ALAN GREENBERG: We did hold two of them, however. Note there's only week after Barcelona and it's the week that often people don't do anything. So, if you wait for that, you may not have a public response. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. You've mentioned considering the EPDP process that is taking place in parallel and you have decided as a group to proceed forward with recommendations. Has there been any discussion … I mean, I gather this report is going to go to the ICANN board for action. Have you already been in touch with the ICANN board as to what their process would be, whether they would be dealing with this topic and working on this and implementing things or whether they would be waiting for the EPDP process to complete?

ALAN GREENBERG: They are obliged to respond and say what they're going to do within six months. We expect to deliver this report by the end of the year or possibly as late as sometime in January, and therefore, by June or July of 2019, we have an expectation that the board will respond. There's very little that we're doing that … Well, there are things we're recommending that may or may not be possible because of how the GDPR unfolds. There's no question about that. So, the board is going to have to factor in whatever the current state of the art is on GDPR implementation at the time.

We've had to consider where we are today in deciding what to look at and what to recommend and they will have to do that also in responding. It won't impact a significant percentage of the responses. It may impact how they're implemented. For instance, we say once we understand what is happening with GDPR, we need to revise all the WHOIS documentation on the web to tell people, among other things, registrants, what their data will be used for to document the decisions out of the EPDP or other processes.

And clearly, if no information is publicly available on a WHOIS portal, well, we don't need a WHOIS portal and we don't need to document it. On the other hand, if certain information is available, then we're going to have to document it. So, how we implement may be contingent on GDPR, but the if is not a major issue. It may well be in a few of the recommendations and they'll have to consider that. I see no more hands, so I will turn it back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. It's 18:22 UTC. The question now comes as to whether Greg Shatan has managed to join us on the call. I know that he has been delayed in his previous meetings. I'll ask staff whether he is—

ANDREA GLANDON: Olivier, at this time, Greg is not on the call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: He is not on the call, okay. That's going to be a slightly difficult thing. I must admit that I haven't had a chance to look at Greg's latest draft statement. He has sent it and it is linked to the agenda. Would anyone volunteer to perhaps take us through any of the changes if they read through them? I see Christopher Wilkinson has his hand up, so let's go to Christopher Wilkinson.

ANDREA GLANDON: Christopher, we're not able to hear you speaking. I can see your mic motioning, but we don't hear anything.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's rather strange, the mic motion and it actually doesn't come through for some reason.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Is that any better?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That works now.

ANDREA GLANDON: Now we can hear you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Okay. Olivier, we're at the end of the conference call and some of us have another conference call coming up. I cant walk you through this document. It's 13 pages long and I also received it about a half an hour before the call. All I would say at this stage, and I allow myself to say this because I was one of the more critical contributions to the previous [session].

This has been greatly improved. I think in Greg's absence we have to thank him for clearly having done a lot more work on this. If I was to speak to [inaudible] I would feel that I was splitting hairs. One of two

points which I would like the author in the working group to make a slightly additional effort, but I think we've got something here that we can work on. I don't want a quick fix. And when I've read it through carefully again tomorrow, if I have further comments, I'll post them to the list. But this is not [inaudible]. I think you can rest assured that the working group can present ALAC with a text which basically [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Christopher. I am not seeing anyone else here so far. I do note one thing which is that the call for comments closed on the 26ᵗʰ of September. We're now on the 3ʳᵈ of October. I recall this was an internal deadline. I'm going to turn to Alan Greenberg and Jonathan Zuck to get enlightened as to what our deadlines should be on this, if we are perhaps to decide on a final deadline for this to be sent out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. We'll figure it out. I don't know what the deadline is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Jonathan. I recall the last discussion that we had, the deadline was somehow a sliding deadline since there was no hard-coded deadline. But, Greg, thank you for this. Greg did suggest submitting sometime this week.

What I would suggest, perhaps, is going further, Christopher has said that this is quite a well-cooked version. Perhaps, should we ask for the

wider ALAC to comment on it? So, not only the CPWG but obviously the wider At-Large community, as this seems to be the final approval before any kind of vote starts on it. I cannot imagine that there would be so much change or so many changes. Christopher Wilkinson?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes, Christopher again, for the record. Olivier, if there's any risk of being short of time, I think you should go to the At-Large for additional comments. There is a point where the appeal to multi-stakeholder participation is all very well but I question whether, particularly At-Large and the ALSes, were really equipped to exercise multi-stakeholder participation in this matter. That was just a personal feeling. If I'm right or wrong, the only people who can answer it are the ALSes themselves. I have no judgments on the formal procedural aspects, but I would start getting At-Large comments as soon as possible.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. I'm not seeing any other hands up. I'm just trying to find Greg's e-mail if I can find it, whether there were any specific instructions that he had put in there but I don't think he has. Jonathan, did you …

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think so. It was pretty last minute, so I don't think he put specific topics for discussion in there. He did suggest submitting it this week, as Evin said. Let's take this discussion I guess to the CPWG list, circulate the document and make sure people read it and perhaps we won't wait for another call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I think that's probably the right way forward. I would suggest that you or I or someone just drop them a note, ask for the points to be made on the mailing list. I gather he has made just a few adjustments. And then continue the discussion on mailing list and with an idea that we can move forward with passing this on over to the ALAC for approval, etc., by the end of the week, hopefully. And if not, early next week if it's too tight.

And with this, it's the half-hour mark. We have two remaining agenda items which are going to be really quick. One which is about any other business. I haven't heard anyone put their hand up earlier on in this call but perhaps somebody has got an idea of other business that they wish to speak about now. The floor is open. Heidi Ullrich?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. This might be just for the co-chairs, but please, could you send your agendas for the two sessions on the CPWG that will be held during ICANN 63? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for this, Heidi. This is of course bottom-up as well, so we invite everyone to make suggestions, to populate those sessions. Obviously, we're going to be discussing policy and there are likely to be a number of things there, but the co-chairs will work together with chair and others to build an agenda for Barcelona. That can be an action item if we want to do that. I'm not seeing anybody else putting their hand up.

So, the next thing is our next meeting. Do we have time for a call next week? I guess we do. Rotation of calls would mean that it would be an early call or early for me in Europe, perhaps not so early for you elsewhere in the world, perhaps a late call for you somewhere else in the world. When is the next rotation time? Let's quickly check if it clashes with anybody's schedule. Hello? Evin, Andrea, anyone?

ANDREA GLANDON: I was just checking. It looks like the next rotation time would be 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Is anyone clashing or does anyone have a conflict with 13:00 UTC next Wednesday? That's Wednesday the 10th of October.

ANDREA GLANDON: October, correct.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, there is one and that's an overlap issue. There is a strategic planning webinar I believe on the 9th of October at 14:00. Is that not the case?

ANDREA GLANDON: This meeting would be on the 10th of October at 13:00.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Wednesday the 10th. I believe that there is an ICANN strategic planning update webinar that is taking place on Tuesday, the 9th at 14:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's the one I'm looking at in my calendar.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, that doesn't clash with the other one. Okay. I'm not seeing anybody saying that there will be a clash. I gather there will be one with Christopher Wilkinson. I understand that. It's a different story. But, with this, I'd like to thank everyone, especially my co-chair, Jonathan Zuck. Jonathan, anything you wish to address or we can just say goodbye to everybody?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think we just say goodbye. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, everyone. Have a good week.

HOLLY RAICHE: Bye, thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]