YESIM NAZLAR:	AC room right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	There you go. So that's perfect.

YESIM NAZLAR:	Yes. Perfect timing indeed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Alright. Thank you. Let's get going then, let's get this show on the road.

YESIM NAZLAR:	Okay. Let's please start the recording, and I'll go ahead with the roll call. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group, CPWG call taking place on Wednesday, 17th of October 2018 at 13:00 UTC.
	On our call today we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Harold Arcos, Sébastien Bachollet, Seun Ojedeji, Joel Thayer, Hadia Elminiawi, Marita Moll, Kaili Kan, Alan Greenberg, and Justine Chew.
	We have received apologies from Christopher Wilkinson, Holly Raiche, Gordon Chillcott, Alberto Soto, Bastiaan Goslings, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and from Heidi Ullrich as well.
	From staff, we have Evin Erdogdu and myself, Yesim Nazlar. I'll be managing today's call. And before we start, as usual, I would like to

remind everyone to state your names please before speaking for the transcription purposes, and now I would like to leave the floor back to you, Oliver. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. And welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call, the last one before our face-to-face meeting in Barcelona. We've got a [inaudible] agenda today. First, we'll hear from Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi with an update on the expedited PDP. After that, we'll look at our usual – well, no, first of all, look at our agenda for the consolidated policy working group in Barcelona. Now is the time when we'll be looking at the workflow, [inaudible] table, etc.

Then after that, we'll have a review of the different public comments that are currently being drafted, and then if we manage to get Greg Shatan on the line, hopefully we'll get him to talk to us about the proposed unified access model. So it could be a short agenda, it could be a long agenda, it really depends on how much we have to discuss. We've got 90 minutes for today's call. Does anybody wish to make any amendments or additions to the agenda as it currently is on your page?

Going once, going twice, going three times, no one has put their hand up. Thanks. Or at least one thing I do have to say, I have a little bit of a delay on my Adobe Connect, so Yesim, if somebody has put their hand up and I'm not noticing them, please let me know, point it out, because sometimes, I do get a [few drops over locally.]

YESIM NAZLAR: [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Currently, [inaudible].

GREG SHATAN: I'm audio only. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I think – is that Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Yes, it's me. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very faintly, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. I may have a bad connection. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can hear you and understand you. I'm not sure about everyone else, but we will see when we have to cross that bridge. Or [I can let staff know] if you could check with Greg and his connection and how loud we can enhance his voice.

Alright, I'm not seeing any hands, so the agenda is adopted as it currently is on your screen. let's go swiftly to agenda item number two, the review of the action items from our last call. There are a number of unchecked action items. One of them is for Heidi and Evin to follow up on the GDPR procedure for expressions of interest utilizing Google forms. I'm not sure if anybody is there to provide us with an update on this. Is it in progress?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Olivier. We're waiting for feedback, but I hope to have it by the time we have our CPWG meeting at ICANN 63. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thanks very much, Evin. The next one that is unchecked is for Seun, Maureen, Sébastien, Alan to discuss and help contribute the initial report on the new gTLD auction proceeds cross-community working group PC. And Jonathan Zuck is going to follow up via an e-mail for a penholder. Jonathan, welcome. How's that coming along? Or are we going to deal with this in the next agenda item?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, penholder for –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now gTLD auction proceeds.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We didn't move on this topic. I hope to be able to discuss with all the members of the auction proceeds cross-community working group during Barcelona meeting, and with Jonathan and Olivier of course. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Sébastien. Thanks for jumping in. That's fine then. Jonathan, were you about to say something else, add something else?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nothing of substance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thanks. That's fine. So that will take place in Barcelona. Thanks, everyone. And then the last one was for Jonathan to invite Greg Shatan to present on the UAM during the ICANN 63 meeting. Now, I realize that we've added Greg Shatan to this call to speak to us about the UAM. I'm not sure whether we want to defer and say that – since it appears that Greg has a bit of a faint line at the moment whether we can defer this over to the ICANN 63 meeting. Jonathan, what's your view on this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm going to guess it depends on whether Greg can straighten up his line or if we can hear him. Obviously, it doesn't make sense if he's that faint, but sooner is better to assess UAM since it's a hot topic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Jonathan, then. So we'll work this out as we reach consensus.

GREG SHATAN: Is this a better connection?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Greg, that's great now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, it is.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. I think it had something to do with my headset then.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, now this one works. Thanks very much, Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we can hear from you a little bit later on today. That's great.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. These are all the action items for today's call, or from the last call, sorry, but to be discussed for today. You've got a listing of the others that have been completed currently on your screen. Is there any comment or anything that anybody would like to contribute on those action items? I'm not seeing anybody put their hand up, so let's then move on.

Thanks, everyone. Let's go to agenda item number three. And that's the update on the expedited policy development process, and of course, that's the one that deals with the GDPR issues. And Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi are on the line. I gather that Alan is going to be able to let us know what's happened since our last call, especially since not only t wo, but I think in addition of, in excess of two calls have taken place [inaudible]. So Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The phone connection here was not very good so I'm trying to use the microphone. I hope it's working. I can't report on the current state because I wasn't on the call yesterday. I can report in general that things are getting interesting, I think, in that for a number of reasons, it's

become obvious that some of the work we did in Los Angeles was good prep work but was not exactly what we needed.

So I gathered from the first part of the call yesterday we are reformulating the various documents we're creating, and I haven't seen them, but form the sound of them, it sounds like they're more targeted at what we need, number one. Number two, we're coming down to an interesting part where some of the major disputes on not access but preparing the world for when we do have the access discussions to third parties, I think the – not quite sure how to put it, the sides are firming up, and I think there should be some interesting discussions, and hopefully with the facilitators and mediators, some way to find closure on them.

As I asked in e-mail the other day, the issue of whether we should distinguish between legal persons and natural persons is going to be a hot topic, I think. It's not one that we need to settle for May 2019, but it is one that I hope we will be able to settle within the EPDP. And certainly, the ALAC's response and At-Large's response to my question was strong and quick, and that was very good.

So I suspect in Barcelona, there's going to be lots of private discussions going on to try to get various people to get together with unified positions. And outcome, I don't have a clue. I'll turn it over to Hadia if she has any insight or any further details on what happened on the rest of the meeting. I listened to the first few minutes of it but then had to leave. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hello all. Basically, yesterday, there was a new proposed [inaudible] which mainly focuses on ICANN purposes, and [inaudible] relevant data element. We've been working on the data elements workbook, and as Alan said, three small groups were formed. The three groups basically tackle three topics or questions. The first, whether registrars should differentiate between natural and legal registrants. The second, if registrars should possess registrants' data in accordance to the geographic location, and the third group address the temp spec and reasonable access.

[inaudible] requirements with regard to [inaudible] should remain in place and until we have [inaudible] model or not, and if reasonable access needs to be further identified. The EPDP [inaudible] ICANN 63 meeting in Barcelona on Monday from 3:15 to 4:45. Currently, we've been trying to finalize the data elements and work on the most contentious purposes like those basically related to disclosure and selection. So basically, that's it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia, and thank you for this additional update to what Alan has provided us with. The floor is open for questions and comments. I had one, because you mentioned that there was going to be a subgroup that was going to look at the difference between natural persons and legal persons and whether there should be differentiation between the two.

You will have seen the discussions that we've had on our mailing list, and I think that the vast majority of the respondents saying that there should be a difference between the two. What are the points, or has the discussion already started on this? And are there any points which have been made as to why there should be no discrimination between natural persons and legal persons?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I don't know if Alan would like to take this, but yes, the discussion has already started, and in the beginning, I believe the first meeting, most of the participants in the meeting were [towards] making this kind of differentiation. I'm not sure how it went on later. I think now it's not going into this direction, and I think Alan can speak to this more than me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Okay. I wasn't on the first call of the small group. I was on the next call. Apparently, the first call went much better than the next one. The issue is twofold. On a minor level, people are saying you don't have to distinguish to be compliant. And that is in fact true. All the GDPR talks about is how you must treat natural persons. It's completely silent on legal persons. So you can treat them any way you want and you're compliant. So from that perspective, there are people saying we don't need it to be compliant.

The largest issue however is the effort it will take to do it. ICANN does not currently have a WHOIS field that says, "Are you a legal or natural person?" There is an organizational field that some registrars, including GoDaddy, treat as an indication of legal natural persons. So if you fill it in, you are a legal person, you are an organization.

Registrars have told me however that we would be amazed at how innovative people get in filling in these fields, and therefore if you are legitimately worried about penalties, that is not a good field to use definitively. I think it's a fine field to use to start.

So it's clear that whatever we do, there'll have to be a phase-in period. The debate however is, is the phase-in period one or two years, ten years – which is the renewal cycle – or infinite? And the only example we have of such a thing is in the 2013 RAA there's a requirement to verify contact information.

But it only needs to be verified at registration time or transfer time. So you could have contact information which is not valid, in fact is empty, and you would meet the criteria forever and ever until someone complains about it. So some of us are fighting to say it needs to be there, it needs to be differentiated and it needs to be soon, relatively speaking, understanding that it is a complex problem.

It's the registrars' favorite answer – and some of you have seen that on the CPWG line – is, "Well, who's going to pay for it?" And at some level, we say registrants pay for everything, but GDPR itself has been exceedingly expensive, and they don't want to absorb any more costs or

absorb any more work. Understandable position, and that's where we are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Hello. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Seun, I think you're very faint.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. How about now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A little better, yes. I think that's fine.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. So, [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we have a problem with Seun at the moment, because I can hear him twice, and [inaudible].

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible].

YESIM NAZLAR: Seun, if you can hear me, I [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. Can you hear me? Let me try this. Can you hear me with this? Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a lot better, Seun. Yes that's better.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, so [inaudible]. Okay, so two things. It looks like the work that's going to be done at the face-to-face is [inaudible] finalizing the [proposed A and B,] and considering the length of the number of proposals that are on the plate right now, I personally was wondering whether the [timing] is actually realistic at the moment, because it looks like there's still a lot on the plate to discuss. But the good thing is that at least [proposal A and B is the target] for finalization and that's in Barcelona.

What I wonder is whether there is going to be the high-level, high-interest topic session which the EPDP are going to be running in

Barcelona. I wonder if there is [inaudible] to kind of brief [inaudible] At-Large community about the whole EPDP [inaudible]. So when they go to that session, EPDP high-interest topic and be more informed to contribute [on the floor]. Because I think the goal for that – during the meeting [inaudible] goal was mainly to get as much contribution from the floor as possible. So it should be good that non-EPDP participants are able to actually put in their comments, especially [proposal A and B] using that medium.

[inaudible] apart from that, [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Seun. Are you saying that they are thinking of having the – okay, I think I got it wrong here, but you're saying that during the public session of the EPDP, they will be basically trying to get as much input from everyone else. But I gather that the face-to-face session of the PDP will probably not be open to observers or anything. So if I understand correctly, the face-to-face version takes place before the public version. Have I dropped off? Seun?

ALAN GREENBERG: I couldn't make out a lot of what Seun is saying, but to be clear, there is an engagement session, cross-community session that will presumably be looking for input. I have not looked at the detailed agenda so I don't know what it is. The actual working group meetings, which are all Saturday and then several other session in the week, are closed meetings in terms of who can speak. They will be physically open and anyone can listen. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Yeah, the point, I think, that Seun was making was there will be an engagement session and they are asking – or what Seun was asking is that we get as many people as possible in the room so as to make our voice heard and bring our inputs and help out in that respect. As you know, often with these public sessions, it's a matter of counting numbers. So if we don't have the – we'll find out if we don't have enough people in there. Hadia Elminiawi, you're next.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. I think the [inaudible] Seun was referring to is the high-interest topic session that I referred to, and it's going to be on Monday from 3:15 to 4:45.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Hadia. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, we're scheduling nothing against it. We're assuming that's where people will be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent. Well, I'm sure you'll be able to remind everyone this when we meet face-to-face on the Sunday before the Monday morning meeting. Hadia Elminiawi.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I just wanted to add that [inaudible] has been reached for the exact format of the session. But yes, this is the one that everyone should be at. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Alan? Okay, Alan has put his hand down. I'm not seeing any other hands up on this, so I think that our next steps on that will obviously be to discuss this further when we meet face-to-face, and then certainly, that public session which is important. And I'm sure that Alan will be mentioning this in our opening day to get enough people in the room, and maybe to even coordinate on some of the points that we've discussed on our mailing list knowing that with these matters, if we don't actually voice our opinion early enough, one of the things that happens is the matters don't get discussed and then we're told, "Well, sorry, it's too late, we can't get back on things that we've already decided." So we have to take the chance to do so, and it's likely to be in Barcelona.

Next on our agenda is going to be agenda item number four, and that's ICANN 63 consolidated policy meeting agenda. I guess I can just say that the proposed agenda so far is to have half an hour on an introduction and general discussion on various points of the CPWG, and then a more focused discussion for the second half hour looking at three specific things.

First, the public comment workflow, so really find out – currently, we have a process for penholders, drafters, etc. that is not really cast in stone in any way, and sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't work

that well, so the idea is to discuss how this could be improved. The possibility of putting together some kind of an expertise table, bearing in mind of course that with GDPR, we might not be able to have a public table, but certainly a table to find out who's able or what expertise and knowledge our members have – our members being members of the Consolidated Policy Working Group – so that instead of having to broadcast every issue to absolutely everyone, it is possible to perhaps ask specific people or know already in advance who within the group would know much about those topics.

And then a presentation by Jonathan Zuck and Greg Shatan on unified access model, although we might already touch on this on today's call. Jonathan, I'm going to hand the floor over to you to expand on any of these points and also to open the floor. So you have the floor, Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can you hear me okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. We can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Sorry. Yeah, I thought my Adobe Connect had locked up there for a second. Yeah, so the idea behind the public comment workflow is just part of a broader discussion of applying kind of an end-user filter to the comments that we reply to. But it's more generally about how we come up with our positions on various topics and how the CPWG might be

used as a catalyst in that context. But then roundtrip, do something to socialize those perspectives out through the regional leaders to the RALOs to get feedback so that we're doing a better job of consensus building or the [inaudible] we can on different policy positions and then developing comments.

And then the other piece of this that has come up a little bit is about how to get more people engaged as drafters, and one issue there is related to nonnative speakers of English. And brainstorming a little bit about how that process could be improved with the help of translation and where that would happen or how that would happen, so we're going to talk about, I think, all those things as we try to work out how to improve our public comment process but also socialize policy so that our participation of work groups is consensus-driven and reported back well also. So those are the topics on that first part of the discussion.

As far as unified access model, I suspect we'll end up discussing it both times, both [inaudible] and then also discuss it in Barcelona just because we'll have a different group of people available to discuss the topic. So I'm not sure they're mutually exclusive. Those were the three topics on the focus discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Jonathan. Well said, and I just thought about it. Indeed, we'll get the full ALAC and regional leaders when we meet face-to-face in Barcelona. So that's great. Any comments or questions on this? The third part, so there's 90 minutes in total, half an hour on the introduction and general discussion, and I note that there is a typo there

that staff will need to check. Half an hour on the focus discussion that Jonathan has just described, and then half an hour on the actual policy, which I believe is going to be the review of the current open policy comments that are currently in place. Anybody wishes to take the floor or discuss any of these? Or maybe we can move on. I'm not seeing [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Seun Ojedeji. Go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I just wanted to ask, the workflow that is referred to, is it a review of the current process? [And is it] something that's been drafted as a proposal, the new workflow, or is there an intention to have the proposal fleshed out in Barcelona? What's the plan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Seun, I think we're in the very early stages of trying to bring about a change. Alan's recommendation on the last call was just try something and don't spend too much time talking about it. But at the very least, I guess we're going to just sort of develop the plan a little bit further. I think that's on my shoulders as well to [inaudible] a little bit further, present it to regional leaders and kind of get consensus around it, and then we're going to give it a try, as Alan said. We don't need to turn it

into something that takes a long time. It's not a PDP [just] process change internally.

So hopefully, I'll have some PowerPoints and we'll talk about the process, and people feel reasonable about it as far as the workflow process. And then as far as the language process, that's going to involve staff and some budget potentially, but we definitely have it as an objective internally to get more drafters that are nonnative speakers engaged. So that may be more of a brainstorming. Oh, I provoked Alan to raise his hand and repeat everything I've said. Alan, go ahead. We can't hear you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Half the time when my microphone [inaudible] it says I'm causing interference, and half the time, it isn't, so I've lost control over whether it's actually on or off. Just a comment that the real problem right now if you have to identify a single problem is it takes us a very significant part of a comment period to get started. And that's the part that we have to short circuit. That is deciding whether to do a comment and identifying who it is that's going to take responsibility.

It's then of course a challenge to actually get them to do it, and sometimes there's a significant delay from the time they say yes to the time some thoughts get posted, but the real problem is that we waste typically well over half a comment period simply deciding if we're going to do it, and if so, how. So that's a challenge, and I'm looking forward to seeing what's proposed. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. And I guess that's part of how [inaudible] to drive that process forward in terms of making initial decisions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jonathan. I see that John Laprise had made a comment a bit earlier and asked us to read it. I wonder if you could comment. John, are you able to speak?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah. So I just wanted to point out that language is not the only problem that we encounter in getting engaging, especially in drafting policy. If we look around the world and we look at the ALSes, a lot of the ALSes are from places in the world where the technology of bureaucracy, the technology of making policy in this way is foreign. So unlike other SOs and ACs, many of our members have no experience, have little experience with this process. So it's not just a hurdle of language, it's a hurdle of process. And this is a challenge that we faced since our inception, and going forward, it's going to be one we're going

to continue to face. I'm not sure how to address this, but it's a significant problem that we at least have to acknowledge. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, John. Any other comment? I don't see any other hands up, so let's then move on, let's go to our policy discussion, and that's agenda item number five and I hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck. I'm not hearing you, Jonathan. You might be muted.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I might be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Now you're not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. I think that the big one is the CCT comments, and Holly [has begun] the process of consolidating the comments from the last comment period on the CCT review and looking at what's changed, and then we are going to spend some time on that together. I don't see her on the call to comment on where she is, but we just e-mailed about it recently. So she's taking the pen initially on that, and then – I don't know what – the other one I guess is the – I guess this is on me. We haven't identified a penholder yet for the RDS comment. Is that right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Jonathan, if I may say, on the agenda it says that Holly Raiche is a penholder for the RDS WHOIS2.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Alright. I didn't remember that that had happened. So I haven't talked to her about that. I don't have an update on that without Holly. So I'll take it as an action item to check in with her on where that process is. I just asked her about CCT. And that may be it for updates on the open policy comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. On the agenda, it also mentions the draft PTI and IANNA FY20 operating plan and budget. It mentions the initial report on the new gTLD auction proceeds CCWG, and of course, the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team final report and recommendations, which have a long time, the 27th of November is the closing date.

And the latest one that has been announced earlier – I think it is yesterday – the draft final report of the second Security and Stability Advisory Committee review, SSAC2 review. We have a number of people that have volunteered for drafting. Is there anything to discuss at this point in time, bearing in mind that we will be meeting face-to-face and discussing policy face-to-face? And bearing in mind I think Holly is not on the call, it's going to be a bit difficult to discuss things with her.

The only one which we have someone on the call at the moment is the CCT, Consumer Choice Review Team, and we need to find a penholder for the new gTLD auction proceeds. But I think that for this – I can't remember if Sébastien Bachollet had stepped forward for that. Anyway, the floor is open for comments from anybody who is on the call right now.

GREG SHATAN.   Just don't forget the UAM.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Greg.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. You have your own agenda item.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. You reached VIP status.

GREG SHATAN.   I'm honored.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Your own lounge.

SÉBSATIEN BACHOLLET: If you can give me the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Please go ahead. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBSATIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. [inaudible] what I tried to say earlier during this call is that we need to have a discussion with the five members representing the five regions participating to the CCWG on auction proceeds, and we will come back with a proposal if we are both penholder or if one of us is a penholder or if we find somebody else. But I guess we will discuss that during Barcelona. And we come back to you. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just on that, there's an engagement session – or, sorry, I don't remember if it's a working group session or an engagement session, I believe on Monday, and based on what happens there, we have a slot in the ALAC schedule which may or may not be devoted to auction

proceeds. So we're going to play it by ear, but obviously, we'll be talking before then as well. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So what's left is to identify a penholder for the SSR2 report that just came out. Is that right, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you, Jonathan. Indeed, that's still to be decided. I note in the meantime that Hadia Elminiawi has volunteered to help Sébastien on the auction proceeds as well, if he wishes, of course. We've got a couple of people working on the auction proceeds now, so all we need is a volunteer or a set of volunteers for the second Security and Stability Advisory Committee review.

If I may ask, because this is SSAC, do we usually involve our liaison? Since we do have a formal liaison to the SSAC. Or is this not the sort of thing that we would do? And I'm asking here with Alan Greenberg whether that's the sort of thing that we might consider doing in asking Andrei Kolesnikov to help with this, or is that a conflict?

ALAN GREENBERG: This is –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm asking [inaudible] the case of the SSAC or member, if you want, or liaisons to the SSAC is actually a fully-fledged member of the SSAC. And I'm not quite sure how that fits within the mandate. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. Are we talking about the interim report form the SSR2 review team?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Draft final report on the second Security and Stability Advisory Committee Review. So it's not the SSR2, it actually is the SSAC review.

KAILI KHAN: Kaili Khan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry. I misheard you then. Normally, it is not the – we can certainly talk to Andrei, but I would suggest that since he is an SSAC member, he is not the appropriate one to comment on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. So we'll ask him informally, and let's not [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: It looks like we have two volunteers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have two volunteers? Oh, yeah, Bastiaan volunteered for the SSAC. Thank you for reminding us this, Seun.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And Seun. Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And Seun as well. So we have Seun and Bastiaan. Bastiaan Goslings and Seun Ojedeji. I heard Kaili Kan a little earlier. Kaili, did you wish to add something?

KAILI KAN: No, thank you. I just rejoined the meeting. My Internet [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, okay. Thanks, Kaili. Sorry about that, I just heard your voice earlier. Okay. I think that we're done with this section then. That pretty much allows us to move on to the next section of our call, and just before that – I'm not seeing any notes in the action item and notes, so I'd like to ask Yesim whether she's taken note of the different people that have volunteered forward.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Olivier. Yes, Evin, go ahead, please.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Yesim. I'm having some difficulty entering the Adobe Connect room, but I'm taking action items and notes. So I'll follow up with you after the call to confirm that they're correct. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great, Evin. Thank you. Thanks for this. And thank you, Yesim, as well. So we can move on to agenda item six, and that's the person we've all been waiting for, the ICANN seeking community feedback on proposed unified access model. Sound the trumpets, Greg Shatan is with us and is going to be able to take us through this today. Yes, today, on this call, this wonderful public comment period that's been – well, it's not a public comment per se but just text that he had drafted. It's rather extensive, and Greg is going to be able to take us through it if all goes well. So you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Checking to make sure my audio is okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Greg, that's fine. It's a lot better than before. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Yes, I've gone off the headset and just used my phone as such. So after a number of comments from different people, I did a fairly heavy edit of the first draft, both in terms of length and substance. I think I in

particular went back and looked again at some of the comments – I should say all of the comments by Christopher Wilkinson and Justine Chew, both in terms of form and substance and tried to take them to heart, in some cases trying to strike a different balance between where I was before on the draft.

Essentially, this is a much more detailed proposal coming from ICANN on a unified access model, which of course drives the length of this response. I did cut out, as you can see by looking at the comparison document, a lot of the introductory stuff, which if people are interested in the background, they can still read it, but it's not necessary to read it and it doesn't need to be in our comment or statement.

I was mindful we need to be consistent with previous statements that ALAC has submitted on access, and that I did quote and kept that quote in full and really tried to kind of work from there. So I take the overall view that a unified access model is a reasonable approach that needs to be done carefully and with appropriate advice from actual legal talent and not just kind of the general feelings of those involved.

Made it clear that I have some general comments here and under the framework. [Obviously,] some people have asserted that his only giving lip service to GDPR. I want to make it clear that compliance with GDPR is a given, as any end result has to do that, not, to echo what was said earlier by Alan, overcompliance or independent invention of privacy regimes instead of WHOIS regimes, but compliance, to make it clear that end user access and benefits of access need to be kept in mind and it needs to be able to perform at scale.

I don't think any of these are particularly controversial unless one opposed the idea of access generally, which kind of gets back to the issue of WHOIS. Putting aside GDPR, we have not changed the general position on what WHOIS should be. Also, I follow with a plea for a balanced approach. Thinking back again to what Alan was saying about one of the small groups that the sides are forming, and of course, the sides have to somewhat unform in order for consensus to be reached unless it's going to be just consensus by exhaustion or by exclusion, neither of which are great consensus models.

The bulk of the comment is taken up responding to kind of the question and answer section of this proposal, which is the way that ICANN chose to express this model rather than just a description, but rather to do a series of questions and answers. The questions without the answers don't really deserve comments, but of course, the answers themselves are quite lengthy, so I chose to summarized them and have made it more clear what part of each comment is summary and which part is our statement.

And I also tried to cut down the length of some of the summaries of the framework responses as well as the length of our comment, in part realizing that for someone who's not a native English speaker, this can appear to be fairly daunting even if I think it's reasonably readable. And of course, readability is in the eyes of the beholder, not the writer, so I could be wrong about that.

The basic position is that supporting the user groups with legitimate interest having access but noting with some [dismay] that very little in terms of specific – in the proposal, noting that there's an open

controversy, within our group and maybe others as to whether third parties who are receiving access should in turn be able to appoint representatives to get that access, such as investigators or attorneys, or whether they need to show up personally.

So that's – I think we've somewhat punted on that. indicate that it needs to be dealt with in implementation but not making a strong argument for or against that type of issue but more looking at how it should be approached.

Moving on again to determining eligibility, harken back to prior ALAC comments that accreditation mechanism should be developed in a multi-stakeholder fashion. There is a concern that the GAC has somehow been nominated by ICANN to take on a number of roles here that are beyond maybe their core competency, such as identifying specific eligible user groups. User groups [almost aren't – really entirely] from the private sector broadly defined. Most governments can get access through other ways or through kind of the public authority of legal obligation standard, which is really not – obviously not available to any other people or groups trying to get access. So really, that needs to be rethought. And again, there needs to be balance between different stakeholder groups. I'll pause here for a moment to see if there are any questions so far.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg. The floor is open for questions, comments, etc. And I have a question for you in the meantime. You've noted the discussions that we've had on the mailing list with some asserting– and I

guess quite rightly – that end users really do not check for WHOIS records so they don't need to have access as such. So they don't effectively benefit from the WHOIS records being accurate. And yet I know that the other point of view is that everyone benefits from it because they're making use of some third-party services that do use WHOIS records for domain recognition and the quality of a domain.

GREG SHATAN: Yeah, I've noted that discussion, and I'll have to see if I've kind of responded to it in one place in here. I'm not quite recalling that I have, but I think there are a couple of responses to that. First, there's no evidence-based support for the assertion that end users don't use WHOIS. And of course, there are all kinds of end users and we don't have to suppose only the lowest common denominator of end users who treat computers like refrigerators or TV sets and that some end users are more sophisticated than that. And if we consider that registrants are end users – while of course that's a double edged sword in this discussion, [certainly] registrars [inaudible] WHOIS and not only for their own registration but perhaps for others that they might be concerned about.

Any end user who is interacting with the domain should have the right and the ability to see who owns that domain. That's the first half, and the second half of the response is that, as you say, end users benefit from third-party access through the various sorts of methodologies that would result in increased security, stability, trust and the like in the Internet and in accessing websites and opening e-mails received through the Internet.

The list of ways in which that happens is too long to go into right now, but I find the idea that after 20 years of WHOIS access people are still arguing about whether WHOIS is useful to anyone kind of funny. But I suppose – and I'm not sure of course if any of the people making that argument can say for themselves that they've never looked at WHOIS, but I guess they don't consider themselves to be mere end users [inaudible] proletariat of end users. Again, to just unfairly denigrate the end users [to be] simpler than they actually are.

In any case, [inaudible]. The third item is about development of authentication requirements. Again, [inaudible] the GAC and members of eligible user groups, so we have both the fox guarding the chicken coop and –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Greg, before you jump into the third item, I did see that Alan Greenberg was waiting patiently, so I'll hand the floor over to Alan. I think he had something to comment on this. And then we can continue.

GREG SHATAN: Absolutely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I gave up. I thought it was too late. I was just commenting on end users' access to knowledge about who owns domain names. Let's face it, if the subject is subject to GDPR, we are not going to get that kind of information for every end user. There's just no way. So we have to get real about this. As useful as it might be, it's not likely to happen for subjects that are subject to GDPR, period. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Alan. I think that's a fair point. Of course, the unified access model looks primarily at access for repeat users of the WHOIS and doesn't do a whole lot for the end user who's not part of an eligible user group, which I suppose from an end user perspective is another shortcoming of it which probably should be pointed out. But I think the unified access model does at least give some statement that there needs to be access for kind of one-off type of access.

Of course, anybody who has as legitimate interest can seek to get that access, and perhaps there should be a way to facilitate it for end users who are not part of an eligible user group. That is an open point here and a good one to consider, but certainly, any kind of [inaudible] facilitated access is going to be harder to create for 100,000 unique people rather than some that are part of a definable user group.

In terms of developing the authentication requirement, again, we have concern that the GAC and the user groups themselves should not be the only ones involved in creating the accreditation process and that the voice of other stakeholders, including obviously At-Large, needs to be part of that, picking up from Christopher Wilkinson's language that it

should not turn into a poacher turned gatekeeper situation. [Not saying that any stakeholders are poachers.]

The process details who would we require to provide access, whether it's registry operators and registrars. I think it's whoever has the WHOIS data [inaudible]. There were some comments that it should only be the registrars, but in many cases, the registry operators are really the collections of data in the new gTLDs, so I did not adopt the idea that registries should be off the hook.

Any comments before I move on? I see Justine's comment saying earlier that she uses WHOIS as an end user. And is she an outlier? I think some would like to say you're an outlier, but that has never been proven. And I think it's usually those arguments just don't want access for reasons other than kind of lack of utility.

What would be the overall process for authenticating legitimate users? Again, it's vague. An application process. I picked up on our earlier comment that there are concerns about this. There needs to be some specificity who the authenticating bodies are and what the criteria are, etc. There's really just nothing – there's no [they're] there in the proposal and we need to have some clarity at least on a policy level about what's going to be sufficient identification and how the process should take place.

The question again about the scope of data, the number [six,] how much nonpublic data – the idea here, I think, is to have a matrix where for each type of user and for each type of access that's being sought, there'd be a matching package of data. The default is obviously not the

complete nonpublic dataset, although I think there are other ICANN stakeholders, including a group that I occasionally hang around with, who would like that [rule] to be the default. But this is not their comment and I'm not commenting from their perspective.

There is the question of bulk access, which in the earlier ALAC model at least opened the possibility of – there is a view that bulk access is terminally incompatible with GDPR, and I think that's clearly a deidentified or anonymized set of fields that in essence no longer constitutes personal data for GDPR purposes because they can't be used to identify a data subject, is one thing, and the other is bulk access to essentially a shadow WHOIS, and that is something that we come out against, using agglomeration to build a bulk database. Although again, there are those who would disagree with that and those who would want to see any kind of bulk access completely shut off. So this again is kind of more preliminary. A lot of problems left to be solved here. But we're not coming down willy-nilly allowing bulk access, neither getting rid of it on an ideological level.

On number seven, fairly simple, would they be required to provide access to nonpublic [inaudible] WHOIS data to all authenticated users consistent with the legitimate purpose and subject to local laws? That seems reasonable, but it's kind of a very vague statement, doesn't really say much. It's kind of a mother and apple pie, [obviously if you] think apple pie is a good thing.

Section eight, a unified access model, would it incorporate transparency requirements? Of course, we're only talking here about transparency in one direction, which is transparency into those seeking access. And their

framework does contemplate logs of access requests unless logging is prohibited by applicable law. Of course, those seeking data are also data subjects themselves if they qualify as natural persons under EU data subject, so that has to be kept in mind. So I think ALAC supports appropriate transparency requirements and needs to be done in a GDPR-compliant manner.

The idea of [declaring] at a policy level that the authenticating body would maintain but not publish a list of authenticated users is counter to transparency. Maybe there's some authenticating users who don't want to be known, but I think that is essentially the tradeoff as long as it's done in a GDPR-compliant manner.

And there was a question about fees. The framework response does not take any position on the response, and I think we say as end users, it would be desirable that there be no fees because end users can have all sorts of varying financial circumstances and that WHOIS provides a benefit to end users, and frankly, I would say t o all parts of the ecosystem and therefore [inaudible] inappropriate, at least that's a level of access to process of reviewing the effectiveness, the framework simply says it'd be reviewed at regular intervals, there's no details, [nobody asked] for details.

As to whether there would be a central repository of WHOIS data – and this is, I think, something I've heard has come up from time to time in the EPDP, the framework does not contemplate a central repository. ALAC, I think, should take the position that it's worthwhile exploring these options, as to some extent it's consistent with Thick WHOIS but it requires further study and should not delay the implementation of

unified access model. So I don't think we come out in favor of a repository but just in favor of exploring a repository but making sure it doesn't interfere with progress on the larger issue.

Technical method, it would be RDAP, long overdue. Technical method of authentication, again, there's very little in the way of details, just that there'd be some system of credentials and that community models [have proposed] credentials or certificates or tokens, and again, we kind of – without details, while this seems reasonable and appropriate, the devil's in the details. I'll stop here, that's kind of the end of a section.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Greg. So the floor is open for comments, questions and any feedback that you might need at this point in time. And whilst people are thinking and pondering about things, I note one thing. This of course is the access model, and I've seen on the EPDP that some are basically saying that when we start putting into the equation anything that goes towards the legitimacy of a domain by having the details of the domain holder, etc., that is out of scope with what the EPDP is looking at because the basic function of WHOIS was a basic technical issue, and so the ICANN mandate being that of stability and security of the Internet's identifiers, it does not include whether those identifiers are legitimate or not legitimate. I'm not sure whether you followed that discussion on the EPDP. Is there anything that you might be able to say on this, or indeed anybody else?

GREG SHATAN: I would say that firstly, the unified access model [inaudible] that conversation by assuming that access is appropriate and that what's being proposed generally would need to be consistent with ICANN's mission but does not take a position on what that mission is. Personally, I believe that that view of the narrowest, most technical mandate for ICANN is way too narrow and that if that really were true, we would basically have a very small and boring policy arm attached to ICANN along with a much more robust technical arm, and that's clearly not the case. And I think it's an argument intended to produce a result. I'm not saying it's [unprincipled.]

Obviously, it's been consistently held by certain stakeholders almost for the life of ICANN, and it was a huge issue in the Accountability and IANA transition working groups as well as the EPDP. But I think I've seen our representatives push back on that. the idea is not to create and expansive and ever-expanding model of ICANN's mission, but to recognize that it goes beyond the merely technical and also to recognize that WHOIS as such is not the method by which registrars communicate their information to their own registrar.

They have a business relationship, maybe that the information is collected in the same process, but that WHOIS was never intended to provide the information for that particular dyad, if you will, it was really intended to deal with third-parties more than anybody else, and ICANN itself depending on how you define them, as a third party or a second party. Or a party pooper.

In any case, I'll see if anybody else has any comment on that. That's one of those discussions for the ages, of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks for this, Greg. I was referring specifically, for those people that are not on the EPDP mailing list, to a note from Volker Greiman mentioning that the purpose description of the purpose for collection of the data to start with, and of course, I guess by extension, the access to [inaudible] data seems to be a significant case of mission creep by including nontechnical users [inaudible] the commitment of section 1.2-a-I [inaudible] focused on the technical role of ICANN and maintaining a secure, stable and resilient DNS. And he mentions specifically here that adding in fraud or crime prevention expands the scope beyond that contemplated in the bylaws and should be rejected. Looks like there's going to be some quite interesting discussions in Barcelona. Hadia Elminiawi, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: I'm not hearing Hadia.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, you might be muted. We're not hearing you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. I have a comment with regard to number eight, with regard to transparency where our recommendation is to have [inaudible] publishes. In the European Data Protection Board letter, they mention that of course [inaudible] is necessary and [inaudible] is security obligations and whether it's in [inaudible] compliance with the GDPR. But also, it takes that – it's up to ICANN and other [inaudible]

participating in the [inaudible] system to ensure that private information is not disclosed to unauthorized entities. Well, I understand that this is only speaking about [inaudible] information, it does not speak about the authenticated users. However, I'm not sure that really, we need to publish the data. I wanted to hear more about this from you, Greg. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Sorry, there was a lot of distortion on Hadia's line so I'm not sure I got everything, but I think I need to look at the European Data Protection Board letter, try to strike a middle ground here in terms of access. Well, there's really kind of two issues of transparency. One is list of authenticated users, and the other is actual logs of requests.

The publication of the logs of requests, to my mind – there's two things. One is – and I guess the third thing is whether there's transparency in terms of reporting to a registrant who is seeking their information essentially in real time. Of course, that is a significant issue with regard to any kind of abuse investigation, criminal investigation, infringement investigation, etc., because the last thing you want to do is have it be known that you are essentially on to them and that you figured out that there's an issue associated with that domain and that needs to be investigated. I'm sure that would make it very difficult to actually resolve the issue or to resolve larger issues that could be caused repeatedly by the same malfeasors.

I think it's [inaudible] the idea at a high level of incorporating transparency requirements is good, but it needs to be consistent with both GDPR and the [inaudible] goal of not undercutting the legitimate interests that are being exercised. I don't know if that's helpful. And Hadia, if you have any language to suggest, since this is otherwise pretty much a complete document, I think it would be great to have that. And obviously sooner rather than later.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No. Actually, I don't have any language to suggest right now. And yeah, I'm fine with this unless we [inaudible] it again and maybe come up with something. Yeah, thank you.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks, Hadia. And obviously, not the last anybody has heard of this point, especially given the vague nature of this entire framework on a lot of these sorts of details and how this is obviously going to come up either in the EPDP or whatever comes after that. Mindful we're running short on time, the next section is on terms of use, and the idea obviously is that every authorized, eligible users would have to agree to terms of use. These would include procedures, safeguards, limitations. [This is] appropriate.

There is an issue that comes up here that WHOIS data must be used for the purposes for which it was provided, at least in terms of GDPR, which

is an Achilles heel I n the sense that the definition of purpose has to be defined in a way that allows the access, that kind of goes back to Volker's comment which, bless his heart, Volker is quite consistent over time in his position, but I think what he calls mission creep is really more his attempt at what I would call mission chop. But we're not going to resolve that discussion now.

And the whole issue of unauthorized third parties is brought up here in terms of something [inaudible] come up in the terms of use. There's a lot that needs to be resolved here. Clearly, sharing of the data beyond the actual initial recipient needs to be considered in terms of the type of legitimate use. It's not only going to be something that's going to be executed in the loneliness of a single user.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Greg, we're going to have to wrap up soon, so if you could please go through the last points, and then we'll have to follow up when we meet face-to-face in Barcelona.

GREG SHATAN: Fair enough. So I think that [inaudible] the rest of it kind of is back and forth about how to develop terms of use. Again, kind of the same problem that the GAC and the user groups and [lack of] multi-stakeholder involvement kind of repeatedly a problem. Obviously, terms of use should have safeguards [inaudible] they need to be developed appropriately.

Monitoring and enforcement of compliance is an issue, and we'll have to see how that is dealt with. Then the last part of interest is really community comments where there were issues raised, how granular [a] legitimate interest needs to be, whether data full WHOIS data must be returned in response to a query. We kind of dealt with that already.

And to some extent, these have been dealt with before, but because of the nature of the way that report is written really needs to be dealt with one more time [to show you what] our answers are to these questions which are being posed to the community. And so we should, rather than give them 30 seconds of lip service here, need to deal with the Appendix E section and make sure that we've accurately reflected community views. But again, I've tried to do so based on everything I've seen before and take a nuanced and end user-centric view of this. So with that, I'll wrap up and see if there are any final comments, and then look forward to hopefully finalizing this in Barcelona. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg. The floor is open for any further questions or comments on the points that Greg has come through. I note that Jonathan has had to jump off. We are reaching the end of this call. Thanks very much for this, Greg. I'm not seeing any hands at the moment or anyone there, so I think that – [let me] just hold on one second, there's a bit of noise. Okay.

GREG SHATAN: I do see one question from Justine in the chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: What is the justification why the list of authenticated users would not be published? The access model document is short on justifications. I'm not sure what it is, but we've objected to that from an ALAC end user standpoint. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Greg. I'm not seeing nay other hands up, so thanks for taking us through this part, and for drafting it, of course. We'll have a more extensive amount of time face-to-face where you can take us again through this and also answer any further questions.

In the meantime, we've reached the end of our call today. There are two items still remaining. One is Any Other Business and the other is regarding the next meeting. Now, in Any Other Business, I just wanted to add that Bastiaan Goslings had sent an e-mail that he was ready to help also with drafting in Registration Directory Services WHOIS2 Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations, and I understand also that he was ready to help out with the consumer trust review and consumer trust and consumer choice review team, so if he could be marked on these as being able to help. And of course, holding the plan of the draft final report of the second Security and Stability Advisory Committee Review.

Any Other Business? The floor is open if anybody needs to bring anything up to the attention of everyone on this call. I note that Greg mentioned that there needs to be distinction between lists of authenticated users and the logs. Log access raises more concern.

Right, the discussion is ongoing in the chat. I'd like to thank everyone for being on the call, and the next call is actually not going to be a call but we'll meet face-to-face. Yesim, I'm sorry to put you on the spot, I should have asked you, when is our face-to-face meeting? Is it in the morning of the – I can't remember, morning of the Sunday? [Perhaps] you would know.

YESIM NAZLAR: Let me pull the ICANN 63 agenda up so we can see the time. It will be 1:30 PM to 3:00 PM on – let's see which day is this – I believe Sunday. Yes, Sunday, 21st of October.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sunday, yeah. So Sunday, 21st of October, and of course, these are local times, so 1:30 to 3:30 – or 1:30 to 3:00?

YESIM NAZLAR: to 3:00, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And that is the UTC+1, I believe, because the clocks are changing. Or are the clocks not changing yet? It all gets very confusing. No, the clocks will

be changing the Sunday after that, so it is UTC+2, which effectively means that it's 11:00 UTC – or 11:30 UTC. Am I getting this right?

YESIM NAZLAR: 11:30, yeah. That's right. UTC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: UTC for those people who are not joining us face-to-face. Right, well, thanks, everybody, for coming on this call. It's been very interesting. We managed to catch up on a number of things, and so for those people flying to Barcelona, have a very safe travel, and see you in Barcelona, for others, and see you on the Internet. And hopefully, you'll be able to join us on the Sunday remotely. And I'm sure that Jonathan and I will be very careful in making sure people who are participating remotely will have an equal chance of being able to participate as those people agitating their card around the room.

And with this, thanks, everyone. This meeting is now closed. Take care. Good morning, good afternoon and goodnight.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Goodbye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]