
GISELLA GRUBER:

We are now officially starting the recording and interpretation of this call.

Good evening. Welcome to the LACRALO Monthly Call on Monday, the 18th of February at 23:00 UTC. On today's call, on the Spanish call, we have Sergio Salinas Porto, Harold Arcos, Mónica Trochez, Raitme Citteri, Adrian Carballo, Carlos Leal-Ni, Lillian Ivette de Luque, Antonio Medina Gomez, Maritza Aguero, Litto Ibara, Alberto Soto, Rodrigo Saucedo, Fernando Velazquez, and Aida Nobila.

We do not currently have anyone on the English Channel, but Dev Anand Teelucksingh has just joined the Adobe Connect and will be very shortly joining us on the English Channel. We do not have anyone on the Portuguese channel at the moment.

We have apologies from Maureen Hilyard and Ricardo Holmquist. From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Rodrigo Saucedo, and myself, Gisella Gruber.

On today's call, we have Spanish, French, and Portuguese interpretation. On the Spanish channel, we have Veronica and Sabrina. On the French channel, Aruelie and Jacques, and on the Portuguese channel, Bettina and Esperanza.

If I could kindly remind everyone to please state their names when speaking not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other two language channels, and also very important to speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

interpretation. Thank you very much and I will now hand it over to the Chair of LACRALO, Sergio Salinas Porto. Thank you. Over to you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: We have a tight agenda for today. We have a webinar, a workshop. So I would like to ask the secretary to begin with the agenda. So Harold, please. You have the floor. Go ahead.

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay, so in the agenda for today, we have comments by our ALAC member, Humberto Carrasco. Then we have a presentation by Dev Anand Teelucksingh. He will be talking about the status of the Stakeholder Tool and he will also perform a demo, a demonstration, of the ICANN Stakeholder Tool.

We also have the LACRALO plan for the Fiscal Year 2019 and then we will have any other business. Some members of the community have requested to add an item on the agenda, and then at the end, we will have the webinar by Marika Konings. She is a Vice President and Policy Development Support at the GNSO so she will be providing us with information on the EPDP. And then we will have our usual GSE survey in relation to the webinar.

So if there are no comments or any other business to add to the agenda, if that is the case, please let me know. Otherwise, Alberto, I see you have your hand up. So Alberto, is there anything that you would like to add?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes. I would like to know about the training course, the leadership training course we were discussing with Sergio and [inaudible].

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay, so we will be adding this item to item number seven on the agenda so that the Chair of LACRALO may speak about this.

If there are no further comments, we will approve the agenda for today and we will begin with our call right now.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Harold. Is Humberto already on the call? I see him on the AC room. If that is the case, I would like to give the floor to Humberto for him to begin with item number four. These are comments or the updates in relation to ALAC. So Humberto, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Can you hear me okay?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, Humberto. We can hear you okay. Please go ahead.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: So first of all, I would like to greet the region members and to thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the topics being dealt with in ALAC. There are some public comments that are open. So let me say

that there are five topics that are now open for discussion. We have the one topic in ALAC which is related to the operating plan for Fiscal Year 20 and the five-year operating plan.

So there was a statement approved by ALAC and there is a statement being draft that will be posted on February the 14th. And taking this into account this statement, this comment is closed, but we have the opportunity to provide public comments for the operating principles for Fiscal Year 20 and focus was made on the linguistic surveys or the language services. This was submitted to consultation and there is a special mention for the transparency and accountability team. So there is an important point here because the interested parties were involved in this statement. Focus was also on the development on policies and advisory policies.

And they're also mentioning the review, the At-Large Review plan. This, of course, involves the interested parties, the stakeholders, and their participation. They also mention ATLAS III in Montreal. There is also a reference to the engagement and coordination of ICANN regarding Internet.

There is another item related to the supporting organization review and the support of the different stakeholders. This is [internal turn].

There is an additional statement that is being voted in ALAC. ALAC is reviewing the operating principles and the budget for Fiscal Year 2020. There are two slots available as well for outreach activities. This has to do with the working session in our community and this is what we are discussing and voting in ALAC.

I would like to mention that there was a vote carried out in relation to the first stage of the EPDP process that is a draft. I'm not going to go into details but there is going to be a webinar and any question or comment related to the EPDP process will be discussed at the end.

There is a comment closing on February the 19th. This is a consultation on the two-year planning operating plan that is another public period closing and this has to do with the operating standards for specific review.

And on February the 25th, there will be another public comment closing and this is for the initial report on the CSC effectiveness. So these are the topics that are public right now. We don't have enough time in our meeting, so these are my comments, Sergio and Harold. Thank you and I'm open to questions. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Humberto, for your comments. And I would like to know if there are questions or comments regarding Humberto's comments. If that is the case, please let me know. Otherwise, I will proceed with item number five on the agenda.

So if there are no comments, we will proceed with item number five, and this is the report on translation tool and the ICANN Stakeholder Tool developed by Dev Anand Teelucksingh. And he has ten minutes to discuss this.

When we speak about the translation report tool, let me remind you all that we had an issue with a statement that was drafted by the region

regarding the [WT-5] because there was some part of the region that was not aware of this topic and this was because of translation failure in our system. So based on that, we decided not to circulate this statement because not everyone was updated on that topic.

So having said this, I would like to give the floor to Dev. He participated with us in some meetings. So Dev, please go ahead. You have the floor.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you very much, Sergio. So just to update everyone on the LACRALO mailing list issues, I posted a link on the LACRALO [inaudible] in the chat, which goes into the long background which I suspect many of you have been aware of about the translation tool.

So since the new translation tool has been deployed in late 2017, in 2018, it's been noted that several e-mails have been going missing, meaning that e-mails ... So what is happening is that as much as sometimes 20 e-mails a month has been missing on the English list. It seems to be primarily coming from e-mails on the Spanish list are, for some reason, aren't being sent to the English list.

So this has been raised as a sort of urgent issue in December. And in January, in fact, we had two calls. One was the Technology Task Force and also with the LACRALO leaders as Sergio said earlier.

And well, fortunately, [Marcus] said that the developers that were working on the program had to leave ICANN, but they have now gotten a new developer within [parts] with staffing literally in late, in February actually, this month.

And that person is now becoming familiar with the program and the code and trying to see what is the issue. So there will be a Technology Task Force call on Wednesday at 20:00 UTC, which the discussion will be focused on the translation tool and possible workarounds or approaches.

So I will stop there and see if there are any questions about the mailing list tool before I go on to the Stakeholder Tool.

Okay, seeing no questions. I see there is a question. Go ahead, Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Dev. I am a bit concerned because I would like to know if we are going to succeed in this. I mean, for the sake of LACRALO's present and future, we need to have a more fluent communication and we are not having a fluent communication and I believe this is one of the most important issues. I mean I'm talking about English and Spanish languages. We are having some problems and I believe that we need to address this and solve this issue.

I know that the solution is not on you. But perhaps we can do a follow-up of this and you may give us your point of view, perhaps, on this issue.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Sergio. I agree this is really a worrisome issue because ... and I made my viewpoints clear on the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee call. And the statement that the Finance and Budget Sub-Committee that the ALAC, I believe has started to vote on now, includes some

comments regarding the tool that needs to be addressed rather than left to the wayside.

I know ICANN keeps saying they have priorities and issues coming up, but this is really important to the region. So hopefully, [inaudible] why will it be successful? Well, until we try, we won't know until we're successful. But I do believe that I think a solution can be found because I have suggested on that call with the LACRALO leader that suggested several things to the ICANN's IT staff, and on Wednesday, we will be going through those options as to whether they are viable or not. So I can give an update after the Wednesday call. Okay? That's it.

I see also Maritza is also asking for the floor.

Maritza, if you're saying something, we're not hearing you. Okay, well, I'm not hearing words on the English Channel. I don't know if she's speaking on the Spanish channel.

MARITZA AGUERO: Hello, can you hear me?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes, we can hear you.

MARITZA AGUERO: Thank you very much. I have a question regarding this translation tool. When we send an e-mail in the Spanish e-mail mailing list, there is a message popping up and it reads that the message cannot be translated

and then we are redirected to the inbox because the message cannot be translated. But there is a translation into English of the message.

I know this is appearing on the matrix, but the question is are they working on a correction on this issue? Are they working on the issue to solve this situation?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Maritza. Yes, that's also been an issue I've been raising with ICANN's IT staff as well. So yes, that issue is also being looked at and if you go to the link that I clicked, that I posted in the chat, you'll see both issues are documented: the one regarding the missing e-mails from one list to another, and a better identification, a better error message because, well, when people get those error messages, it's kind of hard to figure out where the problem lies and one of the things I wanted to suggest to ICANN is can this be improved? Can this error message be improved? Or can we overcome the issue that it's reporting on, the sentence punctuation issue?

So hopefully with the new developer, progress can be made in fixing this, addressing that issue, as well as the missing e-mails which is also very important. That's it.

I see ... Well, I don't know what's the time situation, but Alberto Soto wants the floor. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Some of us make a mistake many times and it has nothing to do with the system, I believe. We are typing in Spanish, but we are using the

English interface and vice-versa. This is what we are doing in our mailing list, and that, of course, affects translation. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks for that, Alberto. And yes, that aspect is also being looked at. So again, I don't want to spend too much time on this because we are going to get some feedback on Wednesday and I will report back to the mailing list about that. So I think I want to move on to the Stakeholder Tool because I know time is short.

Okay. Is that okay, Harold and Sergio?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Yes, Dev. Of course. We agree. We think it's fine, so if you could kindly move on to your next topic, that would be okay. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, thank you. So [inaudible] slide to go through and explain what the Stakeholder Tool is. Can I be given presenter's rights so I can advance the slides or can staff do the next slide? Okay, thank you very much. Lovely. Thank you.

So just to give some background behind this. So the Outreach and Engagement Working Group of At-Large was looking at ways of doing effective outreach. It initially started off as we wanted analyze the fellows that have passed through the fellowship and whether it could yield persons that could be potential members of At-Large.

Okay, and how do we know where to target outreach? What are our gaps? And for places that didn't have an At-Large presence that other stakeholders were not [inaudible] contacted, and who were those stakeholders?

So all that information was scattered all over ICANN's website amongst the [biggest] ACs and SOs, and that made it very difficult to find and tedious to find. And so in most cases, it wasn't being done at all.

So to overcome those challenges, I've created what we call the ICANN Stakeholder Tool which allows you in one location, to identify who are stakeholders in a country and in a region, and what are the [inaudible] in a country and a region?

Okay, so currently, the tool tracks by country and by region, At-Large representation, both the At-Large structures and individual members, membership in the ccNSO, membership in the Government Advisory Committee, members in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, as well as the other ACs and SOs, including from the Commercial Stakeholder Group, as well as the fellows and Next Gen students.

So the tool works by collating all of this different information directly into the tools, meaning it's reading directly from the ICANN website and pulling it into the tool so there is less manual re-entering of information and also, it's able to then be up to date without manually the tools. And part of the [inaudible] will come several challenges. One example is that the different ACs and SOs use different names for the same country and territory, and so the tool will have to take that into account. And well, we'll move on to the next slide.

So this is a slide and we may need to go full screen to appreciate this. What this shows is that ICANN used a drop-down to ... In the yellow, is a drop-down where you could select any country and you will get a breakdown what's happened in what I'm showing for Argentina. You see that there is yes for GAC, yes for the ccNSO, yes there are 11 At-Large structures, 31 fellowships, five Next Gen students, and so on and so on, on the left-hand side. And on the right-hand side, you see the number of fellowships and when those [persons] attended those meetings.

So move on to the next slide.

And just also on the same page, on the left-hand side if you scroll down, you'll see the number, the At-Large structures, the NCEC organizations and so forth.

And this is just to go through quickly what this shows. This shows the Stakeholder Tool worldwide, so we can [inaudible] allows also for to select applicable region.

All right, as an example, I've selected ... The next slide shows the stakeholders in Latin America and the Caribbean. So green indicates there is presence of stakeholder groups and the red indicates the gaps.

So visually, you could look at this tool and then immediately decide what are our stakeholder gaps. We have no At-Large presence in several countries. We can then choose to have targeted outreach for that for particular events or using the regional outreach or CROP. So this was good.

The next slide shows another part of the tool, which breaks down in detail the actual listing of countries, the countries that have At-Large, the countries without, and so on.

And this is the final slide, which is quite dense, but this shows the stakeholder, the fellowship summary. And what it does, it sorts by the person and the total number of times a person has attended an ICANN meeting as a fellow. So the idea is that you can then look at this, decide can we get that person from our region involved more in At-Large?

Okay, so that's it. This was all done by me and the direct link to the tool is that link. I will paste it in the chat afterwards and there's also the Wiki page on the Stakeholder Tool.

So I will stop here and see if there are any questions. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you, Dev. I'm going to check if any of our colleagues would like to take the floor. I think this is amazing. This is really impressive. Great job. I think the region is very pleased that you had this initiative and that you have worked with such dedication, so I want to publicly congratulate you on this wonderful, wonderful job that you have done, Dev. Well done.

I see there are no requests for the floor and we are now going to give the floor to Harold. He is next on our agenda. He will be speaking about FY19. With that, Harold, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Sergio. Well, first of all, I am posting a link to the FY19 document so that you can access that document and today, we are going to issue a call for consensus either today or maybe tomorrow first thing in the morning and it will be open until 23:00 UTC on Wednesday or Thursday.

The purpose of this call for consensus is to allow for a deeper review and also to allow for further input and feedback on this topic. As you know, the point of the Fiscal Year, the Fiscal Year does not really encompass all our activities. We have other opportunities for engagement and outreach.

With that said, there are several things to be taken into account regarding this fiscal year. So we have ... We are sticking to the criteria that resulted from the At-Large Review and emphasis was laid on onboarding new participants, on recruiting new participants and on consolidating participants that we have already recruited. So you see a plan on the screens and the idea is to work together with the different working groups, the Capacity Building Working Group and the Outreach and Engagement Working Group, so they should work together so that we target all the ALSes in our region. So this is closely related with the At-Large Review implementation criteria.

And at the end of this document, you see that there are three key elements that are part of our proposal. One of them is an Internet governance event in Honduras and another event in Nicaragua. That event has to do with the Internet ecosystem challenges. And then we have another event in Panama that is part of the LAC-i-Roadshow and our GSE regional team takes care of that event, the LAC-i-Roadshow.

Rodrigo Saucedo is part of that team and also our Regional Vice President, Rodrigo de la Parra.

As you know, then, we have this support from the Global Stakeholder Engagement team in our region. So I will be sharing all this information. I will be circulating this by e-mail so that you can participate in this call for consensus and we can make this project come to fruition in our region.

And with that, I will be more than happy to take your questions or comments. Sergio, you have the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you, Harold. We are going to wait to see if we have any requests for the floor. If there are none, then we are going to move on with our agenda.

I see no requests for the floor, so we are moving on to any other business and one of our colleagues, Antonio Medina Gomez, had suggested a topic so I give the floor to our colleague.

The interpreter apologizes. We receive no audio on the channel right now.

So right now, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

RAITME CITTERI:

Okay, thank you. I would like to follow-up on a topic that was raised by Alejandro Acosta and this has been a topic that we have been discussing

on the LACRALO mailing list. It has to do with a proposal that, to my mind, is worth supporting and should be addressed, perhaps by a working group, and that has to do with protecting users' privacy. And this was raised in relation to Venezuela on the LACRALO mailing list.

So the idea is for this working group to have a course of action, a concrete course of action, that would go beyond rebutting ideas or positions. I believe that in this case, the most coherent course of action would be the one proposed by Alejandro Acosta. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Raitme.

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay, so Sergio was referring to Antonio Medina and the topic he had proposed for this part of the agenda, so we are inviting members of the community, the different working group chairs, Alberto Soto, any other member in the working groups, we invite them to join in this initiative to support the initiative proposed by our colleague, Antonio Medina Gomez. And then we also had Raitme's suggestion and proposal on our agenda.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Harold, I am back on the call. I don't know if you can hear me. I am back on the call. Can you hear me?

HAROLD ARCOS: Yes, go ahead, Sergio. We can hear you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay, I see that Alberto is requesting the floor and I also believe that Raitme wanted to take the floor to talk about the situation in Venezuela and also, we had Antonio Medina Gomez's topic or suggestion. So I believe we should give the floor to Antonio, then to Alberto, and then to Raitme.

I know or I noticed that Alberto was requesting the floor, so I don't know if he could wait or if he really needs to take the floor now.

ALBERTO SOTO: Harold invited me to take the floor and I have no problem at all to speak about ATLAS III. That was the topic.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Okay, go ahead, and we are now going to speak about ATLAS III.

ALBERTO SOTO: We have two groups working on the ATLAS III summit, but before that, this is a call for volunteers. And I must say we have plenty of volunteers focusing on the program for the ATLAS III summit. I believe that they will be holding their second meeting today or tomorrow. Then there is another group which I am a member of and we are divided in sub-groups, and our task is to define the different requirements to be met by the 60 supported travelers that will be going to Montreal.

Each group drafted a different list of criteria or requirements and the idea now is to consolidate all the requirements. The only thing is that we, in the working groups, are not going to be defining or determining who the supported travelers will be, and we will not be able to identify the supported travelers. They will be identified by a number so that no identification is possible.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Alberto, for this update. We are going to stay tuned for further update and I would like to say that everybody is welcome to give their opinion to participate. Our doors are open to participation.

I see Lilian wants to take the floor. Go ahead, Lilian.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LUQUE: I would like to say something else about the working group that is defining the ATLAS III summit program. We are also organized in smaller teams, in sub-groups, and we are working on ICANN Learn in order to select the training courses that the ATLAS III participants are required to take, and we are doing the same with the capacity building workshops.

We have a block schedule already and we are also working on other sessions and other topics. So this is a bird's eye view of what the group is doing. We are focusing, then, on the block schedule and on the capacity building requirements for the ATLAS III Summit participants.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Lilian. I see that we still have other topics to be addressed. Alberto wanted an update on the leadership training course and as you know, LACRALO has a working group structure and our working groups have been holding different meetings. We held some meetings last week in order to work in coordination with the LACRALO leadership.

We have our LACRALO Board and this week, the working group members received an invite to attend a meeting, and this will be a first meeting. It's going to be a 90-minute meeting, and during the meeting, we will focus on the strategies for the remainder of the year. Surely, well, as you know, all the working groups will be allocated a time slot to present their views and an update on their work. So surely, we will give an update on the course Alberto was asking about and also the training initiatives led by Adrian Carballo. And with that, I think I need to move on now in the interest of time. After Kobe, after ICANN 64 Kobe, we're going to resume our usual meeting for that.

So excuse me. I think there is another item on the agenda and there are any other business, I think it's what Raitme wanted to talk about. So Harold, I give you the floor, so that you can address this topic.

HAROLD ARCOS: Thank you, Sergio. Okay, we are now going to speak about Alejandro Acosta's proposal on our mailing list. He made two specific suggestions for the sake of the region.

He wanted to incorporate specific language and he focused on the memorandum of understanding signed by another RALO with ICANN and he wanted to take that MoU as a basis for a future course of action.

We are working, on the one hand, with staff and we are holding different consultation rounds. And our next step would be to consult Alejandro Acosta again to see what his proposal is. That is what is the specific language he wants to include?

So since this is his proposal, he should come up with a proposal for the region and we are going to move forward, of course, within permitted proceedings and procedures, and also we will go as far as the region wants. And fortunately, our colleague Alejandro Acosta, is not on the call but the regional secretariat will forward this request to him so that we can move on to the next stages in this process and so that he can submit a text proposal with specific language that would modify, would amend our MoU with ICANN in our capacity as a RALO. We are going to deal with this text after ICANN 64 Kobe, so we need to see if this proposal gets regional support.

So with that, we have concluded this item on the agenda. And Sergio, you have the floor.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you. We have now Marika Konings. So we would like to welcome here. She is going to deliver a webinar on EPDP. This is something very important for us. This topic should be of our interest. So now, we are going to give her the floor for her to deliver her presentation. So

Marika, it's a pleasure to have you here with us. So you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

MARIKA KONINGS:

Thank you very much and a special thank you for inviting me to join your webinar. I am the Vice President of Policy Development Support and responsible for the GNSO or Generic Names Supporting Organization, and I am one of the members of the staff, a support team that is supporting this effort.

As I put together a couple of slides to walk through and then I hope to have some time at the end left for any questions you may have.

And so I'm hoping to cover, first of all, a background and introduction to the EPDP, the timeline it's working against, a bit of the background on the initial report – it was published a while ago – and where things currently stand with the final report and then moving into the next steps that basically span over the next couple of [days].

So first of all, looking at the background of this initiative. This was an effort that was initiated by the GNSO, triggered by the adoption by the ICANN Board of the Temporary Specification that was adopted to ensure conformity with the GDPR that came into force on the 25th of May of last year. I think you're probably most familiar, at least, with the sequence of events there and the requirement to address the inconsistencies that proceed to exist between the original WHOIS requirement and the obligations that the GDPR imposes on data controllers and other responsible parties.

So there's a provision in the ICANN bylaws that allows for the triggering of a Temporary Specification, but that comes with the condition that within a year's timeframe, the GNSO Council needs to confirm whether or not that Temporary Specification is to become a consensus policy or not, and that immediately gave us, then, as well, the timeline of one year until the 25th of May to answer that specific question.

However, there is also a second part or Phase Two, as we've been referring to it, that is captured in the chart or for this effort, which deals specifically with a standardized access model to nonpublic registration data, and also covers a number of other items that were included in the annex to the Temporary Specification as items needing to be further discussed and considered.

So I said the phase one, and what the group has been focusing on now, only focus on those aspects and topics that are covered in the Temporary Specification.

So in order to deal with the time available for this effort, I think as you know, a typical GNSO policy development process, there is no specific timeline attached to it, or at least not an external one. But in order to be able to meet the timeline, the GNSO Council considered various ways in making this effort as effective, as efficient, as possible while at the same time, recognizing and adhering to the principle that the GNSO follows in its policy development activities by being inclusive, transparent, and accountable.

And as such, it was decided to work with a dedicated composition of the team whereby each of the GNSO stakeholder groups would have

allocated specific seats to fill in this effort and the invitation was also extended to all the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees. All of the supporting organizations and advisory committees, the ALAC, the SSAC, and the GAC, accepted that invitation and they each appointed members and alternates to this effort.

In addition to the members, there are also a number of liaisons that are involved to ensure effective and timely communication between the different parts that are also involved and affected by this development. First of all, the ICANN Board, which of course, originally triggered this effort following the adoption of the Temporary Specification. But the Board, of course, will eventually also need to consider the policy recommendations that come out of this effort.

And similarly, there are two ICANN staff liaisons that are actively engaged, first and foremost, to ensure that anything that anything that this group recommends is considered implementable and provide any kind of guidance on where potential issues are identified and also to provide the necessary background in relation to the Temporary Specifications and why certain provisions turned out the way they did.

And then there is also a GNSO Council Liaison that ensures that linkage with the GNSO Council who will, of course, have to consider the recommendations for approval as well, and then there is, of course, a [inaudible] effort that was appointed by the GNSO Council after expression of interest.

So that, I think, provides you with a full picture of who has actively participated. But having said that, observers are able to join the mailing

list in a read-only capacity. All meetings are recorded and transcribed so everyone has the ability to review those materials and we've also made available an AC view only room which allows, specifically, the alternates to stay up to date and follow in a live manner at the discussions as well as the chat of the group because I think, as you know, the group has been working on a pretty intense schedule of, at a minimum, two meetings a week, which of course, requires a lot of preparation and engagement.

So a brief look at the timeline. As said, this group was confined to a one-year time period for that phase one part of its work and you can see now that we're moving towards the end of that timeline. There was, of course, some initial start-up work and may be worth pointing out as well, we're referring here to an expedited policy development process and it's important to understand that it's not specifically referring to the overall timeline for PDP, but the main difference is in the initial phases of the work and the expedited timeline itself is really, here, the result of the external factor of the adoption of the Temporary Specification and that year time period that was available to focus on reviewing the Temporary Specification and confirming whether or not it would need to be adopted.

So the group is getting very close to finalizing its report and I'll talk a little bit more about that in a second. So once that has happened, it will need to go to the GNSO Council for its consideration. There is a subsequent public comment period. Assuming that the GNSO Council adopts the report, it would go to the ICANN Board for its consideration, which triggers another comment period prior to Board consideration and down here, the last set would be Board consideration before it

moves into implementation. So the red arrow is more or less where we're currently at, so the Board is in the process of finalizing this work.

As noted, this timeline does not include yet the phase two aspect of its work. It's not that the group is not ... I try not to start that part, but there is some. One of the requirements is that in a number of dating questions need to be answered before the group can commence its phase two deliberations, as well as non-objections from the GNSO Council that needs to be obtained.

It's currently foreseen, or at least being discussed and considered by the GNSO Council that an adoption of the final report on phase one would also trigger phase two taking off with initial conversations focusing on how to plan and organize the work as there are a number of topics that are contained in that phase two, as well as some interdependencies with other work efforts that are ongoing in other parts of ICANN.

So a little bit of background on the initial report that was published on the 21st of November of last year. As noted, a lot of time and effort went into that in a fairly complex timeframe as the group only started meeting in the beginning of August, and so there were a number of multi-hour conference calls in addition to face-to-face meetings that took place both at the ICANN meeting as well as the separate face-to-face meeting.

The initial report very much focused on an original review that the group undertook of the Temporary Specification that has been referred to as the Triage Report and provided draft responses to each of the

charter questions which were developed collectively, but also through small teams that worked on some of these items.

The groups spent a lot of time and that was one of the specific comments that the European Data Protection Board provided to ICANN Org on the Temporary Specification that was essential to provide more detail in relation to the purposes, the processing activities, the lawful basis, and data elements and responsible parties involved, so the EPDP time spent quite a lot of work documenting that in what is currently an annex and referred to as the data element [workings].

And it also tried to prioritize the work to make sure that the critical issues are addressed in this phase one. One approach this group has taken is really focusing on what is needed for GDPR compliance by the 25th of May, 2019, and what are some of the items that are not less important but could be dealt with in that space to as maybe some more consideration or research needs to go into it and it doesn't necessarily affect immediate GDPR compliance.

The report also identified a number of questions that were put out for public comment, and the group didn't hold a consensus call or identify consensus yet on the initial report. Although, there was agreement to publish it but with the understanding that especially some of the items where there was not yet agreement that those were ... Specific questions were identified and the community input was sought on those.

And so I said the report was published for public comment on the 21st of November and the public comment period ran right up until the holiday

period and we're very happy to see that there was broad interest in this effort and we got input from nine supporting organizations, advisory committees or stakeholder groups and constituencies, as well as 33 organizations and/or individuals that provided their feedback on the report.

So that takes us now to the final report and its preparations. So first of all, we'll talk briefly about the approach and then kind of cover what is in them in the final report and then move on to the expected next steps.

So in order to facilitate the review of the comments and input received, which is one of the obligations that every PDP and working group has, the staff support team prepared separate public comment review polls, as we call these, and I hope you are able to click the link here in the slide and otherwise, we can post it separately as well. We basically tried to group together and organize the comments in such a way that would facilitate the review by the group.

So based on those and as well the summary documents we prepared, the EPDP team went through all those documents and basically focused on the input provided. Did it warrant a change to the preliminary recommendation that was included in the report? The group was very keen to focus on any information that was new or argument that hadn't been considered before because as you can imagine with the broad participation and representation in the group, many arguments and positions had already been advocated and made, and certain cases had already been reflected in the report. So the focus was really on what new information was provided or what information was conveyed that had changed people's views on some of these issues. And those

concerns and proposed changes were then discussed in plenary meetings. We also had a number of small teams that helped digest and prepare the post-recommendations for how to address concerns, identify before plenary review, and that then resulted in an updated version of the final report.

Basically, in order to allow the group some time to review this report, we had several iterations of the final report as things were changing basically between meetings. The team, at the request of the group, started a quiet period last week on Monday, basically keeping the report static, already sharing that version of the report as well with the GNSO Council in preparation for their consideration, and basically, asking the EPDP team to review the report, socialize it with their respective groups, and especially focus on any areas where there were either errors, inconsistencies, or things that were forgotten [inaudible]. It definitely wasn't a moment to be open at previously agreed positions or recommendations. So the instructions were very clear on that.

And it was also a good time for groups to work on their statements which the leadership team had made clear that even though groups might expect their support for the report and all the recommendations, that shouldn't prevent groups from providing a statement to include as an annex to provide to the GNSO Council for its consideration and also have the context of some of the compromises that groups have made in order to get where we are today. And I'm happy to report that ALAC, I'm sure you know, is one of those groups that have provided such a statement that will be included in the final report.

That [inaudible] concluded on Friday of last week and we'll use this week. We still have two meetings scheduled tomorrow, Wednesday, to kind of discuss any issues that were flagged and brought forward during that period.

The latest on that, and it's really, I think the message went out probably an hour ago, the Chair together with the support of staff has tried to kind of group all those issues, identify together, and try to identify as well which ones of those items concern, clarifications or accuracy items and such should be considered for changes, but also by clearly delineated that from comments that were brought forward that were basically re-opening previously agreed items and where positions were expressed and others in the group just did not agree with. So the leadership team has tried to identify a path forward to get us to agreement on those final issues. But also they cleared that this is not about re-opening previously agreed to compromises, and [inaudible] all groups here have worked in good faith and everyone, I think, has made significant compromises to get where we're at today.

But having said that, of course, it's up to each group as well to, based on that assessment, to identify whether or not that changes the support that they have expressed for any of the recommendations.

In relation to the level of consensus, and again, we're still in the process of finalizing the consensus as a nation – and again, that's a task of the EPDP Chair, and then he has shared with the group in that same document, his proposed designations, and as well, some changes as a result of the comments that were received at the end of the quiet period.

So the couple that are kind of new, I think there are still some that we're trying to work through, but of course, it's the end of the day, the GNSO Council will need to receive a report in which it is indicated for all of the recommendations what level of support is achieved.

And the GNSO contacts are basically identified in the GNSO working group guidelines, the different levels of support that can be assigned to a recommendation. And again, that said the responsibility of the Chair to, basically, at the end of deliberations and where the group had settled on language for a recommendation to kind of call it and say, "I believe we have achieved consensus." And that allows, then, the group to react to that, to say either, "Yes, we think that's a correct assessment," or "No, actually, we don't agree with that because we think these, these, and these groups actually do not support it or we do not support it," and that then allows the Chair to reconsider its designation.

So it's that fear. For most of this, even for open issues, there is agreement of principle or some final tweaks of the language that are being discussed. So the hope is that those will be finalized during the conversations that the group will have today or tomorrow, and Wednesday, following which the report will be finalized and submitted to the GNSO Council.

Of course, as we shared an initial version with them, we'll be providing them with a redline version so they can hopefully easily see what changed between that version that was [inaudible] last Monday and the final version that is expected to be published on Wednesday.

So what does this report, the current version of the report, include? There are 29 policy recommendations included in the report. We've highlighted here, some of the main ones. I think the next slide has a table that identifies all of the recommendations, and basically, in short hand, the topic that they address, as noted, a lot of time was spent on factoring in the input that was received from the European Data Protection Board information to the Temporary Specification, and one of the comments focused on the purposes and we need to really make sure that those were framed appropriately and targeted the right level.

So Recommendation 1 includes seven identified purposes for the processing of registration data and there are a number of registrations that focus on the collection and transfer of specifically identified data elements, and as mentioned before, there's a lot more detail about that in Annex B which is included for illustrative purposes.

Then there are a couple of recommendations that specifically deal with this display and redaction of those data elements. We talk about the tree limbs of current ICANN concerns and policies. As you may recall, the Temporary Specification had a couple of appendixes that addressed existing consensus policies and how those would need to be modified in order to show compliance with GDPR. So that's also a draft in the policy recommendations.

There's a specific recommendation that puts forward a proposal and that has been referred to as the implementation bridge. It's this kind of notion that the Temporary Specification will expire on the 26th of May. But on the current timeline, the Board is expected to consider the policy recommendations in the April/May timeframe and following adoption

by the ICANN Board, there's always a period needed to translate those policy recommendations into contractual requirements.

So there is a period that could be potentially without any requirements in play, so this implementation which foresees that as soon as the policy recommendations are adopted and following the 26th of May, contracted parties can either continue with aspects of the Temporary Specification, or already start moving over to the policy recommendations until such time, the effective date for the new policy is announced, and then of course, all contracted parties will need to follow in the policy recommendations as outlined in the final report.

In addition to that, there are also a couple of recommendations that identify for the work to be discussed during Phase 2, and as I explained before, to a large extent, that's the result of this consideration of making sure that the priority here for Phase 1 was on GDPR compliance, but at the same time, recognizing that there are some topics that are important and need to be given due attention and as such, the proposal is that some of those are dealt with in Phase 2 of the group's work.

That said, I won't run through all of these. But this gives you, hopefully, a high level idea the different topics that are covered in the final report.

So what are the next steps? I think some of these I already covered and maybe I'll just focus on where we are today. So this week, we expect the final report to be sent to the GNSO Council, at the latest, by the 20th of February, so this Wednesday.

The GNSO Council has already a meeting scheduled on the 21st of this week, so on Thursday, and that will be the first opportunity for the

GNSO Council to consider the report for adoption. As I noted, the group shared a draft version and last Monday, and there was already a GNSO Council meeting last Thursday as well to walk the Council through the report to ensure that they are already familiar with it and allow them to ask any clarifying questions that they might have, and also already consider what the next steps from a Council perspective are.

So we anticipate that on Thursday's meeting. The Council will, first of all, review what changes were made between that version that was shared last week and the version that will be submitted on Wednesday and kind of make a determination of are the changes of such a nature that more time is needed to consider the recommendations or does the Council feel [comfortable] on Thursday to vote on the recommendations if it is [inaudible] the changes that were made are not of such a substantial nature that more time for consideration is needed.

So depending on that outcome, if the Council determines that more time is needed for Council members to review this and consult with their respective groups, there is a second meeting as scheduled that would be dedicated to this topic on the 4th of March. So that is basically the target date should the Council not feel ready to vote on the report this coming Thursday.

So once the Council has voted on the report and assuming it adopts the report, it would be sent to the ICANN Board for its consideration. That also triggers a public comment period as well as a notification to the GAP, to review whether the policy recommendations have any public policy considerations, and if so, the GAC is invited to share its perspective with the Board.

So following that, the Board will review the final report and its recommendations, as well as the input provided through the public comment period as well as any input the GAC may provide. And we anticipate that will be in the April/May timeframe, and that would then be followed by the expiration of the Temporary Specification.

What is not covered here and I did allude to that previously is that adoption by the IACNN Board does trigger, as well the formation of an Implementation Review Team that would work with staff to ensure that the implementation is consistent with the intent of the original policy recommendations. And there has been discussion, and there was a request or a recommendation in the report that that work would already informally start immediately after GNSO Council adoption as that would allow already for some planning and preparation, especially factoring in this implementation bridge that is foreseen in the report.

So I think that's in a nutshell where we're currently at. As said, this is just Phase 1 of the work. Phase 2 is expected to commence once the report for Phase 1 has been adopted and the planning would start for that. So the group is not done yet, but obviously, it has already done a lot of work and substantial time and effort has been dedicated to this initiative.

So when you see your ALAC representatives, I think you should give them a big hug or a big high-five and thank them for all the time that they have invested in this and in presenting the views of the ALAC and making sure your perspectives have been heard and considered.

I think that's all I have so I think we can go to Q&A, but I'll just leave this slide up to note that there is a lot of information available for those that are interested to learn more about this.

As said, the group has worked in a very transparent manner. All meetings are recorded and transcribed. The mailing list is publicly archived. As said, we've posted all the information on the Wiki so if you wanted to read more there, please have a look at that. As said, you can subscribe to the mailing list as an observer, listen to the audio cast or joined if you own the Adobe Connect in meetings. And of course, you're encouraged to provide any input you may have to the public comment period that we expect to funnel.

I think that's all I have. Happy to take any questions or any clarifications that people may have or any comments.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much, Marika. We're going to wait for a couple of seconds to see if we have any requests for the floor, if we have any feedback, comments, or questions. And if there are no requests for the floor, we are going to move on to our webinar survey.

However, before we let you go, Marika, I would like to let you know that this is the first of six webinars we will be holding throughout the year, one every two months. And, I see Dev is asking for the floor. I will give you the floor in a couple of seconds, Dev. But so I was saying we check attendance and there is going to be a prize. You can win a prize. The prize is going to be a visit to La Casa de Internet, the House of the Internet, and Dev has one that applies and we are really happy, really

pleased, that he is going to be able to visit La Casa de Internet, the House of the Internet.

We live in Argentina. It's a very close country, but it's very important for other members in the region as well. And with that, Dev, I give you the floor. Go ahead, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Marika. First of all, thanks for this presentation. I just also agree that this has presented a huge amount of work. I, myself, have not been able to follow all of the details, so really, kudos to them.

So my two simple questions. On the slide, I saw that representation. I could be wrong where they had representatives of the EPDP. I don't see the ccNSO. Was that the case? And if that was the case, is it that the ccNSO was excluded specifically or did they not want to participate? So that's my first question. Okay, yeah, because I didn't see ccNSO in there.

So my second question was that public comment review tool, is this signaling a broader change at how ICANN handles public comments? Thank you.

MARIKA KONINGS: Thanks, Dev. Happy to answer your question. In relation to your first question on why the ccNSO is not listed here and we had to force some other ICANN SOs and ACs that are missing, like the RSAC and the ASO. And actually, the invitation was extended to all ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committee. But several of them declined to participate and indicated that they would follow the deliberations and if

needed, provide input during the public comment period, but they didn't feel that it was necessary for them to participate actively in this effort.

So that is the reason why you don't see the ccNSO or some of the other advisory committees or supporting organizations in this composition list.

In relation to your second question of public comment review tools, it actually is not a new tool. It's something that we've been using in the GNSO already for quite a few years. It's a way in which we're trying to facilitate the review by working groups of input received.

And the way it works is we kind of ... It's not, we don't touch the comments or give our voice to it or summarize those. It's usually really a copy and paste of the original comment, but we usually try to organize it in such a way that input on similar recommendations or similar topics are grouped together so that it allows the working group or the team to review those together, and similarly, it also kind of forces a working group or a team to specify what changes, if any, did they make in response to the comments so that those who have submitted comments are also able them to see why didn't they make the change or what was the rationale for making another change that the person may not have suggested.

So it's actually not something new. It has been used before. I don't know if on an ICANN Org level and they are considering using something similar, but this is a very specific tool that the GNSO team has developed and has been using quite successfully and assisting groups,

digesting and addressing public comments. I hope that answers your question.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Marika, for your reply to this. Thank you very much. I'm going to check if there is any other request for the floor. I see none, so with that, Marika, we are going to thank you very, very much for your time. Thank you for helping us understand much more about this EPDP. This has been a very good, a very thorough presentation so thank you. Thank you very much, Marika. Thank you so much.

And now we are going to move on to the webinar survey. Silvia, you have the floor.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello, Sergio. Hello, everyone. First of all, I would like to thank my colleague, Rodrigo Saucedo, for his help in organizing this webinar and the upcoming webinars in this series. And also, special thanks to Marika for her very interesting and important presentation.

And now we are going to move on to the webinar survey. First question: Are you satisfied with the webinar? So if you can please reply now, thank you.

This is going to be very helpful for us to organize and fine tune our upcoming webinars in this series. I see that you are still replying. Okay, thank you. Thank you.

Next question, please. Okay, we are going to wait until a little bit until we see the following question on the screen. I see it now on the screen. Do you think that the speakers mastered the topic? Did the speakers demonstrate mastery of the topic? I see the question on the screen now. Very good. Okay.

We are moving on to the following question, please. Question three, how is technology used in the webinar? If you could, please reply. Thank you.

We are moving on to the following question, please, which is how many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? And you see the options on the screen. Thank you.

We move on to the next question on the screen, please. Please comment on the timing of the webinar. Was it okay? Was it too early? Thank you.

And finally, please suggest topics for future webinars. So please feel free to type in any topic of your interest. This is a six-webinar series. We still have five more webinars to go, so any topic suggestion is more than welcome. So I'm going to give you a little bit more time so that you can type in your replies. Thank you. Ideas, suggestions, what topic are you most interested in?

We are going to do our best to meet your capacity building needs. I see several suggestions, very good suggestions, very good topics. Okay. So I think that with that, we can conclude the webinar survey. I would like to thank you all for actively participating on this call. Thank you, Harold. Thank you, Sergio. Thank you, everyone.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Good evening, everyone, and good night, actually. Thank you all very much. Thank you to the interpreters for their language support. Thank you all very much. We are now bringing this call to a close. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]