MICHELLE DESMYTER: Welcome, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, and welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group call on Wednesday the 19th of June 2019. On today's call, we have Alan Greenberg, Alberto Soto, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Eduardo Diaz, Glenn McKnight, Gordon Chilcott, Hadia, Holly Raiche, Joel Thayer, Jonathan Zuck, Maria Korniiets, Maureen Hilyard, Ricardo Holmquist, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

We have apologies noted from ... And we have got Sébastien Bachollet, my apologies. Apologies noted from Sergio Salinas Porto, Bastiaan Goslings, Joanna Kulesza, John Laprise, León Sanchez, and Tijani Ben Jemaa. From staff, we have Evin Erdogdu, and myself, Michelle DeSmyter, on call management.

As a reminder to everyone, please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking, to avoid background noise. Thank you, and over to Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Michelle. Welcome to this consolidated policy working group call. This is the last one before we are actually going to be meeting face-to-face in Marrakech. So today we're going to have a call that is going to be dealing with the usual items, starting with ... And I'm just looking quickly on a tiny little screen.

Starting with ... If we can scroll down, please. Our action items, of course, but then we'll start with a consolidated policy, the work on the EPDP, expedited PDP. Hadia Elminiawi and Alan will be providing us with the latest details, and certainly work on the feedback that is required to be sent by the 21st of June. Then, after that, we'll have ICANN65 talking points from Jonathan Zuck.

And I believe that there are some ... If we scroll down. And I'm just working off that screen now, at the moment. Policy comment updates immediately after that. I'm not sure if there's so much to be done in that. And then, finally, there's feedback on phase two, and then any other business. Are there any amendments or changes that should be made to the agenda?

And I'm running off a mobile at the moment so I'm hoping that I can see the hands going up. I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment, so the agenda is adopted as-is. And let's then, please, go to the action items from our last call on the 11th June. There were three action items that were yet to be undertaken, and the one that doesn't appear to be ... No, they're all ticked, actually. Strange. I'm saying strange because it just shows strangely on my page.

So, Abdulkarim Oloyede volunteered as a penholder for the evolving governance of the root-server system, and Evin was to send a reminder for the CPWG, of course, for this follow-up on EPDP2. I don't think there's any comments on this. Are there any comments on any of the action items? I'm not seeing any hands up, so then let's swiftly move on to the next part of our agenda, and that's the expedited PDP, where we have a

statement that is due in by the 21st. And Alan Greenberg, I understand, is with us. I think, is Hadia also there?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia is also there. So, I'm not sure who wishes to take this. I see you have a couple of slides [cross talk].

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll take it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Olivier, if you can allow me, before going through to Alan I wanted to talk about the first item, and I don't think we have agreed, and we finalized who will be the penholder for the evolving of the governance of the root-server system. For the moment, before deciding on that, we are waiting on the feedback from Bastiaan Goslings about what we may do, and after that, I suggest that we decide who will be the pen-holder on that. And please leave that open for the moment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Sébastien. Bastiaan was unable to join us today. I have seen other input in other places saying that we do need to come up with a statement, maybe supporting the current process for the root-server system's governance, but let's pick this up when we deal

with the overall policy comments if that's okay. So, let's turn over. I heard Alan wanted to take this point on the EPDP, so then let's turn over to Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, and I posted a comment and a proposed statement yesterday if we could have it on the screen. While we're waiting, there has been a discussion both among the members and alternates, and on a CPWG call a while ago, on what we would do with this. The overall proposal was to say that this is just not something we can address in any detail, because they were essentially asking for a pass of what are we suggesting to answer all of the questions that the CPWG will be looking for, in terms of access by third parties?

And we said the proposed answer was that we're not in a position to answer this right now. We do reserve a right to contribute as the process goes ahead. There were two specific items that we were going to make a comment on, and there was also a discussion on whether we should comment on what is known as purpose two. That is the access by third parties, or disclosure to third parties, depending on who you're talking to.

That was a recommendation that the board did not accept. They did not accept it because of cautions from the European Data Protection Board, that we are conflating ICANN's purposes with the purposes of third parties. Both I and Hadia have taken the position that that is not conflating, because normally third parties, for their own reasons, want access to data. In some of the cases for third parties, they want access to

data because ICANN essentially has delegated to other groups some responsibilities associated with maintaining a safe and secure DNS.

Therefore, for some third parties, it is actually ICANN's public interest needs that are being satisfied. However, this was not agreed on even by the members and alternates, and there were other people who also weighed in on the call.

And since this question was not explicitly asked in this call for input, I'm recommending that we do not include it at this point. There's just no way to get closure on it in a way that everyone would be comfortable with. And so, I reverted to just saying we are not making general comments, but reserve the right, and have two specific comments. Now, if we could pull up the document. If we can simply go to the Wiki page, it's there at the bottom. I did see the Wiki page a moment ago.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: One moment, Alan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, Alan. Can I ask you a quick question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, while we're waiting. And Holly has her hand up also, I just noticed. Go ahead, Jonathan. I'll take you, then Holly.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. It makes sense not to comment on that SAC about third parties now because they're not asking. But that feels like a really significant issue to be pushed back. Do you have a sense of the path forward? Is it rewording it to be more similar to what you've just described? Like, third parties that are engaged in supporting ICANN's mission, or something like that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I can't speak on behalf of the people who said they would object to it. Maybe rewording would make them more comfortable, or maybe we're never going to get closure on that one. I don't know. I also have to get a sense from the board, at least from board members, whether this is something they'll willing to pursue or not. They may just be more comfortable in taking the European Data Protection Board position and not rocking the boat. Alright, so if we can scroll down a little bit. We're looking for the sentence starting 'the ALAC' ... That's it, okay.

So, essentially, we're saying we're not going to answer this consultation because the consultation was echoing all of the charter questions associated with the third-party access question, and there's just no way we're going to formulate a specific answer. Nor do I see the real merits in doing that. But we're saying we reserve the right to have our members address these issues as they come up.

There were two issues that we talked about commenting on. One is unredacted data elements. There are a fair number of elements associated with registrants' names. There's registrant name and organization, there's registrant contact fields, which is essentially

telephone number, the real e-mail address, and all of the addresses associated with the paper mail address, their technical contact, which is technical name and e-mail address, and, I believe, phone number.

And then there are a few other redacted fields, which are really registree-type things, but they're there. And what we're suggesting for this draft was that instead of looking at all the elements one by one, and there's about 15 of them, that we group them together.

Interestingly enough, Steve Crocker is working with a group of people on a framework for coming up with policy decisions on these things. Not an implementation, but a framework on the policy. And his group also came up with something very similar to this. This is, you can group these fields together and make your job a lot easier, without really impacting privacy.

So, that was one suggestion which we can either include or not. The second one is for the office of the chief technology officer, and there has been some discussion on whether they should be able to get data, and under what terms. If ICANN was a regular data controller under European Data Protection law, they would already have the data and it would be useable for research. That's an implicit part of GDPR. But since we don't have the data, physically, we would have to request it from a contracted party, then we seem to need this provision.

And we're suggesting to keep it simple. We don't know what the chief technology officer will need in the future. The day you need data, you certainly don't want to start negotiating. So, we're suggesting that moving forward, that the chief technology officer's office simply has access to whatever data they need. Subject, of course, to the

requirement that they not disclose it and pass it on, and things like that. This was one of the phase one items that was deferred into phase two. And with that, I'll open the floor first for Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, Alan. The ... Oops. Am I muted now, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I'm just really puzzled how there can be a purpose that somebody has for accessing data that is not part of the purpose for which the data is held. Because if you're telling somebody we need your content to get the data in the first place, and the consent involves knowing what data is held and how it will be used, I have no understanding how some third party can have a different use and get access. It just doesn't make any sense to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Two parts to that answer. Number one, I'm suggesting we drop any discussion of that in this comment, so I'm not sure your question's relevant. But the answer is relatively simple. GDPR says you can access data for whatever your need is if there is a lawful rationale for doing it. And you do that without getting the explicit permission of the data subject. That's one of the terms under which data can be used, that is, access by third parties who have a good enough reason to justify it.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd go along with that, but what you told at the beginning is there will be lawful uses which include X, X, X.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct. No, you don't have to know ahead of time all of the lawful uses. They just have to be able to justify that the use is reasonable and justifies disclosure. It's the whole balancing act that is within GDPR. But I'm suggesting that we don't talk about it. So, it's a good discussion to have, I'm not sure we need to have it in this timeline for a statement that we want to issue by Friday unless you wanted to put back that clause.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, look, I'm fine with what's here. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, it's just a little niche, but ... I guess it's maybe only in your slide, but you say any data requests for research of threat analysis, do you mean 'or for' there? Okay. I didn't know if it was that confined. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: That looks like a typo. Hadia? Hadia's hand is down.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, I'm here, thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I was just going to comment on Holly's question. So, as you mentioned, her question here refers to the comment that we decided not to include them in our statement. However, what Holly is saying, actually, is covered in GDPR by article five, I think it's 5 D, not sure, it's purpose limitation. But in all cases, you know, data can be ... Third parties will need to have their own purposes for disclosure, but those purposes need to be local purposes, and if we apply purpose limitation ... Or, we need, it's not an 'if'.

Of course, we need to apply purpose limitation. We will need to go back to access ICANN's purposes and make sure that the disclosure or the processing is compatible with the purposes. But that does not mean that the third party's [inaudible] need to be the same as ICANN's purposes. No. They will need to have their own purposes for disclosure, but those purposes need to be in-line ... The processing activities need to be in-line with ICANN's purposes. So that's basically purpose limitation, which, definitely, we will take a look at in the end, to ensure compliance. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see no more hands. Is Maureen on the call?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen is on the call. Maureen, how do you want to handle this? At this point, there are no more comments from this group. I think this is about an innocuous a statement as we can make. You can either tell us that we should simply submit it ... Remember, this is not a formal ALAC statement. They're asking for input from the ALAC.

So, we can either submit it, Hadia and I can submit it on behalf of the ALAC, you can subject it to a consensus call, either a very short one prior to Friday, or one after the fact. How do you want to handle it? I think all of those options are open to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi, Alan. Yes, I've just been listening in on the conversation, and I think there is some agreement of course that as you say, is an acceptance of the comment as it is. And I'll just go with whatever you advise that we need to take it and get a consensus vote on this. Let's do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, essentially, we're taking this statement as-is, with appropriate wording changes into a number two to make it make sense. And the current version on the web of two, this must have been captured yesterday, or perhaps from my e-mail. The current version of two actually defines what OCTO is, just to make it clear.

Everyone on the EPDP knows, but just to make it more understandable, I've defined OCTO. And I'll clear up the wording on the research on threat analysis. And Hadia and I will submit it on behalf of the ALAC if that's a reasonable way going forward. And I think, Cheryl, Maureen is saying she agrees.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, Cheryl, I do agree. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then we're done. If there are no further comments, and I think we did it in under 20 minutes. And just for the record, I've got to drop off the call for a few minutes, or at least, I won't be listening on the call for a few minutes, but I will be back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan. And thanks for this efficient part of the call, which allows us, therefore, to move on to the next part of the call, and that's going to be the ICANN65 policy workshop, and over to Jonathan Zuck for this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess I saw a little sub-category, so maybe there's a discussion of the schedule as well or something like that? I don't know, but ... And you probably need to mute again, because we're getting the strum beats.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have muted, so I'll mute.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, cool. So, the ... Gosh, I don't actually know what's on these slides. Let's go to the next slide. Yes, we probably don't need to show these slides. If you want to bring up the talking points, that's probably the best thing. I need to follow up. I got a call from Eduardo today while I was out on the bike, and I forgot to call him back. But it sounds like Eduardo and Glenn are conspiring to do something very similar to what I was planning to do, so we need to merge our efforts at some point via a call. But there's an updated draft of the ICANN65 talking points that is now out on the Wiki.

And so, it's just been a question of trying to bring it down and make it shorter, etc., from what it was in the last draft. I made an attempt to address the points that Sébastien made on the last call, with respect to these points. But I do encourage everybody to go back and look at them on the Wiki and make sure that you're happy with them. And so, the plan will be to present these talking points very early in the week. It'll be the second session, basically, or the second half of the first session. And we will go over the talking points, and then look at the calendar for the week and what sessions there are, and take volunteers to attend those sessions around ICANN, and present the relevant talking points.

And then we have a session at the end of the week to debrief on how that went. Did you get a chance to bring them up? How were they received? And are there any action items for us? And I think Glenn is trying to add

something on top of that, which is the ... Glenn and Eduardo are trying to add something on top of that, which is to write up a little report on it.

So, that's the overall plan, is that there's a session at the beginning and a session at the end dealing with the talking points, and then hopefully everyone leaves that early session with an assignment of the session they've agreed not only to attend but to raise their hand and to raise that talking point in that meeting. So, that's the idea behind the talking points.

I don't know that I need to go through these again with folks. I probably don't need all my time, and I know everybody wants to keep this to an hour this time around. But I guess I encourage everybody to take a last look at the Wiki, and if there's anything that feels contradictory to positions we've taken in the past, or if you think we don't have consensus on it, then please let me know, because we only want things that we've already reached an agreement on to be in these talking points.

Because, ideally, people will be saying the At-Large consensus opinion on this is X, etc., instead of just giving their personal opinions in various meetings. So, that where we're trying to get to. Sounds like Justine's already on that, that's great, thank you, in work-stream five. And so, what I may do, given that we're not going through these point-by-point, is that you have homework, which is to look at these things because you're going to be expected to deliver them during the meeting next week.

Eduardo, do you want to come on and explain what your plan is with Glenn, and then we'll figure out what the best way is to combine these efforts? Because I think they should naturally get combined. Why don't I give the microphone over to you, Eduardo, or Glenn?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I can explain, and Glenn can fill up any gaps. Basically, what we're doing ... This is a pilot project, and what we're doing is we look at the schedule that is the policy schedule that ALAC put for Marrakech, and we went through all these sessions, and we look at the people that are attending ALAC, and we invited them to participate in reporting on specific sessions.

And just a paragraph would provide us some guidelines just to help people filling up the report. You know, one paragraph, main points, you know. Is this important for ALAC? What's your take? And whatever else you want to say there. And that's it. And we are assigning this only one per person, no more than that. Maybe two, like Xavier is in the gTLD Subsequent Procedures, he's going to attend two of those, so he's going to report on that.

So, that's basically the gist, what this pilot project is all about. And if these points are going to be disclosed and assigned to people to go to those specific sessions, we can add those sessions in the report, and no problem with doing that. And then you have it in one place.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eduardo, is this just NARALO, or is this something you're trying to reach out to people?

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is just for At-Large ALAC members, nothing else.

JONATHAN ZUCK: ALAC members?

EDUARDO DIAZ: ALAC and At-Large in the sense that whatever regional leaders are there and are participating in this meeting.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, so that is the ICANN travelers, basically. The people who'll be there.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, we have the same audience, so we don't need to hash it out now, but we should definitely combine our efforts so that we're not making cross-assignments or something like that.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, well why don't we do something? I'll talk to you offline, and we can think that way, okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sounds good.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, bye.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Cheryl's got a question.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I certainly have. Having now looked at my invitation, which came in in my overnight, I'd like to know how my assigned topic was assigned. What is the assumption that I'm available at that time? Yes, I know the e-mail says I would be able to change it, but I for one am in very few of the ALAC sessions as advertised. I'm in a lot of ATRT sessions. I'm in a lot of sessions in the GNSO council because it's my job to be in the GNSO Council, and in the high-interest sessions.

But I am actually, this time around, in very few of the 'ALAC policy sessions'. Including ones that I will have to quite literally go from one room to the other to just do a five- or ten-minute presentation when I'm slotted in in the ALAC room. So, I am looking at what I can or can't juggle, but random assignments of sessions can be fraught with danger. At least if you're trying to get into my calendar.

I also want to know who the 'we' the pilot is for. I understand it's for the travelers, that's great. Happy to comply. I'm actually happy to do it. But I also want to know what is this pilot? Is it under outreach engagement? Is it under the ... I'm just not aware of this pilot, and I'd like to know who I'm working for, especially if I'm going to break my back doing it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eduardo, do you want to take that verbally? He says outreach and engagement.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, this is Glenn's idea that I believe comes from the Outreach and Engagement group, and he was thinking about idea, and say, well, I said to him, I can help you in doing this. You do the [curation], I do the scheduling, and let's see how it goes. So, it's from that group. Thank you. I don't know if Glenn is online, or he will like to ... I don't know. I see him there, but I don't hear him. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eduardo. Also, I guess, just for clarity, and this may just have been a language thing. You're saying the calendar of At-Large policy sessions, and that's not what you mean. I think you mean the policy sessions that are going on around ICANN, such as ATRT, and such ... Or do you mean the ones literally that we're holding?

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is a calendar that is published in ALAC, which I am linked to. And those are the sessions that I used, I didn't use anything else. But again, I'm just thinking people will go to ALAC sessions, and if they are going somewhere else, then let me know. Because I don't know what people are going to. There are parallel sessions going on while ALAC is in a meeting, so maybe some other people are going somewhere else. I don't know. That's part of scheduling.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I just wanted to figure out what the universe of sessions was that you were talking about. We'll take it offline, and then we will confer with –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jonathan –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] session. Go ahead. Somebody was speaking, and they stopped.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, there you are.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It seems to me, seeing as I've been assigned a session which is the 'what impacted At-Large has in this meeting'. That's the session I've been assigned, that it's running off the ALAC sessions, which, for me, is pretty damned useless, because I will be virtually in none of the ALAC sessions. But, anyway, that means that there's no opportunity to raise talking points because that's our meetings talking to each other.

I would've thought the reporting-back value was very clear for meetings that are the other ones. But, anyway, you guys work it out. I'm going to respond to this e-mail, and the answer will be 'I can't do that session', and I don't know how you think you're going to guess which one I can do, but we'll see.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think we'll reach out to you, Cheryl. So, I'll get with Glenn and Eduardo, and we'll get some clarity on this. Does anybody else have any questions? Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, I was just trying to unmute myself here. I just want to say that when it was actually suggested to me what was actually being prepared, I actually quite liked the idea, because I think it's a little bit based on what has been tried before, when we've wanted to get the travelers to these meetings a little bit more involved in what is actually happening for At-Large within the ICANN meeting. It was trialed, and I think very few of us actually took advantage of the opportunity to report back on what we felt we got out of a particular session for At-Large. This is probably a little bit more formalized, and assignments have been given out.

I'm sure that, particularly in relation to Cheryl, trying to find any five minutes of your time within such a confined week is going to be virtually impossible. But sessions can be reassigned, and that kind of stuff.

But I think that the overall thing could actually compliment the evaluation that you're actually doing at the end of this week, was, you know ... Like, what was the impact of At-Large at these meetings? And I think that that's actually probably a really important question because that's what we're being queried about. So, if we can find whatever which way to show that, in fact, At-Large is making an impact wherever they go.

These talking points are going to be absolutely superb, and everybody's on the same wavelength. So, I think that whatever way we can actually find to be involved, that's really good. And I'm sure that Cheryl's topic can be reassigned, and if there's anything that she can contribute to the At-Large, especially in the ATRT3, would be valuable for inputting. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Maureen. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I think what Glenn and Eduardo are doing is great. It seems when I read your e-mail that I could not say, no, I don't want, or I want something else, or I can't do, or [inaudible]. It's not a big deal, they offer proposal, and we are still free to accept or not. I think it would be very useful. The second point is that I guess they don't have all the people

who will be traveling to the meeting, and maybe we can add some additional people to the task.

And if there are other meetings where we as a group want to have a report by one or the other, it could be a good way to ask both Glenn and Eduardo to do these additional topics. And the last point is that I don't think that it's the same thing what you are suggesting, Jonathan, but it could be linked together, maybe you can use the same type of resources and see how each works, because at the end of the day, we will be ... I don't know, 25, 30, 35 people doing the job, whatever is assigned to us. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Hi, sorry, tried to unmute myself. A few points. One is, similar to what Sébastien just said, I actually think that what Eduardo's proposed, and what Jonathan's trying to get through with the talking points, are two ends of the spectrum, or same spectrum. Well, Jonathan's point is we are sharing what At-Large's and ALAC's positions are, whereas I think what Eduardo is trying to get at is rapporteuring the sessions that people attend.

And the second point is, I put in the chat already, but I have proposed to Eduardo four questions for his template, which is ... I've lost it. It's on my screen, somewhere. Yes, just read the chat. Something to do with asking the rapporteurs whether there's any specific issue or action that At-Large

or ALAC should consider taking up based on the outcome of the session. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Justine. Cheryl, that's an old hand, I think? Is that right?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Look, no, it's not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm just interacting, and I'm about to give up on the interacting on this matter. I'll e-mail them back and tell them when I am and am not available on that issue, which is for half of the meeting if not less than half because I've got to be with an ATRT3 meeting for half of what I've been assigned for. So, right, I can probably do it remotely just as well. The point I wanted to make is, we've now got into Holly saying why blog, etc. There are a bunch of ways people can report.

I assumed from this pilot project that the audience for these reports would be ALAC and At-Large. So, I just want to check that that's the case. That's certainly ... My thinking was that's the case, but if it's for a wider audience, then how I respond to questions like Holly's changes. So, help me understand who the audience for these reports is. Or is it just for

going up on a page that, again, very few, if anyone, will ever read? Which is why we canned it.

When I started it back in 2007, I believe, it didn't last for very long because we found, quite literally, of the few people who were handing in the reports, even fewer of them were reading any of them, and the page was almost unvisited, other than by the people who were loading up their report. Anyway, just tell me who the audience is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. Again, I think this probably just requires a little bit more conversation offline. I think one of the purposes of both of these initiatives is to both increase and somehow be able to report on the At-Large presence at the ICANN meeting. And so, I would think that in some form or another this will result in something that's more public, that gets used in the context of discussions about At-Large and a reform, etc., as a result of the review is to be able to have a little bit more information and data about people's participation across the board. So, whatever the initial audience might be, at some point some larger version of this ought to be more public for that purpose. But Glenn has his hand up.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, hi, everybody. Just wanted to mention, on the first day of the Kobe session I did this, and there were 16 people logged into the session, where I was doing copious notes. Similar to what I do for Diplo when I'm at IGF. And a lot of people liked it, and they added additional information as well. So, I said, okay, it's a fair amount of work for one person.

Let's see how we can share the pain. We've seen over the last few years ... We used to have a page where people would do their daily reports on what they did, and that has been frittered away. I really see very little of that anymore. A couple of people like Maureen has done an excellent job in doing a report, but very few of us do it.

So, my particular idea was, people were already in the meetings already. It was less structured than what Eduardo ... Eduardo took the idea, and as an engineer, he did a lot of improvements. He did the schedule, he did the approach. And he assigned names. And it wasn't meant to assign certain names where it could catch people off, Cheryl. I don't think he intentionally put you on the spot that would cause a problem if you were at another session.

That's the problem with, I think, when you assign with not really an idea of what other people's schedules ... And I don't think it was done intentionally, it wasn't in malice of forethought. But it is an issue. As I said, I was much more loosey-goosey with the idea, that people would much more anarchist in the approach, and that people would just volunteer.

And I do understand where Eduardo was going. So, the idea was very simple. A couple of paragraphs, summary. You're in the room already. If you're somewhere else, important meetings, I'm sorry. You can't make it, and no one's going to blame you for that. It's not meant for that.

So, the idea, in part, is for people who couldn't go, our membership. Particularly in NARALO, we really, over the last four years, doing a newsletter and other communication, we really want to keep people informed and raise their awareness of what's going on. Especially leading

up to our eventual other general assembly, that we'll do in Seattle. So, that's in essence, and maybe Eduardo wants to explain.

But on his approach, it definitely was a different approach, and I didn't use the word pilot. But Eduardo, as a professional engineer, he has a different approach. Not to say it's bad or good, it's just that it may piss a few people off. It's not meant to be. It's meant just to increase the communication.

And I think Maureen understands this, because her, like myself and others, Mamadou and a number of us that have done this as curators for Diplo, we see the value of it. And no one's going to put any guns to anybody's head, they have to do this. So, that's just my two cents. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Glenn. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll first give a disclaimer. I came back onto this call half-way through this discussion. I'm rather sympathetic with what Cheryl said about let's not load work onto people if no one's actually going to be using it. Now, Glenn said something interesting. Glenn said that when he tried this, there were, I don't remember what he said, a half a dozen or a dozen or something, people logged into his space and watching. Were those people at ICANN meetings, or were those people somewhere else? If Glenn could answer that then I'll go on with my comment.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: There were a lot of people that were in the room. At least half of them were in the room during the session. There wasn't a lot of lurkers from remote. But I would say the majority were within the room, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, I guess I have a question now. What is the benefit of someone watching how you're reporting if they're in the same room? So, I don't want an answer to that, but I think we need to think about it. Number two, if they're in a different room, why aren't they concentrating on what's going on in that room? And now, if, as with the case of Diplo, you're talking to people who aren't at the meeting, that's a different issue altogether. But if this is being focused at people who are at the meeting and may even be in the same meeting room, I think we have to think about what it is we're achieving.

And the related part is, I typically have competing sessions in almost every time slot. Now, I may be unique, but certainly in my case, most meetings I go to I'm actively participating. Whether I am listening intently, or perhaps commenting, and I'm part of the discussion, and I'm not sure we want to have people ... Maybe other people multitask better than I do, but say, take a break from what's going on in the room to report on it.

And if you're sitting in the room and just listening, that's a different issue. But hopefully, our people are doing more than that, in many cases. So, bottom line is I think we need to think, what are we really getting out of this? And if we're asking people to take on extra load, are we impacting anything, or are we doing something ... Asking them for more than we're

really going to get out of this? I support the concept completely, but I worry about the implementation and details. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Glenn, is that a new hand or old hand?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, it's fine. I'll take it down, it's okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, folks. I guess we're doing some experimentation here, but I think, as Cheryl has said in the chat, that part of this is also to create some accountability for travelers as well. I think that we might be able to handle some of this verbally in our wrap-up meeting, and we'll see how that goes, and maybe get people to write a paragraph after work.

But I think as Alan suggests, you shouldn't take your eye off the ball while you're in the meeting, other than to make brief notes that might turn into something later. So, thanks, Glenn and Eduardo, for coming up with this, and we'll work together to figure out how to make it as tight and as efficient as possible. I think, then, that is it for that, and I go back to Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And now we're going to go to our next part of the agenda, which is going to be the policy comment updates. And I guess we have to go back to Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go for it, Evin.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Jonathan, thanks, Olivier. So, we have recently ratified by the ALAC evolving multi-stakeholder model, and that was unanimously ratified by the ALAC, all voted yes to note. And also, the CPWG submitted feedback on the NomCom review implementation. And there are quite a few public comments now out, open for discussion. There are two closing in June, the first being Non-Contracted Parties House election procedures for board seat 14. That closes on the 24th, the first day of ICANN65.

And the second closes on the 30th June, which is Study on Technical Use of Root Zone Label Generation Rules, and this is usually a topic that ALAC does not comment on. And then the next three close at the end of July, on the 26th. Those three are the Proposed IANA SLAs for Publishing LGRs and IDN Tables, revision to the ICANN by-laws regarding SSAC and RSAC leadership, and Fundamental Bylaws Amendment Proposal IANA Naming Function Review.

And then finally, there are two closing in August, one being Draft Financial Assumptions and Projections and Operating Initiatives for the development of Fiscal Years 2021-2025, and the Draft Final Report of The Second Country Code Names Supporting Organization Review. So, if you'd like to discuss those?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think so. I don't think we have anybody ready to have a discussion about those points.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Oh, okay. Alright. So, then there's three ...

HOLLY RAICHE: I've got my hand up.

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

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm just saying, I'd probably be interested in looking at the one about the root zone and reporting on that because Maureen has put me onto the committee, the C ... I've forgotten what it stands for, the CGS ... Anyway, I've got to be sitting in and listening, so I'm on a pretty steep learning curve, and I think part of that may be feeding into this one. So, I'll kind of tentatively ... It's the study on Study on Technical Use of Root Zone Label Generation, I've got to be sitting there listening to this anyway.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We don't normally ...

HOLLY RAICHE: I know, but I'm just thinking ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We don't normally make ALAC comments on those things, though.

HOLLY RAICHE: I understand that, I'm just putting up my hand to say, I probably am going to be in the thick of it, and I may have something to say. Just flagging it. Okay?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nice one, thanks, Holly. It's great if you read it, and then if something comes up that we ought to be paying attention to, then ...

HOLLY RAICHE: That's what I'm thinking.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let us know and we'll get it on the agenda. It just historically hasn't been something to comment on.

HOLLY RAICHE: I know, and, look, I've got to fly in five minutes anyway, so my premature apologies, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, no problem. Okay. And Bastiaan is [inaudible] until August, but he's going to get back on governance of the root server system. I think we've

committed to doing some kind of a statement on that in basic support, given our meeting with them, etc., so I think that that's in good process. What ... Eduardo, you've got your hand up.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, thank you, Jonathan. I sent an e-mail to the CPWG and I think it's important for us to start talking about the DNS over HTTP, even though isn't here, and we should work on that, and advise the board on what we think it will affect implementation or how it will affect ... How is it affecting the end-user or even ICANN? And I think we should start talking about that from now and not wait for someone to write something for us to comment. And the advice should go to the board, not the GNSO, any other ... Just to let them know. That's my recommendation for this group.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eduardo. You'll see that I've drafted some quick talking points in the talking points document, so again, I encourage people ... I've added that just to a very high level, but I added that to see what people's comfort level is, for sure. And I think we will need to get a conversation going on DoH. It's come up quite often. There was a session on it and we ended up switching it out for Geo Names because that was more imminent, but it's definitely on our agenda to discuss. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. So, two things. First, on the evolution of the root server governance system. I think Bastiaan's going to be out of action for a while. This is something that's got a long deadline. We're

looking at the 9th of August 2019, but I would be happy to help out with this statement. We do need to write something about it in that we just need to encourage what's currently going on. I mentioned the history of it before that.

Secondly, with regards to DoH, Vittorio Bertola, who is a EURALO representative, or EURALO member, from ISOC, Italy, has presented a paper and webinar a few weeks ago. In fact, there's also going to be, for anybody who is interested in following this remotely, a session at EuroDIG tomorrow at, I believe it is 09:00 UTC. You just go to EuroDIG.org's website and you can go and see the live stream. That will give you a pretty good insight of what DNS over HTTPS is, in case you're not aware of what it is.

And that will then also help us with putting together a point of view on this when we meet in Marrakech. I spoke to Vittorio today, and I understand that he will also be present in Marrakech, so if there is any interest then I could certainly make sure that he would be in the At-Large room at the time when we're discussing this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, thank you, Jonathan. So, I just raised my hand to support what Eduardo just said, was that always asking does a DNS over HTTPS have an effect on end-users or not? And the answer is certainly yes, it does have a direct effect on end-users. And so, DNS over HTTPS is certainly a good

thing because of the encryption, it prevents a man in the middle attack, and the logging and the monitoring of IPs and networks in between, but you still have logging and monitoring of the big browser companies who'd be in charge.

So, there are many questions. Is it better to have the logging and monitoring done by four or five big companies like Google and others, or is it better to have it done by many? And also, it does affect users in terms of limiting the choices they have and also it does affect competition for sure.

So, yes, it does have a direct impact on end-users, and at some point, I think we need to discuss it. And finally, I would say that I do think DNS over HTTPS is a good thing, however, the way it's going to be implemented will determine if it's really going to have the good impact that we want, or it will deal to other problems. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. Yes, I don't think it's any longer controversial whether or not this has an end-user impact, it for sure does, and it's definitely on our agenda to discuss further. Like I said, there's some straw-man talking points in the talking points document. So, take a look at those, and if we don't agree on them, please reach out. Thanks. Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Jonathan. Just to let everybody know, we already gave this notice to the board in the last meeting with the board from ALAC and the board. We raised this point, Holly's raised this point, for one of the ALAC

ones. We're aware of this, and the board was made aware of this problem by ALAC in the last meeting. So that's not something we are not aware of, as Eduardo says. Everybody's aware of this. RSSAC, they just shared from RSSAC info about two weeks ago with this [problem. CENTR.] Everybody's now aware of this, but at the last meeting, we were the first ones who raised this with the board. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Ricardo. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Another thing is going on on that topic of DNS over HTTPS. I think we need to, if it's not already existing, to have a Wiki page and to create this topic. Maybe there are people more versed to create a topic, but if you want me to do that, I will do. I think it's important to follow what is done in different groups, and not just the one we do, and in competition with the other RALOs, or with the other people within the At-Large, but to try to gather all of the information we can from the different regions.

I know there are a lot of different things going on on a CC level, either at the regional level or at the national level. And there are things going on in GAC too. Therefore, if we can create the topic, and evolve that on one page, it would be easier for us to find our way on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien, that's a good idea. Staff, if you could take an action item to get a discussion page going on alternative DNS transport, let's get some threads of conversation going over there, for sure. Alright?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Jonathan. One important piece, it's not, for me, before ... It could be a discussion, but what is important is we have a place where we put all the documents, we can [have] presentation, or document that was done on that topic. So, one from the center, the presentation from NARALO, the presentation from ...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Like a resource center, sure.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, resource center. And if we can have also on the same page, or another page, discussion of one would be great, but both, we need.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, exactly, but thank you, Sébastien, for the clarification. Okay. Thank you, everyone. And that might be it for this agenda item, Olivier. So, it's back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Next on our agenda is any other business, already. So, any other business from anyone? Going once, going

twice. I'm not seeing any hands up. So, if that's the case, we're going to be finishing this call early.

The next meeting is going to be after the ICANN meeting. We usually take ... Well, everyone takes a week off after the ICANN meeting, so I think we'll probably have to follow up with our usual rotation, sometime in July, and I'll let staff work it out, what date will work. I'm not quite sure when everyone goes back home, but probably in the second week. Is it the second week of July? [inaudible] I can't see the calendar with two phones. It's too small-scale.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I believe the meeting ends at the end of June, so people will be home the first week of July, and then maybe we'll have our call the second week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Second week of July.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] tenth of July, because for me it would be Thursday the 11th of July, just so you know. And if you give me the UTC time in rotation, I'll [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Cheryl. There appears to be a time posted right now. Does that work for you?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Could you repeat, please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's posted in the chat, 21:00 UTC.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not in the Zoom room, I'm in another Zoom room, running another meeting, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. Wednesday 10th July at 21:00 UTC. And that would be the [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That will clash with anyone who has anything to do with ATRT3. So, that's Sébastien, Daniel, me, Vanda. We've got our ATRT3 plenary rotating into that time slot at that time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. What about ...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 13:00 UTC?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 13:00? Let me go back to Monday. 13:00's currently clear.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Does anybody else know of conflicts at that time?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 13:00's clear, but only for an hour.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well, thanks, everyone. Well, if it's just clear for an hour, I'm sure after having spoken about so many things ad infinitum, and I understand that many of the deadlines for policy statements are towards the end of July. Probably we'll be able to run a call for one hour. But who knows, we might have a lot of new topics turning up, starting from the ICANN meeting ...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We thought today's call would be an hour as well. Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It was an hour and ten minutes, we're not doing too bad.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Evin ... Sorry, Olivier. Evin, back in the comments, I have it in my head that there's one that due on the 9th July?

EVIN ERDOGDU: 15th, actually. Excuse me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, there's nothing that would be before this meeting? That's what I was just asking.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Correct. Just the ALAC feedback on EPDP phase two.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

EVIN ERDOGDU: But that'll be...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, that's great. Alright, thank you very much. Sorry, Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Jonathan. Thanks very much. Thanks to everyone who has attended this call, and for those people traveling to Marrakech, see you in Marrakech in a few days' time. Make sure you pack a lot of light clothing. I understand it's going to be very hot out there. But reminding for people who haven't been in Marrakech before, some of the rooms

can be absolutely freezing too, so make sure you also take a jacket or something, or at least something to put around your neck, just in case.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes. From the salon to the [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly. So, thanks, everyone. And for those people who are not going to be in Marrakech, you can of course at least follow remotely, and of course, get involved remotely. Remote participation works really well in the ... Well, it has in the past, so we'll have to see. Thanks, everybody. This has been a great call, and this call is now over. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]