
YEŞİM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call taking place on Wednesday 27th of November 2019 at 13:00 UTC. On our call today on the English channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Kaili Kan, Raymond Mamattah, Peters Omoragbon, Caleb Olumuyiwa Ogundele, Vernatius Okwu Ezeama, Kristina Hakobyan, Alfredo Calderon, Holly Raiche, Joan Katambi, Gordon Chillcott, Zak Muscovitch, Anne-Marie Joly Bachollet, Harold Arcos, Priyatosh Jana, Greg Shatan, Nat Cohen, Ejikeme Egbougu, Roberto Gaetano, Sébastien Bachollet, Bill Jouris, John McCormac, and Hanan Khatib.

On the Spanish channel we have Sylvia Herlein Leite and Lilian Ivette De Luque Bruges, as well as Alberto Soto. And we have received apologies from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Judith Hellerstein, Eduardo Diaz, Maureen Hilyard, Ricardo Holmquist, Yrjö Lansipuro, Oksana Prykhodko, León Sánchez, Lutz Donnerhacke, Daniel Nanghaka, Nadira AlArj, and also Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez and Justine Chew have informed us that they will be joining late.

And from Staff side we currently have Evin Erdoğan and myself, Yeşim Nazlar, present on today's call and I'll also be doing call management for today's call. Our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and Marina for today's call. And just a kind reminder to please state your names when speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And now I would like to lead the floor back to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yeşim. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking and I hope everyone can hear me well. Today's call is going to be dealing with a small change in the Agenda. First, we do not have a speaker for DNS over HTTPS so we're going to have to move this to a future call, perhaps next week or the week after. But then we'll start with the EPDP Phase II update from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. We'll have the ALAC Advice to the ICANN Board on DNS Abuse.

I think that Jonathan did mention that he was about to, he needed to go fast, so maybe we'll start with the ALAC Advice to the ICANN Board on DNS Abuse and then do the EPDP Phase II. Then we'll have a short introduction from Justine Chew updating us about the Subsequent Procedures. And then of course all Policy Comment updates, we can see there are quite a few listed in there. Are there any other changes to the Agenda or amendments to be brought forth? I'm seeing Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, we have the RDS Review comment is due next week I believe, the beginning of next week. And the PDP 3.0 is due today. So, we may want to allocate a little bit of time for those.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. What we'll do probably is to during the Policy discussions we will try and go through the other stuff as quickly as possible and then make sure that

we have enough time for these two topics, perhaps treating those two topics as a priority in our Policy discussions.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would be good. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great, thank you. Any other changes to the Agenda? Am not seeing any hands up. So, let's then take the Agenda adopted with the amendment that we've just made now and go directly to our Action Items from our last week, or the... Yeah, it is last week.

And there are a handful that are still there. One is to do with DoH, the Microsoft implementation. That, of course, is going to be pushed in a future call. And then we'll have a single issue call to be scheduled on the week of 2nd of December on ISOC selling PIR. Details are few and far between still now, so we'll find out. So, that's another one that we need to work on. Evin Erdoğdu to circulate recording of At-Large DNS Abuse session at ICANN66. Evin, I'm not sure whether that was done yet.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thanks Olivier. This is Evin speaking. Not yet, but as soon as we get the recording we will share it. So, it's on its way. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you. Jonathan to coordinate with Staff and ALAC Leadership on distributing GeoNames Survey to ALSes. That I think is still in progress at the moment. Jonathan Zuck?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, still in progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. And Hadia Elminiawi to work with Evin on drafting and submitting the ALAC Statement on Registration Directory Services and we're going to work on this later on in this call. Any comments or questions regarding the Action Items? Right, I'm not seeing any hands up.

So, yes, there is a question from David in the chat regarding discussions on .org is not on the Agenda. No, the discussion last week with this is it's probably a large enough topic that we need to have a single issue call on that and it's still quite early. There's a lot of information, contradictory information, flying around on the topic and so hopefully by next week we'll have a bit more clarity to have a more informed discussion and debate on this. And this is not an issue that is going away within the next week so rest assured there will be a big discussion going here at the IGF.

And so, sorry, I just heard someone who needed to take the floor? Okay, so I haven't heard anyone. So, right, let's then move to the next Agenda Item. And as I've mentioned earlier, the ALAC Advice to the

ICANN Board on DNS Abuse, Jonathan has to leave early so over to Jonathan Zuck for this please.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Olivier. Both Olivier and I had a meeting with the incoming Chair and Vice Chair of the Board, Maarten and Leon, about what advice would be well received on the DNS Abuse issue. And what was really sort of underscored by Leon was the need for us to make our recommendations specific to things that the Board could unilaterally do, which is a tough road to hoe and we have to figure out what those things are that they can do. And frankly, the things I came up with were direct Staff to do x, right, and I'm hoping that that's something that is still acceptable.

So, I'm thinking about splitting this into two parts. One was just observations and one was specific recommendations. And so, this first slide are some of the observations we want to make about DNS Abuse. And that is the status quo is insufficient, right? There's obviously those who would suggest that because some are engaged in best practices that the self-regulation is the best thing and that ICANN doesn't have a role, and I think that we really need to push back on that concept because it takes ICANN out of the role of dealing with the bad actors.

Just because there are good actors doesn't mean the status quo is sufficient. It just means that we need to make sure that whatever thresholds are set, etcetera, don't unduly tie up procedurally the good actors through a bunch of new processes the bad actors might not even

engage in, right? So, we need to find solutions and have real systemic abuse thresholds that are less likely to impact the good actors.

So, the PIR led best practices is a good start, but even they could go further to deal with systemic abuse, everything in their best practices is still just reactionary, it's not exploratory. The stuff that is happening with URID and Nominet where they're doing some real analysis for DNS AI Analysis appears to have like an 80 percent accuracy and I think that you should suggest that others look into that. But again, it's not something that the Board can mandate.

Good players don't obviate the need for intervention with the bad players. Systemic abuse is a persistent problem. Bulk registrations are a problem. And that no new round should be approved by the Board absent of substantial DNS abuse reform for both the Community and ICANN Org. So, those are observations. I'm happy to stop and take questions. Maybe somebody else could manage the que because my phone can't look at all that stuff at once. So, let me know if there's a... Maybe Olivier, let me know if you see hands up or anything at this point.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's Sébastien speaking. I guess if somebody else can do that because we have trouble with the Zoom for the moment. Olivier [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay. Sorry.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Staff can help us with that, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, Staff, if you could run the que that'd be great. Thank you.

ROBERT GAETANO: This is Roberto speaking. I am in the same room but with Zoom I don't see anybody in the que, anybody raising hands.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. So, next slide. So, the specific recommendations to the Board are to direct ICANN Org/Compliance to use the audit functions to root out systemic abuse. This was one of the CCT Recommendations. Direct ICANN Org to publish more actionable domain abuse reporting data.

Direct ICANN Org to establish lower thresholds for name and shame. For those of you that don't know, Compliance goes to great lengths not to name the actual contracted party in question until they issue a breach notice and so from the standpoint of Consumer Choice and people being aware of what's going, I think we want that threshold for naming who's involved to be lower. I mean, the concept of giving people a chance to correct things is a good one but having that go indefinitely hasn't been working.

And then finally, validate the insufficiency of the status quo. In other words, as the Board declarations say that in fact the status quo is insufficient and that reforms will be needed both contractually and

procedurally before any round can begin. So, that's more about asking the Board to make a statement.

So, those were some recommendations that the Board could take action on directly, and again I open up the que if you don't like any of these or you can think of some other recommendations we should make that the Board is empowered to do unilaterally.

ROBERT GAETANO: This is Roberto again. I see Holly Raiche in the que, and Alan Greenberg in the que.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, just a question. Have you reviewed the CCT Report and picked out the things that haven't happened but were recommended? Because those really should be on the recommendations. And the other thing I'd suggest is I would actually move the idea of direct registrations from observations to at least having a look at bulk registrations, based on not only what we were told in the poll, but some of what was said in the DNS Abuse Session in Montreal. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, thanks Holly. I think one of the biggest challenges we have is the Board feeling like a lot of the recommendations made by CCT are things

that need to be handled by Subsequent Procedures and other processes that are taking place inside ICANN because of the amounts of Policy. They're also nervous about making some contract commitments.

So, in honor of trying to get some kind of incremental change, I was trying to choose recommendations that in fact the Board could unilaterally sort of impose and so I'll go back through our recommendations from CCT to see if there's anything else that fits that rule brick, but that's the framework that I'm trying to use at Leon's request for this particular piece of advice.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. If you were at the DNS Abuse Meeting at the last ICANN Meeting, you heard Elliot Noss stand up and say he believes there are enough teeth in the current RAA to take action. ICANN has repeatedly said that they do not believe they can take action, they do not have the right tools. I think the only way we're going to resolve that problem is if we have active discussions and I think the Board should instigate those discussions, because they're not going to happen on their own.

JONATHAN ZUCK: In what form?

ALAN GREENBERG: Pardon me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: What form would you suggest they take? A CPWG kind of thing?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, no. I'm talking about discussions between Compliance, ICANN Legal, Registrars. If the Registrars in good faith want the problems to be solved and they now, some of them claim they do...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: And despite the fact they believe they're actionable, ICANN Compliance and Legal are not taking action because they don't believe they have enough, strong enough, provision in the contract, then we need cooperative measures to get those contract provisions there. And that's not going to happen unless the Board directs ICANN Org to have those discussions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, alright. I'll try to phrase something and report it to you, Alan, to see if I captured it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who else is in the que?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Bill Jouris.

ALAN GREENBERG: Bill Jouris.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Bill Jouris.

BILL JOURIS: Yeah, I wonder if on the name, on the thresholds for name and shame, we might want to say explicitly that you can start out with a high threshold and drop it over time. And I threw a comment in the chat, perhaps make a note that for some, it's not a matter of name and shame so much as a matter of end user warning. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. So, it's probably inflammatory to call it name and shame, so thanks for that reminder. I probably wouldn't use that term in the actual advice. But, yes, you know, provide sufficient information about

systemic noncompliance, etcetera, so that end users can make better vendor choices, something like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. There is Greg Shatan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are there any other hands up? Go ahead, Greg.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Greg Shatan?

GREG SHATAN: Hi, this is Greg. Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, sir.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Two comments. First, I think it's important to note specifically, whether it's an observation or we can make a recommendation around it, I'm not quite sure, that the DNS Abuse exercise kicked off by the certain contracted parties seems to be designed as much to say what they don't think is DNS Abuse in their narrow definition. And the RAA for all of their shortcomings has a much longer list, I don't have it in front of me to read off, of things that [inaudible] to abuse. [inaudible] a very short list of things that qualify as abuse and then a long list of

things where they're basically saying, "Get off my lawn, this is not... We're not going to deal with this.", and the like.

And many things on that passable list or that part of the list are important to end user consumer protection, safety, trust, all those things and you know, they're trying to really focus solely on infrastructure abuse and nothing else. That's very, to my mind, destructing of the real attempts to try to peer down the conversation.

In terms of recommendations, going back to what Alan was saying, I think we should even recommend that the Board commence a study of the RAA. I guess maybe that's where those discussions might go but recommend a study of how it could be amended in order to give Compliance the tools that it says it needs.

Although frankly, I think I might actually agree with Elliot that the tools are there but that the marshmallow armed Compliance Team tends not to want to use them because they're kind of zookeepers who are inside the cage. In any case, those are my thoughts. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Could you put those into an email for me?

GREG SHATAN: I can try. Hopefully it's transcribed as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, because I'll turn it around quicker. I'm on a phone, like I said. Again, I think part of what we want to stress is that mechanisms can be put in place absent of final definition of DNS Abuse. But at the same time, I don't have a problem with the At-Large taking a position on what we see as abuse if we have some consensus about that.

So, if we have that list from the RAA that's in that agreement already that we can say, you know, we want these things thought about as well, we can certainly put those in the observations, and I will try to capture what both you and Alan are saying about getting discussions going about enforceability in tools. Certainly, that's what James Bladel said in our DNS Abuse Session, that there were sufficient tools in Compliance hands now to deal with that accurately.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for that, Jonathan, and thank you for this input, Greg. Someone has noise in the background, an announcement, I don't know who that is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, it's me.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Jonathan, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Jonathan. You can mute when you're not speaking. Thank you. I do note that there are also some points made by John McCormac in the chat, so I would urge you, Jonathan, to look at the chat when you have the time to later on. It's a saved chat and there's some points being made regarding the different types of DNS Abuse, etcetera. Right, I'm not seeing any other hands up on this topic.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Will do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, where do we go next, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Olivier. I will try to make changes to these bullets and circulate them on the list. And I'll look at the chat for John's comments and I'll make another run, adjust these bullets, and then get whatever feedback we get and then I'll go from there to try to put it into prose.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you so much. Great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, the ball's in my court.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Right, well thank you for this and if you have to drop out and at some point, you have a good trip. We can now go to Agenda Item Number 4, and that's the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase II Update from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. I'm not sure who will take the floor today for the update. I certainly heard Alan earlier, but I see that Hadia is on the call, too. So, you work it out please.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I'll give a very brief report. I don't know. I don't think Hadia submitted any presentation, at least I haven't seen it. But I haven't looked at my email this morning either. Hadia, do you want to take it, or do you want me to?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, thank you, Alan. Just take it. I don't think I have much to add and certainly no, I did not submit any presentations because I don't think that much has happened since last call.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, okay. I agree completely. We're still working our way at building blocks. We spent a lot of time in the last week on things like what the response should contain, how quickly should there be a response, a lot of difficult discussion on how do we make sure that for urgent requests from law enforcement and others that there's quick response to registrars, and of course, do not want to commit. And we also spend a fair amount of time on financial issues. Who's going to pay for it and how are we going to pay for it?

The situation on all of these is being made very difficult because at this point we have no clue as exactly what the system will do, who will be doing it, and where will it be done. So, we're trying to come up with principles which apply in the general case where we're looking at various very, very different systems that they have to apply to. And I think in the name of trying to push forward, we're wasting a bit of time on this.

But in any case, there's nothing particularly relevant that we need to bring to this group's attention at this point. We're plotting on, we have a rather unusual Wednesday meeting next week to compensate for a meeting tomorrow that's been canceled due to US Thanksgiving. And I think that's about all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Any additional points, Hadia Elminiawi?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Just one point, that tomorrow an initial draft report is supposed to be out, and Staff is actually working on it. And a final initial report should be out by the 15th of December for public comment. At least, this is the plan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or that's the theory.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Alan, and thank you for this, Hadia. Any comments or questions from anyone? While people are pondering about this, I should just say that I have seen Janis here at the IGF in Berlin. He seemed to be very composed for someone who is pushing so hard at the moment for I don't know how many meetings per week. So, yeah, certainly good to see that things are progressing at some point.

I'm not seeing any hands up, so thank you so much for the update and we can therefore move on. Now, I do recall a note from Justine Chew that she will not be available for nearly the first hour, so what I would suggest is that we plow forward directly for the Policy Comment updates and then come back to Justine when she comes on the call. If I understand, Justine is not on the call yet, is that correct?

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Agenda Item 7, Policy Comment Updates, Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğan.

EVİN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. Evin speaking. So, we'll go through this. Recently ratified by the ALAC, there haven't been updates since the last week. There is still one public comment for decision. That is the proposal for future root zone KSK rollovers and this closes at the end of January. So, there's still some time to decide on this.

And current statements, of course, there are quite a few going on and with Alan's note as well we may prioritize discussions today. There were three noted that we would like to submit today. Jonathan just presented on ALAC Advice to ICANN Board on DNS Abuse and given any feedback on the mailing list there may be some flexibility when that is submitted, but that will be submitted soon.

Next would be then the invitation to provide input for PDP 3.0 implementation. This is not a formal ICANN public comment but the GNSO requested feedback from the ALAC and they granted the group an extension to submit today so this is nearly final and final comments will be collected today. And then draft PTI and IANA FY21 Operating Plan and Budget. Ricardo Holmquist has penned this, and this has also been circulated to both the CPWG and the Finance and Budget Subcommittee Mailing List and this will also be submitted today to ICANN public comment.

The Registration Directory Service WHOIS2 Review Team Final Report has been extended. The deadline has been extended for submission, so given that many Community Members are in the IGF this week it was determined this nearly final statement would also be granted some more time for comments so that we have until the 9th of December on that one.

Then Justine Chew is drafting a statement, I believe she may have provided comments as well already on the Work Space, regarding the Implementation Plan for the GNSO Consensus Policy relating to the protection of certain Red Cross names. And then finally there is an At-

Large Policy Platform in progress. This is an ongoing project from the At-Large Community.

And, as noted since there was substantial discussion on the topic, there is an At-Large Work Space regarding ISOC selling PIR. And a statement that Roberto Gaetano made on the mailing list has been put there just to provide some context and trigger some comments. But as Olivier noted many people are currently discussing this issue at IGF so stay tuned for more discussions regarding this. With that, I'll turn it back over to you, Jonathan and Olivier. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin. Should we hear from Holly? That sounds like you had PDP 3.0 stuff in the mix.

HOLLY RAICHE: I've got my hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, well, excellent. I can't see that, sorry about that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Holly, go ahead. I'll mute myself.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, just a really brief summary of where we're up to with the PDP. Justine's made some comments, so has Alan. It's an issue that actually started off when we talked about some of the response through MultiStakeholder Models, and a lot of the conversation that was had over probably three or four weeks of these Policy Working Groups had to do with looking at PDP 3 in the context of how do we expand participation. So, a lot of those thoughts have gone into the draft. Justine has added some comments directly about the PDP and participation.

What I added was, first of all, a look back at the GNSO 2014 reporting the first three recommendations from that report were about increasing participation, volunteerism. And the comments I would have to make would be, well, they just don't go far enough to include ALAC. I've made the same suggestions that I made almost [inaudible] when we had Brian on the call and he was really enthusiastic and said, "That's terrific, please put that down."

Really it's just a comment, or a bunch of comments, that hopefully are saying to the GNSO we really want conversations as to how to better involve the At-Large Community, recognizing the sorts of barriers that the At-Large Community faces, the language barrier, the time barrier, the volunteerism barrier, the lack of technical knowledge. So, there are strategies that, and I've just suggested a few, but there are strategies we can talk over with the GNSO to say, "You can help us be better informed and you can help us be better Working Group Members, those of us who maybe have the time. But really it's not that... My view is not that we are trying to say we have all the answers, but we do have some suggestions and we'd like to talk to you."

So, that's where I think where we've wound up, and thank you to both Alan and Justine for adding some of the fresh comments. So, I'm open to any... And by all means, people are... It's a bit late but if you have anything that isn't reflected in the comments, then now would be the time to actually add them, okay? Thank you. Alan's hand is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think it seems that we've lost Jonathan [inaudible]. So, we have Alan Greenberg in the que.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, in the chat, Olivier, you said the background noise is Jonathan. He's in a public place. But shouldn't we mute Jonathan when someone else is speaking then? I'm finding this almost unintelligible. Alright, thank you for calling on me. Two things, well, a couple of things.

I think Holly said, if I heard her correctly, that what we are asking for is for them to talk to us. I think they're really past the stage of talking to us at this point. I think they're planning to take action very soon, having gone at this comment from the other ACs/SOs. So, if indeed we're saying, "Please talk to us at some point in the future.", it may well be too late for that.

I would have been very, very worried about this not because of the bulk of what they're talking about but because of the issues on restructuring of the Working Group Model. We are spending a fantastic amount of effort in the At-Large Review and more recently with ATLAS to try to find more people interested in becoming active in Policy discussions. In

parallel with that, the GNSO is having serious discussions on limiting the ability of those people to participate. So, we could find ourselves in a position where we have lots of people who are active, willing to be active, but they're not allowed to be.

As an example, Justine has been a marvelous contributor on the Subsequent Procedures. On the other hand, according to some of the rules that the GNSO is looking at, she would not have been allowed to jump into this when she did. And we wouldn't have the benefit of that kind of participation.

So, at this point, the comments that I've been making have been incorporated and I'm happy to see them submitted. I just want to make sure that everyone here understands what we're talking about, that there is a potential for saying our participation may be severely limited and such that many of the contributors who have helped us could not have done and we may not be able to use the people that we're working feverishly to try to find to be contributors in the future. So, that's what at stake right now and I'm happy with this comment to be submitted as it is. Thank you.

One more comment, I made some comments in the comment area of the Wiki Page and somehow immediately I became assigned as a penholder. I think it's a really... I'm happy, you know, I'm delighted someone has that much faith in me, but I really believe it's a big mistake if simply by making a comment, which may be relevant or may be irrelevant, the person automatically becomes assigned as a penholder. So, just a note of caution going forward on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Hi, Marita Moll for the record. I just have a question. If while these two streams are going on at the same time, the Evolving MultiStakeholder and the PDP 3, if the PDP 3 ends up restricting the access of some people to become members of the Work Group, would that not be challenged somewhere? Would that not be challenged to the MultiStakeholder Process because they seem to work sort of against each other? And I don't know if there's an answer to that question, but I just felt like I had to raise it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Cheryl, Holly, and me. I think according to my screen Cheryl was next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes but... It's Olivier speaking. I was trying to get a response to this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, no. I'd love to hear Holly's response to this. Yeah, I'd love to hear Holly's response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Apparently Holly doesn't want to hear Holly's response.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No, maybe she doesn't. Holly has dropped. So, Holly might've just dropped from the call. Let's go to Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Is Holly back?
Okay, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. No, what I was saying was in the response to the MultiStakeholder Model, we specifically expressed reservations about the direction IN which the PDP 3 was going. We specifically said we are a bit concerned that it looks as if some of this may restrict membership. Now, at the time, and still, the PDP 3 has not been finalized and we were advised of that fact. Many times, they said, "It's not final." That said we kept saying, "Yes, but the heading and some of the content looks very worrying."

So, we have said that and I'm quite happy to actually stress that at this one again. But it's not something that we haven't said before. And exactly the point that Marita's making, that if they really do want a MultiStakeholder Model, then in fact the PDP 3 threatens to undermine it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl for the record. I guess it also depends, just in response to what Holly said, the argument, and I'm being a little advocate here, this is not my personal belief, the argument of course is it depends on the type of MultiStakeholder Model one is looking at. If one has a seat at the table, is that not a form of MultiStakeholder-ism? And that would be the argument that would be made. However, let's not go down that path line until we absolutely have to.

In response to Marita, yes there would be some actions that particularly the Advisory Committees could try and raise via the MultiStakeholder argument with the ICANN Board, and it'd need, formally, and it'd need the GNSO Council. And that may indeed be where we end up because like Alan, I've been saying the sky is possibly going to fall in this area for quite some time, in fact almost two years now. That said, if by chance we do end up with designs of future PDP Processes which would be much more like an EDPD design, in other words, the placement of seats would be limited to two or three capital R, Representatives, of Advisory Committee.

The other side of that coin is the narrowing of scope, the very tight specificity, and time binding on such PDP Processes may mean that they're in fact is many, many parallel, shorter, leaner PDPs going on. So, we may have an awful lot of people in a wide number of activities as opposed to some of these notoriously long and incredibly painful PDP experiences. So, that, too, would need to be computed. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Cheryl. Next in the que is Alan Greenberg and then Greg Shatan and then we'll come back to you, Holly, afterwards. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. In response to Marita, yes, someone could challenge but that doesn't mean the challenge is successful. Typically, when we go through a long process, the results are accepted at that point for better or worse. In response to Holly, yes, we have said it to Brian Cute, but we have not been saying it to the GNSO and to the people who are explicitly planning to make these decisions.

Now, I've got to go into the weeds a little bit. The reason that the GNSO has the ability today to have the EPDP, for instance, with restricted membership and could have another PDP... Without PDP 3.0, the GNSO already has the tools to restrict participation. For better or worse, I'm the one who wrote those words because the PDP Rules say you can see use other models than the standard Work Group as long as you have rules associated with them. That was a really important thing to say we're not tied to the cumbersome PDP in all cases because there may be simple things where you don't want that kind of complex structure. So, they have the tools to do it, but now they're essentially getting papal blessing, if I may use a religious connotation, to this whole thing and that's why it becomes very dangerous and that's why I think we have to be vocal about this right now. It's going to be too late if we

don't do it now. These don't give the warning. It's hard to say I told you so afterwards if you never told them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. Yeah, I don't think we risk overstating our case here. I think that the GNSO Council has gotten very full of itself and in many ways has lost its way in PDP 3.0. The GNSO is supposed to be, specifically the Council, is supposed to be Policy Management, Policy Development Management Organization. The GNSO is not necessarily intended to define the population of PDP. But that is what is happening here. After the kind of massively MultiStakeholder PDPs and CPWGs, there's a real attempt here to basically shut the door on undesirables and to kind of arrange the seating chart.

And in a PDP, in many ways, the seating chart is deafening. It influences the balance of the discussion, the balance of the consensus, in many ways. It's really a form of gerrymandering to use the US expression. You can, there are lots of fun diagrams that show successive these results can be if you're looking for them. And whether it's intentional or not, the intention, the effect is really particularly jawing I think in terms of our aux here in At-Large of being reduced to kind of the extra wheel and being put in a very small number of seats.

You know, one could make the argument as has been done in other parts of ICANN when things are sorted out such as meeting planning, that At-Large as a whole is equal to GNSO as a whole. That's probably a harder argument to make here but basically the idea that we're being shunted into a marginal role and that, as Alan said, this is being blessed and therefore becomes the default as opposed to an alternative.

And to go to Cheryl's point and then I'll wrap up, if there are smaller, leaner PDPs, we'll still have the same seating chart issues I think in all of them, with the intention that basically the GNSO is sort of self-dealing in a sense, or at least they're dealing themselves collectively the best cards and also deciding in which way within the GNSO the cards will go. I'm not sure you want to go to deeply into that issue from this perspective, but I think from our perspective and the perspective of the seven billion actual and potential end users, you know, we're really being given the shaft. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Greg. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Holly, I hope you're taking notes because you'll speak after Cheryl. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much for that. Cheryl for the record. And Greg, I couldn't agree with you more on just about everything you said, but then that's often the case. A couple of things. First of all, yes the seating charts will be the same and indeed moaning and groaning about the

how much work everybody has to have, and volunteer exhaustion is part of why this is being headed down this pathway.

I'm not sure how a model that may end up with many, many more PDPs being run parallel is a solution to that, either, but certainly scoping moving something. But the seating chart is likely to be very dangerous, not the least of which is how one is supposed to balance deep and extensive experience along with new and fresh thinking if you only have two seats at the table.

So, I just wanted to remind everybody about the fact that the GNSO Council has done this as a Council in-house and it is the Council that has designed this now over moving into it's third year. And the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group of the Council has been instrumental in this part of this design. So, apparently the thinking is, at least with the Councilors, that this is somehow at least in the best interest of individual registrants, if not the people that we are interested in looking after, which of course is internet users.

Note my tone as I say all of this because, going back to what Greg said, I think the marginalization exercise is one that is a strong subject here and one that perhaps not everyone in even the GNSO Council is aware of. But there is another place you might want to raise this, not now but very, very shortly, and that is of course within the ATRT3 context because the ATRT3 is also deeply interested in the PDP Process and the input of the ACs/SOs into that process.

Marita, that is another opportunity for us to make our interests heard and our concerns elevated perhaps to a degree where it is not a fait

accompli because the Council thought it was a good idea. ATRT3 is that valuable opportunity for us to make sure our voice is also heard. And Carlton, you're relatively new into the Council, you will be privy to the sacrosanct spaces finalizing the design of this potential monstrosity to the MultiStakeholder Model when you go into your closet with the rest of them in January and hopefully good luck to you on at least bringing some balance from the At-Large perspective along with you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I'm realizing time is flying and it's obvious. And so, I'll have Alan Greenberg next, and then Holly Raiche can close on the topic. So, Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you very much. To add just a little bit of historic perspective, and it's not just mine. I was talking to a very, very long term GNSO Council Member who's no longer on the GNSO Council and commenting that I found it curious that PDP 3.0 was essentially going back to the Task Force Model without using the term, of course, that was in use until roughly 2008 and was effectively outlawed by the first GNSO Review because it had some really significant disenfranchising problems associated with it.

And one of the things that led to the implementation of the first round of new GNSO TLDs takes so long is because suddenly people had a voice who didn't have a voice in the previous discussion. And it was general agreement. Isn't it curious we're going back? As Cheryl said this is being

done by the Council. Many people on the Council don't actually participate in PDPs. They are reacting very much to the disastrous PDP on the RDS PDP and you know, fixing the problems in the last thing is not necessarily the way to fix the general model. And that is what is happening right now, so I'm delighted we see the action we're taking right now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. And finally, we have Holly Raiche. Holly, you might be muted.

HOLLY RAICHE: Sorry. Just to say based on what everybody is saying, I think probably the response needs a stronger sentence or two to say... And I can make the point about the 2014 Review specifically said you have to actually open up, and I think that we use that to say, "Look, in your review this is what you said you'd done, and you haven't and the PDP 3 the way it looks now looks as if you're closing it."

I think the subtext is interesting in terms of the Council and some of the members that may be on it, but that's just by way of background. What I'm hearing is this probably needs a couple of sentences to make it stronger. Other than that, I think it reflects pretty much what's been said. Okay? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Holly. And thank you to all who have spoken on this topic today. My name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Let's move on to the

next one and that's the Draft PTI and IANA FY21 Operating Plan and Budget. Hopefully less controversial than the previous topic. And I invite any comments on the draft that Ricardo Holmquist has submitted, which is due today. So, I believe that there'll be a process by which the statement will be made and the ALAC vote will follow on this. Any comments or questions?

I don't believe Ricardo is with us today. So, it would've been good for him to have been able to summarize it but no Ricardo on the call. So, you've got... It's a short thing and it's on your screen at the moment. I'll give you thirty seconds, maybe twenty, to say anything that stands out as not being something maybe ALAC wishes to be having in its statement.

Essentially the comment mentions the point regarding the site that since the draft was, since the Operating Plan and Budgets were designed, there have been quite a number of changes with regards to Root Zone Management System. Of course, these are all the statements made and proposals made by the RSSAC and some of these had a financial component to them, then an additional cost, and this does not appear to have been reflected in the budget itself. It might well be that there is a contingency fund of some sort regarding this, but the point is being made that hopefully no one's missed this one in putting together the budget. Any comments or questions? Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Really just to say that's a really good observation that in fact one of the comments that we made when we were looking at that, the change in

the Root Server System, was that if you go to change the system, if you are going to make the changes that are being suggested, there will be a real implication financially as to who's going to do it. We asked that at the time so I'm just saying I think this is a really good observation and I absolutely support it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Holly. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I haven't had a chance to look at this before, but I just wanted to point out that the Root Server System which is subject of the paper evolving the governance of the Root Server System is not the Root Server Management System. The Root Server Management System is within IANA to enable facilitating changes to the root servers, to the root server content. It's very separate from what happens after the root zone is shipped to the Root Server Operators.

So, we're talking about two different things even though the words are almost the same. So, I'm not quite sure of what we're saying here but I just wanted to make sure people understand they are two very different things that operate in two different time zones and they're not the same thing even though the words are almost the same. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So, this is due today, but should you please have a look at this? I read through the statement, it's very short. I understand the point you're making here

but it might well be... I mean, where we are at the moment is we don't quite 100 percent know whether one will impact the other and I think that's the gist of the system here is that the question is have we taken into account the changes into the Root Server System Management and does that impact any financing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The paragraph in italics is the Root Zone Management System, not the Root Server System. Root Server System is the group of the 13 root servers and all of their clones around the world that distribute the root zone in real time. The Root Zone Management System is the process, is what manages the process of creating new versions of the root zone to be shipped. By the time it gets to the root servers, the Root Zone Management System has done its job.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Right, so you don't think this should impact the Root Zone Management?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The only communication between the two... No. I mean, it's conceivable that ultimately there may be some changes necessary if the new root zone is very different, which isn't what is being proposed. Conceivably, if there were enough changes made there, there might be something. But the common link between the two is actually the copy of the root zone, the actual data file, and that's the link between the two. I say it for what it's worth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thanks for this, Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I can just note one mistake then, or one error, there in the last paragraph. Because the gist of the statement is that the two questions that are being asked, or the two or three questions that are being asked, the first one is, "Did these changes have any consequences, short, medium, or long-term to the PTI and IANA Operating Plan and Budget?" And it might well be that the response is 'no'.

And I note in that sentence it says, "Did these changes can have any consequences?" I believe that 'can' has to be deleted from the sentence. And then the second question is, "Did ICANN, PTI, and IANA need to be ready to take onboard any additional root servers?" And I guess maybe the answer is 'not applicable', but these are questions that are being asked. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I already made my comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Do you object, then, to this statement at that point, that's the question that I'm asking basically? Are you saying we should not send this because...?

ALAN GREENBERG: From my quick reading...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Incorrect.

ALAN GREENBERG: From my quick reading during this call, I'm not sure the questions asked are particularly relevant. That doesn't mean they hurt, but I'm not sure they are particularly relevant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Then I guess we'll leave it to the ALAC to decide on whether to proceed forward with this one or not, but we do have to make that grammatical change in the last paragraph. Let's go to the next one, which I realize we still have only a half an hour to this call.

The next one is the WHOIS Registration Directory Service Review Team Final Report. The deadline has been extended until next week but it's a very important one. Hadia Elminiawi is the penholder on this. Hadia, if you're still on the call could you please summarize the statement that you've drafted? Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, sure. So basically, WHOIS2 Review Team identified seven objectives. Each of which we held to an issue, and then they looked into these issues and decided whether a recommendation was required or not. However, Alan commented that referring to the recommendations rather than the objectives is much better because the objectives were mainly intended as an organizational means for the group, and

therefore I will actually change this part in order to reset to the recommendations rather than objectives.

So, I mentioned in the beginning Objective 1 and our support to the recommendations in this regard. And Objective 1 basically addresses the recommendations of WHOIS1 Review Team. Generally speaking, what I tried to do is to look at the report from an end user's perspective. I looked at what might matter to or effect internet users. So, one of the very interesting findings with regard to, in relation to end users is the definition that was actually produced by WHOIS1 Review Team in relation to consumer trust.

We had many opinions during the EPDP Work Stream that consumers are actually the registrants. And the definition that was actually produced by WHOIS1 Review Team, I mentioned again in the WHOIS2 Review Team, says that consumer trust [inaudible], the consumer trust in relation to registration data or the level of trust users have available in WHOIS data and more broadly at the level of trust consumers have in internet information and transactions in general. And generally speaking, this was our understanding as ALAC as well to consumer trust and that's registration data handles consumer trust and effects both registrants as well as internet end users.

I also referred to the recommendations in relation to accuracy, and I have referred to accuracy in relation to GDPR, registrant rights, in addition to the benefit of accuracy to those trying to protect internet end users. But actually, Alan submitted a comment rightfully saying that a very important issue actually is what we did during the EPDP work in limiting the number of contacts, and since we actually don't have

accurate data that could really impact the benefits of the registration data.

Alan also submitted a comment in relation to contractual compliance. And the group looked at Recommendation Number 4 of WHOIS Review 1 Team, and they also added some additional comments in this regard. And I will comment on the Contractual Compliance Recommendations. I refer to translation of WHOIS data, which is one of the recommendations of WHOIS1 Review Team. However, we all know that this is not possible now and until RDAC is actually implemented, this will only be possible when RDAC is implemented.

I also found that the report has excellent findings in relation to law enforcement and their use of the data. The findings of the report in relation to the users of RDS is important to different Stakeholders and it's important to internet end users, although internet end users do not directly use it, are very important and I think highlighting this is very important as well. So, basically yeah, basically this summarizes my comments on the report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia, for this. And I now invite any comments or questions, and I see Alan Greenberg in the que. Alan, you probably are muted at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was muted, thank you. The items I identified in my comment were... Let me backtrack. I was Chair of this Review Team, I stand behind all of

the recommendations and I think they're all important enough to have been made. That being said, in my comment I identified the ones that I believe are A, crucial from an end user, from a user perspective, and from a registrant perspective, it was a subset of users, and are likely to get significant pushback.

One of the purposes of what we can say here is to make sure that the people who are objecting to these recommendations have some counterpoint. And I'm expecting all of the ones that I highlighted to be objected to by some people in the Community. So, that's why I think it's really important that we come out and say we support it and you know, if necessary give some reasons why and I'm happy to work with Hadia over the next week to refine this and make sure that it captures the things.

Clearly, as the author of the report I can't write a comment, but I think it's really important the ALAC understands the parts where we consider them important and there's a good chance they may be not implemented and remember, we're in an environment now where ICANN is resource constrained and not everything in this report will be implemented. So, we need to make sure that the important ones are. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Alan. Hadia, did you wish to comment further?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

I totally agree with Alan. I actually read his comments, but I read them like an hour ago, so I hadn't really the chance to update the comments. But yes, definitely, Alan being the expert on this and being one of the members of the team, knows what's in their best... And I also sent the comment to Alan privately in an email because I did understand how important his comments in this regard are being one of the members.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I am not seeing any other hands up for this. I guess this needs to then move to the next stage. There is still... It's a short deadline, there's still a few more days for more feedback. The deadline has been extended to the 9th of December which I believe takes us to be able to touch on this again next week if there are any further comments please put them in the Wiki Page that is provided.

And finally, there was the question regarding the Implementation Plan for the GNSO Consensus Policy relating to the protection of certain Red Cross names. Now, Justine Chew is actually supposed to... Well, the penholder of that. Now, I've just received note that Justine was supposed to join us later, but she appears to still be in a meeting, which does make it a little difficult. We have time until the 12th of December so maybe we'll touch on this during the next week as by then we will have a draft and obviously the draft comes in before that time it will be shared on the mailing list. So, at least there will be an announcement made on the mailing list.

Okay, so that's with the Policy for this call. We do have an Agenda Item which Justine was supposed to be taking and that's on the Subsequent Procedures Update. What Justine wanted to share on this call, and she had advised both Jonathan and I on her aim, was to point out a letter from the GAC Chair to the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group Co-Chairs on the scope of the additional call for public comments.

The letter, I believe, is linked from the Agenda, let's have a quick look at this. We can click on this so it's a letter from the GAC Chair, Manal Ismail, and it seems to be a piece of GAC advice. And the question basically there... And I see here, there is Cheryl and Jess. I wonder if Cheryl being one of the recipients of this letter and being on this call as well, if she could share the contents with us or summarize the contents to us, if that's okay with you Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Certainly, no problem at all. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. So, just carefully swapping hats here, the request from the GAC is a matter of their concern that the Subsequent Procedure PDP at this stage is planning on going to public comment with new items, in other words, things that have not been taken to the Community in previous public comment and not the whole of the... Can you imagine the size of it? Could be looking at 100 plus, nearly 200 hundred page document last time with more than 100 questions. Please imagine, if you will, if we go through all of those and all the stuff that's been done since.

Anyway, their concern is, and that's my initiation there, purely personal one, that they would like to ensure that the public comment period is

one that allows a final set of recommendations for all of the document, not just changes. In other words,... Sorry, changes that have not been previously gone for public comment.

I can read it, or you can all read it on the screen. But they strongly support the notion of including all the PDP Work Group Final Recommendations within the upcoming public comment proceeding rather than focusing on a narrow scope for the proceeding. And I've told you what the definition of narrow scope is. So, if you'd like to open a que, Olivier, that's fine. I will put myself in the que at some point at the next stage after there is some discussion on the CPWG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Cheryl. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So, Justine in her instructions, it's basically asking the question to the CPWG whether At-Large or the ALAC wishes to react to this GAC letter and if yes, how so. So, you've seen the letter here that is being shared and I can see Alan Greenberg in the que, so let's proceed with Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. As Cheryl pointed out, the last report had hundreds of questions in it and many of those questions had been to one extent or another addressed. And that's why I basically support what the GAC is saying, that I think it's important to put before the Community the current status of the overall project. If we don't do it now, then the first time the Community sees the whole thing is, unless I'm mistaken, is in the Board, when the Board puts it out to public comment after the

GNSO approves it, and that's really the wrong time for the Community to see the whole package for the first time.

So, you know, I think it's really important while the PDP is still convened and while we're still having discussion to have an opportunity for someone, for everyone to see the whole thing. Now, if I'm happy with this report being just the new stuff, but that implies there needs to be another one afterwards. I think, although, making this one a complete report is going to be a lot of work and it's going to be a huge amount of work to review, so I'm not eager for that but I think it has to be done sometime before the PDP is finished and this seems to be an opportune time to it. I think in the long run, this will shorten the amount of work and the timing to get this approved, not increase it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Any other comments? I note that Cheryl had put herself at the back of the queue. What I was going to suggest from the feedback so far was, the question being should the ALAC support this call from the GAC, and if that was the case then we should inform our GAC Liaison, Yrjö Lansipuro, who unfortunately could not make it to the call today due to other issues, him being at the IGF in Berlin. But, Cheryl, you have the floor in the meantime, wearing another hat I guess.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, now I'm wearing my other hat. Okay, so what the Leadership of the Subsequent Procedure PDP is going to do is first of all, we're responding to this letter saying, well, "Right now, thank you very much for the letter and thank you very much for your concerns but right now

we are still in the deliberation phase of the final recommendations and so we are unable to even assess how extensive or otherwise the next report will be with those, with what we're proposing is to say into the public comment document as final recommendations which have not been previously reviewed."

Please remember we're talking about not material that has not been reviewed, but recommendations that have not been reviewed. So, when the Community overwhelmingly support a recommendation that was proposed in the last set of not only public comments that have gone, with a main report, interim report, and a follow on additional report, but also two Community consolation exercises. So, there's been an awful lot of interaction with the Community on these things.

There were a few recommendations which we supported as At-Large and you know, we really didn't think there needed to be relitigated. They were accepted, they should be incorporated. So, that's the response that we're going to give, "Thanks very much, we'll get back to you when we know what the report is actually going to look like.", etcetera, etcetera.

We are looking at ways of making the report, I think we need a new name for it as opposed to report because anything that says this is going to be probably deserves something far more significant as a title than a report at this stage, will be about seven volumes, to make it as digestible and easy to respond to as possible with the recommendations that are being made. And we're looking at how we can do that in different formats at the moment and over the next couple of weeks.

Certainly one of the opportunities that we are looking towards, but I cannot say has been decided upon, is to put out the majority, if not full, document so to ease Alan's mind for the not-faint-of-heart, anyone can drill down and read everything, you know, the 473 pages that will there, but to ensure that the things that we are seeking feedback on, the recommendations being made, etcetera, etcetera, are somehow clearly articulated and in a, perhaps, more welcome or more successful form than what we did last time which was having them separated out as an appendix. So that's pretty much all I can give you at this stage.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this. Thank you very much for this, Cheryl, and your points are noted. What we'll do is we'll get... I think the Action Item that can come out of this is to inform our GAC Liaison of this and of the some perhaps direct discussion with the GAC on their letter and since there is a response that's coming up, it seems to be futile to say me too at this point in time, but it seems that there is alignment between the GAC on the ALAC on the point that is being made with regards to having all of the issues, once the report is finally drafted and the work is completed.

So, that's something to bank for the future. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. So, that means we can now go into our next part of the call. I'm really amazed because we still have five minutes and the Agenda still says we have five minutes' worth of discussion. So, any other business is Agenda Item Number 8. Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Marita Moll speaking for the record. Since we have five minutes, why waste it. I want to throw in something here, a lot of people on this call are probably members of ISOC Chapters. And across the list this week, we had a letter that Bastian submitted from ISOC Netherlands which was sent to the main ISOC Chapter regarding the PIR and there was a request in that for other ISOC Chapters to look at this and maybe send their own comments or support this particular letter to ISOC regarding issues around PIR.

So, I know there's a lot of people on this call who probably are members or heads of ISOC Chapters. I'm sending out a plea for people to look at this and maybe take action as best you can. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Marita. Could I suggest that, because you do have a link, I mean there must be a link to that letter as well, you add this as a contribution to the At-Large Work Space ISOC Sells PIR? Because obviously if we're going to have a single issue call on this, at the moment there is a draft submitted for submission, but obviously having more information and as information keeps on rolling in on an hourly basis, having more information on this page so that an informed draft can be proposed is probably a good idea.

MARITA MOLL: Sure. I'll do that but this was really outside of CPWG or ICANN or anything. This is really ISOC to ISOC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, okay. Thanks. So, next is Sivasubramanian Muthusamy.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: I'll just share a thought. Just as ALAC and GAC come together on certain issues of importance, then ALAC and GAC come together could we also in light opinions of RSSAC and SSAC and try to have their perspectives so that the pursuit becomes stronger? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much for this, Siva. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So, there have been some cases of the SSAC joining with statements, joint statements with the ALAC. One of the difficulties, and this is just something that I learned over time speaking to Patrick Falstrom back in the day, is that the SSAC is not politically oriented or policy oriented. They provide statements and then they... You take them or you leave them, a bit different from the ALAC or the GAC that pushes things.

On the RSSAC, I don't know whether we actually have yet a protocol for engagement with the RSSAC and this could be something to look at and whether we wish to have some kind of, either a liaison or some way in the future to have a good neighboring relations with the RSSAC or make use more of RSSAC advice, and it's interesting of course because the RSSAC just reinforced its way that its engaging now and so we're looking at a new dimension potentially for discussions. Maybe the Action Item here is for the ALAC to check on its relationship with the SSAC, of course we've got a SSAC Liaison, and on its relationship with the RSSAC. Issue-based cooperation, I note. Yes, thank you.

Right, I'm not seeing any hands up for it. Yeah, thank you. I'm not seeing any other hands up for any other business. Before we schedule the next call, one thing that I did want to say, actually there are two things that I wanted to say. First, to was to mention that unknowingly we had been moved from one room to another while we... Or the people who were based in Berlin were moved from one room to another and this is why there was a little bit of a difficulty in the beginning of the call.

But I do have to thank Manuel [inaudible] who is a member of the German [inaudible] who was very kindly hosted us in some way and said we could use the office. But we are [inaudible]. Manuel happens to be from the Free Democratic Party which is the same party as the one of Jimmy Shultz. And you might... I think you probably have now heard that unfortunately Jimmy has left us, two days ago, on the 25th of November. So, I wanted to perhaps spend 30 seconds, I know that we're running over time, but 30 seconds please in memory of Jimmy.

Jimmy was on the ALAC from 2014 to 16, and he was a great guy, a great person to work with, and he had amazing, amazing ideas for the future of the MultiStakeholder Model in Parliament. So, it's... How amazing that by chance we ended up meeting Manuel [inaudible] here to let us on this call in this room. So, if we could have maybe 30 seconds of silence, that would be really helpful. So, thank you. And, yeah, he's watching us from up in the clouds and it is a very cloudy here in Berlin, so I'm absolutely convinced he's there. So, thank you everyone. This has been a great call. The call next week is going to be at what time, let's try and find out.

YEŞİM NAZLAR: Thank you, Olivier. Hi everyone, this is Yeşim speaking. So, for the next call next week, Wednesday 4th of December, normally it should be at 19:00 UTC as we are rotating between 13 and 19:00 UTC. However, it's going to clash with the AFRALO Monthly Call so may I suggest 20:00 UTC instead of 19:00 UTC. Would that work?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm looking if there's anyone...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm only on the phone. My Zoom Room's dropped because my internet suddenly disappeared. So, I'm also in a position where I don't think I can tell you without an internet to get to my calendar. Let's say yes and if one or two of us have to multitask, that'll be it. It's Cheryl for the record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Cheryl, and I hear Sébastien who's telling me there's not ATRT3 at that time, so that's fine. Great. Thank you. And I see other's saying yes. So, 20:00 UTC next week. Thank you everyone, this has been a really, really great call and thanks to all of our speakers...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier? It would be a clash with Subsequent Procedures. We rarely clash with ATRT. But there is often clashes with Subsequent Procedures which may affect Justine. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Cheryl, and we'll see with Justine, but it looks like this is the right time to go. Thanks everyone. It's been really great. It's been an excellent call yet again. Thank you for everyone who is working on these issues, who is commenting on these issues, and for everyone, speak to you very soon and follow up on the mailing list. And this call is now concluded. Thank you and have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Bye.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]