
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group Call on Wednesday, 18th of December, 2019 at 1900 UTC.

On the call today we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Vernatius Ezeama, Joanna Kulezsa, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gordon Chillcott, Ann-Marie Joly Bachollet, Sebastien Bachollet, Chokri Ben Romdhane, Glenn McKnight, Hadia Eliminawi, Holly Raiche, Isaac Maposa, Jose Bebron, Marita Moll, Nadira Al-Araj, Roberto Gaetano, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, Sonigitu Ekpe, Vanda Scartezini, Yrjo Lansipuro, Zak Muscovitch and Steinar Grotterod.

On the Spanish Channel we have Sylvia Herlein-Leite, Harold Arcos and Alberto Soto. We have received apologies from Kaili Kan, Yeseul Kim, Judith Hellerstein, Priyatosh Jana, Adrian Schmidt, Desera Dushi, Jahangir Hossain, Leon Sanchez and Ricardo Holmquist. From Staff we have Evin Erdogan, Michelle DeSmyter and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.

Before we begin, I would like to remind everyone to please state their name before speaking for the transcription purposes and also so the interpreters can identify you on the other language channel. Also, a kindly reminder to please keep your line muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you very much and with this, I'll hand the call over to you Olivier.

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

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much and welcome everyone to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call this week, were we're going to first be hearing from Joanna Kulesza, speaking to us about a proposal for the ICANN67 High Interest Session Plenary. Then, we'll be looking at the EDPD Phase 2 with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. Following up with Jonathan Zuck on the ALAC Advice to the ICANN Board on DNS Abuse.

Then, Justine Chew will be taking us through the latest in the Subsequent Procedures and that will include At-Large Subsequent Procedures Scorecard and Example. It will be quite interesting because the Example will be focused on the Applicant Support Program and it's something we all know very much about. Then, Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogan will take us through the Policy Comment Updates.

Finally, any other business with updates on the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Workspace. Apart from this, the floor is open for an amendments or additions to the agenda. I'll take a little time because sometimes takes a bit of time for people to put their hand up early in the call like this but no hands up, so the agenda is adopted as it is currently is on your screen. We can move swiftly to the action items from our last call and that's the call last week.

Only two action items remain to be to undertaken, one is regarding the deadline for ALAC Advice on DNS Abuse Statement and of course, we're working on that today. The other one is, Justine who's noted the ICANN Public Comments, the FY21 Operating Plan and Budget and Financial Plan to go straight to the ALAC Finance and Budget Sub Committee. Evin, has this been done? I didn't cross check or maybe I have seen, one of many things in the mailbox?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. Those Public Comments have yet to comment, they have been delayed, they should be coming out soon, within the next week or so. Once they are, then they'll be forwarded on to the ALAC FEFC accordingly, so then that action item can be marked complete.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Evin. Any comments or questions on these action items or any of the other action items that are completed? I'm not seeing any hands up, so we can move on then to the next agenda item and that's welcoming Joanna Kulesza, who is the CPWG co-chair and is going to take us through a proposal for the Hi Interest Session Plenary for ICANN67. Joanna, you have the floor.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Oliver. Thank you for having me, I will try to make the best use of the five minutes that I have. The Hi Interest Session proposal focusses on a thread we've discovered or barely touched upon during the meeting in Montreal. The title of the session I'm suggesting is One 'World One Internet?' as briefly indicated by Jonathan as something you might want to address. The question mark reflects the concern about what has been referred to as a splinternet, so we would like to look at geopolitics as they have been addressed by the Strategic Plan, that the Board also addresses.

We would like to look at cybersecurity, for that purpose we would like to invite the SSAC to give us a debrief on the concerns that they see

what has come to the global landscape of the 'One World, One Internet' concept. The specific elements we would like to address is comprehensive policy narrative that the ICANN Community as a whole might want to present to the outside world in terms of why it is justified to stand by the 'One World, One Internet' policy in time where geopolitics strongly impacts the way the global communications unfolds.

We would like to touch upon a few political things that have risen recently. We would like to use the reference to the [inaudible] speech who clearly indicated there are three ways of looking at the internet, that would be the Californian Internet, the European or the parrot so to speak internet and then the Asian or the Chinese perspective being most predominate way of looking at cyberspace.

In that sense, we would like to invite members of the Board, we would like to have, as already indicated, some of the SSAC members to try and jointly look at how legitimate the 'One World, One Internet' policy or narrative that ICANN has been standing by remains in 2019 and 20 and way forward. What is the rationality behind 'One World, One Internet' as ICANN presents it in times where [inaudible] basically.

We would like to have this discussion with Board members, with SSAC members, we would like to this to be more of a panel discussion, providing us with insights but also with readymade take aways that we might want to use in our discussion outside the ICANN Community or the ICANN Bubble so to speak. We would also like to have a GAC representative if possible, invited onto the panel, if this idea meets the

approval of the Consolidated Policy Working Group, we will work on the details.

We would like to have the Civil Society representative, possibly giving us a wrap on how the GDPR is impacting the double consensus when it comes to online policy. We would like to address specific events happening in recent years, GDPR being one of those and then way that ICANN has tackled that issue. We would like to look at the technical side of things and this is just to reflect the [CROSSTALK] indicated as an option for the upcoming meeting with the [inaudible] impacting the way that connectivity is distributed online.

We would like to look at the political side of things or the legal side of things, which states forever more strongly reflecting their cyber sovereignty and their will to have that enacted online. I'm going to stop here. I'm happy to provide with more details but that would be the overall theme. We would like to see how ICANN intends to defend its 'One World, One Internet' strategy of policy in time for a safe thing to be forever more confident in defining and defending their interest in their sovereignty online.

If that proposal meets your approval interests, I'm happy to make this more specific to reflect the concerns or the idea that you might have. I am most appreciative of any feedback and this is just an idea I wanted to throw out there, I always sincerely appreciate all the ICANN insights that the Community always has. If there are any indications of how to make this better, how to shift this around to better reflect the Community concerns, I would most sincerely appreciate those.

I'm going to stop here and hand the floor back to Olivier. I must admit, I have not been successful in logging on to the Zoom Room, it's still launching on my computer, if there are any questions in the chat, I would appreciate them being read out. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for your presentation Joanna and let's open the floor for comments and questions regarding this very interesting topic, interesting proposal. Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Since Joanna can't see it, I'll read out the comment. I said, "Joanna, this sounds controversial and I love it." I think you're going to get -- you would get some very interesting pushback on a lot of the suggestions about that there are various different internets, although we know in reality that's the case. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this comment, Marita. Holly Raiche is next.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question and Olivier, you'd know the answer. Is Thomas Rickert the one who was the GAC chair and he's now on EPDP because I think he'd be a great contributor?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLON: No, he's not. The GAC chair was Thomas Schneider from Switzerland. Thomas Rickert is the person who is currently the GDPR, working on the expedited GDP I believe, he's the one with GDPR.ninja email address, which somehow says something about his level of knowledge on GDPR issues. He also, in case you need to know, one of the plays guitar, the other one plays the drums, don't mix them together.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I think I'm thinking about the drummer. Joanna, I'm thinking about the drum one because he was chair of the GAC, he has a really good perspective on GAC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No, the drummer was not chair of the GAC. The chair of the GAC is Thomas Schneider.

JOANNA KULEZSA: I love them both, we can have them both on the panel, time permitting. I was also thinking about dragging over [inaudible] should she have the time or someone representing ISOC to get more of an outside perspective. But thank you, Holly, [CROSSTALK]. Both are taken on board, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. A mention that I believe that Thomas Schneider, the previous chair of the GAC, will not be there because the representative of Switzerland has changed and so it's Hawk [inaudible]

now who holds the flag for Switzerland but certainly Thomas Rickert would be a great addition and I believe that he will be taking part. Any other comments or questions?

I'm not seeing any other hands. Thank you very much for this. What's the follow up on this Joanna, what do you need? Do you need anything from the CPWG? Do you need a follow up on or will that be presented to the ALAC?

JOANNA KULEZSA:

Thank you very much. I'm taking the comments onboard. I am actually in contact with yourself, with Jonathan, with Maureen. I'm happy to work on the details if there is no strong opposition to what's being proposed. We will work together with the ICANN Staff responsible for setting up the meeting and we will -- I myself and Maureen and Staff will report back on the details. We are still working on the list of participants for that panel. Once we have more detailed conformation on the Thomas's or a Thomas, I will report back and if help is needed, I will be sure to reach out as promptly as possible. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Madam Chair, Maureen Hilyard.

MAURENN HILYARD:

Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to add that we've been given extra time for this meeting to take place so that Joanna could present the proposal to the CPWG and would could get agreement and some kind of endorsement that the CWPG team feels it is a proposal that we can give

the SO/AC chairs to be a High Interest Topic Plenary. I'm all for it. I think it's a fantastic topic. Joanna's organized, the people's she considering including really gives a good overview as to what she wants to cover, and I would fully support it.

I have actually said to Tanzania that I promised we would give her a discussion directly after this meeting as to whether we proposal it, she's holding a space for us if we need it. All I need is the thumbs up from everyone and we can put this forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Maureen. I'm not seeing any other hands up, so that's great moving forward. We can now turn on to the next agenda item and that's the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase Two Update from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. Another week of a lot of stuff going on and today we have a presentation. I'm not sure who will take this but Hadia and Alan, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, I guess I'll go ahead. If we could have the next slide please. Hello everyone. Today I'll be speaking about the response of the Data Protection Board to ICANN. It's actually a response from the [inaudible] DPA, and I'll be talking also about the ICANN Org response in relation to the cost of the Standardize System for Access and Disclosure.

With regards to the response from the Belgium, Goran Marby received a response to the later sense of October, asking questions with regards to a Proposed Unified Access Model based on the Technical Study

Group Model. The Processed Model was based a centralized system, which included a central gateway, authorization provider and identity provider.

ICANN Org's questions were in relation to the structure of the models and the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved and the disclosure of personal data under GDPR. The main purpose of letters sent to the European Data Protection Board was to seek advice whether it is possible to remove certain controller responsibilities from the contracted parties, namely the responsibilities with regard to the decision making and the disclosure of the data.

The Belgium DPA encouraged ICANN to continue its efforts to design a comprehensive system for access control, which takes into account the requirements of securities, data minimization and accountability. But actually, they did not provide any conclusive opinions with regards to the questions that ICANN Org included in the paper. The Belgium DPA indicated that their will to further discuss and invited ICANN Org Staff to meet with them.

The letter says that the policy under development should say who gets access to what and under what circumstances, what conditions and for how long, as well as it should define relevant safeguards. The letter also says whether the proposed system will provide better both systems by ICANN, will provide better privacy for natural persons, depends on the relevant policies, safeguards and administration.

We as a team, are still to discuss the letter and we should be doing this early January, before our LA meeting, face to face meeting end of January. That's with regard to the first topic.

On November 23rd, Janice, the chair of the EPDP sent an email to Goran Marby, ICANN's CEO, seeking input on the financial sustainability issues of the Standardized System for Access and Disclosure, which mostly likely would involve ICANN managing or operating a centralized system to facilitate, to address or disclosure of non-public registration data.

The EPDP teams' questions where in relation to the simplifications to develop, operationalize and run such a system. We as a team also identified some principles related to the financial aspects of such a system. The principles included that the system should be a not for profit system and that tasks should be born direct beneficiaries of the system, not by the registrants or by the contracted parties.

Goran answered that part of ICANN Org's responsibility is to ensure that the system is cost efficient, this includes issuing RFP's and taking other steps to ensure the system is appropriately [inaudible] to ensure the security and stability of the world's internet users. He also did mentioned that this part of ICANN's mission. Basically, the response includes a commitment from ICANN to registration directory service system.

He also said that ICANN Org is examining costs in relational to developing technical specifications, system development, system supports and maintenance, system operation and periodic auditing. However, he said that ICANN Org would like to confirm its

understanding of the three models for which the EPDP team is [inaudible], especially in relation to the models proposed in the initial draft report.

Again, ICANN Org is still working on the estimate and is waiting for our response and their looking forward to discussing those estimates during our face to face meeting in LA. Again, we as a team, we are going to discuss this response in January before the face to face.

That's it for me today. I'm happy to receive questions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Hadia. I open the floor any comments or questions that anybody might have for this topic. First is Tijani Ben Jemma.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Several questions but I will ask only two. First one, I ask it during the public session we had in Montreal. Who will lead data control and who will be the finds of the GDPR? Who will be [inaudible] the finds of the GDPR?

And the chair answered me, "We don't know, we still don't know. When we finalize the SSAD, we will tell you." Today, you told me that you asked the Board if it is possible to transfer certain responsibilities from the contracted party to another party, I don't know who. So, to whom? To whom do you want to transfer them?

HADIA ELIMINAWI:

The preface of the letter to the European Data Protection Board was to see if it is possible to remove the responsibility of the contracted parties with regard to the decision making and the disclosure of the data and whom, based on the model that was proposed to the European Data Protection Board, you would have a centralized system in which you have a central gateway and you have an authorization provider and you have an identity provider.

Basically, said that, requesters would send their requests to the central gateway and then would have an identity provider confirming the identity and the authorization provider would be during the decision making. After the decision is actually made, then a request to the contracted party would be irrelevant, registry or registrar would be sent will all the data, we be sent to the contracted party in order for the contracted party to disclose all the data related to the domain name without knowing anything about the request or the parts of the data that would requested.

Then, after the centralized system received the data, they will only hold the relevant data to the requester and the data is not kept but is deleted. Based on this theory, it was thought that maybe this could remove the responsibility of disclosure and decision making from the contracted party, since they basically have no role whatsoever in this process. However, as I said, the task received from the European Data Protection Board does not include any kind of conclusive answers. We did not get an answer said, "No, contracted parties would not be responsible."

We did not get any conclusive answers in this regard. And also [inaudible] the letter said that determining the roles of what is controller and who are the joint controllers, is determined -- you cannot just decide this party is a controller and is not a controller or those are joint, it doesn't work like this. It is supposed to be examined on case by case bases and determined based on that, based on the particular case.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA:

Okay, thank you. I have a second question. Before asking the second question, Hadia, should I understand that if the Board accepts the system, SSAD System, that means there will not be a responsibility for the contracted party or for anyone, since it is the system who is responsible for the disclosure, is it right? That's your proposal?

HADIA ELIMINAWI:

No, no, that's not right. Of course, there should be someone accountable and, in such case, maybe it would -- if European Data Protection Board had actually accepted the model but no, of course there would have been someone responsible and that someone would have been basically the -- definitely the authorization provider and also maybe the other elements of central gateway as well. Again, we did not receive an answer that says, "This is possible or it could work this way." We didn't receive also an answer saying otherwise. In both cases you do have someone accountable.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Okay, thank you. My second question, you said that the system should be cost recovered. Means that the beneficiary will pay the cost, who will be the beneficiary?

HADIA ELIMINAWI: Those will be the users. But again, we did not get into the details of the financial aspects but those are principles that we put. Beneficiaries would be the users.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Yes, you mean the complainer. You mean the complainer.

HADIA ELIMINAWI: Yeah, the user. But again, ICANN is permitted or at least has said so in its letter -- again, with regard to basic -- ICANN did commit through its response, to contribute or to ensure that the system is self-sufficient, so they did explicitly say that this means that ICANN would participate in issuing RFP's and taking other steps to ensure the system is appropriately resourced. ICANN did make a commitment there but again; the details are still be discussed.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. I see Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Sorry to be late. Both contracted parties and the NCSG have been pretty adamant that the data owners, the data subjects, should not pay for the system.

Now, clearly right now with the contracted parties doing the work themselves, there is no other source of their funds other than the registrants but they've been pretty adamant that if there are explicit costs associated with this system, that they not be borne by the registrars and registries and explicit by the registrant, therefore the only other source of funds is ICANN itself, which would have to get the funds from those contracted parties or the people requesting access to the data.

There's pretty well acceptance right now that there are likely to be fees to access the data and these fees will cover some part and it's not clear if it's all or what part of it, of the process of running the access mechanism. At this point of course, it's not clear whether the access mechanism will simply be a porthole and then pass all the data or rather pass the responsibility to the contracted parties or perhaps do it itself. That's the major part of the discussion right now.

In terms of who will run it? It is likely to be ICANN subcontracting to some organization, that organization is almost surely to be a for profit organization but presumably there will be controls on making sure it's run in a cost-effective way. That's about as much as we know right now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alan. I have a question with regards to who at present assumes the cost of running the WHOIS system.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, other than the WHOIS porthole which ICANN runs and is part of ICANN's internal costs, which currently then just goes to port 43, port 45, whatever, one of the queries the registrar/registry. The registrar/registry bare the cost of providing access to the information that they hold, either through their own WHOIS servers or via the access method.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, why is the same system not being used for the new system? Why the change?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm telling you the position that's been taken, I can't give you the motivation. For NCSG one would presume the data subject should not bear the cost of giving their data out to people and the registrars/registries are taking that same position on behalf of their customers and their own personal position to say they shouldn't bare the cost out of their own profit margin as it were.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But Alan, they have so far, ever since the beginning, they have.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I have made that case multiple times.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, it just looks to me like it's another one of these things where you're going to end up with a very disappointing result, I'm very sorry about this. The system here seems like -- there's a term in French called [Participant speaking in French] a factory to make gas, any kind of gas, and it seems like they're looking at the longest winded way to be able to reach a result and ready to accept solutions that are not solutions. It's very strange but I guess the ALAC will have to discuss this and then find out at the end if it wants to agree or not agree.

Any other questions or comments? I'm sorry, this was taking my chair hat off of course, you can sense the unhappiness in my voice, being that I don't understand why end users need to bear the cost of having to obtain data when a domain holder misbehaves and does all sorts of things that requires this to be found about.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, where do you see end users baring -- Olivier, you're saying end users bear the costs, we're talking about the requesters of the data who are not typically end users, baring the cost. We're talking about intellectual property people trying to defend trademark, cybersecurity people, other things like that, are looking to bear the costs as it stands right now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alan. Because of course we're seeing while the same time some people have omitted lots of noise about doing a WHOIS search on [inaudible] capital.org or .com and found out who was behind that, of course in the future, thankfully you'll not be able to find any of this, which will be really helpful, it will be really great for everyone.

I'm not seeing anybody putting their hand up. Thanks very much for this update Alan and Hadia, are there any other things that we need be alert of and what's coming up next?

ALAN GREENBERG: Nothing other than what we've talked about, I think.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Great, thank you very much. Let's then now move on and let's go to finalizing the ALAC Advice to the ICANN Board on the DNS Abuse. Again, quick reminder we had two sessions in Montreal, we had several calls since and Jonathan has been working hard on coming up with ALAC Advice to the ICANN Board. Jonathan, you have the floor.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Olivier. We have a draft comment that's been open for comment. Most folks seem to be in rough agreement with the comment as it currently stands but there are a few detractors and so what I'd like to do with some limited time is give them some time on this call to summarize their concerns and see if we can wordsmith our way out of them because I'm not sure that we're that far away and it may come down to how people are interpreting different things.

The first person I wanted to call on is Steinar who wrote a comment on behalf of the ISOC Norway. If you could give a brief overview of your concerns about the document and then maybe we can address those comments.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If I can have one minute before you give the floor to Steinar, please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, go ahead, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I just want to be sure that we are clear with the word. The word that you are using is very sympathetic to the position of others, is not a detractor, it's a position, a position of an ALS. I want to thank this ALS to have done homework and I hope that in the future many more ALS will do this type of work but if you present them as a detractor, then they will stop immediately.

I really want to thank them for coming to the debate, it's the first time plenary is coming to the CPWG, it was following a discussion within EURALO on Monday and I told them the best way to put your idea on the table is to come to the CPWG and I would like to welcome him and hopefully in the future other ALSes will do like [inaudible] to participate to the debate. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sebastien. I didn't mean to make a judgment association with being a detractor. I don't view that as a negative, I just mean folks that have a disagreement with what we've got currently drafted. I've been a detractor many times but I take your point home because language matters and so I certainly don't mean to be critical at all of Steinar's comments, in fact I think we're in rough agreement with them and we just need to word out the language to address his concerns.

Thanks for keeping me honest, Sebastien, and with that, thank you, Steinar, and please take a minute if you would to summarize your objections. Your microphone may be muted because we're not hearing you right now.

STEINAR GROTTROD:

I was on mute, a long speech but nobody hearing. Thanks to Sebastien for the good words. I was asked by the Norway to kind of lead the discussion about the ALAC statement on DNS Abuse because I've been in the community since 2000 as both an ICANN accredited registrar and regular operator and also at present, I'm working for a company that's serving registries and registrars for handling their DNS Abuse. The key thing that we object to is that, there's a mix between the different types of abuse, the category is abuse.

The important thing is that when we address these things to ICANN and ICANN Board, it has to be connected to DNS Abuse because DNS Abuse is something that gets to the heart of the stability and security of internet. Things like content abuse, fake web shops, etc., these are not abuse categories that will hurt and harm the stability and security of the

internet; hence it will not be in the remit of ICANN to take this onboard. I think it's a waste of time and waste of resources, not only to focus on the DNS Abuse.

I have a couple of things I'd like to have into this statement. First of all, it has to be clear, it has to be a better understanding what is DNS Abuse. As of today, we have Spec 11 3B on the registry side and we have some requirements on the registrar's side and these are referring to some kinds of categories of abuse, phishing, malware, not spam but we have to have a clear definition of what is DNS Abuse and what's included in these kinds of categories.

Secondly, we need to have a better wording for the contracted parties, how to act on DNS Abuse. Thirdly, is that I find it very, very strange that At-Large asks for an open WHOIS to identify the registrant because in Europe that goes completely mad with the GDPR and as European registry and registrar, I don't like to be fined by the DBS.

I'll stop there and I'm happy to try and answer any questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, Steiner, thank you very much and as Sebastien said, thanks very much for being on the call to have this discussion and we really do want to reach consensus about it. We have a bit of a cue started. One thing that I'll point out is that and maybe we need to clarify the language, we're not calling for a return to all of the data being published again as it was before on WHOIS but instead, talking about rate limiting so that researchers and others are able to still do statistical research.

The names that we're talking about revealing are bad actors among the contracted parties, not end users. I just don't want those two to be confused. Under the section about DAAR is allowing people to make intelligent choices of which registry or registrar they use based on statistics about them. You might still disagree with that but I just wanted to clarify that that's what we're saying in the document. I'll go through the cue and then come back to you, Steinar, so don't go away. Tijani, go ahead please.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. You remember the session with ALAC that was just made regarding the DNS Abuse, I mentioned for them that the website content abuse cannot be in the remit of ICANN and they agreed, he agreed, the man but he said nobody cared, I'm not sure nobody cared. We are not allowed to address anything which is out of the remit of ICANN and the content is out of the remit of ICANN. I support our colleague who made the comment on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Tijani. Again, maybe we need some clarification on the language, we're not talking about content abuse in its normal ways. We're talking about things that are already in the registry/registrar contracts today, we're not talking about expanding that.

I think the reason that IP comes up sometimes is because of its high association with malware and also given the positions we've been taking in the EPDP, we believe that there are aspects of security and stability of the DNS that come into play in terms of consumer protection

and others. I think we're walking a fine line but not trying to suggest that content presa is the issue. I'm happy to try to clarify that language. Hadia, go ahead.

HADIA ELIMINAWI:

Thank you, Jonathan. So, fake news is as old as news, right? And hate speech is as old as speech, however when we speak about fake news or hate speech in ICANN, we do not speak about it from a content point of view, definitely not. We speak about it from the point or the aspect of the technical challenges that the internet brings and that leads to this kind of abuse, like the use of bots for example.

Technically, the internet has affected or helped in the spread of fake news and hate speech. Again, we are not concerned with the content but as we technically contributed to this, we are looking how we can also technically fix it. This is how I see it. Definitely we are not talking about the content but we are talking about the technical aspect in relation to this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Hadia. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a couple of things. First of all, I appreciate there is a definition of DNS Abuse but I would point out in the sessions in Montreal, we had a session, we didn't come up with a definite, we came up with many definitions. There was a public session on DNS Abuse, it also has many

definitions. While I appreciate there is a definition Steinar, I think we haven't agreed as ICANN or as the participants in Montreal what that is.

From an ALAC perspective that is broader, in terms of from an end user, what is the end user impacted by? To some extent, impacted by something that maybe isn't in the definition that Steinar gave. From and ALAC perspective, I would appreciate using some kind of broader definition of DNS Abuse that does take into account the impact on end users of the sorts of things that while they're end users but may not fit nicely into the narrow definition that Steinar gave. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Holly. I guess I'd also stress that the definition of DNS Abuse is something that's currently being debated by the ICANN Community and so it's not like we're saying the last word on this. I think what we're saying instead, that even using the most strict and conservative definition of DNS Abuse, there's more that can be done and that we can put mechanisms into place, such as mandated audits, that allow for contracted compliance to deal with systemic abuse and that way those mechanisms are in place, those tools are in place and the definition simply determines when those tools get used and that's probably going to be dynamic and subject to further definition by the ICANN Community.

Part of what we're saying here is, that there are forms that can be put in place now and even with the most strict definition of DNS Abuse, could bring about some benefits. Greg Shatan, go ahead please.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Clearly this is a debate that's happening and it's happening inside At-Large as well and the question is, where will we come out on it? That in essence, Steinar, is suggesting we come out on it somewhere different than this report does. I support the report as written.

I note that ICANN's remit is not to regulate content but it's also not to be completely blind of content either, if that were the case then the EUDRP, which deals with use of a domain and not merely it's registration would be outside the remit of ICANN and clearly it's been in the core remit of ICANN since the beginning.

Overly narrow definitions of what's in ICANN's remit are just as troublesome as overly broad definitions of ICANN's remit. To try and limit DNS Abuse to infrastructure abuse only, I think is to leave out a lot of what is considered by many to be DNS Abuse and particularly important types of DNS Abuse from the end user perspective. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. A couple of things. First of all, I'm a little bit confused about Steinar's comment about us asking for an open WHOIS RDAP system, I don't see where we're going that, so I'd like to have him point out to exactly what it is that he's objecting to.

Second one is, one of the requests is referred to as third party payments and I'm not quite sure -- first of all the wording is confusing, it says, "Don't process third party payments unless they have been approved

prior to the request.” And I don’t know what that means and I’m not quite sure it’s something either ICANN can legislate in contracts, although it could perhaps give a best practice, nor do I understand exactly what it’s trying to prevent.

I registered domains on occasion where there’s no obvious connection between my credit card and the domain we’re talking about, so I’m a little bit confused on that. Lastly, the last bullet point, the one implements the above in agreement contracts with clear enforcement language for ICANN contractual compliance. I think was driven by a comment I made but it misses the most important part of it.

My comment was, ICANN must convene a group of all the necessary parties, the contracted parties and ICANN compliance and ICANN legal to come up with ways that we have contractual terms that can be enforced. Just saying do it, is missing the main point, that this has to be done cooperatively between the two because currently the registrars say they’re terms that ICANN compliance could use, ICANN compliance says no we can’t, the critical part is having them talk to each other, convene by the Board to actually get it done. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. We can make that explicit, that’s a good suggestion. As far as the credit card thing, I think it was in the context of both registrations that that came up but it would be you using a credit card that isn’t you to register a domain.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, I'm not sure we can legislate that and certainly it's not in any registrars benefit to use a credit card that it's going to be bounced openly or reversed. I think we need to be a lot clearer. It certainly doesn't make the reference to both registrations in the wording there right now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We will add the language about compliance. Steinar, I want to come back to you if I can, if you're still able to see how you're feeling about the arguments that you've heard? I'd love to address the concerns that you have if we can, in the document.

STEINAR GROTTROD: I'm still here. There're a few questions there. The one thing about the DAAR system, maybe I'll speak more privately then we have discussed on in ISOC Norway but DAAR could be a good cue to identify the characteristics of different kinds of abuse, particular DNS Abuse, DAAR is created for DNS Abuse. Whether the results from DAAR should be identified by registrars, bad actors and so on, I think that's an extremely bad idea because we into endless court cases.

The bad guys are well known, they have been identified by different sources not only in DAAR. DAAR should be too for the registry operators and the registrars when ICANN [inaudible] conflicting data and sorted out for the registrars to kind of identify and what these entities are doing and also be a tool for ICANN Compliance for enforcing the contracts if needed. That's maybe more a private standpoint than ISOC Norway but it's noted.

The definition of DNS Abuse, I do agree and I'm pretty aware of that, it's not be said, it's been widely discussed within the community. There's one challenge here, it's that everybody that's kind of monitored the named space for DNS Abuse are depending on the finding from the reputation fee providers.

If a reputation fee is provided, for example Spamhouse identifies one abuse case as phishing, it has to be the same also for other reputation fee providers when they are investigating the same domain name, that's not necessarily the fact of today. There is a challenge that you might be identified as DNS Abuse categorization by on reputation fee but not be identified by another one, even though they have in their workload to try to identify these things.

It's not only a contractual definition of what is DNS Abuse but it's also the fact that this has to be kind of mirrored down to the companies that are doing these security investigations. I definitely disagree in fake news; I don't like fake news. There's a lot of things abused, most abuse things I don't like at all but we have to focus on the DNS Abuse and I hardly see that fake news is threatening the security and stability of the DNS system. I don't like, I can't see it that way.

There is the open WHOIS. When we started discussing this in ISOC Norway, it was a previous version and it was more -- the wording was in more open and freer WHOIS. I see today there is some limitations but it's still in the area I can't understand. RDAP and the tiered access to RDAP is the way to handle this. The registrant will always have the information through the registrar. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

We heard everything Steinar, thank you very much. That was excellent. Again, I think the issue is about creating a system that makes it easy to get to the data that is in fact available. White listing for researchers and others that are doing that work so that they can quickly make data requests, some of these thing lack implementation details but the idea is to make it easier not harder for the people that we want to have access to this data to have access to it, that's the issue.

It's not about opening things back up again or having them wide open, WHOIS or RDAP, I think that's clear in the document now but if you have an idea for how to make it more clear, I'm happy to take that on. I may try to reach out to you offline as well. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. One further comment on the WHOIS issue. Right now, the document, I haven't looked at previous versions, so I don't know what previous versions is. Right now, it's saying, make access to public information actually accessible because right now because of rate limiting and other things, the open public data is not necessarily available. ICANN's WHOIS porthole does not necessarily make information available and the mechanisms, the WHOIS web access or the port access, does not necessarily make information available that is legitimately available subject to GDPR that's number one.

Number two, remember, ICANN's implementation allows registrars and registries to protect information that is not subject to GDPR. I don't want to get into that discussion right now. I'm an active participant at

the EPDP and I'm fighting those battles there but just pointing out that currently ICANN is allowing the hiding of data which is not subject to GDPR and that's an issue that we can't address in this particular comment but just pointing out that protecting personal information, which is what GDPR is not the same as what we have implemented in the revised WHOIS under the temporary spec. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Tijani Ben Jemma.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you very much. Last word from me about the DNS Abuse. Some people are speaking about defining or redefining the DNS Abuse, I don't think it's about definition of DNS Abuse, it is controlling the content of internet or not because you must have two things. The head speech, you know what is considered that speech is not considered head speech there,

it is considered freedom of expression and sometimes we have two head speeches about two communities. One is content and the other is freedom of expression. It is political and please, don't let us enter into the political. ICANN did very good to prevent itself to control the content, let us be part of the content and from the political issues. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tijani. I don't think anybody's actually talking about regulating content or trying to figure out what's hate speech. I don't know how

we got on that discussion. That's not what we're trying to advocate at all. Steinar, you have your hand up, go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTROD: Just want to make one point. It's that Spec 11 3B and the requirements for the ICANN accredited registrar is only for the new gTLDs, the legacy TLD's, they don't have that kind of wording in the contract. If we want to fight DNS Abuse, we also have to take in that DNS Abuse has been acted on by the .COM namespace. We have to take that into consideration. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Steinar. Any other comments from anyone? I think my takeaway is to clarify the enforceability point and to explicitly call for a meeting of the minds between the contracted parties and compliance to get an understanding of how enforcement can move beyond waiting for people not to pay their bills. I can also try to throw in a little bit to strengthen any language that suggests we're not trying to regulate content. I think that's my takeaway for this piece.

I feel like the area that is still a fundamental disagreement is about the naming of parties that are engaged in systemic abuse and so I think Steinar's is that those names are made public elsewhere and shouldn't be ICANN's role to do that and that that would lead to litigation. There are others that believe it would be a good for DAAR if we set threshold high enough because it's another way for people to understand from a trusted source, what contracted parties they want to work with.

I don't know if people want to add more on that, that's something I feel we don't have consensus on. We might have majority consensus on but we haven't gotten agreement with Steinar on that point. If folks would like to talk about that more, please raise your hand. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll just point out that unanimity is nice but it's not necessary. I'm very worried where one person or one entity and I'm not talking about this particular issue on revealing contracted parties or Steinar but I'm worried when we are in a position where a group comes to a very strong consensus but one person doesn't necessarily agree and I think the ALAC needs to have a good discussion, not necessarily in respect to this particular statement, on just how it wants to react. You're often going to be in a position where you don't have unanimity and that doesn't mean we can't take strong positions.

Perhaps we want to shelve and bring back at some other time, perhaps in a face to face discussion because I think it's really important that we understand how to proceed. I know in things like the EPDP and the GNSO PDP's, they sometimes get bogged down, they have formal rules that say you don't need unanimity but then there's a reluctance to act if there's not unanimity and I think we need to discussion on how we proceed on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. And just for the record, I wasn't assuming we needed unanimity, I was just taking advantage of the fact that we had everybody on this call and talking about, to see if we could get it, that's

more where I was coming from but I think we would probably proceed with this statement with a few changes despite the issues that have been raised because we do have a broad consensus among the CPWG. Again, this just now a recommendation to ALAC that will take this up as well. If anybody else wanted to address that particular issue, I wanted to give people a chance to do it, that's all.

I'll make the changes that I suggested and then I will pass this on to the ALAC. Kick the can down the road and let them decide whether to actually issue this advice but I think we've put a lot into it and had a lot of discussion, both face to face and on the phone about the substance of this advice. I think it's appropriate that it be hard hitting.

I feel like there were some really ridiculous things said by some of the registrars DNS Abuse session, there was no way we should be waiting for somebody not pay their bill in order to be able to take action against a contracted party. Let's take a strong stand and these conversations will be ongoing, this won't be the last word in the community nor will it be the last word from At-Large. Thanks folks. Olivier, back to you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Next, we have the Subsequent Procedure Update with Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you very much, Olivier. I'm going to make this very brief because I'm on another call, the NCAP call actually. Two things to update this week. First one is, conclusion of the method that was being discussed

over the last couple of calls, which is the letter from GAC to the Subsequent Procedures Working Group co-chairs on the matter of the scope of the upcoming public call comment. We have since reacted through a letter from the ALAC chair.

Two also goes to Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group co-chairs as well, along the same lines, relaying the position along the same lines as what GAC has relayed, which is to ask for the scope of the public comments to be covering all draft final recommendations rather than a narrow scope. The link to the ALAC chairs letter is on the agenda wiki, I will leave you to look at it yourself.

The second item that I wanted to raise was, in conjunction with the discussions of sub pro, the deliberations of sub pro which is ongoing, also tied to it would be the GAC Focus Group Intersessional work that the At-Large or the ALAC is supposed to undertake with GAC, to the GAC focal group. Also, the fact that I have been mentioning about some sort of a preliminary score card for Subsequent Procedures from the perspective of end users.

I thought I might start to develop what this score card might look like. I've used one example, which is Applicant Support Program because that is something that hasn't brought about too many disagreements within Subsequent Procedures, so I thought that would be a good example to use to develop a preliminary score card. What you see on the screen now is the example.

This is by no means set in stone, I was just developing a structured way to examine all the inputs that have been received, when I say inputs, I'm

talking about inputs in terms of what ALAC has been saying through its statements on Subsequent Procedures.

Also, inputs in terms of public comments whoever has participated in the past few public comments. Also, deliberations of the Subsequent Procedures in terms of looking at those public comments and trying to narrow down all those inputs into easily comprehensible form that picks up the key issues which impact end users.

This is my analysis of all that which I had described. It's meant to touch upon the CCTRT recommendations. Many of you will note that in past from my updates on Subsequent Procedures, I have picked topics which either ALAC has made a comment on or ALAC feels very strongly on and when I say ALAC of course I mean At-Large as well and also whether CCT recommendations have been tied to each particular topic. This draft will show you, as an example, the Applicant Support Program or ASP is something that ALAC and At-Large have pushed for.

There are also four CCT recommendations which have been tied to this particular area, that covers the first three rows of this draft. The next row lists down the policy goals for Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. The rest of the document talks or tries to raise key points from the deliberations of Subsequent Procedures Working Group on the public comments that have been received. For example, from deliberations they have been able to conclude that there is no objections to the Applicant Support Program continuing.

If you look at the middle column, the second column, that relates to -- let me start again. For example, point number one, what the sub pro

PDP working group has been able to conclude is that there are no objections to the ASP continuing. The next column, is this acceptable to us? Yes, of course it's acceptable to us. The next column would be, is there anything else that we need to do?

If there is, who do we need to do it with? In this situation, item number one, since it's favorable to what we have said, I don't think there's any further action that needs to be done. If you look at point number three for example, this relates to my interpretation of what has happened within deliberations of sub pro PDP working group. I believe they would recommend these points. If you look at point three, ASP will continue but it should have certain elements that relate back to the policy goals that's being discussed.

For example, the first bullet point under three, ASP should continue but it should also be open to applicants regardless of the location as long as they meet the program criteria, this touches on eligibility. Is this acceptable to us? Yes, it should be because we have, I allocated for this in our statement.

If you look at what else needs to be broached, there was a particular element that we also stressed on which is, that applicants must demonstrate how they would serve the target region or the community. As to whom should we take this up with? That's still open because as I said, this is not set in stone, this is just a draft and this is my interpretation of what has happened and what needs to be taken up further. Again, this is the approach that I'm taking. I welcome comments on this number one.

Number two, I would also welcome assistance from members of CPWG, especially those who are within Subsequent Procedures Working Group or who are actively following the work of the Subsequent Procedures Working Group to help develop more of these score cards pertaining to the other key areas that ALAC wishes to take up or has taken up and wishes to press home certain points.

I will leave it at that and I'm happy to take questions if there is any. I'm also happy to take volunteers. I believe I have a small team of volunteers already; I just haven't engaged them actively to do this work because I've been trying to find time to develop this score card draft or structure. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Justine. Next is Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Justine, amazing work here, thank you very much for this. I guess I'm one of the people who are probably on this team or should be because I did some work on the original comment paper here. One thing I just needed to clarify with you, this is pertaining only to our input, At-Large input but I thought I heard you say at the very beginning it somehow included some of the considerations that were coming from other groups but as I hear you speaking more, I think you mean that this only the input and the perspective coming from At-Large, is that right?

JUSTINE CHEW:

If I may answer Marita's question before we get onto Yrjo. The answer simply to your question Marita is no. What I was trying to relay is, we have made statements in the past, yes. Those statements have gone into the public comment process. The public comment process -- somebody needs to mute their line because I'm not able to raise my voice. Thank you very much.

The public comment process has collected a whole lot of feedback or inputs from other parties, not only ALAC and Subsequent Procedures have been looking into those and deliberating on those. This approach that I'm taking is the next step. What it tries to do, is to highlight the areas that ALAC have placed importance on, in context of what Subsequent Procedures deliberations have taken place over the public comments that have been received.

Because the public comments, when we analyze it, we have to look at whether there is a majority position on certain things or whether there is a divergence on certain things. If there is a majority a position, then it's likely to lead to a recommendation of some sort by Subsequent Procedures Working Group. If there is a divergence then it's likely to be dropped or maybe a mention but there may not be a recommendation attached to it.

What I'm seeking to do is to see whether -- for example, if you look at the majority and divergent positions or the [inaudible] position, if there is something that ALAC has comment on or ALAC feels very strongly about and it has been taken up and it's likely to be taken up in the recommendations, it will be in this chart and it will be yes under is it acceptable column.

If there is a divergence and it touches on something that ALAC feels strongly about, then the question is, do we want to take this further and whom do we want to take it further with? It could be, do we want to take our positions and talk to the other constituents and come up with a joint position. For example, GAC, do we want to write something with GAC and come up with a joint statement or do we think that this should go into formal advice directly to the Board? I hope that clears up your question, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: It certainly helps, Justine. Thank you. Yes, I was sort of right at the very beginning and then got confused afterwards but thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Marita. Yrjo Lansipuro next and we're going to have to close the cue after Yrjo, we're really late on this call. Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. This area, Subsequent Procedures is potentially a fertile area for the cooperation between the ALAC and the GAC in the policy area. The GAC, as Justine mentioned, they have a focal group on Subsequent Procedures and in Marrakesh GAC actually suggested that we use this framework for the ALAC GAC policy cooperation in Subsequent Procedures.

There was a delay because when it turned out that the focal group, their focus was actually to begin with, more in capacity building for GAC

members but now they are ready to talk to us in the framework of this group. In Montreal we agreed on that and we are waiting for the first meeting of the focal group where a few of our people would be present in January. I think that their score card, the GAC has the same approach, the score card approach with the Subsequent Procedures and I think that this will be a wonderful method for comparing our notes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Yrjo. Justine, last words on the topic please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Olivier, please note mine in chat as well.

JUSTINE CHEW: If there are specific inputs as to whether there are ways to improve on this draft, then by all means, I'm happy to take suggestions. If people want to contribute to this work, I'm also happy to take volunteers to add to the little group I've commandeered. This group will be continuing its work over the Christmas holidays, to come up with more score cards on the different topics that ALAC feels strongly about. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Justine and that's for this excellent process forward and table. I see there is a lot of support in this. There is a note from Cheryl Langdon-Orr that mentions with regard to the GAC's score card

on sub pro, this is full of errors and misinterpretations, so it needs a huge rework. But this specific draft could really help them out with the 'problem' that they are currently faced with in going through the different aspects of Subsequent Procedures. Definitely a collaboration and perhaps a sharing of this information or this score card with GAC might be very helpful and a positive thing forward.

I'm very mindful of the time. Unfortunately, we are already at the half hour mark, I'm not sure how long interpreters will be able remain on but we do need to move quickly to our Policy Comment Updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you, Olivier. I'll be brief since we're running over here. Recently ratified by the ALAC, there are not executive summaries posted of the two recent ALAC statements that were ratified by ALAC, those being the Implementation Plan for the GNSO Consensus Policy Relating to the Protection of Red Cross Name, Justine was penholder for this. The Registration Directory Service with Two Review Team Final Report and Hadia was penholder for this.

There are currently no public comments open for decision but there was one that recently came, which the At-Large community demonstrated interested in drafting and that was the Third Accountability and Transparency Review Team, ATRT3 Draft Report, this closes on the 31st of January next year. We would be looking for a volunteer penholder for this statement.

Otherwise, topic of discussion for today is the ISOC PIR Issue and Next Steps. It was discussed on ALAC monthly this week and it could be potential ALAC advice to the ICANN Board. With that, I'll turn it over to you Jonathan or Olivier. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Evin, thanks very much for putting together this summary. I think now is not the time to reengage on PIR and ISOC, that's really the only issue coming out of this. What we are going to need to do is, identify volunteers for the ATRT response. I am interested in hearing who'd be interested in working on our feedback to that luminous document. Don't everybody raise your hands at one because you might overwhelm the Zoom.

Cheryl's asked a question whether or not it's technically under the CPWG remit and I actually don't know, not having read it but we may just be the best meaning body to come up with a group of drafters and it may be that we skip consensus on the CPWG and go right to ALAC from the drafting team, we should get things going then. Are these hands up with questions, Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Yes, thanks Jonathan. It's not a question but it was I think at the end of last weeks call or at least I remember mentioning it or asking whether the ALAC representatives on ATRT would be taking the lead in introducing the issues or the recommendations to us, I'm just wondering if that would be the case going forward? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Justine, that's a really good point. I guess we had talked about trying to -- we're having a webinar in January but we had talked about getting a presentation from Cheryl or Sebastien together to go directly into the things that we think are most relevant to us and that we might want to specifically address. I guess the question is, how people feel about that? I think that might even have been Sebastien's suggestion on a previous call. I think that's an open question Justine. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll start off by saying, all though I very briefly looked at the start of the document and the recommendations, I have certainly not read it yet. I believe it has to go to the ALAC, it cannot be something which the ALAC rubber stamps because this group or any other subset of people have put together and I think it should actually have some discussion within the ALAC as opposed to just the ALAC voting on it. I'm putting my stake in the ground there.

I'm probably willing to do some significant work, whether I will have the resources to be the lead drafter or not, I'm not sure and I'm not willing to comment until I look at the document in a little bit more depth but I am a potential contributor and maybe a drafter is someone -- if that comes out but I'm not sure at this point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. I guess this raises the issue, part of the process that we try to engage in inside of the CPWG is to identify the areas of interest to

us and then identify the points we want to make before we begin actually drafting and then once we do that, we identify drafters to kind of put meat on the bones so to speak of those talking points.

I wonder if I'm addressing both Cheryl and Alan points about the ALAC but suggesting that perhaps we try to do a quick turnaround of areas of interest to us and the points we'd like to make on them and then send that to the ALAC, potentially even for a special call to endorse those points rather than trying to put this on the ALAC to generate a draft? I don't have enough experience to even know what that would necessarily mean. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. We discussed that last week and I was hoping that the time would have come to review some inputs to this. If it's not the case, the slide will not be ready before, the official slide will not be ready before the beginning of next year, it's what we have today in our ATRT3 call [inaudible]. I'm not sure that we agree on everything, maybe anything altogether, therefore I think it's important to have the voice of each and every one of us, not just one or the other. It's an important point to take into consideration.

The situation is quite tense for the moment and I really think and would like that including the discussion we just had between CPWG, ALAC, I will say first, it will be CPWG and ALAC to discuss about that. If you take all that into account, if we have a presentation in mid-January and we are supposed to have a comment set up for end of January, we are outside of the schedule, therefore I urge At-Large, ALAC to start the

work now and not to wait for anything produce because if not we will be late and at the end we will say we don't have enough time. That's where I am.

The document, it's long, I guess there are a few points where I think it's important to be aware that there need discussion, not to be discussed by us, absolutely not but at least a few that need to be an in-depth discussion by us as soon as possible to allow us to have a clear view of what we want to say to the ATRT3 team. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sebastien. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Number one, there is no such concept as the ALAC drafting a statement or the CPWG draft, work is done by people and ultimately what I was saying was not that the ALAC should draft a statement but the ALAC should have an opportunity to discuss the issues. I strongly agree with somebody who said, let's get some bullet points down. One can draft a final statement pretty quickly once we agree on the content. I would not focus; I would not attempt to draft a statement going forward until we have agreed to what it is we want to say.

I would strongly suggest that we not try to make this an omnibus statement that comments on everything that the report says. I think we should focus on the things that we believe are really important and the things that we believe are dumb and they shouldn't go forward.

We appointed four people to the ATRT and that was done under my watch as chair so I can speak with a little bit of authority; one of the reasons we appoint more than one person is, we don't expect them all to agree. And indeed, if some people on our group, some of our representatives on the ATRT do not agree with some of these points, it's essential that we hear because these are the people that we're -- forgive the expression, paying the big bucks, to think about these things on our behalf and if there is disagreement, that's important.

If it's unanimity among all four of our people on issues, that's important, and I think we need to get to that part really quickly because as Sebastien said, there's not really much time left and although I'd like to think we'll be given a two week extension, we can't count on it. We need to start doing our work but we really need to have input from our members, not presenting the report but giving us their views. I think that's are really important part of this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. I think we are violent agreement. I think what we need to do is, schedule a special purpose call and ask for a presentation by the four members of the ATRT3, that they present on what they believe the key points are for us to address and where the recommendations are and what they think the points are that should be made and where we should highlight where the disagreements are so that we can have that conversation.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I suggest you allocate two hours at least.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's probably true as well. Let's try to get that call scheduled as quickly as we can. Folks on the ATRT3, you're on notice that that's what we're hoping to get from you, is where we should focus our efforts, where we've got consensus on the points that we should make and where we have disagreements. Sebastien, is that a new hand?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, it is a new hand. Thank you very much. I would like to point out, one comment into discussion. I guess it's only way to say something that's every difficult to answer to this, it's maybe not difficult for Alan and some others. My feeling is it is right and it's why I would suggest that we have also a time to help anyone to answer to the document. Yes, you need to have the position of the point of view of the four of us but you need also to have our help to get into the document.

What Justine does each week or Hadia and Alan do each week, is something need to be done for ATRT3. You can't consider that you will jump into the document and say, yes, I understand everything and I know where they are coming from and where they are going. It's why I suggest that we do that and if we wait for the bullet points, we are out of schedule from my point of view.

The question of the document, the fact that we will have a translation of summary but in a few days or weeks, the five other UN languages, it's also more difficulty to have more people getting this document. Therefore, if there is a need to have this discussion, eventually help also, the one with difficulty in English, it could also be sort out how we

can work on that. I can promise you that I can and I'm sure the others, we can give a presentation on the fact and then give you the position of everyone, each one of us can give. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's great. We're not going to go through the rest of this cue. We're going to schedule a single purpose call. We're going to try to see if we can get the maximum number of translators, we can get on that call for a presentation by the four members so that we can get into this document. I think we're all in agreement that that's necessary for us to have any hope of tackling this in a timely way.

That is an action item right away for a Doodle Poll that has a strong emphasis on ALAC members but that we need to have a single purpose discussion with as many translators as possible, as many languages represented as possible to go over this document. Let's pick a date and we'll set it up. Back to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. We are very late on today's call, apologies to those people that still have their hands up. I'm not sure whether this is for any other business, that's where we're going now. I see Tijani Ben Jemma.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA:

Thank you very much, Olivier. It is about what Cheryl, I understand what she said, is it CPWG issue or is it an ALAC issues? It is not DNS

policy and CPWG is about DNS policy. I think ATRT is not a CPWG issue.
Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Tijani. Any other business? Updates on the At-Large Consolidate Policy Working Group Workspace, there are some changes. I believe Evin Erdogan can provide is with some details on this.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. Just a few changes were made on the workspace, for many of you that visit the workspace you'll see that resources have been updated to reflect resources that are utilized by the working group as well as older or archived resources. There's also updated information about the CPWG mailing list, as well as the CPWG Position Development Process Graphic. Just a better page overall, as well as monthly reports are now featured on the page from 2019. Please utilize it and also share it with people who maybe interested in joining the group as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Evin. Any comments? The only thing I could as is, for me the two most important links on this page are the ALARGE Policy Advice Development wiki page and the At-Large Website Policy Summary and those links are somehow hidden in the middle of the wiki page, they don't really stand out.

There is a lot of waffle and thing around on what the group does and blah, blah but doesn't actually send people to the actually working

place, it seems to be a front page for the time being, that's what I've seen, so highlighting it would probably be a good thing to move forward. Any other comments on this?

No, okay. Thanks for sharing these updates, Evin. Any other, other business? I'm not seeing any hands up. I'd like to recognize our interpreters for this call and just ask for the next meeting date and time from Staff.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Olivier, next Wednesday is actually Christmas Day, Monday would be the only option, the Wednesday after that is New Years, ICANN offices are closed. Let me know what you would like to do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Would we be able to move it to the 24th, the day before Christmas, is that something that others might be interested in?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: So, it's my Christmas Day, fantastic, can't wait to share it with you all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: For you it would be, wouldn't it, Cheryl. Wonderful, you can open presents with us all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's all right, no point in worrying about my personal opinion now. I will be there regardless.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Monday, 23rd suggested by Justine Chew.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We could do next Monday, the next rotation time would be [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Could we do it again at this time please, rather than the awful time that the other is?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We could do 1900 UTC next Monday.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Works for me. Any other thoughts on this? I think that's fine. Let's do Monday the 23rd at the same time as today, which is 1900 UTC.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much everyone. A special thanks to our interpreters and let's then move on and close this call. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night. Goodbye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining the call. This meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]