| | |
|---|---|
| YESIM NAZLAR: | Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group Call taking place on Wednesday, the 15th of January, 2020 at 1900 UTC. |
| | On our call today on the English channel we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Abdulkarim Ayopo Oloyede, Alfredo Calderon, Alfredo Lopez, Ali Al Meshal, Ana Maria Moreno, Bill Jouris, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dave Kissoondoyal, Eduardo Diaz, Glenn McKnight, Guela Astbrink, Hadia Eliminiawi, Hanan Khatib, Holly Raiche, Ines Hfaiedh, Jose Lebron, Marita Moll, Maureen Hilyard, Obed Sindy, Oksana Prykhodko, Olivier Bachollet, Ricardo Holmquist, Sébastien Bachollet, Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Tijani Ben Jemma, Yrjo Lansipuro, Alejandro Pisanty, Alan Greenberg,  Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet. |
| | And on the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto.  We have received apologies from Laurin Weissinger, León Sánchez, Kaili Kan, Roberto Gaetano, Pierre-Jean Darres.  We have Zak Muscovitch and Justine Chew joining late.  Our Spanish interpreters for today are Paula and Veronica and our French interpreters for today are Aurélie and Camila.  I would like to remind everyone to please state your names when speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation purposes, as well, please.  Thank you very much, and with this, I the call over to you, Olivier. |
| OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you very much and welcome everyone to the Consolidated Policy Working Group Call brought to you from another country yet again, I'm |

now at EuroDIG preparation in Italy, along with a number of other EURALO whom I can see on the call, who are probably in the same building as me. Welcome and the first thing that I'd like to add, that this is a first, a first call in French, so welcome to the people who are either on the French channel or are listening to this recording on the French channel.

If you are a French speaker, then turn over to this channel, the conference ID is different from the others. The English conference ID is 1638, Spanish 1738, and French 1838. And the reason why I say that is because we are testing this out and of course it needs to be used on each of the channels for the channels to remain being offered.

So, welcome, and let's then look at our agenda for today. We'll have, of course, the Action Items, and update on the EPDP Phase II from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. After that Marita Moll will be speaking to us about the ALAC Statement on the Draft FY21-25 Operating & Financial Plan and the Draft FY21 Operating Plan & Budget. Marita has a significant amount of time on this with the presentation today and our apologies for not being able to fit her in the call last week.

After this, Justine Chew will be providing us with an update on the Subsequent Procedures. Then we'll have of course our usual Public Comment updates with several statements that are being developed either as comment or as drafting stage. That's where we are at the moment. Is there anything else that we need to add, amend, change in the agenda? Please let us know now. I see Marita Moll has put her hand up. Marita?

| MARITA MOLL: | Hi, Marita Moll for the record. Thank you, Olivier. I just need to correct your description of what my presentation is about. It is actually about Appendix C in the financial plan for 2025, 360-page report. Appendix C deals with the evolution of the multistakeholder plan. So, there are still plenty more things in that report to talk about, but I'm not going to be talking about them here and now. Thank you. |
|---|---|
| OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: | Thanks very much for this, Marita, thanks for correcting me on this. You're absolutely right and the Finance And Budget Subcommittee is actually working on the part of the statement, on the rest of the statement, and this indeed is just one specific piece of the puzzle for the final statement that the Finance And Budget Subcommittee will be working on, and hence the reason why, although we have a long-term response date or closing date, hence the reason why we need to get this part done and dusted as early as possible. So, thank you for this. |
| | I'm not seeing any other hands up as we are here, so let's get going and look immediately at the Action Items from our last call, the ones from the 8th of January. You will notice that they are all complete and I just open the floor for any comments or questions on any of these. No? |
| | Okay, thank you very much for this. Then we can swiftly move to the Expedited Policy Development Process with Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. As usual, I'm not sure who wishes to take the floor. I notice that both are on the call. So, Hadia or Alan, you have the floor now. |

ALAN GREENBERG:     I'll take it first, oh, I see Hadia has her hand up, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:     I think you should go ahead first because you were on today's Small Team call.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Alright, we are a week-and-a-half away from the face-to-face meeting, we are not making satisfactory progress in my mind. We spent a lot of time at a meeting yesterday talking about things which I believe were of minimal consequence and I'm not quite sure why, but that is what we did, we were talking about details of auditing and what happens if you find out that people have been accredited inappropriately. Well, I think the answer is pretty simple, you revoke their accreditation and you fix the problem so you don't do it again, but we spent unending time trying to address how to word this.

Anyway, we also spent some time at the beginning of the meeting looking at the SSAD model, that is, exactly how will this system work, will there be a front end that everyone sends things to, how will it make decisions, will the decisions be by the SSAD or by the contracted parties? The contracted parties had submitted a proposal which essentially says there will be a centralized front end and then everything goes to the contracted parties for decision making.

So, essentially that is the current status quo where all contracted parties make their own decisions but with tracking. The current status quo

according to the people who making requests on a regular basis is not working. So, that seems to, in my mind, propagate or continue a system which isn't working with some refinement in tracking, but not much you can do about it. We didn't get anywhere in the discussion yesterday and it was felt that we must make some headway before the face-to-face meeting.

A small group was convened to meet today and we met this morning and will meet again in a couple hours. I made a proposal to that group to make a small modification to the contracted parties proposal to say instead of the contracted party makes the decision, the decision will be made by the authorization provider, which is the technical term we're using for who it is, and that might be the contracted party or it might be the SSAD itself if we can up with automated rules that it can respond to.

I must admit some level of dissatisfaction in that although several other people said effectively t same thing, including the Chair of the working group, there doesn't seem to be any real interest in crafting words that will make it happen. So, I'm a little bit disappointed that people who effectively agreed with me in concept didn't say well let's use that as an example or let's rewrite it in a different way, but with the same result.

The contracted parties said well yes, we believe this is the model we'll evolve essentially to what I was talking about, but don't want to put the words there. So somehow this unknown mechanism in the future will help it evolve. So, I'm really sensing that people are sticking to their guns and almost everyone demanding that their answer be the one that is the answer, even though it's becoming more and more apparent that

no single answer at any of the extremes is actually going to be satisfactory.

If we end up for instance where all of the decisions are made by the centralized model, assuming it's deemed to be legal, the only way I can see that playing out is almost all requests are rejected, because that's the only safe way to make these things.

The same thing is true for contracted parties. If they don't have the resources to make the decision properly, their safe answer is to reject and that's akin to today's world where most requests get rejected or ignored, and in today's world we even have examples of data commissioners in Europe making requests to contracted parties and they get refused.

So, the data commissioner believes they are making a completely fair and reasonable request, but yet the contracted party isn't willing to risk it and is not responding positively. So, we have a situation that isn't working and it's not clear how we're going to get there unless we see some flexible movement in some of the parties, and maybe that will happen in the face-to-face, but I'm starting to worry. Thank you. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:     Thank you, Alan. So, Alan covered almost everything. As Alan just said, we've been talking about a lot of details and we haven't yet reached any kind of consensus with regard to the fundamentals. So, yesterday, among the things we were discussing is also what if the accreditation

authority is in breach of policy and that's accrediting entities that should not be accredited.

And in our report we do say at some point that we will have only one accreditation entity and that one accreditation entity is ICANN. So, actually de-accrediting the accreditation entity will leave us with no accreditation entity and no accredited entities if we revoke all of them, and no path forward to rebuild the system again. This was part of the discussion yesterday. I think what was agreed upon that accountability mechanisms will be followed and then how this is being implemented will be left to instrumentation.

Going back to the fundamentals and Alan said, the contracted parties have made a proposal for a model, basically what we have now in the draft final report are three possible models.

The first is a centralized model where you have a central gateway, and identity provider, and an authorization provider. How this works is that the central gateway will receive the request and complete and verified requests are sent to the authorization provider which actually makes the decision. We haven't yet talked about who the authorization provider is, but this is how the centralized model looks like.

The second model is a hybrid model. You have a central system for receiving the request, but then the decision is directed to the contracted parties where they make the decision. So, this is very much like what is going on now, with the exception that you have a central gateway that receives the request and you are able to log and track.

# EN

And then we have the status quo which is exactly what we have now. I think we all agree the people who have been using the system right now don't see the status quo working. The hybrid model as the [inaudible] contracted parties is very much similar to that. So, we think that the model that will work is basically the first model, which the centralized model.

But again, the authorization provider hasn't been determined yet. So what we were proposing is having a hybrid model but based on the centralized model. Like you will have a centralized system where it receives the requests, the requests are verified, and if complete and verified, are sent to the authorization provider.

The authorization provider in some cases will be able to make the decision and that reply to the request, and in other cases it won't be able to make the decision and that directs the request to the relevant contracted party in order to make the decision. So, this is more or less what we proposing, and it does include what the contracted parties are asking for.

So we start with a centralized model, and whenever it's possible, or whenever needed, you get the contracted parties to make the decision and not the opposite, where the contracted parties now suggest that we have this hybrid model where they make the decision and when the system evolves, with might go the centralized model. So, those are the debates and those are the discussions that going on so far. And I stop here and give the floor to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:   Thank you very much.  Just a couple more words.  A large part of the problem sits around the fact that ICANN in its submission to the data commissioners basically proposed a centralized model where ICANN or the centralized system makes all of the decisions.  That for all intents and purposes is not implementable.

We know it's not going to be implementable, well, the only way it's going to be implementable is for ICANN to refuse a huge number of requests, because we know there are going to be many cases where without the information that is accessible to a registrar about their client, there is no way you can release the information based on the request.

So, we know there are going to be large numbers of requests which are not fairly and properly and properly responded to by a central system, and yet nobody seems willing to accept that and say let us design a system where there are multiple authorization providers based on the details of the request.  I really don't understand why we  all come the same conclusion or most of us come the same conclusion, but don't want to go to the logical step of then how do we design a system that accommodates that?

So, there is some impasse at this point, hopefully we'll get past it.  I was encouraged by the Chair of the working group in an intervention today basically describing just that situation where we're going to need multiple authorization providers.  But I still don't see willingness of the various parties on either side to come up with a system which accommodates that.  So, that's where we sit right now.

**EN**

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:     Thanks very much for this, Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking.  The floor is open to questions and comments.  And Christopher Wilkinson is in the queue.  Christopher, you have the floor.


CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:     Christopher Wilkinson for the record.  Thank you, Alan and Hadia, for your illuminating description of the problems that we have.  Just two basic questions.  One is when you refer to the contracted parties, in their view, who is the relevant contracted party in any particular case?  Are we talking about the sole party that's concerned by a particular application, or are we talking about some sort of collective entity of the collective parties who would generate policy factorial jurisprudence as to what kind of requests would be authorized?

Secondly, why would we, and I ask you to interpret the proponents of these policies, not your own point of view which is already clear, but why would one want to involving the contracted parties at all?  Thank you.


ALAN GREENBERG:     May I take it?  I'm not chairing this meeting.


OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:     Go ahead, Alan, please.

| ALAN GREENBERG: | Thank you very much. In terms of the first question, the contracted party we're talking about is the registrar of record for any particular domain. So we know who is the registrar and the default seems to be the registrar of record. That brings up an interesting little quirk that we know at this point registries get some number of requests, we don't know how many, there's certainly not a large number, but registries do get some requests. |
| --- | --- |

The contracted parties model doesn't seem to allow for that. So, I have asked that question, no answer is forthcoming. The question of why would we want them, well, whether we want them or not, they want them to be involved right now because remember, we still haven't determined who is the controller or who are the joint controllers, these are technical terms in regards to GDPR and other comparable legislation.

The bottom line is whoever is the controller and makes the decision to release information is the one that may be fined a huge amount of their gross revenue if they make a mistake. So, they're worried about a decision being made on their behalf and they bearing the costs associated with penalties that are associated with making mistakes. So, they don't want to subject to those, there is no way ICANN can indemnify GoDaddy or VeriSign for 4% of their gross revenue, that would bankrupt ICANN immediately.

So, ICANN is not going to indemnify them and therefore they are particularly sensitive to being told that we'll make the decision centrally but you will bear the cost associated with it. Part of the problem is we

have still, despite talks for two years now, have not determined who the controllers are.  T

he answer is almost surely we are joint controllers with the contracted parties, but without an actual joint controller agreement which lays out the rules of who does what within the joint relationship, we still don't have any clarity whatsoever on who might bear the penalties associated with these kinds of things.  So, that's the story on that side.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:    Thanks for this, Alan.  Hadia Elminiawi?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:    Yes, just a quick note.  But also we are waiting for legal guidance from the European Data Protection Board.   As you remember, ICANN submitted a proposal to the European Data Protection Board seeking advice with regard to the liabilities and this proposal, ICANN actually proposed to be the decision maker, and if the request is actually accepted, then a request would be sent to the contracted party to transfer all of the data without knowing anything about the request and the request would be provided by the central gateway.

According to this proposal, the contracted parties, as Alan said, they are joint controllers, but according to the assumption here the contracted parties would be liable and responsible for what they do.  So they will be responsible for the retention, the collection, the transfer of the data, but they will not be responsible for the disclosure of the data to the

request; ICANN or the authorization provider would be responsible for that part.

Depending on the legal, if we do receive legal guidance from the European Data Protection Board that actually confirms this and says that the contracted parties would not be liable for the disclosure of the data, then there is no need for the contracted parties to make the decision and my guess is also the contracted parties in such a case wouldn't want to be the decision makers, either.

So, that's why we are talking about contracted parties being decision makers because right now as we stand, we don't have any kind of confirmation that says if they are not the decision makers, they will not liable for the disclosure of the data. If we have legal advice or guidance from the European Data Protection Board that says so, then it is most likely that we will be talking about the centralized model where the contracted parties are not the decision maker. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:   Thanks for that, Hadia, it's Olivier speaking. I'm mindful of the time and we have a very packed agenda today. Clearly a very important discussion. There is also something going on in the chat, so I invite everyone to follow up on the chat and on the mailing. Unfortunately, we have to move on because we only allocated 10 minutes to this. I just had one quick question Alan and Hadia. So, next week you are going to be in Los Angeles. Will you be able to join this call, the CPWG call, to provide us with a hot update then?

| | |
|---|---|
| ALAN GREENBERG: | It will not be next week, it's the week after, we're in Los Angeles, and we are meeting on Wednesday, so chances are we will not be able to join you. It will depend exactly on what the timing is, though. |
| OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: | Okay, well, next week you will still be able to provide us with more details, so thank you very much for this. Let's please move on now, and we're now going on to the ALAC statement on the evolution of the multistakeholder model, the subsection of the wider Draft FY21-25 Operating & Financial Plan and the Draft FY21 Operating Plan & Budget. I think this is a short enough title. Let's go to Marita Moll, Marita, you have the floor. |
| MARITA MOLL: | Thank you, Marita Moll speaking. Can we have the slides up? I've prepared some slides, thank you, in order to help us work through this. Most of you or many of you will have been at the presentation that Brian Cute presented in Montreal and his report which is Appendix C of the financial planning document is pretty close to exactly what he presented, except for a few additions that came out of some of the discussions on the floor.

So, you may recognize some of this or most of it, for some of you it will be new. If you want to, you can read the entire thing as Appendix C. It's a bit surprising to find this bundled together in another very huge document, in my world we call this an omnibus act, where they throw all kinds of things in the kitchen sink hoping that most people won't respond to many of them. I don't know if that's the case here. There is |

a lot of work to do on the budget itself, but this is also an important part of the agenda.

So I'm going to try to bite off a piece of this, not all of it, but try to bring you up to date on what I think might be the things we have to think about mostly. And after the half hour, we'll do this in a sort of organized way, and then I will go over the notes later and turn what you have said into the working document. Brian has taken all those issues which we presented, I think we started with 21, and it's down to 6 or so issues. And you see them on the slide.

Together with the issues themselves, he has also allocated a certain group to work on those issues. You will see this list here, Consensus, Representation & Inclusivity, he's got the GNSO working on this one, and Prioritization of Work and Efficient Use of Resources, SO/AC Chairs working with ICANN Org CEO and ICANN the Board Chair. Culture, Trust and Silos, that's been allocated to ALAC working with ACs and SOs.

[AUDIO BREAK] with information and data, ICANN Org, SOs and ACs to be talking about process procedures and bylaws. He has allocated SOs and ACs on that one. Precision in Scoping, he hasn't decided who is to take that on, but it was suggested that SSAC would be good at this, and so their names are kind of floating around this. Roles and Responsibilities, ICANN Board with community and ICANN Org CEO. So, those are the issues that are left on the table and the people who are supposed to be addressing these issues. Can we go to the next slide, please.

Okay, I'm only going to take two of these particular ones in this session. One of them is Culture, Trust and Silos, because that is our responsibility if we take it on, and the first one, Consensus + Representation & Inclusivity.  If we can get through all that, I think we'll be doing well. Let's go on to the next slide.

Okay, I don't know what happened to one of these slides, but in each one of these topics, he is asking three different questions.  The questions are, and we don't have a slide on that, the questions are do you accept the role, or is this who you think should be accepting the role?  What do you need to do it?  And suggestions how that group could coordinate the work.  So, those are the three questions, that slide disappeared I guess.

Culture, Trust and Silos, are we okay so far?  Does anyone want to break in at this point?  I don't see any hands up.  Okay, so let's go to Culture, Trust and Silos.  We've been asked to take on this role and in the document this is how it's framed.

He says the common issues have come up, just about everybody has said the similar sorts of things, but that we said something that was particular, that no one else had said, that we identified an aspect and issue that's critical to a healthy culture.  He has pointed out that on a regular basis we engage in outreach and information events, face-to-face meetings, explore projects to identify, like this particular CPWG that we run every week, identifying our interest and concerns, and building on this engagement will lead to the development of a solution working with an external expert and in coordination with the other ACs and SOs.  So this is where Brian suggests that we are the most

appropriate group to take on this role.  Can we go to the next slide, please.

He says the resources needed to develop and propose that solution, that is prepared to be offered if we don't ask for anything, volunteers' and leader's time, that's always part of it, ICANN staff time and support, and budget for meeting space and logistical support.  Next slide, please.

So the question to this group is do we accept the role, and why?  That's one of the questions.  And how might we coordinate this work?  There were a number of suggestions that people already put forward in this whole process and those were that we already have a tool intended for silo breaking and meeting [inaudible] is supposed to be exactly about making this sort of outreach and it is not working that way, but it could be perhaps reformatted to work that way.

Another example of how silos can be broken down and trust can built up is the leadership structure in Work Track 5, which is that cross community leadership structure leading a major PDP.  So that was already suggested, meeting B was suggested, and the other suggestion was that the community be consistently reminded and it should be instilled that essential cooperative nature of this kind of work and that's absolutely crucial to the success of the entire project.

So, those are the three things that have already been presented and I'd like to ask you folks whether you think we should take it on and I don't know how we Concentra refuse, but we might have some reservations that we want to put forward and how we might coordinate the work.  And I'm going to recognize Alan first with his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. You just said and you don't know how we could refuse. That may be true. I don't know how we can accept, given that among the groups in ICANN we are probably one of the more criticized ones for not having our act together and doing our own job properly. I didn't say that's the case, but certainly we have been subject to that kind of criticism.

If you look at the comments that were made about us to the external reviewers in the At-Large Review, you can see plenty of that. So, I'm not sure we have the credibility to do it, and I'm not sure we have the means to do it, because they're almost asking something impossible. There are not many times in the world's history that I'm aware of where parties at war with each other simply decided, "Let's stop this," and we did.

Northern Ireland is the only example I can think of. In most other cases, that just doesn't happen. People that are not cooperating, don't cooperate, and occasionally someone can broker cooperation in a particular instance, but rarely do you see them simply saying let's lay down our arms and be nice to each other from now on, and work with each other and trust each other. So, I'm not quite sure what we're setting ourselves up for if we take this on. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Alan, and I think that's a very valid point. In fact, the very first thing that happened when we were suggested for this role was that there was pushback from somebody from NCUC right there on the floor.

However, we might want to consider the fact that precisely because we are the ones who are being criticized, that we've been offered this role, that may be partly how this is coming out, but maybe not. I see Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:       Thanks Marita. I share Alan's concern about the likely success of this endeavor, and it may come down to how we define success. And so if we take this on, I think that we will need to be careful in how we scope what we're taking on and how we will define success in the end to be something over which we in fact have some influence, as opposed to as Alan suggests that everyone has laid down arms, which is unlikely.

So I guess my counterpoint to that, and the same as your point, Marita, is that I think that with the exception of NCSG who just feel like they know everything, I feel like our representation inside the ICANN community is improving all the time. I think we are getting our act together, and one of the ways we're getting our act together is in fact through some amount of cross-pollination.

We did a session that included the NCSG on the EPDP stuff. We did a session that included contracted parties on DNS abuse. And Alan suggested, and I think we're going to try to help facilitate a meeting between the contracted parties and contract compliance. And so I think that we're playing a kind of mediator role particularly in an area that we've decided is of particular importance to us with DNS abuse.

And so I think if we define our success as something structural that promotes more conversations between these parties, that might be

something we could take on and something that we could be proud of afterward, as opposed to something more ethereal like everyone is getting along now, which as Alan suggests, is pretty unlikely.

So I think if we're careful in how we define our success metric and we leverage the fact that we are getting our act together and our reputation is improving and we are in the middle of our review implementation, it feels part and parcel to our own desire to have a more influential role inside of the ICANN community, so I would be inclined to take it on, but be very careful how we scope this. That's my initial feedback. Thanks, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Jonathan, and you have actually ventured into the second question, how we might coordinate this work. I might also want to add that Brian was quite clear when he put this stuff forward, that the fact that we're identified as a lead organization doesn't mean we're expected to solve all problems, but someone has to be reporting and accountable for the fact that something is being done on it.

So basically it's partly, he has to allocate someone to actually be working on it, reporting back, and all that. So I think we don't have to be quite as worried that we we're expected to solve all this, which obviously grew up over many years and it isn't going to be solved over the next couple months. Christopher, next.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:   Thank you, Marita.  Good evening, again Christopher Wilkinson for the record.  I'm also from what I hear a skeptic about this issue.  First of all, it is not likely to succeed in terms of what can be done externally by At-Large vis-à-vis the other silos, and be careful not to carry a can that's got a hole in it.  Secondly, we have limited resources.

I think the main message I would convey on this subject is insofar as you've got resources, don't spend them on introspecting how other silos should behave.  Get out there and break down the silos directly because they are all officially in fact and practice open processes.  The only reason that GNSO, for example, is close to being a cartel is that the other components of the community don't say anything, and leave it to the contracted parties to determine policy.

So, no, don't carry the can that has a hole in it, get out there and make sure, and a few of us on this call are indeed in this case already, make sure that At-Large members are primarily briefed to participate directly in the works of the main silos that we're complaining of about.  Thank you.


MARITA MOLL:   Thank you, Christopher, and on the subject of resources, I think we definitely have to have a very good think about what resources we would request if we take this on, and I suggest that it's more than the resources that he's current offering.  Cheryl Langdon-Orr?

**EN**

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     Thanks, Marita, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.  I'm a non-skeptic, just to clear that right now, in fact I see this as an opportunity.  A couple of points, and in fact I see it as a natural opportunity for us to take a lead in, and I think that Marita's reminder that this is not a go away, make it your project and then come up with solutions and get back to us, but rather an allocation of responsibility for ensuring that efforts are made along clear and transparent lines that will hopefully further work in this area.

And Brian was very clear on that all along.  So, we're reading a short form and forgetting about the bigger picture stuff that's also been presented as this has developed.  Just to remind all of us, some us won't need it, of course, but anyway, it's not actually up to us, CPWG and the At-Large community, to decide whether we take this on or not, it's an ALAC role to do that, but assuming that we will be advising and influencing the At-Large advisory committee.

Just remember these things are being proposed as work pieces to be managed by various advisory committees or support organizations.  In each case it is, to force the word, with the other advisory committees and support organizations, and I suggest that the At-Large advisory committee and concurrently the At-Large community, the backbone and foundation of it all, obviously, is uniquely positioned.  It's a very rare situation where it is mandated to be engaged and involved in the wider ICANN work.

That's not something that you can say about the GNSO, it's not something and certainly not about any subcomponent part or constituency of the GNSO, it's not something to say about the ccNSO or

any of the other advisory committees at the same level.  I think we're uniquely positioned to further this work, but it would be needing to be properly planned, I think it's a natural home, a spiritual home for such an effort if such an effort is to succeed at all.  Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:            Thank you, Cheryl, that was a great intervention and we should look at ourselves as being a group that's broad enough to take this on, and that's an important concept to keep in mind.  We will have to sit down and think about how this might be implemented.  I love the suggestion about not carrying a can with a hole in it.

So, let's just keep that in mind.  We do have a wider role than many other groups.  I've got two more people on this call and I think I'm going to have to close the speakers list.  If you want to speak get on there right now, because there's another part that I'd like to deal with today before we run out of time.  Greg Shatan, please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:          Thanks, this is Greg Shatan for the record.  I don't think we can turn this down, we're not "Bartleby the Scrivener" to refer back to an old work by Herman Melville and I think in fact it would almost prove to others that we're not up to any task if we turn down the task.  I do think it's important and I echo others before me, that we define how we really resource this appropriately.

We can't like seem like pigs, of course, we can't just say well, we need at least 30 more travel slots, or the like, and they all need to be first

class. But we need to be project managers for this up front and get the resources that we need to carry it out appropriately. I think it's the right thing for us to be doing and we're the right group to be doing. We can't afford in a sense to embarrass ourselves by not getting appropriately resourced on it.

I think we just need to shoulder it and take it on. So I think it's important to figure out how this actually, how we can pull this off, as well. And if we're going to reject it, I think we have to reject everything that Brian Cute is doing. We can't just say, well, it's good for everybody else to take on this support, but we can't, that would not work. Thanks.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Greg, and I'm going to echo your project management idea, because I had the thought that if we take on the role of project manager of this thing, we do it in conjunction with people who are experts in project management and that would be among the resources that I would think we should ask for to help the people who do this on a daily basis. Because there are people out there, it's not uncommon to have large corporations do this kind of team management exercise and we need to get help on it. Sébastien Bachollet, please go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I would like to thank the organizers for having included the French interpreter service for this call. I think this provides first the balance of our diversity and our culture, so it's good that all three languages may be used for our working group. Other than

that, I wanted to say that I'm very surprised by the different considerations of each group.

Seeing what Brian did, and seeing what the accountability and transparency review team, the ATRT3 have accomplished, I think we should be mindful of putting all that into the same plan. I think in the prioritization of work there are different considerations that have already been started by ATRT3. And then in terms of silos, we can see very well what the suggestions were through the reviews, in particular with the creation of a holistic review of the organization which should enable us to make clear headway on the matter of silos, or at any rate, the reduction of the weight of silos on our structure.

So, I think we should be mindful, like I said, of the work that each group is doing in terms of these issues. And given that all comments have to be submitted at the same time, I think we should see the chance to make a comment statement regarding all the different documents. Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:          Thank you, Sébastien. I'm going to ask Olivier, how are we doing on time here?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:   Thanks Marita, it's Olivier speaking, not very well at present. We're about 10 minutes behind at the moment, but it's not due to you, but you should think about wrapping up your section and then perhaps suggest further input in a further call or by email.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, well I would like to have at least another 5 minutes to just throw this next section at people so that you can think about this. And we can have a talk about it next time, because I think that there is going to be quite a bit of input on it. Please go on to the next slide.

Alright, the issue of Consensus + Representation & Inclusivity. This has been allocated to GNSO working with other SOs and ACs. Let's go on to the next slide.

Some of this is not going to surprise you. The community has stated these things, that it's difficult to make policy, there is lack of incentives, participants not having the authorization to compromise, all the issues around consensus building is not unusual to us, and we have all agreed that there are some things that need to be done about it. The fact that it's being stuck together with representation and inclusivity is something that I'm kind of questioning and don't really understand why it was done this way. Let's go to the next slide, because I think we all get this part.

Then he says, and this is from the report, Recruitment and Demographics are issues that have been grouped with Representation and Inclusivity. Community comment noted that Recruitment and Demographics are qualitatively different from Representation and Inclusivity. They are related to further growth to ensure diversity of voices and participation and the integration of new participants in ICANN's processes.

Community comment noted that there are not enough new people and not enough diversity coming into the ICANN community through existing outreach programs. There are concerns about whether ICANN has developed effective pathways to participation. To me, I see some of this has kind of logically been the work that we do here, it is, however, put in another box. So I think this community might want to think about that and have a certain way of responding to it. Let's go to the next slide.

Yeah, it's talking about the same things, coaching, we mentioned many of these things in our responses. So the fact that this is put under the GNSO with the SOs and ACs, do we want to say anything about that or not, we might be as uncomfortable with that as some people in the NCUC are with At-Large taking over the silos and trust section.

So, this is a place where there might be a little bit of discomfort. I'm just trying to put this out there and we can either register our discomfort or not, we're just going to swallow this and assume that we're going to get enough input and assume that it's going to work out okay. Let's go to the next slide.

Okay, so this is it. We need to accept, we are being asked to actually accept the allocation of this role and say why, and give suggestions on how they might coordinate this work, although I would suggest that actually that's their job, not ours. But this might be an area where we have a little discomfort and if we want to register it or not, that's up to us. We can think about that, I don't know if we have time to talk about it today. Jonathan has got his hand up, go ahead Jonathan, if you've got something to say about this issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     I do, thanks Marita.  I guess my first reaction to this is that just as people shouldn't have discomfort from us leading something because we're sort of a natural for it, I'm not sure that we should be discomfited by this allocation of GNSO, given that they are the primary policy making body within ICANN.

It makes sense that they take the lead on this, and taking the lead is not again the same as going off by themselves and coming up with a solution.  It feels, as you described, something about which we care a great deal and we should make sure that we identify people ready to put in the time to participate in this working group or whatever form it takes.

But it doesn't make sense to me that we would suggest somehow that they were wrong group, because I think that they are the central group from a policy standpoint and we just want to make sure that we're heard and have some influence over the outcome in this particular area. That's my thought.

MARITA MOLL:     Right, and it's going to have to be that way, I think, we can't all sort of pick and choose and decide to choose one and let the other one go, and then complain about the other one.  We certainly don't want to have all these things end up in our lap.

So, anyways, we can take this away and think about it a little bit, maybe bring it up again next week or if we have time.  I will put this stuff out,

I'll get a Google doc going and we can start actually putting some input in from the Wiki pages and put it out on the list. So, thank you for your attention. I think we better stop there, or we'll be here all day or night.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Marita, Olivier, I just wanted to say that we have a record number of people on this call, nearly 60 people. I wonder if we can do a quick vote to get the level set how people are feeling, because most people have been quiet and we've had some people make points on both sides. Rather than just kicking the can down the road, should we do a quick vote on both of these issues about whether we think At-Large is the right place to lead the other efforts and whether we think the GNSO is the right one to lead this effort. What do you think, Olivier?

MARITA MOLL: I think that's a great idea, Jon. And then, we have the technology to do that, so as long as you allow us the time to do it…

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks for this, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. Jonathan and I have been looking at the time and we can make a bit of space during the rest of this call. So, we could attempt taking the temperature of the room because as you know, a vote is not exactly a vote per se, but it certainly will be able to provide us with a temperature of which way we swing.

So Jonathan, do you want to sort of lead this and ask the questions specifically and ask people to put either a green tick for a yes, or a red cross for a no in your Zoom.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    That's right.  Thanks, Olivier.  I would say the first question is: Do you agree that the At-Large is the right body to take a leadership role in discussing the issue of silos?  Alan, you have a question before we vote?  Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:    No, I was going to object to what you were saying.  I don't think the question is, "Are we the right body," the question is, "Would we accept if it's offered?"

JONATHAN ZUCK:    Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Which is a very different question.  I'm not sure we're the right body.  But I don't think we have a lot of option in not trying to take it on.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    Okay.  I get that.

MARITA MOLL:    Yeah Alan [CROSSTALK] question, do we accept it?

| | |
|---|---|
| JONATHAN ZUCK: | It is, do we accept this role, is the question.  I'm just trying to create a sense of the room so that when the ALAC picks this up, one of the data points -- somebody's got to mute their lines -- so one of the data points that the ALAC has in front of them is how this group of 60 people, which is pretty big, respond to this question.

So, if we are offered this role, should we accept it?  What is your immediate thought on this, don't spend too much time thinking about it.  Put a green check if you think we should, and a red check if you think we shouldn't.  But please do that right now.  Everyone on the call, either hit yes or no on whether or not we should accept the role to lead the effort on breaking down silos. |
| OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: | And in the meantime, I know that Claudia's screen has stopped being shared for some reason, I'm not sure why.  There is a page which is, "Proposed At-Large positioning on the Culture, Trust and [inaudible] do accept this role and why, suggestion on how we might coordinate this work.  That's page number five out of 11 in Marita's... |
| CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: | We're seeing it, or we were. |
| MARITA MOLL: | No, we were seeing the other one. |

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:     Five.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:     [Inaudible] there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:     Yes, that's the one.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Okay, so a lot of people -- let's just focus if we can though also.  If you think we should accept this role, hit yes.  If you don't think we should, then click no.  Let's try to get as many people to vote as possible.  So focus on that one thing, on that question.  If you're doing emails instead of listening, please come back to the Zoom Room and check yes or no, on whether we should accept the role, the leadership role in dealing with the silos issue, the Multistakeholder Model set.  So just take a second and do that, please.  Thanks.  [AUDIO BREAK]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:     Jonathan, it's Olivier.  I'm seeing a majority of yes's and a handful of no's.  So it looks to me like the majority of people are saying [CROSSTALK] -- correct, yes.  So we don't need to take numbers; as I said, we're taking the temperature of the room here, so let's go to the next, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK:          That's right.  Okay, so the next question is, do we think the GNSO is the right organization to take the lead on representation and diversity?  Yes, if we plan to accept that.  No, if you think we should push back on that selection.  Okay, go ahead, Marita.

MARITA MOLL:           Can we go to the correct slide?  Which is a little bit down the line.  It's really about --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:   Slide number seven.

MARITA MOLL:           Thank you, Olivier.  It's about consensus plus the representation and inclusivity part.  So these are actually two different things, but this whole package is being -- it's suggested that they take this whole package on.

JONATHAN ZUCK:          Thanks, Marita.  And part of that's because they're already in the middle of their PDP 3.0 activities etcetera, so.

MARITA MOLL:           Precisely, precisely.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     So please check yes if you think they're the right people to take this on. No, if you don't think they're the right folks to take this on. Please do that now. [AUDIO BREAK]

JONATHAN ZUCK:     So there are increasingly more no's in this case than the last vote, so the majority still does seem to be supportive of the GNSO taking a leadership role on this issue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:     Correct, Jonathan. I've counted and it looks as though there's a few more, a handful more yes's than no's on this, but it is rather close.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Okay.

MARITA MOLL:     Yes, and I think it's got to do with that representation and inclusivity piece, maybe not because we don't want them to take it on but we may want to put some kind of reservations about that our role in that we would see -- we do see a lot of that as our role, outreach. So, that's why I felt I wanted to bring that up this time. We can talk about it again next time. Christopher?

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Alright, thanks everyone for voting.

MARITA MOLL:   Yes, thank you.  That was a really good idea.  I have a couple of minutes; Christopher, your hand is up.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON:   Yes thank you, Marita.  As one would say in French, une explication du vote.  Look, silos is no longer an intellectual or an academic issue, and it's not comfortable about the Multistakeholder system.  It has gone so far in the ICANN [inaudible] we are pretty close to undermining whatever else in other countries is regarded as fair competition practices.

The institute responsible for dealing with this Silo problem is the ICANN Board.  They should not be passing this down to ALAC or to any other, and certainly not to GNSO because there's a massive conflict of interests.  I voted no twice, and particularly on the second vote.  And I accept from Olivier and Jonathan that this is the temperature of the rooms through a poll, it's not a decision for ALAC.

But I just wanted you to be quite clear that I feel very strongly about this and I do not want ALAC and At-Large with the resources that we've got, to be sub-loads with carrying, as I've said before and I appreciate that the image has been echoed, carrying ICANN with a hole in it.  This is up to the ICANN Board to ensure the capture does not influence the decision making processes within ICANN.  Thank you.

MARITA MOLL:                  Thank you, Christopher.  I think we'll close the discussion here for now. Olivier, I hand it back over to you.  Thank you everyone, that was a great discussion.


OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:       Thank you very much, Marita.  Thank you for your presentation and it's great to have had some questions and some answers here.  Moving on swiftly now, we are quite some time behind.  Jonathan and I have discussed with Justine.  Justine, are you confirming that you'll be able to address the points that you wanted to touch on on the Subsequent Procedures sometime next week?  Is that okay with you?  Did I understand this correctly, or perhaps I've got the wrong thing, the wrong idea?


JUSTINE CHEW:                 No, I'm fine.  This is Justine, whatever should be done in this call should be done [inaudible] Subsequent Procedures.


OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:       Okay Justine, I mean is there anything that you needed to touch on this week perhaps?  That had importance for us, and then we can do the rest in the next call.


JUSTINE CHEW:                 Sure.  This is Justine again, thanks Olivier.  Just two things.  One is that there is a revised update on the predictability framework that I presented last week.  The link is there.  And the second thing that I

would like to highlight would be the list of topics, which is the second link that appears on the agenda wiki page. That's a list of topics that SubPro is covering. In that list, I have generated preliminary settings for whether it's a high priority or non high priority to At-Large.

So the small team will be working off of that list based on the definition of priority level. Again it's not set in stone, there are certain ones which are clearly priority. Some other ones which may or may not become priority depending on our small team work going through the deliberations and the potential recommendations that are coming up from SubPro. Thank you.

OLIVIER CPEPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Justine. And thanks for being up at this time and being able to update us. The next speaker will add a bit more, Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier, Tijani speaking. I noticed that we are postponing the SubPro discussion which is a full DNS policy issue because at the beginning we spent a lot of the time discussing an issue which is not DNS policy. We agreed before that this meeting, this CPWG is on the floor on DNS policy issues. I don't know why we don't stick to that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CPEPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you, Tijani. This call is really about policy, not just DNS policy. And the discussion that we had regarding the Multistakeholder

Model was one that was deemed to be policy and not the work of the Financial Budget Subcommittee. So that's why we had this thing today. Anyway, thanks for your point and that's taken, and in fact, noticing no other hands up, we can go into the policy comments update. Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdoğdu. And thanks for this, Justine.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Thank you, Olivier. This is Evin speaking. So briefly going over a summary of the recent policy activity recently ratified by the ALAC, was discussed on last week's CPWG by Leon Sanchez. The ALAC advised the ICANN board on DNS Abuse, and he will hopefully come soon again to the CPWG to present again on how the board is processing this advice.

Currently there is one public comment open for decision. This is the proposed amendment three to the .COM Registry Agreement and it closes mid-February, on the 14th of February. And statements are being developed. The first thing, ISOC PIR issue. This is not from a public comment, but it is an issue that the At-Large has been discussing significantly over the past few weeks, and it could be potential ALAC advice to the ICANN board.

And if you have the agenda in front of you, there's a link to the Google doc for ALAC advice. There's been continued discussion on the mailing list, and the Google doc itself has some formulated facts from Roberto Gaetano on the topic, and the goal for submission of either the advice or a statement from the ALAC would be the end of this month on the 31st.

Next is the ATRT3 draft report public comment. And the single issue call was held on the 6th of January. A drafting team has been formed before assigning official penholders and I believe that most if not all of the ATRT3 team members from At-Large are present on the call. And this public comment closes on the 31st of January.

Then we also have a proposed date for ICANN public meetings, 2024 to 2028, and revised dates in 2022 and there is already a draft statement posted to the work space by Judith Hellerstein. This closes on the 11th of February. And also another statement that Judith is a contributing penholder is the proposed final report of new gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross Community Working Group, this currently being drafted.

And then finally, as I mentioned before, one of the issues that was presented by Marita just moments ago is the draft FY21-25 Operating & Financial Plan and Draft FY21 Operating Plan & Budget. And there's already been an FBSC call which has taken place this week and there is a second one being planned as well. So please do join that call if you are interested in this comment. With that, I'll turn it over back to you, Jonathan or Olivier. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:           Thanks, Evin, so much. This is Jonathan Zuck for the record. I guess I'd like to hear from the folks that are working on the ATRT report and get a sense of areas of focus and what consensus -- not consensus, it's a loaded term but what we think we might want our position to be on that. Is there somebody that is ready to take a speaking role on that? Judith, I see your hand is up. Is that a new hand?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:     Yes, this is a new hand but it's not on ATRT3.  Originally, Evin wanted me to talk about the public comment on proposed draft dates for ICANN meetings.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Okay, great.  I'm going to put your on hold for a second then and come back to that.  Thank you, Judith.  Sebastian, you have the floor.  I'm hoping we can hear you this time.  That's right, you're on the French channel so I Hope we will hear the translation.  [AUDIO BREAK]

At this point we're not hearing anything.  [AUDIO BREAK]

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:     Actually I'm sorry because none of this group is taking a stand on this text.  They can't give us any information and I think it's important that we have a key view on this subject.  Now, on the question to know if we all agree or not, I'm not sure it's good to ask the question this way because there are various points of view and it will be much more helpful to have a written document.

If one of the four At-Large members at ATRT3 can give his point of view is good, but it's not the essence here at stake.  For instance, the question on the reviews, we can tell you what is the position of each of us.  That would be interesting, and it would be good, that each one of us gives his point of view.  Thank you.

**EN**

JONATHAN ZUCK:   Okay, thanks Sebastian.  I'm kind of hoping that a subcommittee of At-Large can kind of come together on an At-Large perspective, but right now anything would be good.  So if we can have everyone give their point of view on the reviews, I'm happy to have that happen because I think we need to get this conversation going.

We don't want to start from a draft, because drafts end up touched by the fewest number of people.  When we have these calls and we talk in high level points, that's when we have the best discussions.  So if you'd like to each give your opinion on the reviews question; I know that was one of the focus questions.  So let's do that, but we need to get conversation going on this call.  Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:   Thank you, Jonathan, and I apologize for being a little [inaudible], both are important points.  So, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.  I wouldn't mind putting up a straw person then for you to all shoot down.

I would be delighted, and yes clearly I am biased, if the At-Large view, the public comment [inaudible] ALAC were to reflect a recognition of the fact that you've had four very active participants in the ATRT3 process, that of the two question areas that are being specifically seeking a public comment on, that are prioritization and of the reviews process.  That in prioritization you reinforce a broad-base community approach to anything that deals with prioritization.

And yes, that sweeps in some of what is coming out of Brian's work as well, would be intentional in my view.  And that you support for example, as I personally support, option two in reviews.  [Inaudible] a

bit longer than that, as far as I'm concerned, do you want to put in more about more bits, feel free. Thank you. Now I got to get back to the other meeting, sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. Thanks very much for putting up option two as the straw man. Can we get someone to quickly summarize what the two options are so that we can get conversation going on this call?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I join back in, please? This is really important. If you look at even the slide, and some of you should have memorized it by now because you'll have seen it four times; is that it shows that the issue of overlapping and time resource, volunteer and other resource management of option one, which is basically do pretty much nothing, status quo, and option two, which is a overarching review of a bigger picture of ICANN and a re-giddying up of what's done when, where, and how, with only one and only [inaudible] one, an overlap of draining resources.

Even that should be food for thought for you to look at. But there is a lot more to the discussion on that that I'm sure my compatriots from ATRT3 can take you [inaudible]. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I'd love to see more hands from the ATRT team to express views one way or the other on those options. I mean I'm trying not to

drive it to a particular direction but I'd love to get conversation going. Sebastian, go ahead please.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:    Thank you, Sebastian Bachollet speaking.  Every question is to know whether we support option one or option two.  In terms of transparency, I think I'm the one who most worked at first to get this motion out there and to give it its current shape, so to speak.  So if you want to have my two cents, I think yes, option two is definitely better.

We've been asking ICANN since the last organizational review where we could see all the pieces together, which was in 2002, and I think it is high time we did this and we should actually circulate this.  If you see what option two says, I think it says that we would suffer more for not doing too much, but that we should actually divide the work throughout the year so that we can after that have a wholistic review.

There is one other point on the question that we're asked, but I won't go into detail about my advice and my position regarding each of the others.  So I [inaudible] have clearly been made in the reviews and I think it is important that we make our standing, which is why I wanted to stress that I think option two is best.  Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    Excellent.  Is there anyone who participated on the review team that doesn't believe that option two is the best?

Alan Greenberg, did you just click a no or is that just left over from… Looked like it just appeared.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I'm sorry, that's very left over.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Sorry about that.  Okay, yes is there anyone that believes that option two is not the way to go, full reviews?  And then what's the essential question for prioritization and do we have a consensus view among our ATRT participants on that issue?  Daniel or Sebastian?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:     Sebastian speaking.  I'm ready to answer, do you want me to?

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Yes that'd be great, thank you.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:     Sebastian speaking.  Okay, so I think indeed we have to face this prioritization; as you see, the proposal that was made to make a number of proposals and of this criterion on how to go about that, it's not so much a matter of prioritization but of considering how to make it in line with ICANN and whether it's the board or staff and the community.  We should find a way to create a structure that would work permanently, to have a standing structure allowing us to prioritize all the elements.

So if I've followed the presentation well and if I understood well some of the presentation on finance that we saw yesterday, there's an annex

with 204 proposals I think that are being classified [inaudible] prioritized. So seeing as we have different public comment periods open right now, there are more items to be added to the list once they close, so this would be a great task. And once again, I think we can all agree on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, well that's great to hear. I for one, it's the first time I've known that we had agreements on those two. They didn't present it fairly neutrally on these calls. So, I think that's good and [CROSSTALK]. Yeah, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here. I think it's a credit to the presenters that we've taken great care to present these things neutrally. But rest assured, for every one of those one line bullet points, there are hours and hours and hours of backgrounding and debate that your representatives on the ATRT3 have gone through. And a huge amount of work for us all to be in support of the text as it is written, has occurred. But if that gives comfort to you, please take it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Cheryl, I wasn't uncomfortable with that fact. I just wanted to see if where there was in fact a question between two things, if we as At-Large had a position between those choices. And so I noted in and presented neutrally which was good, but I think on the whole, people are looking to our participants to guide us in what they believe to be the

best option between the two that are presented so that we could have that conversation. So, I'm glad to get your views now, I appreciate it.

Are there any areas in which there's disagreement among our participants. In other words, an area where we should be trying to have a more heated discussion amongst ourselves about proposals that have being made as a part of the ATRT reviews. I know you all worked on it, I know you all worked hard. And so I just want to know if there's any conversation you wanted to bring back to this group, to help align ourselves behind a particular point of view. Does that make sense? Sebastian, is that a new hand?

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Sebastian speaking. Yes indeed, thank you. It's quite clear that we have spent a lot of time working, and as you say, Jonathan, we could very much consider that we need to find points of agreement. But on the whole, the report that's been represented says that all four At-Large members worked very much, and I didn't go as far as saying that we worked more than everyone else, so I think it's another thing that we each owned part of the proposal, that we each worked on one of the parts.

So if we had to agree on something today, it would mean that what's presented in the working group could generate agreements within the working group. But I wouldn't say it lightly, but there aren't many areas where we can still see agreement on all subjects, not many sectors that could agree.

If that is what we wish to see, it would take more time to discuss and to say, "Okay, this needs to be amended, I'm not entirely in agreement with this or that." But if you give us two choices, I think the first action to say that we are in agreement with the document in global terms, then I think that would pretty much cover it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay thanks, Sebastian. So it sounds like that we have overall general agreement from our participants on the review team with the non-binary questions within it, and that we also have consensus on which choice to make within the questions that are within it. So it does appear as though our volunteer drafting is ready to get started in representing those positions.

So Evin, let's take it as an action item to convene that group in its own call and divide up the work and get a draft going. But it doesn't look as though we have much that we're going to disagree with in the overall report, and we have agreement on which options to choose in the two areas, and which options were presented. Okay? Thank you for that and thanks everyone for your participation.

Judith, thanks for your patience. I'm going to invite you to the ALAC call because I think that's the place to have the conversation about the meeting times rather than on this call.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Can we have it on the latter half of the ALAC call?

| JONATHAN ZUCK: | Sure.  So staff, if you could make note of, or coordinate with Judith the best time for her to make a presentation on the ALAC call.  Let's invite her to present and schedule that into the ALAC call.  Alright?  Alright, well thanks everyone, I'm going to pass the microphone back to Olivier. |
|---|---|
| OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: | Thank you very much, Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking.  Just checking on the agenda here, I noticed that okay there are two things from Judith so the second one being the Final Report on the New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross Community Working Group.  Is this something that Judith is to take up today or at a future ALAC call as well? |
| JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: | Olivier, it's Judith for the record.  We are not ready to discuss this today, I'm still waiting for some of the people within the Auction Proceeds team.  And our reps right now I've heard from -- we're trying to keep it so we can figure out what we're going to do within our At-Large team, which is of me, Maureen, Vanda, Alan, and Sebastian.  And so once we finish some of the discussions, then we'll open it up to a wider group.  Does that make sense?  So we could do that maybe next week. |
| OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: | Yes absolutely, that's fine.  Yes, that's absolutely fine, just to make sure so we don't let things fall through the cracks. |

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:     I especially written up something already that I shared in the group, I'm just waiting for some more people to comment before releasing it to the outer groups.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:     Okays thank you.  And then finally also, ISOC Sells PIR; I just wanted to point out the Google Doc, there is the aim to have a public comment being sent out or some document sent out by the 31$^{st}$ of January.  So this is the last 15 days for you to contribute.  The Google doc is being used to build it together, and no doubt we'll have a future poll where we can go into this in further detail.  So it's not to drop the ball on this one either.

I'm not seeing any hands up so our policy component part of the agenda is complete.  We're now in Any Other Business.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Olivier, it's Jonathan.  I just wanted to also drive everyone's attention to the fact that Mike Godwin did a piece in CircleID that Judith pointed out on Skype, and I don't know who saw or didn't, but I'd recommend that everyone read it; on the .ORG issue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:     Alright, thank you very much for this, Jonathan.  And thanks for pointing this out Judith.  If you could put a link to that piece on the chat, that would be helpful for those people that are not aware of where CircleID is, which is also popular.  Any other business?

I'm not seeing any hands up at the moment. Just as a reminder, we'll have monthly reports in the CPWG and so we'll have presenters and penholders, and we'll note the presenters, penholders and their presentations.

And as you know, we've had French interpretation on today's call. I also should remind you that we also have captioning and today's call was captioned. And you will all receive an email after this call letting you know whether this has been helpful or not. And if it has been helpful and if it hasn't, please answer the survey. It's only with numbers that we're able to show that there is interest in captioning of calls. And of course, that captioning will provide a record of what's being said very soon after this call. So with it, we now have to check into when is the next meeting. I'll turn over to Claudia, I guess. Yeah, Claudia.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi Olivier, okay so the next call will be scheduled next Wednesday, the 22$^{nd}$ at 13:00 UTC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. That's a strict rotation, so 13:00 UTC next Wednesday, and I am looking at the chat now, there's nothing else in addition. So thank you, everyone. Special thanks to our interpreters for having spent an extra 15 minutes on this call, and of course we now have interpreters in Spanish and in French. Or should we say we have interpreters in English perhaps, when one speaks the other languages.

So thank you very much for this, and of course to everyone today. For those of you who have not tracked this, it appears that we've reached 54, maybe even more, I think around 54 participants on today's call. And there's still 52 of you up here, so well done and speak to you next week. In the meantime, follow up on the mailing list and have a great morning, afternoon, evening or night everyone. Bye-bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:               Thank you all for joining, this meeting is now adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**