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 22nd of January 2020 at 13:00 UTC.
	Due to the increased attendance, and in order to save time, we will not be doing the roll call. However, all attendees, both on the Zoom room and phone bridge will be noted after the call.
	We have received apologies from Kaili Kahn, Gordon Chillcott, Nadira Alaraj, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Bill Jouris, Alberto Soto, Justine Chew, Vanda Scartezini, and from Daniel Nanghaka.
	And as you know, we will have French and Spanish interpretation. For today's call, our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and Marina, and French interpreters are Camila and Isabelle.
	From the staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu; and myself, Yesim Nazlar. I'll be on today's call and I'll also be doing call management for this call.
	Just a kind reminder before we start to please state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation services as well, please.
	And as you all know, we have real-time transcription service provided for today's call, and I'm going to share the link here with you on the Zoom chat.
	And now I would like to leave the floor to Olivier. Thank you very much.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. As you might have heard, Leon Sanchez is with us and he has a flight to board in a moment. I just wish to adopt the agenda and we'll go over to Leon afterwards.

So, the agenda today is, first, we'll be speaking to Leon Sanchez who will be providing us with some feedback on some workings in the Board. We'll then have an EPDP Phase 2 update from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg. Justine Chew is unable to make it today, so we'll pass over agenda item #4 and then we'll go over into the policy comment update with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu. And finally, any other business. We'll have Yrjo Lansipuro speak to us about the GAC PSWG at ICANN 67 on DNS abuse.

Any changes, amendments, additions to the agenda? If that's not the case, I'm not seeing any hands up, so Leon Sanchez, I understand you're about to take off. So, you have the floor. I hope you're still online. Let's have … Over to you, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ:	Okay, good. Sorry. So, the Board received the ALAC's advice on DNS abuse. As you might be aware, this advice came in right on [inaudible], so we haven't had the chance to provide with any feedback on this. Now I believe we [can't] provide some feedback on the advice. I can tell you that it is an impression that was well-received by board members. I think it's an issue that is on top of the Board's mind and on top of the Board's agenda. We actually believe—or many of us believe—that this will be a central topic for a year, maybe the coming years.

The [inaudible], of course, are [diverging] us to how to better address the advice that was provided by the ALAC, but I can tell you that my feeling is that the views and the approaches tested, as I said, it's my impression that everyone on the Board has it on top of their mind and their agenda and we value it as a high priority, too, and we agree on the points that are in the [inaudible] recommendations.

One example of something that could be a little bit difficult to address is establishing a definition on DNS abuse. We have discussed this. We are still … We haven't come to a completion, of course, but we are discussing how to better address this piece of advice as it could be good to provide a definition of DNS abuse and we don't feel like it's the Board's role to provide a definition because that would be going top-down. Instead, we believe that this should come from an effort led by community and we are, of course, knowledgeable of the reference made in the advice to the GNSO definition of DNS abuse. That is still a possibility but we're still discussing that.

As this advice came after we finalized our agenda for the LA workshop which we will be holding beginning this Friday, we will not have a formal

[inaudible] to discuss the advice, because as I said, it's [inaudible]. I believe that everyone is willing [inaudible] discuss [inaudible] into the ALAC's advice.

As you know, we have a process to follow-up on advice, and of course [inaudible] advice coming in from the advising committees. So we will be providing of course the feedback according to the process, but this is head's up. I believe that the advice was well-received by the Board. It has [inaudible] and I feel like there is a [positive feeling of the advice].

Also, [inaudible], as I said, we will be holding [inaudible] in Los Angeles starting Friday. Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. There will also be a meeting with SO and AC leadership. Some of the board members I think might attend this meeting. I will participate in that meeting as well, with Maarten Botterman. And there will also be some [inaudible] for some [inaudible] committee, and of course we will have [inaudible] meeting. I will post the link to the Skype chat to the mailing list, so you can attend if you wish.

Well, that's pretty much the update that [inaudible]. Thank you very much for providing me with the space. I have to run now to catch a plane but thank you very much to everyone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon. Do you have a couple of minutes for any questions? Because I see Jonathan Zuck's hand is up.

LEON SANCHEZ: I do have three minutes.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	Thanks, Leon. I just have a quick question. It's about this notion of waiting on a community definition for DNS abuse. I think we all agree that that should ultimately be defined by the community. But the recommendations we were making were structural or procedural and I feel like the implementation of those things does not need to wait on a definition. It has to do with empowering compliance and doing regular audits, etc.
	So, the definition could in fact be dynamic and be based on community work. But putting processes in place to deal with DNS abuse could be done now with a minimalist definition, such as the one that was adopted by the GNSO many, many years ago that has complete consensus.
	So, it feels like there is a baseline definition that has consensus and now it's about how much to broaden it. But none of those things should stand in the way of making procedural reforms around DNS abuse.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Leon, you might be muted.
LEON SANCHEZ:	Can you hear me now?
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Yeah. Now we can hear you. Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. Don't get me wrong, Jonathan. I was just providing an example of how the discussion has evolved. I was not saying really that we should subject any implementation to having definitions that came out in the community report.

We are aware that there are some measures. For example, [providing] the tools to compliance to perform their duties. That is something that was [inaudible] definition of DNS abuse and we agree with that.

Again, I was just providing that [inaudible] as an example of [inaudible]. But of course other points that happened [inaudible] which we agree, we might agree by virtue [inaudible] about some issues. But that doesn't mean that we … At least that is my feeling. I cannot [inaudible] because we haven't reached a decision on the discussion but it is a feeling that we wouldn't be [inaudible] implementation to first having a DNS abuse definition [in the case of] the community. [inaudible] was trying to [inaudible] and just [inaudible] discussion that is going on within the Board.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess just one more quick question, Leon. Do you sense that there's an appetite in the Board to ensure that there won't be any further applications for new TLDs until substantial reforms are made around DNS abuse? I can't hear you. Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: So, my feeling is that there is such an appetite but I believe that we are … It is too early to [inaudible] that. But my feeling—my personal feeling—is that there might be such an appetite. So, yes, it could happen that way, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks a lot, Leon.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thank you very much. And thanks for joining us, Leon. I gather your flight is probably being called right now. I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment, so unless anybody else has a question for you, then have a safe flight. We look forward to hearing from you the next opportunity, certainly after that weekend that you're going to be spending in Los Angeles. I hope you have a helmet with you. I've heard that some people will be demonstrating outside the building. Those are not just stupid rumors. I've seen some calls for this, so good luck. Certainly not a first in ICANN's history but a first at ICANN's new headquarters, or new-ish I guess headquarters now.

I think we can now go to our action items from our last call. That's the one on the 15th of February—January, sorry. I'm way too ahead of time. The 15th of January. All the action items are completed. They're on your screen at the moment. If anybody has a comment or question on any of these, please put your hand up and ask. No? Okay. So, it looks like everything is moving forward. Oh. I see Holly Raiche has put her hand up. Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question. Olivier, do you want us to discuss the two questions that were posed in the notes?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Do you agree that At-Large is right body to take a leadership role in discussing the issue of taking silos [when they] accept this role? And do we think that the GNSO is the right organization to take the lead on representation on diversity?

                          Well, if you wish to discuss this, you're very welcome to do so. But we can do is to discuss it during our policy discussion a bit later on, as long as this is still … Is this still on the cards? Yes, it is.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, that's fine with me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you. Marita Moll?

MARITA MOLL: Thanks. Yes, that's part of the multi-stakeholder model discussion and I'm happy to hear more views on that. I hadn't really planned on [inaudible] on that yet because I've been too busy. But, yes, I'd love to hear a discussion on that. Thanks, Holly, for bringing it up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you, Marita. That's a notice for everyone who is on the call that we have a few minutes, 10-15 minutes until we reach that part of the call. Maybe a bit more. Hopefully, you'll have some questions or comments by then.

Now, for those people, by the way, that were not there, the question is regarding the multi-stakeholder model. The people that were present on the call were asked regarding a number of proposals that are currently made in a public consultation. So, that's where it's coming up. And this is basically leadership roles, studying various component parts of ICANN, let's say, and then making recommendations possibly out of that afterwards.

Let's continue. Holly, your hand is still up. Thank you.

Okay, let's then move on. Our next thing—the next agenda item—is the EPDP Phase 2 update. Hadia Elminiawai and Alan Greenberg have the floor. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you, Olivier. I have actually sent a few slides about the new proposed model that they're calling the chameleon model, but I guess staff did not receive it. We were discussing or we are going to discuss tomorrow a new proposed model that we are calling the chameleon standardized system for access and disclosure. It's a hybrid model that can actually evolve over time.

The model basically depends on … There are some principles that underpin it. How it would look like, first we will have the requestor

obtaining accreditation from the accreditation authority. Then after obtaining the accreditation, the accredited requestor submits disclosure request to the standardized system for access and disclosure central gateway.

After that, the central gateway reviews the request for completeness and determines whether requests meet criteria for automated response or for contracted party review. If it is—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia, can I just interrupt you for a second?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I just wanted to check—because it's obviously easier to follow with the slides. So, I wanted to check whom did you send the slide to and if they received it? Because perhaps we can have those if some slides are available. It would make it a lot easier.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Apparently, they did not. I have sent it to Yesim, Evin, Heidi, and staff. And Alan. So, maybe if Alan brought them, maybe he could send them to staff. But I did that a minute before the call.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, right. Well, hopefully, one of the staff in charge will be able to load those slides right away.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, but it's been 20 minutes now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, exactly.

YESIM NAZLAR: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Yesim, go ahead.

YESIM NAZLER: Unfortunately, neither nor I have received the slides, so unfortunately not able to display the slides.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And Alan, have you received the slides?

ALAN GREENBERG: I did not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, Hadia, the slides don't appear to have left your computer, unfortunately. Hence, the reason why—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I just see them in my sent … I do see them in my sent book, so there's nothing actually I can do about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's proceed anyway.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can we just share her screen? Can she share her screen and just bring the slides up?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I can't because—could I? Let me just post the slides later to the group and that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's really only one really major difference in this proposal from the previous ones, so maybe we could just focus on that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, sorry. I wasn't trying to take—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No, that's fine. No, that's okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: This proposal for the SSAD is different from the previous ones in one very major way. It basically says that we are never going to get to a fully automated model but there are advantages to having some things automated.

This is a statement At-Large has been making for months and every time it gets made, it was patently ignored. It never made it into a document. This time, it's finally [inaudible].

It basically says based on the characteristics of the request, who it's coming from, exactly the details of it, there may be some requests, specifically those from perhaps cybercrime, intellectual property, law enforcement that can be answered automatically, that all parties can agree we know what the answer is going to be. We don't have to analyze it one by one because there's many requests like this and it can be answered automatically. If it doesn't meet the pattern, then it has to go to the contracted party for resolution.

What is not in the proposal is something else that we have said, that we believe it is possible to analyze requests now, to analyze a sample of requests and find a number of profiles which day one could be automated. The proposal is saying it would learn over time slowly. So, hopefully, we can get that last part added.

So, this current proposal is at least somewhat realistic, which the previous ones have always not been. So, I'm optimistic we may be making progress at this point.

The report, the draft—and I'll turn it back to Hadia once I make one comment. The report also talks about the creation of a new steering committee to handle changes as the SSAD evolves. This is a new concept. It was introduced in the staff document that was just distributed.

Aside from questioning whether we really can have a committee that has the power to make policy changes, which is what this well might be, it also says that the public interest will be represented by one member appointed jointly by ALAC and NCSG. I'm not quite sure who wrote that or who could imagine that that would work on an ongoing basis, but that is what is in the document that we say for the first time a day or two ago. And I'll turn it back over to Hadia at this point.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. So, as Alan just said, the steering committee, the ALAC and [inaudible] stakeholder group, they both share one seat.

One other thing. The consensus parties also don't like how they only have four seats and they are outnumbered by the others. One thing about the principles in the document that was shared by staff is that they say that no reliable data is available to assess the exact number of requests, nor the breakdown of urgent versus normal requests, and that this may make it difficult to determine or commit to response time

requirements. It should also be recognized that the number of requests might change over time.

So, this principle I'm not sure that we would like actually to accept because it gives a reason for not to commit to response time requirements. It does say that experience would be gained over time and it is expected that the system will develop whether we are thinking also about [today].

So, this is what the chameleon model looks like. You have a requestor actor obtaining—after being accredited, the [accredited requestor] submits the disclosure request to the standardized system for access and disclosure central gateway, and then the central gateway reviews the request. And if deemed that it is possible for the response to be automated, the central gateway does that and responds to the requestor. If not, the request is actually sent to the contracted party and the contracted party then responds directly to the requestor.

The main parts of this model are the central gateway and this is [overseen by] ICANN, so ICANN is overseeing—would be responsible for managing [inaudible] of the request to the responsible contracted party. Also, it would be responsible for managing automated responses in case the request is deemed to be automated.

Then we have an accreditation authority. Again, this role is also foreseen to be taken by ICANN. And then we have an identity provider for verifying the identity of a requestor and verifying and managing authorization credentials and the identify provider may actually be the accreditation authority.

Then we have the contracted parties who would be responsible for an automated response system and we have a steering committee which will actually review and revise as appropriate the service-level agreement matrix, review and confirm and established criteria for which [inaudible] of disclosure requests must be automated, and review [inaudible] implementation improvements.

Then we have the principles that actually underpin this model. The first one is that we haven't got any legal opinion or legal guidance to date and waiting for this to happen could significantly delay the implementation of the standardized system for access and disclosure and that's why we are thinking of a practical solution.

The other principle—and that one I already talked about, that it may be difficult to determine or commit to response time requirements for now. And I think that this principle should be reviewed.

The other principle, that the standardized system for access and disclosure must be automated where technically feasible and legally permissible. Where automation is not technically feasible or legally permissible, standardization is the baseline objective.

Then we have also the part that I talked about, the standing committee.

Basically, that's the model that we are going to discuss tomorrow. There are good aspects about it, that it is a practical solution that allows for a way forward, but there are some points that needs to be revisited and revised, like we need to guarantee or ensure that the service-level agreements with the contracted parties would actually meet the requirements of the users of the system. I think this is the main thing.

Also, the other main thing, that the policy should from the start allow for a centralized mature system. Currently, this system will not be working in this way or this manner but it is important to ensure that we have a policy in place that allows for that and that we don't need to go back to developing a new PDP when we actually realize that a centralized model is possible. This policy has to be developed now, though not implemented now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Hadia. Are there any questions or comments? I see both Hadia's and Alan's hand up but I'm not seeing any other hands up at the moment. We now have the PowerPoint presentation, of course. Is there any point that you'd like to go through again now that the PowerPoint is there? Alan Greenberg, your hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. One other point I'd like to make. By the way, I did check and it's not April 1st so I don't quite know how anyone could have proposed a single member appointed jointly by us and NCSG but we'll see.

There is a comment in the document that was referred to by Hadia about … And I'm not quite sure on what slide but it talks about that we don't have legal guidance or firm opinion for liability shifting that is to allow ICANN to make a decision that will not reflect on the contracted party and give them liability.

I'm somewhat perturbed and now I am going to take an NCSG position. We have been meting now for 18 months. I personally believe that we could claim ICANN is the sole controller in this and ICANN has the full right since ICANN makes all the rules. That's not a widely held opinion.

But what is a widely held opinion is that both the contracted parties and ICANN are joint controllers but neither our group nor ICANN Org in the year-and-a-half has come to a conclusion and actually said this. And because of that, we have never tried to draft a joint controller agreement, at least not publicly that I'm aware of.

As a result, it's not about liability shifting. The question is can we attribute responsibility to ICANN, not to take it away from the contracted party but simply to say that is where it sits, at which point it would likely be ICANN that is liability in making decisions and not contracted party.

So, we've been told time and time again we can't shift liability but we can assign. We can assign responsibilities. And the fact that 18 months into this we are still ignoring this critical factor, I'm somewhat perturbed about. Thank you.

Anyway, to summarize, we're making progress for the first time, perhaps. Someone asked: what does SSAD stand for? I don't know if it was answered. I believe it's Standardized System for Access and Disclosure. But if it's not that, it's something close.

We are making some progress. There are still some basic gaps. We're all hoping magic happens next week in Los Angeles when our three-day meeting will cause the skies to open and we'll have all of our answers.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. Thank you for this, Hadia. I'm not seeing any hands. I'm seeing some chat in the Zoom chat. I have one question. And I'm looking here at the priority matrix for non-automated disclosure requests. I'm somehow perturbed by the … Well, throughout the document I'm perturbed by the fact that every attempt is being made at providing registries and registrars the ability to downgrade the urgency of a request. But when one looks at the actual three types of priority, and with a note underneath the table which basically says nothing in these policy recommendations explicitly created the development of new categories and defined SLAs … So, that would mean you could define some that made the priority even lower, I guess.

I see urgent requests to be treated in one business day, and the definition of an urgent request as the criteria to determine whether it concerns an urgent request are limited to circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure online and offline, or child exploitation. Isn't one business day … I mean, if it happens on a Friday night, you have to wait until Monday. Isn't that waiting until the whole planet is dead by that time? It seems to be a little slow.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oliver, may I?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please don't take what you read there as gospel. It's an area which we have not had any real substantive discussion on, any agreement. The last proposal we saw from the contracted parties, the only time mentioned in it is 30 days at which compliance could take action. There was nothing in terms of practical ones.

And the rationale for that is people are saying we have no idea what the volume of requests is going to be. We don't know what it was for comparable requestors in the open WHOIS model, and today the system I working so poorly that people aren't even bothering to make requests.

So, without having some idea of volume, the contracted parties are quite reasonably unwilling to make commitments for how quickly they can respond, especially since we're talking about not only the large actors but small actors as well.

So, that's the reason that we have virtually nothing on the table. The one you were quoting there is essentially one from law enforcement. Maybe one business day is unreasonable. Maybe it should be six hours. Remember, all contracted parties are supposed to have a 24-hour line for reporting certain types of problems.

So, that one is probably subject to updating. But the more important thing is there are no criteria … There are no service level commitments for other types of requests, other than compliance could take action after 30 days.

It's a big area. It's not an area that we're going to be able to come to closure on until we address. We're not going to be able to come to closure on the whole thing until we address that better and it's not clear how we're going to address it but it's a real area of issue. But I wouldn't focus on the specifics in one line. It's just not worth the effort right now to try to finalize that one, given that we have nothing else going. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Alan. I note that the agenda has now been updated, so you can all download that presentation and have a look at it for yourself directly from the agenda. Not seeing any further hands up, I suppose we can move on.

The next agenda item was for Justine Chew to provide us with an update on the subsequent procedures. You will notice that there are two PowerPoint presentations, one being the applicant support program and one on universal acceptance. Unfortunately, Justine was unable to make today's call, so she has mentioned that if anybody has questions on these PowerPoint presentations, they can get in touch with her directly. But next week we promise she will be here and will allocate more time for her to go through a bumper issue of Justine's At-Large subsequent procedures presentation. So, that's we have on today. Are there any comments at this point in time for anyone else who has been following the subsequent procedures closely? Is there anything that we need to know today?

I am not seeing any hands up. Okay. So, we'll look forward to the presentation next week. And of course, as I mentioned, these will be added to the relevant Wiki space in the policy development, adding to a large set of other presentations which I, as usual, invite you to have a look at in your own time and study in your own time. They're very well-built and they provide clear details of each of the points that the subsequent procedures has been addressing.

Next we are now going to agenda item 5, the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Olivier. As Leon just provided a great update at the beginning of the call regarding the ALAC advice to ICANN Board on DNS abuse which was recently sent in and is undergoing discussion. There is only one public comment for decision. It's the proposed amendment 3 to the DotCom registry agreement. This closes in a couple of weeks on the 14th of February.

Otherwise, we have current statements and developments. ISOC PIR issue which is potential ALAC advice to the ICANN Board and a goal to submit advice or a statement on this is the end of this month on the 31st of January, which is next week. Jonathan has a slide deck to share.

And then we have the ATRT-3 draft report public comment. A single issue call was held on this on the 6th of January and a couple individuals volunteered as the drafting team before signing formal penholders and they will be on a call later today with the ATRT-3 At-Large members to discuss.

Then there are two draft ALAC statements already shared in the related work spaces regarding the public meeting, ICANN public comment, and then also the new gTLD auction proceeds public comment. There's also … Alan would like to remark on this new gTLD auction proceeds public comment and Judith has provided a presentation as well.

Finally, we have the draft FY21-25 operating and financial plan public comment. The SBSC has met and they will meet again this week to discuss and potentially assign a penholder. Marita presented last week on only the multi-stakeholder model portion of this public comment and she would also like to make a few remarks today specifically on that issue.

So, with that, I guess I'll turn it over to Jonathan regarding ISOC [inaudible] PIR. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Evin, for your as usual great summary. We had a brief discussion about this topic on the ALAC monthly call that took place yesterday. So, the consensus on that call was to drive forward and make some substantive suggestions. These would be a potential contract. Do I have control or is it –no. Okay. So, next slide. Thanks.

So, one of the things that was [affirmed] on the ALAC call is that we need to make sure that we stick to our voice which is the voice of the individual end users. But Evin has confirmed with NPOC staff that they're coming out with a statement very shortly. They're planning to share it with us and we're planning to schedule a call with them to

discuss where they've come out on some of these issues as the voice of non-profits themselves.

One of the things I wanted to put out there was the possibility that many of us have non-profit affiliations, which is part of the reason so many are interested in this, and that it might make sense to join NPOC to be part of this discussion if we want to have some influence over the statement that they make. But at the very least, we'll do a call with them and be able to provide feedback with them. But there isn't any prohibition from being a part of NPOC and At-Large, if you do have that non-profit affiliation. It's just something to think about. But the ALAC statement/advice will be about individual end users. That was definitely the consensus on the ALAC call. Next slide.

So, the specific end user concerns from the conversations that have been going on on the list, etc., seem to fall into three categories. One is a free speech related issue, one is DNS abuse, and the other is a more broadly abstract notion of trust, the trust that people have in domains that are under the DotOrg generic name.

So, I thought we'd go through each of these and discuss possible recommendations that we might make on these, and if we reach some broad consensus on this, we'll get something drafted. So, next slide, please.

So, free speech is one of the big concerns that people have because there are two things, one related to rights protection and one related to local laws that are in the new gTLD contract that was recently adopted

by PIR prior to this. So, that's concern has been expressed in letters from NTEN and the SaveDotOrg folks that are EEFF.

So, the thinking, again from the list—and this is just my attempt to try and reflect back the discussions we've had—is a contractual commitment to … I guess this is worded poorly. A contractual commitment to non-political takedowns. In other words, [find] wording in the contract that suggests a takedown should be for very specific reasons and not—maybe enumerated reasons [in fact]—so that there isn't as much room to force takedowns of domains for political reasons.

Then, the other issue that's come up in discussions that I had with the SaveDotOrg people is some sort of contractual provision for a DRP process for takedowns. So, some way to appeal a website takedown inside the PIR if the non-profits or the Org domain holder believes there website has been taken down for political reasons.

So, that was the two recommendations that seemed to make sense in the context of this particular issue of free speech versus censorship. I wanted to stop here and see if you had feedback on these or if these made sense to you. I see Alan Greenberg has his hand up, so Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I guess I'm a little confused because, from my understanding, the vast majority of takedowns are at the registrar level, not the registry level. The registry is sort of a last resort if the registrar is not responding.

I guess I'm not sure just how relevant these are. Again, a dispute process at the registry level, if indeed something was done at the registrar level, I just don't see how this could be implemented. Moreover, a registry …

If ICANN puts this kinds of things into the registry contract, fine. But a registry itself I don't think has the abilities to do some of these things. So, I'm just a little bit confused why this is a topic of this much interest. Thank you.

GREG SHATAN: This is Greg.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, thanks for that and I'm—

GREG SHATAN: I'll get in the queue after Jonathan. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. You're not on Adobe, okay. Yes. I confess that this isn't an area of expertise for me but it was something that was prominently brought up in the context of the letters that have been written by the non-profits that are part of SaveDotOrg, that this is a difference that exists in the new registry anything, the new [GW] registry agreement. And I guess part and parcel of that new agreement involves a little bit

more control and vertical integration and things like that as well that may make this more relevant.

Again, I guess I'm not really equipped to respond to you, Alan, but this is something that has certainly been taken very seriously by EFF and others.

Greg, go ahead. Then, Sebastien, I'll get to you.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I share Alan's concern and I think that this is a made-up problem largely that's intended to put PIR and the sale and the entity in a negative light. I think we're kind of suckers for believing that this is a real issue and certainly not one that we would feature as more than a footnote in anything that we do because it is largely a [inaudible], and to the extent that it's a fact, as Alan indicates, it's a last resort.

And the idea that because one registry is not owned by a for-profit entity like 1,000 others, that it's suddenly going to become this hot bed of censorship at the registry level, it's really just all part of the campaign of over-heatedness that some organizations are engaging in.

I'd need a much better understanding of what they're pointing to in the registry agreement that thinks that this somehow is a problem because it's a problem for PIR, it's a problem for every registry. And the idea that somehow non-profits are uniquely subject to the problem of censorship is ridiculous. Obviously, there are issues and it could be worse in this place, but mostly I think this is a character assassination wrapped in a [inaudible] recommendation. Thanks. I'm sorry to be so negative and

sorry not to have been on the call or emailed what was discussed. But I think that we need to put a big pause on this as any kind of legitimate exercise for us to engage in. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. Okay. I'm happy to defer to on this. It's certainly something that's raised a lot and I guess there's a belief that DotOrg is used predominately by organizations that are engaged in activity that might be more subject to censorship or individuals, etc. I guess that's the rationale there. Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. It's not very clear for me but I will try. First of all, I want to say that I heard from the leaders of ISOC that they are writing a comment or a document about [inaudible], and as soon as I got it I was [inaudible].

My main point here is that we are in fact [inaudible] pushing or discussing things that must be done without [inaudible] issue. And I want to … That we are very caution on what we do and what we discuss.

First, putting the fact that everyone can join NPOC, yeah you can, but we have to be careful about the discussion we want to have about one organization, one vote, and not one organization and one person who is [inaudible] in the organization.

In doing that, we are pushing people to go in different places, and I still feel that every one of us, every of [inaudible], to find one place, and if

they want, they can participate to the discussion—but not join. That's the first point.

The second is that we are discussing about a single contract pushed by ICANN since years for registrar and now for registry. If we were to disagree with that—and I think it's the wrong way for ICANN to go to have one single way. And if you remember, when new gTLDs were [first produced], [inaudible] and myself, we struggle a lot to have different ways for community TLD, or geographic TLD, and not one single fit everybody. We are clearly in this situation. I don't think that it's a good idea to open this discussion specifically for DotOrg.

My third point is be careful on the word. Yes, free speech in US is important. It's number, I don't know, a constitutional whatever. That fits with every culture and every country. In US, you can [write] whatever you want about [inaudible]. In France, you can't. Is it a question of free speech? No.

then we have to be careful also which word we use. It's not because we have a US culture. It's that we can't take into account this question worldwide. I apologize for that but I think we need really to be careful with that. That's a few of my points. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. Yeseul Kim?

YESEUL KIM: I think it's also related to [inaudible] role because she has also raised the issue of the jurisdiction. We cannot decide what is permitted

regarding the speech, whether any kind of statement can be [inaudible] or not. It just defers from one jurisdiction to another. So, I think we also need to consider this fact as well. But I also understand why you raised the issue, [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Again, I'm happy to defer to the group. I thought that there was some heat behind this issue within our ranks. Because there was this notion that a public interest DotOrg registry had special concerns, and I think a DRP process could take local things into consideration. Again, I'm not trying to push for this, personally. Are there others that … I see a couple of people on the chat. But if there are others believe that it's important to do this, then please speak up, because otherwise we can drop it from our own comments. Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Jonathan. While I completely agree about having free speech and not having censorship of websites being taken down or content being taken down. However, the issue is that each—there is a jurisdiction under which these contents are published, and even if we push that sites should not be taken down or no political content should be taken down, it will not work by the rules of the law of that land. That's where the concern is.

Another point which I wanted to make is when we are looking at from the end user perspective, [inaudible] is also an important thing, especially in developing countries. And if you're looking at small [inaudible] want to do it, even for organizations, if an organization

changes the rate or makes it too high, that would again be a detriment to them.

These are the two points I wanted to make.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I'm not sure I understand the connection, Amrita, so if you could clarify what the connection—

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: No, they are not connection. Just in the first—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not between the two, but the connection of cost to end users I guess is the question that I'm asking.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: [inaudible] end users are actually taking a website. Even DotOrg is taken by some end user or even some small organization, cost is definitely a factor, at least in our part of the world.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, we need to decide if there's something more we want to do about cost, other than the commitments that have been made that were already within the PIR contract previously which is about the 10%. That part looks as though it's not changing. But we can certainly discuss it. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think it was Alan's point about the 10% and how 10% [inaudible] becomes 10% more, 10%, 10%, and it goes up not just 10%, then 10% on 10%. It goes up almost straight up. That was one of the main issues which was about cost and about single [inaudible] or institution itself is commercial or has a great deal of commercial interest in it that cost could be one of the issues. And again, that ties back to end users including, say, small business or individuals who might want to [inaudible]. That to me was the thing that seemed to be of concern. I hope that helps. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. I think Alan made a good point about the compound interest effect in his individual letter to the Board. I think there's two things in play here. One is there's a difference between wholesale price and retail price. I don't think we should assume that there's a linear relationship between the two, such that if there's a doubling of the wholesale price over eight years or whatever Alan's calculation was, that that's necessarily going to lead to a doubling of the retail price associated with it because wholesale price is a very small number and Sebastien notes in the chat a very small percentage of the cost associated with building, hosting, maintaining a website. So, it feels like a red herring, particularly from an end user standpoint. A non-profit might be paying $7 more for a website than they are today. Marita, please go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Are we still on the free speech issue or have we moved on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It feels, since no one is stepping up to defend this—and I don't have a personal stake in it—it feels like we're going to drop the free speech portion of our comment, so we should move on. I think we just got into a price conversation because Amrita brought it up as part of her thing. So, we can move on. What did you want to talk about, Marita?

MARITA MOLL: I just wanted to bring up an issue about the fact that the thing that seems to be bothering people to me, it seems, that's bothering people the most is the move from a public interest perspective to a private equity corporation, which has a completely different set of values. And we can't predict at this point exactly how that's going to divulge or diversify the possible way in which PIR would go.

But I think that the core values—and that's I think part of the ICANN bylaws—and the fact that this was set up specifically by ICANN with the public interest in mind. Although I'm aware of the fact that it was previously owned by Verisign, it was deliberately set up that way and the fact that it would be just in one fell swoop reversed to a private equity corporation, which may have good intention at the onset but we don't really know where it's going because we don't have any real public interest control. We don't know who the board is, we don't exactly what their--

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let me just stop you. There's other recommendations related to structure and things like that.

MARITA MOLL: That's why I asked the question, are we still on the same—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. I wasn't trying to open it up for … Let me just continue on and then we'll just see because there are recommendations that are related that Roberto has made. Thank you. Sorry to cut you off. Alan, what is your intervention?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Two comments and they are on price but I'll be very, very brief. I raised the issue of price in my letter not because of the price. As I pointed out, we have no control over that. It's in the contract. It's a done deal. I raised it only because what I saw was they were whitewashing it and not even being completely honest about it because of the compounding issue. And that was the part that bothered me.

I've owned DotCom domains now for a good number of years and the prices have gone up far faster than the cost from the registry. The registrar markup has increased at a much higher rate than I've seen from the registry itself.

So, as you pointed out, the registry part is only part of the cost. And really, it's not a major issue, even if we had control. Unless you have a huge number of defensive registrations or unless you're a domain

investor. So, price I just don't think is the relevant issue that we should be focusing on at all, if nothing else because we have little control at this point. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Next slide. So, another area that we're taking the banner up in a general sense and there should be no difference here is that trying to anticipate some of the things that might have end user consequences under new ownership or even potentially under current ownership, we should also just view this as an opportunity to improve the contract regardless of who the purchaser is. PIR eliminated bulk sales and we should turn that into a contractual commitment. Harden current PIR practices around DNS abuse because those are what we heard wherever we were—Morocco, I think—where we had our panel discussion on DNS abuse. We saw, ironically, the DNS abuse practice document came out of PIR, so hardening those contractually.

Establish a DNS abuse percentage ceiling and commit to audits around DNS abuse or some recommendations, particularly in the area of DNS abuse, since that's our banner issue at this point from the standpoint of end users. Are there comments or feedback or suggestions related to DNS abuse? This is an attempt to begin to touch on culture and things like that but do it via the contract. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: I really like that list of four things because that's really what came out of our letter and it seems to me these [are the] things that [inaudible]

follow with the Board. These are the things that [inaudible] in terms of [inaudible] out of the [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Your voice is breaking up pretty badly, unfortunately, Holly. But it sounds like you were largely supportive of these bullets.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm sorry. Yes. Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thank you. And Marita, yes, I think they should apply to all contracts and that's sort of the angle we're working on the Board. I guess my point is that anytime we say anything about anything, we should bring these points back up, and so any opportunity.

And one of the points that Roberto has made is that historically PIR has played a leadership role in eliminating things like domain tasting, for example. So, it seems reasonable that an ongoing commitment to public interest would mean that they would take a leadership role in this as well. I guess that's how I would justify not waiting until the Board somehow imposes this on everyone but instead let's just make it happen here if we can—or at least recommend it. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I just wanted to make two comments. Number one, we seem to have a very short memory. It was only about a year and a half ago that

PIR was being subjected to a number of very negative comments because of their policies on takedowns and a variety of other things. This I think came to a head because of issues on drug-related takedowns and things like that. They claimed they never did something and then there's proof that they did and messages from their council indicated there was some lack of straightforwardness from them because they were saying things which clearly were not necessarily correct. So, they haven't been 100% pure in the past.

I'll also note that there's another registry, Afilias, that are generally regarded as good guys and they're a commercial organization. So, I think we have to be careful about generalizations. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. I guess I'm kind of taking a cue a little bit from the NCSG comments on this and some of Milton's writing on this that regardless of who gets the DotOrg contract, that the best place to have this conversation is about the contracts and not having, as you say, a soft discussion about values, etc., because we can't really count on anyone in particular, so we should view this as an opportunity to at least try to influence some changes to the contract for DotOrg in particular because that's what's up for discussion and we have a public interest basis for having that conversation. I think that's why I think we're supportive and the list has been largely supportive of taking that approach. All right, I see no more hands up, so next slide.

Another issue for end users is trust. Again, potentially in the contract, specify—even thought this would be a soft commitment—specify commitments of public interest. Greater transparency.

Then Alan raised [inaudible] to the Board and I don't mean to put you on the spot, Alan, but I'd be interested in whether or not you had any ideas specifically for how we might, in a recommended contract change, retain focus on DotOrg. Obviously, it's an unrestrictive, it's an open domain now but it has managed to maintain a non-profit characteristic. And you've expressed fear on our calls and in your letter to the Board that that characteristic might change over time with a commercial interest. So, I wanted to capture that and see if you had something specific that you might recommend. Go ahead, Alan. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. It's a really difficult one, because as you say, it's very hard to put words in to control a marketing campaign, but it's an issue that I felt had to be raised because it's probably the single most attractive way to make lots of money quickly and it could essentially kill the level of perceived trust. Now, there's no necessarily guaranteed reason we should trust a DotOrg as we know anyone can register one, but the reality is you don't tend to see DotOrgs, other than for individuals or for organizations that are not known for their profit-making position.

So, the real issue is, is it within ICANN's remit to force a contractual issue like that or can they simply use their almost moral position at this point to get such a commitment?

I don't know what the answer is to that. I suspect the ICANN Board is going to be reluctant to force an issue like that but I think we're the only ones who could at this point. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Roberto, go ahead.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes, thank you. I was prompted actually to say what I'm saying by Alan's comment in the chat, the observation related to the fact that there were some bad behaviors or debatable behavior of which PIR was accused.

I think that the whole issue here, and when we are talking about trust this is one of the basic elements, we used to have a registry that was PIR that was in some way responsive to the community and that was behaving in a certain way. I mean, we are just pointing out all the things that PIR was doing or what we expect a registry that works [in the] public interest to do.

On top of that, part of the money that people were paying for the domain names was going to ISOC and so was going to come back to the community in terms of services that ISOC was providing. So, this is the whole essence.

I remember when the issue about pharmaceuticals came up. I was chairing the Board of PIR and I went in the ICANN meeting talking individually to the people who were raising the issues, just to make sure

that we could bring that discussion back to the Board. And as a matter of fact, the Board changed its attitude.

Another change was with the—I don't remember the acronym now but it was the takedown policy that had also objections with the community. I mean, this is the link that we as ALAC and generally speaking, the user community and in particular the registrants of DotOrg had with the registry that was operating in the public interest that is going to be missed [inaudible].

This is the basis of my [proposed letter], at least one person in the board of the new PIR is just I'm trying to figure out ways in which we can guarantee that this link is not broken and guarantee that, to the maximum, [inaudible] possible DotOrg is going to be still operated in the public interest and not in the interest of investors that maybe at times can coincide but can also diverge.

That goes also for the objections, like for instance related to free speech that there were certain things that in any case all … I mean, avoid the takedown for reasons that are just for going [inaudible] to limitation of free speech. Of course this is a general thing but we need to have an example of a registry that does this because, otherwise, even our influence to the ICANN Board, if we don't have a champion registry that does those things in practice, our ability to influence the ICANN Board will be even lower because they can come back to us and say, "Oh, this is unreasonable, it's impossible, and blah-blah-blah." But if we have a DotOrg that does those things, then we can show that it is possible and it will be an example.

So, I think the whole request, the whole matter goes around the fact of preserving the life of a registry that acts in the public interest. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Roberto. I think that's where we're trying to get with this, but as you've suggested on the list, etc., that might be best accomplished through contractual provisions about board makeup and things like that that's less abstract than describing it as a public interest corporation and trying to disrupt the sale directly. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Trying to … It's not the same thing, disrupting the sale or saying that a corporation that takes this over should look like this. We should be able to say that there should be a board, that we can actually see the names of the people on the board. It should be a board that's accountable to the public. This is not what's happening. This is not what we're seeing. It seems to me that we should be able to say that that is what we want to see. That would be in the public interest. It's not the same thing as blocking the sale I don't think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thank you, Marita. That's the next slide. Abdulkarim?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I think for me the issue of trust is one of the arguments which I've [seen] which I've … It's one of the [inaudible]

arguments from the end user perspective. I think this is one of the arguments I see now we can actually make on the end user perspective. That's just [inaudible]. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Abdulkarim. Nat, go ahead. Nat, you might be on mute. I'm not hearing you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Nat doesn't have any microphone.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yeah. Jonathan, Nat's audio connection is not enabled. Oh, he has just now.

NAT COHEN: Am I okay now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. We can hear you now, Nat. Thanks.

NAT COHEN: Okay, thanks. I was trying to join through a phone as well. Okay. I was trying to say that since we're supposed to be considering things from an end user perspective, it seems there's a pretty clear choice that we're facing.

On one hand, you have the non-profit community that's vehemently opposed to this sale. On the other hand, you have ISOC and Ethos who are trying to get a billion-dollar deal done on a DotOrg namespace. And I think that end users have much more [inaudible], much more interest in common in the non-profit community [inaudible] engaged in that in some ways or another. Most of us support non-profits, make charitable contributions from non-profits, benefit from non-profits.

So, I think as end users, our interest would be more aligned with keeping the non-profit community healthy and happy and enjoying their use of DotOrg rather than allowing Ethos Capital to earn high profit returns for its funders. So, I'm not really seeing how when you weigh the pros and cons of this how the scale is balanced [anywhere] but strongly opposed the sale. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Nat. I know you've brought some things up on the list about not selling ourselves short by deciding up front that blocking the sale is not possible but there doesn't seem to be an appetite among the ALAC to address this question that way and the board hasn't gotten good feedback from the lawyers on doing a reallocation or something like that. That's why we're trying to focus on what the contract should look like regardless of who the owner—or not the owner but whoever the contracted party is for this domain.

NAT COHEN: I would challenge that because I believe that what the comment is, a lot of [people's decision is] for the board is whether to oppose the sale or

not oppose the sale. So, that's the decision facing the board, and if our comment is going to be a relevant comment, it could comment on that question as to whether the board should oppose the sale or support the sale. So, that's the issue in front of us and the decision that we need to make is whether to support or oppose, not to assume the sale will go through and then tweak the terms of the contract assuming it goes through. That is to decide the decision before we even make the decision.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Nat. Zak?

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Thanks very much. What I'm not understanding or following is why there appears to be an assumption that the registry agreement is open for negotiation. It was already signed. It's a ten-year term with a presumptive right of renewal. That horse has left the barn.

So, if there's going to be a request or a suggestion or advice to the ICANN Board to change the terms or negotiate the terms with PIR, what is the legal basis for that demand? PIR doesn't have to change any terms. The only leverage, in my view, that the ICANN Board has is to say unless we see these revisions implemented in the contract, in the registry agreement, that we're going to withhold approval.

So, the notion of negotiating and changing terms is premised on a threat of withholding approval. And in order to withhold approval, you

need a reasonable basis. So, what is the reasonable basis? That's where the attention should be turned to.

From what I'm hearing, there are arguments that there's a reasonable basis for refusal because the new entity wouldn't be acting in the public interest. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Zak. As a lawyer, you have a better sense of what that reasonable basis might look like. I think that is our premise is that we see this approval as a point of leverage over PIR to come to the negotiating table. There have already been some indications that they're willing to open the contract back up and make some changes.

So, I think you're absolutely correct that the basis for that is in fact a threat of a disapproval but it appears that the appetite of the board and of ALAC is to try and leverage that situation and make the approval contingent as opposed to saying we don't want the sale to go through. But that seems to be the heat of the mailing list. It's not unanimous but it's the heat of the mailing list. Seems to be the appetite of the ALAC and the appetite of the Board.

But I think that you're exactly right, that that is going to have to be the basis on which any of these kinds of recommendations for the contract are able to [inaudible]. Zak, is that a new hand? I saw it go off in the background.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Old hand. I'll take it down. Thanks very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	All right. Thanks, Zak. Next slide. So, the other [inaudible] recommendations that came from Roberto was about board composition. That's why I sort of cut you off, Marita, and I apologize because it was coming. And making a recommendation that at least a third of the board is made up of representatives from charitable non-profits, what we call 501(c)3 in the US or the equivalence internationally.
	when this came up on the ALAC call, Sebastien suggested that there ought to be a board member that is specific to end user interests as well that's separate from non-profit interest, even though I think we all agree that there's definitely, as Nat pointed out, a big overlap between those interests. Sebastien was suggesting that there be somebody whose job is specifically to look after the interests of end users as we recommend structural changes or structural commitments for the board. Yes, Marita? Thank you.
MARITA MOLL:	I'm sorry, Jonathan, to be jumping ahead of you all the time but I hadn't seen all these slides. Yeah. I think this looks good. This would definitely hold whatever corporation ends up doing this looking a little bit like a public interest corporation. But I think I would add to that the need for transparency and accountability inside that board. We don't get to know what goes on inside the board and [inaudible] plenty of boards who don't know who votes for what. There's not dense minutes kept. So, I'd like to see something added to that so that we really know what

goes on inside the board in terms of making it more like an ICANN Board which we actually see what's happening there and we're able to influence that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita. Maybe this is the place for it specific to the board. I mentioned transparency on the other slide, but I think you're right, maybe it's part of the discussion about the board directly as well. Other comments or suggestions about this issue related to the board?

Okay. I think this is the last slide, so Olivier may yank my chain on this issue a little bit but if anybody wants to speak up further on the issue of wanting the outcome of this to be [inaudible] another steward of DotOrg, go ahead and raise your hand and air your views now I guess. These are the recommendations that we're thinking about trying to make, and again making them, as Zak suggested, as sort of pre-conditions to approval of the sale because we would want these changes regardless of who actually became the steward of DotOrg, whether they were profit or non-profit. Any other comments or suggestions with respect to the PIR? Yeseul Kim, please.

YESEUL KIM: Are we going to include the [first part] or not?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I got nothing but negative feedback on that section.

YESEUL KIM: [Fair enough].

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I think we're going to drop it. I'm happy to discuss that further but that seems to be the consensus on this call.

YESEUL KIM: Yeah [inaudible]. I just got the sense of [inaudible] better for us to talk to [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Yeseul. Marita, go ahead.

MARITA MOLL: Jonathan, I really liked the way you did it last week to call a temperature of the room to see if everybody is happy because usually it's not that many people speaking and there's about 40 people on the call, to see if people feel that we're heading in the right direction. Would you care to do that this time? I think it was a good move last time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Let's do it. Let me ask … Let me think about how to word the question. The question is do you believe that these points represent the basis of a good At-Large comment on this sale? By comment, I don't know what that means. It may mean advice, etc. But is this a good set of positions for the At-Large to take vis-à-vis the sale of PIR to Ethos? If you believe that it is a good set of steps dropping out the one related to free

speech, then please press yes. If you don't believe that it's a good set of comments, please press no.

Hopefully, everyone heard me. Please vote if you can, so we have as many people reporting in as possible.

GREG SHATAN: I'm on audio only but you can count me as a yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. Is there anyone else on audio only that would care to speak up quickly?

Okay. The preponderance at this point seems to be support. Zak, I may try to circle back with you on wording about reasonableness, etc., so that we have a good basis for suggesting [this possibility] but we'll go through and create a draft based on these points.

Thanks, everyone. Thanks, Marita, for the suggestion to take the temperature of the room so to speak. Olivier, back to you. Is Olivier gone? I remember reading something on Skype that he might be absent. Has he left the conversation, Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR: Jonathan, he's still on the phone bridge but he said that he won't be able to chair the last 40 minutes of the call, so unfortunately he had to step away.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, I guess the other thing that we wanted to raise was those that have agreed to be drafters on the ATRT-3 draft report are going to have a call later today to sort of break the document up into pieces draft a comment. That's just on the agenda to let people know that that's going on. So, we should have something to look at fairly quickly with regards to the ATRT from this group. So, that call is taking place today.

Okay. And then I guess the next thing is Judith to talk about the new gTLD auction proceeds public comment.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Jonathan, I have raised my hand about ATRT-3 please.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Sebastien, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Go ahead, Sebastien. I didn't see it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. About ATRT-3, you asked me two weeks ago to send a presentation. I have done so. I have now presented [some]. But that's okay. I don't think that it's enough to have this group meeting this afternoon for me. We need to have some discussion here. I would have been happy to have a full presentation of what it is, option one and option two, [inaudible] it was done before to have the sense of what we

think here. It seems that there is no will to have the discussion. I am sad about that.

My other question is that it was supposed to be a two-hour call or a one-and-a-half-hour call? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, which call, Sebastien, this CPWG call?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, this current one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. I don't know the answer to that. What do we have scheduled, Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR: We have scheduled for 90 minutes as usual.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see. Okay So, I guess we're out of time on that. Sebastien, I'm sorry about … My impression was that we had a discussion on the last call about option one and option two and that there was consensus among the participants in ATRT and then support from this group of the decisions or of the opinions that were expressed on that call. So, the drafters had direction to go forward and be supportive of the drafters. I think that's why there's a call, just to get things going on this. But there

was a call for consensus around that on that call and it appeared as though there was broad support for the opinion that was shared by the drafters at the ATRT-3. Okay. Thanks, Sebastien.

I guess we are out of time today because we're going to lose the translators. Let's push auction proceeds to the top of the agenda for next week. I think it sounds like we may be missing our EPDP folks on the next call, so we won't start with that next week but instead we'll focus on auction proceeds, the subsequent procedures and the ATRT report. Alan, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to be at the EPDP meeting next week and I was supposed to be one of the speakers on auction proceeds. What time is the meeting next week?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yesim, what time is the meeting?

YESIM NAZLAR: Jonathan, [inaudible]. It's going to be at 19:00 UTC on Wednesday, the 29th of January.

ALAN GREENBERG: That means there is no chance I can participate. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, then we will communicate on the list and try to figure out how to handle that situation. It may be that we just ask you to step out to comment and to stay in communication with you and try to get you on the call because we made a decision not to move times around.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not asking you to move times. I'm just noting that I will try to send something concise by email and ask that someone present it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks, Alan. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I think it's important that Alan participate and maybe you can don't change the time but have a single-issue call on that issue and have time where Alan is able to join and the other members from At-Large of the auction proceeds. It's a very important topic with deep disagreement of where we are with members. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thanks, Sebastien. We'll take this under advisement and we'll try to make sure that Alan's views are represented on the next call and take it from there.

I think we're out of time, everyone Thanks for your participation on this call and a good conversation about DotOrg. Sorry?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes. Can I have just a minute for the AOB item on the—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Just to tell you I was contacted by [inaudible] yesterday and told that eh Public Safety Working Group of the GAC would like to have an informal meeting with people from our side who are knowledgeable and sort of experts on DNS abuse.

So, since it's late now, I just wanted to raise this here and I'm going to send an email to the CPWG list asking for names, asking for people who would like to participate and I hope that I get answers by the end of the week. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Yrjo, and thanks for your ongoing efforts to maintain our relationship with the GAC. All right. Thanks, everyone. We'll be continuing these conversations on the list. Thanks for your time today. Bye, all.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of your day. Bye-bye!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]