
CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. Welcome to the Consolidated Policy Working Group Call on Wednesday, 25th of February, 2020 at 1900 UTC. Just with the increase of attendance and in order to save time, we will not be doing the rollcall, however, all attendees, both in the Zoom Room and on the Phone Bridge will be noted after the call.

We would like to note that we have received apologies from Judith Hellerstein, Marita Moll, Obed Sindy, Vanda Scartezini, Pierre-Jean Darres and Alberto Soto. Also, from Staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. Our Spanish interpreters for today are Marina and Claudia. Our French interpreters are Jacques and Camila.

Also, a friendly reminder to please keep your lines muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise and to please state your name when taking the floor so that the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels. Thank you very much and with this, I turn the call over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much and welcome everyone to this Consolidated Policy Working Group Call. Today we'll have Paul Diaz, Vice President of Policy of PIR and John Nevett, the CEO of PIR speaking to us about Ethos accountability initiatives to secure .ORG's future. We'll then have an update from Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg on the Expedited Policy Development Process Phase 2.

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

Then, we'll have Justine Chew and her Small Team and the Subsequent Procedures, taking us through some more updates of this very, very vast topic.

Finally, we'll go into our usual -- no, actually we still have something else. We also have a presentation on Middle East and Adjoining Countries Strategy of ICANN from 2021 to 2025, and Hadia Elminiawi will take us through this, she's part of the working group. Finally, we'll have the Policy Comment Updates, our usual Policy Comment Train as one would call it with the various statements that are in various stages of development. That's our program for today.

In Any Other Business, we'll just point people to the ICANN67 Frequently Asked Questions Document. As you know, that meeting has now been moved online. My Zoom seems to have died at the very most essential moment in time, where I have to ask if there is any change or amendments to the agenda.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Olivier, Alan has his hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you and your line is exceedingly noisy with background noise, Olivier. Just to note that there's a draft statement from the SSR Review with a very tight deadline, I believe the deadline is next Wednesday, so

we should make sure we have at least a few minutes to review that. It's not a long statement, it shouldn't take too long but we don't want to let slip off the end of the agenda.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I believe that is in the Policy Comment Updates. We'll try and go as fast as we can for the other.

ALAN GREENBERG: You may want to change the order because depending on how the time is going.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Noted, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Laurin has his hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Laurin.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I just wanted to say that is indeed possible that there will be an extension to the SSR2 Comment. This is not 100 percent yet but it is likely to happen, just in case it falls off the agenda, I think we will be fine.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Laurin, that's good to know. Any other hands up?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Olivier, I missed completely what Laurin was saying because of the background noise.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Don't worry about it, we don't need to cover it now, Christopher, it was just a logistical thing. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan and Olivier. I just wanted to note that I have not sent the presentation for the Middle East and Adjoining Countries ICANN Strategy but I'll be able to talk about it. I actually do have the presentation but today was a very busy day, we had a workshop, I just didn't have the time to but I can briefly talk about it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If you have it you can still send it as well, Hadia, it will be a bit before we get to you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, that's everyone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic, super, thanks very much. Let's now go over to Paul Diaz and John Nevett from PIT for the -- sorry, we had the action items that we had to look at. I think that they're all done. Just trying to see, no, there are a couple that are still not done.

The action items one is for Joanna Kulesza, Hadia Eliminiawi and Alfredo Calderon to work on preparing some webinar topic lists. There is an action with Jonathan to present on the At-Large Policy Platform and Gender Diversity for Future CPWG calls and also Evin to follow up with Jonathan on At-Large ICANN67 talking points. I guess this is all in progress at present.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All in progress, exactly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jonathan. Let's then move on.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Is this for the action item where we had to produce topics for the webinars? Actually, this one is done. Yesterday we had the webinar meeting and we came up with a list of hot topics for five webinars. The first -- If I may, I could say them now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Please, go ahead, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: The five topics are, the first one is EPDP for gTLD registration data, the second topic is DNS Abuse and private security. The third topic is GNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS. The fourth is the GEO politics and cyber security and the fifth the new round of gTLDs and subsequent procedures. The first webinar will take place the first week of April, I think it's the fourth of April. We will have a webinar the first of Monday of each month. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Hadia. Now, for the fourth time I guess, let's have Paul Diaz and John Nevett, both from PIR. Paul being Vice President of Policy and John CEO. Over to you.

JOHN NEVETT: Thank you, Olivier, appreciate and thank you Jonathan for inviting us and thank you everyone for listening. This is John Nevett from PIR, I'm here with Paul Diaz, most of you probably know. Knowing that you have EPDP Sub Pro and three other agenda items, we don't want to take too much of your time but we did want to reach out and talk about the transaction of .ORG. Where PIR has offered to be sold from essentially from ISOC Ethos Capital.

I think we all know the background but we wanted to reach out to ALAC and other members of the ICANN Community and talk about recent

developments where Ethos has agreed to binding commitments in the contract to deal with some of the concerns that have been raised.

The largest concern that we've heard is that the commitments that Ethos had been talking about over the last few months, weren't binding on the Community, binding on the Ethos and what happens if the sell .ORG or what happens if they change their minds?

We certainly pushed and Ethos agreed to make these binding commitments in the registry agreement. Their commitments can be enforced directly by ICANN but importantly because within the public's interest commitment section or Spec 11 it's called, it could also be enforced by the members of the Community as you know through a fixed CRP that has been used to successfully in the past.

I just wanted to go through these really quickly and answer any questions and then also, invite everyone to a webinar tomorrow that Ethos is having to discuss these public interest commitments. The webinar is tomorrow at 2000 UTC or 1500 East Coast in the US. That will be held by Ethos and Andrew Sullivan from ISOC and I will be on the call as well to answer any questions that come up there.

You can think about it or ask questions today or you could join the webinar tomorrow and ask questions then. We did want to do outreach and talk about the commitments to address the concerns that have been raised. Concerns about pricing, there's a commitment on pricing.

There is a commitment on -- so we're forming a stewardship council as you know, they will have binding rights to address issues like freedom of expression, our anti-abuse policy, which we're very proud of and we

don't want to change. Use of .ORG data, registrant or user data. A community enablement fund, to help fund special projects in the Community, .ORG Community and the amounts would be 10 million dollars.

The annual report to keep up the level of transparency that we currently have. We're very proud at PIR for what we're doing now. We believe we're an exemplary registry and we want to continue to be an exemplary registry. We would look forward reinvestment that Ethos can bring.

We certainly didn't ask for this, we're kind of like the football player that was traded from one team to the other and some fans aren't really happy about it but we think that overall, the transaction is positive for the internet society and positive for .ORG, PIR and the Community and certainly positive for Ethos as .ORG is the crown jewel of the DNS from our perspective.

Obviously, there have been a lot of concerns, we can't undo the process that ISOC took and whether that was right or not, doesn't really matter at this point because we can't go back in time. We're here where we are and we wanted to make sure that we did some outreach with Community members. I know there are definitely some critics on this call and there are others that are sympathetic.

We're happy to answer any questions and address any concerns. We were hoping to do this face to face in Cancun but obviously we're not doing that as it's a virtual meeting now. We thank you again for inviting

us to participate in this call and happy to answer any questions now or feel free to join the webinar tomorrow. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

You don't have slides or anything that list the commitments that you're making? You just listed them. Maybe Staff, if you could go to the link with the announcement and at least bring that up, then we'll be able to see it. I think we can go to questions.

I think and I don't know what you feel in a position to answer but I think one of the biggest questions from this group is, what is your impression of the core part of Ethos's strategy to make this a worthwhile investment? Is it to expand the types of people that register .ORG's? To be more open, a generic type of domain? What do you imagine at this point, since you've probably had discussions with them, what are you hearing they're going to be asking you to do differently than what you did before?

JOHN NEVETT:

Thanks Jonathan, great question. Potentially .ORG already is an open top-level domain, as you know anyone could register names. We certainly market to mission driven groups and individuals, people who are doing good on the internet should look at .ORG but it could be a corporate social responsibility site, it could be a family site, it could be a local club, my daughter is a big soccer player, her soccer club uses a .ORG and obviously 501T3non-profits in the US and their equivalents international all use .ORG pretty regularly.

I don't think the scope of .ORG users as a category would be expanded. One thing that we do want to do and having additional investment will be very helpful, is that .ORG right now is mostly, I wouldn't even say mostly, to a great extent North America centric, we want to get into more international markets and it costs a fair amount to do that.

We need to have a local presence; we need to partner with local folks that do it well. We're a perpetual harvest mode with ISOC. ISOC does great work and we fund their annual activities and if we're in a position where we need to invest over a two- or three-year period, it's very difficult for ISOC because that's money that won't go to them.

If you have a long-term horizon like Ethos does, where all their investors are looking at 10 plus years, they're not looking to flip this, they'll be more willing to invest in international markets for example or other types of services and dealing with other channels. That's certainly a focus that we want to do.

We're doing market research to see if there are other goods and services that would be of interest to the community but definitely, to answer your question, I don't think we're expanding scope of the registrant but certainly the location of the registrant is very important to us.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Those of us that have hand companies acquire know that acquirers often tend to change the culture of the acquiree. Do you have any concerns about risks that you need to manage or mitigate associated

with being part of bigger organization that more profit driven at this point?

JOHN NEVETT:

They didn't have a set of employees already; it wasn't like one company buying another company and there has to be some integration. The PIR staff is going to stay as the PIR staff, whether we're owned by Ethos or our sole member is ISOC, either way we're going to continue our good work. But obviously yes, when this came about, I had interested and think, what are the long-term plans? Our employees are obviously interested in that as well.

I spoke to more than one suitor once ISOC brought us into the process and Ethos has the most specific plans for the future of how to maintain the mission of .ORG. Non-profits get services from for profits all the time, even in their web presence, whether it's registrar or hosting, pretty much soup to nuts in a non-profits web presence there's a for profit that's providing the service.

Just the pure fact that it's going from not for profit to for profit is something we want to consider. We all took jobs a not for profit. We took all jobs with a certain mission we had in mind and we want to make sure that they continue that mission. These commitments go a long way to prove that they're willing to do that.

From a staff perspective, we're heartened by the fact they were willing to enter into a contract that's binding on them and it will stay with .ORG. No matter what happens, .ORG will be protected by these commitments. Yeah, certainly something we thought about and

something we're getting and have been getting comfortable with over the past four, five months that we've been involved with this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, guys. I'll stop hogging the microphone and go to the que. Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKSON: Thank you, Jonathan. I don't want to sound in any sense over [inaudible] but I've been a member of ISOC for 25 years. I was the original member with David Maher of Policy Oversight Committee, which designed the original structure of the competitive domain name system.

I was also the primary author in 1990's and 2000's of the very large and very successful geographical top level domain .EU. I'm not comfortable with what is going on.

Two points. First of all, I'm among those and I think I'm not alone, that are rather skeptical of policy of PIC commitments both because we don't see how over very long terms they can be sustained and secured, nor do we understand that over the very long term that ICANN will be able to enforce them. I'm disappointed that the resort to PIC is apparently the solution to the fact that PIR might lose its independence and its mission. I would also...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Christopher. Why don't we let them address that question?

CHRISTOPHER WILKSON: No, I have one other point. I hear you when you say that PIR should be more international, though you don't do such a bad job of that, that wasn't the criticisms that came to mind particularly but I don't perceive Ethos through its basic economic and financial structure, I don't perceive Ethos as being a useful vehicle for internationalization, at least in terms of its political image and I think you're on the wrong track.

There are one or two other things that I could comment on but indifference to the Chair, I'll keep those for later and let other people make the same. I'm afraid to say in this quarter, in Europe, you're dealing sever skepticism in this regard. Thank you.

JOHN NEVETT: Thank you, Christopher, I appreciate your honesty and your approach and your opinions, I'll take them backwards. When you're looking at internationalization, the most important thing is having the financial resources to be able to do that. In order to be very successful, we need financial resources to do that and we don't get that with ISOC.

ISOC needs the money for its great work and service and keeping the access to the internet, free and open internet and everything else that they do. We just don't have the ability to do that, Ethos can bring those resources that are important.

I don't think as PIR would go into an international market, the fact that is owned by an entity like Ethos Capital, I guess I personally don't think that that would make us less attractive as a partner for a local registrar

for example or hopefully the local registrant community as well but time will tell on that and you may be right.

On the PIC thing, I'd point you to an article by Allan Grogan, the former Compliance Officer of ICANN, he's been working with Ethos about the background of PIC. I'm perfectly comfortable if for some reason PIC has some concerns with some people, even though it's actually better than putting it in the main body of the contract because the main body of the contract is only enforceable by ICANN but by putting it in the Public Interest Commitment or Spec 11, it's enforceable not only directly by ICANN, as I mentioned it's also enforceable through a PIC PRP.

You or Jonathan or anyone else on this call could invoke that process, there is extra protection. I'm not sure from what perspective you're coming from, I saw some chatter that people don't think the PIC PRP is affective, I've seen it used and it's also a deterrent of folks that are subject to it, to make sure that they are following the rules straight and narrow.

You have ICANN Compliance and then you have anyone in the world could be involved and start the PIC PRP process, I think there is extra enforcement and extra compliance because of that but I people in the community think they'd rather have a different vehicle for these contractual commitments, that's fine too but I think this is the most effective one, for me personally. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, John. Before we continue with the que, I just want to remind everyone that we have a long que and a long agenda for the call.

Remember who these folks are and what they're really in a position to answer. It's not an opportunity for you to express your opinion about the transaction.

I think we need to keep our speechifying to a minimum and really just try to get clarity about this announcement and how it will affect the operations of PIR. These aren't folks that are in a position to make a decision about this transaction for example. Let's try to keep our comments short and our questions crisp so that we make the most use of having these guests here. Thanks a lot. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Quickly, with relation to the PIC PRP, you'll not that till you file a PIC PRP you have to demonstrate harm to yourself and it's not clear that these are the kinds of things that one can demonstrate harm, nevertheless. The issue I want to raise is one that we touched on vaguely already.

As you noted, the .ORG TLD is open, there is no restriction as to who can register for it but the reality in the real world of what people see is almost invariably if there is a .ORG, it's likely a non-profit or a personal use or some organization that is clearly not in it just for the money and the largest exposure I see going forward and maybe not immediately but this is a long term endeavor, is that a decision will be made to start marketing the .ORG TLD essentially in competition with .ORG, it's clearly a lot fewer names and a lot less competition for names and could be very attractive marketed that way.

How do you put commitments, whether they're PIC's or something else, enforceable commitments in place so that some future groups who is in control, be it a year from now or five years from now or 10 years from now, does not decide to let's go after .COM, change the marketing thrust all together because if that happens, essentially the value of .ORG to all of us who have .ORG for non-profits, for do good things, for personal use, disappears because if the perception of the public is suddenly that .ORG's are starting to be populated by the real for profit companies, the value disappears.

How do you put commitments in place so that that cannot happen? Not that you just don't plan to see it happen now but that it won't be allowed to happen? Thank you.

JOHN NEVETT:

Thanks, Alan, that's a great question. First of all, I think .COM is .ORG's biggest competitor already. I think .COM posts a lot of mission driven sites. I watched the US Presidential Debate last night....

ALAN GREENBERG:

But's that's not the issue, the issue is backwards.

JOHN NEVETT:

I'm sorry, what?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's not the issue, the issue isn't, are there not profits in .COM, the issue how do we make sure that the target for .ORG is not become profits.

JOHN NEVETT: I understand that Alan, I get where you're going. My point is, .COM already is the big competitor for .ORG. I don't want anyone to think that we're not competing with .COM because there is a vibrant competition with .COM. I think what sets us apart and I think you're right about that, is that when someone looks at .ORG they think it's more likely to be mission driven than others and that's great and that's value.

There is a huge value in the .ORG brand and by going beyond that, by marketing as you say, corporates have corporate social responsibility sites. I'm very comfortable with Patagonia.ORG being out there for their foundation or for their social responsibility as an example. As far as weakening the brand, that wouldn't be in anyone's interest, especially someone coming in that key is a huge value in the brand.

I don't see that happening but with that said, the protection in the public interest commitment, is the .ORG stewardship council, they will provide advice. I'm viewing it more like the GAC in away, maybe that's a bad example but that they'll provide advice and they actually have binding advice on issues, so that people don't in the future like you say, "I'm done, my leadership team is done."

Where is the direction of .ORG in five years, 10 years, whatever it is and apparatus set up to protect that, to help represent the community through that stewardship council. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Roberto is next.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Hi John, hi Paul, I think we have met a few times before. My question is about the governance. So, members of the PIR Board are now ending their term this year, up till now its ISOC, the ISOC Board of Trustees that selected the PIR Board. That has given a certain guarantee about for instance, the ISOC principles, some ethical behavior and so on.

Do you know what is going to be the process in the future Ethos thinks to be able to guarantee the presence of people on the Board that are traditionally oriented to the .ORG Community or at least have the core internet values in their background? What I see the Board in turns selects what is no longer the advisory but the stewardship, so everything depends in reality from the PIR Board. Thank you.

JOHN NEVETT: Thanks, Roberto, good to hear your voice. Yeah, as far as the Stewardship Council selection, the first I believe five members of the Stewardship Council would be selected by the new PIR Board, is what Ethos is proposing and then those folks would be names that you'll recognize I'm sure, they're talking to folks, they haven't announced it

yet but they're getting ready to, hopefully soon as far as a couple of the members.

They would have a nomination process and select additional members as well. It's even more removed from PIR. No one knows fully contractor, Board member or anything like that from PIR will be on the Stewardship Council, they want it to be as independent as possible from PIR to get that independent advice that you're thinking and suggesting that they get.

I think the charter that is also public and was in the announcement will show that this independence is an important feature of the Stewardship Council. Hopefully that gives you some better feeling about it.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yes, John I understand this but my question is, how is the PIR Board going to be selected in the future because in the past it was done by ISOC but now it's going to be done by procedures that are not yet known by Ethos, so how can we guarantee that on the PIR Board, not on the Stewardship Council, on the PIR Board we have people that have their interests of the .ORG Community at their hearts?

JOHN NEVETT:

I think Ethos has been public that the future PIR Board would be made up of five people picked by Ethos. I don't think they're talking about some kind of nomination process or anything like that. It would be run as a for profit and following those principles but they'd be using the Stewardship Council as a lot more than what PIR currently does.

We have a wonderful Advisory Council; I don't know if Maureen's on but she's on our Advisory Council but they provide advice to the PIR Staff and Board now. In the future, the Stewardship Council of PIR would have binding authority, which is very different then our current Advisory Council. That binding authority would be a feature of the Stewardship Council and the PIR Board would be separate.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks guys. Greg Shatan and then we're going to close the que.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, John and Paul for joining us, too bad George and Rhino couldn't join us as well. A couple of questions. First, it appears to me that the mandate or at least the binding mandate of the Stewardship Council is quite narrow, really only two noted things. Why doesn't it have free rein or is it intended to have free rein over all issues regarding the operation of PIR?

The second related question is, beyond the Stewardship Council, has PIR been thinking about how it will essentially regain or enhance the amount of trust it has from the non-profit community, especially since there is a knee jerk reaction by most people to ownership by a private equity company and essentially it's gone from being part of us to one of them so to speak? Would appreciate thoughts. Thanks.

JOHN NEVETT:

Thanks, Greg. Yeah, the Stewardship Council would have the ability to provide advice on any topic it so chooses, the binding advice is limited to the certain areas, freedom of expression, use of data, things like that. If it had binding authority on everything it would just be the Board itself and that wasn't the intention of the commitment.

The commitment was to set up an independent body that had certain binding requirements and authority and the ability to provide advice on other things. It hasn't been fun to be a PIR employee over the last couple of months. Reading the articles and reading the concerns. We have a very hard working, it's a small staff but a very hard-working staff and people are very mission driven and they're very excited to further the mission and the brand of .ORG.

I think we'll be very excited to do two things going forward. There's obviously, as you say, some repair that'll have to be done and we're excited to entertain that work and more importantly, we're excited to prove the critics wrong. We've heard some outlandish, wild accusations that we're going to X, Y and Z, I don't even want to share, some of them are pretty reprehensible and it'll be fun to prove them wrong. That we're going to continue to do the right thing.

We're going to continue to operate it as an exemplary registry. We've been leaders on anti-abuse and leaders in the ICANN Community and we'll continue to do that. I don't think you'll see a change in that at all and we're excited to continue that work and again, to prove people that have had concerns, prove them wrong.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot guys for being on board. That's a great note on which end this portion of the call. We really appreciate you coming on. We'll definitely have people on the webinar as well and you can expect to hear more from us probably in that area of small areas where we might expand the scope of that Advisory Committee. But thanks very much for coming on and for your openness and we look forward to working with you on this more.

JOHN NEVETT: That's' great. Feel free to reach out if you have anything else and look forward to speaking tomorrow and thanks for everything. We appreciate it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks guys. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan and thanks John and Paul for joining us on this very, very interesting discussion. I'll certainly be listening to the recording again. Next and we are really pressed for time. We have the Expedited PDP Phase 2 Update, Hadia Eliminiawi and Alan Greenberg. Hadia, have you managed to get your slides across?

HADIA ELIMINIAWI:

I don't have any new slides for today's call. We had the slides last week, which have a summary of the recommendations. This week actually there are two important things that I would like to mention. The first is the blog about ICANN Org meeting with the Belgium Data Protection Authority.

ICANN Org met with the Belgium Data Protection Authority of 14th of February and this was to continue discussions about the Unified Access Model Document that ICANN presented to the European Data Protection Board in October. The Chair of the PDP provided an overview of the initial report at the meeting and the status of the work.

The DPA provide feedback with regard to two very important and crucial topics for the model. The first is the creation of centralized model and the second is the ability to automate various in the model. With regard centralization, the DPA said a centralized model is worth exploring and it seems to be a better common-sense option in terms of security and for data subjects.

With regards to automation, the Belgium DPA noted that GDPR would not prohibit automation of various functions in an access model. They also said, it is not how the disclosure decision made that matters but to be able to demonstrate that any algorithm automating decision making considers the criteria required for such a decision to be compliant with DPPR.

I regard this blog as very important because it does provide two assertions, one with regard to centralization and one with regard to the automation of the decision making. Yesterday, actually we had

meeting, the automation small team meeting and I presented during this meeting a chart about -- in many parts of the report we say that automation is possible where technically feasible and legally permissible.

One question that was always coming up, how do we determine if it's legally permissible? Yesterday I presented a flowchart that actually speaks to when is automation legally permissible. The flowchart basically -- maybe I could share the flowchart after the call.

During our call yesterday we started going through the use cases and again, there is agreement I think for two cases, the law enforcement request from same jurisdiction and request for data from UDP and USR and discussions are still going with regard to the other use cases. We managed to address five use cases out of the 10 uses cases.

One of the parts of the discussion was with regard to, should be it be a must or should? I think with regard to obvious cases like law enforcement from certain jurisdictions, requesting registrant data from the same jurisdiction and also UDRP and USR, I think those should be a must. Maybe, for some other cases where registrants are okay with it but have some kind of concerns, maybe it could be a should.

One thing I wanted to talk about today is the possibility of -- I haven't said this yet at the EPDP, I was thinking of sending out an email in this regard, that is the automation of disclosure of the contact email, contact of the registrar.

The reason I think or I believe that this is actually permissible under GDPR is that when you look at .EU and if you go to [inaudible].eu and

click on their WHOIS service, type any domain name and then the registrant's email will actually appear. If you click on their WHOIS policy, you can read clearly that it says that for natural persons they will publish the email address, they do offer though a service for their registrants to have an alternative email address.

We should all remember that .EU, all its policies are approved by the European Commission, so this is totally GDPR compliant. The purpose of providing the email is to be able to contact the registrant and this is essential for security reasons. Again, I think that this -- we have, from the start, decided not to make this email available but then that could be a use case which could actually be automated.

Basically, that's what I wanted to say today. I give the floor to Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I don't have very much to add. There is a meeting tomorrow where we'll be discussing among other thing exactly what we're going to do as a result of the cancellation of Cancun, which I think is one of the more critical issues.

We had very tight schedule and did rely on the fact that we would have a significant amount of face to face time, which now we will not have the face to face time and in fact, we will not be meeting nearly as many hours as we would have even remotely. That puts a pressure on our overall schedule, which I don't know how it's going to be resolved.

I will share that I was on a meeting just before this one with Graham Bunton from Tucows and he spoke first on the issue of the EPDP from a

perspective of his perspective, not necessarily registrars in general. Part of what he said was, number one, we've ended up at a place where he doesn't feel uncomfortable and he doesn't understand why we didn't arrive there two years ago because it's a rational decision that made sense. I ended up saying, "Well, perhaps for the first time ever, I'm completely agreeing with Graham Bunton."

We are in a place where it is rational. It's probably implementable. It may address some of the needs. Why we didn't get there instead of looking at completely ridiculous options for a long time is not clear to me but we are where we are.

The challenge right now is in fact going to make it operational and that's going to rely on finding more use cases where we can automate and that's questionable right now if we're going to be able to do that, both on a basis of law and on a basis of dogma. It remains to be seen where we're going. There is a lot still up in the air.

will be deferring a lot of issues that we were supposed to be looking at, passing them back to the GNSO Council and saying, "Sorry, we didn't get to it." And it's not clear how they're going to be addressed. Some of those are issues that were and are important to At-Large, including things like geographic legal differentiation and things like that, we may address partly but probably will not.

We're in a better place than we were. There is a lot of unknowns. The cancellation makes the unknowns significantly more unknown. We'll keep on working at. We're not in a bad place right now.

The comments that were made by the Belgium DPA do give us some level of encouragement, despite many people on the EPDP and particularly those representing the NCSG basically saying, it's not possible at all to make any automated decisions. We'll see where it goes. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan, I was just checking the queue. Olivier, there is no one in the queue with questions. I think we can move on

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Jonathan. Yes, I'm under snow at them moment, so that makes it a little more difficult to focus. The next thing in our agenda is going to be the Subsequent Procedures with Justine Chew and she's going to take us through some of the progress that has been done this week and of course, what's coming up next. Over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I'm just going to keep my interventions short this week. Just to provide an update on a couple things. One is the score card for IDN's and UA. I sent through a message to the IDN Working Group as decided as the action item a couple weeks ago. I have to report that I've not received any feedback, so I'm not sure whether people are actually reading it or not.

The second thing is the score card for GEO names we had a first call yesterday to try and sort out the score card for GEO names, a draft

score card. We had pretty vibrant conversations around that, just to say that we didn't manage to get through the entire score card and perhaps a different approach or a revised approach is needed for both the IDN and UA score cards and GEO name score cards to achieve what we need to achieve. In terms of the Item 5.2, the At-Large Score Card Topic List, as before, it's updated on a weekly basis.

It gives you an indication of progress that the small team has made in terms of producing score card, which is also reflected in 5.3. More importantly, the list in 5.2 shows the designation of what is high priority, what is medium priority. If anyone has comments or disagreements in terms of what you think is high priority versus what you think is of medium priority, then would appreciate hearing from those people in terms of input so that we can adjust, we can consider that input and adjust the list of priority topics accordingly.

Also, in terms of indications as to what people might want to consider in more details by single purpose calls, an indication of those would be great as well. Under 5.3, just to mention that since last week we have posted the link to the four score cards under Overarching Topics, which is Item 2 Continuing Subsequent Procedures, what we have termed as costs versus benefited program.

Item 3 Predictability, Item 4 Applications Success in Rounds and Item 5 Different TLD Types, those are not really new but four draft score cards that have been posted since last week and they are out for comment as with others. The score card for GEO names will be an ongoing work in progress. Happy to take questions if we have any. Thank you.

JONATHAN CHEW:

Thanks, Justine. There is nobody in the que. I'll just say something briefly. To repeat what Justine is saying, we really need people's feedback on these score cards and get them talking because on the single purpose call it became evident that people were filling them out in some instances from a personal view standpoint and not necessarily a consensus view standpoint.

We are probably going to have to go through some of these things and revisit them for our consensus decisions and make sure that we're not, as has happened a couple of times in the past, making contradictory statements publicly via this process.

I do encourage people to be on the next single purpose call but I think what we're going to try to do is make very efficient presentation of the positions that we're taking in them and try to get a temperature of the room for those positions so that they ALAC has a good sense of this broader group and their feelings on these issues.

Otherwise, if we're too apathetic about this, things will just filter through into a common and out the door and I think it's important for us not to be passive about that. I really do encourage to take a look at these and make a list of your questions and concerns and participate in the next single purpose call which will happen after the ICANN meeting. We really want to make sure that have a consensus driven and conscious perspective on these subsequent procedure's topics. Christopher, please go ahead.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Jonathan, thank you and I appreciate your diplomacy in attacking my drafting. I agree, it would be good to have a consensus, especially in At-Large but my experience with GNSO and PDP over the past three years is that their position is so predatory regarding geographical names, that personally, I find it very difficult to find scope for consensus.

We cannot, as a user-oriented entity, organization, community, we cannot buy into a process which is designed hi hijack and privatize the geographical names of people and communities and countries all around the world. I agree, please react and respond to Jonathan's invitation but I urge, if you do agree with the text I have proposed, please say so. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Christopher and to clarify, I have no specific problem with your positions on these things, I just want to make sure that our process as a consensus driven one, that's all, that's my only purpose here. The one time that we had a face to face meeting devoted to geographic names, we did not have consensus on very many things, about whether it was governments that had the last work or communities, etc., how really should have an answer? What represents a geographic name?

These are all things upon which there is yet not consensus among the At-Large and so while everyone is free to make individual comments to subsequent procedures and to make their case, the comments made by At-Large as a group, by the ALAC needs to be a product of consensus, that's the only point I'm trying to make. It's a procedural point, that's all.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I can understand that position and I thank you because I think you've moved significantly since a few weeks ago. A personal assessment of the way's things are going and I thank you.

That being said, the bottom line I'm afraid to say is, in spite of Justine's heroic efforts to codify and document this whole process, it is two years too late. Alan, will agree that we had the opportunity in San Juan and in Panama to get this ball really rolling and here we are now in effect just starting when...

JONATHAN ZUCK: And we've readdressed the fact that it's late many times as well. We need to also made a decision we're going to stop discussing GEO names or decide that we're going to take what opportunities we have to still have influence over the outcome. That is a finery question.

If we fundamentally believe we no longer have any influence over the outcome of this, we should stop wasting time on it but if instead we believe our unique position as provider of advice to the Board, etc., in what is going to be a long and extended process prior to new rounds of gTLDs and we should continue this process and cease obsessing over the fact that didn't do it when we should have.

I feel like we wasted six months on GDPR having that same discussion. We need to focus on what we can accomplish going forward, be realistic about that but then focus our efforts on those changes.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Don't ask me about GDPR. Yes, fine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I didn't, Christopher, but thank you.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: That's a matter for Maureen and the ALAC Leadership.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is indeed. I know that Alan, you're next in the que but I know that Cheryl said something about a point of order, I just wanted to let her go first if I could.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you and apologies to Alan. I would appeal to you as manager of this call Jonathan, to discourage shall I say, the most volatile statements being made with regard to characterization of policy development processes of key pillars of ICANN. These calls are looked at by others and I think it is all of us to conduct ourselves with sufficient care and courtesy to aid our ability to build consensus. With that, I'll put my hand down but believe me, I am more than willing and able to take.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Cheryl. Always a good reminder for us to avoid any kind of ad hominem and focus on the substance and the outcomes that we'd like to accomplish because we're more likely to accomplish them if we focus on them. Alan, go ahead please.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you and I support what Cheryl said and by the way, it's not necessary ad hominem we're worrying about it, it's ad comitium we're working at our councilism. Representing the views of a council which changes and has a moving dynamic as being specific things, I don't think is helpful. I tend to agree that may often be the outcome in some cases but that's different. I think we need to be very careful.

I strongly support that our score cards try not to espouse individual positions as positions of the ALAC. I for one don't agree fully with Christopher. I don't think it's an absolute thing that geographic names must be permitted with no expectations and no processes. I think we need a balanced outcome; I don't know how to achieve it and I'm not sure anyone knows how to achieve it. I may be in a minority and not supported by anyone on the ALAC currently, I have no idea.

Let's make sure that when we make statement, we can either support them or we say we are divided if there is some merit in saying that in the case. Not put positions where we're forcing other people to counter them and say, "The ALAC said that but I don't agree." I think we need to be careful going forward. Thank you. And as Jonathan said, we may not come to closure on this item and so be it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you. I said it yesterday and I'm going to say it again. The score cards are the responsibility of the small team and I take responsibility for the small team. They are drafts, they are not set in stone, they are meant to tease out questions that we want to bring to the attention of folks that are participating in the position development process within the At-Large.

If people disagree with certain things, then I'm happy to hear those and that's the whole point about using these score cards to generate some interests or some responses to things. As I said earlier, we're going to look at how to do things better. I appreciate what Jonathan is saying and also what Alan is saying and, in some sense, I also appreciate what Christopher has done, whether we agree with him or not.

Let's look at how to make this a better process. As people have said, if we do not come to consensus on anything, then fine, we don't come to consensus on anything but at least we would have discussed them. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Justine, I agree completely and thank you very much. That's why I was making a call for people to pay attention and not let this process go by passively and uncommented on. Let's move on Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Can you read out my last comment though.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, that strong opinions can often lead to a conversation. I agree completely. Again, I think the point is not what's there but the fact that people aren't looking at them. That was really the point of my statement, is that we should not assume that what's in these score cards is the result of a consensus process within the At-Large.

That's the only point I'm trying to make and therefore absent that assumption, please look at them and make your views heard. Thanks, folks. Back to you, Olivier, and on top, Hadia.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you so much for this, Jonathan, and thanks for all the updates to Justine and her crew. The next person is Hadia Elminiawi with a presentation on the Middle East and Adjoining Countries Strategy 2021-2025. Over to you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Olivier. I have sent the wrong the version, there is only one slide is not correct in this one. I have sent another now which is the correct version. We can go ahead with this one, what we have on screen instead of wasting time. It's the Middle East and Adjoining Countries Regional Strategy, ICANN Regional Strategy in the Middle East and Adjoining Countries.

First, we have an introduction and then I'll be speaking about the regional goals and At-Large interest and then a conclusion. The Middle East and Adjoining Countries Regional Strategy covers the 22 Arab

countries that are members of the League of Arab States, in addition to Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan and Turkey.

The Regional Strategy has four focus areas corresponding to four of ICANN Strategic Objectives. The focus area that the ICANN Strategic Objective does not speak to the one related to financial aspects. Each regional focus area has some regional goal, expected outcomes and suggested actions.

The first focus area is security. ICANN Strategic Objective is to strengthen the security of the domain name system and the DNS root server system. The Regional Strategic Goals, we have two. The first is to support the development of technical capacities and the building of regional network of technical experts to further strengthen the security of the DNS in the region.

The second is to identify and mitigate security threats to the DNS through engagement with irrelevant stakeholders. I see of course At-Large and ALAC does have a goal if we look at those two goals. For example, the ALAC is an individual member to have a role in the development of the technical capacity.

ALAC has been focusing on the topic of DNS abuse and its impact on end users and [inaudible]. The ALAC is an individual member to cover DNS and the regional needs in terms of capacity development and expertise. If we look at the goals, we do we see that At-Large could have actually a role in making those goals.

The second focus area is ICANN's governance. ICANN's Strategic Objective is to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder

Model. In this regard we have two strategic goals. The first one is to support and grow active and informed and effective stakeholder participation from the region.

The second is to take part in the improvement of ICANN Multistakeholder Model and share learnings and experiences at regional and national levels. Again, the ALAC is an individual member, should have a role in increasing community members participation from the region in ICANN's policy making.

The third focus area is the Unique Identifiers. ICANN's Strategic Objective is evolve the coordination and collaboration with relevant parties. In this regard we have five Regional Strategic Goals. The first one is to support the use of IDN's in the region.

The second is to promote readiness for Universal Acceptance and encourage stakeholders from technology developers. Third is providers and policy makers to consider Universal Acceptation Implementation. The fourth is to inform regional stakeholders about the new round gTLDs.

The fourth is to encourage the development of [inaudible] related to the unique identifier system within ICANN's remit. The fifth is to promote ICANN's role as it relates to the unique identifiers within the Multistakeholder community.

Again, there is definitely a role for At-Large here. ALAC with its working groups in addition to the ALAC individual members could have a role in keeping stakeholders informed about the new round of gTLDs. At-Large could help in the promoting adoption of a new DNS related standards

and product goals. This would be like DNS SEC or RDAP and IPV6, all that kind of necessary protocols.

That's the last focus area, which is geo politics. ICANN's Strategic Objective is to address GEO political issues impacting ICANN's mission. In this regard we had two Regional Strategical Goals. The first one is to monitor legislative efforts that could impact ICANN's mission.

The second is to work with ICANN support organizations and advisory communities to expand outreach to the wider community and engage with all stakeholders in relation to ICANN's mission. Again, the one of the goals does actually consider working with At-Large and ALAC Outreach and Engagement Working Group could be of help in this regard.

My conclusion, I think it is in the interest of ALAC to provide [inaudible] as many of the action items related to the strategy relate to At-Large work and is in the best interest of the end users. Thank you and I'm open for questions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Hadia. The queue is open now for any questions on this topic. I'm not seeing anyone currently in the queue. Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Thank for this presentation, Hadia, I think it's very useful. I have just one question, more global then just the topic we are talking about. We have five regions in ICANN, it seems that GSC and

ICANN Org have decided to organize some other region in this world, therefore how we cope with that.

I have one example in my region where we are two sub regions and we are to cope with both of them. It is something we think is okay and how we will work with that. I'm sorry to take your example of Middle East because it's not one of the five regions of ICANN but it's still one relevant for the work you are doing. I am more global question on that. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Sebastien, for that. Actually, we had many, many discussions about and this relates to what you just said. For example, the name of the strategy, Middle East and Adjoining Countries, what are those adjoining countries? We spent a lot of time talking about Iran and Pakistan and Turkey and how we could best reflect them in the strategy instead of just saying adjoining countries.

Then ICANN has the Middle East and Adjoining Strategy which covers the countries, Iran Pakistan, Turkey and then they have in Africa also engagement strategy and also the African engagement strategy for [inaudible] been concluded and I believe will be out maybe for public comment soon.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Hadia. Any other questions? Justine Chew.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. Thank you very much, Hadia for the presentation. This is just an opinion of mine. It seems to me that if we were to respond to this strategy or give our comments to this strategy it would be useful to hear from people who are within this Middle East and Adjoining Countries Group.

I for one, I don't reside in that region so I may not have pertinent knowledge of what goes on in that particular region. I think it would be useful from people who are, who reside within those countries that this thing covers. As an ALAC member, I also have a little discomfort responding to something that I may not have personal in terms of geographic location. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I totally agree with, Justine. As someone from the region and also because I participated at this strategy, I do feel that we could actually provide a statement in this regard. Yes, you are absolutely right and people from the region are the ones who should actually decide if we should respond to this or not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Abdulkarium Oloyede is next.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I happen to also chair a similar committee in the African Region and I want to say, I think it will probably be a little bit unfair. I'm not sure if ALAC is supposed to respond to this because I believe Justine what she said and I think that will probably be the best way. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. If this is what most of the people from the region think, then maybe we should. But I find for example, in some of the roles, there is a reference to engaging and working with the Advisory Committee and we could take this -- we could provide our opinion on how we would like to engage or work with them and in what ways. Even if we would like to engage or not.

The strategy does relate to our work and does relate to lots of things that we do and does relate to some of the topics that we are actually raising and trying to adopt. For example, DNS abuse and mitigating DNS threats. I don't have any qualms with this in relation to this. Again, I agree with what Justine and others said. It should be people mainly from the region deciding if we would like to comment on this or not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Hadia. I put myself in the que, seeing there is no other hands up at the moment. From history, in the past we have had other regional strategies up for comment that were published.

I remember there was the AFRALO Regional Strategy, there was also the European one and if I recall correctly, we had exactly the same concerns from our ALAC members, from other regions says, "Well, we don't really know about that region, so we can't comment on it."

One of the ways that we went around it was to actually get the RALO in which the region was located to comment and to have effectively the RALO provide a statement. That sometimes has actually a better approach to things, because of the fact that if it was the ALAC, one could always say, "Well, the ALAC just voted on something they don't know about."

When the RALO is actively involved with this, draft something, that usually is seen as being something quite significant. I would suggest and this is just a suggestion, to check with APRALO, if they would be interested in having a statement and providing comment.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

This actually makes perfect sense. Then we go back to Sebastien's comment, that actually this region is not one of the identified ICANN regions. Part of it lies with APRALO and another one lies with AFRALO. Again, many of the APRALO members would actually relate to this strategy and many of the AFRAO also members wouldn't also relate to this. That's interesting. Maybe we could do that.

We could ask both APRALO and AFRALO if they would like to have a comment on the strategy and if not, we leave it there. Holly says, "AFRALO has many regions in the Middle East, the Pacific Islands. Yes, this will be an APRALO." Okay, if you say so.

But again, it goes back to what Sebastien said, that this is not appealing -- when it comes to ICANN putting strategies in regions, they have different strategies than the identified officially by ICANN. Let's take

the opinion of APRALO and maybe also AFRALO and if one of those RALO's would like to provide a statement then we go ahead. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, that sounds good. Thanks so much, Hadia, for your presentation and thanks for getting the slides to the Staff. With a multi-lingual audience, it helps to have those bullets in front of people. What I'd like to do is jump directly to Alan, making a brief statement about the drafted comment on SSR2 because that's very time pressing, so we're going to skip the intro's and go right to you, Alan, if it's alright?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm happy with that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Please, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Three of us were asked to write a statement. I wrote some notes and Jonathan thought that they were a pretty good start to a statement, the third person it Lutz and he has since agreed as well. The proposed statement is on the screen right now. I'll read it out I guess if we have time, it's not very long.

"The ALAC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the SSR2 Review Team Report. Ensuring the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS is arguably ICANN's single, most important role. SSR1 identified 28

recommendations. The ICANN Board Report indicates the Board judged [inaudible] be relevant and implementable and that they were all fully implemented.

SSR2 analysis was that of the 28 recommendations, two were not implemented at all and 26 were partially implemented and none fully implemented. Of the 27 of the 28 were found to be still relevant. This is an astounding analysis eight years after the acceptance of the SSR1 recommendations. The ALAC has particular interest in recommendations related to domain name and abuse and notes that several of the recommendations overlap and compliment those issues by the RDS Review Team.”

And I have in parenthesis, “The CCT Review Team.” And Jonathan, I’d ask you if indeed there is overlap with the CCT Review Team Recommendations, we should...

JONATHAN ZUCK: There is indeed.

ALAN GREENBERG: We should remove the brackets and the question mark. “The ALAC also notes, that in the opinion of SSR Review Team, many of the recommendations are deemed to be high priority. Given the current interest in ICANN of prioritizing activities, with the implicit effect of not addressing those lower on the list, this could lead to no addressing issues critical to the SSR of the DNS.

DNS security, stability, resiliency is not something we can afford to ignore. The lead item in ICANN's Strategic Report is strengthening the security of the domain name system and the DNS root server system. This is must be taken into account when allocating resources and we trust this will be taken into account when the Board works with the Review Team Implementation Shepherds on deciding how to prioritize the recommendations.

Summary. We are living in a world where many parties seem to have an interest in destabilizing critical infrastructure and the internet in particular. The fact that our systems have been sufficiently robust in the past is not an indication that this is sustainable moving forward. ICANN needs to take seriously the need to professionally and rigorously ensure the SSR of DNS operations, in particular, known venerability's need to be corrected with the outmost hast."

The focus of the last half statement is that we know the current attitude and the recommendations of the ATRT3 are pushing us to say we must prioritize things, we can't do everything, we must balance things and the question is, how do we rationalize that when related to the SSR security, stability and resiliency of the DNS? Which is our main reason for existing. And that's where we stand right now. As far as I'm concerned, the statement is ready to go but obviously, others may have comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. Justine Chew, go ahead please.

JUSTINE CHEW:

I think it's a pretty adequate and strong statement. I just had a question about something some people have raised in the chat already. Is whether we need to have a point about not having this situation repeated in the sense that ICANN decides that they have implemented something when everybody else don't seem to thing so.

Whether there is an issue with the reporting mechanism or analysis mechanism on ICANN Org's part, to deemed whether something has been implemented or not. Just a question. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's an issue that the RDS Review Team found as well. That everything had a green checkmark beside and I know from the one issue in ATRT that had a green checkmark on it was one I had happened to have written and in one case, virtually nothing was done but there was still a green checkmark. It's a recurred problem.

The involvement of review team shepherds as they're called, to be involved in the analysis and perhaps in the ongoing implementation may well help. But currently, ICANN -- we've trusted ICANN to rigorously analyze whether they have implemented things and very clearly, according to the review teams, they're not doing a good job of it.

I'd like to think that after two or three review teams has noted this, that it will not be ignored. I think might comment about astounding, that I wrote there addresses it. I'm sure we want to address the particular issue any further in the SSR Review comment because remember, this comment is aimed not at the Board, but at the Review Team to take

into account as they finalize their report. If we want to emphasize it, then we should emphasize it in the statement to the Board, which is separate from this.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alan. I was going to just echo that point. One of the things that ICANN Org is trying to do is to institute this shepherd's process during implementation, so that there is some buy in and participation and clarification, etc., from the review teams themselves on the implementation. That is at least something that a reform is taking place but we might want to consider constructing advice about this because it is a systemic thing, not anything particular to SSR2.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Jonathan, it's not clear the shepherds will have involvement once the Board has issued their final analysis and statement. Certainly the shepherds are involved while the Board is deliberating on whether to accept or not. We haven't had an example yet, so we don't know to what extent shepherds will be involved in the years after that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right, so the CCTRT shepherds have remained involved during the implementation of the recommendations that were outright accepted by the Board. From an intention standpoint, the intention there is to have them engaged throughout.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, I wasn't aware of that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Laurin, go ahead please.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: I see Sebastien has his hand up, maybe because I wanted to make some comments and observations, he could go first he wants to and then maybe I could respond to that as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Sebastien, go ahead. Remember, we're over time so let's all try to be concise.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I wanted to use half an hour to my speech. Just two things. First one is that in ATRT we face the same trouble. We have made recommendation as ATRT is in charge of reviewing the reviews, it's something very strong. I hope the question raised by Alan is moved because we need to have the shepherd doing the working, the implementation not just doing the time the Board will decide if they accept or not the review, the recommendations.

You talk about CCT, I hope Work Stream 2, it's another example, even if we don't have too much to do for the moment, as shepherd of the recommendation of Work Stream 2. That's something we have taken into account in ATRT3 and taking into this discussion, I will check again

what we are writing in our recommendation to be sure that embedded all your concern here. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. Laurin, take us out.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Thank you. Reading the comments, I personally appreciate the approach the ALAC has taken here. It is early stage for public comment, there is a lot of stuff that needs to be resolved, I still remain happy in case there any questions, let me know. In regards to some of the stuff that happened in the chat, a lot of what we're focusing on is really find some international standard of some sort and just do it and get audited by an external party, essentially like the rest of the world.

I think this will also then help with the method because if there is an actual audit, an actual process, it will be easier to assess. Thanks again for this comment and I remain available should anyone want to ask anything about SSR2.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot, Laurin. Olivier, Laurin was going to make a brief presentation as well on another topic. I feel like our time is tight, is that something that can be pushed, Laurin, or do we need to handle it?

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Next comment is due in 30 days. That can be moved.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. I think we'll close out the policy stuff there, Olivier, so you can bring the call to a close. Olivier, are you still on the line? I guess not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Olivier, I hear you now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I must have been unmuted by the operators because I usually mute locally. Sorry for this. That's great if Laurin can do it next week, that would really help on time. That takes us straight to Any Other Business. Reading the ICANN67 FAQ document.

There is a whole document that explains, tries to answer all the questions that people have been asking themselves with regards to how this meeting is going to be held now. Laurin, your hand is still up. I'm not sure whether... okay, how the next meeting is going to happen.

I wonder if we could have either for like a minute, either Heidi or Maureen, to explain how At-Large will work with the overall schedule that's currently being put together?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Maureen had to drop from the call. Let me see if Heidi is available.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I must have called on two people that had to leave, sorry. Anyway, while we're trying to find out, the schedule in itself is currently being completely redrafted. There is a new tentative schedule being worked out. It will involve a significant number of calls during the ICANN week.

The timing will all be based on the Mexican time, Cancun time. I know that for some people it will be a little bit hard and details are still being worked out for it.

Soon, there should be a schedule and what the group, the Organizing Committee is working on at the moment, is to try and see if some of our sessions cannot moved to a later week, so that it puts less pressure on our Community to be on the phone for X number of hours per day, which I know is pretty terrible. That's it really for this. Jonathan, anything else that we need to touch on before we close?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't think so. We will begin the ICANN meeting, the virtual version of the ICANN meeting as usual with a kind of overview of the sessions that are going on, the things being discussed and the sessions that folks might want to attend.

We're hoping, again, to have people attend these virtual sessions and to raise At-Large concerns where appropriate. We will have a kind of orientation at the beginning of the virtual ICANN meeting, which I encourage everyone to attend. Sebastien, has his hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sebastien Bachollet, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Olivier. Two things, the first one is that we are still struggling with ICANN Org to have not only English and Spanish but to have English, Spanish and French, it was a request not just by us or people from At-Large but it's also people from the GAC and other parts of the Community, therefore I hope that it will done.

My second point is that I really hope that At-Large and ALAC is taking almost all the things that we can do in the normal work as it is already a virtual our work outside of this week, we don't need to have a for example, the CPWG can still work next week or the week after, not during the ICANN meeting. If we can decrease the number of meetings we will have in this week, it's already too much I guess, it will be great. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. That's indeed the plan, we're cutting and slicing. Trying to make this a very streamlined meeting for the At-Large. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you to everyone who has participated in today's call and of course, a big thanks to our interpreters who have yet again remained longer than they official closing time here. Next meeting next week.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi Olivier, we are not sure if it's going to place, we do not have interpreting services available. We will chat with you and Jonathan regarding keeping the call without interpretations or scheduling for the following week.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you. I gather you announced it.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Interpreting services are not available for next week, so we need to decide if we're going to keep it as is without interpretation or hold it off until after ICANN67?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'd say we have to go on, the show must go on. I say we have to continue because this is ongoing policy work. Let's try and see if we can still get -- Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Olivier, let's take that conversation offline because the other thing we'll have is having to find times that aren't conflicting as well. Let's take that offline and we'll make an announcement on the list on what we've been able to pull together.

OLIVIER CREPING-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thanks everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening or night.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]