CLAUDIA RUIZ:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly teleconference call Tuesday the 28th of July 2020 at 16:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel we have Abdulkarim Oloyede, Maureen Hilyard, Bastiaan Goslings, Jonathan Zuck, Marita Moll, Barrack Otieno, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yrjö Lansipuro, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Joan Katambi, Alan Greenberg, Vrickson Acosta, Sébastien Bachollet, Vanda Scartezini, Roberto Gaetano, Erich Schweighofer, Sarah Kiden, Chokri Ben Romdhane, Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong, Ricardo Holmquist, Hadia Elminiawi, Sivasubramanian Muthusamy, Judith Hellerstein, Aris Ignacio.

On the Spanish channel, we have Harold Arcos and Alberto Soto. We have received apologies from Joanna Kulesza, Shreedeep Rayamajhi, Matthias Hudobnik, Silvia Vivanco from staff), and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Evin Erdogdu, Yesim Nazlar, Herb Waye and myself,, Claudia Ruiz on call management.

Our Spanish interpreters for today are Veronica and David, and our French interpreters are Isabelle and Claire.

We also have real-time translation and I will be putting the link in the chat for you to follow if you wish. Thank you very much, and please keep your lines muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise, and please also state your name when taking the floor so that the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels.

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.

Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the floor over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Claudia, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening to you all. Welcome to our August monthly ALAC call. Today, we've got a pretty busy agenda. Of course, it's going to start with our usual sort of activities, but we've got important updates from Alan and Hadia on the EPDP report, which is of course, there's a vote happening at the moment that will close tomorrow and give the ALAC members a chance to hear what Alan and Hadia want to present about that report and our perspective of it.

Just going briefly through the agenda, we have our policy updates with Evin, Jonathan and Olivier first of all, and then Alp's giving an update on membership. If there are any important updates or announcements from the liaisons, working group and RALO chairs, and I believe EURALO has an announcement.

We'll have Alan and Hadia giving their presentation, and then we'll have any updates from their working group leads on current At-Large activities that are happening at the moment. A brief intro into what we're going to be starting already in our preparation for ICANN 69. And León has given his apologies that he can't attend until later in the meeting, so we've given him a slot a little later on, and Alan will give us a brief update on the ALS mobilization paper which of course is a continuation of our At-Large review report. And then we'll finish with Any Other Business, if anyone's got anything to add at this particular

point in time. If there are no amendments to that agenda—very long agenda that we have—and nothing else to add, and no objections, I think we can adopt the agenda and move on.

The very first thing that we actually have to do is of course look at action items from the previous meetings that we've had since ALAC. Of course, there's been the ICANN 68 ALAC meeting on the 26th of May. There was an item that was about the ALAC use of tools, including Loomio, to be reviewed by the TTF after ICANN 68, and there's going to be a single-issue call. Did that happen, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: The TTF call has been moved to August 3rd, so we haven't had our discussion about Loomio. Oh, I'm sorry, Judith, you're the TTF person. Why don't you go ahead and handle it?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. We had to move our call to August because some of the key staff could not make the end of July. So we are having that call next week, and we're hoping to discuss this as well as some other tools that we were also looking at. And I believe Mark and Carlos Reyes are going to be confirmed for the call, and we're trying to get confirmation also of the people from Legal and IT security. And that was also an action item from the last TTF call, to be on that call as well. And I haven't checked back to see if we had confirmed those people. But I will check in with Evin and see about that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And we also changed the agenda to make it less about Loomio and more about a tool for course authoring called Udutu, so that's probably what we might cover, or at least one of the things we might cover on August 3rd.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, that is correct. But we're also having a talk about tools in general, and that's why we invited people from IT security and Legal of what is the holdup of these types of tools in general for us to be using. We can try them, but we want to know what the holdup is and why can't we deploy them. Thank you for that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you for that update, and yeah, it has been—

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Carlos Gutierrez.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think Carlos wanted to talk.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Carlos. Carlos from LACRALO?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, [inaudible].

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Maureen, I believe it was just when he was joining Zoom. Apologies for that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. That's great. Right, so that's a good update on that one anyway, because it certainly follows on from the activation discussions that Jonathan's having anyway, so we do need to look at some tools and what might be appropriate for us. Thank you very much.

Okay, so that's August 3rd if anyone wants to go along to that meeting. Following on from that, the next action item from ICANN 68—I think there was only one item from that one, and it wasn't actually an action item, it was a decision that was made. The only decision that was made at the wrap-up was about the At-Large review and the finalizing of the review report and getting the endorsement from the ALAC members so that we could move that on to the OEC.

So not an action item that we have to do any further follow-up on, so we can move on from that one. And action items done, we can move on to the policy development activities with the policy team. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Maureen. I guess I could go first as usual and then turn it over to Olivier and Jonathan, unless they'd like to go first. I'll just do a quick summary. There were seven statements recently ratified by ALAC since the last ALAC monthly meeting, and that includes two RALO statements. Both of those RALO statements, one from AFRALO and one from LACRALO, were regarding the ICANN GSE regional plans for their regions and their RALOs. And the executive summaries of those statements as well as the other ALAC statements are on the agenda for you to review.

There are currently no public comments for decision, but there are current statements being developed by the OFB working group. The first is the ATRT3 final report, which is open for comment. A statement was just posted by Joanna in coordination with the drafting team members, Bastiaan and Fouad. And also, Marita Moll has just circulated a draft statement regarding enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. And those will be discussed later today on the OFB working group meeting.

As already noted, there's a post-ICANN 68 policy report, and the consensus playbook was updated and can be downloaded, and those links are on the agenda. That was just a brief update, but please go ahead, Jonathan or Olivier. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not sure Olivier's on the call, unless he's just on the phone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [I'm definitely here.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, excellent, Olivier. Did you have something you wanted to discuss?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to let you follow up and I'll follow up after you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yeah, we're really honing in on a place where we're going to be probably devoting the majority of our policy development time to a response to the subsequent procedures final report. There's so much to it and so much that Justine and the small team have been doing on that that we're going to have to just go through that piece by piece and develop an overall strategy for responding, etc. So I think that will be the dominating characteristic of the CPWG work, both online and offline, over the summer probably. Go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Jonathan. And just adding on to what Jonathan has said, tomorrow's Consolidated Policy Working Group call will be dealing with geo names, Work Track 5 final report, objections, GAC advice and GAC early warnings, objections [of ALAC] and independent objector and limited challenge appeal mechanisms and conflicts of interest. A lot of topics for tomorrow's call, as provided in the SubPro small team workplan.

We have another two CPWG calls that will take us to the middle of August, and then we're likely to be deep, not even knee deep but neck deep in having to formulate advice in response to the public consultation. That's one thing, and of course, you'll hear from Alan Greenberg and Hadia Elminiawi in a moment regarding the expedited policy development process, which is reaching an end. And I'm sure they'll be happy to celebrate this with you shortly. That's all. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Nothing further? Is that it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you. Do we have Ricardo on the line? Yes, we do.

RICARDO DIAZ: I am here.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Do you have any updates?

RICARDO DIAZ: Yeah, Evin already made the update, but anyway, we have a call in about two hours and a half for the OFB working group and we're going

to discuss these two, the final discussion for the ATRT3 and the multi-stakeholder model drafting that will be presented, one for Friday, one for next Sunday. So if you're able to attend, please do so and do your comments.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Ricardo. I realize that it's only in a few hours' time, thought you might want to do a bit of an advertisement to get people along. That'd be great. Thank you very much.

So, no other reports then on policy. Moving on therefore to Evin and Alp on the membership updates.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Maureen. I'll start and then turn over to Alp. There have been quite a few updates with the ALS and individual member applications. Actually, the ALS snapshot is the total is now 245. We just accredited one more ALS from LACRALO, so that brings the total LACRALO to 60. In addition, there were four other ALSes accredited in the past month and those were from APRALO and AFRALO. And there are several awaiting advice as well as undergoing due diligence at this time, so there'll probably be quite a bit more movement over the summer on those. And I'll turn it over to Alperen for the individuals snapshot. Thanks so much.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thank you so much. [Our part of the] item is review of current ALS and individual member applications. The ALS snapshot, in the region of AFRALO, there are 65 ALSes in 32 countries and territories. In APRALO

region, there are 59 ALSes in 29 countries and territories. In EURALO, there are 38 ALSes in 18 countries and territories. In LACRALO, there are 59 ALSes in 22 countries and territories. And in NARALO, there 23 ALSes in three countries and territories. In total, we have 244 ALSes in 104 countries and territories.

In ALS application status, there are five new ALSes that are certified. Number 314, Asociación—yeah, I cannot read that, probably. One LACRALO, one in APRALO, one in AFRALO, one more in AFRALO—actually, three of them are from AFRALO.

We have no decertification, we have no awaiting vote, and we have five waiting for advice.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alp. One of the things that I did note and went into above the ALS snapshot is the ALS application tracking page, which I found interesting as it has lists for each of the regions, the applications and the status of those applications. And so if anyone's interested in learning more about the various applications that are at hand, use that tracking page. Quite interesting.

Okay, any more on that then?

ALPEREN EKEN: And we have four ALS applications waiting for due diligence and six applications on hold. Evin, it is over to you, if you like. And I will also—there is a broken link now. I am going to add image there soon, in minutes.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thanks, Alp. Yeah, thanks so much. As you noted, there was a great graph of the individuals that was there, so that'll be updated for everyone to see. Back over to you, Maureen. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Evin and Alp. It's good to see that the membership is growing. Moving now onto the reports and discussion with At-Large Plus leaders. If there are any updates that liaisons, working group leaders or RALO chairs would like to give at this particular point in time, now would be the time to do it. No hands up yet. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Maureen. Not too much a report, but an information. and as Erich Schweighofer, is with us, maybe you would like to talk, but I wanted to congratulate him for his role at the European Commission. I can do a little bit more, but I don't want to jeopardize what Erich, if he wants to say something. Therefore, I would ask him first to do it, and if not, I will go ahead. Thank you. Erich, if you wish.

ERICH SCHWEIGHOFER: Okay. Thank you, Séb. Yes, my role in NomCom is now finished. I had to resign due to this new job in the official of the European Commission. Not a very important job, but it's an interesting one in [inaudible] agriculture, dealing also with data protection, digitalization,

competition, but I'll be still active as an academic and also active in ICANN and ALAC too.

For the NomCom, yes, we are now in the next phase, meaning the interview phase will come. It's still not decided if interviews will take place, where, and how many. It will be a hybrid solution, so it means that maybe some NomCom members present, others can't travel intercontinental, so they may be online.

It's not such an easy situation to decide on that, but given the slate of candidates and now the shortlist, I must say it's not such a difficult situation. It's possible, it's a bit different, but I guess the result would be quite acceptable to the community in the very end. Diversity is a question that has to be handled and discussed. And also you know, concerning EURALO we had this special situation, and hopefully, the result is not a big surprise to many. But I guess it's quite interesting and acceptable also to EURALO and the community.

So, thank you very much, also, Séb, thank you for the support in this job. And yes, I stay on. So we will meet quite often in these kind of calls because as a commission official, you still sit a lot in your office or in your home office and are able to participate in this kind of communication. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Erich, and once again, congratulation. I am sure that you will still get Internet end user even in your new role, maybe some agriculture people will be able to know about Internet because of you. and I am sure that the two ALSes where you were participating will

be still participating within EURALO. Thank you once again. And I don't know what will be your possible or not possible replacement in NomCom for the end of your term, but I think you are almost at the end and I'm sure that four other regional representatives from At-Large, ALAC will do the job if you are not replaced. We are confident on that. And once again, thank you very much, and back to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much for that, Sébastien, and thank you, Erich, for the great work that you did on representing EURALO on the NomCom. We very much appreciate the contribution you've made, and we certainly wish you well in your new endeavor. Congratulations again, and thank you. And thank you, Sébastien, as well.

ERICH SCHWEIGHOFER: Thank you very much too.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Do we have any other exciting announcements from anyone else then, from the group? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. First, congratulations to Erich, of course, in his new position. It's really amazing and exciting. But I have a question, because I'm somehow confused on timelines and things. I was looking at the NomCom page and seeing the timelines for the selection of people, and I thought that by now,, looking at the graphic that is

given, the selections were made, and it was just a case of now having the due diligence and the last things being done on the people that were selected. Am I getting this completely wrong? Because it says the announcements, NomCom selected announced will be before the end of August. But the selection process seems to be showing until the end of August. I don't know. Usually, in prior years, I thought that the NomCom meets after the ICANN June meeting and make the selections there, and then in the summer, it's just done for the due diligence and then the announcement.

ERICH SCHWEIGHOFER: Yes, Olivier, you're quite right. That's the plan, but COVID-19 crisis changed that so we are late, actually, by one phase. That's the interview phase. Normally, [this has been] done in June, but we haven't done it yet. So it's maybe in September. And it was also too delayed due to the problem of interviews onsite. So all NomCom members consider it necessary to have it on site, but it's maybe not possible. So we maybe have a hybrid solution or only an online solution, depends how corona will develop.

So I guess we may be short for October. It may be, let's say, just in time or a bit late, but that's actually a result of the crisis. But I guess we will do it just in time for the October meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much.

EN

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Yes, thank you, Olivier, for the questions. It is an unusual sort of situation. So I don't know what the process is, but Heidi has said that she has informed NomCom support about Erich's resignation, and to get any feedback on what we might be required to do or what the status is at this particular point in time. So more on that as we get information. Thank you very much, Erich and Olivier.
	Okay, so moving on then, if there are no other updates from that group, we then move on to Alan and Hadia to give their presentation on the EPDP final report. Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. Just give me a moment. All right, thank you. What we're going to do today is a little bit of a review of history of how we got here and what the key issues are, and then where we ended up, and a little bit of looking at going forward. Next slide, please.
	The phase two of the expedited PDP that we're just concluding now really had two tasks. One is to develop what became called the system for standardized access and disclosure of public registration data. There was something that was proposed by ICANN, which was the unified access model which we'll talk about in a moment, which his essentially a different name—and a very different concept—for the same overall requirement.
	We also had to keep on working on a number of phase one issues that we ran out of time. You'll recall that phase one was replacing the temporary specification which had a one-year drop dead deadline on it with a formal policy. And that was done, but because of that tight

EN

deadline, we didn't fully discuss all of the issues that should have been discussed in phase one, so they were held over to phase two.

As it turns out, phase one was adopted by the board in the end of 2019, was supposed to be fully implemented by no later than February of 2020. That date has come and gone, and it's still not implemented. There are still discussion and debates going on about what some of the things mean. One of the crucial ones is whether Thick WHOIS policy which was adopted was implicitly turned around and reversed by phase one, which is what is claimed by the registrars and registries and not necessarily agreed to by others, including the board. So we're still sitting in a never never state where the temporary specification has expired, the replacement policy is not in place, and if you were to ask us exactly where we are, I wouldn't know. Next slide, please.

Now, you can see the tick marks of the things that we actually, in the mind of your At-Large representatives on this group, this is what we did. We ended up addressing those four issues that are ticked off. Not necessarily well, but they were acceptable. We supported them. All the other issues either were not dealt with, we were told not to deal with them by the GNSO, or we ended up with a solution which is questionable at best, and that's where we end up at this point. Next slide, please.

Well, why are we in a state where after a year and a half of work, the best we can say is there's some chance it might work, maybe? The reason is simple: GDPR carries with it fines up to 4% of gross revenue. Just to give you an example, going into the records for GoDaddy, one of the largest registrars, their revenue in 2017 was $2.2 billion. Their

earnings were $150 million—their profit—and that's 6.8%. That's not a bad return on investment.

If one were to imagine the European Union were to come in and take 4% of that, that's no small amount. So the risks are large. Now, what are the chances that because of WHOIS data being revealed, they're going to have the maximum fine? I would say the chances are negligible, but one can't guarantee anything.

So the contracted parties are quite naturally risk averse. They do not want to take any actions that might put them at risk, and therefore their positions are exceedingly conservative. We employed external legal counsel that was highly skilled at making sure that we were aware of all of the potential pitfalls and therefore, the legal advice, if you take it in the most cautious way, was also very risk averse. And that's where we ended up, largely because of that. Also because of the constitution of the EPDP, and we'll get to that in a minute. Next slide, please.

Two key issues. There's a concept within privacy legislation—certainly within GDPR—of a data controller. Now, the definition in GDPR is—I won't say it's simple. I'll read it to you. Controller means the natural or legal person, public authority, agency or other body which alone, or jointly with others, determines the purposes and means of processing of personal data. Everyone got that? It's really simple.

Well, it's not so simple. And it's not at all clear within the ICANN environment who the data controller is. The registrars and registries went into this process claiming they are the sole controller, or at worst, they're a joint controller with ICANN.

I found that rather curious because we were sitting in a room, writing the rules. And clearly, whoever writes the rules has a good say in controlling what is done. And of course, whoever is the controller is the one liable.

So, exactly why the contracted parties were insisting that they were the controller when that increases their liability—and there was strong evidence to the fact that they weren't the controller or at least weren't the only controller, I have no idea how to explain that. I still don't.

The second issue that's really key to the whole discussion is the right— this is, again, verbatim out of GDPR—to the protection of personal data is not an absolute right. It must be considered in relation to its function in society and be balanced against other fundamental rights in accordance with the principle of proportionality.

Again, not a clear, easy statement to parse and not at all easy to understand what the implications are. But the bottom line of this one says that there may be overriding reasons why releasing personal data is okay.

We have had innumerable discussions in regard to the SSAD of under what conditions, if someone asks for redacted data, could we release it. We didn't have many discussions at all about what information could be in the public data with regards to balancing.

So in general, anything that was deemed to be slightly personal, we redacted from the public data without having this discussion at all. It came up again in one of the issues of anonymized e-mail addresses, and one of the great high points, I thought, of our legal advice, was that if an

anonymized e-mail address, no matter how it's anonymized, if the registrar could figure out who the real person is—and of course, the registrar has those records—then it's personal data and can't be released. In my mind, that didn't make any sense at all, but that is the kind of thing that we were working with. Next slide, please.

Who are the players here? Well, there are nine groups within the EPDP. The number of people representing each of the groups varies from a low of two for the SSAC and the ALAC to a high of six for the NCSG. The number of people representing groups within the GNSO council was the exact same number as on the council, and the others were somewhat arbitrary as decided by the GNSO when they chartered this group.

And they're grouped together in general. The contracted parties and the NCSG, for very different reasons, have tended to agree with each other on many things. Contracted parties because they want to reduce liability and to some extent protect their customers, and NCSG because they believe privacy is something that should be widespread and, to the extent absolutely possible, should be enforced, and not only for personal information but also legal entities.

And then we get the other groups. SSAC, ALAC and GAC, and BC and IP, which had very similar positions. The BC and IPC of course were looking from a business aspect and we were looking from a public interest aspect.

Then there's the ISPCP. That's the ISP group constituency within the GNSO. And that group really has not a lot of stake in this game, but they were represented by Thomas Rickert who is a lawyer specializing in

GDPR, and so he was ... It's not clear to what extent he was representing the ISPCP in his actual ideas, but that's not really our business. Next slide, please.

The unified access model which ICANN proposed essentially was a concept where you'd have a system where a request or would request data from the unified access model, the UAM would get the data from the contracted party, it would make a decision on whether to release the information, and would release it, or reject the request, period. Next slide, please.

That had a number of problems. Number one, ICANN doesn't have the data so it would have to ask for it, and it wasn't at all clear contracted parties were willing to release it. There were potential problems with cross-border data flow. That is, not all information could be sent into the US. Now, that might have been handled by having multiple instances of the UAM around the world, but nevertheless, we never really considered it. It was rejected pretty well out of hand by a number of the groups around the table, and for better or worse, we had a presentation on a prototype implementation of it but it was essentially, I'd say, never discussed. Next slide, please.

As said, the contracted parties had a position that they are the controller or perhaps a joint controller, they're liable if data is released improperly, only they can make the decision. There was an admission that there are bad actors in contracted parties. That is, those who at this point are rejecting all requests that are made to them without necessarily any reason. But there was not a real lot of action to try to

address the problem. And they were, as I mentioned, largely aligned with the NCSG. Next slide, please.

I'm going pretty quick here, but I hope most of you have seen a lot of this before. But I think it's important to pull it all together. The SSAD options that we'd looked at, we were looking at as of a few months ago. We were really looking at two options. One is the SSAD makes all of the decisions, a centralized model.

Again, understanding that the SSAD has no data. Not only does it not have deep information like the registrars have about who their clients are, but it doesn't even have the redacted WHOIS information—what was the WHOIS information. So it virtually has no data. The only safe way you could make the decisions on behalf of the SSAD was to say no.

However, that is a model that was being pushed by some people, for reasons I have no comprehension of. I don't think it was implementable in the least, but that was what we were talking about for the longest time.

The position of the contracted parties was they had to make all the decisions since they believe they have liability. They have data. Remember, registrars not only have the data in the full WHOIS record but they have information about who their client is.

But that wasn't acceptable, largely, to the advisory committees or the BC or IPC because again, there were many contracted parties who were not acting—they were certainly not willing to commit to acting quickly. And something that would live like that forever was not going to be acceptable.

EN

Finally, I guess now a few months ago, we had a breakthrough in that there was general agreement that we could have a hybrid model, a bit of each. Now, I will mention for any of you who are reading the mailing list or looking at documents, the term "hybrid model" was being used by the contracted parties to be a system where the requests come in at a centralized site—the SSAD—but they make all the decisions. So the term "hybrid model" has had different meanings as we go forward.

But in this case, we were looking at a thing where the SSAD could make decisions if they were deemed to be risk free for the contracted parties.

SSAD decision making—next slide, please. The term "automation" is used. GDPR has some really strong provisions saying you cannot make fully automated decisions if there is strong liability to the data subject, such as being liable to be sued or to have legal action taken against them. And that meant even if you're filing a UDRP, which is an ICANN procedure, to say someone else is squatting on your domain name for instance, because in theory a UDRP could be followed by a court case, this was deemed to be something you couldn't release the information to, even to the authorized UDRP service provider, the WIPO for instance.

And at the end, some of us were trying to push the case that you might have a centralized decision which is not fully automated, that is human assisted. That would remove the GDPR prescription against calling it automation because there would be a human involved in the decision.

In the end, we ended up saying any centralized decision is automated, and by the way, the automated decision may have human assistance. So

we have redefined the term "automation" to be non-automated. That is the way we ended up. Again, it doesn't make a lot of sense.

And the criterion for the policy is centralized decisions could be made centrally if it is technically and commercially feasible and legally permissible. So those are the three ifs, that if something meets all of those criteria, it can be centralized. Next slide, please.

We ended up with four use cases where the SSAD could make the decisions in an automated way. Requests from law enforcement in local or otherwise applicable jurisdictions that are either a confirmed GDPR 6.1(e) lawful basis—even though we claimed that we were trying to make this compatible with other privacy legislation, we do name specific GDPR rules on occasion. Processing is to be carried out under an Article 2 exemption. It's a very specific use case and there are not many of them.

Investigation by data protection infringement allegedly affecting a registrant by data protection authority. This was an interesting case. Early on in our procedures, we were told by data protection authorities that they had made requests from registrars for data and they were refused. So we added a specific exemption that if a data protection authority asks for data, under certain cases, we will give it to them.

Reuqests for a city field but only for certain purposes, and requests where the data had previously been released and had no personal information in it and has not changed since then. So we have four use cases. They are very small percentage the total requests. Next slide, please.

Now, under what conditions might this evolve? Might we add more use cases? Well, we may get rulings from the European data protection board. We may have case law which says some things are okay. We may eventually have a joint controller agreement that can allocate responsibility and maybe liability, and of course, we could have legislation change. The GDPR can change, there could be legislation in the US requiring information to be released. None of those are going to happen very quickly. Next slide, please.

Okay, but we were told when we agreed to the SSAD model, the hybrid model of the SSAD could evolve, which means there could be use cases that we added. Next slide, please.

As the discussion continued, it became obvious that, number one, any mechanism to evolve the SSAD must be a GNSO council-based group, which would require GNSO council approval to go forward, and there were proponents—particularly contracted parties—who said any decision to have new use cases, even if the policy was followed, that is, it met those three criteria, would still be policy and still require a PDP. Next slide, please.

We're almost at the end. Bottom line is the issues that are causing us problems could be addressed by the GNSO council. The GNSO council could interpret the vagary in the policy, and the priority two issues from phase one that we haven't addressed, the GNSO council could take action to address them quickly. So we are not rejecting the report out of hand, but we're saying it is conditional on the GNSO taking these actions. Next slide, please.

Our statement says the phase one issues must be addressed in a timely manner. And we put a somewhat arbitrary date of April next year in there. And the SSAD must be able to increase automated use cases without the recommended—sorry, to meet the recommended policy without further policy development.

And I will note that Hadia, in the chat just before this talk started, said— we had proposed a statement that would cover the second bullet. Hadia put a note to me saying she thought in the end that was accepted. I'm pretty sure it was rejected. If indeed Hadia is right, then we need to make an adjustment in our statement. But that would be a really good thing if that happened. I really don't think it happened, but we need to verify that. But I couldn't before the presentation started. Next slide, please.

Looking ahead, it's unclear if the GNSO council will be able to adopt the recommendations. It would appear that at this point, we may have some recommendations that are not accepted by four of the nine groups. That's not consensus. The GNSO may choose to interpret the groups as not all being equal. Certainly, the NCSG has made the case many times that their number of votes in the council is larger than the BC for instance, and therefore they should be given more weight in these decisions. That remains to be seen just how this is done.

It's unclear if the board will adopt the policy even if the GNSO council does. We're talking about a multi-year, tens of millions of dollars project which may not deliver very much. Is that an investment we're willing to make?

So it's not clear. If it goes forward, then some years from now, we will have a system which will automate some use cases and may be able to automate others going forward later. If it doesn't go forward, we're stuck where we are right now where requests go to the contracted parties, there's no tracking. They may or may not answer, and it's not a very satisfactory situation. And there have been many complaints, including from the European Union. So that's where we are. Next slide, please.

And I open the floor. Hadia, would you like to add anything at this point? I'm sorry for dominating the thing. I hadn't realized this call was today until very late last night, and so this presentation was put together very quickly and without my ability to interact with Hadia on it.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Alan. So yes, you actually summed everything very well, and this is where we are. So thank you so much for that. In relation to our proposal on [training] automation, yesterday was the last day when we actually could put comments in relation to the report, and we have put some extra comments in relation to some of our recommendations and are now looking at the concerns or issues document. I can see our suggestion, proposed update or change, is there, and there's no input or request from EPDP team in its regard.

So I don't know that it actually was resolved, but what was there, it's not there anymore. So I don't know if this means—but it might have been resolved.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll check that out with EPDP staff right after this call, and if there's been a change, then we'll get it out to the ALAC and to everyone.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, we don't know yet. So I think because all the suggestions were made by end of yesterday, closing of business day, I'm not really optimistic, but I'm saying that there might be something different today than it was yesterday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, that was rejected out of hand by many groups, so I doubt it's there, but it will be interesting if it is. I see a hand from Siva.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Thank you, Alan. I want to ask you about ALAC positions on legal versus natural and ALAC position on Thick WHOIS, and to what extent ALAC is able to make headway in conversations with EPDP members.

The other question is if there are any hurdles I'm jumping, is it something to do with the constitution of EPDP [inaudible] imbalances, some lack of strength for ALAC in putting forth its positions? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Legal versus natural, we have taken a strong position along with the other advisory committees that it's absolutely mandatory. The contracted parties have said it's virtually impossible for them to tell

whether a registrant is legal versus natural. It would require interactions with their registrants which they are not willing to undertake.

Other entities around the world have done that kind of thing. So they basically said it's too difficult, we can't do it. We've taken the position saying it must be done, that you cannot redact everything just because it's easier. And other groups have taken a similar position.

Our position on Thick WHOIS was very strong at the time the PDP went forward, it was passed. We believe it should still be in effect, but as I said, there are discussions going on in the Implementation Review Team of phase one whether that in fact is correct or not. So the board will no doubt get involved in this and it's sort of out of our hands at this point. At-Large does not have someone on the Implementation Review Team, but there are people from some of the other concerned groups who are strong proponents of Thick WHOIS.

In terms of imbalance, the group is what it is. As I said, the number of people who could speak varied based on the groups. Sometimes, the chair would say only one person per group, sometimes he would allow all six people from the NCSG to go in one after the other, and similarly for the registrars and registries. Other times, they were restricted.

In theory, I believe the rule was each group should have equal say in terms of decisions. That was never made crystal clear, and it's going to be interesting to see how the current acting chair will interpret that as he assesses the level of consensus. The current acting chair is Rafik Dammak who's one of the council vice chairs and a member also of the NCSG. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. First, absolute congratulations on Hadia and you for having survived—or nearly survived, because it's not finished yet, but hopefully you're soon exiting this hell that this big working group is about. I've watched this from the sidelines and it's not been fun every day.

I was going to ask you, just to be absolutely clear, on your recommendation here. I'm seeing at the bottom of the statement there are four points which you are asking that the GNSO council should agree to, four different things, and the statement is that if these are not agreed on by the GNSO council, then the ALAC will only ratify—will be okay with only four of the whole 22 plus recommendations that are there. Is that effectively saying, right, so do this or else we're just not giving our support at all for this final report? And the question is, how would this play out? Because obviously, the GNSO has to provide its full way forward before sending to the board. Or could they say, "Well, we'll send it to the board and we'll agree to this—or maybe not—later?" Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, the official level of agreement which will be documented in the report when it's published shows us as not agreeing to several critical recommendations. Specifically, the ones on automation, one of them on releasing of data for emergency use, and third one's on financial. I didn't mention financial, but the statement does.

We're really concerned that because the report says that ICANN can contribute some into this, but probably not very much, of the cost. We may end up with a pricing structure which everyone refuses to pay. So again, we have a $10-20 million system which no one's using. So at this point, we are saying we are not supporting it. That could be changed to a support if the GNSO takes action. And of course, the level of support will be documented when it goes to the board. The recommendations we're accepting are not part of the SSAD, they're recommendations on some of the issues carried forward from phase one. Hadia, do you want to add anything to that? Sorry, Olivier, did you want to—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, I was just going to ask quickly, is the ALAC also submitting a minority statement on this?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is the statement that's being approved by the ALAC right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That is it. Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's more nuanced—we didn't call it a minority statement, but it's going into that section of the report. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I just wanted to note that our ask in relation to the automation actually, I wouldn't even—we are saying that our agreement to the report—this is one of the conditions that it's based on. However, I even wouldn't call it—it's only we require clarity in relation to this recommendation and that new automated cases are considered implementation. And other parts of the report actually state this. For example, in the definitions section, just in the beginning under the EPDP team SSAD recommendation, the part where we define the central gateway manager, it says the central gateway manager role performed by or overseen by ICANN is responsible for managing and directing requests that are confirmed to be automated to contracted parties for release of data consistent with the criteria established and agreed to in these policy recommendations or based on the recommendation of the GNSO standing committee for the review of implementation issues.

So that's part of the report that clearly states that new cases of automation could be added through the standing committee. Another part of the report also, in the automation part, section 9.5, says that if a contracted party determines that automated processing of disclosure decisions for the use cases specified in this recommendation which is the automation recommendation, or through the processes detailed in recommendation 18, which again says that use cases could be added to recommendation 18 for automation.

So other parts of the report say that new cases could be added as an implementation issue. However, the parties or some of the—two, actually—stakeholder groups refused to highlight this. So it's not that they said no, but when actually we wanted to put a clarifying statement

that states clearly that new automated cases is an implementation issue, they refused that.

So again, it sounds like a conditional acceptance, but actually, it's not that. If we actually do not agree to that, then we are backing up from the initial agreement of the hybrid model, and again, we've been also discussing whether this is one new package or if it could be accepted one recommendation, we could accept some of the recommendations and some others not.

But again, that's not possible, because of one simple reason that this whole set of recommendations is what describes how the model we agreed on works. So if you—

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia, we're going to have to go on because I've been given four more minutes.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So to conclude, yes, this is a one [set] package, and it's not possible to accept some and refuse others because that will change the agreed upon model. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a comment. Hadia has quoted parts of the paper that in my mind say there's no problem. The problem is that indivudals from three different stakeholder groups, three quarters of the GNSO council, have clearly, uncategorically said that some or all use case decisions

recommended by the standing committee may be policy and may be treated as requiring a PDP.

So despite the clarity of the words, that's not what the people are saying. That's the request for our clarification. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan and Hadia. This is in no way trying to foreshadow the vote or the outcomes of what the ALAC is going to [inaudible] statement, but I wanted to know very briefly from both you and Hadia, do you think that with all the work you have put in on behalf of the At-Large community into this has made the outcomes of where we are in this final report better than it would have been if you happen to have been in the room fighting he good fight the whole way? Yes or no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Let me give you one clarification statement. The hybrid model, which I said was finally accepted where some decisions are made centrally and some made by the contracted parties, even though the balance right now is not satisfactory, the concept was something that I and Hadia fought for for months and months and it was ignored, and finally, through a mechanism I won't go through, we finally succeeded in getting it on the table and accepted. So yes, I believe so.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. So there has been useful influence. It is a better thing for you all having been there. And in that way, there is a measure of

success the At-Large community can take in [reflected glory] obviously from the efforts you've made. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, and there are other similar examples where I believe we've made a substantial difference in how this has evolved. Whether it has been worth our effort given the outcome is a different issue altogether. I will share two things with you before I give the speaker back to Maureen.

Number one is one of the members of our own community suggested to me privately yesterday it shouldn't have been called the system for standardized access and disclosure, it should have been called the system for open standardized access and disclosure. The acronym for that would be SOSAD.

And the other comment is someone who, again, I won't quote who it is, but in a personal comment to me saying, "I hope you have a well deserved break now that the EPDP is lurching to a somewhat abortive end." And I thought that wording was just marvelous and apt given how we are continuing.

And with that, I will turn it back over to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Alan and Hadia. I think we have been really overwhelmed by the passion that these two have brought to the work that they've actually given to At-Large at the EPDP, and I think that they deserve mega thanks for the amazing work that's been done. And yes, the voting by the ALAC concludes tomorrow, so I think this presentation

has been a great contribution to the final decisions that are made. Thank you very much.

Okay, but we've still got a lot of work to go through at the moment, so let's forge on. The next item that we have is just an update on the activities that are actually happening within At-Large at the moment. And just working through some of those activities, for the people who aren't here, Eduardo I note is not on the call, but just to note that the recommendations report that was made—there are recommendations that have actually been assigned to the four key areas of our activities, policy and capacity building and outreach and engagement and the operations side of things. So those recommendations still have to be considered by those particular groups, and that will be done in the course of time. But the report is there, the recommendation is there, and work will actually happen on those eventually.

So moving then on to Jonathan about what's on top within the policy area, apart from the policy issues that we've actually discussed. There's quite a lot happening there. Jonathan, would you like to just give an update, please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. We are working together with Joanna's capacity building group to develop a course for At-Large participants to get more involved in policy development inside ICANN. We settled on a name for the course, which is ICANN Policy Development, a Guide for At-Large Participants, and we are very close to a final draft there.

we also realized that the At-Large was one of the few organizations within ICANN that didn't have a kind of onboarding course the way that the NCSG does and the IPC does, etc., on the ICANN Learn platform, and wanted to get something in place that we could point everyone to that was just simply new to the At-Large.

So whether or not that gets called onboarding like the other courses are I guess is still up for discussion, but that course is close to complete in terms of its script drafting. So we hope to get both of those courses over to ICANN Learn to implement on their platform, perhaps the next four to six weeks after that. So hopefully, we should have two courses, an intro to At-Large or At-Large onboarding, something like that, and then a second one on ICANN policy development, a guide for At-Large participants. That'll be sort of a follow-up to the overall policy development course that was developed by the staff on the policy team that's just about how policy development generally takes place inside of ICANN.

So the idea would be that the prerequisite for the policy development course would be the onboarding course and the generalized policy development course that's now available on ICANN Learn and folks should check out for sure.

So those are a couple of big things that are happening. We're also having discussions around trying to develop—this came up before, it sort of pops its head up in a couple of different instances—trying to have discussions around creating a fluid communication channel between the ALAC all the way down to ALS members, and is there a way to create an efficient mechanism to push out an outreach campaign?

For example, we want as many people on the planet to know about key turnovers or universal acceptance, etc., and so, could we create an efficient mechanism to use our network of RALOs and ALSes to get a lot of blogging and social media done on a particular issue on which we want global outreach?

And then the flipside of that is using that same communication channel to survey the broadest possible number of At-Large interested parties, again, out through the RALOs, out through the ALSes to their individual members and back again on things like geo names or other issues where we want to try to make the process more bottom-up?

So there are some exercises and discussions going on with the outreach and engagement group about how we could develop that system and test it and create a pilot around it, because the outreach and engagement group would like to have that outgoing channel of communication, the CPWG would like to have that incoming channel of communication, and to be as efficient as possible. So we're just doing some experiments and pilot projects around that over the coming months as well.

I see two hands up. Sébastien, you're first.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Jonathan. It's very difficult to coordinate what happens within At-Large. I try to organize a meeting and I report on that meeting [with the ALT Plus,] and now I discover that there's one more project talking about onboarding. Therefore, I really think that we need to put all those projects together and give this responsibility to

someone—I don't care who. I think it's not possible to have three different projects going on, one in EURALO—and that's good because it's from the bottom, it's coming from the individual end user association who is the place where all end users who are not affiliated to other ALSes are coming together within EURALO, there is one run by Dev in the outreach and engagement group, and now there is this one. And I guess it's not good at all to have all that going on. That's the first point.

The second is that we are talking a lot about bottom-up, but we are doing top-down. We want to survey, we want to ask, we want to know, we need to have the bottom coming up and not the top coming to the bottom. It's really we need to think about how we want to do that, but it's not just because we need to be sure what they think, because they need to be the voice. And yes, that's difficult, but that's our task, is to have this coming from the bottom.

And when we try, it seems to be very difficult, but keep trying, please. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. I agree completely. I'd love for these things to organically come from the bottom and to be push-based instead of pull-based. I guess it's my belief that in the absence of that initiative, that engaging in some pull-based polling and things like that is a good interim solution. But agree with you completely, I'd love to have these things percolate up from the bottom. Sure. Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Jonathan, you spoke at length about needing an effective communication mechanism between the At-Large and the RALOs and ALSes. I'll just point out that creating such a mechanism was exactly the gist of the recommendations we made in the At-Large review. The recommendation that we do that was what allowed us to defeat—and I use the term "defeat"' carefully—the independent report that we got from external examiners, and we proposed something different. And the main substance of that was effective communication all the way down to RALO and ALS members. Not just to ALSes but to their members. And that is exactly what the ALS mobilization work party is almost finished doing, as I'll be reporting shortly.

So thank you for bringing it up, but it's not a new idea. It's something that we have been actively proposing and advocating and working on for nigh on four years not. Thank you. That's perhaps no excuse for it taking that long, but just to make it clear, this is the direction that we have been going in since the start of the At-Large review. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. I didn't mean to represent it as new. I just meant to represent it as an experiment. So I'm very much looking forward to the work product from the ALS mobilization working group for sure. Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I'm still on the issue of communication and the way we delegate our work. The fact that a lot of top-down approach has been exhibited as far as communication is concerned, there's still a challenge that comes

from the bottom-up process on how do we measure the level of engagement of the community in this bottom-up process.

The challenge comes in here, in case we have low participation, sometimes bottom-up may not effectively work, and there are points whereby you need to get [to speed] and we have to implement a rough top-down approach whereby we take input from the community.

In this case, I believe that the communication strategy, once it goes into full implementation and the levels of engagement have been improved from the community in their respective participation, then thus you can at least operate with a full bottom-up process measuring over 70 or 80% of effectiveness.

I think we're on the road to implementing all this, and I see it happening, and the thing is we need just a dedicated team that can make this absolutely right. But I have no doubt [it has happened] but can still be improved. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Daniel. I agree completely. Anybody else? I guess that's it. And I think that's all that I was aware to report on. Sorry, I got caught off guard, Maureen. I guess Joanna's on vacation and would have been a better shepherd of this. I approached this in my typically abbreviated and blunt way that has triggered everyone. But those are just some discussions that are going on. Back to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I think you did it perfectly, because I think as I've mentioned in the chat, one of the key points of the At-Large review is how do we get those messages out across [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maureen, did we lose you?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi everyone. It was the Adigo line, so I muted it for a second, and that's the line that Maureen was speaking on. So one moment. That's where the music was coming from.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, so those of us on the phone bridge were probably the ones who heard this, and that was really hard to—I couldn't hear anything else. Okay, just to say that you've actually covered all the areas in which we want to bring the policy. It's getting the policy down, as Alan said, it's getting those messages down to individual members. and I think that the ways in which people can actually become part of that process—I know Sébastien's worried that it seems as if it's top down, but all of these are actually brought into the Capacity Building Working Group, outreach and engagement, that I know—we want to do the work, but as Daniel has pointed out, we need to know how effective this process is, and that's something that he and Jonathan are working on. But even down to the communications side of things as well.

So I do appreciate what Jonathan's doing, but I do also appreciate what Sébastien's saying. But at the same time, the mechanisms are there.

There are people in the Capacity Building Working Group that are from across the regions. They should be bringing that sort of thing. The whole point is to try to be more coordinated and to use the working groups, the At-Large working groups, as the mechanism to actually have the At-Large discussions, although taking into account as well that each RALO is quite unique in its own self. So while we may have an At-Large program, that there may be specifics that are brought into a particular program to meet the needs of the RALO.

Okay, Daniel, do you have anything additional to add to this particular section on the working groups?

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Yes, if you're speaking about the issue of the process, [there's a list of a] series of processes that have been happening, but the challenge is that the first one, especially when it comes to the onboarding program, it was shut down [inaudible] some work, then another one came up to build capacity, and now there is this other one that as kicked off in the EURALO.

I think the challenge here is how to harmonize all these activities and come up with one solid tool. I recall, in the meeting that we held, I mentioned that there's need to consolidate all these respective works that are happening so that we can avoid replication of work. But in case there is a need to enhance the work that has already happened, then we just simply update with latest information on content. But something comes in, how frequently are we going to look back to

review all of this? I think that comes to the option of time. I think that's my main input towards that topic. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. And it's the coordination thing that we really do have to work on, and it's something that Joanna's taken the lead on. She's working her way through there. I think it's important that Jonathan and you, Daniel, are at those meetings so that you're actually coordinating things together, especially about capacity building and delivering those messages to the individual members.

Okay, now Hadia, did you want to mention anything about the webinar program?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Maureen. So we've been organizing a webinar that is presented on the first Monday of each month. Our next webinar would be about the subsequent procedures and the lead will be Justine. It will be the first Monday in August. And the following webinar is supposed to be about ATRT3, and then we're going to have DNS over HTTPS and DNS over TLS. And then we're going to have a webinar about the interplay between the Internet of Things and the DNS.

The upcoming webinars of September, October and November, the titles have been determined, but the exact dates, we haven't set yet because we have to take into consideration the ICANN virtual meeting in October.

So basically, what we're trying to do through this group, it's part of the Capacity Building Working Group led by Joanna and Alfredo. And also, apparently, in the team, we are trying to set out—this is led by Abdulkarim—a sheet with some webinar topics where At-Large members and individuals could actually determine their areas of expertise in relation to the topics so that maybe they could be contacted as presenters to some of the topics. So that's something also that we are working on. Thank you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much for that update, Hadia. Okay, now I do note that our board member has arrived from another long meeting beforehand. So with the indulgence of the group that is here, I hope that you won't mind if we let León have his session now, because he's already come from a long meeting and I'd like to allow him to give us an update on board activities. León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Maureen. Thank you, everyone, for having me here again. I apologize for joining late. As Maureen was saying, I was in another overlapping call that involved the BGC, the board governance committee, and candidates for the NomCom leadership. So we were introducing some candidates, [inaudible] candidates. So that is why I joined late.

[inaudible]. I'm not sure whose microphone is not muted. Hearing some noise.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It's on the Adigo line.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay, so it seems to be muted now. So, thank you again for that. Some of the stuff we've been doing on the board, as you might be aware, is we held two special meetings, one of them on June 18 which coincided with the KL virtual meeting, and the second one on July 9th.

In the first special meeting, which was held on June 18, we passed a resolution to transfer the .ao for Angola top level domain to the ministry of public communications and information technologies. That was approved, and we also passed a resolution approving the president and CEO [at risk] compensation of the second half of fiscal year 20, and also, another resolution in regards to officers' compensation. So those were the resolutions passed on that meeting. You can have a full view of those resolutions in the link that I'm posting to the chat right now.

The second special meeting was held on July 9th, and in that meeting, we approved the president and CEO fiscal year 21 goals. So as you know, we do a review of the goals with the president and CEO, he proposes six out of ten goals. Those goals have been posted and published in a blog at ICANN's website, and the other four goals are established by board. So we've come to agreement to the fiscal year 21 goals and we passed a resolution approving these goals.

We also held, as part of this meeting, an executive session on the ombudsman fiscal year 20 [at risk] compensation, and the extension of

the ombudsman contract. As you know, the ombudsman contract was coming to an end, and there was some consideration on a probably extension of his current contract. So the board resolved that it would approve the extension of Herb Waye as ICANN ombudsman from July the 1st 2020 through June 30 2025, or until the board appoints ICANN's next ombuds, whichever is sooner.

The reason for this is that, as you can see, as part of the [inaudible] in the resolution, there's consideration of the CCWG accountability Work Stream 2 recommendation about the ombudsman that the board adopted, [approved the] creation of an advisory panel which, among other things, would contribute to the selection process for the new ombuds, which would meet the various requirements of the board and community, including diversity.

So since this panel is in formation, the board decided to extend Herb Waye's contract, and of course, directed the CEO to take all steps necessary to effectuate the ombuds contract extension. But we are mindful that there is a process from Work Stream 2 that relates to this process, to the designation, so we didn't want to, of course, override the recommendations from Work Stream 2, and that's why we chose to resolve in a way in which we could extend Herb Waye's current contract but also leave space for when this panel actually [produces] to fulfill its work and maybe designate a different person from the current ombuds.

So you can see both resolutions in the second link that I have pasted to the chat, and that is where we are. I would also like to commend and congratulate the At-Large review implementation working group for their delivery of the report that was recently submitted, the At-Large

review implementation final report. This is a report that has been reviewed by the organizational effectiveness committee in the board, and as far as I am informed, they will be making recommendations to the board in due course. And the thinking of the committee is that overall, this report provides a comprehensive overview of the work that has been done by the implementation working group, and it has been asked for ICANN Org to publish the document in the relevant review page.

I am not aware if it has already been published, but that is certainly something that has been asked, and if it hasn't, it should soon be published in that reviews space.

I would also like to acknowledge the, how to put it, outstanding work that the representatives of the At-Large community have made in the ATRT3 team. I would like to commend and congratulate all the members from the ATRT3 that come from the At-Large community. You have done an amazing job. I think that you have a lot on your plate. It wasn't easy to carry out this review, especially given the circumstances that we all know and we are facing currently in terms of this COVID-19 pandemic. So I would definitely like to give a round of applause to these ATRT3 members, Cheryl as co-chair, Sébastien, Daniel, and all who actually took part of this review team. you did an amazing job in putting this review and this report together, and I have nothing but compliments to you guys.

The board has also received this report. We will be reviewing it, we will be commenting on it, and of course, we will be giving due course to this report as well.

So one last thing is that I have continued to explore and to push for ways in which we can better support our community volunteers in terms of the challenges that we are all facing during this pandemic. There is still not anything conclusive as to how we can better support you in these trying times. But it is not something that has been just watered down or forgotten. It is something that is still on the table, it is being discussed, and of course, I will continue to push in order to try to get the best outcome possible and be able to support you and all the hardworking volunteers that invest a lot of time in making this community and this organization better.

So that would be all on my side. Maureen, of course, I will remain for the remainder of the call and I'm open for any thoughts, comments or questions you may have.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: León, we have a hand up from Judith.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi León. Thanks so much for the excellent overview. I have two questions. One is for the .ao, the domain for Angola, was it because it was managed outside the county, or was it shifting within the country? It didn't really say anything on the links you gave us about that.

And two, on what you just talked about, on the connectivity issues, I also wanted to call attention, and maybe the ICANN board would like to look at, so RightsCon put together a connectivity fund that they gave out to different members who are attending RightsCon these next two weeks. And I think it might be interesting, once they finish up, to look at the empirical evidence they collected and the applications and that type of thing, what it was useful and how helpful it was, and maybe that could help with [you pushing] the board and convincing people. So just a question and a thought. Thanks.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Judith. With regards to the .ao top-level domain, well, as you know, the board has to approve these transfers. It is [inaudible] IANA naming function or PTI evaluation process. So what we do is that we receive this work from PTI, we evaluate whether it has fulfilled and ticked all the boxes as required by process, and if it does, then the board approves.

As to the motives for the reassignment, we don't dig into those details at this level. That is something that PTI is in charge of fulfilling.

In terms of the proposal for the connectivity fund, that is definitely something I would like to achieve. As I said, there are a number of challenges in terms of administration cost, etc., that need to be dealt with. But again, I will not cease any efforts and continue to push for this fund and hopefully, we'll be able to make it possible.

It is also a good reference that you mentioned this, because if you have any further information about how these funds function, what are the

criteria, the requirements, etc., I would definitely thank you if you could share them with me so I could add them to the discussion that we are currently having on this issue.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thanks so much, León. I can write to the people running RigthsCon. I've put a description in the At-Large Skype thing about what I saw on the website. But being from there, we also might be, I can write after the RightsCon conclusion when they'll have more time to ask them those other questions and see what light they can shed on that, and maybe what evidence they picked up on how successful these were when they evaluate the program. And I think that would also be very interesting [inaudible].

LEÓN SANCHEZ: You're absolutely right. Thanks very much for that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Judith. Abdulkarim, very briefly, please. Eight more minutes [inaudible] the meeting.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you, Maureen. Very briefly, León, I just wanted to find out the current status of the At-Large review report, and why I wanted to find out the current status, because the three of us from the African region rejected not just the report [inaudible] but the way the report was [inaudible] back to the community [inaudible]. So that is why I want to

find out the exact status of the report, because I'm surprised it's been published without—because my own understanding is the report will still come back to us before it goes to the board. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks, Abdulkarim. I had a little bit of trouble following you. You sounded a little bit muffled to me. But if I understood correctly, your request or your question is about the exact status of the At-Large review implementation working group. Is that correct?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: No, the [inaudible] report, the report that was submitted.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Which reports, Abdulkarim? I'm sorry, I'm having trouble following your audio.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay, I think probably we should take that offline and I'll come back to you on that.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes, that would be great. I would appreciate if we could follow up offline, because I'm sorry, I'm having difficulty following your audio on this setup.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. And sorry, Abdulkarim, the line was rather muffled, so it was probably a little bit difficult. We've only got six more minutes. I do want to give Alan a chance to update on the ALS mobilization, if we can move on. Thank you, León, and please stay with us for the last few minutes. That would be great. Alan, your update.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Maureen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll be very quick. The work is proceeding well. We have finished all of the ALS criteria and expectations. We've reviewed the application process to accredit an ALS. We've reviewed the process to withdraw accreditation, and we are now reviewing the application form.

The last items that we have to do are a couple of things of just looking at the bylaws and seeing what changes we need to make. We've already noted a few small changes. So the work is coming to a close. I would expect it should be finished by the end of August and ready to go to the ALAC, presumably at its next meeting, at the next virtual face-to-face meeting.

One note though, not related to the work, but since we are going to be requesting a number of small bylaw changes—nothing substantive, but

just clarifications of wording and things, if there's anything else the ALAC believes should be changed, this is probably a good time to discuss it.

I will note that one of the changes made last time has received a number of comments over the years. That is the very first line of the ALAC bylaw saying the ALAC is the home of individual users within ICANN. And it's been suggested that that really should say At-Large, not the ALAC, because that just increases our confusion of what the differentiation between At-Large and ALAC.

So I would suggest that Maureen, you may want to put together a small group of just look at the bylaws, are there any other changes to make? Hopefully all corrections and not substantive that will be onerous. But if we're going to do that, we should probably do it quicker rather than later. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. Sébastien, you have your hand up. A question?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Maureen. It's a very short comment. Maybe it's a good time—thank you, Alan, for your report and work on that. Maybe it's a good time to request that the way each SO and AC is working can be in another document than the bylaw because the bylaw is currently very big and it would be useful to make this change to allow less things to be on the bylaw because the bylaw is currently very big and it could be

useful to make this change to allow less things to be on the bylaw. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for that suggestion. Okay, and yes, Alan, we'll work on that small group to do that. We just have one other item on our agenda, and it was an initial discussion on At-Large at ICANN 69 looming already. We've put out a call for volunteers for our next planning committee meeting, and getting some good numbers from across the region. Really important that we do, just to get some input from our community about what we want to do at ICANN 69.

And there's actually a production call, I think, tomorrow with the SOAC chairs, and so that's when we actually hear more about what ICANN's doing. Until we get that information, it makes it a little bit difficult to discuss with the team. Hopefully by the time we have our own meeting, we'll have a little bit more information, especially from Gisella, about the block schedules and how we can fit into the schedule itself that ICANN has set and how we can actually fit our things into it.

Okay, so we've got one more minute. If there's anything that anyone else has got absolutely burning, to relay to the rest of the team before we close. If not, thank you very much for this. It's probably been the longest meeting we've had in a long time, but we had so many issues to discuss. Thank you so much. And a bit of music in-between as well, and also that, you may not have noticed, but I was cut off from the phone bridge for a little while. So lots of exciting things happening in our ALAC meetings, but thank you very much for sticking with us right until the

very end. We have 50 participants. Very good. I do thank you for coming, and I hope you have a great morning, afternoon, or evening, wherever you are. Thank you very much. Bye.

VANDA SCARTEZNI: Bye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all very much for joining.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]