
CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC and GAC topic [leads] on EPDP call on Tuesday, 15 December 2020, at 16:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Alan Greenberg, Laureen Kapin, Chris Lewis-Evans, Dave Kissoondoyal, Hadia Elminiawi, Joanna Kulesza, Jorge [Cancio], Luisa Paez, Manal Ismail, Maureen Hilyard, and Yrjö Länsipuro.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich. Rob Hoggarth is joining the call now. Gulten Tepe and Fabien Betremieux, and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Claudia, I'll just mention that we've also been joined by [inaudible] on the [inaudible].

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Oh, I missed her. Thank you. Yes, I see her now. Thank you very much. Thank you all very much for joining. Please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you very much and with this I turn the call over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Yrjö asked me to chair the call. Do Maureen or Manal have any comments to make before we start though?

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.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Manal? Or I'll start.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you. Thank you, Maureen. Thank you, Yrjö and Alan. Just quickly, this is an action item from our last call that we had, this joint call between the [properties]. But before this, very quickly, just to let you know that we have an expression of interest from the GAC delegate from the Republic of Korea to be our point of contact to the ALAC.

So, Maureen, we've been discussing the GAC point of contact to the ALAC for a while, ever since Anna left the GAC. So we now have Chang Shi Young, GAC delegate from the Republic of Korea, expressing interest to be the point of contact. So we'll be [moving] him onwards, and Yrjö I'm sure will be helping out and he will be your counterpart at the GAC side. Yrjö, I hope you find this helpful. Thank you, Alan. I'll stop here and leave it now to the topic of the call. Over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you very much. That's good news about a replacement for Anna. The purpose of the call is to try to start working together, actively working together, on the EPDP Phase 2A. The first meeting is tomorrow.

We'll be talking a little bit later in the agenda about next steps, but I'm delighted that all three GAC representatives are here. I know originally Melina had said she couldn't make this meeting, but I'm delighted to see everyone here. Hopefully, we'll have a productive meeting and a start to coming up with some ideas about how to address the problem that we're going to have in the EPDP of getting some changes made.

Could we have the slides, please? If you can go to Slide 3; 2 is just the agenda.

Now there's an old saying about insanity is doing the same thing over again and hoping to have different results—often attributed to Albert Einstein, apparently incorrectly though—and that's the situation we're in. The issues that we're looking at in Phase 2A—the natural versus legal person distinction and some level of anonymized email addresses—are issues that we have talked about innumerable times. And they're on the agenda this time because we've never really had satisfactory discussions and certainly never come to a conclusion on how to move forward and mostly certainly not one that the two of our groups find acceptable. So the real challenge going forward at this point is to do something different enough that we have an outcome that's different. Next slide, please. Slide 4.

All right, there are a number of problems in my mind. I just put these slides together quickly yesterday, and I don't pretend they're complete. But just to give people a flavor for where we are, there are two difficulties I see—two major difficulties. One is we have a number of legal memos which in our minds indicated that we should be able to move forward on these two issues. And clearly, in the minds of other people on the EPDP the message was we can't move forward.

So how we resolve this is not clear. It's not clear whether we're going to have access to legal counsel on this meeting or not. The agenda that has been published does imply that we can ask questions about the legal memo. That implies to me that there's going to be someone on the other end to answer them. I would even prefer to have a real discussion

as opposed to just tossing questions back and forth. But it's going to be a real challenge because the memos have not provided the clarity that we needed up until now, and how we move forward and get that clarity is going to be I think one of the problems.

The second one is the other teams led by the registrars who are mostly affected by this, the registries, and NCSG are to a large extent unchanged. It's going to be very difficult to get the same people who have been adamant about not being able to address these issues to change, and I think we're going to have to find some persuasive arguments to go forward with that. Next slide, please.

Legal versus issue is the first item we're looking at. In my recollection the reasons for not addressing it, there are a whole bunch of reasons. One is certainly unlike some of the ccTLDs we don't have a field in our old WHOIS records for are you a legal or a natural person, so there's been nothing to automatically distinguish. There was an organization field which we were told by registrars has been used in a number of haphazard ways by people and, therefore, they didn't feel they could rely on the organization field.

To therefore create such a field, we're going to have to interact with the registrants. Registrars don't really want to have to have one-by-one contact with each of their registrants. And there's the concern of if they tell the registrant to go fix the field, ignoring the fact that to many registrants the concept of legal person versus natural person is not one that's going to be well understood, what if they don't act? What we are allowed to put in by default is not clear.

And then there's the potential for there being personal data in a legal person's registration. There have been a number of ways that we've proposed addressing that, including putting the liability on the registrant to make sure that there is no personal information. That also, although it's used by many companies to make sure that they don't have liability, that's not something that our registrars and registries have been willing to accept.

And lastly, we need to be very careful. If we're not careful, we will end up with a legal versus natural field where virtually everyone says they're natural persons. It's the easy answer. It's the answer which gives you the most protection. And yet it will end up with a field that says it's legal versus natural but effectively result in redacting almost all information. So going forward we need to think about how we're going to play this to make sure that isn't the end result. Next slide.

It's up to us to come up with a proposal. The registrars have made it clear they're not going to. Their preference is to do nothing, to minimize or eliminate risk, to minimize effort and minimize cost. Anything we propose is going to push them on one or more of these things, and that's a challenge. Next slide. I will stop talking in a moment.

I think we need to immediately start working on a proposal for how we end up with a legal/natural distinction. I think that proposal is going to give the registrars a fairly long amount of time. Whether it's a full ten years of the potential registration cycle or something less, I think we're going to have talk about. Of course, I think immediately we have to start making sure that for new registrations that we get the information filled in.

Next on email addresses—next slide—the wording that has been used in the documents is the feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized email address. The first problem is that’s not defined anywhere. It’s a rather complex phrase that was invented quite a while back and we’ve continued to use it. It’s not defined, and I believe that various people have different understandings of what it means. And that’s not a way to move forward with a result.

The Bird & Bird memos, the legal memos, talk about pseudonomination and nomination as two different things. They also talk about “European rulings on masking information.” Masking is a very simple concept of you present some of the information but hide some of it. The Bird & Bird memos use that as a precedent, whereas none of the anonymization/randomization of email addresses that I’ve seen proposed us anything resembling masking. So again, very confusing. Next slide.

The main issue that I see is if you look at GDPR, there’s the concept of a balance test. That is, should you redact information and hide it, or are there reasons why there are benefits to doing it? Now in the EPDP we have talked about the balance test a lot but only in regards to under what conditions we reveal information once it’s already redacted and then someone makes a request for it. We never talked about the concept of a balance test in making the decision on whether to redact or not.

The whole Phase 1 of the EPDP never really talked about balance tests. The concept that we used was if information has any personal content in it, it must be redacted. There was never any balance test. And the

fact that we've never talked about balancing in any of the decisions really implies that we've never had an opportunity to look at what are the merits of providing information under any conditions as opposed to completely redacting it and hiding it. That's really the question I think that we have to address is, yes, you may construe an anonymized email address as personal information, but are there enough good reasons to reveal even though it is deemed to be personal information? That I think is one of the things we're going to have to do going forward.

The way forward on this one—next slide—well, you can see how many ideas I have on that one. I am drawing a complete blank. I don't know how we're going to make the case to convince contracted parties that, yes, it's personal information but it needs to be revealed anyway.

Next step, there is the first EPDP meeting on Thursday. It's a pretty full agenda. They imply that we will be able to ask questions on legal memos and other things. They are looking for input, I think including proposals but I'm not sure on that, in time for the next meeting. The deadline is 11 January, Monday. And I believe the meeting is on the 17th or something like that, about a week later.

The question is, how do we do this in a coordinated way and who is it that we try to coordinate it [with]? Is this just the GAC and the ALAC? Do we try to bring the SSAC into it or the two GNSO constituencies that we believe are largely aligned with us?

With that, I will turn this over. I'll open the floor. I see Hadia has her hand up. Please, Hadia. And then I would I guess like some thoughts

from our GAC friends as to how to proceed effectively on this. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Alan, for this presentation. As Alan rightfully said, we need to look at what new elements we have. Looking at legal versus natural, for example, what was not addressed before? We have the study. This was never discussed before. However, whether based on that we will be able to build a case or not, that's doubtful.

But there is also one thing that Alan said that is very important. We actually never looked at the benefits. We never balanced. We never tried to make this balance. And GDPR does not regulate specific security measures beyond making recommendations about what people should consider. And then depending on that, people should do a sort of a risk assessment and based on that they should adopt certain policies. I think this is also one area where we could start approaching.

Also, in relation, for example, to emails of a legal person containing email addresses of natural persons, we have an example. For example, the zone file. The file, the sort of authority record, contains actually an email address for the administrator. Checking those in Phase 1, none of those email addresses actually contained any kind of personal information. So that could be an example of how actually legal email address could actually contain nonpersonal information.

So we need, as Alan said, to start looking at new elements and discussing those. In relation, for example, to the anonymized email addresses, I think there was a sort of a profusion between

anonymization and pseudonomization. Pseudonomized data could actually with some other pieces of information relate to the information to a specific individual. However, anonymized data is very different. Anonymized data actually does not relate to the original data and is permanently irreversible. So maybe also this is something we did not fully consider during Phase 2 and we didn't have the time actually to do that.

So I'll stop here and give the floor to Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Hadia. Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS LEWIS-EVANS:

Yeah, thanks, Alan. Thank you both for that summary. I think it's a good starting point of where to push off now. I'll take them in reverse order to what you did, Alan, and start with the email side. I don't think we really discussed the email in great lengths during the EPDP, either Phase 1 or Phase 2. I think, as you rightly said, it sort of got lumped in the, well, this may still be personal data therefore we're going to redact it anyway, and it didn't really go any further than that just due to the lack of time that we had and the lack of want, shall we say, for conversations [on the side] into this.

I think for me, as Hadia just said, there are a number of options on the table. I think the first thing that we need to decide is which one do we push for, where do we want to go with this? This is maybe my preference more than a GAC preference, so more from the public safety

working group perspective, is we would prefer the pseudoanonymized email address as it allows us to do a lot more protective functions with the data. And we believe that allows those benefits that we have by releasing a small amount of personal data alongside it.

So as you said, Alan, I think those benefits we haven't discussed, and I believe that looking at more the pseudoanonymized data for this allows us to make better use of those benefits. But realistically, we do have to highlight those considerations. And whilst it still is personal information, [note] does it actually reveal personal identity? Yes, it will [inaudible] a registry or a registrar, but then they have all the other data fields anyway. But we certainly need to be aware of that and make those arguments. So I think when we do come to the date which I think is the 11th—yeah, 11 January is on the screen—I think we need to maybe come round to which form of anonymization technique we want to push for first off and then work from there.

With regards to natural versus legal, I think there has been lots of discussion and it's much harder. Laureen has been much more engaged in that, so I would hand over to her if that's okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Christ, before we leave, just one note that the pseudonominization which says the same email address even for different registrations always translates to the same pseudonominized one, there are two variations of that also. One is that's true within a rather. The other case is we use a standardized algorithm and it's true across all registrars. We've never differentiated between those two or

even had the discussion, so that's another flavor of that that we have to bring into it. Clearly, if we could do it across registrars, there are some benefits from your point of view, perhaps some negatives also. Laureen, please go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Thanks, Alan. Natural versus legal, the other great saying is it's déjà vu all over again. When we first looked at the Bird & Bird memo, to me—and I think we went over this in detail in some of our GAC input on the issues that weren't going to be covered in the Phase 2 proceedings—to me, that memo really does provide a clear set of options to deal with this issue. That's sort of on the legal front, but I do think that memo provides us with some very concrete suggestions on how to deal with liability risks.

To me, the other challenging part of this is going to be focused on what I'll say is the logistical issue that you very precisely identified. That's the fact that we can come up with a plan going forward, but the issue is then how will the registrars deal with their existing customers who haven't self-identified? To me, that's going to be perhaps the more challenging part of this equation, whether we would be satisfied just having this phased in at the time of domain name renewal, and I'm not sure what the average time of renewal is but if it's something very, very long like ten years, maybe not.

The other thing that occurs to me is that there are periodic times where I assume the registrar is in contact with its customer, for example, at the very least yearly payments. I don't claim to be an expert in the registrar

business, and I definitely invite people to chime in. But I would assume that there is a regular time where the registrars are in touch with their customers for the purposes of payments or other issues which would come up regularly, and perhaps that might be an opportunity we can leverage for information being given to the registrant on identifying.

Because I would think at the very least if registrars simply went over the names that the registrant submitted under, they could quickly at least roughly identify potential candidates to inquire further. If it's an .inc or a .co or a .org that is the registrant, that could also trigger some further inquiry. So there could be several logistical ways to explore handling this. And it probably would be a good idea to speak to the registrars to get a better understanding of what are their regularly scheduled contact points with the registrants so we can leverage those.

Those are just a couple of thoughts on this issue. That's separate and apart from the starting point which is that this information isn't protected and it's very useful to the public, law enforcement, IP rights holders, cybersecurity, etc. I know I'm preaching to the choir here, but that is a starting point. And I do think that is always a point worth hammering home. The premise is, this information isn't protected, therefore this information should be in the public sector. And I think the real challenge is for us to figure out logistically how to make this happen and then figuring out which of the methods described in the memo might be most palatable to the registrars.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Two of the points you made is the average registration time. Looking at .com in the last month reported, they did 6.5 million renewals for one year, 227,000 for two years. So that's a 30:1 ratio. And then 50,000 for three years, and the number goes down from there. So the vast majority of renewals are every year and some relatively small fraction, a few percent, are more than one year, and most of those are two or three years.

But what we don't know is how many people give a credit card and have it automatically renew. Registrars obviously know that information, but that's not something they've ever shared with us and probably not something they would be willing to share in a public forum. Perhaps in a confidential way they might, or perhaps not. But even when they want credit card information, most of that is automated.

And certainly based on the discussions we've had until now, the discussion of are you natural or are you legal is a complex enough one that isn't well understood that they really don't want to have the discussion at all. And from our point of view, not only is it important to have it but to get the answer correct and not simply use the easy answer. Certainly, the kind of methodology that Laureen was talking about would be a good start.

Do remember there was an organization field and based on Phase 1 in many cases it has been zeroed. It has been eliminated, or at least in theory it was. So that field which would have been useful to begin with may not be there anymore, just to make our life more interesting.

Any more hands? We still have another half hour in the meeting if someone wants to talk. Melina, please go ahead. It's delightful to have you here, and I look forward to meeting you in person someday in the future.

MELINA STROUNGI:

Hopefully. Hello. I'm [inaudible] an opportunity for me to say hi to everyone. I obviously don't have, I mean, it's too early perhaps to say something but maybe a few general remarks. But I want to clarify it's on my own capacity and view and not on behalf of the Commission.

My background is a privacy lawyer, and I would like to have some first views perhaps when I have a chance to see these legal memos, which I understand that they indeed pose some problems. The way I read them back at the time, they also gave me the impression that they do not necessarily always reply directly to the questions that we posed to them and they leave up to the [contracted parties, the registrars and registries] how they will [inaudible] and how they will see the risks.

And indeed a question as you rightly raised it would be, to whom are we going to raise these clarification questions? So I understand that one of the purposes is to gather certain questions. So will we go back to them? Will we seek another law firm? Or will it be among ourselves? So this is one issue to see.

For the issue of anonymized emails, again I also agree with the point that we need to come to a common understanding on the definitions and notions used. For instance, a question I had personally when reading when describing, for instance, anonymization it's described as a

string which would be unique for its registration. But at the same time we refer to a uniform anonymized email address across domain name registrations. So taking into account both, I'm wondering what would be the exact meaning of uniform. Is it one time only or more?

So things like that, technical issues like this, I think it would be useful to at least among ourselves agree what the problem is and what we want to achieve. It's clear reading the memo from Bird & Bird that between pseudoanonymization and anonymization, the anonymization would be a more privacy-friendly solution as with pseudoanonymization it's still possible to get back to the natural person.

But, yes, all these issues are very interesting, and let's see how we can progress. I'm optimistic.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm delighted to have optimism here. There's a dearth of that, unfortunately, sometimes. I see Hadia has her hand up. Before, your point about what do we mean by uniform is exactly the point I was raising earlier. We've been throwing around this term, the uniform addressing and uniform anonymization, we've been throwing around for years and no one has ever actually defined what it means. Is it uniform across a registrar? Is it uniform across the whole name system? Is it uniform across a single domain? Which has no meaning whatsoever. If everyone is unique, then why do you call it uniform?

But I believe I know what they meant when they invented it, but we've never said that and I don't believe everyone has the same understanding of that. So clearly, having clarity of what we're talking

about has got to be the first step of moving forward and coming to an agreement. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [Thank you, Alan.] Thank you, Melina, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia, you're cutting out. We can't hear you after you said thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay, sorry. Apparently, I was muted again. So, Melina, you are right about the Bird & Bird memos being sort of not unclear but open to interpretation. And that's why they were of very little benefit to us throughout Phase 1 and Phase 2. Because we are already divided and we already have very different opposing opinions and the legal memos do not actually provide answers that could clearly define one way or another.

But you did mention maybe asking some external legal advice or other kind of legal advice. I'm not sure if I understood this correctly or if this is even possible. Because this could be an option, but I'm not sure if it's doable. And I see Alan's hand is up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you very much, Hadia. Just a couple of comments. My understanding is there's no budget for legal support at this point. But as I said, the agenda does imply that we can ask questions. One of the

problems that existed for Phase 2 is the methodology we used to submit questions for legal advice had to have unanimity. That is, everyone on the legal committee had to agree to support it. And we had questions that some of us wanted to ask that others said, no, you can't ask that. I refuse to let that go forward. And therefore, the questions were never even asked. So that's something that I'd like to see adjusted if indeed we're going to have any budget for legal counsel going forward.

One of the things I think we need to address right now is, to what extent do we try to work with other groups or are we going to just do this the GAC and ALAC specifically? Should I or we be reaching out to the SSAC and then try to schedule a meeting perhaps next week with the lead reps from the GAC, the ALAC, and maybe the SSAC and/or the GNSO groups? Do we want to try to do this as a combined effort, or is that going to make it too difficult to come to closure and therefore we do things independently?

I guess I'd like input from the GAC side as to whether we want to try to make this a larger group or not. Anybody? Laureen, I was going to put you on the spot anyway, so thank you for raising your hand.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

You can count on me, Alan. You know how shy and retiring I am. I mean, I think it's always good for us to coordinate, so I think we're happy to coordinate. The only thing that I'm mindful of just logistically is sometimes we can be more nimble working within our own groups. The coordination typically takes more time. And strategically, I'm not sure that there's that much difference between the GAC reacting to an ALAC

proposal or ALAC reacting to a GAC proposal as opposed to putting forth a joint proposal.

So I think my preference off-the-cuff would be to keep lines of communication open. I'm feeling just a little reticent logistically with these timelines which are rather quick to commit to presenting joint positions in lockstep. I'm just worried about the timing needed to coordinate on that. But I think I'm happy to...and this is just me. I'm not speaking for anyone other than myself, so I leave it to everyone else on the phone call to react. But I think my preference would be to try and coordinate but not necessarily submit it as this is the GAC/ALAC position.

The other thing I worry about is whether that would at least initially cause some bristling by other stakeholder groups who would then come back and say this is the registry/registrar position, this is the registry/registrar/NCSG position, so there. These are just my off-the-cuff remarks, and I'm happy to hear other views.

So succinctly it's, yes, let's coordinate. I'm not sure we want to make it more formal than that at the outset. Now at the end of the day, I think when we come up on final things, then it probably is good to get very formal support. At the end of the process, this is where we land. That's a different thing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you, Lauren. Two comments on that. Number one, remember we have been told by the GNSO in no uncertain terms that if those who want to see action on these items...the registry and registrars

said their position on this was we discussed this, it's settled. It's done. We don't need to have a Phase 2A. The GNSO Council has made it clear that if we the people who don't think it's settled and who objected to it in our comment set the final Phase 2 report want to see action, then we must come up with a proposal or proposals. So we've been told very much that we have to present something. So, yes, they may come back with a counterproposal, but really the onus is on us to come up with something.

And the reason I'm suggesting working together—and that doesn't necessarily mean a common document that we submit—is you saw my slide on the ideas on how to move forward on the email addresses. I don't really have a lot of ideas. Yes, we have to define the terms so we're all talking about the same thing, but I'm not sure how to make the arguments why the balance test can allow registrars and registries to feel comfortable even though they are taking some level of risk.

So I was hoping that some initial discussions among the groups, certainly the two of ours if nothing else, at least that we do some brainstorming and try to figure out how to move forward. Because I'm just worried that without that we may come up with something that's so weak that the whole thing just dies. And the GNSO has threatened a number of times saying if we don't come up with something that effective, then they're just going to cancel this and not move forward. And that's really my concern.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, and for that proposal I would wholeheartedly say yes. And I would say maybe we want to identify some primary points of contact just to keep it lean and mean.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And I'm happy to serve as the natural legal point of contact and then, of course, I would coordinate with my colleagues on the GAC side.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. All right, maybe Lauren, you and I can talk briefly later on today and decide just how to move forward. At this point, we have about one week before Christmas, and there is just one week after New Years to come up with our final document that we submit on the 11th. So really we have two weeks, neither of which are great weeks to do work in from various people's perspective. So there's certainly not a lot of time between now and then. It sounds like a month from now, but it's really only two weeks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. I mean, because I've already actually thought about this quite a bit and have laid out some thoughts in prior GAC submissions, I see this as having two parts. One is laying out some of the methods that have already been "blessed," so to speak, by our legal advisors. And two, I think really asking some questions from the registrars about what are

their regular points of contact with registrants and, essentially, what gives them heartburn here so that we can try and address those issues. Because I think the legal advice does, to a certain extent, give some comfort on the liability issues. And then it's the logistics and resources issue, and for that I think it would be good to get a little more guidance from the registrars about what their concerns are.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will note, I don't know if you've looked at who the primary reports are.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I've looked.

ALAN GREENBERG: So we're dealing with people who are not meek and mild-mannered. All right, anything further?

[MELINA STROUNGI]: Sorry, I didn't raise my hand. If I may just comment on the timing raised, which I understand is a very valid concern. Is there a way to, I don't know, do we have flexibility on the timing? Is there a way that we may extend by one week, for example?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can ask, but I doubt if they'll accept that. We can certainly ask. I think it's going to be a really difficult sell to get them to extend at this point, but I have no problem with asking. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. Yes, I just wanted to say that definitely trying to extend is a good thing not only because we might not have enough time to come up with good proposals now but actually interacting with the group for some time and for some meetings before coming up with a proposal gives us the ability to come up with a proposal that might meet the needs of the registrars or some of the needs of the registrars. So it helps us also in understanding how they are thinking about that. Though, of course, throughout Phase 1 and Phase 2 we do know that they don't want this. But still, it helps us to understand more what they're willing to give at this point or what they're not willing to give at this point. So it extending it is definitely a good thing.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, just to be clear, from the agenda that's published, it is not clear that they want our formal proposals by 11 January. That was not said clearly, and that's one of the things we're going to have to ascertain in the meeting on Thursday. It may well be possible they're looking for initial input but not proposals on Thursday, so we may have more time than that for actual proposals. I'm hoping that's the case. It certainly was not said clearly.

Anything else? Then I will turn it over to Maureen or Manal for any final comments, and we will diligently work between now and then to try to come up with something to move this forward. Manal or Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I'll jump in here. Thank you, Alan and Manal. I just want to say thank you to both the At-Large and GAC team for this great turnout. And I hope we can have more of these conversations in the future on what is important to our communities and sharing such useful information which is both helpful and of value to us [inaudible]. But while maintaining our own positions and supporting each other's positions. I very much agree with that, Laureen. I think that's an important aspect [inaudible].

But, Manal, I really look forward to meeting our new GAC liaison to the ALAC, and I'm sure Yrjö will really appreciate being able to coordinate these sessions together to ensure that they're really effective for everyone. So I do thank you for supporting this.

But overall, I'm just looking forward to our continuing conversations, and I really hope that within the year we'll actually get to meet each other in a face-to-face situation as well. So thank you very much. Manal, over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you very much, Maureen. And thanks, Alan, and all [properties] for this fruitful exchange. I hope we continue to align views and coordinate efforts. And as you mentioned, Alan, this time the Board is in our court, so we need to be very conscious that everyone is looking at the GAC and the ALAC for triggering this discussion and providing any necessary material that would keep the discussion going, hopefully to a fruitful end.

So thanks again. And I know it has been a significant process starting very early, but thank you for your continued efforts in this. And I see Yrjö's hand up. So, Yrjö, please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yrjö, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah, thank you, Alan, for chairing. And thank you, Manal and everybody. If I can be helpful organizing a meeting for all this group in the coordination, I'm happy to do that. But it looks like now the time is short. So what I understood is that Alan and [you] take it in a small group.

I'm also very happy, Manal, that I now have a counterpart on the GAC side, a GAC liaison to the ALAC. And I just look forward to meeting my counterpart at the next physical meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And with that, I thank everyone. I wish everyone a good holiday season. And stay safe and healthy. And we'll all be talking soon, I guess. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]