

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly call taking place on 27th of March, 2018 at 21:00 UTC.

On the call today, on the English channel, we have Alan Greenberg, Olivier-Crépin Leblond, Seun Ojedeji, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Alagie Ceesay, Bram Fudzulani, Barrack Otieno, Vernatius Ezeama, Daniel Nanghaka, Maureen Hilyard, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Holly Raiche, Sébastien Bachollet, Yrjo Lansipuro, Isaac Maposa, Bartlett Morgan, Sarah Kiden, Ricardo Holmquist, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Lutz Donnerhacke, Marita Moll, Javier Rúa-Jovet, Jonathan Zuck, and Bastien [inaudible].

On the French channel, we have Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.

Currently, no one listed on the Spanish channel.

On the Russian channel, we have Andrei Kolesnikov.

We have received apologies from John Laprise and Christopher Wilkinson. And [inaudible] has informed us that he will be joining us late.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Evin Erdogan, Claudia Ruiz; and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

Our Spanish interpreters for today's call are Veronica and David. Our French interpreter are Aurélie and Isabelle. Our Russian interpreters are Ekaterina and Maya.

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.

Before we start, I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking, not only for the interpretation reasons, for the transcription reasons as well.

Once again, I would like to remind everyone to press *6 to mute and *7 to unmute, please.

Now, apologies if I've left anyone. I see Maritza has joined us on the Spanish channel. Leaving the floor back to you, Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Did I miss Hadja and Bastian? Are they on the call?

YESIM NAZLAR:

Bastian is on the call.

BASTIAN:

Yes, I am.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Hadja is not on the call as far as I can see for now.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, she is active in—

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, say that again, Heidi. Heidi? Have we lost Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now I can. You said Hadja and I didn't hear what you said after that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry. I'm technology challenged here. She will—

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, she's dialing in I understand or she's being dialed to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see in the Skype that Hadja is on the Skype chat. [inaudible] does the call start, so obviously she will be dialed in.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. She'll be with us in a moment. That's fine. Thank you very much. Thank you very much for joining us on this call. The attendance is really great. This is a meeting that normally would have been cancelled due to the proximity to the ICANN meeting. However, because we have three very substantive and time critical issues to discuss, this meeting is being held. It will be an unusual meeting in that we will be focusing the bulk of the time on these policy issues and not on some of the other issues that we normally will spend time on. So, either the items have been reduced

or eliminated from the agenda or will be very abbreviated. I ask people speaking on any of the other non-policy issues to be as short as they possibly can.

Because we don't have Adobe Connect, if you are on the ALAC chat – that is ALAC and Regional Leaders – then please type something there. Put a hand or a hand up to indicate that you want to speak. Heidi will be keeping track of these. If you're not on Skype chat that Heidi has access to, then I'll try to periodically give people an opportunity or when you hear a lull in the conversation, just call out your name and say you'd like to speak and we'll try to cover you then. Are there any questions?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Is it the ALAC chat or is it the At-Large chat?

ALAN GREENBERG: The ALAC chat is the one we are using. Heidi is also on the At-Large chat, so people who are not on the ALAC list could use that. That one tends to have a lot of other traffic on it, so it may not be the best one. But, if that's the only chat you're on, then Heidi will try to keep track of that one as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I'm looking at [inaudible] communities.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. It's going to be difficult. We haven't done this in about five or six years, maybe longer, since we haven't had Adobe Connect, but we will manage. Let's not worry about it.

The first item on the agenda, substantive item, is the adoption of the agenda. Are there any issues that we want to add? We've already added one AOB on the ICANN Ethos Award. Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, then we will proceed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Am I on the right chat?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, you are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm waving my hand around.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alan, Alberto Soto wants to take the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. We'll give Alberto time in a minute. Olivier, whatever chat you use, Heidi will try to find you, but the ALAC chat is the preferred one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, I just saw that. I was writing on the At-Large chat. Alan, Olivier—

ALAN GREENBERG: If Olivier would like to speak, Olivier should speak.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I note that you've got in any other business the ethos awards, Stephane Van Gelder at number 12. I'm not sure if everyone will be there at number 12. What is your plan for there? Are you going to hold a vote or something or a consensus call?

ALAN GREENBERG: I will introduce the subject briefly. If you've been following any e-mail or Skype chats, you will know that Stephane was unfortunately killed this weekend in an accident. It has been suggested by many different groups that he be named as a candidate for the ICANN Ethos Award to be given out in Panama. The question is does the ALAC wish to formally endorse him as a group? That will be the question. If you're going to drop off, then please send e-mail with an opinion, if you have one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's it. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Alan. It's not the way to answer Olivier's question. He wanted to say something and you are [inaudible] and it's not a good way to start this meeting. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien, Olivier asked me what is my intent with the item. I told him what my intent was.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, you answer him what is the content of the item. His question was to know if [inaudible] to do it before and not at the end of the call. Sorry. But, maybe you can try to have a better discussion with people and I am sorry to be interrupting you like that, but I am very puzzled with what is happening. Sorry. I go back to mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, since you asked me, did I answer the question you asked correctly or would you like to raise it in another way?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. No, what I was asking was what was your intent and you said that you were going to ask whether the ALAC should endorse Stephane Van Gelder as [inaudible] Award for the Ethos Award and that if somebody was going to leave before then, they would have to let you know before this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or after the fact, but soon after the fact. The deadline is tomorrow.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, very soon after the fact.

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I just thought that perhaps the consensus call, whilst we had a [inaudible] would be helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is it the will of this group that we readjust the agenda and do any other business now?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We may as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, God.

YESIM NAZLAR: I'm so sorry for interrupting, but please don't forget. I'm telling this for everyone. Please don't forget to state your names. It's very important.

Otherwise, we will be ending up with “man” and “woman” on the transcript.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Yesim. Please state your names when you speak. I have now had a request to readjust the order of the agenda to put any other business first. We will now do that. Is there any other changes to the agenda?

The issue is, as many of you know – all of you know, perhaps – Stephane was unfortunately in an accident in I believe Switzerland near the Italian border on Friday and he passed away I believe on Monday. The suggestion has been made by a number of groups that Stephane be awarded the Ethos Award. The ICANN Multi-Stakeholder Ethos Award is awarded to people who strongly have supported the multi-stakeholder model, and in particular have worked across the various groups within ICANN reaching out and not only working within their own particular group. Stephane I think is an excellent example of that.

I know when I was on the GNSO Council as liaison from the ALAC, he made an explicit effort to make sure that I was active and included not only in policy discussions, but even in the internal GNSO matters. Cheryl will be interested to know that although she was told that she was not welcome at the GNSO strategy meeting that was held recently ... We have an echo with someone. Can we please try to find it?

I did mention that to Stephane at the meeting in San Juan and he was somewhat appalled that the practice that he had initiated – and he wasn't the first – had not been continued. So, I would strongly support

endorsing him as a candidate for the Ethos Award. I would like to ask is there anyone else who would like to speak to it before I ask for a consensus? Please go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I'm of course not on the ALAC anymore, but I was ALAC chair and I did work with Stephane and I can absolutely agree with you of his great character and his integrity in everything that he did for the GNSO Council at the time. I would fully support this. Of course, you will have seen the motion from EURALO, unanimous. We had a call earlier today. Unanimous from those people who were on the call to ask for the ALAC to please proceed forward with this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I would support Stephane for the Ethos Award if he was still with us. It's not solely because he unfortunately is gone.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, Cheryl has her hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Anyone who knows the history on how long and how well Stephane and I have worked together over the years as well. I just want to make sure that we are aware that there are a number, as I think

you also mentioned, Alan, of other parts of ICANN which are suggesting exactly the same thing. I would think that if the ALAC had the group [inaudible] – make my bias there – to endorse this, I think it would perhaps be something that might come to ICANN formally from a number of sources and I think that's a very good thing, indeed.

But, I would also suggest that we may wish to say if the management of the Ethos award feel that this particular award is inappropriate [inaudible] that some particular exceptional recommendation should be made for such an outstanding contributor to our ICANN community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I'll note this is a recommendation, a nomination, for the award. It then goes to the Ethos Award Selection Committee of which there are two people on this call right now who will be participating. Anything else? Then, I'll ask is there anyone on this call who ... Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I support your proposal and I note what Holly wrote on this chat. She said that she needs to leave and she wants to speak on the three substantive items of the agenda. And me, too. I have the same [inaudible]. So, please [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That is why I am trying to do this as quickly as possible, Tijani. Is there anyone on this call who wishes to either abstain or vote against? Sebastien wants to speak. Sebastien, please go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, that's okay. I will not speak. I wanted to see a few words about Stephane and what we have done in the EURALO call a few minutes ago, but as people have no time to take care of that, we will take care of that in another time. Thank you for raising this issue and for putting that on the list of the items today. I support firmly. Just to let you know that I have put his name before everybody was talking about that on the [inaudible] and you may find others who are supporting him directly. But, I support this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak? Then, we'll restart the vote or the consensus call. Since I have heard no one who wishes to vote against this or abstain, and we have a quorum on this call, then it is a decision by consensus and we'll take appropriate action at the end of this meeting. I'd now like to go back to the meeting as scheduled.

The first item is policy issues. Evin, can you quickly outline the issues that are currently on the board that are not being discussed today?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you, Alan. I'm sorry that are not being discussed today?

ALAN GREENBERG: We do not want you to list GDPR, key rollover, or fellowship.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Okay. So, then, I'll just go through the latest updates. As you know, the ICANN draft FY19 public comment was approved. The ALAC statements was unanimously ratified during ICANN 61. There are several new public comment requests to which the ALAC needs to make decisions. The first being draft procedure for community gTLD change requests. The public comment closes on the second of April 2018.

The second is uniform board member integrity screening process. Comment closes on the 17th of April, 2018. The third is draft project plan for the proposed name collision analysis project (or NCAP). That closes on the 18th of the April. Lastly, the ICANN reserve fund proposed replenishment strategy which closes on the 25th of April.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The board integrated integrity screening process essentially says that due diligence will be done a number of the board members for whom it has not been done before. It has been done previously for ALAC board members. I would suspect that we have no problem with that and I don't think we need a comment. If anyone disagrees, then please put your hand up after I finish this summary.

The community TLD changes, Justin Choo I believe has submitted a draft and we need to look at that. It closes in just a few days, so we're going

to have to act pretty quickly on that one and I ask anyone who cares about that to look at the policy page and make any comments there.

The draft project plan for the name collision, I don't believe we need to make any comments, but certainly if anyone feels we should, then we can. It's a relatively complex project. It's the first such project that the SSAC has ever endeavored and they are looking for community input and presumably concerns. If anyone believes that we should make a comment on that and would like to take responsibility for it, for doing the first draft, then I would suggest they speak up at the end of this discussion.

And on the replenishment of reserve fund, I believe we must submit a comment on that. We have a fair amount of time. I certainly will be making comments on the Wiki and I hope other people will as well. I think we can defer deciding who is going to be a pen holder until we start seeing some substance there.

Does anyone like to speak on any of these issues? Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. I will not speak about those issues. I will [inaudible] three topics that we need to discuss on today's [inaudible] today because I and Holly have to leave, so please let us finish those three points and then we come back to the other points.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Can you tell me when you have to leave?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: As soon as possible. Tomorrow very, very early I have to be at the airport. I have [inaudible]. I have a lot of things to do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We'll be very quickly. Is there anyone else who has any comments on these policy issues?

ANNOUNCER: One minute remaining.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't care if someone has one minute remaining. The next issues we have to do are on the At-Large review. There is a current Google doc that is outstanding and is available for comments by the ALAC regional leaders and the formal working party. If you are one of those, you have received an e-mail and the comments are open for about another four or five days. So, feel free to comment on that. We'll defer number eight, ICANN 62, to the end of the meeting and we'll go into the first item for a formal discussion. That is the KSK rollover workspace, or KSK rollover; I'm sorry.

I sent out a message earlier today on a link that people could click. I acknowledge – yes, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Susannah would like to speak.

ALAN GREENBERG: What would Susannah like to speak about?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm not sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is it on one of the previous topics or is it on the key rollover?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Susannah, are you wishing to speak?

ALAN GREENBERG: She said she doesn't want to speak. Back on the key rollover. There's an echo again. I sent out a link that people could try which would tell them whether ... It would not definitively tell them whether they were safe in the case of a rollover, but it would tell them that their DNS resolver was not using DNSSEC and therefore was safe. If you haven't tried it, try it, preferably right now because it does allow you to verify that you personally would not be ... Whether you personally may not be affected by the key rollover.

There has been a lot of concern raised in the ALAC that a huge number of users would be affected and potentially cut off from the Internet. This is a simple test that will give you a good indication if you are safe or not. Now, I'd like to open the floor in a moment for discussion.

The summary that I put on the Wiki a day or two ago received a number of likes and a number of confirmations that it summarized the points. The points that I made there were – and this attempted to extrapolate from all the many, many comments that were earlier on the Wiki. We had never had a discussion that has been that extensive on any policy issue as far as I can tell, ever.

So, point number one, our community understands we need to roll the key, but is divided on the path to follow at this point. We believe we need an intensive awareness campaign including targeting ISPs, Telco, major industries and we should use the RIRs to the extent that they can point us to potential DNS providers.

We need an information packet that we can send to our ALSes, individual members, and by extension other parts of the community can also send to prompt them what they should do in their own communities.

We would like to see a holistic review of the situation including risk assessments and time for further discussion in Panama and including the then current state of whatever data we have and a forecast on the sentinel protocol which could allow us to get more information and allow users to verify – potentially verify – if their providers are properly up to date or not. And we'd like to understand the conditions under which the date could be changed either to delay it slightly or to somewhat or to change the day of the week, which many in our community feel would be problematic.

I'd like to open the floor now for things that are either missing or you believe should not be stated. We do not need confirmation that you agree with the points. I open the floor. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. I agree with most of what you said. What is perhaps missing is to say that, as you said, the rollover is necessary. Second point, the more delay we put, the more people are already put their resolver on DNSSEC, so the problem will be bigger. This is something that [inaudible]. It is people from SSAC who told me that.

Another point, the delay will not solve the problem. It will not give more information. What we may do and what we may ask for is to make the [inaudible] for all the ISPs if we can, but especially we have to make the comparing with the regulators [inaudible] are linked to the regulator and they are not linked to the registrar, registry. So, this is also an advice from SSAC people. I think that we have to include that.

I saw the compilation that Bastian made from the statement done by John and approved by Olivier. I think that is not bad at all. We have to add small things and I think we are in the right direction. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Two points. Number one, John's statement was explicitly advice to the board. I believe that is not the right way to go right now. I believe we should submit to the public comment. That's number one.

Number two, you said you were told use of DNSSEC is increasing. In fact, there's indications use of DNSSEC is decreasing also. So, it's not clear

which way we are going. Regardless, there is significant use and we don't know what the impact will be.

The last comment is the use of the sentinel protocol if it is published and implemented quickly will provide additional data. That's something that does need to be factored in. Anyone else like to speak? Yes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

A moment. Alan, I spoke about what Bastian wrote based on the statement of John and it wasn't an advice to the board. It was more a process, if you want. He wrote the process. What we think, we must have [inaudible] information so that we can decide and we can give an advice to the board by the next meeting of ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will consult with Bastian to see what is missing from this list that was in his document.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I am sorry, but wasn't Bastian but Sebastian who wrote the document [inaudible].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I am sorry if I confused the name.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien, do you wish to speak?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. I think, Alan, even if I think my document put some question to others and it seems that other people in ALAC are not willing to go in that direction and I am okay. I think your document is a good document as a compromise. I don't find everything I would like, but I am sure that John who may be another side of the situation didn't find either. It's a good compromise and I would like to support to go ahead with that. If we need later to ask SSAC for more advice, we will do it later. For the moment, it's good as [inaudible]. You have my support. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Asking for the holistic review I think also implied consulting SSAC as appropriate.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No problem. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments? This is not written as a statement, but is the substance of what will go into a statement subject to any other comments that people make now. Hadja, please go ahead.

HADJA OUATTARA: Just to review the situation. I'm not quite sure who is going to provide this holistic review and is it going to be included in the final plan or is the holistic review or the risk assessment going to be doing, and then according to the assessment to be incorporated in a new plan? I'm not sure how this works, though.

ALAN GREENBERG: What we are asking at this point is that a review be done and presented to the community by Panama so that we can continue this discussion. We are certainly not saying cancel the rollover at this point. Clearly, it could be cancelled sometime later or delayed should the overall decision be that. So, we're asking for more input by Panama.

HADJA OUATTARA: Okay. So, actually, we are not saying whether to go or not with the plan and that's fine. But, that means – I thought that we might be asking for the holistic review of the situation or the risk assessment and that risk assessment will be attached or included in the plan that's actually presented to the board because if we actually just put it out there and say we are not commenting until we receive this information, this is different. I'm not sure which one of it. I think it's better to ask for the risk assessment and to have the risk assessment included in the final plan that is going to be submitted to the board, rather than us waiting for the conclusion or the result of the risk assessment and then commenting again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Hadja. My understanding is there is currently a plan. It is being proposed. It is what the comment is on. At this point, the board does not approve the plan. The board says, "Yes, go ahead," or, "No, do not go ahead." So, what we're asking for is an assessment to be done which will help us and other parts of the community decide whether to recommend to the board to delay, change the plan, or go ahead as planned. That's my understanding.

HADJA OUATTARA:

Okay. And then another. I had a comment with regards to what Tijani was saying that actually the number ... I'm not sure of course it's the number of the DNSSEC users is increasing or decreasing, but what we definitely know is that the number of Internet users is expected to increase a lot in 2020. I think I had seen somewhere something published about the number of users in 2020 tripling.

So, yes, that's not related to DNSSEC directly, but it's related to the number of users connected to the Internet. I just wanted to mention this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I strongly suggest ...

HADJA OUATTARA:

[inaudible] more. If you have more users, I think yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I strongly suggest that everyone, if they have not tried that link I provided or one that Lutz provided on the Wiki page towards the bottom to try it. It may well demonstrate that many, many of the people who are worried are not vulnerable and that's really important. So, I would suggest everyone in this group try that link and put a comment on the Wiki saying whether you found you could get to the page. If you can get to the Comcast page, then you are not using DNSSEC and the rollover will not impact you.

It's important. It's an empirical decision, empirical measure. It's not hard statistics. But, if we find out that most people are not subject to DNSSEC, that should increase the comfort level significantly. Any further comments on this? Otherwise, we have the basis for a statement and I, in combination with other people who are interested, will go forward with it. I'm hearing no other comments. Then, this item is finished and we'll go onto the next item on the agenda.

The next item is the fellowship. There's a public comment out – sorry, it's not a formal public comment. It is a query to ACs and SOs for what their position is on the fellowship. They asked a total of 18 questions plus a general catch-all at the end. Do you have anything else to say? We have had a lot of dialogue on the Wiki, but there was very, very little that was focusing particularly on the questions that we were looking at and I think it's really important that we do address the specific questions.

I'd like to review these, go through these one by one and see to what extent you believe this captures it. Now, I will tell you that I answered these questions to the extent that I could assimilate what was in the

previous comments. I tried to summarize them, and in some cases, I didn't find anything there and I put what I believed was my own views, but perhaps are similar to those of other people.

I'm going to go through them one by one with a pause, giving people an opportunity to comment. Clearly, the language here can be fleshed out a little bit but we only have until the end of the week to do it, so there's not a lot of time.

Question number one on goals and vision. What does your group believe should be the objective of the fellowship program? How would the success of this objective be measured? The answer that I have is integration of graduates into the various constituent parts of ICANN as active participants in ICANN activities. Does anyone like to add other thing? Vanda, please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. I believe it's lacking the measure we're going to do that because one of those points that went in the beginning of this program we were looking for was to bring more people from developing areas and not generally.

Then, it was a little [inaudible] and it started to keep most of the same people coming most of the time, and those become the ones that are really participating.

So, what is the measure we should do? That is a question. Do we have statistically information about what region, from what part, what countries and how many of them are continuing or not?

So, I do believe that fellowship starts to make the statistics and I never saw anymore. So, I believe we need to have [inaudible] statistic on each person that is skipping in the connection, keeping the list [inaudible] of this fellowship group and who is keeping, writing, suggesting, making comments. We need measures on any program that we have. I believe we need to reinforce that point that [inaudible] measurements on this participation from region, from gender, from [inaudible] participation, etc., should be done for this group. [inaudible] review of this fellowship, so we need to [inaudible] we meet those measures.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Vanda. I asked people to be very brief. We have 18 questions to talk about on this one, and we haven't gotten to GDPR yet. So, please, be brief.

Vanda, there was a survey done that preceded this that is available and is pointed to on the Wiki. You might want to look at that. Part of what you're looking for is obvious from that survey. Specifically, they couldn't get hold of about 40% of the people who were previous fellows. Of the people they got hold of, only 60% of them answered the questions. There's a lot of numbers there already saying if we can't even find the people, we know they're not active.

From my perspective, we can count the people who are ex-fellows that are active within At-Large. We know who they are.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I'd like to get in the queue, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Seun. You're next. We have statistics. I believe we must document them. And of the 700 or whatever fellows, we have a handful that are active here. I'm not sure that's a really good return on investment when we extrapolate to other parts of ICANN. I might be wrong and my views don't necessarily count.

I believe people who are actively involved are the measure we're looking for and ICANN does have the ability of tracking that, so we can have metrics. Seun, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I lost dial-out. Just to be clear on what we are on, are we still on the KSK or we are now on fellowship?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are on item number one of the fellowship, one of 18.

SEUN OJEDEJI: What's the decision on the KSK, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are going ahead with a statement based roughly on the summary that I presented and with one or two other issues added in.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. I think I wanted to make my comment about the summary that you presented. The last two comments I don't think it needs to be included in the statement because I don't know what [inaudible] expecting to get again. I don't think we should be going into something that we don't even have technical understanding about. I personally think we have said what is very, very important in the first few bullets, which is about awareness, which is about engaging other [inaudible]. I don't think we should be in the position to give a more [inaudible] opinion about asking for other information or holistic review. I don't know [inaudible] because they can't get that data. It's not practical. They cannot. So, I think we should just not [inaudible].

The last comment about dates. I don't know why want to change the dates. If the date needs to be changed, let the technical opinions determine that this is a very, very technical activity that needs to be done. The more we delay it, the more we unnecessarily [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Seun, there were significant numbers of people in this group who would like to see a risk analysis of the various options and that is what we are asking for. I understand you don't agree, but most other people did want to see that, and by consensus we are asking for it.

In terms of the date change, there was significant concern expressed with the fact that it was scheduled for a Thursday, which is Friday in many parts of the world. The question is what are the reasons, what is

the rationale for not being able to change it or the impact of changing it?

I understand Judith now wants to make [inaudible].

SEUN OJEDEJI: I hope we make [inaudible] from the review [inaudible]. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand Judith has a statement on the KSK. Holly, you may want to leave right now. We're probably not going to get to GDPR at this point. That was a joke.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, I think Cheryl answered my question. It's a question on the KSK. It was a local [inaudible] couldn't really send it out to just my people. If you can't get to it, if no site is showing up or is not going to anything, does that mean the KSK, the rollover, is working? Do you—

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, you're talking about the link I sent you?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you get to the Comcast site, then your resolver is not using DNSSEC. If you do not get to the Comcast site, then there is no way for you to know for sure whether things will work or not in the rollover. In your case, I happen to know Comcast will do it properly, but general case, all you can do at that point is try to contact your ISP. This is not a definitive measure. It's a first-cut test to tell you whether you are not vulnerable.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. Thanks so much. Now, on [inaudible], I had a question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Wait. Do you have an item on the first item on the fellowship, what should the objectives be?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: The objectives I guess ... The question is sort of on the first item. I think it relates to the first item because the objectives should be that one of ... We need to also figure out when we're looking at tracking fellows if they are participating in one or two constituencies because some may not be active in At-Large but may be active in [CSE] but participate in At-Large as well.

My other question is I think that could be effective coach. They can't be a coach right after they become a fellow. They should only be allowed to be a coach after at least twice.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's not the item we're on right now.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Okay. It was hard to tell what you were on.

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer that is there right now is the target is to get people involved active in ICANN and that measure should be done by ICANN, not by a single constituency or single group to measure what happens with these people to maintain contact with them and find out what happened. It's a trackable thing. I haven't heard anything to say that it should be changed. Last call.

Number two, the fellowship program was established to provide access to ICANN meetings to individuals from underserved and underrepresented communities. In your group's opinion, how effective is the fellowship program at fulfilling this current goal?

The answer that is currently there is it is moderately effective in getting people to know about ICANN. Although there have been a number of notable successes, it is far more effective at raising awareness than in generating workers. That was echoed by a statement that Maureen put at one point saying that some of these people may be working in their

local communities telling people about ICANN. We don't know that's happening. We can't measure it, but that might be happening. So, it's more effective in terms of awareness than generating workers. Seun, I'll put you in the queue. Is there anyone in the queue already, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm just thinking. I'm wondering why we put moderately there. I think for At-Large it's effective, especially if we look at those who are actually participating in At-Large. A significant number of them have gone to the fellowship one way or the other. So, I would think that we shouldn't put moderately. I think we should recognize that it's been effective.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what it says. It is moderately effective in getting people. Although there have been a number of—

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm saying let's remove moderately. That's a different [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We are talking about close to 1,000 people and 3,000 trips, probably close to I'm guessing \$6 million put into this program so far. The question is: has it been effective?

SEUN OJEDEJI: And the question is has it been effective for our community, for At-Large? And it is actually for At-Large. I think it has been effective for At-Large, so we should remove moderately. That's my suggestion anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Seun thinks it's been very effective. I would say we've had some successes, but not many. Anyone else like to comment? Vanda, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, Ricardo had his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Ricardo first, then.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Ricardo, are you able to speak? Ricardo, can you try again? You've been unmuted. Okay, Yesim, can you see if we can get his audio and we can go to the next speaker, Alan, please.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi, Heidi. Sure. Ricardo is on the Spanish channel and currently we're checking if Ricardo is speaking or not. Let's give him ...

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I think that there is something we are not measuring within this program and this is the amount of people in this fellowship program who are currently an ALAC member. We have the case of Bartlett Morgan. He is working on the RALOs.

We also have the case of Leon Sanchez. He is nowadays ... He works in different parts of ICANN. So, I believe that we need to take this into account. I mean, people who participated through the fellowship program but who are now actively working in ALAC or in different parts of ICANN because they are really important. And if the program hadn't existed in the past, they would not be able to participate.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead. Who is next? Vanda, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Then Sarah, Alan.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: My point is we have two questions here. I agree that it is moderately effective in getting people to know about ICANN, but the question is is it if effective to bring people from underservice, underrepresented community? That issue specifically was good, but the overall result is

moderately effective. So, it's two point here. The fellowship program was established to provide access to ICANN meetings for individuals for underserved and underrepresented [inaudible] propose success. What is not success is too many people that they are growing and growing and not really following the focus underserved and underrepresented communities or even they are not continuing to follow their activities in ICANN.

So, it's two different points. I would like to have those separate points. What is written there, it's okay, but we need to respond to the question properly. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sarah is after Vanda.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sarah, please.

SARAH KIDDEN: Regarding question two, I would also like to suggest that where you mentioned that we have notable successes, we actually mentioned real numbers. For example, you can say we don't know how many leadership right now or in the past just to add numbers to make it sound better.

So, in number one, instead of saying graduate, can we say alumni? I think that's [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi, are you in a position to tell us how many people who entered the fellowship program are now active? Is that something you or your staff can do? Dev, I believe, has the full list of all people who have gone through the fellowship program.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Do you mean active in At-Large?

ALAN GREENBERG: In At-Large.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, we can get that. We can make that an action item.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. That's within the next day or so. We'll adjust the wording here factoring in that number. We'll perhaps put the actual number in. Daniel, please go ahead. I note we're now at the hour mark of the two-hour meeting. Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Another thing [inaudible] outreach and engagement, the [inaudible] list of the fellows [inaudible] based on metrics of the fellows, the ICANN fellows and the number of [inaudible]. Thank you. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, thank you. I noted that to Heidi. Number three, in your group's opinion, is this goal still a priority for ICANN given the new bylaws? If not, what goals would your group propose for the program?

The answer is, yes, it must still be a goal with the target of measurable success as measured by the ACs and SOs. Comments? Javier and Vanda agree. Anyone care to disagree? Maureen agrees. Alright.

Item number four, if there's no one who wishes to speak to it, have fellows contributed to the work of your group? If so, where do you think they have added the most value? What might be changed so that the fellowship program to enhance participation of fellows in your group?

At-Large has had a number of great successes with fellowship alumni. The greatest value has come the relatively few who have chosen to devote time and energy to ICANN post-fellowship.

It does not address the question of what may be changed. I do address that a little bit later, however. Any comments? Vanda, please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I would like to add quality of the people because during the years, in my opinion, in talking to many fellows, the quality is dropping and just a few are in the same level that we could use them afterwards.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's interesting. I don't know how you measure the quality.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, but I don't know how they are using the alternative to select the people to come, to go to the meetings. I don't know. I don't know now how they are doing, but in the beginning we were very strict on the performing and talking to with some ... To knowing people that they referred to. Well, it may be more less people because they increased the number of people. So, it's more difficult to select good people from a large number with reduced people working for this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other comments before we go on to the next item? Go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes, sorry. I want to comment on the last—

ALAN GREENBERG: Who is speaking?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: My name is Abdulkarim Oloyede.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yeah, I want to disagree that the quality is dropping because I was a fellow at the last ICANN meeting and I don't understand how quality has

been measured. I don't think [inaudible] it went from [inaudible] has effected the quality in any way. I think [inaudible] it has enhanced the quality in a way. So, I want to disagree with the [inaudible] the quality is dropping. I don't think so in any way compared to probably the people that have been fellows before me. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. It's rather hard for you to assess the people before you, though. Alright, next item.

Does your group make efforts to involve, educate, and/or inform fellows about your work? If so, please describe the efforts.

The answer is yes, but it is rather haphazard. We engage at ICANN meetings, but there is no concerted effort to draw people into our activities. Anyone like to comment? Please, go ahead.

SARAH KIDDEN:

I would like to disagree that it's haphazard. I know At-Large goes to the newcomer day and I know there are so many efforts to try to get people to engage. So, if you say haphazard, it almost sounds like we don't make any effort, so I don't know take out that word and find something else to replace it with.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, certainly we can acknowledge that we do go to the regular events, but I don't think we do a lot other than that to try to really engage with

the people and draw them in. At least I'm not aware of other activities. Maybe someone would like to enlighten me. Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yeah. I do believe [inaudible] make some effort not so much because everybody is [inaudible] during the meetings, but the outreach and engagement events that we do every meeting maybe have some information more deeply on the activities of the At-Large groups presenting that meeting, together with the fellowship.

Also, people that go to talk with the fellowships during the mornings during the week also explain better, but it's of course not enough. That was the first objective of onboarding program.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Vanda. I'll point out that I've gone to a number of these meetings and I give out business cards and e-mail addresses and if one person every three meetings contacts me, it's a lot. I'm not sure we've been very successful. Alright, I will mention the outreach and engagement activities, however. Bartlett, go ahead.

BARTLETT MORGAN:

I'm away from a computer right now, but I think we're at a section where we're putting some notes in place and I think one of them has to do with the coaches. That certainly needs to be amplified, because for the life of me, it [inaudible] that somebody who could be a coach who isn't integrated into one of the SOs or ACs. What are you coaching on? To me, that's a fundamental flaw with the current program which is

directly linked possibly to the whole question of output and quality of the fellows. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Noted. I think we'll come to that a little bit later. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I believe Alberto is before me if you don't mind me pointing that out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, Alberto, then.

ALBERTO SOTO: In the previous ICANN meeting, Humberto and I discussed or talk to Siranush and she said that she was going to give us the e-mail of the fellows in our region so that the chair could commit to continue with the relationship and inviting them even to the monthly meetings. I really don't know whether Humberto did this or not, but this I think is initiative that is something we do want to approach and we do want to work with them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. This question is asking what we are doing now. That sounds like something we could do to enhance it. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. I believe that I would limit to the response to this question to say what we are doing now and that is the regular appearances and it goes back to my day as well. So, we go and hawk our stuff there, but we also do have the outreach and engagement opportunities. I would not mention haphazard aspects. I think it does nothing to benefit the future opportunities that we always have. So, I'd just delete that.

I would also just mention that we need to go back into chat at one point, Alan, more in reiterated something that was said which probably needs discussing as well. There are some other important points coming in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We already eliminated haphazard a while ago. I don't know what Maureen said. I haven't been reading the chat. If someone can say it or Maureen could say it, that would be useful.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I feel like [inaudible]. Which part are you particularly referring to, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You were talking about the feedback that has occurred there from value proposition, [inaudible] to keep the fellows engaged. I certainly [inaudible]. But, that is an issue that we probably should point out in our responses at some point anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I ask, in general, in addition to this call if people have particular targeted things they want to add that they believe is representative of the ALAC, not just a single person, then please add them to the Wiki. Otherwise, we're not going to get this out by Friday. Is there anyone else that would like to add anything to does your group make efforts to involve, educate, or inform fellows about your work? If so, please describe. Hearing nothing, we will go on to item number six. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. I don't know whether one has to put hand up in the chat, which I have done.

ALAN GREENBERG: it doesn't matter. Let's go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I am quite puzzled about this sentence which says there's no concerted effort to draw people into activities. That's pretty much [inaudible] to what the ALAC should be doing. I would have thought that, as you said earlier, the Outreach and Engagement Working Group does a number of things, but in there we should also list our appearance at the ICANN booth which has a lot of fellows there. I don't know how many ALAC members went, but I certainly went on a few occasions. A number of us went to the ALAC booth and engaged fellows.

We also had a NARALO booth. So, the RALOs engaged the fellows quite directly, especially when the fellowship is in the region of the RALO itself.

Thirdly, also, these fellows which we see don't just come about like this. Often, these are people that are engaged at At-Large Structure level or at RALO level in regional events such as EuroDIG, for example. I could certainly tell you that a few of the fellows that came to ICANN over the years were originally told to go and engage at EuroDIG level and also in the global IGF. So, maybe we need to expand a bit on this and shine a bit of a more positive light on the fellowship than actually say that we don't engage at all or there's no concerted effort to draw people in our activities because that will not only reflect badly on the fellowship, but it will also reflect very badly on the ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any further comments on number five? Number six, how willing would your group, SO, AC, stakeholder group, constituency be to participate and take ownership for selecting and developing fellows, including giving them assignments, assigning mentors, etc.?

The answer I have at this point is we are willing to participate. Mentors are possible, but that would presume filtering candidates who have particular interest in our areas. Further comments? Tijani, please go ahead. I heard someone else speak, but I don't know who it was.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that we have also to answer the question about do we want to participate in the selection of the fellows? The answer should be, yes, we do. We insist that the community should decide on the selection committee because now the selection committee is chosen, I don't know, by whom. Nobody knows by whom. Some people are always there. Some people are not there, etc.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, the list of people selected is well-known and documented. Right now [Nadira] is the At-Large person on that group.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, this is Seun. I'd like to stay in the queue.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We hear you, Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The list is known, but who selected them and how they were selected? This is the question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The statement starts off as we are willing to participate.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So, the question [inaudible] we want to participate and we insist that we need to participate.

ALAN GREENBERG: What you're saying is we, in our case, the AC should pick the people who will be part of the selection committee or the person if it's a small group, instead of ICANN staff picking. Is that what you're saying?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: if you go on to other speakers, tell me whether you're agreeing with that or not. Who's next, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Seun.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yes, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay, thank you. I think it may not be practical for SOs and ACs to take [inaudible] selecting fellows, new fellows. It may be practical for returning fellows, for instance. I think we probably should engage [inaudible] in that new fellows are just [inaudible] ICANN select [inaudible]. But, because new fellows [inaudible] become active [inaudible] participate in that. I see the policy meeting B as a particular meeting that SOs and ACs may want to participate in selecting the fellows for that particular meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I don't think we're going to be able to just select those for meeting B. They're asking us do we want to participate. I'm going to make an executive decision at this point. We are 45 minutes before the end of the meeting. GDPR I believe is a higher priority than this. I would suggest that anyone who has any comments or suggestions to change any of these things, please make concise and very clear comments in the Wiki identifying the number of the question that you believe needs to be modified, the answer to the number of the question. We'll come back to this at the end of the meeting if there is still time.

We'll now go to the GDPR questions.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Whoopie!

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll allow anyone to talk, except Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are seven questions on our agenda. There's a preamble, which makes it clear that ALAC and At-Large is divided on whether we believe the proposed model meets the GDPR regulations, whether we believe ICANN is overreaching in collecting all of the data, whether the data – we should be using the current thick data or a subset of it. I don't think we need to debate whether we're in disagreement with this. We are in disagreement.

Clearly, the data commissioners will have to pass judgment on this, and if we are not compliant with what they are saying is the regulations that they plan to enforce, then clearly we will have to change, but I don't think we want to spend another hour debating that we're in violent disagreement with each other.

Holly has identified five items that she believes need to be addressed and I have added two more to that. I would like to, if possible, get some idea of where we stand on these particular issues.

What I would suggest is I will read out the item. Holly will get 30 seconds to present what she thinks. I'll present what I think in 30 seconds and open up the floor for other people to agree or disagree. I'll

serve notice that in many cases we are diametrically opposed to each other. This will be fun, or not.

The first question is must registrars continue to collect the contact details for administrative and technical contacts and transmit them to the registry and escrow provider? Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

First of all, I totally agree with your introduction, which is the model that has finally come out, the 58-page whatever it is, suggests that they've already come to views and you and I are not going to agree on everything. So, I'm not going to add to particular questions because we're not going to reach answers. The thing I wanted to focus, and I put it on the chat for both ALAC and At-Large, the thing that's still open for discussion is really who can access the data and what kind of scheme is it going to be? Is it going to be self-certification? And I'd have difficulties with that. Is it going to be a determined certification, somehow sanctioned by ICANN? I would prefer that. Will there be blanket access for all groups to non-public data? I would suggest that's inappropriate, that there be different tiers that law enforcement—

ALAN GREENBERG:

Holly, can I interrupt, please?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is one of the items that is number five, I believe. Five and six.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I'm going to be quiet until five or six because I think most of what you and I have said, it's on a public record. They've made their minds up. And really, I'd only like to spend time on what I think we can still make a difference on. So, I'll be very quiet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. You did identify these issues as ones that ALAC should come out on, so I copied your text. I'm a little bit confused.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, and I'm happy with that. I'll be quiet until then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, let me summarize to the extent I can, and then you can come in if you want. The first item you identified was should the administrator and technical contacts be still used? My answer was I don't know whether these contacts are the right ones. The PDP will probably determine a different set of contexts to move forward with. At this point, they're good enough and we should continue using them until we come up with something different. I think that basically matched your comment as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Totally agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Number two is should anonymized e-mail addresses be substituted for those e-mail addresses with the registrant for the various contacts? Holly's answer was, yes, that's fine. My answer was, yes, it's fine, but it only will work if the same anonymized address is used across the board. If every time you create a new ... You register a new name or you move to a new registrar, you get a new anonymized address. Then a huge amount of the work that's done on cyber abuse protection can no longer be done, and similarly, a huge amount of the case law that's being built up with UDRP and URS is no longer valid because patterns of abuse is one of the things that they rely on e-mail addresses for.

So, I believe it will work, but they would have to be a centralized repository of anonymized addresses, not made up one by one for each new name. Holly, do you want to comment on that and then we'll open the floor to other people?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think it's a really good approach. Totally agree. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Anyone else like to have a comment on this?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Yes, I want to have a comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't hear who it was, but whoever it is, please identify yourself and speak.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Lutz Donnerhacke here. I'm pretty sure we are running on the wrong issue here. I know we can't do a lot of basic discussions, but in principle we are discussing just dormant points simply because we are not allowed to transfer data to collect private data and to make it accessible. The whole proposal is to make a layered access to data which should not be collected and should not be transferred, so in this model we try to hide that we are breaking the law. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. You are speaking as a data commissioner for which country?

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: I am speaking from European side of the law. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I believe ICANN will be consulting with the formal data commissioners who have responsibility for this. If they agree with you, then we will have to change. But, that is the disclaimer we have at the top. We're not debating that right now. We are presuming – something you may not like. We're presuming that this data can be collected and the question is what should we be doing with it in this case? Tijani, go

ahead. We're talking about anonymized e-mail addresses or non-anonymized.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I would like to speak about question one and question two.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You said collect and transfer to the [inaudible] and the escrow agent. My answer is no. Collected, we will see with the commissioner. But, transfer to both registry and escrow agent, I disagree.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. In other words, you are going back and saying we should not have thick WHOIS, something the ALAC previously decided was a good thing, said was a good thing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am speaking about transferring, not [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what thick WHOIS is. It is transference of information from registrar to registry. You're also suggesting it should not be transferred to escrow providers. Is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you're going to have to provide a statement objecting to that. To stop doing escrow and say if a registrar fails, all of those registrations disappear, I think is not something that I would support.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But, Alan, you choose to make three [inaudible] by three. Why not by four or by five? If you have it in the registrar and the registry, you have [inaudible]. So, why you want it to be another [inaudible] and have three points so the leakage would be easier?

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, we cannot debate that issue here. That is going to be decided by the data commissioners.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So, why are we mentioning them at all?

ALAN GREENBERG: Because there are issues like anonymized e-mail which is being proposed that I think we need to comment on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But not the collection of data and transferring them to the registry and the data escrow.

ALAN GREENBERG: Who is speaking? Is that Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: it's Holly and I was just going to support you. There is anonymized e-mail, but I think you've added a very important point about it. Tijani, basically if you read the paper very carefully, they've made up a lot of tentative issues to the extent that we can add detail such as Alan did on anonymized detail. I think that's helpful. But, going back over this stuff now, it would be a waste of time unless we can be adding value to that. So, that's what I'm doing I hope.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any further comments on anonymized e-mail? So far, we've had Holly agree that my statement is a valid one that we should raise. Lutz, go ahead.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: The purpose of WHOIS is to get in contact with technical people or [inaudible] people in the case that a domain is not working. This use case, this purpose, requires that we have access to data where we can reach some people. If we anonymize this information, we can drop WHOIS. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, you're saying accessing them via an anonymized address, it still gets there. You just don't know who they are. It's not sufficient.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Exactly. We have to [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I will note that. I'm not quite sure I understand. Perhaps you would put on the Wiki explaining why an anonymize address which gets to the right person is not sufficient. But, we don't have the time for that now, but I would really appreciate understanding why an address that works but simply, essentially you cannot figure out if it's Gmail or Hotmail that it's going through is not sufficient.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: Yes, I will write something on it simply because you want to get rid of spam or something like this. That's why you want to hide your e-mail address. If you are using a proxy e-mail address, you didn't solve this problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: The problem it's nominally trying to solve is that e-mail addresses are deemed to be personal information, and therefore it is hiding them. That is the problem it's trying to solve.

Next item. Should registries and registrars be permitted to optionally apply the model on a global basis? That is, should it, from a non-European registry or registrar who is not bound to follow GDPR for non-Europeans, should they apply that model?

Holly says it leads to consistency and it's easier to implement. My comment is that presumes GDPR is the only rule around. We are likely to find there are other countries that have either stricter rules or lacks their rules, or for instance may say that an American registrar for an American registrant must publicize certain information. Therefore, I believe we should not be doing things on a global basis. It's going to have to be table-driven to accommodate different jurisdictions and I believe to the extent to which data should be made available for cyber abuse work, it should be as wide as possible. We should make as much data available as the law allows.

Holly, would you like to come in? Then anyone else?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just very briefly. I think the model is already indicated that they're going to go with the ... In the European economic area, GDPR or this model will apply. Global application will be [inaudible]. That's not what I argued for, but I think we need to go with it.

My one response would be for any and all law protection issues, there is generally an exception as to access. To me, it's not [inaudible] this one because I think the model already suggests what's the way forward. I think there are perhaps more important issues we need to discuss.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can say we differ. Holly and I can talk privately in the next day or so if you want. I personally believe we should be giving up as little as possible and this [inaudible] makes it too much.

Should the model apply to contact details supplied by registrants who are legal persons? This is the same sort of question ... Tijani? Did you want to speak, Tijani? Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you very much. This interim model is to comply with GDPR. We don't have to make a general case because general case should be done by the working group on new generation RDS. This is only to comply with GDPR, so it must be [restricted] to the compliance with GDPR and not extend it to all the cases. This is my response.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a good point. The question it was asking is should we give registrars and registries the option of applying the rules everywhere even though GDPR doesn't apply?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: This is their choice, but ICANN doesn't have a requirement for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. That's the point. ICANN is giving them their choice, so they can choose to apply GDPR rules everywhere in the world. Should we give

them that flexibility or tell them that they still must make data available for places where GDPR does not apply?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that is their choice. They have to choose.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so you're supporting the model.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: As is Holly. Alright, we have a difference of opinion. Anyone else want to chime in on this one?

Alright, now issue number four, legal persons. ICANN has proposed in this interim model that everyone be treated as a natural person. That is, all information can be generally hidden, even though GDPR does not apply to legal persons. The rationale is that there might be some information contained in legal person's registration information that refers to natural persons. For instance, if it says `alangreenberg.com` administers name, is the name administrator, therefore my name has been shown. I believe that it is the responsibility in this case of ICANN to protect its personal data, not the responsibility of WHOIS to protect it. Therefore, I believe we should treat legal persona as the law says and legal person's information is not protected. Any comments?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll make one comment. I'm happy with what they've come up with, but for me this is a difficult one because I think there are very valid arguments on both sides.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, between the two of us, we can say we're divided.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Me, too, Alan. I don't have a special choice. Both are valid. It's no problem for me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else want to weigh in? The question is GDPR does not apply at all to legal person's registrations. ICANN is saying treat them as natural persons and hide all their information. Yes, please go ahead. Jonathan, please go ahead. Jonathan, we can't hear you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I think he's not connected. Just one moment, Alan. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: it's *6 to unmute, I believe. Or *7.

YESIM NAZLAR: The Adigo bridge says that Jonathan is unmuted for now. Jonathan, if you can hear us, it's *7 to unmute.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, *7.

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes, you got it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I wanted to support your position on this, Alan. I think that we shouldn't be taking this as an opportunity. As Tijani said, we really need to treat this as an interim model and shouldn't be taking this as an opportunity to over-enforce GDPR but be more minimalistic and be compliant and leave more of these questions for the working group that will take this up rather than setting a precedence, as you say, for being worldwide or for treating legal persons as natural persons. I'm inclined to agree with you on both those points.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Holly, can you live with that?

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, I can live with what they come up with. As I said, if you look at their 58-page paper, they've listened to everybody. They have argued what they think is a reasonable position. Quite honestly, I think it's going to be very hard on some of these issues to change their actual position. But, things like the point you raised on anonymized e-mail, where we can add to it, I think that's important.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, you're disagreeing with Jonathan and I saying you accept the model. You don't think it's overreaching.

HOLLY RAICHE: I don't, but at this point, I just ...

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine. I'm not asking you to agree. I'm just trying to find out where people stand.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. First, Alberto and then Sebastien.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: I would agree, but in terms of regulations in any country, well, we need to take into account that they are different in terms of rights and responsibilities for legal persons and individual persons. There is a difference. A company, a business, does not have the same rights as a natural person, so I'm not sure how we are going to solve this issue. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Alberto is agreeing with Jonathan and I that the rights are different and we shouldn't give privacy rights to companies that don't have it explicitly. I think that is what Alberto said. Sebastien, please?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: To be short, I agree with you, Alan. Just natural person to be [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Okay. Next item – I think we're at the end of that queue. Which elements of WHOIS should be published in a public

WHOIS while an accreditation program for layered, tiered access is being developed?

I did not really answer this question because I don't know the answer. Clearly, self-accreditation which had been proposed and rejected is not a particularly attractive thing. In the long-term, it's going to be a real challenge to figure out how to accredit people and whether ICANN simply promising to follow a code of conduct is going to be sufficient or whether we need some other more rigid program to accredit people. But ,that's the accreditation program. The question this is asking is what we should do before we have the accreditation program? Because it is going to take some time to develop. It's going to take some time just to debate what the terms are, never mind actually implementing it.

I don't see any way that we have any practical option other than some level of waiver that we don't have to comply until we get the accreditation program with a very strict timeline applied to it because the alternative seems to be an almost complete blackout, with the exception perhaps of law enforcement, and we know that the way cyber abuse is handled these days that will simply not be practical. So, I don't see any answer other than a waiver. Does anyone else have any possible answers? Holly?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Alan, this is Heidi. Sorry, Holly. Hadja has her hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see. I'm going to go to Holly first because she did have some answers to this, and then go to Hadja.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's a thought I didn't put down before, but I remember sitting on one of the many WHOIS discussions and it was about the privacy-proxy and circumstances in which there would be access to privacy-proxy and we worked on a solution for IP applicants. I'm just wondering if it's worthwhile my going back and ... Because it was a PDP, so it's now an [approved] public process saying there's a bit of a model there that says in certain circumstances beyond just law enforcement the community has looked at this issue and said these are possible rules. It's just a way through, because I agree with you, what's going to happen is everybody is going to go blank. GoDaddy has already gone blank.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. GoDaddy only went blank on bulk access. That was a different issue.

HOLLY RAICHE: But, what's going to happen is a lot of people ... There is going to be just nothing. I think the really big issue is how do we get self-certification – sorry, certification – up? How do we get a code of practice up? And it's something where I wouldn't mind spending a day or two and thinking through using the models that we've already got and agreed on as a way through. Does that sound constructive?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don't think so because I believe the only models that we have thought through at all are related to intellectual property issues and the UDRP and URS, and those – lawyers are accredited. There are huge, formal processes in place by which we can recognize an accredited lawyer or an accredited intellectual property lawyer and they are bound by certain ethics.

Lawyers I believe we can address, but it's the cyber abuse people that's the really difficult part. And the company is trying to protect their trademarks where they're not at the level of the lawyers requesting information that I think are problematic.

Remember, the question is not how do we build an accreditation program? It's what do we do until we have it? And it's not going to be here the end of May.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I don't have an easy answer for that one. I really don't.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Hadja?

HADJA OUATTARA:

[inaudible] elements of WHOIS data should be published. I don't think we have any choices or options. The data that's [inaudible] to be published and negative else. I don't believe that we have any choices here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. If you will publish the whole thick WHOIS, you would not be compliant with GDPR and this is about compliance with GDPR. What do you mean by waiver, Alan? I don't understand what kind of data would be public.

ALAN GREENBERG: A waiver would be the permission to keep on doing what we're doing now or some in between model until we get the accreditation. This would be a permission from the data commissioners to allow us to do things until the accreditation program is [done].

I mean, right now every one of your browsers uses services – reputation services and [inaudible] services – that decide whether a URL is safe or not. All of that ... Much of your spam filtering is done based on things that use WHOIS. All of that disappears if we suddenly can't do anything at all anymore.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, understand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO:

Speaking about the model – this is [inaudible]. But, once again, we are saying what kind of data are we going to [inaudible] and how are we going to do it? Perhaps it would be interesting to be on the other side of the [inaudible] and ask what kind of data can I get from WHOIS? And [inaudible] who only wants to know whether a [inaudible] is taken or not [inaudible]. If the WHOIS has data from [inaudible], then maybe we could have this kind of category of data to be published. Perhaps this is how we should take it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Anyone else like to weigh in on this one? This is a really thorny issue.

Alright, next item is how many levels should the tiered access method? We talk about the term tiered, but in fact within the document, we only seem to talk about two levels, nothing or everything. I believe that's not going to be acceptable. Clearly, law enforcement on presentation of a subpoena should be able to get anything. But, I would think that there's going to have to be in between levels particularly for things like intellectual property lawyers or people who are doing cyber work where they may get some data, but not all of it.

I believe, for instance, that on a subpoena, law enforcement should be able to get the real e-mail address, but clearly that's not something we're going to put out on a more general level.

So, I think we need to be very clear that we are looking at an accreditation method which will end up having tiered access and different people will get different types of access. I'd like to know what people have comments on. Heidi is saying yes. Ah, Holly. One of you has to change your name to not start with an H. It's confusing me.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Look, I agree with you, Alan. I think law enforcement, clearly. Maybe this is where the work that was done in that PDP on access to privacy-proxy, there was a set of circumstances where IP lawyers, which was a smaller, more difficult test to pass, offers the kind of tiered access that I'm talking about. Some of the elements – and this is just from memory. I would have to go back and look at it. But, it was, for example, a particular instance there were ... It wasn't necessarily a legal test, but grounds for thinking you should have access.

If I can unearth that, which I will do not today but tomorrow, that's the sort of thing where those tiers where in fact you have reason to believe there is some particular thing that you are interested in and spell it out, and in those circumstances, you get access to only that information you need.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Could I ask you to send me a pointer to the document and where in the document this is?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Yeah. I'll send it to you tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: It was a PDP on privacy-proxy, who gets access. I've got the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: These documents are larger than I can read quickly right now.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll send it to you tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Anyone else have issues on the tiered access? We seem to be in general agreement. Alright, we have agreements from Hadja, from Javier. I don't see anyone else.

The last access is bulk access. Should it be allowed? This is something that wasn't covered really well initially and it came out in spades at the ICANN meeting. The real issue is that there's a huge amount of information that is essentially created by comparing things. What e-mail ... One of those comes back to the e-mail addresses of what registrations are done with the same e-mail?

One of the critical issues in UDRP, for instance, is does this particular registrant have a history of abuse before? That is, when I say abuse, UDRP cases where they lose?

A lot of that is only possible with the ability to scan bulk data, and bulk data is readily available right now. Many of the reputation services that control ... That give guidance to e-mail providers on filtering spam. The reputation services that browsers use depend on bulk access.

So, I think we're going to have to end up with a small number of accredited and authorized users who are going to have a strict code of conduct of how they can use the data and who can get access to the data, but I think we need to be able to provide this kind of data or we lose a huge number of the services that we depend on right now. Comments?

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'd have to think about that, Alan. I haven't thought about that. I do have trouble with bulk access. It's such a honey pot for so many people who shouldn't have access do it, that unless you actually carefully, carefully [inaudible] it and are very careful as to who gets access to it, I have deep, deep problems with it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

As I said, I think you're going to have to control to a large extent. I mean, the registrars ... GoDaddy is going to have bulk access to all of their data. There's plenty of places huge amounts of data is going to be available. The real question is how can you use it? There's code of conducts and rules and laws which kick in at that point.

As we've learned from Facebook, huge amounts of data can have interesting implications if it's not protected properly. I don't think

anyone is going to disagree with you on that today. Three weeks ago, they might have disagreed, but not today.

HOLLY RAICHE: Could I see a form of words around that just to have a think about it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think in my answer on the Wiki I put some words.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I'd like to have a look at that again and just think about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll even read them to you since we actually have a few minutes.

HOLLY RAICHE: I have seven minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe this must be allowed for specialized uses. Many abuse control mechanisms depend on it, including reputation servers and browsers depend on it. Sorry, I didn't write words saying we need to protect it, but clearly it needs to be protected.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd like to see final words, but I think we're headed in the right direction.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will try to write up a summary of what we have come to today. We've actually completed the GDPR list. We don't agree on everything, but we completed the list and at least had a substantive discussion. We didn't come anywhere near completing the fellowship one, so I ask people to please right short, concise things which can be assimilated. If you write three pages, I'm not going to be able to read it and summarize it.

We have been given an extension, but that extension is for a week and it expires in a few days. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Alan. We didn't speak about accreditation, in fact. The model proposed at first the [inaudible] and it was refused. Now we are going through the GAC to find a way with the governments to see how to find the process for accreditation. But, this is something that we have to think about. The accreditation is one key point because it will give access to the full data to people who will be accredited. That is the position of ALAC [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think we've already decided and everyone who spoke agreed that accreditation will not necessarily give access to the full data. We need tiered access with multiple levels, so there will be different levels of access to different people. But, I agree with you that we need to go forward on that. No one had raised ... I didn't raise it and Holly didn't raise it and no one else posted anything on the Wiki on that issue.

I don't quite know how we can determine that other than to say let's see what the GAC and staff come up with and comment on it. I don't feel like I'm comfortable in trying to invent the proposal myself. Certainly, other people have done that. The Business Constituency did propose an accreditation model which is posted.

One second. Tijani first, then Holly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay, thank you. Alan, why I am asking that, because there was a big pushback regarding the use of GAC or the government for the accreditation, if you remember. So, what are the alternatives and what ALAC or At-Large people think about that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

There certainly was pushback from the GAC saying they don't want to be part of a process. They may well be a conduit for getting information, but it's not clear how you get conduit from countries that may not be GAC members. So, I think that is rather problematic. But, certainly, the GAC has some input as to how one could build it. But, the non-law enforcement parts I think are the much more critical ones and I'm not sure we're going to get a lot of information out of the GAC in general. Certainly, the EU has already spoken out on the need for non-law enforcement getting access. They've made that very clear, and clearly intellectual property people are going to speak on their own behalf.

I don't feel comfortable trying to build such a system, but there is one that was proposed by the Business Constituency or the Commercial

Stakeholder Group. I'm not sure which. And certainly that's something we could comment on. Holly, please go ahead. We're just about out of time.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I know. I was just going to say I'd like to have a look at the model that was proposed. I would like to make some comments on it and I think that – addressing the point Tijani raised – I would like to comment on that model, and in doing so, it will be clear that ALAC is part of the discussion which was my point.

ALAN GREENBERG:

May I suggest that we don't have to There is no formal public comment on this. They want answers as soon as possible. May I suggest we treat accreditation, the actual accreditation mechanism, as a separate item and not tie it to these other items which we'd like to get some answers in on quickly? I encourage Holly and Tijani to work together and come up with some thoughts on it.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Okay, I'm [inaudible].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

When is the deadline, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no deadline. They first wanted it, if possible, by the end of the San Juan meeting. We didn't make that. We're now trying to make something within the next week. I will have a go at writing something up and I expect people to comment on it quickly. If people don't, then we don't go anywhere.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. The homework is once something is posted on this, please comment on it. On the fellowship, if we're going to get a statement in, then it has to be by the end of this week. Really, you have the next day or so to comment if you care about any of the items, but be concise and short. It's important that we say things that we can defend as a group, not just one individual person. So, try to look at it from other people's perspective when you are posting things, not just your personal opinions. It's hard to do, but I think we have no choice. We're not going to be able to have another call on this as we go forward.

I'll remind everyone that the At-Large review document, for those who have access – and that's certainly ALAC regional leaders and the formal working party members – please comment on it. The comments close I believe on the 1st ... No.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I think a Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, close next Sunday or Monday. Then, we'll be trying to pull it all together in a final document. This has an absolutely hard deadline because we have to get it to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee in time for their meeting, so our target is roughly middle May for getting this out. I think we're—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Mid-April I thought.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, mid-April. Thank you. We're very close. Most of the comments so far are really typos and minor wording corrections and those are great. We do have tentative approval from both Khaled and Leon have looked at it and said it's the general level that they want to be able to present to the board. So, we're not looking for massive changes, but we do want to make it clean and professional.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, I've got to go.

ALAN GREENBERG: With that, I thank you all. Is there anyone else who has any last comments before we close the meeting?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. It's been a strained meeting with no Adobe Connect and with subjects that are far from simple to deal with. I thank you all and I wish you a goodnight, good morning, good evening, whatever part of the day it is. Bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Thanks, everyone.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]