YESIM NAZLAR: On our call today, on the English channel we have Alan Greenberg, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Maureen Hilyard, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Daniel Nanghaka, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Vernatius Okwu Ezeama, Alagie Ceesay, Otunte Otueneh, Joan Katambi, Seun Ojedeji, Adrian Schmidt, Leah Symekher, Satish Babu, Jonathan Zuck, Joel Thayre, Ricardo Holmquist, John More, Avri Doria, Vanda Scartezini, Nadira Al-Araj, and Sarah Kiden. On the Spanish channel we have Alberto Soto. On the French channel we have Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. On the Russian channel, we currently don't have anyone listed. We have received apologies from Kaili Kan, Sébastien Bachollet, Loris Taylor, Holly Raiche, Andrei Kolesnikov, Bastiaan Goslings, Anna Loup, and David Morar. From staff side we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber, Evin Erdogdu, Siranush Vardanyan, and myself Yesim Nazlar. Our French interpreters today are Claire and Jacques, our Spanish interpreters are Veronica and David, and our Russian interpreters are Ekaterine and Galina. I will be managing today's call and before we start I would like to remind everyone to state your names before speaking, not only for the transcription, but also for the interpretation reasons as well, and also a kind reminder for those who are on the phone bridge, please don't forget to use star 6 to mute your line and start 7 to unmute your line. I see that Barrack Otieno, our CCNSO liaison has joined us on Webex as well, and now I would like to leave the floor back to you Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, the first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. Is there anyone of us who has any comments, questions, on the agenda or any other business they would like to schedule? I see no hands, and no voices, I will assume the agenda is adopted as presented, and the first agenda item is ALAC policy. Sorry, was there a voice? Someone speaking? I guess not. The first item is ALAC policy, development activities and I'll turn the floor over to Evin to introduce the issues that are currently on our table and require the attention of the ALAC right now. We are starting 6 minutes late, so I will ask that we try to keep this part brief but clearly there are some important issues here.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you Alan, this is Evin for the record. As you can see there were four statements ratified by ALAC, they're summarized at the top of the agenda, but the first currently in comment mode. There was a draft posted for, by Jonathan Zuck on the release for registration one dot com domain name, with the single character label, dot com. That closes on the 20th June, so there is still some time, but the first draft was posted and approved, I believe by Bartlett and Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go over all of them and then I'll take over.

EVIN ERDOGDU: OK. Next then is the draft final report of the RSAC 2 review, that closes on the 10th June, and the volunteer penholders are Seun Ojedeji and

Alan Greenberg. That is in draft mode, there is not yet a first draft posted. Next is short term options to adjust the timeline for specific reviews. That closes on the 6th July, and actually Alan is penholder for that as well. I will update the agenda, that also will need a draft. Next is long term options to address the timeline of reviews. That is also due 20th July, and Alan is also the assigned penholder for that. Lastly, there's the IPC BC accreditation and access model for non public data version 1.5. It's not formal ICANN public comment but there is a working work space setup, and Hollie, Alan, and Jonathan have contributed to the first draft posted in that space. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, on the O dot com. The release of the single letter O by Verisign for dot com. There was a very short and concise statement posted by Jonathan a while ago. We opened a comment period that ended on the 11th May and I asked for it to be extended to the end of this week, I believe. If there are no more comments we will go into a vote on that. I think it's an appropriate statement and so far the only comments we're supporting it. The RSAC review, I think as I may have said last time, I don't remember. I think it's an important one, there are few things as important as the root servers in making sure that the internet keeps on working for users, and I think we need a comment. The RSAC review has a lot of questionable and negative things in it, not so much negative, but pointing out the lack of clarity on a number of RSAC issues. On the short term options, I have been listed incorrectly as the penholder, I am not the penholder on that one. That one I will be responding to as chair of the RDS review team and I don;t think it's appropriate for me to respond or be actively involved, but I do have

some opinions and if you look at the Wiki, you'll see the start of some of them. Certainly for the RDS review there were a good number of inaccuracies in the document, some of which may be corrected, some of which may not be corrected. I believe the whole process was rather ill advised, but others may disagree. And of course, there's the ATRT comment, which I think is reasonable that we comment on also, and I am looking for active contributors to that one. I will not be the penholder, we will look for a penholder, but regardless of who writes the final statement, we need comments and thoughts on that one. The same is true on the long term implications for overall reviews and that's both specific reviews, what used to be the ALC reviews and organizational reviews, which we have a little bit of knowledge about. Lastly, again the accreditation model, we'll talk about that a little bit more when we get into policy issues later in the meeting. Does anyone have any comments or thoughts on any of these? To be specific, we are looking for contributors on the RSAC, short term options, long term options, and the accreditation. If anyone would like to have their names added as involvement, you can certainly let Evin know. But you can just make comments, if you make enough comments you are involved. Regardless of whether your name is listed. I see no hands, I hear no voices, I'll assume we'll go onto the next agenda item. Giving people a moment to comment if they have anything.

I have a question for staff, on my agenda list, on the attendee list, I have a large number of exclamation marks, does anyone know what those mean? The majority of people now have exclamation marks in front of them.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Alan, this is Yesim speaking. I'm currently on edit mode, are you talking about the Wiki agenda page, or?

ALAN GREENBERG: I am talking about the attendee list on Webex.

YESIM NAZLAR: I am just re-checking it. If I see anything.

ALAN GREENBERG: If no one knows, nevermind.

YESIM NAZLAR: It seems fine for me.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't say it's broken, I was asking what does the exclamation mark mean in front of many people's names? If nobody knows that is fine, I'll ignore them. Alright, the next agenda item is, the review of ALS and individual member applications, and again if we can do this as quickly as possible. Thank you.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure, thank you Alan. This is Evin for the record. The total number of ALSes is the same as last month, sorry, increased by one. A NARALO ALS has joined us, and we have several, both being processed under due diligence, as well as a couple waiting on regional advice, and then those

could proceed to vote. On individuals, we've had a good uptake in individuals joining. There are four that joined recently, one from NARALO and three from AFRALO, and we have another that just applied today from NARALO. That's all from me unless there are questions, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no questions, I do have a comment that it sure would be in light of the responses that we're sending to the OEC, it would be sure nice to see more individual members showing up. But it is what it is right now, but hopefully all of our RALOs are actively thinking about how we're going to address the issue. I see no hands, and we'll go on to the next agenda item then, which is reports. An opportunity for all liaisons, or anybody else for that matter, should be submitting reports. The actual performance varies, we won't comment on that right now but we will be following up on that. This is an opportunity for any liaisons or anyone else who has something they would like to bring to the attention of ALAC, even though it's already in their written report, or will be. Anyone like to take the floor? There we go, please go ahead [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah this is [inaudible]. Hello, I'm going to participate tomorrow in the GAC leadership call, which in itself is another good step in the direction of more thorough of the relation between these bodies, and that basically it's about the agenda for the call, ALAC leadership team GAC call, and then the preparation for the Panama meeting. So, I have a few items already for that, geonames, and especially the question that why

the GAC and the DPAs in Europe or so much on different lines on the GDPR, and also on ITI, information transparency initiative, and how that would relate to the joint declaration we gave at the meeting months ago, ALAC and GAC. Any other ideas for topics to take up at our joint meetings, they are welcome. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone else have anything else? I believe our agenda is looking like it's getting full as it is, so I'm not sure we need more but anyone else have anything else to contribute to the GAC report. I would note that hearing that the relationship is improving, is a positive trend in light of what seems to be the deteriorating relationship with other parts of the organization. I do note the exclamation mark, I just checked. What it means it's a measure of attentiveness, and we have red exclamation marks before most of the people in this group. I don't know how it measures it but Webex is not impressed with your attentiveness. With no further comment. Alright, no other liaison? Thank you very much if that was actively [inaudible] by someone, it is not. Now we have an echo, and instead it's coming from the Adigo bridge. Can you still hear me?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi [inaudible] has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alright, if there are no other reports we'll ignore the echo and noise and go onto the next agenda item, which is ICANN 62. Do we have Heidi and/or Gisella on the line?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, this is Heidi. Can we please get rid of the echo?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yesim, do we have Heidi or Gisella?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Alan, can you hear Heidi speaking?

ALAN GREENBERG: Am I still on the line?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan, this is Heidi, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Alfredo says he can hear me. Alright, so I am still on the line, do we have Heidi or Gisella.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I am here.

ALAN GREENBERG: You are here, would you like to take the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, if we please could get rid of the echo.

ALAN GREENBERG: We won't know until we keep talking.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much.

ALAN GREENBERG: It still seems to be there but not very loud.

HEIDI ULLRICH: We have put together a draft agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia says the echo is loud to her.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It is getting louder.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will count while we try to eliminate the echo, 1, 2, 3, 4, no it's not gone yet. Is someone actively working on this?

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Alan, yes we are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. 7, 8, 9, 10, it says Adigo bridge.

YESIM NAZLAR: Alan, this is Yesim speaking. I will try mute call in users for and let's see if we'll be able to hear.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. 1, 2.

YESIM NAZLAR: We still have the echo.

ALAN GREENBERG: 3.

YESIM NAZLAR: Trying the line one more time.

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't hear an echo that time, but it's still here.

YESIM NAZLAR:	Currently I am going over all the connections on the Webex to see if everyone is muted. OK, just muted one more line.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Do we have an echo now. No echo, that was the one. Back to you Heidi. Do we still have Heidi? Do we have Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER:	Hi Alan, Gisella here. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:	We can hear you very much.

GISELLA GRUBER:	I can hear myself twice. It's quite [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:	You are the only one hearing yourself.

GISELLA GRUBER:	OK, thank you very much, this is Gisella for the record. We have 33 days left to Panama, I hope that all the funded travelers have finalized their travel arrangements and registered by the website. Again if anyone has any issues if you could urgently contact me, and hotel details should be with you later on this week. What we will also be sending out is the link to the restricted page for the funded travelers and their travel information, in and out of Panama. So, the Wiki page and the ICANN 62

page [inaudible] on Webex, have been updated with the draft agenda. Our let Heidi and Alan take you through these, however, just to update you on the social events so far, Monday to Wednesday, 6:30 to 7:30 PM [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Gisella? If I may interrupt, people are saying they still hear an echo, I am not hearing it at this point.

GISELLA GRUBER: I will be honest. I have such a bad echo in my ear that I'm rambling on because I [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yesim, can you please mute my line, and see if that's causing the problem

YESIM NAZLAR: OK sure. Alan if you just [inaudible] Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, just doing a test again. The echo has gone on my side.

YESIM NAZLAR: Same here. I think it was coming from Alan's line.

GISELLA GRUBER: Perfect, this is Gisella. I understand this perfect now [inaudible] now we just have a ring. I'm just going to continue, please do let me know if there are any questions, I'll keep an eye on the chat. As I was saying, Monday to Wednesday for social events, 6:30 to 7:30 PM that's 18:30 to 19:30, we have the social networking event, you may recall for the last two policy forums we have a cocktail which is usually in the foyer area which allows for all groups to mingle and network. Then on Thursday we have the closing cocktail at the same time. Other social events, we're likely to have Gems performing on Tuesday evening. All details will be confirmed closer to the time, and we'll still looking at a [inaudible] get together with Alberto Soto who is kindly assisting with this. Again, work in progress and details will be posted once confirmed. Heidi and Alan, would one of you like to take everyone through the agenda that we've got so far. I don't have any new [inaudible] out of the stage.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you so much Gisella, this is Heidi. Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

GISELLA GRUBER: Loud and clear.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Perfect. OK. We have apologies for the technical issues, we do have a draft agenda for the entire ICANN 62 drafted and go ahead and take a look at that from the agenda, as well as perhaps, Gisella can put that into the chat. Again most of the items, of the topics that are listed on

the agenda are incorporated into the agenda, with the exception of three, which we will add later today. I will just go through this relatively quickly. Monday we do start with a welcome and multistakeholder ethos award presentation, first at-large session, it will be moderated by [inaudible], sitting at 9:15 to 10:15 and it's basically, in addition to the welcome, it will be the...

ALAN GREENBERG: Heidi? It's Alan. There's going to be significant changes in the detailed agenda, so why don't we review what the topics are, but not exactly where they are.

HEIDI ULLRICH: That's fine. So the topics, as you'll see on the agenda include the at-large review, ALS criteria, individual member issues, and those are [inaudible] various agendas already. Then because of the [inaudible] session, we also do have new gTLDs, work tracks 1 to 5, those are included in the daily prep. We do have Theresa coming to talk about the strategic planning, the trends, hopefully there will be a working lunch at that time. We also have GDPR discussions, including the accreditation model, including the temporary specification. We also will have KSK rollover. I don't know Alan, if you wanted David Conrad to that one? We also will be looking at ATLAS 3, we will include that. We have representing the interest of internet users scheduled. We have policy advice scheduled and we have a 20 minute presentation on the ITI, [inaudible]. We also have, again as I mentioned earlier we have a daily prep all four days, talking about the afternoon sessions. We also have a

regional leadership meeting scheduled, and we have an AFRALO meeting scheduled [inaudible], and finally a wrap up session as well on the final day. Alan over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, the schedule is still under refinement, at this point we do not have external speakers coming in on issues such as gTLDs, RDS, or work track... or CCWG accountability, but if you believe that we do need speakers for those, then please speak up. If there are any items that are not on the agenda that you believe should be focused on, or vice versa, issues that are there that you don't believe should be there. This is the time to speak up, it's going to be locked in very soon. Certainly I will open the floor right now, but if anyone has any other comments, get them to the meetings team as soon as we can. I don't see any hands up at this point and I hear no voices, so I'll assume we'll go on. If we can go on to other activities at ICANN 62, and we have Olivier, Mario, and Gisella. Olivier is not with us, at least not speaking, is there anyone else who can speak about the outreach event? There is a joint outreach event either with NCSG or NCUC I am not sure which. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was just passing security and my mobile was in the scanner. NCSG event was the ALAC, we're working on a comment, agenda with some topics, if you have any suggestions for topics, now is the time to make them so we can build them into the agenda. Policy topics for discussion, proving the

at-large view, pointing out the difference perhaps, between some of the views of the other communities, and our view, and obviously performing capacity, not capacity building, more like outreach. Trying to get people to sign up for the at-large community, whether it's an at-large structure or an individual. Things are on their way. I did send an email asking should we continue, I've had a lot of responses from a lot of people saying yes, let's do it. So we're set on course. There's not much else to say at this point in time as the agenda still hasn't been built, and as I said, it's the time to build it. If you have suggestions for topics, please email me or email the outreach and engagement working group, we will then complete them and we need to have some topic matter experts as well to come into the room, talk, and provide the input. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Olivier. I'll note that the outreach and engagement session is spanning two sessions, in the morning of, I don't remember if it is Monday or Tuesday, I think it's Tuesday. Tuesday. We will not be conflicting with the first of the two. We will have sessions going on, on the second of the two. That's about the best we could do, and still make sure we had reasonable time to do the rest of the work we're looking at. Any further questions on that before we go onto social activities or anything else? Again, I'll focus on the issues that are listed on the agenda, if there is anyone who wants to make any comments on any of these, now is the time to do it, in the next day or so, and not much later. See no hands... oh, we have a hand from Tijani. Please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan, Tijani speaking. Is there any draft or something from the [inaudible] or ALAC, or [inaudible]. Is there any format, anything that is already done, or should we propose everything, from the beginning?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know if Olivier is in a position to speak, he said the agenda has not been developed yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, sorry it took me a while to unmute and unlock my phone. The agenda is yet to be put together, so Tijani, if you have some topics that you would like to suggest for discussion, please send them now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: OK, will do.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, this is Seun, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, please go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I just wanted to ask Olivier. I don't know [inaudible] which has to do with at-large review, one of the suggestions, at the beginning of the statement that we shouldn't be [inaudible] in policy, and you mentioned that one of these outreach point that will talked about in the session, that will be collaboratively worked on, has to do with policy. Do you think that NCSG is really good to be contributed in this? As I want to be sure that we are not stopping policy [inaudible], so that we don't [inaudible] to do this engagement. [inaudible] response or interest for NCSG [inaudible] or the one pushing for it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, if I may try and answer first. By the time we hold this engagement session, if the schedule goes ahead as we currently envision it, this will be a done deal, a settled issue, so it may well not be relevant what they think if indeed, things go through. If there are problems, then this is an issue that we may well have to discuss with them beforehand and change the agenda because of it. Clearly we don't want to stage a disagreement in front of these people we're trying to attract, and I think we're going to have to try to keep this as civil as possible. We consciously decided to go ahead with this session and not let the, what's going on in the background takeover, but obviously depending on how things unfold, that could change and we'll have to react at the appropriate time. Olivier do you have anything to do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I think that if the ALAC believes that the ALAC shouldn't engage in policy then it

would be futile to engage in policy as the joint session. That said, if the ALAC says that it has to engage in policy, then [inaudible] correct in engaging in policy. Also, I'm agreeing with you that we shouldn't end up in a discussion about whether the ALAC should engage in policy or not, at this session, it is obviously not the right location to have such a discussion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Does anyone else have any comments at this point? I am scrolling through and I see no hands, Abdulkarim did have a hand up at one point but is no longer up. Alright, back over to Gisella, do you want to talk about any other activities before we go onto any other agenda item.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you Alan, this is Gisella. I have covered all items on my side but I do believe Heidi has something that she wishes to add.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you Gisella, just very briefly Alan, [inaudible], we do have the LACRALO roadshow, the Latin American and Caribbean roadshow, will be taking place the 21st and 22nd in Panama City. It is at a different location, the agenda is being developed at the moment and I am aware that Humberto and Jacqueline has submitted [inaudible] requests to attend that outreach session.

ALAN GREENBERG:	For those of us who might be more ignorant than others, can you tell us what a roadhow is and who is putting it on?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	That is a... they hold four of them, they bring in various members of the community as well as interested other parties.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Heidi, They is?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Yeah, I'm getting [inaudible]. It is GSE, global stakeholder engagement and that's [inaudible]. Thank you so much.
ALAN GREENBERG:	This is an ICANN general outreach session in Panama, just prior to the ICANN meeting. Any further issues on ICANN 62? We are a little bit ahead of schedule, we may well use it all up, but right now we're ahead. Please go ahead.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you Alan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just to add actually that we do have people from our community that will take part in this roadshow. It is not just a global stakeholder engagement thing, it's something that's being done with the community. I am very glad to see that we've got people actively involved with it. I don't know whether they will be traveling back home and traveling back to the ICANN

immediately afterwards, I gather they probably won't. I look forward, if any of them are on the call, if they could coordinate as well with the outreach and engagement working group, and with me as well, on what's going to be said. So we have a message that actually fits. One of the feedback that I have received from the past is that, several groups come up from the same community saying different things and that confuses people, somehow. So, having a songsheet or having some kind of agreement on what our points are and so on, would be helpful. Certainly coordination helps. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you share with us, who in our community who are participating?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan, Olivier speaking. I believe Humberto Carrasco is one of them. I can't remember the other person. Would it be Maritza maybe?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: No. It's Judith. I think it's Humberto and Jackie, but I will double check right now. Then the question is, it ends the day before the Panama meeting starts, so his question is, is it worth it for the people to travel back to their countries and then leave the same day back to ICANN?

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith, by Jackie, I presume you mean Jacqueline Morris?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, I am going to double check right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. Not everybody may be familiar with her. Alright, any further items on ICANN 62 before we go onto the next issue? The next issue is our standing item on the agenda of the ALAC at-large review. Normally it's set as a three or four minute item as we don't have a lot to report. Today we have allocated 20 minutes for it. As you are all, I hope, perhaps not all but many of you are aware the at-large review implementation overview proposal was submitted to the organizational effectiveness committee several weeks ago, just in April. There has been a number of reactions to it in the community. There was a letter sent from the contracted party house, or at least specifically from the registrar and registry stakeholder groups, which among other things said that the board should not act on our proposal, because we have not addressed all of the issues identified, nor did we answer the large number of questions posed by MSSI in their mapping document. There is also a letter under draft which we believe has not yet been sent, or at least it hasn't shown up in the ICANN correspondence page yet, and I'm presuming it will show up there as soon as it is received. If it's received. Which is a significant number of other statement made about the review, and again, saying that the board should not act on our proposal. In response to those two letters, LACRALO has decided to start an initiative, and I am not quite sure what that initiative is. I believe the last

I saw was a message from Humberto saying that this would be discussed, I think at their monthly meeting next week. It was supposed to be this week but deferred to next week, and that there would be something like a 10 day period in which it would be discussed, and whatever the outcome is, either LACRALO would reach consensus, or they would have a vote on it. It's not quite clear to me exactly what the intent of this is, and perhaps someone from LACRALO on the call can elaborate a little bit more, what it is they are planning and what the effect will be. At this point, our initial reaction was to do very little with the registrar, registry letter, given that there may well be a second one coming. At this point, I think there is an inclination among the... certainly among the leadership group and very much from my point of view that we should respond to these letters and I believe we have a good strong response, but nevertheless, I believe we should respond and do that moderately quickly, like in the next few days. This item is due to go to the organizational effectiveness committee, I believe on the 29th May, which gives us 7 days between now and then. I don't think we have very much time in which to respond. And, I will open the floor, and I presume there are other people who might want to comment, and I see Alberto has his hand up, so we'll turn the floor over to Alberto first to talk about what I presume will be the LACRALO initiative.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. That's right, I am going to speak about that topic. The policy that we have adapted in LACRALO is, we ALAC members shall discuss topics with enough time so that we can deal with that within LACRALO, so that ALAC members do not express your own personal

opinion. What we did was this, we took notes about the different topics and we submitted those topics to LACRALO for LACRALO to consider these topics. So, because if we have to submit or present a motion, well we will not have enough time. We need to have enough time to be able to discuss all topics. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We seem to have some feed through of the Spanish channel on the English one. I guess my first comment, I though ALAC members were selected by RALOs to do exactly that, to express their opinions, obviously if they choose to, there may be consultation. But, ALAC members are not computers which simply follow instructions, hopefully they think for themselves. But, clearly any ALAC member may consult with their RALO on whatever they like. Alberto, I don't know what the intent of this is, the... all LACRALO ALAC members have already voted on this proposal and the proposal is submitted, so I am not quite sure I understand what the intent or result of this should be.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. Well this is a topic to be discussed as any other topic, I mean, that is an issue where ALAC members should present our opinions and of course have requested the opinion of the RALO. Of course I have my own personal opinion, but I present LACRALOs opinion when there is such an opinion. If there is no opinion by LACRALO then I will present my personal opinion. This is a topic, and we have to address this topic, so as an ALAC member, I want my RALO to provide its own opinion. If there is no opinion by my RALO, I will provide my personal

opinion. But that is the mission that I have as an ALAC member, that's why I was appointed as such. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. Thank you. I will express some confusion. This discussion, how we respond to the at-large review report has been going on for many months and there has been significant involvement from within the RALO, including a number of people who were very active from within LACRALO, so I must express a little bit of confusion but I would like to go to Ricardo next as another LACRALO ALAC member appointed by the NomCom and then we'll go to Tijani.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Ricardo Holmquist speaking. Yes, [inaudible] policy we have now in LACRALO, that was submitted in any point in the list of policies, but ALAC has to do a comment. We want to have the feedback from the community. It doesn't mean that we don't have a voice. We want to have the voice of the community. That's the first point. The second point, I guess there is a confusion in the email you mentioned at the beginning, is that there are two different things, one is the letter from the CPH and the old one is an email from [inaudible] to LACRALO, and he confuses both what CPH says with the mediation process of the [inaudible] right now. This mediation process is in the middle and [inaudible] mentioned in the email, it doesn't [inaudible] that CPH is looking in the ALAC report to the active review are more of less the same thing that is happening with the mediation now. As that both are [inaudible] they are something that are not complete, and I send an

email to the list telling that, I don't agree with the position with most people in LACRALO now about the ALAC review, because a lot of people working from LACRALO in this review, giving answers. Not only inside ALAC, but also in the RALO. I don't know if this sounds better for the opinion of LACRALO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Ricardo. What you are saying is largely in line with what I believe. I don't think anyone is going to disagree that RALOs and people within the RALOs should be involved in these discussions, but it's the timing that confuses me somewhat. In any case, please let's go onto Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan, Tijani speaking. First of all, I would like to say that we work very well with the logistic stakeholder group, and [inaudible] in the letter of the contracted house, contracted parties house. So, it is not threatened by the logistic stakeholder group chair, it is [inaudible] was copied. Why don't we contact him and try to understand what is the issue for him? We are too silent, we don't interact with people, and we are letting people who try to destroy our organization do whatever they want and we are silent. Perhaps we have, before reacting to the rest of the letter, have a contact with [inaudible] and try to understand what is happening. Second, I do agree with you Alan, that we need to respond to those two letters, and I am told that also the [inaudible] letter will be sent, and we have to respond to them. We have to respond to them with clarity and with [inaudible], not with reaction, not with frustration.

We are sure of our point and we are not defending our case, we know that is the right position we took and we are taking now. So, I agree with you that we need to respond, for sure, but before that if we can contact people with whom we worked before, and with whom we have very good relationship, I think it will be helpful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. I will point out that the letter was sent by Graham Bunton, but it was sent and I quote from the very first words in the letter, on behalf of the contracted party house. He was not sending this is a personal capacity, he was not sending this truly as the registrar stakeholder group. He was sending it on behalf of the contracted party house, which includes the registrar stakeholder group, the registry stakeholder group, and NomCom member Carlos who was appointed to sit in the contracted party house. So, he is representing both of those groups, and it is definitely not a personal issue and it is not a... well he may have personal issues, but he is sending this on behalf of both parties, on behalf of the whole contracted party house, so I don't think we... we need to make sure that we don't confuse this. Since the letter was sent to the board and to the OEC, we were not copied on this and we were not asked to comment on it ahead of time. I don't believe it's appropriate for us to enter into a discussion with them at this point. Certainly we could privately, but I don't believe there is any requirement. We will talk about the process going forward, since we are on a rather tight timeline. Does anyone else want to comment at this point before I do that? I see no other hands up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I am not in Webex, it is Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there anyone else with their hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: No you're it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier too as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK, Olivier then Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I will be interested to hear Olivier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier please go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan, and thank you Cheryl for letting me jump forward. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was going to just suggest

some back channel diplomacy in getting in touch with Graham, getting in touch also... when the letter from NCSG gets sent over, maybe getting in touch with the chair of NCSG. At this very moment getting in touch with Graham and really trying to find out where does the problem lie, because they could be saying, we don't want the implementation to go as such, as the ALAC is certainly saying, as we think there are significant problems with it and you need to follow what the items review says, is not an answer. They really have to start focusing a little bit more and saying what is it that they have a little problem with, because otherwise it just looks like something political, rather than something that is based on facts. I think that a back channel discussion with the senders, the co-signers of the letter to explain the situation. To diffuse anything so that it doesn't escalate into something that brings some bad blood in our relationship is probably a way forward I would suggest. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The two letters are quite different and I don't think we want to mix them up. If I may make this comment before Cheryl speaks. The contracted party house letter makes two allegations, number one, we did not respond to the issues raised in the report. I am not aware of any issues that we did not respond to. All of the issues which the items international group thought were substantive and therefore made recommendations on, and these issues were identified, not by us but by MSSI in their road map. We have responded to all of those issues. So the claim that we have not responded, I do not believe is valid, and that is one of the main substances that I believe that we should be saying. The second allegation that they make is we did not respond to all of the questions raised by MSSI, and indeed that is correct, and it was a

conscious choice and I believe that we are reasonable to stand by it. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. I am glad you did say what you did then and following on from Olivier. I certainly agree with what you've said as well as what Olivier said as well as of course, Tijani conflict of diplomacy as being important here. We need to look very specifically at what these communication channels are. I don't know who the non-commercial stakeholders group may be writing their letter to. I assume it will be to the organizational effectiveness committee, and the ICANN board, as well as the contracted party house. If that's the case, I don't see that we actually have the right to interfere with that interaction. It is, I agree Alan, arguable and defensible that some of the claims that the contracted party house letter that we have seen, our [inaudible] false, but that's up to the organizational effectiveness committee, and indeed the ICANN board to deliberate, discuss, or dismiss. This is not a public comment period, this is not an opportunity for any part of the ICANN wider ICANN community to interact with us, the at-large advisory committee on this review. So, I am not saying we should treat this with the disdain that it so rightfully deserve, I am saying I am not sure that I see an appropriate communication channel for us to even do other than go, well I am sorry you feel this way, so noted. But certainly use all the interactions, diplomacy, and discussions that one can do, to see if we can change what are, in my view, sadly misaligned and misdirected beliefs, that you possibly politically motivated. I am saying that as co-chair of the review working party, I just don't see what actual business it

is of ours, to interact with the correspondent to who it is addressed, when we are not even in that address list. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If I may summarize what you said. I think what you're saying is, we should not have formal interactions with those, the senders in relation to this letter, but we should respond to the board or the OEC as appropriate. Am I reading that correct?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You're probably going a little further than I was saying. I am quite happy for us to make our opinions in response to their letters, or letter, but letters we assume to the OEC. But, this is the same as neighbour writing to the local council, and saying our dog is barking. They're not writing to us. When the local council asks us, is our dog barking or not, then we get to reply. But right now, we don't even know if the local council cares that the neighbour is concerned about our dog. Do you see what I mean, we're not actually in that communication link to be putting this much effort and this much energy into it. Is it disappointing? Yes. Should we be doing much about it? I doubt we should, other than conversations in back channel.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two points. Number one, I have been advised that we probably should respond to the, not respond but comment to the board on our position because of this. That it would not be wise to not respond. Number one. Number two. I have also been informed that the

NCSG letter was sent, and will be posted shortly but I've asked for a copy immediately.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl again. Fine, if the OEC, or whoever it is, believes that it would be useful to their deliberations to have something on their books in terms of responses from us, fine. But, let's stick to the facts, and we went through an enormous amount of effort to put the implementation plan together and justify why we were not responding to things like the independent examiners specific questions. Now, as for the MSSI exercise in whatever it was the MSSI thought they were going to do. I think we should be able to cover that off in one sentence, but let's keep it in perspective. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, I am not contemplating anything exceedingly long. Leon is next on the agenda and he may choose to have some words of wisdom. I will say, I have not received anything formal from the board or from the OEC saying that we should respond. I don't think we're going to get advice from them as to how we respond to this. I think it's going to be upto us to decide. At this point, if we are going to send something and it is going to have an impact then it must reach the OEC prior to their meeting on the 29th. That gives us a few days. What I am proposing is that something will be drafted in the next day or two, and it will be passed by the ALAC for any comments, you will have a very short comment period, and then it will be, I will take it upon myself as chair to send it with the support of the ALT, to be ratified after the fact and that

is in accordance with our rules of procedure. I don't believe we have time to do anything more elaborate than that. Any further comments before we go onto the next agenda item, which is Leon has asked for some time to talk to us? And of course, he may choose to talk about this but that's his call, we haven't discussed ahead of time what he's going to be discussing. Any further comments or questions on procedure? Not hearing anything, Leon, the floor is yours.

LEON: Thank you very much Alan, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you well.

LEON: Thank you very much. So, we have been following this discussion, the board just formally received the NCSG letter, and it will be posted soon to the correspondence website, I assume. So I think I can't advise you at this point, on whether to reply to the senders or not. My guess is that you should maybe just follow up with the board and the OEC, and my mind doesn't come any precedent of a review that was intervened this way by other parts of the community. So, I guess this will need to be handled accordingly by both the OEC and the board. But, yes the board, in the end needs to take into account all the input from the community, although I've noted by Cheryl, this is not a public comment period and any comments should have been submitted in time, and if they were taken into account by the reviewer or by the different bodies, well they

are there. If they are not, well they didn't make it. That's what I have to say in regard to both the contracted party house letter, and the NCSG letter.

I am here to talk to you about what happened in the board workshop in Vancouver, as you know we held a workshop last week, two weeks ago, and during that workshop we held four public sessions, which included a public board meeting. I was constantly in contact with you, letting you know the times and the ways to connect to the Adobe Connect room, which by the way worked marvellously and we had no issues with it, so I guess you should soon maybe be coming back to Adobe Connect in your meetings. So, we had originally planned our workshop, we of course, have many issues to discuss, but in the end, GDPR issue dominated the discussions, and we have to reorganize our whole workshop to discuss the approval or the modification to temporary specification. As you are aware, these temporary specification on registration data for gTLDs, was circulated to the community and the board at the same time. This means that the board didn't have a chance to see that specification before it went live, so what we did, as I said, was to reorganize our workshop so that we could analyze the proposed temporary specification that the organization had setup, and we discussed it very robustly and I could say very heatedly amongst board members. Of course, we evaluated the model that was presented by the organization, and also the input that was in from many parts of the community, because while we were looking at this temporary specification, of course, we received all sorts of input from different parts of the community.

The main topics that were discussed in regard to the temporary specification were how would these proposed temporary specification could facilitate compliance with GDPR. As you know, the contracted parties have obligations to ICANN, in regard to collecting and maintaining data related to WHOIS. So, ICANN cannot impose any obligations on contracted parties that force them to violate local law, or any laws at all, so this is why we are in this period of kind of uncertainty and struggle with the [inaudible], in regards to registration data services. Other topic that we analyzed was the guidance on addressing [inaudible] interpretation of terms arising out of GDPR. The letters that the board received from Article 29 working group. Article 28 working group is the one in charge of working with GDPR in the European community, so as you may be aware the organization requested guidance from Article 29 in order to better interpret what the GDPR means to ICANN and of course, its community and contracted parties. We also analyzed the potential for use of common anonymized email addresses for registrations, this is an idea that just came up in a way that when you raised the domain name, there would be... or when you try to access the registration data for a domain name, there would be a webform would ultimately lead to an anonymized email, so you could contact the registrar. This is of course, something that has been discussed, [inaudible] temporary specification at this moment, but it's something that was discussed in our workshop. We also discussed the access rights to work with patient mechanisms, of course, we could not come to a conclusion as this is just not something that the board needs to decide, but this needs to be a result of a PDP process from the wider community. We also reviewed the [inaudible] for further community action, such as the continued work to develop an accreditation model,

as I said, and the general need for a temporary specification. Although this was need or not, the conclusion for this was that it was needed, hence we approved it. The ICANN compliance [inaudible] and the ability to work in the temporary specification if needed. This temporary specification is the main [inaudible], it's not set in stone, and it can be modified during the course of its effectiveness. This temporary specification is initially up to be in place for one year, but the board will be reconvening every 90 days to re-approve its adoption or to make changes accordingly. So there might be some issues that might be solved during the course of the PDP that may be incorporated into the temporary specification, so then the board could do that to just modify the temporary specification, in order to be incorporating thing that may solve the [inaudible] to be addressed, of course. The temporary specification is far from being perfect, of course, it's not flawless, but the board thought that this was the best path at hand to find a balance between the obligations of contracted parties with ICANN, and the legitimate interest for access to data by other parts of the community. This said, we also spent a full day discussing approach, the strategic planning for the 2021, 2025 period, and we held as well a lot of discussions on this issues, and this will, of course, feed into the process of building the strategic plan for this period, as I said. So, it's good to be here again, it's good to be back home, and I, of course, will be willing t o answer a couple of questions if you have any. Thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Leon. Anyone have any questions for Leon? This may be a short meeting. Well in the absence of anyone else, I will ask a question. Leon, the interim specification, temporary specification, which

to be clear, this is a provision for those who may not be aware, this is a provision in the contracts with registrars and registries, saying that in the event that something, a policy is needed quickly to ensure that the domain name system keeps on working properly, not the exact words, the board can pass policy. That is, this is only exception to the GNSO, to gTLD policy originating with the GNSO. The board can pass policy for a three month period, renewable three times. There will be an expedited PDP, which is a new construct that has not been used before, I believe, that will be charged with addressing a permanent policy in that one year timeframe. For those familiar with the PDP that was previously ongoing, on RDS, you may understand what a challenge this is going to be. But, we do have an interim policy to look at as a potential model. The question for Leon is, if you envision changes during the year, does that constitute a new one year period, and has the board considered what it would do, if at the end of the one year period, the expedited PDP has not resulted in a policy that the board can approve at that point?

LEON: Thank you very much Alan, these are very good questions. So far, to my knowledge, modifying the temporary specification would not imply that a new one year term would initiate after the moderation of the [inaudible]. As you said, this is a new process, it hasn't been done before, this is the first time that the board has been in the need to act in this case of emergency, so this is a first for everyone. As I said, I don't think that modifying the temp spec will actually re-initiate the one year period of its validity. Just remember, that this needs to be reaffirmed every 90 days, so I don't think it will initiate another one year period. As to the question on what would happen if we get to the year that we

have from now to the end of the temporary specification validation, fine. Well if we get to that point the contracted parties will not be subject, or will not be obligated to follow the temporary specification. What happens now is that the contracted parties are obliged to follow this temporary specification, but if we get to the year that is the furthest point that we can reach with this temp spec, and we don't just have a consensus policy on the expedited policy development process, then the contracted parties would be released from this obligation and they could choose to do as they wish.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Leon, but of course, if they're released from this one then the old policy becomes active again, and the full WHOIS policy, which clearly will not work, so clearly it will be interesting if we get to that point. The registrars have requested...

LEON: Just remember Alan, that the WHOIS as it exists, is not in compliance with the GDPR.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand but it would be our policy at that point even if it's not in compliance.

LEON: Yeah, but it wouldn't be in place, it wouldn't be effective, because we cannot force the contracted parties, so as the contracted parties or anyone to actually break the law.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we revert to a compliance model of saying what we're not going to enforce. Question, the registrars have asked for a 6 month abeyance from any compliance on this new policy. Has the board reacted to that?

LEON: I am sorry Alan, I lost that part, can you repeat it?

ALAN GREENBERG: The registrar stakeholder group has asked for a 6 month period with compliance not taking any action on the new policy, that is not enforcing it, the new policy, for the first 6 months. I'm just wondering if the board has reacted to that or not?

LEON: We have not, and this is, of course, something that the compliance department needs to address and take care.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other comments or questions for Leon? Any other issues you would like to raise with Leon. I see no hands and I haven't heard any voices.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just wanted to follow on from this discussion to advise that large advisory committee that today, earlier in my today anyway, the GNSO council conducted a 90 minute call relating to their decision to go an expedited PDP process, the [inaudible] untested a new model of PDP, and a number of things will continue to be discussed relating to that, it's also going to be on the agenda for the GNSO council meeting on the 24th, later this week. [inaudible] to say however, that it is, at this stage the intent of the GNSO council at least, to do it [inaudible] to come up with a workable and effective, and agreed model for the expedited PDP, for example, membership, where [inaudible] specific enough so that it addresses the necessary, if not the nicety, and to make this system work. However, one point that was raised in that meeting today that I wanted to alert you to, was that it was indicated, unless I was hearing incorrectly, that should the GNSO council, for whatever reason, fail to manage an effective PDP process in these 365 days. I will be asking the board, for example, the same questions that you've asked regarding any reset on changes on a 90 day turnover etc. But, should those efforts fail, they said that the board would in fact be in a position to then manage a process without the GNSO being in the driver's seat. I wonder whether or not, the automatic default would be back to a patently uncompliant

set of rules, but just to let you know the GNSO council has planned on extra work and attention on this. This meeting was not suddenly called today, it was planned to be called in case the board did what the board has done, so that they can do the best to let the timeline of the 365 day limitation. More on that as it happens, but I didn't come away from today's meeting with the understanding that it would be an auto reset to the [inaudible] on the previous model being the compliance based one. That's it from me. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. Two questions. Number one, you implied that the GNSO is considering to what extent, I think if I heard you correctly, to what extent this will be a free for all, anyone can join group, or something more constrained? Do you believe this could result in no participation for at-large? I am not differentiating between anyone can join and we have to name three people, or something akin to that, or are you envisioning there will be no involvement for at-large?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. I will deal with that question first, if you don't mind. No, in fact I am able to report that the current thinking, please note that it's current thinking, this is a discussion, were at the preparatory phase of the timeline, not the set in stone phase of the timeline. But the current favour of at least GNSO council representative of the component parts of the structure, on today's call were favouring what we would in shorthand suggested they... more of a cross community style model, but with very specific limitations. The current

thinking is something along the lines of, note that these are not firm thoughts, these are the current feelings that you may have two or probably three members, capital M, Members, from the various component parts of the GNSO, and you would have the ability of having a couple of alternates in that mix for each of those component parts, and you would also have a singular member appointed by the other parts of ICANN, therefore in this case, the at-large advisory committee, with a single alternate so that there would be input from the wider community. So, it would not be a situation at this stage that it would be a closed door, rather that it would be a managed model with a sufficient number of people. It would also be a situation where members will be acting as, we saw in the cross community working groups in the last few years, [inaudible] observers, would still be welcome, so watching briefs will still be held, input should be encouraged in a not dissimilar way to what you saw the at-large advisory committee and the at-large itself using its own five members in the CCWGs, in this case it would be acting in an advisory capacity to the one member and alternate that they are probably going to be having in this expedited PDP. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: But no speaking participants as there were in the CCWG.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. I was saying one member, and alternate.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct, and I'm adding, and no participants who have speaking rights as in the CCWG.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, there would be a tighter control. The concern is that one really needs to also sign up to the timeline and make a firm commitment, so that you wouldn't be saying oh no, I'm too busy for the next three weeks of meetings, we'll have to come back to that later. This is an extraordinarily tight timeline, with the intention of the GNSO council to do it [inaudible] just to meet it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I wasn't debating, I was just making sure everyone understood. One other quick question, I hope a quick question. The GNSO has planned a closed session on this subject for Panama, do you have any comment on that? That's a rather unusual concept, a closed session for the GNSO. I am interested to know.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do not.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have no comment, fine. At this point, you do not know if you're going to be included or not, also I presume, but we can discuss that later.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I have no indication that I am not, but I do not have that confirmed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, any further questions? We have drifted into the subject that was actually next on our item, so I am not too worried about the timing right now. But, does anyone have any further questions for Leon before we go onto the next issue, which is in fact, the GDPR and we have now covered a fair amount of that? Looking for hands. I see nothing, and I will. Thank you very much Leon, you are welcome to stay or leave if you have any other commitments.

LEON: Thank you very much Alan, it has been very good to talk to you and I will say that the board will be, of course, following closely the EPDP, so thanks again for having me here and I will have to leave the call unfortunately, but I am sure we will talk to each other again very soon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alright, the next item is in fact the policy issues and we had two policy issues that I put on the agenda for today. We do have a bit of time if people want to wander into other things. The first one is the temporary specification, which is the interim policy that we just spent a significant amount of time discussing. The second is something the temporary specification presumes exists but without details on it, and that is an accreditation model which allows individuals or organizations to potentially access WHOIS data which is not public, and based on whatever credentials they have, at this point are not clear. This was a

model that was originally proposed by the distance constituency and intellectual property constituency of the GNSO, clearly there has been a lot of other participation in it, and it's evolved, I think we are now on version 5 of this particular model. There have not been a lot of people in at-large involved in it. I have very peripherally looked at it, Hollie has spent some time looking at it. I think this is going to be a rather crucial area and I believe we should have more focus on this, but at this point there certainly has not been. I open the floor, does anyone have any further issues to discuss or raise on either the overall GDPR privacy issue, or on the accreditation model which is a part of it, and the floor is open. I see nothing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, it's Jonathan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes Jonathan please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, I just wanted to let folks know, if they hadn't noticed that I did throw up a draft comment on the version 1.5 of the accreditation model, so it's just something for people to look at. It's been difficult, I think, to reach consensus in the at-large community with respect to the accreditation model in some measure because of the definition of purpose of data collection, and again, tried to sort split the baby and find a compromise position that everyone will be equally unhappy with [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If we can try to find out where that noise is coming from. It seems to be gone. Jonathan, can you elaborate a little bit on the data collection model that made. I know there are people within at-large who have been very vocal saying we cannot collect all of the data, it violates GDPR. I have a real concern with that, because if you can believe that there are reasons that data is needed, even if it is not for ICANN, even if it is for law enforcement. If the data is not collected, it cannot be distributed no matter how good your rationale is. So, how do these people who say we cannot collect the data propose that we implement a WHOIS which will provide the information to at least law enforcement, is the data is not collected? Obviously, privacy officers may ultimately have a ruling on this but from our perspective we're supposed to be building a reliable DNS, and the question I am asking is how are they proposing to address this issue?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess the issue is, you know, taking it a step at a time and that the collection of data has to have a stated purpose that's within the mission of ICANN and so folks who are starting that far back, I mean, this is coming up in the accreditation model. Basically, what's happened thus far, if we looked at all the uses of the data, how is the data being used now, and kind of work backwards to suggest that that was the purpose of the data. There are some within the ICANN community, generally in the at-large community in particular that believe that approach is incorrect and that we need a much more basic usage statement. In other words, what was the purpose of the data, shouldn't be based on

how it's now being used. To some extent this is semantics, and to the other it's a purest approach to reading the GDPR and then obviously, you've taken the position, as many others the BC and the IPC as well, we need an expanded definition of purpose because the internet has evolved in a very dramatic way since WHOIS was created in the first place. I guess that's the... I don't know if that's very enlightening, but that's sort of at the core of the debate, is that we shouldn't be working our way backwards from potential uses of data, in order to determine purpose. The purpose should be based on, you know, what ICANNs purpose is for having the data.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess my confusion is, ICANN's mission is to create, effectively a trusted usagle DNS, and I don't see how one can do that unless you have provision for policing it. Otherwise it cannot have the trusted users, and that is what I believe brings that into our mission and purpose. But we have a speaker queue, Tijani and then Alberto.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. Tijani speaking. I don't think we will solve it now, [inaudible] position. I would like to make a [inaudible]. If someone among us one day, maybe [inaudible], we have to collect all data, so that when this person made the crime, it is easy to catch him [inaudible]. It is the same for the WHOIS. The GDPR is very clear, collecting data related to early [inaudible] purpose and not more than that. Don;t think about other things because when it is needed, we will find them, these data we will find it. Don't say I have to get all data now

because one day perhaps we will need it for law enforcement etc. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. I have a question, when we speak about the law enforcement officers, what is the procedure for them to collect information, to collect data, because when we have information we have data on the WHOIS that can be seen by anybody and some other data, which is not seen by anybody, but when we speak about officers or law enforcement officers, I believe that they have a court order to gather that information, and when we have that court order, nobody can deny that information. So, I don't see anything bad. If they have a court order, everything is OK with them, they can gather the information they need. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The issue is that they cannot gather the information which does not exist somewhere and I think that's part of the question. Of course, we're not just looking at law enforcement, we're also looking at the non-law enforcement cyber people, but again Tijani says, we're not going to address the issue right now, I was just trying to explore some of the issues that were raised directly because of the accreditation model and we have Hadia next.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, so I think we should not be dragged into thinking about the cases for which this data is going to be used. I believe we should only stick to the purpose and this is what is required for ICANN to accomplish its mission. So, if the data is required for ICANN to accomplish its mission, then it should be collected. I don't think we should be dragged into thinking, and then after collecting the data, who is going to need it, who is going to use it, what case is the people who need it. We stick to ICANN and what is required for ICANN. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Hadia. The question is the definition of ICANNs mission, and different people have different views of that, that's one of the core questions. Alberto, is that a new hand?

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. No it was from my previous question. Sorry for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alright, any further comments or questions on this agenda item? I see no hands, I hear no voices. The other issue that I put onto this policy discussion, is the specific reviews and the short term options, and there are two different parts to that, one is the RDS part, which I can certainly give a strong opinion of, on behalf of the RDS working group as its chair, and I will summarize that very quickly, and specifically we were not consulted or informed this was coming. The document has a number of factual errors in it, and a number of other implications. I

will give an example, it says if we continue the review right now it will cost an additional $460,000. Whereas if we curtail the review, that money will be largely saved. The reality is, in fact in this fiscal year we are about $400,000 ahead of our budget, that is unspent, and if the review continues into the next fiscal year we will probably spend about $150,000, not $460,000. Those numbers are very rough. Like other parts of ICANN, these budgets were done by ICANN staff without any consultation with us, and do not bear a lot of resemblance to reality. I believe a lot of the statements, the facts on which the comment is based, there are significant number of errors in it. You've gotten a glimpse into the statement that we're going to be making, the RDS review team is going to be making. The ALAC, of course, can make a statement that may be quite different from that, and I welcome other people to provide input on it. Hollie already has provided some input, but I look forward to some other people as well. The other one is on the ATRT, and there are several options that are provided for ATRT. The first option is no change, the review goes ahead and basically they have to respond to how the previous ATRT was implemented and do anything else as appropriate. The second one is to limit it to the just the specifications, just the review of the last ATRT, and of course, that's not a decision that the community can make. The review team, once it convenes can override that should it chooses, but I presume if there's a strong message from the community, the review team may choose to follow it. The third option is to defer the review for another year, and at that point the review will have to consider whether it does thing in addition to the ATRT 2 analysis, and by that time it will have had the answer from the ICANN board on what it is doing with work stream 2, and therefore could factor that into its decision. If the review team

convenes now, it will do most of its work in absence of knowing how the board is responding work stream 2 of the CCWG, and I'm wondering does anyone have any input on it? We have a number of people who have been named, who were have identified as potential candidates for this review team, and I was wondering if anyone on this call would like to comment based on that?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, are you asking people who are likely to serve to comment? Or are you asking people to comment based on the fact that you've had people who are likely to serve basically waiting to be deployed for well over 12 months now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I am asking anyone who has any thoughts on it whatsoever, whether they are the people who are waiting to be deployed or otherwise. You are the lead person waiting to be deployed, or one of the lead people waiting to be deployed, so I welcome comments from you. Vanda is also on this call and she is also on the list.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. I will [inaudible] and utterly and absolutely person opinion, but not one that is unrelated to work in the accountability work for ICANN, not only the review teams in the past, but also the CCWG work streams 1 and 2. I think the latter one is a bit of a hollow argument, in as much of the three options there, that you outlined Alan. Only in as much as, there's always going to be, we need a bit more time

to implement, oh we haven't quite finished this. I am unconvinced of the validity of waiting until implementation, primarily or otherwise of the work stream 2 recommendations are done, as a winning argument. But I do understand why that may be appealing. I really think, from my point of view, should go ahead, and that there is little point in demanding limitations to its mandate, other than to remind the ATRT, that yes whilst it has certain rights to establish its own key objectives with certain hard coded parts still in it, of course, such as the review of the effectiveness of the last review. But, I think it would be a very silly ATRT that ignored the feelings of the community, including the letters that have already been sent, relating to trying to narrow and control the remit. I guess I would suggest that out of all of the reviews, that one, this should just get on with the job and hopefully be not too far out of sync with the next round. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think any comment we make also has to factor in the cost. I mean, the rationale for having this comment, perhaps is work on the community, but since the work is focused on a very small number of people who have volunteered, I suspect the dollars saving in this fiscal year are something we cannot ignore. The numbers that have been proposed are something in the order of a quarter to a third of a million dollars for options B and C for the ATRT. Just a thought, but I think we will have to comment on that if we include that overall... if we make a statement at all. Anyone else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree there Alan, but what here in the future is some form of budget boogeyman not going to be an issue?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just commenting. Perhaps the long term one is the question there, do we need all these reviews and should they be held at the same frequency, and things like that. The long term question certainly is something that we have to comment on. [inaudible] Any further comments on it? We have now managed to use up pretty much all of our time. I am not against moving onto the next agenda item, we seem to have no other speakers at this point. Do we have someone speaking or just an echo? Just an echo, call in user 6 seems to be causing a problem. So perhaps call in user 6 can be muted, maybe they have been already. The next agenda item is at-large elections, selections, and appointments, and a relatively quick one. The positions have largely been selected in several of the RALOs. There are elections going on in NARALO for the NomCom recommendation selectee, and for the ALAC seat, there are elections going on within LACRALO for I believe, the chair, the ALAC seat, and the NomCom position, and an election going on for, I believe, the NomCom position in EURALO, if I got that correctly, if not I am close. Several of these elections have had problems in that the big policy configuration was not done properly initially, for a number of reasons. Largely due to the transition of staff and several of these pools had to be restarted to make sure that they were in compliance with our various regulations, including anonymity for individuals selections outside of LACRALO. LACRALO they are not anonymous. Everything at this point, I believe is on track. Some of the selections will be delayed slightly because of this, but I do not believe

that is a substantive issue and will not affect the timing overall. The chair selection is scheduled to begin, assuming we have all the ALAC members selected in the proper time frame, there is, of course, possibility that there could be ties or other unforeseen events in the ALAC selection and that could delay the chair selection, because the ALAC did indicate that they wanted all the new members appointed prior to that selection beginning. If that selection goes smoothly we will have a new chair selected prior to Panama. If, of course, that new chair takes office after the Barcelona meeting, otherwise we will probably make the selection during Panama, if there are some reason that this is being delayed. I don't believe there are anything else we need to report on this issue, it's pleasing to see at least several of the candidates for ALAC seats participating in this meeting, and I thank all of you who are here for this meeting, that does show good intent. I see we have a hand up from Alberto. I don't know if that's a new hand or an old hand.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. This is a new hand Alan. I just wanted to ask staff to please send a reminder of the LACRALO elections, because I'm receiving information from more than 5 people who said they have not received their credentials. These emails may be going to the spam folder, or they may have been some other issues. I think we require a reminder of the closing date and I also wanted to say whether there were some issues with the applications. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, if someone believes they should have received credentials and have not, they should contact staff directly, to make sure that we can rectify that situation. Anyone else have any further comments? Including staff at this point if you feel that it's appropriate. I see no more hands up and no comments, and I believe there was a request for any other business from Javier. Please go ahead Javier. We cannot hear you if you're speaking.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we can.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Very good. I just wanted to remind everybody that tomorrow at 13 UTC the first at-large capacity building webinar, thanks Tijani for getting these together. Tomorrow we'll be speaking on work track 5 of the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. I have the honor of learning from Cheryl who is going to also take on these slides with me, and just to invite you all to be there and I think the idea is to be not only well informed about what is going on with geographic names in work track 5 as TLDs, but also have enough knowledge to come to the work track and impact things as they get ready for the initial report of that this July. So, you're welcome all to come. That's it. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Javier. Any further comments or any other AOB issues? Thank you very much then. I will call this meeting to an end. We are just about on time, we started a few minutes late but we made up for the time, and I think this has been a productive meeting and I look forward to seeing you. We have some extra hands up.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Tijani's hand. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan, just an information. It is not yet sure but it might be good information. The IGF for this year might be [inaudible] and it might be in November, around 20th November. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am sorry. I didn't quite catch what you said. It may be in?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: In Paris.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, Tijani is saying that...

ALAN GREENBERG: In Paris, France. That is what you're saying. Sorry your voice was a bit muffled and it wasn't clear, just wanted to make sure. Thank you very much.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Alan, it's Judith. The IGF... I also wanted to talk about the additional budget request, and the budget request that came out, but it's a much longer topic than what we have left for the meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes it is right now, since we are just about over time. Next time please suggest it earlier and we will do our best to fit it in.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes and as for the IGF, there is still no election time, it could be options are either December in Asia, most likely Bangkok, or November in Paris but overlapping with the ITU meetings on the planning [inaudible] which is an extremely important meeting. It will cause great damage if it's done in November. Let's hope that they pick December.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I note in the chat that there's someone petitioning to hold the meeting in Paris.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think that's Evin.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments before we close the meeting? Tijani, is that a new hand? It is an old hand and we have a smile for Javier. I think on a smile we will call the meeting to a close, thank you all for participating. Bye-bye.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, this meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of your day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]