
CLAUDIA RUIZ: ... May 2018 at 18:00 UTC. On the call today, we have Alan Greenberg, Yrjo Lansipuro, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Seun Ojedeji, Maureen Hilyard, Barrack Otieno, Manal Ismail, Tom Dale, and Bartlett Morgan. From staff, we have Yesim Nazlar, [inaudible], Robert Hoggarth, Heidi Ullrich, Julia Charvolen, Silvia Vivanco, Gisella Gruber; and myself, Claudia Ruiz, on call management. Before we begin the call, I would like to remind everyone before speaking to please state your name for the transcription purposes. With this, I hand it over to you, Yrjo. Thank You.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you very much. I am chairing this meeting because Alan says that he has chaired enough meetings for today. So, I'll try my best. I'm on the telephone, and if that fails, somebody else. I think Alan and Manal will take over.

Welcome, all. We have the agenda displayed here. There is kind of duplication in the sense that the GDPR and the new gTLD are actually twice mentioned here. The purpose of this call is to prepare for the ICANN 62, so that what I propose is that we go straight to agenda point four and talk about the things we have up in the meeting at ICANN 62. Is this acceptable?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sounds like a good plan to me.

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.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay, thank you. So, the first item here or sub-item under agenda point four, there's an introduction to the ALAC. This was news to me, but Heidi explained that this was discussed in Puerto Rico and it was thought that it was useful for the GAC members to actually hear a short explanation what the ALAC is about. I'm certainly willing to do that. Of course, that would be more for Alan, but anyway, somebody [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't ask to have your name put there. We can certainly discuss who does it then and how. I'm willing to do it or do part of it. The general feeling was there are so many new GAC members that if we're going to have meaningful discussions and some sort of interaction, then it probably is worthwhile spending a few minutes – not a large part of the hour – on just an overview of what the ALAC and At-Large are and why we're there and how we complement the GAC.

YRJO LANSIPURO: I completely agree. Manal, is this something that the GAC would like to hear?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, Yrjo. Thank you. Actually, I had my hand up, but I'm not sure you have seen it. But thank you for asking. I think it's a good idea, and as you and Alan mentioned, we have many GAC team members, so I think it would be [inaudible].

YRJO LANSIPURO:

That's fine. So, we do it. We produce it. Anything else on this point? If not, we go to our favorite [inaudible] for this last recent months. GDPR many months later.

I think that the idea is to see, to compare notes on what actually has happened and whether the sky has been falling. Manal, would you start? What could we say about GDPR at the Panama meeting?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you. I'm going actually to share with you where we stand, from the GAC side where we stand at this point in time. I'm not sure by the time of Panama how things will develop. As you know, things are very dynamic and that's why I think the agenda shows one month later, one month after the 25th of May.

For now, I have just came out of the board meeting where they actually approved the budget, but also they decided on the GAC GDPR advice. The GAC provided GDPR advice to the board in San Juan. Actually, they were [inaudible] of GAC advice, and per today's meeting, the board accepted six pieces of GAC advice and deferred the decision on four pieces, four points, of GAC advice.

Those points, actually, we had a discussion before the board meeting and we knew about the difficulty for those four pieces of GAC advice, and actually they agreed on a deferral date on the GAC request.

Those four points are already part of the [inaudible] annex, which is quite important issue for further community action. So, the GAC really hoped to work with the whole community on those pending issues as

soon as feasible and as soon as possible, and not necessarily waiting for a whole year before getting things done.

I think it's important, first, from a GAC perspective to [seek] how the community can agree on, how agreed incremental changes could be added to the [inaudible] as we go. And second, how the different parts of the community will be able to participate to the [inaudible] PDP.

So, we really hope that thing could be implemented [inaudible] and not necessarily after a year from now when the [inaudible] PDP concludes. Let me also maybe give you a quick brief on the fourth point that were deferred from the GAC advice, one on confidentiality of [inaudible] for the registration data by law enforcement authorities. The second on limitations in terms of query volume envisaged under an accreditation program balanced against [inaudible].

The third point is distinguishing between legal and natural persons, and of course the most important, consistent process for continued access to registration data basically between now and the time when a final accreditation and access mechanism is fully operational.

So, those are the four points that were within the GAC advice to the board and where the board deferred decision on those four points. We hope that between the interim model and the [ultimate] model we can work on incremental changes and incremental deployment of any agreed additions in light of those four pieces of GAC advice.

So, I hope you find this useful. Over to you, Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you very much, Manal. That was a good summary of the GAC thinking. I can't see, unfortunately, on my screen any hands raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: My hand is up.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah. Please, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I have a question for Manal. Something I certainly could raise and I guess I want your opinion on whether I should raise it or not. That is with regard to GDPR, there seems to be a fair amount of tension within countries between privacy officers or privacy advocates and those who are concerned with cybersecurity, whether it's law enforcement or private cyber monitoring.

The question I could ask is how are governments handling that pressure between the different parts of the same government? I don't know. I'm certainly interested in it, but I'm not sure it's a can that we want to open. I guess I'll follow your recommendation as to whether to ask it or to be quiet.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Manal, please?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Yeah. This is [inaudible]. First of all, we have both views within the government, within the GAC representatives. But also, as you rightly mentioned, within the law enforcement part of the government, who are also represented in the Public Safety Working Group within the GAC.

To our best, we are trying to reach consensus on everything we submit before sharing with the community. It's not easy, as you may guess, but we're doing our best and we're trying now to have a small group that would be in charge of compiling very quickly any GAC input to the expedite PDP. I mean, it's obvious from [inaudible] that the pace is going to be even faster than what the GAC has been already complaining about. We're trying to [inaudible] in order to cope with the pace of the [inaudible] PDP. We're trying to put a small group in place so that we can try to [inaudible] our differences and get something that has the GAC consensus quickly and timely submitted to the [inaudible] PDP.

Apart from that, I think that the national level remains at the national level, so there's nothing we can do about it. I hope I answered this question.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, the question really wasn't how you're coping. Is this an issue I should bring up? The ALAC has the same problem. We have not come to closure on many of the issues associated with GDPR because we have people who believe that privacy is ultimate, and whatever the strictest interpretation of the GDPR is, that is what ICANN should be working to. And we have other people who are very worried that we are building an

environment where we may not be able to create a safe Internet if we do that.

We reflect the same sort of attention between the two. The question is should I raise this and say how we're handling it or not handling it and ask about the GAC? It sounds like that's something that it would be reasonable to raise. I'm not touching sensitivities that you don't want to raise in public.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. I'm sorry. I didn't get the question at the beginning. But, yeah, definitely please raise it. It would be good to know, also, how the ALAC are dealing with the changes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or not dealing. We have an easy way out. We can simply say we haven't come to a single conclusion. You're in the position where you either have to give advice or not give advice.

YRJO LANSIPURO: [inaudible] thing on this as far as the government is concerned, [inaudible] to registration, registrars about GDPR. So, the situation is evolving all the time. I think those chairs are my sympathy in coping with the different opinions in their bodies. Anybody else on GDPR?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't see anymore hands.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Okay. Thank you for being my hand spotter because for some reason I can't see. Basically, the result of this discussion is that this item will be on the agenda and we'll compare notes between ALAC and GAC. Maybe we can even help each other one way or the other.

The next point of the agenda, sub-point C, geographic names works track 5 matters. Well, again, following all this track 5 meetings including today and somehow the discussion seems to be stuck quite – how will I say? Anyway, Manal, would you like to tell us [inaudible] experience in the track 5 work?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Yrjo. I hope if we have other GAC colleagues as well that they chime in to correct or complement what I'm saying.

In terms of process, the GAC is a bit concerned with the timeline for work track 5 on geographic names to conclude its work, so [inaudible] more generally with the timing of further [inaudible] new gTLDs.

So, in terms of process, we feel that this was a really hot topic that needs discussion. It's too soon to have it concluded with the other tracks as well.

In terms of substance, at some point, the GAC took a study. It was requested to consult with the PDP support staff to prepare a simplified document on key work track 5 discussion points and to [inaudible] that members input on those points. We were then receiving feedback from the different GAC members and this simplified document has been

prepared and is currently being populated by GAC input but has not yet been submitted to work track 5.

It may be based on what work track 5 has been discussing in terms of the different aspects within the geographic. So, it's nothing new. It's simply putting everyone, everything into one [inaudible] so that we can talk to and compile GAC input and have this submitted to work track 5.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Anybody from ALAC side?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm afraid it sounds the GAC is more organized than we are at this point. We have a number of people who are representing the RALOs on the group and we certainly have a number of active participants. I don't think the ALAC has – I know the ALAC has not put together any formal comments or anything.

When we have talked about this in the ALAC before, the largest single conclusion we came to is the bulk of the people in At-Large, these folks who have participated, do not really care what the answer is, but are adamant that we do not have strong winners and losers. Although we may not take the same position as some of the more strident people in the GAC, it is really important that no one come out of this feeling that they have lost and are therefore we're going to have difficulty in the actual implementation of any new round.

Certainly, the last time we had the discussion, that was a very strong conclusion. Now that we're actually getting down to the details, it will

be interesting to see whether we maintain that or start taking stands on particular issues.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Well, it seems to me, like even today, [inaudible] somehow it seems that it's becoming as a principle discussion. It's a little bit dangerous. [inaudible] discussion city names, not capital cities but city names otherwise. The [inaudible] opinions, [inaudible] opinions on both side. On one side, we have heard today that cities have no legal rights to their names. I don't know what we should say about all those documents where varies kings and [inaudible] and parliaments had actually funded cities and put their name on them. Are they not legal? That's from the other side. We have the other opinion [inaudible] opposed, which seems that every little town and [inaudible] has actually exclusive rights.

Somehow, I think that what we could do and perhaps what we could do together would be somehow ... As I said, I've been trying to find ways to solve problems without [inaudible] level.

The other example is the intended use with [inaudible]. Basically, whether intended to [inaudible] or not. [inaudible] the non-objection. That is to say, again, this seems to, at least to me, somehow [inaudible] asking for non-objection is not a [inaudible] somehow the applicants throws himself or herself at the mercy of the city or [inaudible]. But, it's just a convenient mechanism. So, a lot of things [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yrjo, we have a queue of people with hands up.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: We have Barrack and Cheryl with their hands up.

ALAN GREENBERG: We also have me, and in one of the lists Manal has her hand up and I don't know if it's real or not because she shows up in one list but not the other. Manal, if you're still on the phone and want to speak, why don't you go first.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alan. Just very quickly to support what you have said. I think that's why the GAC would like to give more time to the process, so that no one feels that they were not heard. The reason we had this simplified document together, GAC input, was that we received tons and tons of expressions of interest in the topic and people who wanted to participate to the process. But those who are actively participating are less than a few. That's why we tried to proactively tried to [inaudible] input from different GAC members. [inaudible], I give you and others requests for the floor to speak. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't know the order. Why don't we go with Cheryl first? Cheryl, can you speak?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, I can. I was just going to say I think it's appropriate for me to [inaudible] on this queue because I see switching hats.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Barrack?

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay, thank you. I wanted to share an observation I made in the work track 5 conversation. I see the conversation [inaudible] technical, for lack of a better word, because mostly now it's the service providers that are making arguments for and against what should be done or how the Applicant Guidebook should be updated. I think what I have noticed is there's a big gap because countries or territories of countries that are to be affected don't seem to really understand what's happening or what is going on.

[inaudible] the commercial benefits insofar as geographic names are concerned. There's also a public interest perspective that is being discarded. The balance between the two issues are not coming out very clear. I suggest that probably this is an area that requires a bit more information or a bit more capacity building for people that are ... For [inaudible] or interested participants to be able to equipped with the right knowledge to be able to make proper decisions. Otherwise, it will continue to be a difficult conversation. So, just an observation I made that the meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I think I'm the last one in the queue before Cheryl. Just a couple of very short comments. Like GDPR, I think we have an issue here that different people have different views of what public interest is. In some countries, cities do have legal rights to their name within their countries. Unfortunately, we're dealing with a global resource in top-level domains and the laws that apply because a king gave a city a name does not necessarily apply in another jurisdiction far, far away.

If you take almost any popular city name or any large city, you'll find 30 of them around the world. They're certainly not protected in those other places. That's what makes it difficult because different people have different perceptions. Trademark people will clearly think it is in the public interest that a large, prominent company be able to use their name. It's resolving these different views of the public interest so that in my point anyway, so there are not great winners and losers, but somehow we come to compromise is the real challenge. Cheryl, you're next.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. I'm not speaking other than the co-chair of the Subsequent Procedures PDP, and therefore in overall charge of work track 5 [inaudible].

We recognize that [inaudible] to earlier points, that there are extreme time pressures on that, but we're not going to stop ... Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sorry, Cheryl. I don't know what you're asking. We can hear you talking.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I heard someone making a comment. I thought someone wanted to speak or I couldn't be heard, which wouldn't surprise me at the moment. I'm coming down with a cold again.

We aren't going to apologize for a very aggressive timeline, and should work track 5 need to exceed the timing of the final report for the other work tracks, then we have a very real risk of the default of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook being the only way that geographic names are treated. And what we have seen and heard since 2012 and during 2012 is a great desire for some improvements where possible if we can reach consensus and make recommendations on both pre- and post-delegation improvement. Now, in the post-delegation world, it also includes things like remedial actions that are in various jurisdictions.

So, what we're doing now, looking at that flow chart that we've created and trying to find out where some adjustments can be made is vitally important and I think, Manal, your documents that we look forward to receiving from the GAC will be very useful to us in that, and hopefully that document will continue to be modified as we go through that process.

The other huge advantage for both the ALAC and the GAC to realize is that with the release shortly – it should've happened already, but if not it will happen in a few hours – of the working document and the working document is a collaborative tool which will continue to collect the input we see happening from list discussions and from, indeed, our face-to-face meetings in ICANN 62, remembering that there are two

workshop-style activities for work track 5, which of course is the more GAC and ALAC people can be present in that and making their voices heard, the better. So, input from that will be added to it and input of course from our meetings and meeting notes.

We're hoping that that will also [inaudible] power through what we recognize is a very aggressive timeline, but the fear certainly from my perspective is if we cannot bring work track 5 work to [inaudible] ending, we're at least getting a few necessary modifications done. Then we will move to a next round with [inaudible]. Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Cheryl, for this information. Okay. Are we through with geographic names here?

ALAN GREENBERG: The only hand I see is Barrack's and I assume that's an old one, so let's go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay. So, D, ICANN information [inaudible] initiatives [inaudible] and how it relates to joint ALAC-GAC Abu Dhabi statements [inaudible] for meaningful, informed, and inclusive participation in ICANN matters.

I think, Alan, you wanted this on the agenda. So, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure I want it on the agenda. The question is, it's a follow-on at some level to the joint GAC-ALAC statement that was made a couple of meetings ago. The question is do we want a discussion on it?

To be honest, my inclination is ICANN is proceeding at this at I want to say a leisurely rate, but are doing this in a very organized way and I'm not sure there's really a lot to talk about the ITI right now. Although I put it on the agenda, I'm not convinced it's something we need to focus on, other than perhaps to keep our joint statement alive and visible. But my inclination at this point is to probably take it off, but I'm willing to listen to anyone else if they disagree.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Manal, what do you think?

MANAL ISMAIL: Hello, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm sorry. I had to disconnect and connect again. I heard when you were concluding the geographic names. If there are any comments on agenda item D [inaudible].

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah. Thank you. This was about the ICANN information transparency initiative and how it relates to the joint ALAC-GAC Abu Dhabi statement on [relevant] barriers for informed, inclusive, and meaningful participation. Alan just said that he's not real clear whether we should have this on the agenda in Panama other than just to remind everybody about the existence of our joint statement and that we want to follow-up. [inaudible] your opinion [inaudible] keep this item on the Panama agenda.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Yrjo. And thanks, Alan. Apologies for disconnecting and connecting again. Frankly, it depends on what the next steps are. I mean, we have already issued this joint statement and this is part of our GAC Communique of Abu Dhabi. So, it's got [inaudible] the new platform, the ARR, the Action Request Registry.

I have to say that every time we follow-up on this GAC advice with [inaudible] tool, the ITI initiative, the Information Transparency Initiative. And to be very frank, I'm not really sure how the initiative maps to the advice. I mean, does it cover everything that we have included in our joint statement or is this not necessarily a troubling [inaudible] advice? I'm not sure, but actually, this is what documented – we had two pieces of GAC advice. One on developing a [inaudible]

document management system, and this is where we were referred to the ITI initiative. And the other piece was producing easily understandable executive summaries and key points and synopsis in plain English. Again, here we were referred to what ICANN already produces in the form of monthly one-page PDP updates; regular, clear, enforced ICANN meeting reports and newsletters; the brief [inaudible] interviews; they conduct the ICANNLearn online platform. Even with live captioning and the executive summaries of all PDPs and the slide decks and infographics.

So, again, I'm not sure here what the next step would be. So far, it's flagged as open in the action request registry. So, it's not yet closed as GAC advice, but I'm not sure how we can jointly follow-up on this. As I mentioned, I'm not sure also how the ITI maps to this as well.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let me try to address those issues. The ITI is certainly not going to be a quick fix to document management. We were talking about something quick and ICANN is saying we're going to do it properly and those two do not map to the same thing. They didn't map to the same thing when it was announced and with budget concerns, it will probably be slowed down even more.

On that one, to be honest, I think a reasonable conclusion is to say we'll be patient and wait because I can't really see ICANN doing something in parallel as a quick fix while they're trying to build an overall good system. I don't know how we finesse that, but that's where I think we stand. So, either we say, "No, it's not acceptable. You have to do

something immediately,” or we accept that this will be part of an evolution.

In terms of the simple documents and things like that, I think that one is more relevant. Certainly, the next item on our agenda is the At-Large Review and a very key part of the implementation that the ALAC is proposing is the existence of understandable documents that will make something understandable to someone who is not already part of our ecosystem.

The document that ICANN does right now I don’t think quite hit that mark and we are going to be forcing the issue to try to get some of those out, at least on some critical issues, if not all.

But, from our timeline, that’s going to probably happen starting after July, maybe even after October, as we start planning the implementation of our review. So, although I think there’s a good overlap between what we are planning to ask for and what was asked for in our joint statement, the timing is not right at this point for us to push the issue.

I guess, in summary, both of those items are still open and I don’t think ICANN is fully [aggressing] them today, but in terms of priority, part because of the review and just part because of the number of other really critical issues that are on our table right now, I can’t see us focusing on them in depth over the next couple of months in any case.

I guess my advice would be to just know that they’re kept open and we are going to have to make progress on them, but it’s nothing that we are even in a position to – certainly in the case of the documents, simple

documents, we're not even in a position to identify to ICANN what the problems are. We will be doing a lot of that work come later in the year and over the coming year, but we're just not ready to put energy into it today.

That's why I suggesting that let's just leave it off the agenda, knowing that it's still sitting there. It's just not an item that's high enough priority for us to take action on today.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Alan. There are a couple of suggestions in the chat from Maureen and from Cheryl. To the effect that this could remain in the agenda as a sort of reminder that we still are interested in it, but that it would be just a small point and mostly just a reminder rather than a deep discussion. Would that be [inaudible] fine with the deck slide?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Yes, I think it's an [excellent] suggestion that the slide deck [inaudible] given the current situation [inaudible] have it as a priority at this meeting.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you. Okay, so we go further to the sub-point 40, [inaudible] update on At-Large review. Alan, please?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, certainly, whatever the status is then, we're prepared to talk about it. At this point, the current proposal has gone before the OEC. My understanding is things are moving forward. There's not been an official answer coming back. I am optimistic that the proposal that the – the implementation plan that the ALAC has provided will be approved by the board prior to Panama. We can talk a little bit about that.

I don't know how, to what extent, Manal and the GAC people are aware of some of the things that have been going on in the last few weeks. To quickly summarize, the recommendations in the report were, from our point of view, not very acceptable. They recommended a number of things that not only would be bad if implemented in our minds, but would be catastrophic. That put the OEC in a difficult position of what to recommend to the board. What we ended up coming up with is they asked MSI to put together essentially a mapping of the issues raised. Not the recommendations made, but the issues raised in the report with what we were proposing to do about it and that has progressed through a number of stages and that is the proposal that is now before the OEC and the board.

In the last few weeks, the board and OEC received letters from the contracted party house, the registrars and registries, and from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group basically demanding that they not approve our proposal and essentially send it back to us and say we have to implement what was recommended, or at least closer to what was recommended by the reviewers.

In addition to that, there has been some anonymous websites and Twitter accounts that were set up in the last couple of days, saying

they're going to expose At-Large for the horrible group that we are. So, the politics have gotten really interesting. I won't say a lot more than that, but yes, we are certainly prepared. Whatever the stage is at that point, we are prepared to update the GAC on it without talking about all of the dirty laundry that happened in between.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah. Can I ask Manal, is it okay a short summary of these events to the GAC?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, please. I think it is good to keep the GAC aware and up-to-date on what's happening. I don't think many, if any at all, are following the At-Large review and what has been going on. I have been following it, not so closely, but being on the board, I saw your letter, Alan, to the board and other letters as well, so I'm familiar with the interesting situation. But I doubt the GAC will need a following. So, it would be good, a brief overview on where things are at I think would be useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're certainly not going to advertise the bad things. If nothing else, this will serve to convince the GAC how lucky they are they don't have to have these reviews.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay. Alright. So, we go to the last point here, and right away we have [inaudible] in the chat that six items is a lot for the time we have

available. Anyway, the six points that we proposed is the process for charting organization evaluation of the work stream 2 recommendations. I think, Manal, this came from you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Yrjo. In fact, it didn't come from myself, but it came from the GAC side, as you rightly mentioned on the GAC leadership call.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay. I'm sorry, yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: It's okay. There was a suggestion from one of the vice chairs that we have this on our joint agenda. I think it is more of comparing notes, as you mentioned at the beginning, as well. I'm not deeply involved in the process, so I'm not sure where we actually stand right now and whether a decision will be needed at Panama. So, I stand to be corrected here, but again, it would be good to compare notes as to what the GAC will do and what the ALAC will do as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: The working group is certainly putting pressure on us, at least through our co-chair, that we approve this in Panama. They would really like to see this tied up and completed by then.

We have been watching each of the sections and we made our comments as appropriate. Our comment to the final, the draft report,

where basically we were asking, “Are there any conflicts?” Our comment there basically said we have no problem with the individual items, but as a whole, they are going to put a very, very large demand on the ICANN Organization, on the [inaudible] staff, and on the volunteers to implement.

We have a very great concern that overall the amount we’re going to have to invest in this, although it is all for the in aid of transparency and accountability, there’s going to be a very high cost. As the board implements this, they should factor that in. A sustainable ICANN that doesn’t do any other work because we’re only transparent is not a good thing. So, we do have a concern and it may not be with any of the individual ones one by one, but put together, the total package we think is going to be a very heavy burden and ICANN is going to have to think about that as we go forward with any implementation.

But, that being said, we almost certainly will approve it, but with that warning.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Okay. Thank you. I gather that we should keep this item also on the agenda. I hope that we can make some of these items fairly short, so that we manage to have all these in our meeting in Panama. Any other business?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I don’t have any other business. I just wanted to comment that, in the past, we’ve had a hard time filling out – actually, getting through these

agendas. We did a really good job in San Juan. That is, we said what needed to be said and moved on. I'm hoping we can do the same thing here.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you. Anything else?

MANAL ISMAIL: Just to thank you, Yrjo, Alan, Cheryl, and everyone for the call, and also to thank you for the flexibility in trying to find a common slot for our meeting in Panama and to apologize for any inconvenience caused by changes from our side. I think we're now set and I think we have a solid agenda. Thank you, Yrjo, for chairing this call and keeping us on track and doing a great job in time management as well.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay. thank you very much. We [inaudible] of course the ALAC staff and GAC staff with making the preparations. I want to thank everybody – Manal, Alan, everybody else. Thank you, and my apologies one more I was handicapped because I did not see the hands, pun intended. From my point, [inaudible]. Thank you very much and goodbye.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you, everyone. This call has now been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect your lines and enjoy the rest of your day or evening. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]