ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Yrjo, are you on the call?

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Yes, Alan. I'm on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then, let us start with the first item of new gTLD subsequent procedures. Let me tell you where we are in At-Large. We are valiantly trying to address the issues. As you know, it's a huge report. What we have done so far is we essentially had gone through the questions and tried to identify the ones where we believe there is a significant user either impact or we believe we need to say something. Generally because we believe it's important to users. On occasion, there are things that we are commenting on because we believe it's important that we speak up.

An example of that is on fees. Although the actual level of fees doesn't matter to users a lot, we feel that we have to make sure that the fee does not go down too low because then it becomes a commodity and we believe that the simple proliferation of TLDs, essentially as something that can be stockpiled, is not a good thing for the Internet. So, we are speaking on behalf of things like fees.

But, in general, we're trying to identify what the issues are that are relevant to users and try to formulate comments on them. It's a huge amount of work. We do have a number of people working and we are slowly making progress. The fact that the comments was extended I

think gives us a running chance on actually having a response that is meaningful. I guess I'm curious how the GAC is faring. You two have a problem dealing with such a large document and such a diverse community you're working with.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, Alan, if I may. And apologies for not being in the Adobe room, so I'm not able to raise my hand. Can I speak to this now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please. We're just glad you're here at all.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. As you may guess, we are suffering the same problem. It's a very long report. But, also the EPDP thing consuming all active members. So, we're trying also to compile GAC input. We were encouraged by the [extension] also. It won't be a surprise because it's more or less based on previous GAC advice on the different topics under the different [inaudible], so we're trying to consolidate where we already had a consensus GAC advice and to see if there are new points that we need to tackle and to develop consensus input on.

Something was initially shared with the GAC colleagues on the GAC mailing list from the leadership based on this compilation, but we haven't still heard any feedback on the specific points, so nothing final yet.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess you're in a different position in that you have a long history of advice you have given and you can just stand by it. We're not quite in the same position because, although we were vocal along the way during the implementation at the same time as your advice was being given at various times, we weren't nearly as formal with it. So, I think we're sort of starting almost from a zero base and moving forward.

On top of that, I think there are things that we didn't really come up during the original discussion that are now being discussed. Fees, for instance, are an example of that. Or should this whole thing be cost recovery, which I don't think was considered at that point because there was simply a statement saying it would be cost recovery.

Now with ICANN's financial situation not nearly as strong as it was and we know there's not likely to be a lot of revenue associated with operation of the new TLDs, I think that changes the perspective a little bit, certainly from our point of view.

MANAL ISMAIL: I fully agree. [inaudible] and those are the points I was mentioning, that there are new points, as you rightly mentioned, that were not discussed within the GAC before, so we don't have a consensus GAC input on them yet, so those are the parts that we are taking some time to compile GAC input on. I'm happy to share with you informally my [inaudible] of where we stand if this would be useful to your discussions as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that would be very useful, if you could do that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: All of our stuff is pubic, so it's easily shareable. How easy it is to process it right now, I'm not sure. But, as we get to the point where it's something that [inaudible] ship a document over or point you to something concise, I think we should do that as well.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, sure. Informally, I'll share with you what we are discussing. Right now, it's under discussion. It has not been approved by the GAC yet, but I'll do this and if there is anything you can share with us as well, it will be helpful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll do our best to pull it together. We have a meeting on it tomorrow and I'll raise the issue there to see if we can try to point you to something that's usable.

The next item is the EPDP and current developments. We are working hard at it. It's really clear from the first number of meetings that it's going to be a hard slog. The different factions are starting to show themselves, really, not surprisingly. Clearly, the registrars and registries simply want closure. They want something easy to implement and they

want security, protection from being cited for failure to apply the GDPR. They don't have really strong interests other than to protect themselves and make their lives easier.

The NCSG, with six voices at the meeting, are obviously putting a lot of effort and time into this. They're among the few people that are, other than registries and registrars and intellectual property people, that are clearly doing a lot of homework and putting positions forward. At some point, anytime you put any position forward, it's better than silence. So, they're in a strong position because of that.

I think the GAC, the ALAC, and SSAC, and to some extent the intellectual property people are sort of aligned with each other, but not nearly working together as effectively.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alan. I also agree with you. I can see the GAC, ALAC, the IP groups and the SSAC [views that are] aligned. And you're right. I think if we consolidate views and work more together, maybe we can balance the discussion and make sure our views are well-represented.

I have to admit, I'm not far from the EPDP, so I don't really follow everything real-time. I try to keep up with what's going on. Let me take this observation back to our small team. We have a small team from the GAC working on this. It's mainly the members and the alternates. They are the focal point between the GAC and the EPDP. So, I'll make sure to convey this and to see how we can coordinate together.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. An awful lot is going to focus ultimately on building the case that we have … I'm not sure how to put it. Within At-Large, we've had lots of discussions on this and we keep on coming back to the fact, well, this has to be balanced. But, from a GDPR point, it is going to be balanced because ultimately we are going to have to convince the data commissioners that what we're doing is balanced.

The data commissioners I think are willing to accept absolute privacy, that we shut down WHOIS. The rest of the European governments might not accept it, but I think the data commissioners would.

So, ultimately, our challenge is we have to make strong cases for not shutting it down and making sure we can get access. Much of the discussions that we need to have we're not having yet. Exactly how do we determine who gets access and how easily?

I can easily see this going in ways that are not going to be very good because law enforcement and cyber professionals are going to want relatively quick access to data. It's not enough to say law enforcement has due process. That can take nine months. So, it's going to be the automated access that's going to be the real difficult part. It's going to be hard for us to get that to happen, I think, because talking to registrars, they don't want to take risks of data being given out automatically and then they're accused of not honoring GDPR.

So, I see some real challenges ahead of us, and as I said, the privacy people are working really, really hard to shut as many doors as they can as quickly as possible.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah. I cannot agree more with you. As you already know, the accreditation and access are two topics that are of utmost importance to the GAC. How do you see the unified access model now being discussed? Will it ultimately fit into the same process or …?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the unified access model really is a mechanism by which it will work along with an accreditation model and stuff. I know certainly registrars I have talked to, this is very informally, really feel that they don't want to be able to do things on an automated basis because that gives people too much access without having to really justify the need. So, I see the threats of the unified access model and essentially an automated unified access model as being registrars and registries don't want to take the risk of allowing that to happen. So, that then translates to how do you get enough support for the accreditation model to have faith that the people who are accredited are trustworthy? Those are questions we really haven't dealt with at all. I think we have to end up with a unified access model with automated access, but I don't know how we're going to do it. Certainly not in the timeframes we're looking at.

Anyone else want to speak, please? This doesn't need to be just me and Manal.

ANA NEVES: Okay. I'm Ana Neves. [inaudible] because I'm having problems with my computer. I don't know why. I'm in the conference call through my mobile. It's [inaudible].

I think I missed the first point on the new gTLD procedures because you already discussed it.

ALAN GREENBERG: We did and basically we said we're both working really hard with a huge amount of work and we're trying hard. Manal volunteered to when you have something that you can share, even if it's not yet approved, you'll do that and we will do the same, just to try to give you a head's up of where we're headed, where we're going.

ANA NEVES: Okay. So, I was thinking about what joint discussion between GAC and ALAC could be on this question. So, I think that we are being too passive and I think that we are only following ICANN's agenda and we are not influencing the process anywhere.

So, I thought that maybe in Barcelona we could do something a little different during our joint meeting. We don't have a report of impact saying for what the new gTLD served for. So, do we really need them? I know that everybody is working on the new round, blah-blah-blah. But, the thing is that governments and ALAC, they should discuss why do we need gTLDs, the new gTLDs? They were useful what for?

So, I think that this kind of discussion among government and Internet users, it will be really interesting. So, I think that we could prepare like three or four questions or two or three questions about that and to have this kind of discussion. So, it will be something different. Let's see if we have any common ground somewhere because we are being too

EN

passive. So, it's always ICANN is giving us the agenda, the dynamics, everything. So, I think that we could be more active and [influence] somewhere.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The whole concept of can we stop a new round is interesting. That would require a significant part of [inaudible] very strong.

ANA NEVES: Well, I'm not saying that … Well, I don't think that [inaudible] like to say that we should interrupt or – no, no, no. I think that we should have a discussion on what is the benefit that we received from the new gTLDs. So, maybe we could influence the process to make it better.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure we're going to find a lot of benefits, but it's a good question to ask.

ANA NEVES: Well, I think at least it could be a good discussion among some members of the GAC and some ALAC with these [inaudible] questions, two or three. So, it will trigger the discussion in a totally different way and we would be more active.

I think that ICANN maybe would start to listen in a different way because GAC with ALAC could be much stronger together, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to think so.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, if I may chime in here – and thank you, Ana for thinking out of the box and for joining [inaudible].

ANA NEVES: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yrjo has his hand up, so we should let him get in.

ANA NEVES: I'm sorry. I'll go after him.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's okay.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: We met with Ana in Tallinn at the ICANN-Studienkreis and we had a chance to discuss the agenda and also … What I think that Ana's idea is that we should, in Barcelona, we could take a couple of steps back and see how this whole thing is doing and going and have a sort of [inaudible] discussion on how [inaudible] at the end of the process when both ALAC and GAC had an opportunity to say yes or no what kind of feeling we have at this point on that.

As Ana said, the idea is not [inaudible]. We are [late in the day now]. [inaudible] get going. The idea is not to stop everything and [inaudible]. But just to take a couple of steps back and see how it's doing and whether eventually we have to prepare at the end of the day a situation where we have to say no. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. Thank you, Alan. Thanks, Yrjo and Ana. My question would be shouldn't we receive an answer for this question from the CCT review? I don't know about the final report, but I think the objective of this review is to evaluate the first round from consumer and competition perspectives. I mean, I stand to be corrected and, frankly, I don't know where does this stand from the final report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I don't know either. I know that they keep on saying it will be issued soon, but I'm not quite sure what the exact timing is. I don't know if anyone else on the call has any better information.

ANA NEVES: I don't have any information about that, but I would like to have a report of impact, definitely, as soon as possible and not one with [inaudible] because nobody is going to read it. It should be a very small report, maximum 30 pages, for us to discuss. But, if we are keeping

waiting for ICANN to issue this, well, we are not being active. We are being totally passive. So, it's always the dynamics of ICANN that are we taking what we should do.

So, I'm trying to have this chance to have GAC and ALAC on the same page and to be active. So, if we don't have this report, we should discuss this in a way that would show the importance that governments and ALAC perceive the situation and how could [inaudible] be better, and not to be so tight to the processes and to the policy processes in ICANN. It should be a political, technical discussion. That's what I think should come up from these joint meetings. So, it's not more of the same and two or three persons [inaudible] the question and then nobody asks for the floor and that's it. I think that we have to be active. Even if we don't have these reports, we could have this discussion based on some questions that would trigger the discussion about the gTLDs.

We are wasting our time in discussing these things and then it's always ICANN that takes the lead and etc., so it will be a good opportunity for them to see that GAC and ALAC, they think [alone] and they are [inaudible] on something and [inaudible] they should pay more attention of what we are saying, even if we are only [inaudible] committee.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I agree with you. I'm not quite sure how to have that happen. ICANN is very, very good at building processes and we built a process—

ANA NEVES: Absolutely. Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: To evaluate [old] TLDs and that report hasn't come out yet and I can guarantee you, when it comes out, it will not be 30 pages.

ANA NEVES: I know. It will be like 300 and nobody is going to read it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll share with you, the RDS Review Team, which I chair, and I vowed we would not come out with a huge, unreadable report. Well, we just issued our draft report and it's 180-something pages. When you start looking at the process and what we have been told we have to include and the formats, it's [inaudible]. I suspect the other one is going to be the same.

So, that report is going on. We are spending an immense amount of time on how do we do a new round, but we never have asked the question: should we do a new round?

We, like you, have a session with the board and they have asked us a number of questions and we've been asked to give some questions to the board. And as you're speaking, I just wrote down a question for the board. Why do we need new gTLDs? And if we don't, how do we stop this? No one is asking that question. It's religion that we need new gTLDs.

[MANAL ISMAIL]:   The only thing we need to consider is … Because I think this review team is looking into whether the first count was useful and whether we need or how to learn to [improve a common ground]. I don't have the exact [hope] in mind now, but what I'm saying is that whatever discussion we will have should be informed by their final findings, just not to reinvent the wheel. We might not agree with the outcome, but at least to have an informed discussion if you see what I mean.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not disagreeing. I just don't quite know how we do that. We don't seem to be even asking the right questions in the general sense.

ANA NEVES: Okay. And they don't have an executive summary or anything that could be [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sure they will. But, we saw the draft report. What the draft report said is next time around, we need more studies and more instrumentation because we really can't tell.

ANA NEVES: Okay, then I withdraw what I said maybe because I haven't seen the report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the draft report certainly did not say anything very startling. And of course they have a lot of people on that group who are strong supporters of the gTLD process, so it's really hard for them to come out with a consensus saying anything other than neutral or not very positive but not very negative either. We value consensus in ICANN enough that sometimes we can't get a straight answer.

ANA NEVES: [inaudible]. Actually, with this new world with so many apps, etc., gTLDs, they are ... We should be discussing this kind of thing because it's a waste of time and it's a waste of money perhaps and we have to be realistic. Governments should be realistic. ALAC can be realistic. GNSO cannot be realistic because ICANN still works, so they have to find some work for ICANN. But, it's not as well. We don't have the same objectives. We are advisory committee, so we can think by ourselves.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have Olivier's hand up, but before that, I must admit, I would be intrigued to know what would happen if the GAC would give advice to the board not to proceed with another round. That would be very interesting.

ANA NEVES: That will never, never happen. My point [inaudible] discussion not to have a conclusion. So, [inaudible] discussion. It will be like a brainstorming and we don't have to conclude anything. We have to reflect. It will be to have more food for thought, so it will be something

for us to reflect and to think on the way forward in a different way, perhaps. So, we don't and we should not conclude anything. We should discuss and joint meetings are for this, right? To discuss together. We don't have to conclude anything for the time being.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Just at the recent ICANN Studienkreis, there was a question asked of all participants whether they would be in favor or against another round of new gTLDs. I can't tell you who said what because the meeting was conducted under Chatham House Rules, but the only … It appears that the only interest would be from [inaudible] that would be interested in another round. It's also worth noticing that there was a strong pushback from many of the participants, including some that I was quite surprised to see as pushing back, towards [closed generics]. That's it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We've talked about two of the subjects and I think we have some interesting potential talks we can do in Barcelona. We only have a 45-minute session. I believe that's what we scheduled. So, it's going to be a little bit tight.

The third item on our agenda today was the joint GAC-ALAC statement signed in Abu Dhabi and a follow-on statement which I gather Ana and Yrjo have been working on. Yrjo, please go ahead.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Yeah. Thank you, Alan. We went over my draft in Tallinn with Ana, and Ana, you have your version now so that it could be presented to this meeting?

ANA NEVES: No, no. I don't have … I didn't update it yet.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Sorry.

ANA NEVES: I mailed you about that.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Okay. Fine. But, perhaps we can … When you have it ready, you could put it to the list that includes all of us and we could prepare that way or before Barcelona. Basically, the idea with that statement is simply to say thank you very much for the promises to have the information [inaudible] which will be operative in [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yrjo, I've got to go away from the call for a minute, so if you can take it over, I'll be back as soon as I can.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Okay.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yrjo, if I may.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, do we know how the [ITI] initiative relates to our joint statement? I mean, in order to be more specific with our concerns, does this cover what we [inaudible] on in the joint statement … But our concern is that it would take very long to achieve this or it doesn't even cover what we asked for.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Well, both, actually. The [ITI] is basically about organizing the documents better, to have a proper document managing system which ICANN doesn't have now. But, if you happen … According to the ICANN website, the delivery of the system as expected in December 2019, but also that's not the answer to all our questions because what we asked for were summaries, executive summaries, and synopses and so on and so forth in connection with the documents issued by ICANN. So, basically, our follow-up statement concentrates on this and asks ICANN to implement some of these easily implemented things. That is to say summaries and synopses to documents. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Yrjo. Then I would say it would be good if we have those clearly identified in whatever document or statement we come up with because we keep following up on our statements and we keep being referenced to the ITI initiative. So, what I mean is that we need to be more specific this time, that this is not the answer and this is why.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Exactly. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm back. Sorry, I wasn't muted before. I should've been. The other thing that ALAC will be working on over the next year or so is to try to get documents out, not only synopses of documents but essentially translation documents. And when I say translation, I don't mean another language. I mean into something that could be understandable by our communities and I suspect the same applies within governments, that if you have something that you could take back that someone who doesn't understand ICANN acronyms could understand what we are doing or why we are doing something, that would be valuable to you as well.

ANA NEVES: Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, certainly we're going to be working very hard to try to push for that, and if we do that jointly, that also may help.

MANAL ISMAIL: Definitely. I think this is excellent. Let's coordinate together and, again, we're all suffering because of our new members, lack of resources, and complexity of the issues, so it would be really lowering the barriers to participation as we would have wished to make things simplified not only from [inaudible] but also simplified for people to understand them by just very quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. Our challenge is to get more people involved, but if we can't explain what we're doing in ways that they can understand, there's just no way to get someone involved. You almost have to trap them first, and to do that, you need things they'll understand.

MANAL ISMAIL: Absolutely.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? We had an any other business item. I'm not sure we have anything. No one is mentioning anything yet. Ana or Yrjo, do you have any last words?

ANA NEVES: What is the way forward now?

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　　Well, I like your idea of taking a tax on the new gTLDs. Let's try to formulate. I'll let you and Yrjo work on the working but try to formulate a question we can put to both of our groups. And I think we should put it to them beforehand to allow people to think about it and come up with half a dozen answers.

I know from my community, the vast majority of people will probably say we don't really need new gTLDs. We have seen very little benefit from them. If you look at what we said initially, why do we want new gTLDs? We said IDNs. But, if you now look at how successful were the IDN new gTLDs, there's a few that I think are successful, but not many.

So, the question of why do we want them, should we only have certain kinds of new TLDs for the next round? I think they're all valid questions. So, I'll leave it to the two of you to formulate it.

I think on the EPDP, we don't have the luxury of waiting for Barcelona. If we're going to try to start working together, we have to do it a lot sooner than Barcelona. We'll have to think about how we can get some sort of focus group to at least talk to each other on a regular basis, or maybe just a back chat that we can use during the calls so that we're not completely in isolation. So, I think that one we have to think about quicker than Barcelona. By then, it's going to be too late.

I like the direction we're heading on the ALAC and GAC statement. Let's see if we can come up with something, to practice what we preach, a short and concise statement that says what we want.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I see Yrjo has his hand up. Please, go ahead, Yrjo.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Yeah. Thank you. I think that this is pretty much [inaudible] agenda for Barcelona for now, but there's still time of course to react to [inaudible]. On this new gTLD subsequent procedures, for the principle discussion, Ana suggests, I think that would be a sort of good [inaudible] warning shots that's like shot across the [inaudible], as they say, that would actually make it easier for us to get accepted some sort of points that we're still talking about with these various work tracks. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I think we probably should … We don't necessarily need a formal call, but we should probably have an informal check point maybe three weeks or so before the meeting. Beginning of October, let's say, and see where we are and make sure we're all on the same page. So, essentially, we'll keep on working quietly in the background for September and then check with each other in beginning of October.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah. Okay.

YRJÖ LÄSIPURO: Yeah. And we will keep working together with Ana, keeping everybody informed.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, please. If you have any new write-up or anything in writing that you can share in advance, I like Alan's idea that we share them also with our corresponding community, to have them think about the questions and have an interactive discussion when we meet face to face.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, if we're going to submit something in a few weeks, we better have some preliminary draft soon. I'm hoping we will have something to share.

Alright. Any final words?

MANAL ISMAIL: Just to thank Yrjo and Ana very much for the discussion and for their [inaudible] and for the agenda of today's call and [inaudible] for the face to face. So much in a very short time. Thank you.

ANA NEVES: Thank you, Manal.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, all. And thank you, Ana. It's great to have you with us.

ANA NEVES: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: It will be nice to actually work face to face when we see you in Barcelona.

ANA NEVES: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

ANA NEVES: Keep in touch. Okay. Thank you. Bye.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alan. And thanks to all ALAC. Thank you. Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone. Have a great rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]