SAN JUAN – ALAC & Regional Leaders: Wrap-Up Session, Part 1
Wednesday, March 14, 2018 – 17:00 to 18:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to call this meeting to order. And if we can start the recording or any other procedures we need to do. I won't say, make sure we have remote people on Adobe Connect. [AUDIO BREAK]

Could ask if we have anyone remotely on the bridge, but I suspect the answer's, no. Are we ready to go? That's a yes? Thank you. The first item on our agenda is to vote to -- votes or decisions of the ALAC -- our formal rules require us to: No. 1, have quorum; No. 2, have a representative from every region. We do not have a representative from LACRALO because they're all involved in another event.

We will be using the rule, however, that for non-essential -- for votes that don't need an answer immediately, we will be giving people the opportunity to vote after the close of the formal decision. Do I have the general agreement, in violation of our rules -- technically -- to proceed with this without LACRALO? Thank you. Let the record show that we -- nobody disagreed with that decision. We don't need a formal decision.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Question -- Javier Rua-Jovet for the record -- does LACRALO know about this?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: But they do know there is actions taking place today. We were in error that we didn't point out that they should have someone in the room, temporarily -- but I don't believe either of these decisions are such that we'll have a problem with it.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Can we say they were constructively noticed, because it's somewhere in some Wiki, or some --?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: The first item on the agenda is the confirmation of Barrak Otieno as our ccNSO liaison. To recall the background, he was selected many months ago as the candidate to work with Maureen for transition. My understanding is, that process has been carried out with great success. He has long-standing involvement in the ccNSO, and the ccNSO is happy to accept him. And I would like to formally recommend that the ALAC confirm him as our liaison. Discussion. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. President. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm in receipt of an email in the ALAC internal list, which mentions that the -- "Please note tomorrow, the ALAC will act on two decisions." The email was sent today, so I'm a little confused as to whether it will be tomorrow or today. It's today. Okay.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: Sorry about that. My fault to [CROSSTALK] --

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, may I ask who sent it. It may have been me; I don't remember.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Evin.

EVIN ERDOĞDU: It was me. I sent a draft yesterday, and it was approved just moments ago. So, the draft still had the wording tomorrow. My apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is my fault for not having approved the draft. And Evin's fault for not changing that word. So, we take joint responsibility for the error. Does anyone have a problem and would like to postpone this decision till tomorrow because of it? I see no indications. We both beg your forgiveness. Do you accept our request? Do you forgive us, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I'm not mandated to take such an action.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In fact, he's not an ALAC member, so --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. Not being an ALAC member, I'm not mandated to emit any opinion of any sort on this issue. Thank you. I was just pointing the message, that's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're still asking for your forgiveness. I think he doesn't forgive us; we'll have to live with it. Yeşim.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you. Yeşim Nazlar speaking. Please don't forget to state your names before speaking. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: For the record, the previous interchange was largely between me and Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Me, being Alan Greenberg. We have a request to speak from Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Javier Rua-Jovet for the record. So, is that email the notice that LACRALO has? So, they think there's two decisions tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG: I doubt if any of them say that email because they're busy in a session right now. We have ALAC actions on the agenda

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

published -- well, a week or two ago. And we will be -- and Heidi mentioned -- and we will be giving them an opportunity to vote. If anyone would like to rescind this and request us to go on to this tomorrow, we certainly can do that. Is there any further discussion? Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Kaili Kan speaking. The email I received talked about actions for the 14th of March, and here it says, "Please note tomorrow, ALAC will act on two decisions." So, tomorrow is the 15th.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is the same subject.

ALAN GREENBERG: That was the issue that Olivier raised.

KAILI KAN: Yeah, yeah, right. Right. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: The message was sent today by mistake -- because I had not approved it. And I approved it without noticing that. Evin sent it without noticing that. We beg your forgiveness. And we could

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

continue talking about this for a long time. Either we defer the decision till tomorrow, or we make it now. All right.

KAILI KAN: Are we -- excuse me -- Kaili Kan speaking. Are we in a hurry to make the decision today? Cannot wait till tomorrow?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just that we have a slot on today's agenda, which is rapidly going away. That was Alan Greenberg. I'm taking an executive decision. We are not making -- taking these actions today. We'll take them tomorrow. We go on to the next item. Next item is GDPR discussions. Can we have the GDPR document on the screen, page 34?

Alan Greenberg speaking. I will call for people in a moment. There have been significant discussions at ICANN about the GDPR, the general data protection regulations -- as I presume you know at this point, ICANN has published the model, which they are proposing that we use and have asked for feedback. They have asked for feedback, preferably, by the end of this meeting. We will not likely give that feedback by the end of this meeting.

But I would like to take this opportunity to have a face-to-face discussion for a little while -- until León comes -- so that we start getting a feel. We will continue this electronically and make a decision, I hope, within a week. Because if we wait much longer, it has much less value. I'd like to set some ground rules, however, for the discussion. The discussion is whether the ALAC believes that this is a good model, from a user perspective. We will not discuss whether we think the data commissioners will accept it or not. We have asked the data commissioners, and, hopefully, they will come up with an answer.

So, we are not judging ICANN's rationale for doing this -- just to what extent we believe this serves user needs, or does not serve user needs. Users do include registrants, and we have taken the position before, and, although, we can reopen it now, the position we have taken earlier, within in the ALAC -- over a many year period -- is: we care about registrants; individual registrants are individual users.

In the relatively rare case that the interests of registrants are opposed to the interest of end-users, end-users -- we could them and there are several billion end-users. There are tens or hundreds of millions of gTLD registrants. We don't actually know how many. We know how many domains there are, but not how many registrants there are. And the user interest

predominate -- that is an established position of the ALAC -- although the ALAC can always change their position -- that is the one we're working with unless there's a request to explicitly change it.

So, if I have agreement on the ground rules, I'll open the floor to any general discussions before we start looking at the individual points within the GDPR. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. So, two points. One, procedural; and one on the contents of the document itself. The procedural one being that, currently, we have the document on the screen, which is not scrolled to the page that you asked for, but it would be helpful if we had a link to that document, so we could download it on our respective computers. May I suggest that the ALAC Skype chat might be a good channel for sharing that link? I can't see it on the Skype. Can't find it. Oh, the request is already on the Skype. Well, this is to the record.

Now, secondly, on the actual contents of the document itself. I understand this is a working document. I am quite seriously a bit concerned about the names, which have been given to the document -- if you will have noticed, at the beginning it says, "The cookbook." Further down, I think there might be -- well,

actually, I don't know whether further down there's an allusion to a calzone, or something. I'm not quite sure this is -- given the status of the document itself as being particularly important -- it's a great way to describe a document as a cookbook.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Your comment is you believe they have named the document irreverently, or -- I'm not quite sure what you are saying.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, it's a serious discussion we're having.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, I'm just noting that I'm a little surprised by the names given to the different parts of the discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I will comment that the vast majority of comments I've heard, people think it's rather apt, and proposal for a tiered-access accreditation period was called appropriate -- an Italian

dessert. I really don't want to spend time debating whether they were sufficiently serious enough in naming the document or the model. We can do that later tonight over the music.

Any further comments. We have several comments. We have Tijani and Sébastien.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. Tijani speaking. First of all, concerning the name -- "the cookbook" is not the name of the document. The cookbook includes several things. One of them is the interim model. Coming back down -- now, you said it, "Is it a good document for the end-users?" I would like, first, to say that I understand very well the position of those who wrote it. I listened to them several times, and I know that they are between several interests, so the community push them to have this kind of document.

If I am speaking about the interest of end-users, I say, no -- because, first, the collection of the data, it's maximum -- the Thick data, which is not, in my point of view, in the interest of the end-user. The second point is the storage of this data in several points.

And the third point, I am not sure about it because we don't have clarification about it. It's the accreditation. So, the

document, in general, is not really in the interest of the end-user, but I understand, and I know that they cannot make better than that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure that everyone in this room has read every bit of this document and has studied it. My intent was to go through the individual points and try to assess. If this groups wants to start into a general discussion -- you know, identifying the points you know, without full knowledge that everyone else know what you're talking about, we certainly can. But I would have not thought that that was the best way to go forward. We have about a half an hour before León arrives. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Now, that you explain what is the process you want to go, then I will be very short. I don't think that it's a good idea that the chef always ask somebody, outside, how to cook; therefore, the article, the G19 or 29 -- must not be asked for everything.

We need to make a decision and that's not a good idea to give them idea how to explain their remit. I know that you don't understand, but I tried to [inaudible] in English. But go ahead

with your process. I think it will be the better, and I will come back on that -- eventually, personally, with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you were saying, we shouldn't come up with the model; we should let the people who are experts in it, do it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, I say, it's not a good idea for Goran to put names to go each time we have a question, to go to the G19 -- it's a very bad idea, because each question will raise an issue for them, and they will say, "Oh, that's a good idea. I will extend," or, "No, it's not a good idea," and, therefore, we need to have a decision by our organization and not going to outside, even if it's a G19, 29 -- sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi for record. First, I agree that we need to go through the document in details before we start the discussion. Second, I just wanted to have a quick respond to Tijani -- where

he said it's not in the interest of the end-user to collect the data. Well, we could go on arguing this forever.

I could say it is, for example, in the interest of the end-user, because it does protect the end-user. It's a kind of protection because consumers -- it's a way of seeing legitimate websites and legitimate shops -- anyway, it's a debate I don't know if we should go through it, and I don't think we should. But, yeah, I would like to go as Alan said, and, first, examine the document or look at it.

ALAN GREENBERG: When we get to that particular item, Sébastien -- Sébastien -- Tijani can tell us, in very succinct, short words why he believes it's not in the interest of users. May we start? Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: My question's about the framework of the discussion itself, which seems like the time to say that. Right now, we're trying to figure out whether or not they've come up with a valuable interim document for their own compliance with a regulation coming out of Europe.

So, I guess, it's my recommendation that we not get embroiled in the discussion about absolutes -- about what makes good

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

privacy policy or not, but, instead, figure out if this document is practical and functional in the near term -- not whether it'll be accepted, necessarily -- but, I mean, whether it's, you know, implementable or causes great problems in the -- because it's meant to be an interim document that's going to become a PDP, to have more extended conversations about where ICANN is on these issues, and where the community is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think that's all we're doing. We are not pretending this is permanent. We do not if the data commissioners will accept it. We know that the interpretation is in flux right now, for a number of reasons. All we're saying is, if it were to be accepted, do we believe we should support it? And that's, I think, the general tone of it. All right. Sorry, we need to scroll down a little bit; that's where the model starts. Okay. If we can scroll down to the bottom of that page.

Okay. The first substantive section is the purposes of processing. They list a number of purposes; those will be accepted or not accepted by the policy commissioners. Those are the ones we're claiming are the purposes. I don't think we need to debate it, because that, again, comes into what will be accepted or not. Scroll down to the next section after 2.7.1 -- keep going to the next subsection -- the next -- that's it, .2.2:

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

what data must be collected by the registrars at time of registration.

Now, this model says, "collect everything we currently collect." Okay. Tijani has raised the point of; this is not good for users. Why does it matter to users what is collected. That information collected may or may not be displayable -- why does it matter to users what registrant-data is collected?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani speaking; because if you collect data that are not necessary for the purpose of the collection, you are taking data of person's or of users that you don't have the right to have. And there is no need of them. You'll tell me, "Why you say that?" I will tell you, because when we spoke about Thick and Thin WHOIS, Alan, it was decided that the registry will take -- would take on the Thin WHOIS. That means that there are data inside the Thick WHOIS that shouldn't go to the registry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm not sure why that affects the millions -- billions of users in the world, as opposed to the registrants, and I believe your statement saying, "it is not needed," is a judgment on whether the privacy officers will consider our reasons for saying it's needed, as valid or not. Okay. Please, Jonathan.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Jonathan   Zuck for record. I guess, I go back to the same thing. That's the status quo, today, and so, the other objective here has got to be figure out the smoothest transition into this interim mechanism, as well. And so, it's not like there's some brand-new proposal being made about the collection of data and using GDPR as an excuse to do it. I mean, this is the data that's being collected today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi for the record. I just wanted to say that it's not possible to collect data that's not needed -- because, according to the GDPR, you only collected data for the purpose needed. So, it's not possible, so let's not argue, is the data required or not, because it will not be possible under the current GDPR to collect data that is not required.

ALAN GREENBERG: And it will be a judgment of the data commissioners whether they agree that our rationale for requiring it is justified, or not. So, I think that falls under the category of things that we said

we're not going to debate. Tijani, would you like any further word before we go on?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to say, how do you know that it will be compliant with GDPR?

ALAN GREENBERG: We don't. It has been submitted to -- if the privacy office should come back and say it is not compliant, we will have to do something -- because we cannot request that our contracted parties do something where the privacy commissioners have already said it's not compliant, and everyone will be fined huge amounts of money. So, whatever we write will be changed if they definitively say it is not accepted. That's a given. John.

JOHN LAPRISE: So, a question going back a bit -- so, on the Thick versus Thin WHOIS. Did ALAC issue a position statement on that issue?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe we were strongly in favor of everything being Thick.

JOHN LAPRISE: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: At that time -- the world has changed. But I believe we were strongly in support of changing *.com* and *.net* and *.job*s to conform with what everyone else was doing, and not have to rely on registrars to preserve the data. For better or worse, we did support that. Now, we may find, because of data transmission rules, we can no longer do that, and the world will have to change. The board did halt the implementation of the Thick WHOIS for that very reason.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record again. So, yeah -- I just wanted to see what the precedent was from us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any further comments? Daniel.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: [inaudible] here.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're not Daniel.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: No, sir.

ALAN GREENBERG: My eyes are not working very well today.

ABDELDJALIL BACHAR BONG: Yeah, it's Abdeldjalil. My question actually requires a bit of a clarification. When you speak of data, here, is it data for those who have already paid for their domain name, or is this is law going to be applicable to new domain names, exclusively?

So, as a new user, I want to register a name under the .com -- so, I would like to know whether this is for the data of all the users who have already purchased, or they registered a domain name -- or only for new users -- because it's speaking of transfer, so I would like to ask you for a clarification there.

ALAN GREENBERG: All domains. All of them -- several hundred million, as of today. We have John. My impression is that, with the exception of Tijani, most people believe that we should not be commenting on this, at this point, because it is up to the data commissioners

to tell us whether we're crazy, or whether we're appropriate -- and that will be acted on. Sure, why not? Bastiaan.

BASTIAAN GOSLINGS: Thank you. Bastiaan speaking. Leaving my personal opinion aside, what I do think -- I agree with Tijani, and that's purely based on my -- it's not necessarily an educated guess -- but whether we're going to be compliant if we follow this particular model. And looking at collecting the full WHOIS data.

It's not only a matter of waiting for the data-protection authorities to tell us whether that's the case, or not -- like timelines are very, very short, and if we can actually -- okay, the law's not there yet, so what it turns out to be in practice, we don't really know, but if we can make a rather -- an educated guess, like what is going to be like, then this is not going to be compliant. So, I wouldn't wait for the data-protection authorities to tell us so.

ALAN GREENBERG: The ground rules of this discussion established before you came in, were, we are not going to debate what the data commissioners will accept or not. We are looking at this from a point of view of end-users, assuming the data commissioners accept what has been presented by ICANN -- is this a reasonable

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

model from a user perspective? Not a registrant perspective, a user perspective. Go ahead.

JOHN LAPRISE: In that case, I will not comment any longer on that, then, but just listen -- and for your information -- I think the discussion with regard to user interest, etc., that we should leave that to the PDP, and this is about being compliant. So, I would like to separate the two.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we can ever ignore what is the users' interest. I have the real Daniel next; and then I have Tijani, I believe; and then I have either Sarah or Olivier, I cannot see whose card is hidden a water bottle.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's Olivier's card.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: It's Daniel for the record. One thing is, we have to put into consideration the limitation of time right now -- the time limited to go through all this review. So, I think we should proceed with the compliance and also leave the genius, the RDS working group -- because also some doing some awesome work. Because, at the latest stage, we shall be discussing all these requirements and the use cases. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's exactly, we have to think about the compliance with -- this is about GDPR, so it is not about the new generation RDS. We have simple proof; we don't have to make a lot effort to say that the Thick WHOIS is not needed for the registries. So, if you give a party that data -- that is not needed for the purpose of the work, you are violating the simple rule of privacy. That's why I say that the end-users will be harmed if this happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the parts we skipped, and maybe we shouldn't have, is the reason for collecting, that ICANN has presented. They did an analysis -- they asked for use cases, remember -- where the ALAC

was part of the groups that put in use cases. And they looked at the use cases developed by the overall community, and found that every element that is currently in the Thick WHOIS is used by some people for what they believe are valid reasons.

You can debate whether they added up the numbers in the spreadsheet correctly, or not -- I'm willing to take it that they did. And that is the rationale that is provided that is not, "Why did we build WHOIS in 1973?" but today, how is WHOIS being used. And ICANN is taking the position that any part of the community that was, in their mind, validly using the data is a good enough rationale to collect it. That doesn't mean everyone can get it, eventually, but it has to be collected if anyone can get it. That was the rationale.

Again, it may be acceptable by data commissioners; it may not. And if not, we're going to have to adjust it, because we clearly are not going to do something that the data commissioners have said they're going to fight. So, that was the rationale that it was collected. Not whether the registry alone needs it, but whether any part of the community needs those elements -- and law enforcement, among other people, have said those elements are useful in their use of the data. Further discussion? Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I think that the points, which were made regarding the Thick WHOIS versus Thin WHOIS is a battle that's already passed -- the decision was made by ICANN, with the Thick WHOIS report that was published last year, I believe -- that all gTLD registrations would need to follow a Thick WHOIS model.

So, looking at the interim plan that we have there -- and please correct me if I'm wrong, but I've re-read through it -- it looks as though what we are doing with regards to Thick versus Thin, or with regards to the quantity of information that is collected, is a status quo. There is no change to the quantity of information that is being collected, and there would be changes to the access to that information. So, I wonder why we would be -- the ALAC would say that they would be against the status quo.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's why I skipped over that section, initially, but clearly we are not -- we are now --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Almost 20 minutes into our 30-minute discussion, and we have not effectively started to get to the first item yet. We will continue this on email, but I thought it would have been good to have a substantive discussion on the real parts of this proposal before we left town. I have Daniel in the queue.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel for the record. I still stand at the position that the data collection should remain constant, with the Thick WHOIS -- [CROSSTALK] -- and then wait for the recommendations to come in from the other side. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: What other side are you talking about? Sorry.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: That is the data controllers.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, that was the premise of this discussion, which we have not followed. Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Alan. Christopher Wilkinson. I don't know whether we're having a transcript now -- but I think the key area from the point of view of the final user is, and particularly the registrants is, first of all, given Thick WHOIS, the security with which the Thick WHOIS database is kept, including escrow, because we know from bitter experience that, from time-to-time, vast databases can be hacked and stolen. And the loss of such databases to malicious parties would be quite dramatic.

And the second area, which we need to look at, from the point of view of the user, is this business of accreditation. Who is going to be accredited and for what purposes are they allowed to use the data that they acquire, by virtue of their accreditation?

And there, we've heard two extremes -- one is, basically, that law enforcement would be accredited, and the other extreme is that almost everybody who is currently downloading individual or bulk data from WHOIS would be able to continue to do so, for whatever their purposes are. And we have heard descriptions of purposes, some of which led me to raise my eyebrows. So, I think those two points need to be emphasized. First of all, the security of the storage, because I agree that we are in --

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll point out -- earlier in this discussion, we decided -- no one objected to keep on using the standard ALAC premise that, if registrant rights are in conflict with users, we take precedent on the users, not, in this case, the privacy issues.

And second of all, we're trying to do this section-by-section. I'll note that we're nine minutes from the end. We've spent 21 minutes, we have not gotten anywhere into this document. Anyone else like to speak? Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi for the record. It's a quick one. I just wanted to say, so what if we decide, now, to say this is too much data collected, we don't want this -- then, will we come with another proposal? Do we have time to debate? I think this part, it's already over, and it's, as mentioned before, it's now up to them to say if the collected data is actually as required by the purpose, or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, I thought that the premise of this discussion. Section to 7.2.3 -- what data must be transferred to the registry -- the answer is currently, according to Thick WHOIS premises, again, due to data-transfer regulations, this might be considered invalid. We're not considering that aspect of it today.

Next point, what data must registrars and registry transfer to escrow agents? Same answer. How long must data be retained by registrars, registry, and data escrow? No, new retention requirements are required -- that is, the ones that stand right now are the ones that we are recommending.

They may well be objected to by the data commissioners, and say we have to shorten them, at least, for European -- according to European -- remember, this whole model only applies if the registrar has a European presence, or the registrant has a European presence; however, the registrar may choose to apply it in a wider range than that. Sorry. Now, I'm causing the feedback. Hadia, please go ahead.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It's a quick question. So, in case the registrar or the registrants are not European -- do not belong to the European area, that means that there will -- the original WHOIS is going to be used, and that means that there are two parallel models -- two models will be used in parallel?

ALAN GREENBERG: This model applies only to European registrars and European registrants, for all intents and purposes. The registrar, any registrar, resident anywhere, may choose to apply it in a wider

scale than that. So, it's judgment call. If you do not have a presence in Europe, you could do business as usual, today, or you could apply this model. Your judgment.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, I know, and that means that two models will exist. The interim model will exist, and the other model will exist for those people who actually will not follow this model.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct. This model applies, potentially, to a subset of registrants. The model is the same, for all intents and purposes, it's just what can you end up displaying? So, again, we're looking at it from the point of view of users. Daniel.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel for the record. What about, in case something else that looks a little bit similar to GDPR comes from another region -- is it going to require setting up of a new model? [Inaudible] step to keep on having multiple models based on every region?

ALAN GREENBERG: We are focusing, right now, on GDPR. It is likely that there are privacy models in 100 other countries that are slightly different.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

I am presuming that we will ultimately ensure that whatever we end up with will be sufficiently table-driven, so that it can be tailored to the rules of somewhere else. We are focusing on GDPR, today. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If we say that everything that we are looking for the answer of the data commissioner, we don't have to discuss it. So, we will not discuss anything, because everything is there. So, I don't know -- and Hadia said, if we don't accept it, that means, do we have time? In this case, we don't discuss anything, and that's all. I come back to the storage. Why give the Thick WHOIS to the registries? Or to the escrow agent? For me, those two are against the interest of the end-user.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like you to explain why it is against the interest of the end-users.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will tell you. I will tell you. We need it in one single point -- why do you want to spread it? We need it a single point. If we need data for -- I don't know -- law enforcement -- we don't need to have cybercrime, etc., so we need some data -- we need them in

one point. Why do you want to distribute them? If you distribute them, the risk of leakage will be greater. So, when we say it is not public, it is not right.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe Olivier, or somebody, suggested that since we've already decided that Thick WHOIS was the preferred method for ALAC that we adhere to it, and the ICANN principles that they started with, saying we should make as few changes as possible to go forward with this interim compliance model.

Now, let me finish, please -- I know you really want to push the button -- ICANN started doing escrow a long time ago, because registries and registrars, sometimes, go belly-up -- I think is the expression -- we have had cases where a registrar basically disappeared, gone -- if we hadn't had escrow data, all of those registrants would have been erased. So, we do escrow for, I believe, very valid reasons. Why did we agree that Thick WHOIS was better than Thin WHOIS?

And that decision was made, by the way, in 2002, in the first round of new gTLDs, where all new gTLDs, going back to there, had -- were Thick WHOIS -- and the rationale was, we trust the registry better than the individual registrars -- some of whom may or may not be maintaining the data. That was the

rationale. I'm not going to debate it. So, that was the rationale, and that was the rationale why the PDP, three years ago, recommended Thick WHOIS for the remaining registries. And we have a speaker queue of Christopher and then Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. Jonathan Zuck for the record. Maybe I can suggest a path forward in this conversation -- maybe the first question to ask is, what, if anything, this interim solution does to change the circumstances of end-users and is that change harmful, as opposed to using this as an opportunity to re-litigate things from before?

In other words, what in this interim solution amounts to a delta? And then, let's look at those delta situations and see whether or not they cause harm over the status quo to end-users. That might narrow down the conversation a little bit.

ALAN GREENBERG: To answer a question a question Tijani asked a little while ago, why are we doing this if every answer is, "We'll wait for the data commissioners?" Because if we'd gotten far enough down in the list, there were items that, some of us anyway, believe were not done correctly -- from the point-of-view of end-users -- we

haven't gotten that far. León is here. This conversation is over; we'll be continuing it electronically. León, wherever you are.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I am here.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to welcome León Sanchez, the board member selected by At-Large.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we have no set agenda, other than León to either present to us whatever he wants to present to us, ask us whatever he'd like to ask us, or we can just smile at each other for a half an hour.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Bring over drinks. Now, I thank you, thank you for having me here again. As we usually do, we have had a very busy week -- very busy meeting -- and well, you could wonder which are the main topics on the agenda -- GDPR, right? GDPR; in the case of

ICANN 61 COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

At-Large, the review; and I would like to get your feedback on the session that we had between the board and the ALAC.

I think it was a dynamic session. It was a fruitful session -- at least in my view -- but I would like to know where we can improve; how can improve; and, of course, start this conversation, as you said, with no preset agenda. And if you have any comments or questions you would like to do to me, I'm obviously open.

ALAN GREENBERG: León's question, on how did the board/ALAC meeting go, and your impression? I'll let other people speak before I give my comments. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. And thanks for joining the meeting here, León. I thought the meeting went pretty well with the board, but, obviously, the conversation was dominated about the budget and cuts and various programs it would affect, the At-Large.

And I attended the budget meeting, as well -- Xavier led, and I think what is causing a little bit of the disconnect between the community and the budget process was the rationale used; in other words, there's an umbrella rationale that was used, but

the weighing of interest that took place on specific programs about why this program made it in, or why this program got cut rather than this one -- that conversation had to have taken place, or criteria had to be used -- and bringing that to the surface, I think would help make people either understand, or have a basis for having a discussion about the cuts that have obviously raised some concerns within the At-Large community.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks, Jonathan. I agree -- I mean, when we see cuts and we don't actually see where they came from or why they came to be -- it's like just puzzling and brings a lot of uncertainty to people whose budget is actually being cut, I think. What would you think -- and this is, of course, an open question for everyone -- there are two questions --

ALAN GREENBERG: Are we going on to a budget discussion, or we still on the board?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: This is still on the budget discussion --

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I thought we were on the board -- discussion of the board meeting.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes. Well, just -- if we can log these two questions, so I don't forget them --

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, we can go deep down and stay on the budget, and then go back to the board meeting, if people like.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Just two ideas, again -- the one about having a longer process to develop the budget -- you know, Göran spoke about a two-years' process, in order to develop the budget, which, in turn would have a broader participation, and far more information, and deeper involvement from the community in shaping the budget -- that is one end. And the other one is about the streamlining of the reviews, of the organizational reviews, and the specific reviews.

As you might have heard, we have 11 reviews, which have to go according to bylaws, in the same time -- and we're our hands of full of reviews. And, of course, this implies, not only resources, but also a lot of volunteer time, and a lot of volunteer resources,

as well. So, just don't let me go if we don't comment on these two aspects, as well -- but, yes, you are right, Alan, we are discussing the board meeting and the ALAC meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I do have comments, and I'm sure other people have comments on the budget -- perhaps, that have not been said, certainly, in this venue. On the board meeting, I found it rather productive. I was rather -- I don't know what the right word is -- chagrined or something -- that we did go into a budget discussion when we had, I believe, decided to not have a budget discussion there -- that it would not reflect well on the ALAC, if we, again, went to the board and said, "Money, money, money."

But we did have that discussion; it went into it; it was an interesting one.   I don't think we prepared our answers sufficiently for the -- answers to the board questions. We did it in a short period of time in our opening session. I don't believe that ended up being adequate. And the questions we posed to the board, again, we ended up with one question -- a second one, I contributed, because Heidi told me we had to have two -- and I had three more minutes to do one.

We have to take this more seriously if, indeed, these meetings are productive, and as I said in my closing remarks, those

meetings were not only useless, were damaging for a number of years. They are much better now, but I think we need to do the job somewhat better, in terms of the board meetings. That said, if we now want to go on to the -- you wanted to -- we wanted to talk about budget, I believe -- anymore further comments on the board meeting, not the substance of what we discussed, but the overall tone and format? John, please go ahead.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. So, I thought the board meeting was very good. My only disappointment was that -- so, I happened to be in the room for the prior board meeting, and, you know, Cherine's comments were canned. He made basically the same statement to the previous group, and I would have hoped -- and I recognize the importance of -- he's got to -- the position with respect to the budget as he's talking -- he's saying the same things to all the groups -- because that's the way it is in the current budget situation. I would have hoped for something a little bit more tailored, I guess. And maybe that's a style issue for me, but I was mildly disappointed that it was the same response I was hearing, and wasn't so particular to At-Large. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, you will find that in meetings such as that, and one-on-one meetings with either the chair of the board, or the CEO, you will likely get their canned remarks that they're sprinkling to everyone, one-by-one. One-on-ones with the chair is not -- the board -- that is not the case, but with the CEO and in any public meeting with either of them, that's what you're going to get. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Budget.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Just one final reminder --

ALAN GREENBERG: We're still finishing the board.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: So, in terms of the format and how it actually went, nothing to improve?

ALAN GREENBERG: My only comment would be that the introductory comments should not take a third of the meeting.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless you want me, or whoever's chair at the time to also take another third with introductory comments.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: No, that's very useful. That's very useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just in response to your question about, you know, how we felt the meeting had gone -- with respect to the questions that I asked, which were off-the-cuff -- I felt that they responded, even though, John, as I'm sure, it was the same sort of thing -- it did address -- I thought that it did address, you know, at least some of the things that I actually raised. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Budget discussion, taking a queue. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. You spoke about two-years' budget. I think this is a good thing, and even we can make even more than two years, but it will be in parallel with a yearly budget, because the longer the period is, the less accurate the budget will be. So, we need to the long-term budget to, if you want to propagate, to -- I don't know how to say it in English -- on longer period, but we need a budget of one year to work on it for the year.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I guess that Göran's suggestion is that we need make the crafting of the one-year budget, a two-years' period, so that everyone is able to actually drill down each line, in each project, and everyone is able to go into details as to why, what, and how it is being proposed -- not only cuts, but also expenditures, etc. So, that is how I understand what Göran is suggesting. So, we wouldn't be building a two-year budget, but we would taking two years to develop the year budget.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm next in next in the queue - I understood something rather different. Cherine has already said that when we do a five-year strategic plan, and a five-year operational plan, we will cost it out. So, at some level, that's a budget. That's not quite a line-item budget.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yeah, I agree. But I think -- my understanding is that these are two parallels --

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, I agree. I'm saying, we are looking at a longer-term budget. My understanding of what Göran was saying is, we currently have a 15-month cycle to develop a one-year budget because of factoring in the IANA part of it ahead of time.

We spend an immense amount of time -- the staff spends an immense amount of time doing it -- we're not just talking about finance staff -- it goes all the way down to staff -- all the way up -- departments submit their budgets. You go through a whole planning process. Takes an immense amount of effort -- an immense amount of effort on the volunteer community, when these budgets come up. I believe what he was proposing is that, instead of doing a 12-month budget, we do a 24-month budget.

It presumably will still take 15 months to develop, but we're not starting the next one before we finish the first one. And that was my understanding from a number of discussions with Göran. I may be wrong, but that was my understanding.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I think the best would be to ask Göran directly, but -- because, yes, my understanding is the other way around, as I said.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: To take two years to develop the one-year budget.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. That I don't understand -- two years to develop the one-year budget.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Yes, for example --

ALAN GREENBERG: That means, at any given time, we're developing three budgets.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: If we're talking -- no, if we're talking about fiscal year 22, we would take two years -- that is June 2022 -- and please bear with me, I'm not good with numbers -- fiscal year 22, that would be June 2022, so we would be developing that budget from June 2020.

ALAN GREENBERG: We need a clarification. If that's what we're doing, I'm stopping to work with ICANN, at all, because that doubles the amount of work, instead of halving it. We have a queue, but I was still in the queue, I think. But I will note --

LEÓN SANCHEZ: But, yes, we do need clarification of that.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Tijani and -- okay. I have, after me, Olivier, Maureen, and Tijani. In terms of the existing budget and the problems we had this time, what I see, specifically, in our "outreach" problem -- is we had three different departments, each deciding to cut their respective part that helped contribute to our outreach -- that is CROP, additional budget requests, and travel. And they fed up, and no one tried to look at them as a whole and judge whether,

in fact, that made a lot of sense. Because each department was told, "You have to cut a certain percentage."

That's the way I read it, and I think that indicates a real problem. It also indicates that there is an awful lot of discussion going on about this, when you look at the mismatch of the words that went along with the travel slots and the table, where they had clearly made a decision at the last moment, change one thing and not the other. There's lots of discussion going on, why it all has to be done in secret, within staff, without a little bit of feedback and give-and-take? I'm not quite sure, but I would like to see that changed.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: And that --

ALAN GREENBERG: And lastly, the fact that the CROP change was made without any notice, and without any alert to it, hoping perhaps -- you know, whether no one thought to mention it; or whether it was deliberately omitted, so we hoped no one would notice it -- either way, not good. León would like a rebuttal, or something like that, and then we go on.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

LEÓN SANCHEZ: No, just to follow on the same issue of the two-year process to develop the one-year budget -- I think that it is meant, or the suggestion is meant to address exactly what you were saying -- that no one knows how these cuts came to be, or what did it come from.

So, my understanding is that through this two-year process, then the committee would have an opportunity to deep-dive into the budgeting process, and to ask all the questions and, of course, have this interaction with staff as to the proposals that would be affected in any way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's not debate our interpretation of what Göran means -- we'll ask him. Next in the queue, we have Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And if we're speaking about a multiyear budget, which is the two-year budget being put together, I think that the ALAC is on record for many years, for asking for a multiyear budget to take place or to be set up, but was told in the past that this was impossible. So, if it's possible now, I would imagine the ALAC would embrace this.

On the topic of the slashing of outreach, etc., thank you for the explanation, that makes sense. We were given further information -- we, as in the RALO chairs, had a fika -- F-I-K-A with Göran a little earlier today, and were given details that, in fact, some departments -- other departments -- also, reduced their costs greatly, including on the staff side, but this doesn't appear to been communicated very well.

So, it might well be that there is a communication problem here, that's part of the problem. As you know, I was a little upset and did tell this to the board, and said there needs to be more fairness across all of ICANN. But it appears that some of it is due to communication. Thank you.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thanks, Olivier. And I completely agree with you. I personally have been very focal about the fact that we are not communicating what has been done -- to even the distribute -- the cuts and the savings, across the organization. Not only impacting the community, but also, of course, impacting the board and impacting the staff. So, I'm on the same line as you; we need to be at communicating that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just, Olivier, to clarify -- if, indeed, my interpretation is correct on the two-year budget, that means we would do fiscal year 20 and 21 at the same time, and then 22, 23 -- so, that crosses some boundaries, but not others. If León is correct, I think it means we're doing two or three years, every year, and I'm not quite sure what that means, at all. So -- next we have --

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Let's not delve into [CROSSTALK] -- the equation.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Alan. It's Maureen for the record. I just -- I don't know, maybe I'm -- maybe I've got it wrong, but when we've had the board person come to the ALAC, we've allowed the board person to give their update before we start bombarding him with -- him or her -- with sort of questions and queries, and I don't think we've given León a chance to tell us about how his -- you know, like what he's experiencing in his role as a board member.

But I know that, you know, we, you know, we've got things that we're concerned about -- but, I mean, this session is really for him to talk to us, and for us to talk to him, rather than sort of like analyzing what Göran said in his message. So, I'd just like to make that comment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd be glad to turn this over to León; I thought he came in and said, "I'd like to open it up to the floor, what you have to say." So, he chose not to give us an update, which [CROSSTALK] -- limited time and it's a matter of priorities, but León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I think it's a beginner's thing, right? So, yeah, I mean, if you're asking me what my experience has been, so far, Maureen, I can tell you that it's been a very rewarding experience, as working in any other part of the community. It's been an eye-opener to many issues -- I mean, when you are in the board, you get to see things from different perspectives, but the good thing is that you also bring in the perspective from where you come from, right? So, having this mix of views, actually, helps a lot to take better decisions and make better choices for the good of the organization and the community.

I mean, I can tell you much more -- it's -- you know how I am -- I like to dive into details really quickly. I like to make contributions on a regular basis, and, so far, all my board colleagues have been very welcoming, very eager to reach out and to help and to actually discuss things in our meaningful work, in a meaningful way, and I think that is one of the things

that has strike me as more surprisingly, because sometimes, when you are outside the board, you would think that the board only rubberstamps issues, right?

It's like, "All in favor, say aye; all in favor, say nay." That you raise hands and that's it, right? But isn't like that, at all. I mean, we do have very heated discussions, at sometimes, for many issues, and what I like this, is that no matter how heated the discussion can get, it is always a constructive dialogue. It's always something that happens in a very collegial way, in a very amicable way.

So, that actually brings me to the point in which I was telling you that you get to see things from a very different perspective, and it actually let's you know that those who are the board are also part of the community and are also human. So, it's been a very good experience.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just one extra question -- so, apart from GDPR, and the KSK rollover, and the budget, what other things have you discussed, been talking about?

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Well, we talk about many things, of course. I mean, me in particular, I'm involved with the OEC, with the Organization Effectiveness Committee. So, all the review processes that are happening have to go through the OEC. We read the reviews.

We, of course, discuss the reviews, the recommendations that are being made; and we actually have these discussions -- like for example in the At-Large review, I can tell you that the discussions have been -- I mean, that the review working party won't let me -- won't let me say otherwise -- the discussions have been heated and I can tell you that board members of the OEC have had a look at the review process of the At-Large community in very much the same way that those part of the At-Large review working party have seen it.

I mean, there is the sentiment that some of the reviewers, however capable and however recognized they might be in their professional field, they might not be the best to actually carry the different reviews. We are seeing that many reviews are being -- causing some kind of itch in the reviewed community -- it's not only the At-Large community -- so, there is a trend there, and we need to be better at that. So, that is an example of what -- what are the kind of issues that we discuss.

I'm also part of the Accountability Mechanisms Committee, and, of course, all the IRPs and all the reconsideration processes go

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

through the BAMC, so we actually look at all the documents that are attached to any complaints or to any process.

In that way, I cannot go further into details because, of course, these could affect any of the process that we are looking into. But you get to see all the string from when a certain complaint is raised to when the board actually resolves that -- it needs to be taken care of in these or that ways. So, those are the kind of pieces that --

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may try to take the meeting back -- I suggest the two of you may want to talk over a drink.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: A drink's always good.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Tijani who's still in the queue. Well, not yet. Tijani, who's still on the queue, on budget. León did ask us to talk about reviews, and we have five minutes left for the whole meeting.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Go ahead, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Christopher, I'm not sure which topic you wanted to talk on, but I'd like to give it to León to talk about reviews -- so introduce the issue in not less than a minute -- or not more than a minute -- and so, we can get some input before we have to adjourn. Some other people do have commitments at this point.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: So, the issue about reviews is that we have a lot of reviews to actually care out, and we have our hands full with reviews. And we have everyone's hands full with reviews. So, the question, here, is how can we find a process to properly or adequately streamline these reviews, so that, instead of carrying out nine reviews in one year, we are able to distribute this workload in, let's say, two reviews, yearly? So, in the timespan of five years, we are able to carry out all the reviews that are bylaws mandate.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm first in the queue, because I put my card up when you first mentioned the issue. I think Göran's statement that we are going into nine reviews in the coming year is accurate, but not necessarily relevant. Seven of those reviews are already started with budgets committed, and contracts made, in the case of the organizational reviews. Some of them are almost finished.

So, it is a fact, but there are only two reviews that we have, at all, discretionary, at this point -- and that's ATRT and ccNSO organizational review. These two are the last of the sequence of reviews. We don't start again until another three years or so, when we start the GNSO over again -- and, you know, so it's -- we have a hiatus period. It's automatically built in.

We have no choice. If we do not, during that process, decide on how we're going to do organizational reviews to not waste so much time and money, then we've made a decision that we like what we're doing. If we do not change the bylaws for the specific reviews, to No. 1, give the board some discretion, as they had before; and No. 2, change the sequence -- if we started all five specific reviews in sequence here, we're going to start them again in five years, so we have to change the rules, so we can spread them out -- you know, and giving board discretion may automatically do that.

So, we wrote rules that forced us to do this. No one thought about the implications of it. We've learnt the lesson hard, bad, and we now have a quiet period of several years that, if we're smart, we will do something about it and make sure we don't repeat this again. So, let's be honest about where we are -- and we do have the ability to make a change; we have to actually do it.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I agree, and that is why I'm asking the question, now. Because I don't want to ask this question when everything is on us again.

ALAN GREENBERG: The only good thing is I won't be here in this seat to answer the question again, but I think I've given my opinion, personally -- I don't know what anyone else's are. Open the floor.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I think Tijani want to say something.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I cannot agree more with Alan. Really. Because this kind of doing the reviews will make us -- doing reviews, continuously. And I am not sure it is efficient and it is cost-effective. So, having

the period between two reviews should be the period between the end of the first review and the beginning of the second review.

ALAN GREENBERG: I should point out that the review done by items, as it turns out of the ASO, apparently, the ASO is happy with it. I know of no organizational reviews that we have done in the history of ICANN -- that I've been aware of -- which have really been effective. Maybe it's just my opinion. We have John and Christopher, and one minute to go.

JOHN LAPRISE: So, I just want to comment that -- sorry, John Laprise for the record. Having been an external reviewer for other organizations, I don't know what process was used to perform due diligence on the reviewers for ICANN. But given the experience with the current review, I recommend looking at those processes, in terms of due diligence. I have lots of issues I can talk about it offline that I -- there are issues there, and I don't know how the situation ended up being the way it did.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give you a 30-second answer after Christopher.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Christopher Wilkinson. On the reviews, just to communicate a non-frivolous contribution -- in the front of the GNSO council earlier today, each review should take three days. And this business of having, by implication, this business of having expensive external contracts to achieve, as Alan has indicated, very little, should stop. On the budget, I have a lot to say, but there isn't time -- in agreement with Xavier, we have a session tomorrow morning, don't we?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a session on a different subject.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Yes. Xavier and I would like to follow-up on your idea of having an At-Large panel to review the development of the geographical names issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll see if we can fit that in.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Five minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: To answer John's question, we explicitly asked to be part of the review -- a part of the evaluation of the applicants, not to be part of the decision-making, but to specifically, make comments. We were given redacted versions of the applications, minus names or anything else that could identify with them. I personally objected because I, too, have been a reviewer many times; and an applicant, many times more; and I know how these bits are written.

As it turned out, our comments on the redacted versions -- we ended up selecting items also. And a comment of someone, who I will not quote, from ICANN staff is, "You wouldn't have wanted to have seen the others." [CROSSTALK] maybe one of the others would have worked out better, we're never going to know. We don't -- we can't -- we're not going to repeat it.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: So, we need to do a review of the reviews.

ALAN GREENBERG: Last comments. León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: I just want to thank you for this time with you, and for listening to me -- for providing me your feedback. And, of course, as I've always said, I remain open and close to you, and feel free to reach out to me -- sorry -- anytime. I'm a click away, so -- thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, León. We reconvene when?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Tomorrow.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know that. 10:30 tomorrow, in this room -- hopefully, on time -- although, I'm only talking to a third of the people. Thank you very much. Thank you to our technical staff. Thank you to our At-Large staff. And thank you very much to our interpretation staff; appreciate you bearing with us all. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The meeting is adjourned. I'd just like to note that tomorrow morning at 8:30, in this room, we have the At-Large capacity-building working group; 8:30–9:30. And also, for those who haven't met Andrea Glandon yet, she is sitting here, and I'd like to introduce her. She'll be joining -- as she is already part of the

At-Large support team. And if -- maybe if we can just go around the table -- this is not on record, just to say your names, and then she'll know what you look like. Welcome, Andrea.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]