
BARCELONA – ALAC and Regional Leaders Working Session (11 of 13)

Tuesday, October 23, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 CEST

ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Dev. This is Heidi. Could you please check your Skype? We're just trying to figure out how long you might need for your presentation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we try to gather people in? We said we were going to start about ten minutes ago and we didn't. It's not fair to the interpretation staff to bring them back and then not be here.

We are reconvening. The schedule has been completely changed. If any of you care what it's going to be, you can refresh. Look at the Wiki and refresh. Or you can just sit here and we'll tell you what it is as we go along. For all I know, it may change again before we get to an item. It will implicitly change because we are starting 25 minutes late or 22 minutes late.

The first item is EPDP and then the next item is a number of different discussions on communications and how can we make it more effective. On the EPDP, we in theory have 45 minutes allocated. I don't know if in fact it will take 45 minutes, but Tijani would like the floor before we start.

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.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you very much, Alan. I really apologize for the confusion I had. I don't know how it happened. I am getting old. No. I am not getting old. I am getting very old, I think.

The most important problem is that I put a room that doesn't exist. So, you see how the problem is big. Thank you very much. I sent an e-mail to say that I will be absent. I will not be absent. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. Just for the record, the agenda for this meeting changed logically at 11:45 last night or sometime around then. Then, it formally changed again just after or just before the first session started this morning. I foolishly didn't refresh. For instance, when I was told there were 15 more minutes left in the session and I could reopen the queue for Betsey, I didn't realize there was another agenda item. So, I apologize. Everyone apologizes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl doesn't apologize. I'll apologize for Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You could try.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. I'm apologizing that we have Cheryl here.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: EPDP. I will try to give a very short summary of where we are. How many of you were in the EPDP session yesterday? I hope I'll see most hands. Okay. Were you thoroughly amazed at how convoluted and complex this is and how arcane the issues are that we're looking at? You should be, most of you. Those of you who have actually done GDPR implementation might not be.

It has been an interesting endeavor. We're only partway through it. The really difficult discussions are the access ones which we haven't had yet. We have deferred most of that. It's difficult because it is easy to say that there are certain data elements which we know people have a valid right to get to. It is not as easy to say that we know how to implement that.

So, as an example of one of the current discussions that's going on is technical contact. Now, you might remember that the reason WHOIS is there to begin with is to enable communications if things are broken.

There's a general agreement that we still need that capability. It is not obvious how we implement that. Clearly, if you are trying to enable communication to tell someone something is broken, it's not a group of people that we can pre-authorize to do that because you don't quite

know who's going to discover something is broken, if indeed that's the reason it's there.

Therefore, how do you make that information available? There are all sorts of ways. If we're talking about e-mail, there is anonymized e-mail. There are web pages, web forms you can use for communication which don't convey any personal information. Telephone numbers are a little bit harder.

There's also the issue of do we need ... I'll give you an example of one of the questions that we probably spent an hour talking about yesterday. Yesterday, two days ago, one of those. Assuming you need a technical contact – and there seems to be some general acceptance that we might need to contact people for technical reasons – what contact information do you need? Currently, we ask for essentially mailing, physical address. We ask for an e-mail address and we ask for a phone number. The question is do you need those?

Now, I will point out that, from a point of view of data minimization, which is one of the things that GDPR considers – don't ask for information if you don't really need it. Then you might want to minimize those.

On the other hand, we do have a letter from the European Data Protection Board who are the composite data commissioners from all the countries that acknowledge that it is reasonable to collect this data. You may want to give people options of whether they set unique addresses or not. But they don't seem to have a concern with data minimization on that particular item.

The registrars, on the other hand, would like to not collect data that isn't needed. They have suggested we don't need a physical address. I have a hard time disagreeing with that because I'm not sure how one would use a physical address to report a problem.

On the other hand, they have also claimed we don't need a phone number and I find it somewhat problematic, given that a very large number of domain registrations use the domain that is being registered as part of the e-mail address. I find it somewhat problematic to say x@icann.org is where you report a problem that icann.org isn't working. So, although you might want to give a personal phone number, an organization might.

Remember, we're talking about collecting now. If you don't collect it at all, there's not a choice of saying I want to do it.

We spent a good part of an hour talking about whether we need a phone number or not. I would have thought it was a no-brainer to say collect it as optional. You don't want to put it in, you don't have to put it in. But you should be able to. But these discussions are long and convoluted and are not necessarily related to what is allowed under GDPR because everyone has their own personal needs that come into this.

So, yes, we do have the somewhat arcane issues that we talked about yesterday in the public session of what is the lawful purpose. You get into interesting philosophical discussions of transferring data from one entity to another is one of the things that GDPR considers. We need to assign a lawful purpose. Do we need to assign a lawful purpose for the receiving of the data? A transfer always incurs someone sending and

someone receiving. Is there one lawful purpose for the transfer or is there a lawful purpose for the sending and a different lawful purpose for the receiving which is deemed to be collection?

This is a debate that people that interpret GDPR differently, so there's no single answer today. It's not clear what the answer is, at least among the experts.

So, that's where we are right now. They're really difficult discussions of to whom does this data get made available to and how and is it going to be a somewhat automated mechanism? You may have heard Goran talking about the unified access model which essentially implies this will be an automated process that somehow you can get authenticated to access certain data and you may access it and the presumption is you will only ask if you have a specific need to know that data. And it will be automated. Contracted parties who have a liability associated with this may worry about that because the decision to release the data is now out of their hands and they may have a liability associated with a decision that they can no longer make. So, that's the reason that the unified access model is tied heavily to liabilities and why ICANN is looking at ways to reduce the liability by acting as the conduit, or at least taking responsibility for it. We don't know if that's going to fly. The general wisdom is it probably won't. But we're trying anyway because it's not clear what the alternative is. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

So, as Alan mentioned, we're not discussing access right now, so we are basically publishing the rights or principles that third parties of

legitimate interest could have access under lawful basis to the registration data that is already collected. So, that's one part.

The other part we've been working on, which data should be collected and which data should be collected, it should be the data related to the processing activities related to purposes.

So, we've been working on purposes. And as you saw yesterday, we have several purposes, A, B, C and so forth. Taking each purpose and then looking at which processing activities are necessary for this purpose, and then what are the lawful basis for – GDPR lawful basis – for the processing of this data? And also the different roles. So, who's the responsible party for this processing? Is it ICANN as a controller or joint controller? Is it the registrar is a processor, controller, or joint controller? Registry as a controller, joint controller or processor? So, we are defining these roles.

Also, of course, this leads to the data elements required to be collected. Once we determine the data that needs to be collected, that's one thing. Then the access will be only to this data and it would be according to the legitimate interest or according to ...

Of course, one thing we need to start with that we all agree that it's now a closed system. It's not an open system anymore. Lots of [inaudible] are, "Well, WHOIS shouldn't exist as it did before." Well, it's not existing as it did before and no one is asking for that. We should all be aware that it is now a closed system and will remain as such. We are only at looking at means for making it available for people who need this data and their legitimate interest.

Again, as Alan said, we've been discussing many issues, one of which of course he mentioned the contact information. Alan pointed out to the technical information. We had a letter from ICANN saying that OCTO, the Office of the CTO, for example, they used to do trainings, outreach, and other kinds of training in which they showed how WHOIS data could be used – WHOIS data, registrant contact and technical contact, could be used to contact the registrant or the service provider in case the machines are compromised. So, there are many aspects of this and many inputs coming from those who actually use the data.

We've been discussing issues related to should contracted parties, registries, and registrars be differentiating between registrants based on geographic basis? Permitted or required, that's the thing. Should they be permitted or required to differentiate between registrants based on geographic regions? Should they differentiate between natural and legal registrants or not? Of course, as we know, under the GDPR, there is a differentiation, but under the temp spec, there is no differentiation.

One other thing we've been discussing is reasonable access. The temp spec has this term that says reasonable access. Should this term be defined further or not? Small groups were formed to discuss these issues.

Again, we're not discussing access until we go through the gating questions which we have not gone through yet. We are expected to have an initial report in about 16 days or maybe a little bit more, but in November, and it will be out there for public comment. So, of course,

we invite you all to just go ahead and comment on that and please give you your feedback. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have, unfortunately, seven minutes left. We currently have a speaker queue of John and Tijani. I would like to do a one-minute timer. Please proceed. John?

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you. So, as some of you know, I'm not in the GDPR group, but in my capacity outside of ICANN, I'm one of the GDPR leads for my organization which is not an [inaudible] organization. So, I've gone through much of this content.

I was relieved to see Thomas Rickert [inaudible] the presentation in terms of the form they're using and I would ask that Hadia and Alan convey, at least my personal thanks, to Thomas for the work he's done in leading that part of the discussion.

It would be helpful to me and I think probably to other members, if at some point Alan and Hadia can get together and sketch out some of the major discussions that are going on within the EPDP working group, so we have a sense of what's going on, as well as the positions they are advancing relative to the conversation that's going on in those key areas. So, identify a handful of the top topics or the really hot topics and let us know where we're at.

Finally, one last comment. Alan mentioned related to automated access and I just want to ... I'm going to take a few extra seconds because I'm going next in the presentation.

I just want to say that's, from my understanding, fairly problematic because that gets into algorithmic profiling which GDPR frowns upon very highly so I'm not sure that that's going to fly. I know you said you don't have high hopes that it's going to fly, but I suspect it [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

The access model has been encouraged by the data protection board. The fact that using it will be funneled through ICANN and therefore ICANN removes the liability from the contracted parties is the part that we're not sure will fly.

I think there's a general acknowledgement that the volume we're talking about is such that we probably need something like that. Hadia, please. And we have a queue at this point of Tijani, Jonathan, Holly, and [Joanna].

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

I'm not sure that we are talking about an automated system. It's a unified or a uniform system, but to your point, John, not automated.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can debate that separately. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'm going to speak in French. Very well. If I understand clearly, yesterday during the session, the EPDP session, the debate with the NCUC yesterday, the outreach session with NCUC, the disagreement is not only about access. It's also about collecting data and I'm concerned because we only have seven months for the PDP to be over and for the board to confirm the comments and to change the contract. And I do not see how we're going to make it because no points were really finalized in the PDP work, so I'm really concerned.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, as I noted, we spent a significant amount of time talking about whether we should optionally collect a phone number, something which I would have thought is an easy decision to make because it's not requiring anything. We spent a lot of time on it. You're not the only one worried. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. On this issue of access, a lot of the unified access model, etc. might not even end up being policy but just being an ICANN implementation. But it feels like it's the role of the PDP to deal with this reasonable access question, even as a kind of SLA, need to respond within 48 hours or yes or no and provide a reason why or something like that. Does it sound like that's the direction that the group is going to go?

ALAN GREENBERG: Access on our agenda. It's way down the road. It's number three, I believe. I won't even predict what kind of details we'll work on. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: What Jonathan just said might, but not for sure yet, be put like principles under one question that speaks to reasonable access. So, there might be some broad principles or criteria among which could be some of what you mentioned, but that's not sure yet. As this doesn't speak clearly to access but it's about general disclosure principles.

ALAN GREENBERG: Clearly, it can be silent to principles, to service-level agreements. Who knows? Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think there's still probably a fair way to go. I'm sure everybody agrees with that. The actual unified access model is going to probably solve the technical thing but listening not only to yesterday afternoon but other of the sessions, and obviously a lot of the preceding discussions, having read through it, who gets access and under the circumstances is still not decided. Even the public session that I attended, just in terms of phrasing who gets access, there were at least three different wordings to accommodate less or more of different people. That's still ...

And I support John saying at some point where are we up to on defining both who gets access in the circumstances. Not so much from an actual

provision of access. But I would actually point out to John that a lot of the registries and registrars are saying we can't do it if it's an [inaudible], but actually listening to some of the debate, there's still some discussion to be had amongst just around the table because I saw the position change three times.

ALAN GREENBERG:

To be clear, some of the larger registries and registrars are saying, "We could not survive without an automated one." The smaller ones are saying, "We will not accept an automated one and we must be able to make our decisions one by one." How one comes to closure on that, interesting discussion. I'm not talking about discussions in the EPDP. I'm just saying if you talk to individual people, you'll find both positions and they're both quite understandable.

Then there are people who are saying, "Well, I will only accept a subpoena," and other people saying, "I have a very large legal fund. Do you really want subpoenas for each one of those?"

None of this is particularly clear. It's gotten more confusing to some because if you look at the temporary spec, one of the reasons for collecting data in the temporary spec is so the registrars can interact with their customers. Well, there's virtually nothing in WHOIS that allows registrars to contact their customers. They have a customer database that's separate from WHOIS. That sounds like a simple statement until you look at escrow and say the data that goes into escrow is from WHOIS, and in the case of a registrar failure, the only information the new registrar has is from WHOIS. So, it's a messy area.

It was never thought through from this perspective and we're trying to catch up. Do we have anyone else? Joanna, please, sorry.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. I just have questions, as you might expect. I'm trying to figure out what the negotiating power is and what is our interest as ALAC. So, I have three specific questions. For the sake of time, I'm just going to ask them but I'm happy to give more background if they're not clear enough.

My first question is how high is the EPDP and the outcome of the process on the At-Large agenda? I understand we represent the users. The question is whether there's a uniform position that we are trying to defend. What is that position and how significant is the actual outcome of the current process to this community? I know there are various communities. I know they have various acts and interests, various agendas. Alan has been very gracious with his time sharing his concerns and I understand those and I know where he's coming from, but I'm wondering if there is one uniform policy that At-Large, or effectively ALAC, stand for, if there is one uniform policy. Is there a document, a policy document, that we could refer to? We've been talking a lot about negotiating, the negotiating power. I understand this is a community of volunteers.

My second question is human resources. I'm just closing up. My second question is on human resources, whether we do have human resources who are professionals, semi-professionals, working on implementing the GDPR within the European region. I understand that both of our

representatives have not had the opportunity to work in this particular legal regime. I'm just an academic, but I see other communities being represented by legal professionals operating on their daily jobs within this very environment. I know it is challenging to live up to that standard.

So, my question is how high is the outcome of the EPDP on the At-Large agenda and how effective can we be in pursuing that particular agenda? I have a few more comments, but for the sake of time, I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let me try to address those very quickly. We do not have a document. So, sorry. We have discussed this pretty extensively and there is a consensus, but it is no unanimity, that our main interest is looking at protecting the end user. So, essentially, we are sitting in a position not dissimilar from law enforcement, cybersecurity people, and the GAC who have those main interests.

As I said, it's not unanimous. I'm sure I'll get people around this table to disagree because several of them are around this table, but the general position has been if we have to weight registrant privacy for 50,000 registrants or whatever the total number of registrants is in the gTLD space, to the potential for more spam, malware, phishing, whatever to the four billion, we tend to say we worry more about the latter than the former. So, that is the position that after a significant amount of debate going into this we have taken. No, it is not well-documented. So, that's the position we've taken. Clearly, it could change. Those are the

marching orders Hadia and I have going into this process. So, I think that's where with are right now.

I do have another related issue I want to talk about and we're already over time. And I think we're out of the queue. Is that correct? Okay. Hadia wants to make a comment, a short one, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yeah. I just wanted to make a comment to Joanna's second question. I want to assure you that we all take a GDPR training course. The other thing, also, in order to be able to defend your position, you should be well aware of what you're defending. And that's the end users.

While, yes, you do need to have a GDPR and legal background, which I'm sure we both [inaudible] to have related background, but in addition to that, it's necessary to be aware of the end users and their requirements that you're defending. And I think that's the priority when choosing who's going to defend a certain position, and [you find] the same not only within our stakeholder groups but within others as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. The other related item is tomorrow morning there is a GDPR session. The focus of that, if you can believe the published agenda – and I always have a little bit of worry that it's changed and hasn't been published – the focus on that is what are the solutions to address the needs of the various communities, projected solutions?

We have been asked to put someone on the group. At this point, nobody has been named. We were also asked to make sure it's someone from Europe, preferably a female, and someone who is really trained and knowledgeable of both the subject matter and of course the At-Large position. I don't think anyone fits all those qualifications here. So, we have to decide do we want someone on that group.

To be honest, we have talked very little about potential solutions, other than things like a unified access model or more likely to provide reasonable access to ... And from our perspective, the cybersecurity people are the real clue. Law enforcement, ultimately, you get a subpoena, they get what they want. They're operating under a completely different lawful purpose under GDPR than the other ones are. The cybersecurity people who we know are not a well-defined group are far more problematic and yet are the critical resource in this process. Even NCSG people, some of them anyway, will say that. But how we make that work is not clear.

So, the question I'm putting before the group right now is do we put someone on this panel, and if so, who? Because I have a very short window in which to say that. Joanna, did you want?

JOANNA KULESZA:

I just wanted to respond to what you're saying. My understanding is, coming from the legal background, that the outcome interpreting the GDPR depends. So, it depends what we want to achieve. When you address the uncertainties within the GDPR, I am certain we can use those to our benefit. So, we can interpret the purposes, the goals, all

the issues that you mentioned – and I’m happy to go into more detail – to our benefit. It is just my understanding that we need to know what that benefit is. I understand it will be far more challenging to make that beneficial to law enforcement and governmental officials access than it would be to individual users. We have the Internet Society well-represented in this group as I understand, who are sort of [inaudible], I would say, but that’s more of a technical [inaudible].

So, if we know what our purposes are, we can use the GDPR to interpret it, to support them. And that’s just a very practical remark I wanted to make, not going into that details of the GDPR at all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Putting it in somewhat different words, you have said exactly what we have been saying for a long time now. It’s fine to say GDPR doesn’t allow it, but there’s lots of vagueness and a lot of it comes down to ... The critical lawful purpose is, if you want to go physically to the GDPR, it’s section 6.1F which says you can give information to third parties, but there’s a balancing act. Does their needs override the right of privacy? Clearly, I can’t think of a better word that reflects judgment call than balancing because there’s no metric scale that will do that.

So, that’s the challenge. What the perspective we are taking is can we develop the lawful – not the lawful purpose, that’s a technical term. The balance need to justify release of the information and how do we determine who it is?

Now, my simple answer to the question of what should we be doing to do this is we should have long ago – it’s too late, but we better start now – starting to talk about how do we recognize cybersecurity professionals? How do we accredit them? Because unless we can do that, we are never going to be able to get to the end point.

JOANNA KULESZA: I’m happy to [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: We have 30 minutes. We’re already eating into the other time. Hadia wants to make a comment and then I want to ask a question. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. I just want to make a quick comment with regards to the lawful basis based on GDPR, that as you mentioned, some of them are 6.1F which is it depends on the purpose. So, for others, we have 6.1B which actually doesn’t require that balance. So, it depends on the purpose and processing activity and the lawful basis for disclosure depends on that. So, it could be 6.1B, 6.1A, 6.1F depending on the activity.

ALAN GREENBERG: Going to third parties that are undefined. I mean, escrow agents, for instance, can fall under the it’s part of the contract. But, for third parties who are undefined at this point, F is the only game in town.

Okay. The question is do we send someone? I'm willing to sit on that panel. I am not a female. I don't live in Europe. I've spent a lot of time in European airports and hotels, I must admit, but I'm not sure that qualifies me. But that was a preference. It wasn't a specific. If someone else wants to do it, come see me real soon. But I've got to give an answer to the chair in the next hour or two. So, come see me during the break if indeed anyone else wants to do it.

Next item on the agenda. Next item on the agenda is something that you haven't even heard about on the agenda if you haven't refreshed it in the last ten minutes and it is Dev Teelucksingh will give us a presentation which I'm told will take ... An introduction to his stakeholder tool. Six minutes. Dev, if you're online, you're on.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks, everyone. Good morning, everyone. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I just want to walk you through the stakeholder tool that I've developed over the past two years [on my own].

The background behind this stakeholder tool was that the Outreach and Engagement Working Group as looking at ways to do more effective outreach and one of the things we were coming up with was we need to do analysis of the fellows, so that we can find persons that could be potential members of At-Large. Where do we target outreach? Especially related to CROP, the Community Regional Outreach – well, at the time, Pilot Program – where we do outreach to various countries. What were our [gaps]?

We were looking at the ALAC and ccNSO. We were looking at ways in which ccTLDs and ALAC At-Large could work better together. But, how do we find out who's who and where they are?

And for those places that didn't have an At-Large presence, could other ICANN stakeholder [inaudible] from that country be contacted? And [inaudible] where were these stakeholders?

So, all of this information is scattered on myriads of different pages. We have to do the [inaudible] started by Glenn to put together a spreadsheet to cut and paste the text from the fellowship to get all of the fellowships in one location and then the challenges were how do we then sort these fellows by country and so forth?

That led to what I call the ICANN Stakeholder Tool. The key benefit is that, in one location, we can identify who are stakeholders in a country and within a region, and what are the gaps in stakeholder representation in a country and in a region?

Currently, the tool has been expanded [inaudible] to cover nearly all of the ICANN stakeholders. The At-Large, ccNSO, GAC, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, the two group input in that, the NCUC and NPOC, the Commercial Stakeholder Group and the GNSO, the ISP Constituency and the Business Constituency. [inaudible] of those, including a breakdown of the unique number of fellows and the number of meetings they attended as a fellow. The Registrar Stakeholder Group and ICANN-accredited registrars. Also, regarding the fellowship, also the NextGen students that attend.

So, the tool works by collating as much information from all the various ACs and SOs [inaudible] the tool, meaning that less manual reentering of information and an ability to use the live information from these AC and SO websites.

Some of the challenges have been that different ACs and SOs in ICANN use different names for the same country and territory, which made comparisons very difficult. And the tool tries to take these differences into account.

Some ACs and SOs don't list the country where their members are from. The fellowship and NextGen continue to be in very separate [pages]. So, these are still manually added and manually processed which is time-consuming.

So, I do have some screenshots but I thought what I might do quickly is just share my screen so you can see [inaudible] information. I believe my screen is being shared now.

So, here's the first [inaudible] country dashboard. You can select any particular territory that we want to in the world and you'll then get a page showing ... I'll use Spain as an example, since of course the meeting is in Spain.

You can see that Spain is in the GAC. They have two At-Large Structures. They have five NCUC individuals, one NPOC organization, and so on. They're color-coded in green for, yes, there is a presence, and red for there's no presence.

What happens now is, if you scroll down, you will now see the information presented. Then names of the two At-Large Structures and the website, the At-Large website, is linked and you see individuals, the NPOC organization [screen], and so on.

So, from this, you can really see some potential for outreach opportunities. For example, maybe we can contact this NPOC organization and ask them to join At-Large, for example. Or contact the NCUC individuals. Do they want to be accepted as individuals within EURALO?

The regional dashboard shows also the stakeholders by region and by [a simple drop-down] we could quickly see what each country, whether they are in the various stakeholder groups. So, green means they are present and red means there's absence.

From this, and also by [diving down] into regions, we can quickly see and this helps the RALO to then identify what are all the gaps and which territories we should strive for in terms of possible outreach. Actually, I would say ICANN as well, because one the things that [inaudible] the tool was that there really was not [inaudible] as I understood it for this information to be collated in such a manner.

The regional dashboard summary is basically a way to see, for those who want to me a more detailed documentation as to what are the countries that are in a particular AC or SO. So, we can, for example, look at – sorry, let me just [get] the European region as an example. As you can see, it updates immediately.

So, the European region has 59 territories without At-Large representation. Then, EURALO can take this information and decide, “Okay, what are our priorities for outreach?” or, “Who do you want—”

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost him or is he finished?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was midsentence. I don’t think it was finished.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yesim is working on it. Strong indication that it’s still going on.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I’ve informed Dev. He knows he’s dropped. We’re just trying to get that sorted.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I just wanted to take, in this small hiatus, I know Dev knows that I’m a great fan of his tool, but I’m sure there will be votes of thanks later. So, perhaps you might want to note that as intended now if someone who is actually in the ALAC or a regional leader, which I am not, would like to support that sort of thing. This is a fabulous amount of work and it’s an enormously useful tool. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out that several times we have asked, please, is ICANN staff willing to take over the updating of the data, and I don't believe we have ever actually received an answer. Maybe I'm wrong on that. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Dev is back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev is back. Then, let's go back to Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Thank you very much. Sorry about that snafu. Just to quickly conclude, I showed you the regional dashboard. And just to show you the fellowship summary, what this page does, it breaks down the unique fellows list and also shows how many times they were a fellow and the listing of the meetings that he or she attended. So, you have that information now, too. Those that have at least attended at least two or three, then we can start looking at perhaps contacting them and trying to get them involved in At-Large.

I think that's really it. There's a direct link to the stakeholder tool, this link in the presentation. Again, I'm happy to answer any questions or comments. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Dev. I've been informed that, although we have "asked" ICANN several times, we have never formally asked several times. So, I

would like to add an action item that we formally ask ICANN whether there is someone who can take this on.

I would think that if I try to allocate it, where does it fall within ICANN's remit, I would think this is a Global Stakeholder Engagement issue, although they're not necessarily the ones who manage each of the things. They certainly don't select the GAC representatives. They don't select ALAC members. And they're not the group that selects fellows. But, as a group that is interested in where do the various stakeholders come from and who are they, I would have thought that is a logical place for it to be. But I really don't care what part of ICANN takes it on. So, can we have a formal action item? And the former chair and the incoming chair will come up with some actual words for the request.

We have a number of hands. We have already exceeded the six minutes that nominally this presentation was going to take. Where are we on the overall schedule? How much time do we have left at this?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 20 minutes.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have 20 minutes left. We have several things. We'll take some very quick questions but make them very quick. John, you were in the queue. Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Dev, I think this is the most amazing tool. It's wonderful but I have one issue. I've spoken to you about this before. I find it really hard to navigate. I'm looking at your link and all I get is Argentina screen. When I scroll down, it says there was a problem. "You're trying to edit a protected cell." For me, anyway, I don't know about others, it's wonderful. I just can't seem to get where I want to go. Maybe we need a little instruction.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: So, if you click on the yellow bar, you can then see all of the different countries. So, just pick Australia, for example. It will then automatically change there. That's how you do it. The drop-down there allows you to pick the territories.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. But when I'm doing that, I get, "There is a problem. You're trying to edit a protected cell or object."

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we're going to have to take the training offline.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. We'll go offline for this. Maybe it's just me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Dev's works magically different than yours does. Next item on the agenda is John Laprise who is going to slack off.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you. Let me share my screen. I'm going to be very brief because this is a technology tool like the last one but for a much different purpose.

So, the Technology Taskforce in the past has evaluated a number of different tools to assist – there we go. We're live. A number of different tools for communication because we use Skype and we use e-mail and we use mail service, but what we're using ... Technology Taskforce came up with, for an interim solution at the very least, is Slack which some of you may be familiar with. I've been using it in other capacities for a while.

This is the Slack tool. So, it's a communication tool. It allows you to save files, save content. In fact, that's how I shared the link on the Adobe Connect earlier as Dev had posted the link for the shareholder tool and I just grabbed it and dropped it. We are implementing this across the Social Media Working Group right now and it's just getting started. I created this channel [layer]. But Evin has been posting content in here that's related to social media. You can also contact people individually. It has a lot of ... It's very flexible. It has a lot of plug-ins. We are presently using a free version. Dev, Evin, and I are admins on this system. Training we will take offline. It's an easy system to learn. I would recommend go on, try it out for yourself. Play around with it. There's a lot of training tools online there free, YouTube. Learn how to use it, if you're interested. If you're involved in Social Media Working Group, you are using this.

Between both the Technology Taskforce and the Social Media Working Group, we determined this is probably one of the more effective tools we can use to facilitate communication within At-Large. So, this is a full-fledged trial in Social Media Working Group. I encourage others to try it out and see how it works. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Questions, comments? Ricardo?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Just a quick comment. I am still new in some of the decisions in how ALAC works. The decision from the Technology Taskforce to use Slack as a good tool is a decision that was made maybe two years ago or something like that. We're still not using it. I'm really surprised and really uneasy that finally we are going to use something that was two years ago a decision from the TTF.

ALAN GREENBERG: As far as I know, the TTF looked at it but certainly in the time I've been chair, we never got a recommendation that we should adopt it across the ALAC or even test it across the ALAC. At this point, the social media group has decided to adopt it and that's going forward. It is completely reasonable that we said we should do a trial for the ALAC or some other subset. I would think, at this point, let's leave this one for six months and then get some report back. Well, I'm not chair anymore – or won't be chair anymore real soon.

We have a decision session tomorrow where we're going to take actions. If someone would like to propose to the ALAC that we instigate a Slack trial among ALAC members or regional leaders, that's a decision we could take tomorrow. But it's never come to that. Anyone else? John, you wanted to speak but I think I said what you were going to say. That rarely happens. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGKAHA:

Thank you very much. Really iterating during one of the ICANN meetings we had them use the, demonstrating the Slack tool within the meeting and before the meeting, prior to it. But we've never come up with the outcomes of the use of the tool. So, I think for the next action items, in case different tools are coming up, we come up with what happened, what went wrong. Can it be adopted? I think that will lead to a more decisive decision during next meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All it takes is someone to make the recommendation. I'm a technical person from way back but my resources are limited and I have not participated in the Technology Taskforce, so although I've heard rumors that they have looked at things, it just makes a request. Clearly, if the request is we adopt something which needs ICANN IT support, it's a different issue than if it's something we're just going to use. Or if it needs funding. That's certainly something we could do if someone chooses to bring this, but if you're going to bring it onto the agenda, do it soon, please. John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah. Like I said, this is the free version. We've not asked for funding for support, so we don't have the full functionality of the application. Dev actually commented in Adobe Connect and I'll read this out. "During the extensive presentation on the group chat before recommending Slack at the ICANN 60 meeting." So, the recommendation is about a year old. We've had some change in the interim, so now we're actually moving forward with a trial implementation for the Social Media Working Group.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible]. I don't know who that recommendation went to. Didn't come to me or the ALAC. Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Just a quick question to John. How durable do you think that the Slack presence in the ICANN community is going to be? Because we're going to switch from one channel to another, [inaudible] Twitter, Facebook. I'm happy it's not Facebook. How durable, in your assessment? And it's just an objective question. How durable do you think this input into Slack is going to be? Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: Really just depends on usage. It's like any technology problem. If we get adoption, it will be used just fine. If we don't get adoption, then it will die. It depends on users.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the problems of any tool is there are almost always people in our community who do not have access to it, for one reason or another. Either their employer doesn't let them install it on their machine so they don't have access at work or the country doesn't allow that tool to work in their country or things like that. So, we always have to be careful about any of these tools. I don't know anything about Slack and whether it's relevant in this case.

JOHN LAPRISE: One thing I'll add on Slack is that what I'm showing up here right now is I've got a desktop version installed but it's also browser-friendly, too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We still have ten minutes left. The other items that were on the agenda ... Bart, is this something you want to get in on Slack?

BARTLETT MORGAN: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Very quickly, please, then. And Satish also. We really have to go on to the other items. They're not long ones. We have Bart and Satish. Very, very short.

BARTLETT MORGAN: Just quickly. I was just wondering about data portability. Is that something you guys consider?

JOHN LAPRISE: Could you clarify the question just a little bit, Bartlett?

BARTLETT MORGAN: Well, in three years we've been using it, then after a while, we stop using it, but there's critical information on there. Can it be ported to some other platform readily or that kind of thing?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah. So, data is exportable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Satisfy?

SATISH BABU: Thank you. There is a separate process going on for short listing the web [inaudible] solutions in TTF. As far as Slack is concerned, we have often found that it is not just the technology [inaudible] of a tool that matters for our community.

We have had, for example, discussions on some tools which are very popular, but some slice or section of the community have refused to accept it. So, now imposing a tool on the rest of the community may be difficult, so I would recommend a consultative process of checking out

if anybody has any problems, any region. For example, Latin America, if they have any problem with Slack. We don't want a situation that you officially recommend that and then you have a problem with that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think that goes for any tool we use, and virtually any tool we use, including the ones that are advocated by ICANN across the organization are likely to have some problems. That's why we do pilots and that's why we try things for a while. So, it's [inaudible].

But, let's go on to the other items. We regularly use two other tools, e-mail and Google Docs. We have had fantastic success with both in selected cases. So, if you look, for instance, at the documents that we did for the At-Large review, most of those were done on Google Docs. We had abundant contributions and it allowed a large number of people were interested to contribute to the process.

We have similarly had really fantastic production – use – of e-mail sometimes. Almost always for reasons I won't even try to guess, it's never policy issues. It always tends to be some administrative issue but it catches the attention of people and the amount of traffic that it generates in a day or two days or a week is unbelievable. That demonstrates people are using e-mail. They're reading it. They know how to respond. Most of the time, silence. Or one person comments and no one even comments on their comment.

I'm not sure I understand the social dynamics that are resulting in this. Those documents, those technologies, are the ones that we have used most in addition to the Wiki, although Wikis are editable by anyone like a Google Doc, it doesn't have a suggest capability. So, when you make a change, although in theory, laboriously, you can go back on the revisions and find out who made the change and when, that's not practical in a real sense. So, essentially, whoever speaks last is the authoritative one. The technique, of course, is to get in just before it closes and you can make all the changes you want. That's a joke sort of, not really.

We have made very effective use of Wikis where a document is posted and then people use comments to comment on it. Sort of hard to point to the right line. It's not quite as easy as Google Docs.

But, again, we have instances over the years where we have used them very effectively and other times, nothing. People completely ignore a topic, even if it's one that they've indicated other times they're interested in. I don't know the patterns.

But, going forward, if we are indeed going to become more active and able to consolidate more input, especially on policy issues from a wider number of people, we need to focus on a relatively small number of tools but they're ones that we have to feel people are comfortable enough with. Google Docs, at one point, certain countries couldn't get access to it. It's not a widespread problem. The bandwidth is sometimes problematic. Wikis work really well unless, of course, you're on a mobile phone where you go to a Wiki and it says "data not

rendered” and it’s really difficult to get it. We use Word documents on occasion, and of course if you’re on the wrong platform, all of the changes disappear and you can’t see ... People do complex edits and then they go to someone and they say, “I don’t’ see any changes.”

So, each of these tools are problematic. We’re not going to fix any problems today. I’m just raising the issue that we have used a number of tools. Each of them have proven successful at times and spectacularly unsuccessful at other times. I have no idea how do we determine which is the right tool to use for the next project.

I’m just seeding the discussion that if we are going to get effective in involving more and more people, we need to make sure the tools we’re using are usable and effective and I don’t know which those are right now. No matter what tool you pick, someone in the room is going to say, “I don’t like it,” and someone in the room is going to say, “It’s my preferred tool.” Guaranteed.

I’m just bringing up the discussion. I see two hands, three hands up right now. I see Marita, Tijani, and Satish. I don’t know the order, so we’ll take it in that order. How much time do we have left in the session? Three minutes. So, we have three minutes for any questions and answers.

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you. I don’t think it’s a mystery why some people don’t quickly engage in most of these tools. The issue is language. And the more complex the issue, the harder and longer it takes for someone whose first language is not English to post anything. So, that is why you’re

going to see big gaps sometimes in policy discussions, not because you don't know the policy but because having to put it in another language just takes a long time and sometimes you don't have that time in your life.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll note in the cases I'm thinking of, that's not the answer, because we're dealing with people, in my experience, who are familiar with the language and are conversing but choose not to use it in some cases or others. Language in our environment is a big problem. It's not the one we're talking about right now, though, I don't think.

MARITA MOLL: But, Alan, I don't understand how you can say that because if people aren't engaging, then you don't know who's not engaging. Do you know who everybody is who's not engaging? Is that your point?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but I know who is on the ALAC who is not engaging.

MARITA MOLL: Alright.

ALAN GREENBERG: Language is a really relevant issue, but it's not the only factor that is controlling what we're talking about. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. One of the best examples of the use of the e-mail for dense, heavy, hot discussion on the e-mail about policy was the report of the new gTLD PDP new gTLD subsequent procedures. I think that the e-mail was really useful and it helped to come to a consensus to get the result we had.

So, we are not always using e-mail only for process, etc. We are using it also for policy. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I didn't say we'll only use it for that. I'm saying the most spectacular examples are things that catch people's fancy on administrative things. Not solely. Satisfy?

SATISH BABU: Thank you. I have a couple of comments on the matter of Google Docs. Very convenient to almost seductively convenient but there are two concerns that come out of it. One is that if you have an e-mail that is not recognized by Google, you cannot participate in the collaboration. So, if you have somebody coming from a [inaudible] have their own e-mail, you can't use it on Google Docs.

Second is that actually the terms of licensing for Google Docs is enormously one-sided. You're actually [inaudible] all kinds of rights to Google if you look at the fine print. So, that's a little angle. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Let's take this offline. I'm not aware of e-mail addresses you can't use. It's not restricted to Gmail addresses. Maybe we can talk offline and find an example. I wasn't aware of that problem at all. In terms of the rights, you're correct. We're putting anything there, we're giving it to Google. And they may use it for something. Most of our times, I don't think we care, but ... Discussion over? I see no more cards. Is it lunch time? It is lunch time. When do we ...

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's a working lunch.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. When do we reconvene the discussion part? Maureen? 10 minute, 15?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Give them 10.

ALAN GREENBERG: 15 minutes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: [off mic] come and sit down and then I'll call everyone together.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Maureen will ring the bell when it's come to reconvene.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]