

---

BARCELONA – Joint Meeting: ALAC and ccNSO  
Sunday, October 21, 2018 – 17:00 to 18:30 CEST  
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, everyone. I'd like to welcome the ccNSO. So lovely to have you here in our little community. Did you bring the whole team? It seems like it. But we're very pleased to have everyone here.

We do have a set of questions, which fortunately, the ccNSO provided. But which we have actually given a lot of attention to these questions because we sort of feel that they're certainly off the [dust] with a lot of... It made us think about things we hadn't actually thought of, hadn't been concentrating on before, so it was a good experience for us and we've only just done it a couple of hours ago.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Details, details.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. But what we would like to is we'll go, I think we sort of worked out that there was questions that related to Internet governance, to the strategic plan that's being proposed and to ICANN budgeting. And so what we'd really like – we can take them one at a time and have a bit of to and fro if you like – but whatever way suits you.

---

*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.*

---

KATRINA SATAKI:

First of all, good evening everyone. It's always great to be here and yes, we work as a team. That's why we came here as a team.

As you probably understood, currently, we think about all these questions and we try to find the right answers ourselves. That's why we're really interested to learn if you have thought about that and what are your thoughts on these, I agree, pretty interesting questions and sometimes they do need discussions and deeper understanding of what we are doing.

I'm [inaudible] to find where they're taking them, one at a time. I'm not able to answer them all at once anyway.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay, looking at the first one it was mainly to do with Internet governance, and of course, that's quite an important issue for us and I must admit when we were having our little discussions, that was the group that had the largest participants so it gave an indication as to its importance to At-Large.

But the questions related to does ALAC view activities in the area of Internet governance as part of ICANN's mission and its strategic priority, and this was something that we gave some consideration to, and the other associated questions. So can we have someone from that group? Do you want to? I know Javier is take... so it looks like it's left to you, Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. Yes, we did have a small group that convened earlier today, and unfortunately, the person who was supposed to report on this is taking in another meeting. I have a somehow biased view on the question, but I'll try and be a bit more neutral.

It's vitally important for ICANN to be involved in Internet governance. The environment in which ICANN evolves is one where there are a lot of political work being done outside in other fora. As we know, the ITU, the Internet Governance Forum, the United Nations General Assembly now, UNESCO, UNDP, lots of different fora out there that are more and more, increasingly so, touching on the governing of the Internet, in fact, more like the control of the Internet.

And some of the points that are being made in those fora and for ICANN to completely ignore what's going on outside its own borders, it's not a particularly wise thing to do. You need to be aware of your environment and also engage with the outside environment so as to be able to set facts when some of the information that is being carried outside is often not factually based, as such, and is more of a political maneuvering of some sort. That's the short thing of what we discussed in our group today for this specific question.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Maureen?

---

JOHN LAPRISE: Thanks. So many of my colleagues know, and some of them don't know that I came to ICANN via an Internet governance route. I consulted at IGF. I have taught at a couple of different schools of Internet governance. I used to be a professor and my area was sort of the geopolitical impact of the Internet. And it's absolutely essential that ICANN talk about Internet governance.

I would just sort of point to the opposite case. What if we didn't think about Internet governance? What if we left it for someone else? Where would that leave ICANN? Probably nonexistence in the foreseeable future. So I don't think it's a tenable position for ICANN to ignore Internet governance, so I think it's absolutely essential.

KATRINA SATAKI: ICANN being one of the governors of the Internet, right, and I think we agree here. We do govern the Internet. When you say that it's important for ICANN to be involved in the Internet governance, what do you mean by Internet governance?

JOHN LAPRISE: I guess at the very least, they have to be at the table. They have to be situationally aware and constantly monitoring what's going on in the environment and where actors are sort of choosing to – interfere is not the right word – but to intervene where it affects ICANN's mission, ICANN needs to act or react or push back or bring the community together in order to think, "Well, is this a good thing or is this not a

---

good thing?” But insofar as governance affects ICANN’s mission, it’s critical.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Going back to my question, so what do you mean by “Internet governance” and this table mentioned? Where is this table?

HOLLY RAICHE:

Speaking as a lecturer in Internet governance, the first slide that I start with is “What do you mean?” And the students, I have to switch their brains from a national perspective where you have a head of stage, you have a parliament, you have laws that govern the area. You have to move to the Internet, where in fact, none of that applies.

So then you have to go through the list of “To what extent do you have rules and to what extent are they reflective? Are they enforceable?” And so governance is, to me, almost a list of the ways in which rules are developed and forced is the wrong word.

For example, if you’ve got the ITF. Now if you are a provider of Internet services, there’s no way you are not going to comply with the protocols because otherwise you are selling a service that doesn’t work. You’ll go broke. That’s not enforceable. It’s an RFC, but at the same time, it’s a rule that people obey.

You do anything from that to, say, ICANN and ICANN has contractual relationships that can be enforced because they’re contractual relationships in circumstances, and in other circumstances, it has

---

suggested rules that may or may not be enforceable. You have the ITU and you would say, and say in the Australian context, you would have something in our legislation that says we abide by international treaties and we are signatory to UN treaties and so forth.

So there's another whole route to follow to say why something may or may not be enforceable, but it is not a rule that was set in Australia. So to me, Internet governance is a whole body of rules that may be anything from nice to follow to enforceable, set by blokes sitting behind computers talking to nobody to a whole bunch of people that are all talking to each other. And so I just do a slide and say, "These are the international bodies," and they are, in their own way, impacting on the way that the Internet is governed. That's the only thing that I can do in terms of a definition and my definition is it's a couple of slides, and it's understanding the interaction.

So going back to John's point, you want to be part of the interaction. You want to be part of the conversation amongst the rule makers.

KATRINA SATAKI:

So if I may summarize, that table that John was talking about where ICANN should be –

HOLLY RAICHE:

So it's a bunch of tables.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, exactly. That's what I meant. So you mean all those international organizations where they discuss something.

HOLLY RAICHE: Awareness of, you might go anything from the ITU is doing something weird and wonderful that might impact. Certainly, if you're looking at the Internet, you have to look at the transmission systems because the Internet sits on a transmission system.

So the ITUT, the ITUR set rules that everybody complies with and that's your platform. Now sitting on top of a platform, you've got to, we just heard from RSSAC and about a governance system of root servers that are critical for the management of the traffic, but they're going by Jon Postel's rules, God help us.

They finally decided 20 years later maybe they should do something about the rules. So they may have some rules, but the rules are probably going to be ICANN rules maybe, maybe rules that are not enforceable. But that will certainly mean that there's a whole section of how the Internet works and it's going to suddenly have governance structure.

So it's tables and you need to know all of the tables. And to the extent that they impact, you need to understand the extent to which you need to be involved if you're going to be impacted.

From a national point of view – and okay, this is from an Australian perspective – our Department of Communications, what are they doing? They're going to go to the [inaudible]. They're going to go to

---

DR2. They're going to go to the UN General Assembly. They are going to be involved in probably several international discussions that impact on various aspects.

And then the most recent thing that happened was a piece of legislation that is so bad that the IAB and the International Court of Human Justice and everything is writing the government saying, "Don't do it." It's a law that shouldn't be, but globally, they're looking at what we're doing and saying, "That's wrong." So to me, when you say, "What's governance?" I take about 15 minutes and list all of the institutions and say some of them are important in the national context and some of them are less important, but you have to be there. You have to know and you have to know when there are things that might happen unless you were there to put your hand up and say, "Don't do it."

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay, thank you very much. Just a short comment from ccTLD perspective. Very often, we stress that ccTLD is actually, in their own countries, they operate in the environment that is very much similar to the one that you described globally, right? And one of the main things that ccTLDs do according to some RFC, it's to serve their local Internet communities. And, of course, in most cases, it's impossible to do it without interaction with all the stakeholders.

And at the same time, many ccTLD representatives, they do attend most, or at least many, of those fora that you mentioned and so they,

---

so to speak, sit at the table. Nevertheless, they do not represent ICANN.

So who do you think should represent ICANN at those fora?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I wasn't going to answer directly on this, but I think [inaudible] was first, and then me and then Sébastien.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, thank you. Since the whole notion of Internet governance, and I was with the WSIS, World Summit on the Information Society in 2005, I think we could cite the definition of Internet governance that emanated from there and it informed our thinking for more than ten years now.

Internet governance is the development and application of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures and programs that shape the evolution and use of the Internet. And this should be done by multi-stakeholders, that is to say by governments, by private sector and civil society.

Coming from that background, it's obvious that ICANN belongs to that [inaudible], has a sense of growth. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, [Maureen]. So I'm going to answer our ad a little bit more to the Internet governance thing and then afterwards, I'll answer your question if you'll allow me.

I often think of Internet governance as being Internet administration and ICANN and its component organizations and environment, should I add, so that includes the regional Internet registries. It includes pretty much everyone else that currently is, so the IETF, the ISTAR organizations, etc.

They administer the Internet's identifier system as we're looking at, and for other organizations, they go and administer other parts of the Internet and maybe other layers of the Internet.

This whole administration system at the moment is multi-stakeholder, as we say. It's not controlled by a single organization, single company, single stakeholder as such. And today's fora that we are seeing, for the ITU, like the UN General Assembly, etc. are challenging this current educational process that we have through various, maybe not the organizations themselves are challenging, but some of their members are challenging this and this is one of the reasons why ICANN needs to be at the table.

Now you ask who should represent ICANN at the table, and it's quite obvious that a single, a community member cannot represent ICANN at the table without having a clear mandate as to what they have to say.

---

Currently, ICANN is represented at the table by ICANN staff. There's a department that deals with this. There is also, and this leads into the second part here, there are three main centers, if you want, discussing the Internet administration or Internet governance as such.

There's the ICANN staff part with multi-stakeholder strategic initiatives on one side, but the people sitting at the table being the government engagement department. The second stakeholder group is the ICANN Board and Board members have been known to go and attend many of these meetings. They're not able to speak on behalf of ICANN as such, but in some cases, they certainly have been able to provide answers when asked factual questions about ICANN and ICANN's processes.

And thirdly, we also have throughout the community, whether in the ccNSO but also the GNSO and the At-Large community and also people from SSAC. We have individuals that do participate, perhaps sometimes wearing other hats being with governments or with civil society organizations or with private sector organizations and being able to continue promoting the multi-stakeholder model and factual information, again, about what we do at ICANN in the face of the informational attacks and other information that's being purported out there and saying that ICANN is not accountable, is running, is controlled by a single entity, etc. as you all know.

The whole point of the critical Internet resources is something that is often used to basically say if it's critical Internet resources, it has to be run by a government. It cannot be run by an independent operator. It

---

cannot be run by ICANN. It cannot be run by a multi-stakeholder system. It has to be multilateral and that's the importance of being present over in these fora.

So today, who represents ICANN? Government engagement staff represent ICANN both in New York and in Geneva and in other fora. That's the current state of affairs. But they work very closely – and I'd like to emphasize this – they work very closely with the community thanks to the Cross-Community Working Group that's currently in place and with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. There is a constant sharing of information between those three groups in ICANN. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Any other comments or questions? Oh, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Thank you Katrina for your very good question and I think we need to get back to a few years ago because the question you ask raised, for me, another issue that we're the voice of ICANN today and there is no anymore because the new CUN president decided that he is only the voice of ICANN.org, of the staff. He is not anymore the voice of ICANN as a whole, what I call the ICANN Organization. I am sorry that's the same word. So it's a global ICANN who includes the staff, the Board, and all of us.

Therefore, we have here a real trouble because you can say that it's someone in the staff with representing ICANN and giving the voice of

---

ICANN if the boss is not this voice. And I remember when I was in the Board, I struggle for that and I say, “No, the voice of ICANN must be the Chair of the Board because the Board is elected by all the constituency and by NomCom and so on and so forth, member pulled by the NomCom.” And it’s the same for other U.S.-based organizations. They say, “No, it must be the CEO.”

Therefore, it was the CEO and President. Even if I disagree, it was the case and they have a strong voice. So pray for your CEO being the voice of ICANN. Now it’s not anymore the case.

Then your question is much more than “Oh by the way, who is talking about [inaudible] off of ICANN?” It’s a very deep question that you’re asking.

But part of my answer will be, “Okay, but again, we don’t care.” We are ICANN. We, not you, not me, but “we” together, we’re ICANN. So therefore, we are the voice of ICANN. It’s why we need all of us to participate to those fora. Why? Just a small sentence. Because if someone wants to destroy or take part of what we are doing as a multi-stakeholder organization, we need to be there to [counterargument] about that and we can’t wait for the other to do that. We need to be together to do this.

It’s why I think it’s important to be on the IGF. Now you have IGF at the local level, regional level, sub-regional level, global level, whatever. And it’s why we need to have all of us engaged in one way or another at one another’s level and that’s something, your question is, I guess,

---

to have more thought on who needs to be the voice of ICANN or if we decide not to have anymore advice of ICANN. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Sébastien. We have a remote question.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much. We have two remote comments from Abdul Karim [inaudible]. The first comment is, “I think Internet governance at the moment is not just one table. It’s a lot of tables, which I think it’s a good thing. Then the rules set by ITU is as a result of consensus reached by people who are part of this ecosystem. The aim is not to destroy the Internet, but to make it stable. Hence, I disagree with some of Holly’s comments on ITU.”

And he has a second comment as well. The second comment is, “Yes, ICANN cannot speak directly but indirectly. What ICANN needs to do is to make sure that they engage those who are representing the member states at ITU and the academia. Thank you.”

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Barak?

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you, Katrina. Just to echo what has been said by the past speakers and also to add words by Michael [Ensi] who unfortunately is not a member of this community, or at least, I’m not sure. We’ll say if

---

you're not at the table, you're on the menu so I think it's Olivier who has captured it very well.

In this day and age, if ICANN is not on the table where Internet governance issues are being discussed, then it will definitely be cannibalized by the rest of the organizations and I think you can't talk about the Internet in this era without mentioning ICANN, and so ICANN is a critical stakeholder by virtue of the role it play sand ccTLD's world of not just in the African region where I come from, have played a critical role in evolution of national and regional initiatives which have been really key to growing the Internet governance conversation around the world. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Barrack. Okay, let me reiterate again. I think we govern Internet here and we are a part of Internet governance and our discussion is a part of Internet governance.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Tijani.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, I know Tijani but there might be, okay. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Katrina. I enjoyed your short questions, which are answers for the speech of Olivier and John. You answered very

---

short questions that means a lot. I think I'm understanding what you are saying.

I have the feeling that each time there is a plenipot meeting, there is more or less a heating there, here in ICANN and I don't know why. We are very, very good at Internet governance ecosystem. And the IGF, ICANN used to participate only by the ICANN open forum that was very poorly attended because the CEO and the senior staff come and say that ICANN is the best. We have the best model, we have the best, etc. So people don't come. They are not interested until we tell them that if you want people to be interested in ICANN, you have to make the community of ICANN participate in the IGF.

And they accepted that and we participated, and we made a lot of impact. People come to our events. They listen to us. They see that ICANN is not only staff, is not only board. ICANN is also the community and the community has positions, so it is not like it was said before that ICANN is just senior staff and the Board deciding.

So in the Internet Governance Forum, there is no problem. We are very well-represented there now and even if this year, ICANN decided not to fund anyone from the community to go there, it was a mistake. But we are there. I personally have two workshops in the body's IGF.

It's right that there is and there will be always those who think that the Internet governance should be done by governments. There are people like this and there will be, always, those people. The only response to them is how we are working, the efficiency, an Internet which is never in failure. Always there is a security, there is a very good

---

job done, and also, there is participation by everyone, by the community. The community is diverse. This is the response or the answer to those who always ask for making it multilateral governments.

So I don't have any fear. I don't think there is a problem. The only problem is that when we stop participating, we have to participate and nobody can prevent us from participating. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Young-eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thank you, Katrina. I don't think that Katrina disagrees with the fact that the issue of Internet governance is very important and that ICANN needs to be involved in it. I think the question is focused on whether considering the real day-to-day activities of the ccNSO and also considering the fact that maybe the GNSO has a similar sort of stance, whether the support of all of the SOs and the ACs are necessary. And so that's where Katrina's coming from.

And I think that although the day-to-day activities of the ccNSO do not actually have a lot to do with the Internet governance activities globally, I think the many responses here have emphasized the fact that there needs to be some sort of a cross-community support for this activity, and maybe not just the Board. Thank you.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you very much. So I see that you, around the table, believe that Internet governance, participation and Internet governance should be a strategic priority for the coming years and here we can smoothly move to the next question. What other activities does ALAC consider as strategic priorities for the upcoming strategic plan?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes. We had a group that was actually looking at strategic priorities and they based the priorities for At-Large as such on the current priorities, sort of in the hope that if they were presented to the Board, that they would incorporate those priorities into their things. So could I have someone from that group to present those?

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, while you're getting organized, may I ask Giovanni to tell a little bit about our exercise in this respect?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Katrina. Giovanni Seppia, .EU. What we have been doing is that, first of all, there was a session that was organized by ICANN at the Panama meeting to collect possible trends and to summarize those trends. And then we looked at, let's say, what could be strategic priorities for the next five-year strategy plan cycle and we came up with some priorities that like, for instance, having a security and stability of the entire Internet infrastructure as one of the priorities should be kept in the ICANN strategy plan.

---

We understand that the ICANN strategy plan group that is looking after the production of the strategy plan is going to share a very first draft of the strategy plan with the community in the near future and will be ready as we did five years ago to comment on the various priorities. And as five years ago, we will highlight if there is any overlap between the different priorities.

It's an ongoing exercise and at the same time, one important element is that for the first time in the entire ICANN history, what ICANN has stated is that the next strategy plan will be a fully-costed strategy plan. That means that we will have really to think about the priorities not only from, let's say, a sort of philosophical perspective but mainly from also a financial perspective because ICANN is going through some resources, possibly issues, and the main revenue from ICANN are the registrations of Top-Level Domains.

The trends are not as positive as they were a few years ago, so the community, as even the current CEO said, is called to make a list of priorities on which ICANN should act and this is our duty. It's not going to be up to ICANN to decide on those priorities. It will be up to us to decide what are those priorities and now to eventually allocate the funds available to ICANN to those priorities, and that's also [inaudible].

The last question, what is the exercise that we should do to find ways to optimize the ICANN budget spending?

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Giovanni. Giovanni is the Chair of our Strategic and Operational planning committee. Every time they look into all those planning documents and ICANN budget and every time they submit, really, very valuable comments and suggestions back to ICANN.org.

So are you going to present your views?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Glenn, did you get them?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: This afternoon, we broke into groups as Maureen has indicated and we looked at the five core strategic plans, and as a group, we had a consensus in terms of looking at how we can, I guess you would say, harmonize or endorse the core concepts of the strategic plan.

So the first one we looked at, and I think they're going to pull it up now evolve and further globalization. And we looked at that, and echoing the term "One World, One Internet" where we stressed the term "evolve" in terms of our analysis that it's a slow process. It's an evolution in terms of production to be an inclusive and empowering process, reaching out mainly to those suffering on the wrong side of the [inaudible] divide.

And one of the areas that our group identified is bringing into the fold some of those contraries that have the geopolitical ostracizations, such as Cuba, North Korea and elsewhere.

---

That was one of the first strategic goals. The second one was support a healthy, stable, and resilient unique identifier ecosystem. That was a little bit simpler in terms of the our team approach. It's, again, keep it as unique to identifier system with no fragmentation. We need to be able to provide the facilities that connect everyone.

Thirdly, advance organizational technology and operational excellence. Again, like any other organization or company, it's core to the effectiveness of the organization to have at its root, concepts of continuous quality improvement, increase efficiencies to not only meet the bottom line but to deliver on to what they stated that they needed to do.

Fourthly, promote ICANN's role in the multi-stakeholder approach. Here we identified the need to improve awareness of ICANN's role and that's partly an outreach strategy. But to educate people on the openness and the non-exclusiveness of the multi-stakeholder model. Again, in summary, keep the doors open.

And lastly, develop and implement a global public interest framework bounded by the ICANN mission. Again, one of the tools to do that is to deploy a multi-stakeholder approach.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any questions? Giovanni, comment? No.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Do you have questions from your guys?

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, and then the last one, perhaps. Do you see any areas where we have an opportunity to reduce costs?

JOHN LAPRISE: That was not our analysis, but there was another group that actually did that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, I was in that group. But unfortunately, we didn't actually get around to it because what we ended up focusing on was not so much getting ICANN to be able to reduce their cost. It was, first of all, really identifying what it is that we need funding for within At-Large and we were actually focusing on end user needs and how we can more effectively address those needs within communities and our outreach programs, and also how that whole purpose that we have for At-Large, and that's actually sort of like engaging. How do we engage our ALSes and individual members into the whole?

Policy development is sort of like process and so we got quite carried with it. Didn't we, Joanna? [inaudible] so that we didn't actually touch on the money side of things, but we've got the budget talks soon anyway. So we can't help you with that one, unfortunately.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much.

---

HOLLY RAICHE: I think we've got a remote person who is probably trying to get through. Yes, Yesim. Yesim, can you get hold of the [inaudible]? Is she able to...?

YESIM NAZLAR: It was. Judith, are you able to speak? I know you have dialed in but not sure if you are still on the phone bridge. This is Yesim speaking.

Judith is saying she wants to be unmuted so I'm asking tech support if Judith's line is muted or not.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yesim, I'm sorry. We're going to have to sort of forego this because Katrina and her team have only got a few more minutes left.

Okay, one minute for each of these two.

[HOLLY RAICHE]: Just a quick comment. We had Silvia talk to us with the whole team, talk to us. The message she gave us is not that we are going to lose funding but that we're at a plateau and they are not necessarily cost cutting but at cost no-rise and the sort of thing where if somebody leaves, you seriously ask if you need that. So his message is not that we're losing money. His message was manage the money wisely and understand there isn't a pot of gold somewhere else.

---

So I guess it's wrong to characterize it as just losing. It's just not going up. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify. I didn't say "losing money". I said that the revenues coming from new registrations might be lower as is the case now, has been the case for the past two years, and this is something the committee, as a PC committee, has been pointing out to ICANN the past five years [inaudible], two years, to realize that it was the case. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Katrina. As you might know, the ALAC and At-Large community has just come out of a review process that has taken place.

KATRINA SATAKI: We're just entering it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a thoroughly enjoyable experience. You'll love every little bit of it and we've loved it so much that we've decided to put together an implementation team to take another few years to take us to the next review. But one of the, or many of the points that we made there were

---

also about making good use of funds that ICANN is currently having and so on, and spending. And several of our processes are introducing metrics when it comes down to the way that we do things, how effective we are in doing things, how effective our At-Large structures are, our representatives, how effective the ALAC is.

So we're at the beginning of implementation. There's much work that's going in there, but that's one of the ways that we are proposing in making sure that ICANN money is well-spent and although we are not a product as such with a return on investment, we do take much care into making sure that when we're here, we do work and we actually produce results because ultimately, that's what we're here for. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, and thank you very much for taking our questions seriously and answering them as good as you could. So thank you very much and I think we could actually, next time, we can let you ask questions to us.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

[inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Maureen. I was just going to take 30 seconds just to let you know that cooperation between regional At-Large organizations and regional organizations that coordinate ccTLDs is

---

doing quite well. I understand that APRALO has signed a while ago, an MoU for collaboration with APTLD and I wanted to let you know that EURALO is currently in discussions with Center so as to be able to also sign a similar collaboration MoU.

Unfortunately, so many things happen, we did manage. We're not going to manage to sign it here but we're hoping that this can be signed very soon and I'm sure other regional At-Large organizations will follow suit as well. So it's great to talk at various levels, not only once at ICANN meetings every now and then, but also throughout the year directly. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Olivier.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you to the At-Large community and thank you very much to the ccNSO for coming along. We really do appreciate and want to work in with you as much as we can.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. It was a pleasure. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just for the record, this session is now adjourned. Thank you very much, which means interpreters, thank you very much for a great

---

second day. And thank you, technical team. We are returning the half and hour we stole last night. Thank you. Not that it makes up for it.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**