
MARRAKECH – At-Large Policy Debrief - what impact did At-Large make this week?

Thursday, June 27, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:00 WET

ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. If you wouldn't mind getting settled now, I'm sure that Jonathan is just raring to go. I can see the energy. Buzzing. Okay. Over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Jonathan Zuck for the record. Welcome back after your coffee break. I hope you're energized by your coffee, juice, and brownies.

We can talk a little bit about policy. There's a couple of things that I'd like to do with this session. Obviously, the session that was the bookend to this one went a little off the rails because we spent quite a bit of time just talking about how we would build consensus in At-Large, which is very important discussion. It just was transactionally distracting I guess, for lack of a better term.

So we didn't spend a lot of time talking about what the opportunities might be to use the talking points and things like that. We had a spreadsheet. A couple of people signed up for the spreadsheet. I'd be interested to see how that turned out. But I guess what I'd like to do is put out three questions and go

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.

around the room and get you to answer those three questions are succinctly as possible, non-philosophically but just sort of literally sort of report on your experience of the week, if you would. Because I want to make this process of talking points and things like that to be a useful one for all of us. This time around, we ran them through the CPWG a little bit more. They weren't sprung on you at the last minute like we did last time just because we got the idea on a different call. I mean that was really the issue. We had the ICANN64 Planning Committee call where we came over the idea of having talking points. And as a result, nobody got to see them until the day of and so hopefully that was a little bit different.

What I'd like to do is just get your impressions of the document and whether you found that useful and what improvements you'd like to see in it. The second is, what sessions did you attend outside of this room, and did you get an opportunity to raise any of those points? And then a third and related question is, did you have informal conversations outside of any room, in the hallway, at dinner, etc., where you were glad that you had these briefing points? Because these conversations came up about EPDP Phase 2 or Subsequent Procedures etc., did you have those opportunities and how did they go? And how well prepared did you feel to have those conversations? That's the idea. I mean the bottom line behind this document is to arm you

with some information and talking points on things that we've spent a lot of time talking about within the confines of the CPWG so that when you're out in hallway, you feel like you're in a good place.

So, do you want to intercede before I try to go around the room? Yeah, yeah, I really just wanted to literally hear from everyone, their feedback on that because we were hoping that everybody would get an opportunity to make use of them either formally or informally, and I'm anxious for you feedback.

Perhaps I'll start with Sebastien. He's in the corner of the room over there. And we'll talk about consensus later.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'll talk in French. Because I need the consensus for that. No. I need a unanimity for that. Okay. Excusez-moi. I'm sorry. I am trying to make a joke. It's difficult for me you know that.

Jonathan, in order to respond to your very good question, my use of this talking point for me is that it was very useful to have an idea of the points that were coming to all of us. So I can't tell you that I had such discussion with such and that was useful but globally it was good because it allowed me to have a bit of a landscape on the most important themes within At-Large and ALAC, and therefore I think this was really useful.

The sessions that I went to in the outside had to do with the third review team of transparency and responsibility. It's very difficult to translate ATRT3. So, there were no really talking points for me on that subject because we listened to what other people were saying, but I think that it was a very useful exercise. But to answer your question directly, I can't tell you that I heard this and this and that at such or such point of time. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, can we just continue around the room. Perhaps Olivier? What language will you be speaking?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm going to speak French. I'm sorry, I'm writing something that's a little important, so can I come in a little bit later please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Let's continue around.

SARATA BARRY: Next speaker. No, I don't have much to say. Please, you can continue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Share a little bit about what your experience of the week was.

SARATA BARRY: My name is Sarata Barry from Guinea. I do not have much to say. Can we continue please? Sarata Barry from Guinea. I just got started as an individual member for AFRALO.

ISAAC MAPOSA: Isaac Maposa. I really love the sessions on Policy Development Process. It has quite a good session. Since I also want to get more involved into policy development, so I really love the session. Unfortunately, there are some other sessions I could not attend because of the afternoon Fellowship session which I was attending, but they request quite good for me. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hey, Jonathan, it's Judith Hellerstein. Of the outside sessions, the ones outside of At-Large that I attended, I'm very active in the Auction Proceeds. We had a three and a half hour session trying to sort of close out and move on to the next phase. It was a very active session. I think it was also good, a lot to take back into the At-Large community.

I'm looking at some of the illustrative examples and as well as finally choosing a mechanism that we're going to actively using to wait for the independent panel to judge it. I was also in the Internet Governance session as well and the Multistakeholder. I

think the Multistakeholder session is very important, it also highlights the importance of some of the work that we had done and I had done, the statement with Marita Moll on the Strategic Plan and the five-year initiative and finding out the priorities.

I had a separate meeting prior to that because on the pre-webinar I had asked several questions to Suzanne on that. So we scheduled a pre-meeting and I got to ask many of the same questions that people asked at the Multistakeholder event. More on how do we make sure that we know what the priorities of ICANN are so At-Large priorities can match better, and especially if we find what theirs are and they're not going to be done into like the third phase then we could say, "Our priorities are these and we would like to get them in the first phase."

So she encouraged us to – I would probably also maybe join with Marita in doing the response to the comment on the Strategic Plan so that we could make sure that the At-Large priorities are focused on and that we can match them so that they're not in the third phase when we will need them done much earlier. So I think that was very helpful.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Judith. That's great. And it's okay if the answer is no or whatever, but if I could drill in a little bit of this exercise of us having points. We had a couple of talking points about auction

proceeds, you added to them so you know better than any of us what our At-large priorities are for that Auction Proceeds group.

I guess I'd love to ask you how those priorities are faring. How are they doing? When you raised those points, are you getting pushed back? Is there something we should be doing to support you better? It was about ALS's transparent process, ALSes being able to apply and you added two more as well that I'm blanking on. They were our points, how are they doing in that process?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes. Our points are doing well. We do have a lot of support especially the At-Large statement. We have not dealt with the Conflict of Interest and the other things that were on the other statement. We're working with the Board in getting many of our points are aligned with that of the ICANN Board especially regarding the independence of the review panel. And then the independence of the mechanism, but also is allowing outside entities to apply. But we're not at that stage yet. We had to pick a mechanism first but also we will be allowing outside entities to apply.

Xavier and Sam talked about some of the legal issues, but it doesn't seem like that's going to be a problem. The ALSes have to be separate entities in themselves. So if you're a registered non-profit or something else in another place then you won't

have that much difficulty in applying. The idea is you still have to apply like any other person and the independent panel will then be reviewing applications. What we worked on is a contribution that also Alan and Vanda had given was that if an evaluation panel turns you down and they say a reason that doesn't seem work with what you have submitted, you can request them to have a debriefing on that and explain, "Why we are disqualified was not relating possibly. We didn't explain it well," or something like that.

Right now we're trying to really go through all the public comments and make sure that there are answers and whether do we need to go with another stage of public comments or do we need to narrow down the fine stage of that so that we don't end up with a lot of public comments that we didn't spent a while to go through, that we can really get this thing on the road into the next phase.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

But there's no action item for us to take on. You feel like that's proceeding in a way that is beneficial to our objectives as the At-Large?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, I do. Once we finish this second round, these rounds of comments – before we go for another public comment on the mechanism, we’ll brief everyone because there’s still very much confusion of what an independent panel means and what an advisory panel means especially in the phases. We had the three phases: one was setting up an internal foundation, the other is a separate group doing it, but also the first phase which is ICANN only, the question is – and it was not clear to the group and even within At-Large we have confusion on what they actually mean. And from my conversations with the Board members representing them, Becky Burr and Martin, they are going to try to work out and will clarify what the Board means by independent and whether in mechanism A, which is ICANN only, that it does contracted out, what are the rules of the contracted out people. If they are hired by ICANN and can be fired by ICANN at will, that’s not necessarily truly independent.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So, we’re still hashing out these things in the weeds.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Thank you very much. Satish, go ahead. I'm sorry, were you not here? Sorry.

SATISH BABU: Sorry. Satish for the record.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry about that. Three questions. One is, were the talking points useful? How could they be improved? And did you get an opportunity to raise those points either informally in a session outside of this room or in the hallway or dinner or something like that, and how did that go?

SATISH BABU: Can I take after the round is over? Because I was talking with the Bangladesh GAC member so I got held up there outside.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

SATISH BABU: Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi, this is Sarah Kiden for the record. I was late so I don't think I have much to say about this. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great. Glenn for the transcript of record. The first thing I saw when we sat down at the first day was the document. I thought this is a great step in the right direction in terms of identifying the key issues for discussion. Perhaps we could've went through it at the launch and the purpose of it, but I enjoyed it. I think it helps us in NARALO in particular because we're trying to identify whether you call it hot issues, hot topics, whatever you want, but this is where the action is and it helps us formulate the communication to our unaffiliated members and our ALSes extending the additional information through the monthly newsletter, through our educational webinar series as well as our NARALO Insights video series.

So, I think it's great. I think this helps us try to galvanize and pinpoint where the pressure points are like an acupuncture thing. So, I don't know whose idea it was but I congratulate those who created this – and I don't know if it was you, Jonathan – but I really enjoyed it and I think perhaps this is something that should be enshrined for future meetings as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Go ahead.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: This is Eduardo. I think it's a very good document in the sense that it syncs up the all of us to say the same thing in a nutshell. I remember that one of the purposes for this was to go out and getting to this meeting, and I found that kind of odd because you don't know what is going to be discussed in those meetings to say what it says there. But you're networking, so that part of if you get to talk about some of these things, you more or less know what the ALAC position is on that. So, I think it's a great document and not only for this meeting but for the people that are out there. Our ALSes, they can use this document and they know what we were talking about.

I had the opportunity to go to a Rights Protection Mechanism meeting with an expectation that I was a Rights Protection Mechanism for users, it was a GNSO. Well, I just went there with Humberto and I found that it was for trademarks. But it was very interesting in the sense that they went like tan-tan-tan-tan-tan-tan-tang. Humberto was able to get a comment in one of the questions that they were asking for the charter. They were very interesting in the language issue, so it was nice that we went there and did that.

One of the presentations that I really like was the DoH.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just to hold you up. Did you hear anything in there that concerns you, that you thought we should take on or anything like that? Something beyond than being interesting, I guess.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Well, you mean from the Rights Protection Mechanism? We really don't know because we don't do trademarks here. I'm not a trademark person. I mean I don't have a brand, so really I couldn't relate to that.

What I took from that, it was the way it was done. I was like bang, bang, bang, bang. There wasn't this rambling of going around somewhere, it was like pointing. I guess all of them, all the people they were lawyers.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: This is Fatimata, AFRALO Vice-Chair. This meeting has been very special for me because I was with the students most of the time – the students from [inaudible] brought in to know more about ICANN. I really enjoyed mentoring them, attending technical meetings with them, and answering their questions. Questions around DNSSEC and the little things around root servers, how are they being allocated? How come we don't have a root server in Africa and things like that? And how they can engage?

Most importantly – I don't have a good night sleep, I'm sorry. Most importantly, the visit we prepared at the University of Marrakech to present issues related to ICANN and answering students' questions. It was really important for us and we had – I was really amazed by Hamza, this young entrepreneur, young registrar, ICANN registrar, explaining how he got to that level and answering all the questions from the students.

The other meeting I attended was the African meeting. I mean it was also very amazing because this time the room was full. It was the Diamond room. The room was full of African leaders and also ICANN leaders from Goran to – you know, they're all there, explaining how we can engage, what ICANN has been doing, and what needed to be better done in a better way.

These are the main things I attended outside the ICANN meeting. And in terms of networking, really I think I was like a teacher for those students and also for the newcomers attending the GAC meetings and wanting to know about what we're doing within At-Large and how they can engage. So, I had to explain that. The government people are not really the ones who would be attending At-Large meeting and stuff like that, but please look what you have in your country. If there are associations dealing with end users, dealing with the use of Internet, development of Internet in your countries, those are the people we would like to see in At-Large, and I gave them the way to do that, telling them

how to get access to the website, to do wiki and see what they can do. Also, they wanted to learn more about what we're doing within At-Large. It's open to anyone to be accepted in the mailing list. They can also be individual members and things like that.

So, really, this time I mean I think the African community was very active and we got a lot of questions also lately to the AFRALO/AfrICANN statements drafted during this session. I think that's all. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. That's very interesting. Do you feel like most of your conversations were just about the processes of ICANN? Or did you end up getting questions or talking about the policy discussions that are going on around privacy, around application support, things like that? Were there things about the substance, if you will, that the people are asking? And did you feel empowered to answer those questions? I'm just kind of curious whether there was some that – like the politics. Were there questions like, why does the government feel this way but the registrars feel this way? Those kinds of questions. Does that make sense?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yes. Both, actually. They asked questions related to processes a lot and of course, for example, some students will ask, within Africa, how come we can't do our own things? For example, how come governments will not let us decide on doing something? So, we have to really explain the multistakeholder model and explain to them how ICANN works in terms of processes and Policy Development Process.

And of course, the questions were about how come – I already said that – how come all root servers are in the U.S.? Why don't we have some root servers decentralized? The other question was fragmentation of Internet. These are students, also they learned about the Chinese people trying to have their own root server and also did the Russians and stuff like that. They said, "What will the world will be if there is this fragmentation?" Difficult questions. I don't have always the answers but I tried and also I gave them references. I said, "Just read, you're students. You can read things and also continue to ask questions. Even you can ask questions through the mailing list and you have people answering some of those questions."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: You're welcome.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: This is Ricardo Holmquist for the record. I had several issues to discuss. I always thank you for the documents. I think it's becoming better each time. I still do criticize as a constructive criticism the fact that we have gone from four to five items in Kobe that was easy to remember. At my age, it's difficult to remember a few things. So I remembered the five items or five issues in Kobe. But I think the final documents that were released was actually excellent.

One of the things we do have in ALAC is usually they come, they visit us, and they tell us things. But a few times we go there, now with the exceptions of the GAC, and this is an excellent document that you can provide to SSAC, to the GNSO, to the ccNSO through the liaisons or whoever, because what they state is what is our position, what do we think about what is going on here? So, I think we can actually use this, if I'm not mistaken, if I didn't misunderstand Satish. I think he was the one who said this. This is even good to bring it inwards beyond our ALSes, beyond a number of people. So, I think it's an excellent material for the social media group to have material to send to people and to them what it is that we're doing, even the ICANN people who are always in need of information. And that is our position.

At the end of the day this is a summary of what we've done and I think this is excellent material.

Perhaps there is an imbalance or a balance that is difficult to understand between meetings that we have here where we're supposedly discussing what we're interested in to then go to the other meeting. Out of these few meetings, we have been building the high impact meetings, so the kick sessions. But I think in order for this to be constructive for us, we need to be in all the panels.

I was surprised that the DoH and DoT panel had no representative of each of the SOs or ACs. There should be. It wasn't a meeting that the ccNSO built with the SSAC. So sometimes we spend one month discussing which should be these kick-off meetings because large parts of the ALAC members wearing this ALAC [inaudible] discussion. So if we decided that it was this or that, this was because we wanted to be there, and not to just be spectators as they say in my country. We need to be able to say, "This is my position but from here not from there, not from the outside to stand in the microphone and say it."

This leads me to ICANN66 where we will have Atlas and it will be more complicated to say which meetings we will attend. We will have very limited space, so I think it would be important to have

all these talking points and send it via social media or somehow else because we will have very limited time to be able to interact with others when we will actually be interacting with the 60 or 80 or 100 people attending the summit.

Finally, to bring this to the attention of other constituencies, I don't really have 10 or 15 years in ALAC as is the case of Judith. I've only been here for two years. I go out to the corridors and I have coffee with some of you. Judith knows everybody. She's in ten different groups, so it is difficult to bring your own words when you're new. The constant complaint we get from other constituencies is you need to be renewed, and when we are renewed part of what we lose is the friendships that are out there. And in my case, I was a Fellow and then they may find another Fellow out there, but if that Fellow or those five Fellows that I met did not come to the meeting, it is very hard to say this to someone else. And they [see] this Herbalife seller or one of those who are really persistent and want to understand. So, it's complicated to do that. That's what I wanted to say. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you. Did you feel like you could raise your hand in the DoH/DoT session and make an intervention or not? Was it just they took all the time with the panel?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Yes, I know I can raise my hand there. There was no problem in doing that. I understand the presentation. We have a position there. Sebastien made the position. I was expecting Sebastien to talk because he was about to do that. John I guess was only the one who talked – and Holly and they were very aware of that. So if there was a point not taken by any of those three persons, maybe I will raise my hand. This was very useful. In fact, for DoH I put half of the paragraph at the end of the last page. So, yes, I contribute something there.

WALE BAKARE: Alright. Wale Bakare for the record. EURALO Secretariat. I've attended Auction Proceeds then ccNSO then At-Large sessions as well. What I discovered there are two things. The challenge that we have is about balancing between end users' interest and the ICANN business which is about DNS. We find it so difficult to really balance between these two aspects. One thing I discovered in all these sessions, one key thing or two elements that I discovered that these meetings centered on is about cyber security, security and maybe other upcoming innovations with regard to Universal Acceptance.

The policy development, what I would like to see in the next meeting, ICANN66, I would like us, At-Large, to really be able to emphasize on what are the interests of end users. How are we

going to get this integrated into the maybe policy implementation process of ICANN? There are issues that are very pertinent to the end users from different regions.

Also we talked about the presenters, they talk about IoT. IoT is a different landscape entirely and its architectural work is quite different. That is going to add to the complexity of cyber security in the sense that we need to really understand, what are the interests of end users? Central is security. We need to balance this. We need to really emphasize on how we can really gravitate towards the interest of end users. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Did you get an opportunity to do that outside this room in sessions around the building? Were you able to bring up the interests of end users in sessions outside of the At-Large sessions?

WALE BAKARE:

Yeah. I discovered that the focus there was about [inaudible]. I wanted to but they mentioned that. There are different working groups and the process has just started. So the next meeting, I tend to come up with maybe kind of draft towards that, about what are the interests of end users and how we can really integrate this into the policy development with regard to

ICANN's perspective on this. That's what I'm trying to put in place in the next meeting. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Tijani speaking. If the exercise is good or not, I think it is wonderful. ICANN64 exercise was very successful. This one I think it is also very good.

Have I talked with people in the corridor during the breaks about those points? You cannot stand and talk to anyone in the community without speaking about Subsequent Procedure, about EPDP or about essentially evolution of the multistakeholder model. This is I think the hottest topic among people here. Everyone speaks about that.

Other sessions? Yes, I attended other sessions but all the student's sessions and they were mainly learning sessions, so we didn't address those points. I attended the [Consultacion Francophonie], but the concern was not those points.

How people react? I felt that there is a big disappointment from the contracted party essentially about the position of the Board regarding the Phase 1 of the PDP. And regarding the multistakeholder model, some people think that this evolution, this exercise shouldn't be done by this community because they said they are always the same people who do that. So we will

end with another or a new version that is not very far from this one. I think this is all I want to say. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

John Laprise for the record. If staff can please give a one-minute timer please. I haven't gotten to many sessions outside of this room. Some of the high-interest sessions I have made interventions in – and actually I used the talking points as well. Actually, this morning I invoked the documents in our very first discussion this morning, so it was very useful to come out strongly with things that I could just – in fact, I've referenced them. I remembered from having read it and said, "I need to refresh my memory before I spoke," so this was incredibly useful.

In the halls, yes, I've had lots of conversations and the talking points have been always sort of at the back of my mind. So, yeah, I found that useful and I've used it on many occasions across the board. I don't have any suggestions per se about the format except perhaps maybe a top-line list of bullet points across the range and then below a more detailed explanation.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay. I've been outside of this room. Most of my time should have been taken out with individual meetings. So when I've

been talking to people like Cherine or Goran, it's been very important for me to have been able to refer to those talking points so that it's always been in my little book. I think that taking them to that high level has also been just as important. I must admit that when I've been [inaudible] has been more not so much talking policy. It's other stuff.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You said you and John were in a meeting on Saturday when you were able to use them some hours or something like that – SOs and ACs? I don't remember what it was.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. It was SO/AC's Chairs meeting. Yeah, we had to give what was on top for us, and that was an important document so it's good, it's great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Yeah, I missed my slot earlier. It feels a bit strange sitting here, a lot of people looking at you. Just kidding.

Two things, what did we do well? I think that our meeting with the GAC was very successful. Very much thanks to all the efforts that Yrjö has been going on in between sessions and with his counterpart on the GAC. It's a very different dynamic than it was a few years ago when we were trying to do things but we didn't know which way to move forward and so on, so it's great to see this expansion of collaboration. I'd like to see this go further because really, when it comes down to issues of the public interest – and there's so many different topics today that relate to this from the Subsequent Procedures to the EPDP to everything else, we seem to have more alignment than disagreements between those two Advisory Committees, so I'd really like to see further collaboration on this.

What we didn't do so well I think is we didn't take advantage of the small setting that we have here to do a lot of small bilateral discussions with other parts of the GNSO in particular. Little informal meetings during lunchtime and things where you just try and see, "Okay, what are your views on this? What are our views on this? What differences do we have? What can we do together?" But maybe we just have such a filled schedule that this was impossible to do.

Actually, coming back to the collaboration with the GAC, I also think that we probably could also action the fact that many of us are in connection while the At-Large Structures are also

influential in their own country, and I don't know to what extent you all talk to your GAC rep but I think a lot of us do. The GAC having changed a lot in the past few years, as you know recently there were a lot of new members that came in, so they really are eager to learn things and they have to learn on a very fast track because there's going to be some real decisions to be made in the close future. In fact, there's some time. So the more support we can give and provide our views informed over the years, the more likely we are to have an even better impact. That's all. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Jonathan. There'll be no surprise to you I'm sure anyone else who deals with the Consolidated Policy Working Group that I'm a fan of the talking points. I think the talking points are a very valuable tool and I'm absolutely in support of our continued use of them.

That said, I think it's something because if we can establish and perhaps, Madam Chair, we can establish at this meeting, if this is going to be a tool that we visualize regularly, we can actually build them earlier or almost build them as we go between meetings so there is greater time to refine them to make sure all of us – even those who are Fellows or been busy doing other things – are aware of them and come pre-planned, pre-prepared

within and maybe making some annotations, and then we can have our meetings to see if there's – first up, are there any annotations or adjustments or whatever? That's a suggestion for improvement. So, useful yes. Improvement – that would be one of them.

Did I use them in a session? Well, since I have been immersed in GNSO Council, immersed in ATRT3, and immersed in additional things that actually did have to do with policy regarding Subsequent Procedures, I guess what I didn't use them in a session, I certainly did use them, though not in detail, I used the fact that they existed very effectively in some of the bilateral discussions that I had with other leaders, for example, of Subsequent Procedures and the GAC leadership. Then Subsequent Procedure leadership and staff also had an additional meeting just in case the program wasn't busy enough with what I think is a great thing, and that is the Focus Group that the GAC has is developing on Subsequent Procedures. The fact that this existed, even though we didn't table them, was really, really useful to me. So that's a good thing.

Informal use? Yes, I did use them informally again to remind – and this is the corridor talk question – some leadership and some rank and file that I work with in Subsequent Procedures that we have got a consolidated opinion on some of these things that is going to come out of the At-Large Advisory Committee.

As a leader of SubPro – because our coach is SubPro – I felt it was useful for me to awareness raise that team or parts of that team about the fact that this is on its way and you should be expecting it. That’s far too long a nutshell it for me.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess a lot of being a Chair removes you from a position of advocacy within that group, so I think we’ll try to leverage you as much as possible from an intelligence gathering standpoint so that someone else can be assigned to jump on a fire that you see starting or something like that. So let’s keep trying to do that going forward.

HOLLY RAICHE:

First of all, I think just developing the document was really useful. Making everybody – at least we got to come to consensus or at least determining what we haven’t come to consensus. In terms of when it was clear, we hadn’t come to consensus when I had to report on the discussion on geonames, it was pretty clear. We had consensus on the first three, not the fourth. That was [inaudible] out.

In terms of the meetings that I went to other than these policy meetings, I didn’t get a chance to use them. One was the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. That was all

about [inaudible] itself with its own structure and then it was about national legislation. Of course Australia’s legislation came up [unhappily].

Other meetings that I went to – I did go to the briefing on the DoT/DoH one and we didn’t have anyone in the panel but I went up afterwards and said, “Look, these are the issues that we’ve got and I think you should be aware of the fact that we’ve talked about these.” At least I was able to use that.

Other meetings – I went to the root zone server meeting. Now, I don’t know anywhere near enough to talk a lot about it except to say I was stunned the day we’re working through metrics. They don’t have metrics about performance. I sat there in quiet amazement I guess. They’re working though that. I didn’t put my hand up because I thought I’m not going to say anything, but maybe come back and say they don’t have metrics. They’re still arguing about metrics. That really surprised me. I would’ve thought that they did.

What else did I do? A couple of ccNSO meetings but those were just briefings about what they’re doing. It was some briefing about the one guy who’s developing an open source blockchain thing explained that, which was interesting but again, not necessarily relevant for these meetings.

So, very useful document and I use at occasion. Of course, I used it this morning to back John up. I think that's it. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. First, I wanted to support what Ricardo was saying in terms of distributing the points. I think it's a very relevant point. I love the talking points. They help me out I understanding where we stand and what we do. In that sense, I also support Cheryl's note on refining the procedures, so we might want to start earlier and make sure that this is a consensus opinion but overall, I think it's a very good point of departure for any discussions we're having here.

In terms of sessions I participated in, there haven't been many, unfortunately or fortunately as I've spent my time predominantly in this room. We had the capacity building meeting together with the GAC which I found to be very fruitful and in terms of impact of those talking points and our hot topics list which correlate as we have heard mentioned before. I found them useful because that gives a clear position of where At-Large stands. The return to document was the result of a survey that GAC had among its members and there clearly is a correlation when it comes as you might predict to privacy security, DNS security, understanding the multistakeholder process.

So in that sense, the discussion points would fuel the joint capacity building exercise we're trying to perform together with the GAC. I must admit that the questions that I was approached with in the corridors mainly focused on procedures, which is probably the result of the capacity building session we had. So I would have people coming up to me and saying, "How do you do it?" rather than approaching the topics themselves. I think it complements the discussion on the talking points, so once people understand how we do it, the discussion points document is very useful for them to pick and choose from among the topics that we feel are relevant and our positions to better understand how to swiftly get involved into that policy drafting process. So I would view that as an indirect impact of those talking points. Once they get the procedures, the talking points are very useful to get them involved in the actual drafting process, if that makes sense. Thank you.

FOUAD RIAZ BAJWA:

Thank you. I had to leave for the Fellowship Wrap-Up. Thank you for having me here. This was my last fellowship. Sorry, Fouad Bajwa from APRALO. I had the opportunity to join ICANN in 2009. Thank you, Cheryl, for bringing me on board from the IGF community.

It has been a very amazing journey through APRALO. I hope I've been of some contribution to the ALAC community. The schedule journey has helped me embrace the world of public policy development and I've been doing that to a great degree until now. This opportunity in my last fellowship has helped me come back and engage with the community and learn the most pressing issues, the developments that have been happening.

I wasn't really up to health when I came in Abu Dhabi but thank you for having me then again and helping me work through with the APRALO. Satish, thanks so much. Maureen, thank you so much. ICANN staff, thank you so much.

It has been really amazing. I wasn't aware of the DoH and when I sat through that session, I made an intervention but I couldn't really interpret that because there was so much going through my mind when I heard about the technology, TLS over HTTPS. For me, that was just amazing because it would just open up new opportunity for the end users that their traffic would no more intervened by governments, and that would really put the state of all content over the DNS in a new perspective. And when you look at that from the user's perspective, it really means that we are embarking on this new journey of awareness and helping our user understand how the DNS is innovating. This is amazing. This requires a lot more attention from our end, for our ALSes,

for our RALOs. I think it requires a bit of deeper understanding how it is going to evolve.

The day of 24th was mostly updates and throughout the day I think it was really important for any Fellow to go through that day. One thing I've understood through this process through these days is that I want to contribute to the penholding activities. This morning, I had a one-to-one discussion with Justine and I think there are areas where I can volunteer and contribute to ALAC without my presence physically over here. I won't be joining the Atlas, I wanted to give that opportunity to someone from our region. I've already done Atlas. This one is different definitely, but others should come in, they should get this experience. They should join the community, they should move on within the ALAC processes.

The MSM was one thing which I was amused in the sense that why was it happening. I think that is something I would like to learn more about from our senior members – why is ICANN doing that activity when we've already gone through the EPDP. It feels as if there's a new structure, a new power play happening within ICANN with the MSM activity. Maybe I'm still too backward on that.

One amazing thing which I felt is a good thing which has happened in ALAC was the Policy Development Workshop. That

was amazing. A round of applause to all of you who put it together, and I believe I even discussed this with Joanna that [raised them] the day right after the workshop. It's an asset. It should be there on the ICANN Learn platform. It should be there in Atlas. And I think it should be part of our ALAC, our activities across the world. Even if you could do workshops around other regions, you have really designed it in a wonderful manner.

One thing I still feel is that our knowledge on from the user perspective, knowledge on the Universal Acceptance and the GDPR issue still remain not at a very high degree. I think that is one area where we as users should be more educated and a lot of ALAC capacity building is required on that.

Once again, this is the last day. It has been a great opportunity to work with all of you and I hope to continue working remotely with all of you and seeing you as well. And as they say, Sha la. Thank you so much. Wonderful.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LUQUE BRUGES: Thank you for this opportunity. I'm Lilian de Luque for the record. This is my first policy forum and I am a declared advocate and fan. It is my second time as a regular Fellow. I attended all the At-Large sessions because it is an interest of my community. I am here representing the interests of Latin

American users. I also attended some of the GAC sessions, also the mandatory meetings of the Fellow Programs.

Two relevant events of this meeting in my view are, first, Universal Acceptance is the topic of interest for everyone. Second is to pay attention and follow on any new discussion or comment on the new gTLDs that will certainly have an impact on cultural issues of less favored and poorly represented people such as indigenous populations. I can't imagine what might happen with names that preserve our cultural identity and there is a multinational that dares submit a registration for them, and we do nothing as spectators. So we should pay attention, discussions are well progressed. We have come to learn about them too late perhaps. I will read with further attention the document that Humberto has given to me.

Then something else, we have started some work. We have had a meeting with Siranush and Sylvia from staff to organize some sort of training for the youth mostly from Latin America, mostly indigenous youth, to allow them to start their engagement with ICANN, specifically for the Cancun meeting.

So I am already receiving the proper materials. I'm working on them. I am organizing some meetings with some communities, young women and men from Oaxaca in the south of Mexico, and with the special interest group of women from ISOC. The Chair is

a Mexican woman and with many of my friends of the south governance school from Mexico who are highly interested in ICANN's business.

Ordinary people are not aware of what ICANN does. It is about time for Latin America to appropriate to take ownership of what ICANN does and so that the Latin American voice is heard louder. Let me thank you, basically, all of you relatively from my heart. I had been more than welcome and that motivates me to work further. So many, many thanks. I hope to see you again. Unfortunately, I have to leave now. I have to go to the Fellows meeting and I am very responsible as an ugly boyfriend. Thank you very much.

Just one last thing. We are on the NomCom Review Team, Cheryl.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

For me one of the most important things during this meeting was I think it was in our internal geoname session is that I think Jonathan was just pushing on trying for all of us to do problem solving-based type thinking like really bottom-up thinking, like focus on a problem and see what solutions are instead of getting lost in philosophical, theoretical musings. We all have ideologies. That, of course, is important. We also have the tendency just to stick to that type of discourse I think. We have

to keep on pressing on that. Try to maybe get questionnaires out there, problem-based thinking. This is very natural for us. For me as an attorney, that's the way tests are given in the legal world. Just a set of facts and what's your solution to that? Maybe there are solutions that are different and they're both right but it's a great way, they heard us all, into maybe even consensus.

In terms of the talking points, I think they're great. I don't know if I used them consciously on purpose. Subconsciously, yeah, because you see the narrative of various things that are At-Large things and the way At-Large approaches things, maybe in conversations with leaders but not really in a meeting in public as such. Thanks.

Maybe one thing about the talking points and maybe this is because I got lost, maybe getting in there in the document itself, just a paragraph on how these talking points are process-wise, how they are an ALAC position somehow. I know they are. I mean just to make it more ... yeah. They're like a ALAC position. For example, Work Track 5 talking points, they look right. Then you ask, maybe ALAC versus At-Large. When you ask At-Large people, there's a billion views about geonames. Maybe there's more consensus within ALAC. That's possible. I don't know. But process-wise, just maybe put in there something like, "The Cross-Community Working Group provided this and that, and this is the position."

HAROLD ARCOS:

This is Harold Arcos. I am the LACRALO Secretary. I'm going to speak in Spanish. The three questions were useful. I think the fact that I was an ALAC member and a Secretary, you just have some habits that help to explain things to other people. I think the summary provided and the way in which it was drafted was very digestible.

Can it be improved? Well, this is one of the first experiences, of course, everything can be improved. I fully support Cheryl's suggestion. I think being more present in the prior meetings and especially in our Consolidated Policy Group, we will have a lot more muscle to improve this in the next phase.

We did have the opportunity to use it out of the rooms. I couldn't really attend other meetings except the GAC and other very specific meetings. But in meetings with the Fellows, not only on the issues that were listed on our topics on our documents, but actually those that are on the table, many of the newcomers do want to know about those issues.

Again, what Joanna was saying, trying to locate first the person in the process and then be able to locate the content. That's one of the key things because explaining the content at once can even cause greater difficulty to locate it in space and time, so you attend a policy meeting and then trying to locate the issue is

already difficult if you don't know the environment in which the process is involved. So I think it is a great opportunity to continue polishing the tool and I fully agree that we should be more engaged in preparing the next one. Thank you.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

First of all, I'd like to thank Olivier for your kind words about the cooperation with the GAC. But there is actually a direct line from the positive development of that cooperation to the very topic of this session. Talking points, that is to say our endeavor to develop, to aggregate and to articulate common positions in spite of the differences we have internally, that is a prerequisite of successful cooperation with other groups. It's also a prerequisite for what we try to do next with the GAC, that is to say to engage in intersessional policy talks, policy cooperation with the GAC especially with the Focus Group of the GAC on new gTLDs. I think that any group that wants to have impact and influence in its surroundings needs to do this, that is to say develop internal cohesion and express it like it has been done, expressed in this. Plus one to John who suggested that actually the talking points that we were used will be even shorter and more second, and then a little explanation for those who want more. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS:

The LACRALO Secretariat and Chair agreed to be here in the session and not to leave the room. We believe it is very important to bring everything we're bringing to our region. I need to highlight that this document – I don't know who wrote it but I want to thank the person or persons or the authors or co-authors of this because it would help us a lot to work internally. It's a very viable tool that we're going to use in the working groups in the region.

Let me go back to this. I did not participate in other meetings except the one that we held with the GAC. What impactful things would we engage in? There was a good interaction with some members of the GAC and we have been able to exchange ideas and experiences, and even views that sometimes enable us to reach an agreement and some other cases, the perspective was different but it was interesting to discuss that. There were issues that were discussed here and I think that is very good for us who bring to the region. That includes WT 5, the Universal Acceptance. We didn't know that that was going to be discussed here. It was implied for us to make one step forward and it somehow adds value to what the region is undergoing right now. I think that's all I have to say. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I will continue to speak Spanish. I would like to build on what Eduardo said. I joined him to the Rights Protection Mechanism meeting and I have been able to provide some input to the policy being discussed. There are some questions and answers. I mean there is a trademark issue there, how to protect the abuse in terms of the trademarks. I wanted to add my experience as the director of the Legal Clinic of the university where I work. We have an agreement with .cl in Chile that was started two years ago. We started a pilot project that has already been used in other ICANN meetings. We have defended more than 250 end users of the large law firms because many times these users have no representation. I've discussed this with [Cathy Klein] and she asked me to participate in this meeting to tell about this experience. We have been able to provide a suggestion when there is a conflict, the registrants can inform the end user that they have the possibility to have access to these pro bono clinics and get some kind of defense for the end user, and this is not in bad faith. I do not accept cyber occupiers in my clinic. We do not defend them. This is our contribution. Probably it must have been discussed in this meeting but it wasn't because I had to be here. So that's all. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I'm just queue jumping. I did ask if I could come back later.

I do take notes whether I'm expected to be reporting on them or not. I just want to share some of the words I've noted here. I think you need to remember the history of hot topics. The original hot topics which was started before ICANN even had an At-Large site when the At-Large site was proudly owned by a bunch of people. That is way back 2006-ish, we had hot topics. It was to be ready reckoning list of things we could talk to people at ICANN meetings about. These all to me just closes the circle and says it has been a long-standing need.

But the thing is, what you've got now has longevity and the hot topics never did. These things can have longevity if you design them right. Think about that. Think also how you're going to store them, how you're going to archive them, how you're going to access them. Make sure some of the stuff you wanted to say is just basically disclaimers on the top of your wiki page rather than having to take up space every time you printed because how we get to them and the links to how we develop them, etc., etc. That's all pretty static, but that needs to be thought of in that way. And how we access them, even if you haven't committed them all to memory, think cleverly if you may. It seems to me based on what Glenn and others were talking about in earlier meetings when I was blessedly in this room briefly, business cards with QR codes just seem to be such a simple way. Business cards with QR code to our repository once

we have a repository for these sorts of things would be a smart way to go.

My apologies, Jonathan, and to whoever is currently Chair. I gather that's you, John. I now have to go and sit with the GNSO Council. Bye for now.

NATALIE:

Natalie [inaudible] speaking. As you know, it's my first ICANN meeting. I would like to thank all of you for the nice days here, great opportunity to be involved in our work. And to shake all of your hands not remotely fine. Of course, thank you for amazing commotion during all this day. If I may tell now about my emotions, I would like to add one general comment, actually. As I understand correctly, directly in Kobe we started great lead of joint discussion with our RIRs. I think I'm not sure that may be appropriate for the policy meeting because I don't know something specific. But I think it will be great to allocate a special time and maybe gather people from round table and to invite to our discussion, representatives from our [inaudible] and RIRs who are present here. Because I think it may be the best opportunity to get information about end users' problems or maybe new solutions in each region. It may help us to shape or correct our frames of work and pay our attention to may important issues. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think we may be tenth out of time. So I appreciate that people – I welcome your feedback directly to me too on these issues of policy development, etc. It’s an interesting fact of life that when the NCUC has a discussion about a policy, they reach consensus within about five minutes. Okay, geonames. Freedom of speech, yeah. Okay, fine. We’re done. We’ll go to coffee now. And we’re having a much more different conversation about what the practical implications of these policies are and whether or not these should be a community-centered discussion or a government-centered discussion. And I think we’re engaged in a great deal more nuance because we’re not just taking an ideological approach to answering these questions, so that makes it hard. Our job is harder. But I think it’s worth doing. I know that it can be frustrating and that we almost necessarily will not please everyone with whatever kind of consensus we reach but it will have a greater more influence within the community the extent to which we’re able to reach consensus on some of these issues.

We have a lot of experiments going forward. We’re going to do scenarios on geonames and try and do a survey on those scenarios, etc. so that we can get that conversation going. We’ll make it a regular part of the CPWG calls to get that conversation going. Because if anything else is revealed, we have a lot to talk

about. Thanks for your indulgence on this issue of policy development and we'll keep trying to find what the right path is forward. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

We're going to conclude this session. We have to give interpretation a break because we are running into lunch. So with that, I want everyone to thank our interpreters and technical staff.

Do we have any housekeeping announcements? If not then the next session begins at 1:30, the At-Large review of ICANN65 and planning for ICANN66. So we're already getting ready for Montreal. I will see you in an hour and a half. Have a good lunch.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]