
MARRAKECH – At-Large Review of ICANN65 and Planning for ICANN66.

Thursday, June 27, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 WET

ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hi, everyone. I'm dearly sorry I'm late. I'll tell you all about as soon as you sit down.

Welcome to the final session of the Marrakech meeting for At-Large. Before we get started – I'll be calling on you, Amrita very, very shortly – during the lunchbreak we had a meeting about preparing for Montreal. The SOs/ACs and other little groups had a meeting to discuss that and did a bit of an evaluation of this meeting and the positives and negatives. I felt it was a little bit unfortunate we hadn't done the evaluation that we planned to do today before I actually went to that meeting. It was interesting hearing the positives and negatives that came from the other teams as well. That's looking at also the difficulties that we had as we were preparing for this event and looking at how we took so long for the block schedule to get organized. So it meant that our planning got delayed before we could fit things in.

So it's those sorts of issues that we're talking about. Of course, the Montreal meeting is going to be a lot bigger as far as the rest of the organizations concerned. I'm just reminding you that, for us, the ALAC meeting will be set on Sunday, and the rest of the

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.

week is going to be ATLAS stuff and ICANN. So it's going to be a different kind of meeting all together.

Then I got held up coming back from the meeting with the SO/AC chairs – the actual chairs themselves – to discuss two key issues that have come up. I'm just giving you a heads up about what's abuzz at the moment.

The first thing was that one of the things that Goran offered the SO/AC chairs on Monday – when did we meet? Sunday – was a million-dollar fixability fund to be used by the SO/AC chairs for whatever reason they might want to use it for. A one million-dollar fixability fund. That's what it's called.

Anyway, other groups have actually been discussing it in a little bit more depth. They took it more seriously than perhaps I did. Looking at it from the viewpoint from someone who's just been nearly three years at the auction proceeds meeting, there's now decision made about how they're going to allocate it or anything. We were just discussing that perhaps it might be a better idea if they looked at the ABRs that actually refused and found a million dollars' worth of ABRs that they had trashed, that that might be a better one because at least each of the constituencies would have already prioritized what was important for them to have actually had in the ABRs. So it might be a better lot. Anyway, a decision hasn't been made but that was a suggestion. So there's that.

The other thing is to do with SSR-2. There's a big issue there. So that's why I was late. I wasn't ambling back slowly from lunch. I was really involved in something that was important. So now you're all up with the [goss].

What I would like to do first off is – this is the rounding off of our work. We will be doing a little bit of a round-the-table look at what was good, what wasn't good, and what can we do better. First I wanted to introduce you to Amrita, who's the Fellowship mentor. She's going to tell us about what she does. She's got five minutes. She's going to introduce us to some of her mentees. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Maureen. In the new Fellowship round, the various communities – the SOs and the ACs – had selected mentors from their own part, and I had been fortunate to be selected by ALAC to the Fellowship. Though we were supposed to have 35 Fellows in total, this year there were 32. We had mentors from the GAC, ccNSO, GNSO ... yeah, that's about it. And RSSAC. Each of us was assigned seven to eight Fellows. I have a few of the Fellows here in the room, if you can raise your hands. Most of them were interested or are part of some ALS and interested to contribute.

While there were more who are Fellows but were assigned to different mentors – Lilian was there, Fouad was there – the idea was for the Fellows to have an overall understanding of the

different constituencies, and then the mentors guide them in the best possible way on how they can participate in the communities which they are interested.

With Heidi, we were having a discussion yesterday. She raised a valid point as to what about the other Fellows who were not my mentees but are interested in ALAC? I said there might be geographical [reasons] for allocating certain numbers. Again, to mentor 20 people who might interested in ALAC might be difficult. So perhaps that is why they are broken down, irrespective of the group they could from.

While we would also be ranking the Fellows, the Fellows also have to rate as mentors on whether we've actually been able to help them in their journey. When talking to various Fellows, one of the things which was coming up is how do we contribute? The answer which was being given was to go to the website and look at the various working groups. If you feel you're interested, try and join some working groups as observers and see. I think that is something we would possibly have to work on, even for non-Fellows who are ALSes. They may want to contribute, but how they want to contribute is something which is a concern.

If I have two more minutes, I can have one or two Fellows just quickly in a half-minute share something.

Desara, you want to go first?

DESARA DUSHI: Hello. I'm Desara Dushi from Albania and part of EURALO. I learned from Amrita that I'm one of the selected participants for ATLAS III, and I would really thank the selection committee. I would also thank Joanna Kulesza for convincing me to join At-Large, and also my mentor for convincing me to apply. I haven't seen my name there yet. For some reason, I cannot access the page. I promise that I will try to stay as engaged as possible. Thank you.

RADHIKA CHERIE LAGAKALI: Thank you. My name is Cherie. I'm from Fiji. I joined ICANN as an ALS in 2016 in Abu Dhabi, and I also found out that I'm going to be at ATLAS III, which I'm looking forward to. This is my second time as a Fellow. I've also been [keen] with the work on the working group, which I'm also looking forward to working on in the next couple of months as well. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Maureen. Any questions I'm happy to take.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Amrita. We've just made an action item to make sure that the Fellows are more integrated into our program. We need your support with that. [It'd be good].

So – oh. Yes, Fatimata?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you, Maureen. Fatimata Seye Sylla, AFRALO. I just wanted to know if we, as RALO leaders, are allowed to share the results.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, you are on an individual basis, as long as you're talking to someone who – the only thing is we cannot share the list because it actually names people and where they come from. But Heidi assures me that we will get a resolution today. It's ICANN Legal that has actually stopped it. I have actually shared the list with the RALO chairs. You can share it on an individual basis. Was that – okay.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: We can share?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Okay. Just verbally.

JOHN LAPRISE: You can inform individuals but not share the list.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Just talking to them, telling them you get ready. Okay. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. You can tell them. Just do not share the list because they might see other people's names. Horror.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I understand all of your point, but didn't we ask any one of those Fellow applicants for the possibility of submitting his name once elected? If we're not doing these kinds of things, we're not understanding GDPR. We need to do this in the next round.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Lesson learned. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just really quickly, the larger issue for the delay, which is being resolved, is really that it was the names and the people that were selected by ATLAS III were the ones that are eligible for funding.

But they need to go through the same checks and process as all other supported travelers. So we've put some language on the page, and that's been approved. I'm just waiting for the final okay. Then we'll go ahead and open that up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. That just means that, when they actually see the list, they will know what the obligations will be in relation to their accepting.

Yes, Ms. Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. Just a quick intervention. In terms of the application form, we did have lots of disclaimers to say that, whoever is submitting an application, your data will be subject to ICANN privacy policy. Thank you. But what happens after it's ICANN?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you for the question. I'm sorry we're having to clarify and reclarify that but it's beyond our control. How about if we take 30 seconds to just let me know what you felt was good about this week, about our week as At-Large, and anything that you experienced as a person from At-Large within this meeting? Let me know if it involves anyone else. I'll pass it on.

We'll start with Mr. Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. The At-Large is a very unique institution with a very diverse set of folks that are participating. That its strength. It's also what makes it a challenge to figure out the best way to bring that group together in things. I think sometimes we bring up a conversation and another conversation ensues. We ended up having a conversation about how we reach consensus, for example. It wasn't what I planned to have conversation about, but it was clear that it was a conversation that we needed to have. Whether it was needed then or not is another question, but it did highlight that it's something that people are thinking about and concerned about.

Discussions about geo-names was very interesting to have as well because we needed to figure out whether or not ... Some people have as a basic assumption that the governments have the best interest of their individual users at heart and that therefore we can equate the two. Then there are others in the community that feel very strongly that that's not the case. That's going to complicate our relationship with the GAC and it complicates our ability to reach consensus around these issues as well. So we're going to have to find ways to go a step deeper and look at outcomes, I think.

So I think one of my biggest takeaways is that I'm going to be trying to phrase a lot of things in the form – we did this as part of the accountability framework – of scenarios. “If this happens” – and then maybe do a survey – “do you think that’s likely, and would you be happy with that outcome?” and start thinking about use cases, as some people call them, or scenarios that might occur. If we can reach consensus on that, like, “Well, I wouldn’t want that to happen,” then we can focus our policy discussion around how do we prevent that thing from happening. Or, “That other thing would be really great if it happens.” Then how do we focus our policy discussion around how to make that good thing happen? That’s something we’ll try to experiment going forward because it may give us a better approach than this more abstract approach that we’ve used to date.

So those are some things that I took away and I’m taking to heart and will try to incorporate into the work that we’re doing in the policy development team.

MAUREEN HILYARD: A little bit more than 30 seconds but very valuable feedback. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I missed that part. Sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you. So we are on a timer. I actually have two issues. I'll try to fit that into 30 seconds. The first issue is very pragmatic. I want to use that 30 seconds if I run out of time just to tick off an AI of the list. Yrjo and myself have taken away from that Monday workshop with the GAC an action item that relates to a joint capacity building with the GAC, either right before the meeting or after the meeting. The funding question remains open and to be explored if there is no objection from the At-Large community. I will presume for the purpose of further discussion that there is no objection to an additional half-a-day capacity building training on technical issues within and around ICANN.

If there is anyone who has a strong sentiment and says that the training on the technicalities of ICANN is wrong, please use this opportunity to flag that this discontent or just come up to me and we'll talk further.

Is that discontent? Someone raising a flag? All right. I didn't mean to start a discussion but I wanted to use those 30 seconds just to tick that off. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That’s a devious of way of not actually talking about what happened.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I’m happy to—

MAUREEN HILYARD: Very clever.

HOLLY RAICHE: It was a packed week. It wasn’t even a week. It felt like more than a week. I actually liked the fact that we concentrated so much on policy. If I have anything at all to say, it’s that sometime I would love to see an ICANN meeting where the instructions to us were to go out and go to any other meeting and report back on it and not have anything here so we don’t feel guilty about not attending.

JUSTINE CHEW: My thoughts are aligned with Jonathan’s. I don’t have anything else to add, except for the fact that we still have a lot of work to do.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I agree. I just want to say that there's a lot to do. I just had a discussion with Sergio. We have some months ahead with a lot of work to be more strengthened when we arrive in Montreal and Cancun.

There's something I else I had forgotten, and that is to especially thank Eduardo Diaz. He has been an angel for me in this meeting. It was through him that I got a very, very important document to go ahead on the work of universal acceptance in the region. So thank you, Eduardo, and thanks, everybody. Maureen, I love you.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Quickly, repeating myself a bit, I want to stress what Jonathan has been saying and also what Justine has been saying. It felt like a policy meeting, which is good. It felt like a policy meeting but we're still getting our sea legs on how to do it here amongst us. What I said before is it seems like we're going to get there if we focus on problems and then deduct such solutions out of that.

The geo-names session – I was so happy to have that session alongside Justine and working with Justine, which is awesome – maybe if it was an hour longer it would have worked. In Work Track 5 I'm not an advocate, really. I'm just a co-lead. But in a way – I don't want to speak for Justine – Justine is liaison for us in there, and that geo-names meeting could have been a set of

directives for her. We didn't get there. But I think we're getting there by thinking about how to get there.

So I'm thankful for the policy team that you're herding us into that. Thanks.

HAROLD ARCOS:

The LACRALO secretary – Jonathan, I do not want to repeat what others have said for the sake of time. Let me say I share Javier's words in the sense that it felt like a policy meeting. If I may add, the dynamics of this meeting have been very agile. With the talking points, the list of points we arrived here with is not the same word, [inaudible].

The fact that this paper has been put in the cloud means that document is updated on the go as we attend and leave the meetings. Every night over the day we're able to update the paper. That would allow us to have a complete, very comprehensive talking-points list. So that I think is very positive. Thank you.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

It was good that we spent time discussing policy. In the beginning, it's good that we had the talking points. As far as the GAC/ALAC cooperation is concerned, I'm glad that we now have a concrete roadmap to follow. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I will be extremely quick. I cannot add anything to what the previous speakers have said, so I'll let others take the floor. Thank you.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I will also be very brief and say that, in ICANN, you are always in a learning process. Meeting such as this allow us to go deeper in some topics. Additionally, as we've said oftentimes with other participants from our region, we feel like this needs to focus on all times, but there is no time, there is no expertise, for any individuals to focus on everything.

So the recommendation I made to myself was, let's try to pick one or two topics and get focused because it's better to do one thing right than ten wrong. So even though you have a lot of passion and enthusiasm to follow a roadmap because many topics are of interest to everybody, though some are not so interesting – technical topics for me as a lawyer is not an area of interest – there are other areas where we can make a better contribution. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible] is speaking. I'm so sorry. I'm writing a letter about ICANN for our colleagues in Russia. I would like to see a lot of

things for this opportunity to participate, as I said previously, for a lot of information for me as a newcomer because I've not been so long a time with you, and for your time to get me a lot of information for preparation for my future work in the position of the secretary. I think we have a very bright future and very positive changes. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I wanted to touch on one thing, which was the overall high-interest session on the multi-stakeholder model. There was a lot of discussion that had taken place on the ALAC and At-Large mailing lists before then. I didn't see that many contributions in the room itself, apart maybe from John, who said a few things.

The concern I had was that the session itself appears to have not been as successful as the first one. I have a real concern that we probably need to ask for more information and, perhaps as next steps, get Brian Cote to speak to us to explain this in further detail.

The feedback I've received or heard around the room was, "It's complicating things. It's academic." Well, it's all sorts of things. So if we care about that track, we need to follow up on that. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think for me it was the regional engagement that we did. That was excellent in most AFRALO/African regions, we had a full room. The statement I think was ... I don't want to say what [we received], but it raised lots of questions. The participation in the African strategy session I think was useful. So more focus on the regional engagement and the work we're doing within the region. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I have three points I would like to cover. First, my motto would be "No presentations, debates, and discussions." Let's do webinars before the meeting and no presentations here. We should talk here. We should not have to prepare here.

I do not agree with what Joanna proposed, not in principle. With the strategy working group, we had an [extra] day that was for a summary meeting to prepare the team. Someone said that it's not going to happen, that we're going to miss that extra day. I would have liked to work with the RALO teams that are new, that are very new, at the end of the Montreal meeting.

Last point I would like to raise. We do not work with presenters for the most interesting topics. Regarding DNS-over-HTTPs, it hasn't been covered enough. I do not know who didn't do his or

her job, but the voice of the end users should always be present.
Thank you.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I think the first improvement came before the meeting when the titles of the individual sessions were in the full schedule when it was distributed. This is probably my 15th or 16th overall meeting but only my 4th or 15th in At-Large. Traditionally, I would look at At-Large in the schedule and it would essentially say, “At-Large Speaks to Itself: Session 7 of 9.” That was not particularly engaging for those who are not already engaged and not particularly informative, even for those who were. So not only are the topics, but the fact that it’s transparent to the entire community – what we’re doing and when we’re doing it – I think was a great improvement.

Sebastien made the point I was about to make, which is that presentations needs to be curtailed/done beforehand. Javier and Justine both did amazing jobs preparing presentations to kick off the geo-names discussion, but their presentations took about half of the geo-names discussion. And Javier said we needed another hour. Well, we had that hour. It was just taken with the presentations to get to the point where we could talk. So we need to figure out how we get the pre-gaming done or the pre-

informing done so that we're not starting every conversation with a long presentation. So I think that's important.

I also just want to pick up briefly on a point that Humberto made, which is, for people who have been doing policy a long time or have been watching other people do a policy a long time, picking one or a couple of things and really sticking with it.

For instance, in the intellectual property constituency, Steve Metalitz, who's no longer coming to meetings but started, I think, with Meeting #1, was Mr. WHOIS. He didn't do other things, primarily. Occasionally he did, but he was always on that topic. So if you pick a topic and you keep running with it, you'll become an expert. You'll become a guru. You'll become a ninja. You'll be able to help other people come along. If you want to participate in another area, because it's always good to have more people, then you will know who to look to, who can help bring you along. So identifying subject matter experts and becoming a subject matter expert in an area of policy is so much more effective than just spreading yourself all around and may also allow you to have a life. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I think I'll be very quick. I think we've done a lot of wonderful things this week. It's been fantastic. I really loved the presentations, especially on the policy development.

For me, an area that I think would need improvement is in terms of engaging people, especially other people in the room.

I'll give you a typical example. We have a large portion of people sitting on this side. That was jump from that side. So it shows something like, if you are not at the table, you don't have a seat. So it seems we are actually leaving out a large portion of the room. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks very much. I didn't get a chance to give feedback about the talking points in the previous sessions, so I'll just take 30 seconds to do that. I think the talking points were a very good start to the meeting. I appreciate the work that has gone into the document. You have been a CPWG participant, I'm sure it will have been easy to absorb.

For me personally, it is useful also for the pre-meeting and post-meeting readouts that happened back in my region. So it's a very useful document. Particularly interesting for me have been the technical sessions – IoT, DoH, DoT – and this session on evolving the multi-stakeholder model of ICANN. I find that the title has changed from Kobe to Marrakech. It was Evolving ICANN's Multi-Stakeholder Model in Kobe, but here it is Evolving the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multi-Stakeholder. I don't what that

really means, perhaps that these structural issues are off the table, maybe.

In the talking-points documents, I would have appreciated IDNs had found a place – IDNs in UASG. They’re not there currently. Also, Olivier’s session on that broader Internet governance issues, which I consider as the future risks of ICANN being identified at an early stage. That would have been also interesting for me.

One thing that I would ideally like, which may not be possible right now, is that this talking points document becomes a living document, which means we can refer back to it at any point and it gives us currently what is being discussed. I think it may be very difficult to do, but that would help us in many ways where we speak about what At-Large is doing.

For the first time, in this meeting, a GAC member [was] referred to me by Joanna – the GAC member from Bangladesh. He caught me and said, “We want At-Large to provide the following support.” He listed about a bunch of things which are technically outside our remit, probably. But I find it very interesting that they reached out to us. They’re coming to us to send them experts and send them [inaudible] material and so on. So I think the At-Large has become more visible, not just in this meeting but overall.

Thanks to all the people who have put in the efforts. I’d like to congratulate all of us for this change. Thank you very much.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: As someone who participated in some of the pre-ICANN webinars, although it was a great idea, I find that they have been a failure for most people because they were very sparsely occupied by the community. So the idea, while good, that we don't have presentations here is not necessarily good for getting involvement in writing policy comments or writing other things. So although that is a good suggestion, I think it will fail because we're just not going to get the people involved. We need to figure a way, maybe, to get the presentations shorter.

I thought the capacity development sessions that were doing the lunchtime hour were really good. The policy development really explained to people who have never done policy how to do policy and how to join.

The only thing I think I would add is that there's also policy that is governance policy. That wasn't touched upon, just on the PDP. But governance policy is also very effective in doing things. So I would add that in.

Of some of the sessions, I think the face-to-face were important because it allows a lot of work to get done, but having your hour time period is always a very difficult thing. I think maybe one of the reasons that the Auction Proceeds was successful more this time is that we have a three-and-a-half hour time slot, which was

hard to get. But it meant that people could really concentrate and get some of the work done. So maybe we have to figure out how do we get more central topics? [Do we] get larger or maybe smaller groups or something to get people time in certain other subjects that need to get it? I don't know the answer to that.

I am in favor of capacity building of the GAC because I think that's important. I do see the concern of new people coming, and that is Development Day. We have a half-day for the development of RALO[s] and a half-day for the ALAC development. Where are we going to take the time and put this session? I'm not sure, but if we could figure something else, then that would be a good idea.

As a past Secretariat, I know how things run, so I don't necessarily need that. But I'm happy to help lead sessions. I was gratified for [people thinking] I had 15 years' experience when I have less than five. So that's good that I'm viewed as an expert in things when I'm not really.

[YESIL KIM]:

Hi. I just became an individual member for APRALO, so this is my first time as a member of ICANN. I was just honored to be a member and probably primarily thanks to Maureen, because she just got me here.

I actually learned really a lot by attending the meetings here. I've been in ICANN meetings for three or four times already, but this was actually the first time that I learned something. But as much as I learn things from here, I also got to have a lot more questions, [like] how the RALOs are run and how all these structures are composed. So I just would like to have some kind of documents of input so that I can list some questions that I got, to ask the leaders here so that they can just reflect my opinions or my questions into their works in the future. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN:

Hi. I'm just going to talk about the setup of the room. I think I like this setup better because we can see each other. We have the screens in front of us, so kudos to the meeting team and to the tech team. Thank you.

GLENN MCNKIGHT:

Great. Thank you. Many people have said many of the things I would like to say, but I'd like to reiterate what Greg said. It's really important to preliminary reading so that the time is well-spent rather than just death by PowerPoint that you come with your questions and expect some dialogue and discussion. I'm not sure how we can turn this around, but it's something to consider in the meetings in the future.

I have three things I want to quickly touch on, what I got out of the meeting and as an action item on the policy issues. Just two right away. We've set a schedule with Ajay on the UA since it was identified as a very important issue that John Laprise mentioned. So we're going to follow up for our NARALO members to do a one-hour video, and also our associate at the back, Bill, on the IDNs. So that's a concrete action item that we will be walking through. So the talking points were really seminal. If anything, perhaps having them in advance wouldn't be a bad idea.

I have two other quick points. Eduardo will be talking about collaborative notes in a second. I did mention earlier today that I was one of the evaluators of people coming in as NextGen for the next group in Montreal. I had an opportunity to be at every session of next NextGen, and I filmed every presentation. I was very disappointed that no one else was there. Nobody was there. It's sad because these are great students. They were very enthusiastic. They are like sponges. They really want to learn. Many of them are dealing with topics that are very applicable to what we're doing. As I stressed, this was a journey, and it's a great thing to meet all of us. I would stress again: if you have the time at the next meeting, there's going to be 16 great, enthusiastic youngsters that are going to be doing the NextGen.

I also spend time with the Fellows. Again, this is consistent with the outreach and engagement strategy we have. NextGen and Fellows are very important in terms of reaching out to.

Last thing, very quickly, it's great to hear that we've selected our ATLAS III. I'll just warn you. The Fellows and NextGen are jumping all over the application for NASIG. If any of your members are interested in joining NASIG for the two days before, jump on it. There's not unlimited seats. We'll be sponsoring the extra hotel rooms for you, but it's not guarantee that everyone at ATLAS III will have that space. And that's it from me.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Glenn and I have been running this pilot [reading] ... [him] – oh. This pilot [reading] project that you have seen popping out in Skype is really a collaboration work that we've put together. It's a pretty long report. It's about 90 pages now. The idea here is that we wanted to capture people and in which session they were. With the fact that it's being done in a collaborative way, you will see different styles and different understandings of what happened in the meeting because everybody has different understandings sometimes of what they here. From that point of view, it's very interesting. Also, they're in different languages, but you can use Google Translate and translate it to a language of your choice.

The idea of the pilot is if there's something worth doing going forward. I don't know. So I'm open to ideas. First we need to find out if this is effective because, if we do something like this and nobody uses it for anything, just for the record, it would be a record but the record is here. You can come [inaudible].

Does that mean ... do I have more time?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: [inaudible]

EDUARDO DIAZ: No? Okay. Anyhow, if you have any ideas on how I can take this document and see if it was [effective] or not – I'm thinking about a survey, but I don't know if that's an effective way – because, if it's not something that is effective or is not going to be used, that's it. Gone. Thank you.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: I will be very short because I'm not going to repeat what Mohamed said and also what Glenn said about students and people coming in to know more about what they're doing. I think I learned one thing. I think it's very important. What can we do at the local level? We've got people and AFRALO people to do this capacity building you're talking about. We've been talking about

this for the longest time, but there's not enough collaboration at the local level.

So, if we have a webinar for the GAC people for one year, the following year it will be another person representing that government. It wouldn't do anything. So I would recommend that we do that at the local level instead of the international level. Thank you. Your job is very good, by the way, Eduardo and Glenn.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [No, that's for you.]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: The only maybe concern was one that I mentioned in the talking points: it was very nice, at the Kobe meeting, having this [inaudible] broken in that we have a joint meeting with NCSG. It was very nice because they found out that we have the same problems that they have. In this meeting, we didn't have some sort of thing trying to discuss one thing among other [inaudible]. It was very nice in Kobe. I think this [inaudible], just to have this in mind for the next.

WALE BAKARE:

The old discussions, debates, and talks about process developments? So far, so good. But one thing we are working towards is we are working towards the fragmentation of the Internet. That is all what we are talking about, which is a great thing. The policy development process we are embarking upon is a continuous process. It's got to be continued as long as the Internet remains.

One thing that I would like us to do is integrate into the development process. We need to build agility and lucid actions into the discussions. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

What worked well is the talking points. Wonderful. Local community engagement: very good. And what we did with the students here and in the university. Especially in the university it was a wonderful session. So this is work that we will continue to do every time ICANN holds a meeting in Africa.

What didn't work well? I was really disappointed this morning that the discussion on the readiness for the new gTLDs was stopped because the SSAC people came to make an update of their activities. I am disappointed because it was planned for only 30 minutes for the readiness and 45 minutes for the SSAC update. By the way, I think the update is a waste of time. We have to call those people to make a presentation about issues, about

[focused] issues that we want to discuss with them, to not make a presentation about their activities. It is not important for us. Perhaps it is very important, because we can see it on their page, etc. Thank you. That's all.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you. I guess I've got the last comment before Maureen. I think I echo a lot of the comments around the table, but I think I want to exit with a single philosophical point which came to mind through Evan Leibovitch's comments online in one of the threads, and that is, when we come to this table, when we come to work at ICANN and volunteer our time and our efforts, we all embrace a certain spirit of altruism in our work. We are working for the common good. We're working for the individual user. As long as we keep that idea of being altruistic in the work we do and the work we produce, we're not going to go wrong.

So I would say to hold true to that point as we go forward in the work at ICANN 66. I'll take my bell. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Do we have any comments from the people at the back? Anyone else want to make another comment? If you've been in the room during the week, is there anything that you've seen that might be on top for you? Anyone? Don't have to, but feel free.

RUDI DANIEL:

Hi. Rudi Daniel. I'm from the Caribbean and am also a Fellow. This is my third meeting. I just want to say that, at this particular meeting, I designed it such that I followed the At-Large all the way through. Usually I'm here, there, and everywhere, but I thought it was very important to actually follow a track. What that gave me was that I made a lot of sense of the whole ICANN structure simply by following one group as they interact with all the other constituencies and ACs.

So I thought it was a fabulous policy meeting, and I'm really glad to be here. Thank you very much for all the efforts you put in because you work very hard. Thank you.

BILL JOURIS:

Hi. Just one quick thought. Glenn was concerned about the lack of attendance at the NextGen presentations. I think we could help that a lot if there was some clue in the program as to what the presentations were about. Even just list the titles because, as it stands, there's no way to tell what you're going to hear. So you tend to go off to something else that might be more applicable. Thank you.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Maureen? I'm going to do that as an action item. That's a great idea, Bill. I will come back with that before the meeting. So I'll have a list from [Megan and Debra.]

ANNE-MARIE: I'm going to reiterate what Glenn said earlier. When it comes to the NextGen, it was very interesting. Each time I go to this presentation, it is extremely interesting. But unfortunately, you have to always choose between one session of At-Large or something else. That makes it complicated but I have to say it was very interesting. I confirmed that point.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much. I do refer back to these notes. I've been taking some notes as we go through. Of course, once we start our planning for the next meeting, which we'll be starting pretty shortly, that's how long it takes to organize it. Gisella will be starting to gather us together. These sorts of comments are really important because I do want to make this meaningful for us as well as for people who are joining us. I think that, as you've seen, it's really important how we present ourselves to our community. The development of our policy sessions – I really do have to congratulate Jonathan and the others who have really contributed to this. I know that we're really making our mark

through the efforts that we're making in this area. It makes it more interesting. I just find it so much more interesting anyway.

I do take on board the idea of having our own webinars before the meetings in preparation. That means we're better organized, too, for the sessions, if we know what the presentation are going to evolve [into] and what we want to try and get out of the sessions and the discussion. Again, it's all to do with preparation.

I must admit that, even when we were planning the first particular meeting, it was really interesting that – I would have liked to have seen more people participating. Jonathan and Joanna really took over a lot of moderating role. I'd like to see more people, more members of the ALAC and At-Large. It doesn't necessarily have to be just the ALAC – someone who is really passionate about a particular session and wants to run a workshop or run an activity-based something that is interactive, something that actually encourages and enhances understanding of policy issues or how it is that we actually operate.

So I really want you to think carefully. The only thing is that, for Montreal, ALAC just has two full days: Saturday and Sunday. Of course, the rest is taken up with ICANN and ATLAS. So it's going to be quite a busy time. At the same time, we can still make our own At-Large time interesting as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alan is [inbound.]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. All right. That's fine. He's only got two minutes. So planning will start for ICANN 66 soon. ATLAS III, of course ... Eduardo, is there anything you want to say about ATLAS III for prepping?

EDUARDO DIAZ: From the program side? Well, it's like what we explained at the beginning when we were talking about ATLAS III. There is a case study that was selected by the program group. Joanna went through all the priorities that we want to [educate the people] [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just remembering that now some of the people who are going to be in your group are here and they want to know what it is that they're going to need to do between now and Montreal as well as in Montreal.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I will defer this to Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Just very briefly, we will definitely have webinars that will serve the purpose that was discussed here as well. so we will prep you before you come. We will provide the participants with webinars, at least two webinars, and there will be reading materials that will be sent out to them which will be selected together with Alan, Hadia, folks on the EPDP, and our wonderful staff. So that's definitely coming on top of everything I explained in my [inaudible] in a previous session that Eduardo referred to. So that's the brief update.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Sorry. I was answering the wrong question.

JOHN LAPRISE: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Suddenly I'm very surprised. We're going to have mandate people to work on the EPDP. Where are we going? The EPDP is a very small part of what we have to do. I hope we're not going to get into that [micro] discussion of the WHOIS, which has been going on for 20 years now. Participants have to be interested in that question. I hope that we don't do that.

Before this meeting on Sunday, there was a training for the GAC people. They did that with the GNSO. Do not reinvent the wheel, please.

Maureen, it's great to offer that other people take on leadership roles, but I already told you, and I say it officially today. You have a Vice-Chair of one region which did not share one session this week. We are in Africa, and we do not have one person from Africa who chairs the meeting of ALAC. I think we lose something. What about diversity? Why are we five people and that's it?

The last thing I wanted to say is that, when we ask for different things, we have to be able to do them. We need time to have this discussion. Thank you.

[JOHN LAPRISE]:

[inaudible]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to touch on one thing regarding ATLAS III. We've had a little bit of an intro as to what could take place with webinars and so on. There's also ICANN Learn that is there. As you know, there was some ICANN Learn mandatory courses for participants. But there are a lot more courses on ICANN Learn. So I just wanted to let those people that will be participants and even non-participants to [know] to

actually take those other courses as well. They're really interesting. I'm told that there will be some courses that might be ready by some time in the summer. So, when they come out, it would great for them to be available and for people to take.

Ultimately, the discussion we'll have in Montreal are going to touch on a whole other set of skills then the actual background knowledge about ICANN. So I guess that the more you know about ICANN as an individual, you will be able to take a lot more benefit from attending ATLAS III because you will not constantly be struggling with understanding what we're talking about, etc., etc. So that's effectively just a recommendation.

By the way, it's not a mandatory thing. It's recommended reading if you want to enjoy ATLAS III more. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: Right now, Jonathan, and I'll close the queue. We will be moving into Agenda Item 4, which is the Board seat process.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, John. There's been a little bit of discussion about this idea of having webinars prior to the meeting. Some people are in favor and some people are concerned that people won't watch those webinars. I had that conversation with Sebastien. He raised a very good point, which is that we made that expectation of

people wanting to go to ATLAS and we were pretty strict about choosing people to go to ATLAS based on whether they actually watched those Learn classes, etc., beforehand. So why aren't we willing to take on the same level of discipline ourselves?

Part of the At-Large review is coming up with participation metrics. Cheryl is heading up that team. I know Judith brought up this point as a practical matter, so it was well-intentioned, but it may very well be that it will be part of the metrics for your continued participation that you do some of this homework prior to a meeting. That may be a reasonable expectation of people. So thanks, Sebastien, for bringing that up earlier.

JOHN LAPRISE: Maureen, you're opening up Item 4. I closed the queue after Jonathan.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, we do have an important issue to discuss. Do you want Yrjo up here as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. We're discussing whether Yrjo should be here on there. I don't think it matters, but ...

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Just to introduce what we're going to be doing, of course you know – well, you may not know – we are due to go through the process of electing the Board member representing At-Large. With respect to that, there are two phases, which I'm sure that's what Alan is going to be talking about anyway. He will explain it. Yrjo is going to be one of the chairs, and Alan is the other.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Maureen. I'll briefly go over the process because there's a fair number of new people. As you all know, At-Large has a Board member, a single Board member, that is selected by us. It's a three-year term, and the term is up at the end of 2020. Our process is probably not the simplest one in ICANN. We'll be talking about it in a moment. It'll be kicking off relatively shortly.

The short version of the process is we will be issuing a call for expressions of interest from people who believe that they qualify and are willing to take the responsibility of occupying Board Seat 15. Those expressions of interest are evaluated. A short list is created, and an election is held, omitting a few steps. But that's basically what the process is.

There are two committees that oversee this process. One has the name or the acronym, BMSPC. No one has ever tried to pronounce that – at least no one that I am aware of. That stands

for the Board Member Selection Process Committee. That's the group that oversees the process.

The second group is the BCEC, the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee, and that is the group that solicits the expressions of interests and takes them and reviews them and comes up with a short list of candidates, which if I remember the wording from the rules of procedure, who would make a good or a superb – I can't remember the exact wording – Board member. So they're not selecting the person, but they're selecting candidates that they believe are worthy.

There is also a process by which RALOs, if they think the BCEC has made a real mess of it and has omitted a candidate that they feel should be added, the candidate can be added along the process.

I'll talk about the timeline that we're looking at in a minute. The timeline is far from finalized right now. Very quickly, we will be populating these two committees with people. The BCEC is made up of people who are – the rules of procedure are curiously worded – selected by the RALOs and the ALAC. In the past, we have taken that to mean that the RALOs propose people and the ALAC ratifies, not dissimilar from the NomCom procedure of selecting NomCom delegates. There are two people from each RALO who are identified, plus one alternate.

To be honest, that's probably overkill. This is now the fourth election or selection we're running. We've got it pretty down pat, so there's not an awful lot of work to be done and decisions to be made. But the rules of procedure to call for that and we will be following it. I personally am going to recommend that we reduce the number in the future because there's just not a lot of purpose in it.

That being said, the BCEC is selected by the RALOs. Someone can verify. I believe that is purely a RALO selection. There is a qualification that none of the electorate may sit on this selection committee. In other words, the first triage cannot be done by people who will later be voting. The people who will be voting will be the ALAC (the ALAC sitting next year, of which we don't know exactly who they are right now) and the RALO chairs who vote on behalf of their RALO, either directed by the RALO or undirected, as the RALO decides.

We will be putting out a call for both of those committees. The BCEC in particular will have a call that will specify what we are looking for. It's a group very similar to the NomCom. That is, you're going to have to experience a lot of judgement in deciding who are the good people. This is not a time to pick your friends. This is the time to really look at real, hard qualifications.

I'll come back and talk a little bit about the overall timeline. Yrjo, do you want to talk a bit about how you see the BCEC running? Now, Yrjo has sat on a BCEC before. He has chaired a NomCom and sat on the NomCom, but he's never been the chair of the BCEC. So he'll add a new flair to it, I think.

YRAJO LANSIPURO:

Thank you, Alan. Yeah, I was a member of the BCEC last time. Now we're in the process of retrieving, from my memory hard disk, that process that happened. Luckily, it's not only that but we have an excellent report by the chair of the previous BCEC, Julie Hammer, complete with the recommendations for the guidelines and operational procedures for the 2020 committee. So I think she had made my job pretty easy. We don't start from scratch. We start from a good proposal.

You're going to talk about the timeline, so I'll leave that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

All right. Might as well look at the timeline. What you – oh, sorry. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will do it in English to be quicker. First of all, I want to say that I will not intervene in this discussion, but I think there is one point that you both Chairs are both forgetting. It's that none of the future winning candidates can be in that committee. You don't say it but it's better to say it: if you want to be considered as a future Board member, you can't be on this committee. It's obvious but it's better to say it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. That will be very, very clear. I'm not actually sure that's true for the BMSPC, but I don't remember. But don't worry. We'll follow the rules. Certainly, it's true for the selection committee. As I mentioned, it also has to do with who's going to be on the ALAC or RALO leaders next year. In some cases, we don't know that. So we'll word these things carefully.

The timeline right now, what you see on these slides, at least from the version I'm looking at, it seems to be cut off partway through the righthand side. What you have now is of a timeline that presumed we would be calling for members of the committees just about now and allocating the amount of time for each period that we currently think is reasonable. All of this has to be adjusted. But when we come down to the bottom, you'll see we're in good shape.

Can we go back to the top, please? All right. We're going to start off with selection of the two committees. Once we have the committees, the BMSPC has to be approved by the ALAC. The BCEC does not. Once the BMSPC convenes, they will look at the timeline that you're seeing here, revised as necessary, and do a final approval. So the timeline will be approved by the overall community.

One of the things that we have to do along the way is to try to make sure that we don't set critical dates on holidays and things like that. As good as any single person is, it's nice to have more eyes than fewer on that kind of thing. Clearly, we're doing this starting in the summer, so we have a sensitivity in the northern hemisphere. It's going to run over the year-end holidays. So, again, that's something we want to make sure that we're okay on. Luckily, this year we are not pressed for time, as we have been in the past.

The BCEC will be convened. Their job is – if we can scroll up a little bit. It'd be really nice if we can scroll to the right so we can see what those words were. Thank you. The BCEC will decide on the rules they operate under. Not unlike the NomCom, each BCEC has to set their rules. There are certainly very closely aligned to what they were before, but there are changes and, I guess, improvements each year. The BCEC has to set its own rules and publish them. There's also, I believe, an approval phase by the

ALAC. They have to decide on exactly what the call for expression of interest – what questions are we asking, what infrastructure are we using. I presume we’re using an online one, similar to the NomCom again. But that has to be all verified and put in place. They will do the call for expression of interest.

Can we scroll back to the left and up? Or down. Down, down. Sorry.

We have a question from Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don’t know the right point in the process to raise this question, but our currently-selected Board member is one of the potential candidates, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: There are no term limits in our rules, so, yes, certainly. If the current Board member chooses to run and he’s not term-limited by the Board, which is limited to three terms, then he or she is eligible to run.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you. Then the other part of my question – this is me as a broken record for the last ten years – is, have we ever considered doing anything like a Mechanical Turk or a [Grap] or

something to back through all the Board minutes and get an understanding of end user perspective raised, etc., by our sitting Board member to have a more objective understanding of what that ... I know they're not directly representing us, but in theory they're meant to represent the interest of end users. I'm wondering if that's something we've ever considered doing.

ALAN GREENBERG: The Board minutes do not echo what everyone says, although in some cases they do—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, the transcripts [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, there are no transcripts, as such. Well, there are no transcripts – excuse me – published as such. There are Board minutes published.

I'll go to you in a moment, Sebastien. In the past, there have been in some years internal evaluations done of Board members. In some cases, those have been released by the Board member to demonstrate how they are viewed by their colleagues. We certainly have evidence of who is appointed chairs of what committees or who is on which committee. So we have that kind

of thing, but an actual record of what the Board member is doing, other than that on occasion there are things in the public record? That's somewhat opaque to us.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Before leaving, when I was a Board member, I was not allowed to come to talk to you. I was not allowed to participate in committees. A lot of things were changes. If you want to compare, you will compare apples and oranges. Today, it's much more open. You have public meetings of the Board [and calls]. That was never done before. Therefore, it's something you can start to do now, but you can't do that for the history, unfortunately, except if you ask a Board member to tell you what he was doing and what he was talking about. It was secret what was happening in the Board, much more than today. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I see [you], but we are three minutes from the end of the meeting and I'd like to at least be able to get down to the end of the timeline. If you have a very quick question, ask it, but I'm not sure I'll answer right now.

[SEUN OJEDEJI]: Okay. Thank you. Very quick question. I just want to find out why is the process so complicated, and is there anything we can do to actually make the process less complicated? And the importance of these two committee. Because I've been trying to understand what's the importance because it [can] be changed.

JOHN LAPRISE: We'll table that question until the end of the meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. I'll answer that question. The rules of procedure are very specific in this case. When we started with the ability to have a Board member, which was relatively recent, there was a huge amount of effort put into designing this process. There was some very different opinions within the community of how it should be done. This is the process we have. Should we have a simpler process in my mind? Yes, certainly, but right now we have to follow the process that we do.

To be honest, as complex as this is, the amount of time we'd spend rewriting the process I'm sure we want to take away from real work. But that's something the ALAC could discuss, should it choose. It is a complex process. It's more complex than anyone else in ICANN uses, as far as I know. But it is what it is right now, and it's not going to change this time.

Okay, where are we? So the BCEC will issue a call for expressions of interest. There'll be a deadline. The expressions of interest include candidates, include references. Those references will be consulted. The BCEC will do its work and [will] come out with an initial slate of candidates. That slate could be as few as one. It could be as large as ten or something like that. Hopefully not larger than that.

The RALOs then have the ability to take candidates who have submitted an expression of interest and have allowed their expression of interest to be published. You could submit an expression of interest and say, "I don't want anyone to know." But if you allow people to know, the RALOs can, from among the candidates who submitted an expression of interest and published it and were not selected, [could select them, could petition them.] It requires the independent action of three RALOs to add someone back onto the slate. Essentially, you're adding someone on to the slate if you feel the BCEC really erred. It's possible and we have a provision for it.

Candidates are given a position to post their statements. We will very likely have some form of public interaction and questions with the candidates. The BMSPC will decide on the exact form of that. Then there is one or more rounds of voting to narrow the candidates down to one.

If we can go to the bottom ... okay. If you notice there, it says we allow a fair amount of time for voting – I think 30 days for multiple rounds – because you can have up to three rounds and rounds can be repeated if there are ties. Remember, we have a very small number of electorate: 20. Therefore, times are quiet possible.

With the current time, that brings us to an announcement ready by March 1st. The ICANN bylaws require us to announce someone by the 22nd of April, six months before the end of the annual general meeting. So you'll see we have almost two months' slack there. Once we come up with the final schedule, the date will likely be later than the first of March and hopefully well before the 22nd of April. That's what we'll be working on over the next couple of weeks.

That's all I really have to say. To repeat, the BCEC call will be looking for candidates with real special qualifications. Each RALO selects it, and in general, the request goes to the RALO chair. The RALO chair can use whatever methodology is appropriate for selecting the candidates. It should not be, "Everyone put up your hand and we'll select someone randomly," because we really are looking for qualifications. With the BMSPC, again, each RALO can do it its own way. The ALAC has to agree, but to be honest, that's going to be a real lightweight committee without an awful lot of work. So you can pick whatever you want to do. As Sebastien pointed out, there's all sorts of rules and regulations about who

can participate in what committee. That'll all be clear when the calls go out.

I'm done. Any questions?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

As Alan explained, everything will be in the notice. All the explanations of what's required will be in the notices that go out for making the requests for members of those particular committees.

Okay. So that's our final formal item on the agenda but we have one more person who would like to have her say, and that's Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you, Maureen. I think we've got many of the ALAC members and regional leaders here, as well as our liaisons. Very important. The e-mail will go out over the next – give me maybe 24 hours. We need to confirm the travel database by next Friday, the 5th of July. Montreal does have potential visa issues. We just need to make sure that we're all on time to apply for the travel from all the regions of the world.

As per usual, unless you're very new to the system – I can just see Natalia looking at me, but I'm make sure that I catch her en route.

But everyone else who's used to the e-mail, please confirm that you can attend the Montreal meeting from the second to the seventh of November. Approved arrival dates: Friday the 1st through to Friday the 8th of November. Again, that you can attend the entire time in Montreal, not arriving three days late or one day late, etc. Please let us know. It's really important for the travel database. So I'll be sending the e-mail out. Even if you are able to attend, please just write "yes." Just send me a yes. That's absolutely fine.

Again, if you need to go back and check with your families – I know that everyone will be traveling over the next few days – it would be really appreciated that you get back to me as soon as you get that e-mail in your inbox. This also goes for all incoming leaders. I think all the incoming leaders know who they are. Thank you very much for your time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not quite all yet. We do recommend you bring your snowshoes.

GISELLA GRUBER: My apologies. Correction for the record: not all LACRALO. We don't have them yet, but we'll be following this very closely. Apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG: We also have NomCom appointees.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just one other housekeeping item is that we have several brochures here from all of the RALOs. We also have the AFRALO hot topics document. Please, if you're interested, I know that we have a lot of events coming up in Europe. If you'd like some, please take them home with you for those events. Thank you so much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: The last announcements. Yes, there will be an e-mail coming out to the RALO chairs about NomCom appoints. We will be making that decision by e-mail.

What I want to do, first of all, is to thank the interpreters again, and, of course, our brilliant techy staff. It's really good. No hiccups that I see this time. So we've really enjoyed good-quality sound and audio and all that kind of stuff, except I know that people have actually had some poor Internet connections in their rooms, I must admit.

Did you have that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

MAUREEN HILYARD: People were complaining about the rooms.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: [inaudible]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. It was terrible. What I want to do is there is this session, the EPDP, [of course]. Our team will be expecting everyone to be there. That's at 3:15. 5:00 is the universal acceptance hot topic. Of course, at 6:30 we'll meet at the community wrap-up reception. If I don't see you, because there's several meetings in between times as well, before then, travel safely. Take care. We'll see you online anyway. Thank you. Enjoy.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]