

MONTREAL – At-Large Leadership Session: Welcome to ICANN66, At-Large Talking Points and Policy Platform
Saturday, November 2, 2019 – 08:30 to 10:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you everyone, we'll be starting in a minute. If you wouldn't mind settling. Thank you everyone. Welcome, a warm welcome to what is a cold Montreal outside. I must admit, when we came out of the main door of the main building and crossed the street, we were hit by one degree of Montreal. I'm sorry, but when you're coming from a very tropical Pacific Island, this is not your normal temperature. It's really great to see you all here. Welcome to what's going to be a really busy week for us all. I think with ATLAS, which you're all going to be hearing about over the next few days, that's going to be all encompassing for us. Although that's a focus for us, there is still other things that we have to do. Of course, these two days are our days for getting our work done.

I think that first of all, just looking at who we have here, we've got first the -- looking at our current ALAC Committee for example, I welcome all those who are currently on the ALAC and are present. I must admit, we actually have been looking at whether we actually had a quorum but we do have a quorum and we do realize that there are some people who are still yet to come. Lots of cancelled flights and rescheduled flights, people still turning up and I hope they do.

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.

Welcome to our current members. I do want to acknowledge that there are people on the current ALAC team who will be either leaving the ALAC structure or reorganizing themselves within it. For those who soon to be leaving us, thank you so much for what you have contributed to the ALAC and At-Large to date. We hope that you will continue with us in the future.

I think that when we're actually at looking at who we've got on the team and what they've done, is like looking at what we've achieved over the last year and I think that one of the important things was -- I really think that we consolidated a really good team. I really enjoyed working with everyone. I think that one of the important things for me was getting the ALAC and the RALOs working, RALO Chairs working with the ALAC, was something that I was really quite keen to do and ensure the membership, input from the membership came through to ALAC level. Probably not as much as I would have hoped and I think that I want to consolidate that more, a little more in the next year.

I think the ALT Plus was something that was a progress and as I mentioned, the whole point of it is to have a sounding board that we can take already discussed decisions, already discussed issues to the ALAC for decision making. Of course, the success of At-Large has actually contributed a lot by the CPWG and I really do thank Jonathan and Olivier for coordinating that particular working group on a weekly basis and at horrible hours for some people. I think that's really added value and the feedback that I've been getting from the Board and ICANN Org has been pretty superb and I really appreciate that.

The only thing is and I think that Jonathan's already made a start on that and looking at the Policy Platform, that's a development which I think is going to help us prioritize and that was a big word yesterday's SO/AC Meeting, is that every section is looking at how we can prioritize what it is that we're doing. That's going to be a really important thing for us moving forward because it's a weekly meeting, same people turning up, we need to get more people involved but at the same time, we need to have people who have a full understanding of the issues.

Of course, the policy workload was offset by looking at ways in which we could share the load a little bit more and the finance and budget committee has been tasked with dealing with those finance issues that come up occasionally and have been dealt with by the CPWG but it's not policy. We've only had to do that once and I must admit, I wasn't impressed with the feedback we got from it, from that committee, it's something that we have to work on and I hope we do that. I've already tapped Ricardo on the shoulder to see if he will take the lead on that committee and we'll see how that goes.

Talking Points for our ICANN Meetings are really important and Jonathan has been tasked with that job and he will be discussing Talking Points for this meeting very shortly. They're really important that we actually have a consistency of messages that we give to ICANN about important issues, that are being currently discussed within ICANN and as the ALAC At-Large perspective within the Talking Points.

Again, Outreach and Engagement, very grateful to Daniel and Joanna, Tijani, people who have had some really important contribution to our work and the area of Outreach. Policy, Outreach are the two mandated areas for At-Large and we're really lucky to have people who are committed to work in those areas. We really pleased with that. I think to that the important thing with the Outreach and Engagement, has been the regional contributions that we're asking of the co-chairs. Daniel can't really do the work on his own, he does need the co-chairs from each of the regions to be engaged in the work of the committee but also to spread that work back to the regions. The co-chairs with Outreach and Engagement, I hope that they people that the RALO chairs choose for that particular task chose well and make sure that they actually gives those messages because it's important to what goes out into our communities.

One of the important things that we raised yesterday at the SO/AC meeting was the collaboration that we've involved ourselves in with GAC, the NCUC and also the continuing relationship that we have with the ccNSO and the SSAC regulars. You'll probably hear, later on through the Multistakeholder Model discussions that we are being asked to work on how we can breakdown the silos within ICANN and that's something that we will come up. But I think that we're actually already starting to make headway into breaking those silos by having a greater presence within each of those other constituency groups and hopefully beyond, especially through strengthening the SOs chairs, work that we're actually doing at the moment.

Strategic Plans came through, were completed and the collaboration with GSE is really important, Sally is very pleased with work that's actually being done within the RALOs and involving the GSE staff. That's a really positive. The RALOs and At-Large itself, working in with GSE staff, that's really important, that ICANN Org At-Large collaboration.

We're nearly at the end of our At-Large Review Items. Of course, the big one is ATLAS in regards to -- ATLAS is very much associated with the final item, which is the biggie that still needs to be covered. I think that is where we have really probably focused a lot of our attention, we left it to last because we knew it was the hard one. But ATLAS will actually help us and the Post ATLAS activities that we do, are going to help us complete that and get it done by December something, that we have to get our final report?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, not our final report, we need to have our next Interim Report done. In fact, we don't need to get it in by the letter of their law until I believe sometime in January or early February but we had decided that we would be doing it by the end of this calendar year.

MAUREEN HILYARD: So, we actually imposed that deadline for ourselves and I think that's doable.

Of course, the selection of our At-Large Board Member and we've got the BCEC BMSBC working groups on track. There is some hard work starting, there's about six months' worth of work there. It's something we're sticking to the process and I'm sure you'll come out with the eventual selection that we want.

Again, people within At-Large are always going to be sought for various committees, ICANN related committees and it's really important people volunteer but it's a big commitment, it's a big commitment on top of the work that we do within At-Large. I really have appreciated the fact that there are people within our group, who are prepared to do extra over and above what it is that we're expecting people to do within our system, I really do appreciate that. Of course, ATLAS, ready to go. I'm really grateful to our ATLAS Organizing Committee, everyone here who's actually contributed to putting this show together.

Again, Olivier and Eduardo and their ProGraeme Committee has done a marvelous job working with David to get the ATLAS activity up and running. I really do appreciate the Leadership Development Team, who helped with the selection. I'll try not to mention the four letter word which has prevented a lot of people from arriving here and participating in person but we will enable remote participation so that anyone who had Visa difficulties will be able to get the completion certificate, which is something that we will be giving at the end.

I think that we actually did quite a lot, I'm really thrilled. I feel really grateful for everyone's help and contribution to achieving some great things. I think that we've done our job. Anyone got any questions or queries on that? Comments? Oh my gosh, good.

First is looking at the Organizational Chart for 2020. All the new ones have been inserted. This is the new team, really looking forward to working with people. This is to finalize this particular section to say these they are new people in the -- you can see how people have been shuffled around. Good to see Sébastien is still with us and Sean, a new role at RALO level and that they're -- I haven't removed Olivier from CPWG, I'm expecting that you're just going to be jumping up to be there. The enthusiasm, you wouldn't want to break up that team would you Jonathan? Exactly. I noticed that and I see -- okay. This is a new team and I'm really looking forward to working with everyone on this.

Moving then on to what we've got this week. Over the next two days for example we've got -- there are things that we're doing together as a team and there are things that -- there's Capacity Building, there's Outreach and Engagement, everyone's bound to have seen the hard work that Gisella and Heidi put into the At-Large schedule. There was amazing amount of struggle just trying to get some completion from the ICANN, about the actually ICANN schedule and we were shuffling all over the place.

I think we've got a pretty good set of activities over the week, which of course, starts with this one and then we go into the Policy Issues that we're going to be discussing. I'm not going to go through it all because it's there, it's available to everybody. Saturday and Sunday are days and we would like everyone if at all possible to be at the ATLAS Sessions, if at all possible because tomorrow, you're going to actually be given, everyone in ALAC and the regional chairs, is going to be given a task, a coaching task, it will be handy if you're there to find out what you're going to be doing.

Of course, we do understand that there are going to be people who are going to be -- there's the ATRT3 people, SubPro, who are going to be out -- doing their own thing. We appreciate that there are people who are going to be representing At-Large at other activities happening within ICANN. But, if you're not doing that, you're at ATLAS. Just thought I'd remind you, let you know. Yes, attendance will be, or you won't get your certificate. Any questions for queries?

I think it would be a good time for Jonathan to talk about Talking Points.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Good morning. This is a little bit of a different ICANN meeting in that we have an overlap between ATLAS and the ICANN meeting and so instead of trying to cover all the discussions going on inside of the ICANN meeting, Maureen asked me to draft some talking points, related specifically to the Plenary Sessions that are taking place as

part of the ICANN meeting, which is the EPDP Phase 2, DNS Abuse and Evolution of the ICANN Multistakeholder Model. If you look at EPDP Phase 2, you can see that there's some background discussion there about what has gone on in the past.

There are still some outstanding issues from the Phase 1 that we still grapple with a little bit. One of those is geographic distinction. The desire to only have the GDPR basically enforced in Europe as opposed to around the world and another one has to do with legal verses natural persons. We want more information to be published about companies than there is about individuals. There's pushback on that because if you're a very small company, you may be putting your home address or something like that as your company address and so that's still an open discussion but those are some things that are still clinging on from the previous phase of the EPDP.

From this phase, what we're principally focused is, as quickly as possible, getting access to the people who need it, whether it's consumer protection, agencies, whether it is cybersecurity researchers, spam house that are doing spam filtering, etc., and there are still some open issues there about bulk access to the data and then also, to the degree to which the system can be automated. Right now, it's turning out to be a very manual process, which will make it very difficult for those that are trying to do macro level analysis of the data, it will make it very difficult for them to do their jobs. That's the one of the things Alan and Hadia have been working for on our behalf

in the EPDP, is the ability to get some people the right to get to more data and in a more automated fashion.

You can see that with each of these areas of the Talking Points, there is some background on it about what's going before and then some bullet points about where we stand on some of these issues. The first here is, we're crest at the issue of geographic differentiation be reopened. We request that the issue of legal natural differentiation be discussed in Phase 2. We request independent studies related to the implementation of geographic and legal natural differentiation as well because there has been some assertions by contracted parties that making that distinction would be unduly burdensome on them and unduly expensive and so again, Alan and Hadia have promoted the notion that we have to actually get the answers of those questions before making those assumptions.

The other issue has to do with taking some of the liability away from the contracted parties. Another big issue in the context of the implementation of GDPR inside ICANN, is who will be responsible for mistakes? Because when we make mistakes, there's likely to be fines and things like that and so part of what's motivating the contracted parties to be as conservative as possible about the data they share and they conditions under which they share it, is the liability that they face as controls of that data.

ICANN has been working to try and insert itself as a data controller so that they can take on some of that liability and take it away from the

contracted parties, to make it less frightening for them to share that data. That's one of the issues that we continue to work on, is ICANN taking on as much of the liability for the registries and registrars as possible. The support of automation, update a disclosure whenever possible.

I can stop there if anybody has questions, but that's kind of where we are now. We're trying to make the impact of GDPR be as narrow as possible, so that as much data is available that won't affect individuals and won't affect people outside of Europe and then also trying to make data available to the people who need it, as efficiently as possible. Those are the big Talking Points from the At-Large. Are there questions or comments that I can address? I see -- is that Holly? Go ahead, please.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think we can take about access really and I'm asking really, you're here, two process of automation. One would be actually accreditation and how do you make that an automatic process because some of the exemptions in EPDP are about law enforcement but that's so differently from one jurisdiction to another, that that becomes I think a challenge? Then once you have the accreditation piece in place, are we talking about access as an automation process once somebody's been accredited? I guess comment on those two would be useful.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sure Holly, thanks for the question. My understanding of it, is that the majority of this conversation is about automotive of the disclosure of information to accredited parties and so it's about once you're accredited and you're requesting information, what is the efficiency with which you can request and receive the information that you've requested and what the quantity of that information can be and how automated it can be?

I'm not aware of any major effort to automate the accreditation process because that's kind of one-time only issue and there is going to be a whole outside of processes associated with it, that probably aren't even going to be ICANN, they're going to be outside agencies that are involved in that. This is more about whether or not the contracted parties are going to be able to in a legal way, provide automated access to the data that's not initially made available publicly because as you know, there's public and non-public data and that was Phase 1 of the EPDP was to decide what data would be left out in the open verses what data would be kept private and only available on request.

Phase 2 is about what that request process will look like. We're trying to move toward more automation. There's been some legal advice that's come in, that suggests that automation would be difficult, so this is a fight that's ongoing inside the EPDP but it's still the At-Large position that we would like to make the process of requesting and retrieving data as efficient as possible. The reason for this is we've already seen the impact of WHOIS going dark and we had a

presentation two meetings ago from the SAC about different cybersecurity researchers and others whose availability of information has gone down dramatically and that will have long term consequences on things like spam filters and malware filters etc. so remedying that is one of the highest priorities of the At-Large. Any other questions or comments?

As Maureen said, this is just about us getting on the same page so that when you're having conversations in hallway, that we're sort of saying similar things. We're focused on -- I think that one of the things that is going to be discussed a lot in the near and midterm is, how our position is different from others that are part of this discussion. Most everyone is focused on the registrants inside the EPDP process, they're focused on the people that registering domain names, what their rights should be, what the risks might be to them and then when looking at costs that might be endured by the contracted parties.

We've taken it on as our responsibility to worry about everyone else, which is roughly three and a half billion people and so these are just the people that make restaurant reservations and flight reservations and do email and haven't registered a domain name, have never heard of ICANN and how best to protect their interests and we know that their interests have been dramatically affected by the temporary specification as it's been implemented and so we are very motivated to move to a situation in which the availability of that data to trusted parties can be restored as quickly as possible.

Moving on, is the Evolution of the Multistakeholder Model. Again, there's some discussion background discussion about this as well. We've been involved in this iterative process that Brian Cutes firm has been hired to facilitate inside of ICANN. It is a perennial problem of At-Large that we represent the largest constituency in the internet space but probably have the smallest voice within the discussions around DNS policy. We are very vigilant about restructurings of the Multistakeholder Process and issues that might arise there. We're active participants in this.

I think one of the things that are most focused on, is making sure that there's not an inordinate amount of structural change to the way that policy is developed, that would lead to more working groups like the EPDP because one of the things we have found in the EPDP, is that this distinction of representation has become harden, it's become more cement like inside of the EPDP because they restricted how many people can participate from each SO and AC. Our minority position has been imprinted on that process and seeing that replicated across working groups across the organization is something that concerns us a great deal.

Part of the process that they've gong through in the Multistakeholder Model Development, is trying to determine whether or not problems that have been raised are already being addressed by other areas inside of ICANN. If so, then maybe they shouldn't be the highest priority for this effort because that would be duplicative. The danger is that if those processes are still ongoing, we don't know the outcome

of them, so we're relying on them entirely for the solutions to these problems related to the Multistakeholder Process, gives us some pause because if they turn out in a way that is not agreeable to us, then we need to retroactively say, "They were not taking care of the problem, even though people were suggesting they were."

One of the principle areas where that's true is so called PDP 3.0, which is a process that the GNSO is going through to try and reform the Policy Development Process and it's true that there's lots of improvements that could be made in terms of scoping and other areas and setting clear objectives, but we're very concerned about this cementing if you will, of our minority position within those discussions as a result of that reform. We're taking a wait and a see attitude on some of the questions that were raised because they leave too many unanswered questions about what those resolutions might look like. That's what's given us pause about the Multistakeholder Development question. Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I will speak in French if I may and even if you don't allow me to, I will still speak in French. I would like to wait for everyone to put their headsets on. This is the first time that we use another language, so I will wait for everyone to wear a headset before I start. Thank you, Jonathan for this introduction to the topic. I am a little bit worried with the way that things are being introduced because if this is done in another area of ICANN, what we need to ask is to have our voice heard

so that a decision takes our point of view into account. If it's just to say, "Okay, this is happening over there, and if we don't agree with them, it shouldn't have happened there, there will be a problem for us."

First of all because this is not how we will reduce the number of places where things occur and it's not just because we disagree with that position, that things should be done elsewhere. Basically, what we are doing there is that we are questioning the Multistakeholder Model. I think that if there are places where things happen, things are being taken care of, I think it should be -- I'm not sure what's going on, maybe I need to step away from the microphone but anyway. I think that the voice of the users needs to be heard, presented and taken into account. I think this is more important than saying, "Well, we're not quite sure what will come out of that. So, for now we just wait and see."

In terms of Policy Development 3.0, it is quite clear that if we have something to say today, well this is not the right place because our voice can only be heard by a liaison and not by our active participation. It's good that we have the voice of our liaison but it's not enough from the standpoint of the user community. What we need to do is -- this is occurring over there, so we need to be there. What I heard from the GNSO chair, what I heard from him is -- well this is something internal to our structure, so please go elsewhere, there is nothing here for you. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Sébastien. Just to clarify, I agree completely that we need to insert ourselves as much as possible into the PDP 3.0 Process. This particular stage or phase of the Multistakeholder Model, was asking the question, can we drop these issues because they are being addressed elsewhere? That's the question we were asked and we answered the question, no. That's really the point -- for this particular consultation, we were suggesting that the PDP 3.0 should not be a basket that we all rely on necessarily because we don't know what that outcome should be.

That's separate from the fact that we need to participate in the PDP 3.0 to make it as good as it can be and that's equally important but for this particular Multistakeholder Model consultation, they were asking the question, can we table this issue for now because it's being handled already by the PDP 3.0 effort? That was the question we were asked and that's how we answered and why. I agree with you completely, that we need to find every way to interact with the PDP 3.0 issue and be aware of it and arm our liaison to carry our position into the GNSO as we develop and awareness of where that process is going.

Cheryl and Alan have been warning us about where that PDP 3.0 Process is going for some time but it's still also ongoing. We will be seeing more from that and we will be studied it probably through the CPWG, come up with some talking points for Cheryl to take back to the

GNSO, that's the process for that. The process for this is whether or not we're willing to rely on that process, to further develop the Multistakeholder Model and that question, we said no. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BENJEMMA:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. You spoke about EPDP as if it is a bad format for the working group, for the PDP working groups because it doesn't permit us to be -- it will make us another minority position. I don't have this analysis for the EPDP because, in my point of view, it is important that all stakeholders be represented in these working groups. The problem of the EPDP is that we are not equal.

You have a constituency that have, I don't know how many representatives, while we have only two. I think that -- because if you open all PDP working groups to everyone, when we come to decision, the party that wants to win their position, they will bring everyone inside the working group and at the end we will have a consensus of the attending persons which is not the consensus among the stakeholders. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Tijani. And I didn't mean to get to specific about what we want from the PDP 3.0 effort, I don't know the answer to it. For the Multistakeholder consultation, we asked whether or not we are willing to rely on that process for resolution of issues related to

representation across the community and our answer is, we're not willing rely on it. That's all. That's all we're saying here about the Multistakeholder Process question.

We need to become more actively engaged in the PDP 3.0, to make sure that there's some kind of more equitable representation to allow for voting and the issue is, we don't actually know what's being proposed yet, that's our real reason for not supporting it here, it would be an act of faith to support here and the rumors we've heard thus far are not favorable to us. We need to work on that separately. All we're saying here is, that no, this should stay on the table, in the Multistakeholder Process that Brian Cute is running because PDP 3.0 is too much of an unknown. That's all we're saying as part of this talking point.

JOHN LAPRISE:

We have 10 minutes left in this portion of the session. We're going to go to a one-minute timer please. We have Marita, Holly, Cheryl and Javier in the queue at this point in time. Marita.

MARITA MOLL:

We keep getting hung on PDP 3.0 thing and I'm questioning who are the recipients of the Talking Points? A lot of people that you might be talking to are not going to be totally aware necessarily of these issues that we have with that. That came up through the Brian Cute's particular paper, which we were responding to. If you're talking to

people just generally, who aren't going to be tied up in this, we need say, that we are the largest constituency and we won't allow our voice to be restricted.

We need to continue be involved in policy. We realize that the process needs to be streamlined and prioritized, everyone else needs that too but we're watching out for current processes that could undermine that, to me that's the way I would put it. Just generally speaking to people. If you're speaking specifically to the paper that is about this Evolution of the Multistakeholder Model, then you might need to get into the PDP 3 issue but we could be more general then that without really getting tied up in that. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Two brief points. One, I think we out to at some point acknowledge the recommendations that the GNSO Review actually came up with, which were about more inclusive working groups and they had a range of recommendations. They ought to be monitoring that because it just doesn't feel like they've actually done that. That would actually answer the points about -- Marita's point. They should be following what they said they were going to do, would be the first thing.

The second thing is, there were a whole range of recommendations that we came forward with that I'd like to see reflected and that's about in terms of when you have a PDP Process, that the GNSO itself might reach out a number of ways to assist those who aren't familiar with the issues, become more familiar. Find different ways of getting to people and when you talk about participation, don't just talk about membership of a committee, talk about the ability to contribute and the ability to educate people to contribute and see that as important as having a few people in a working group. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. I'm not going to repeat my often-stated declarations of our needs to actually get in and have more and more people known what they're talking about, coming to be engaged because I think is something, we all understand. I do want to pick up on Marita's point about keeping the messages simple and fit for purpose, and I think that's something that we can all benefit from if we do that, be smart about this. What you've got here is material that you can drill down with as well. Use these Talking Points as they are meant, as aid memoire for your interactions.

The one final point on this, let's not also get hung about the balance questions please Tijani because any PDP consensus call is established

Platform

in the minds of the leaders of that PDP and it's their job to take into account whether you've got stacking or equity, there's a process to look after that. Let's not go down that rabbit hole. Thanks.

JOHN LAPRISE: Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Following up on that and just to be crystal clear on Talking Point 1 Talking Point 1 speaks of need for rebalancing of participation and powers, to be crystal clear, it's our position as ALAC that we want more power as ALAC because rebalancing participation and power seems a little bit watered down. It's our position that we're seeking more relative participation or powers within even bylaw change or is it something lesser than that? Thank you.

MARITA MOLL: Just to speak to the paper we put out, in which one of the issues that was brought forward was the holistic view of ICANN. Our recommendation there was that there needs to be a review. We didn't prescribe or specify what needs to come out of that review but that a review needs to happen, although we realize it not necessarily part of Brain Cute's process, we think that of his response ought to be that there needs to be review and give a timeline under which that could be done. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may, Marita, it's important from an ATRT3 perspective, to note that that is in fact part of our job description and we would very much like to hear reinforcement of that from the community when ATRT3 interacts with you and we will be doing that during this meeting. I'm looking forward to hearing that as a very, very official point of view.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I want to reinforce what Marita said, to keep the Talking Points high level. I think the thing to keep in mind, is that as an Advisory Committee, we're between a rock and a hard place because we were created in order to give advice to the Board, much like the GAC but when you give advice, after a two year Policy Development Process, you're criticized for waiting until the last minute to give contradictory advice, when you should have participated along the way.

Well, now if you're reforming your process for Policy Development and suggesting somehow that we should participate along the way, then we have no way to participate without criticism, I think that's the broader point, is that we represent the largest constituency and we need to ensure that our voice is heard in Policy Development and that we're working on a lot of different levels to try and make sure that's the case.

Platform

JOHN LAPRISE: It its 9:30 at this time, we're moving on to point four, which -- oh Holly, I'm sorry, did you want to make a comment on that last bit before moving on?

HOLLY RAICHE: A really brief point that picks up all of that. In terms of breaking down silos, the problem with the silos we have is that the GNSO is where the policy happens, that's the silos. If you're starting from there and you're saying, "Break it down." That's what we're talking about. Let's recognize that structurally we don't make policy.

JOHN LAPRISE: Okay, so we are 9:30, we are on point four of the agenda, this is the At-Large Policy Platform, so Jonathan and Joanna, this is your next item.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You don't talk about DNS Abuse?

JOHN LAPRISE: It's still your floor, points three and four, you have some discretion there, so by all means.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perhaps the biggest conversation that's going on at this particular meeting is about DNS Abuse. It's come up for a number of different

places within ICANN. The At-Large has expressed a lot of concern about DNS Abuse and so what's happening right now, is that the Board is taking it seriously and asking the Community to about defining DNS Abuse. Some registries and registrars have realized that this may not turn out they way they want, so they preemptively define it and came out with their own framework for addressing DNS Abuse. This is a very big discussion that's going to be ongoing. I think the idea of this particular topic is particularly important to us because it affects, again those individual internet users.

DNS Abuse is one of the biggest challenges faced by individual end users. No new round of gTLD applications should happen without reform to mitigate DNS Abuse. The CCT Review Team, the Consumer Competition Choice and Trust Review Team found that DNS Abuse just moved right in to the new name space and that none of the safeguards were effective in preventing it. I think that's why we have some pause about the fact that Sirius came to talk to use about how we're getting ready for the next round and things. The optics of that are pretty bad if you haven't already dealt with some of the issues and failings of the round from seven years ago.

We've also been very supportive, the At-Large has been very supportive, thank you, of the CCT recommendations related to DNS Abuse and we don't believe that a new round should take place without implementation of those recommendations.

One of the hot topics if you will, is about how to define DNS Abuse because there's lots of different levels of it. There's sort of technical DNS Abuse and it's a whole spectrum that goes all the way into what might be considered content abuse, that's where the contracted parties are particularly concerned, as they don't want to be responsible for what their customers are doing with their websites, where as the IP community is at the other end of the spectrum and wants them to have to actually follow what's in the contracts and take down websites that are engaged in illegal conduct.

It's a big discussion about how DNS Abuse should be defined but DNS Abuse was defined in the most restricted way in the CCT recommendations. It's been our position that you can implement those recommendations today, with that restrictive definition and then you can expand the definition at will later on but you've put those structures in place to better address DNS Abuse.

One of the biggest problems is that compliance has not had the tools to look at DNS Abuse in a holistic way. They can only reply to complaints and they have a process. We got a compliant, we asked them to look into it, they told us they looked into it, okay, case closed. That doesn't do a lot to change the fact that .science had 50 percent of its registrations involved in DNS Abuse. Empowering them to look at that via their audit power, etc., in a more holistic way, was at the core of the CCT recommendations and our support for them.

There's going to be a lot of discussions about DNS Abuse at this meeting. Thanks again, Sébastien, for reminding me to get those talking points and we were going to have a DNS Abuse session ourselves, where Drew Bagley, who was the person on the CCT review that came up with those recommendations, will speak to us and Graeme Bunton, who's responsible for the kind of preemptive definition and framework for addressing DNS Abuse, that came from a few of the contracted parties, is going to be coming to speak to us as well.

We'll get a good background in this but as far as our top-level talking points, DNS Abuse is critical importance to individual end users and mitigating that critically important and no new round should take place without fundamentally addressing the problems that have arisen since the 2012 round. Any questions or comments about that? Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Maybe I should sit next to you; we could have a conversation. There's such an overlap, we've got subsequent procedures and yet we've got CCT review and CTT review, much the same thing, what lessons have we learned coming out of the first round, that should be dealt with before the second round? Are Justine and the rest of us actually talking so that we're on the same page? We've kind of isolated this particular issue, which is really important, I don't detract from that at

all but it's part of our larger subsequent procedures, sorry you don't move ahead unless you've addressed all of the issues. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Holly. Again, because DNS Abuse is one of the plenary sessions, that's why we focused on it here in the Talking Points, but yes, Justine has been working very hard as our liaison to Subsequent Procedures and those discussions and she brings up the CCT review recommendations and the context of the Subsequent Procedures discussions. One of the difficulties, one of the challenges is that, the entire organization of ICANN is focused on how to make the process smoother for applicants than it was, more predictable and things like that.

As an organization, it seems less focused on organizational preparedness for the aftermath of putting these strings out there. That's again, a big part of our focus, is to make sure the organization is giving equal time to everybody other than the applicants if you will and those are some of the conversations we're having with [inaudible]. Thanks.

JOHN LAPRISE:

One of the things I will mention from the SO/AC meeting yesterday was that this whole area was a hot topic among the leadership of the community. Within the past couple weeks SAC and the Board and the Org are aware of security breaches at domain registries and also this

past week, Facebook has started suing one of the domains -- another registrar for false -- for domains that are closely named to Facebook. I think the community is aware that if they don't start doing something, other mechanisms will be invoked outside of ICANN. The pressure is on so to speak.

I see no more cards, so I'll turn it back over to Jonathan and Joanna four point four, At-Large Policy Platform.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, good morning. Together with Joanna, we've been tasked to work on a long-range project to come up with an At-Large Policy Platform and so much like the platform of a political party or something like that, a broad overview of what our areas of emphases are and what our positions are in those areas.

The first part of this exercise was identifying the areas themselves and coming up with a mechanism by which we'll chose the areas on which we focus going forward. A framework for defining what our key issues. We have a PowerPoint presentation that we made into a quick video, if we can play that, everyone will get a chance to see our current thinking on that framework and we'll get the benefit of these simultaneous interpretation so that we can then make the video available in other languages as well. That's why we're showing it to you as video now, as opposed to going through the PowerPoint little by little but we'll take questions after the video plays.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

While we've got a bit of a break, I just wanted to say, people in the audience, if you have anything that you would like to add, a question or query, that's why the microphones are there, please feel free.

1:08:16 - POWERPOINT:

Hi, my name is Jonathan Zuck, and together with Joanna, I've been tasked to create the At-Large Policy Platform and to facilitate its evolution with consultation with the RALOs and all the other members of At-Large leadership. With the At-Large Policy Platform, we help provide people with principles behind At-Large policy development, as well as an overview of some of the key issues on which the ALAC is currently engage. The At-Large Policy Platform is meant to be a living document, that evolves as new issues present themselves. Hopefully, it will be an aid to any At-Large representatives to various ICANN efforts, such as working groups, review teams, commenters and advisors.

The policy platform is based on a bottom up process, that began with surveys by the RALOs of their members, which were in turn forwarded to the CPWG for evaluation and approval, ultimately by the At-Large Advisory Committee.

There are many topics of potential interest to internet end users, our first step is to separate the individual users from the business users. Once we do this, we can see there are many interests in common but

several that apply only or mostly to business users. Our next step is to impose the remit of ICANN, which is focused solely on the security, stability and trust of the dynamic naming system or DNS. Now we see that there are interests of individual users that fall outside ICANN's core mission. It's on the issues within ICANN's remit we must focus and in particular those that are less represented by others, such as the business constituency.

The ALAC mission is to advance the interests of individual end users, not to represent end users. The reason is simple, individual end user interests are not a category of user, instead they are a category of use. In fact, we are all individual end users most of the time. Individual use of the internet includes browsing, searching, research, shopping, travel and dining reservations, online banking and video streaming.

Ideally, the ALAC advances the interests of all users but there are small categories of users that are ironically well represented inside the ICANN Community, they are the business users and registrants. The business users are well represented by the business constituency and the registrant interest are well represented by the NCUC and registrars, that means if there's ever a conflict, the At-Large focuses on the non-registration related interests of individual end users, both the issues are privacy and geographic names have raised these distinctions.

Once all these things are taken into consideration, Joanna and I have broken this down to the following big topics that we'll focus on as we

create this living document. Internationalized domain names, IDN's and universal acceptance, DNS security and abuse, DNS SEC and cybersecurity, ICANN and human rights, privacy policies, consumer protection, ICANN jurisdiction and internet governance, new gTLD, the issues of public interest commitments, security, stability, indigenous rights and trust, ICANN transparency and accountability, consensus through partnership with governments, business and civil society and beyond that, we open it up to feedback from all the RALOs, including you, to give us feedback into what other issues you think need to be included in this document.

What are the next steps? We're going to create Wiki space for the document and to finalize these topic areas. Get ALAC approval and then create a document that summarize them, as well as the current At-Large perspectives on these topics. Ideally, this results in a living document that continues to evolve, with issues raised by the regions and direct participation of RALO leaders and policy development. Thank you and we're happy to take any questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That was just a PowerPoint with some narration but what we're trying to do more of, is when we have presentations that we want to live beyond the time that they're first presented and be made available for people to review later, we will capture the recordings from the call on which they're presented and the interpretation of them, in terms of multiple languages so that we can make these presentations available

as videos in the languages that were available for interpretation. Just now we got simultaneous interpretation of this video and be able to then make versions of it available in those languages online for folks to look at later on. Meanwhile, Joanna and I are happy to take questions or comments about the topics that were raise, provided you were able to follow them.

JOHN LAPRISE:

I'm going to start the first one around the table. I see Sébastien, Satish, Ricardo, Tijani, and that's who I have in the queue at this point. We will not have a timer -- we'll give it a two-minute timer, we'll be generous. So, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you for giving me a counter because I'm the first to speak so I need to be on equal footing with everyone, so I need to be timed. The power of the tool is extraordinary. We need to really rethink this. First of all, it's bottom up that we need to do, it's not top down that we need to set up. We need to really rethink everything that was presented and we need really agree on what we want to do. We looked at gender balance, well gender equality, it's not diversity to be a man or a woman, it's a reality and so there are other points where we defer. There are other diversity points that we need to take into account, and it is something that we need to do within ICANN.

If we think of this outside of ICANN, 50% of what I do is useless and I'm not sure why I'm here. Let's not talk about policy -- anyway, we can talk about that. What I would like to ask is that we rethink this in a bottom up approach, it's a great proposal with great tools, it's very impressive but in terms of content, I didn't read everything, I didn't fully appreciate the entire thing, however I don't -- let's start from the standpoint that I disagree just because we need to work on it. I think it's an extraordinary start point but we can't exactly work this way. We need to show the rest of the world something a little bit different because it's not just about technology, there's more to this.

JOHN LAPRISE:

I have a speaker at the mic at the end of the queue.

SATISH BABU:

This video was presented at our last APRALO meeting and I think it's an excellent first effort. I would agree that maybe there should be a process to refine this further. I have a couple of quick points. One is, maybe you could provide subtitles, which will make it easier for people to read, in multiple languages also. Second is that cross cutting concerns such as diversity as mentioned and the global public interest; we wonder at the RALO level discussions, if this should find a place somewhere in the text?

Finally, the Venn diagram was actually very good, it's a great model to separate. I was wondering if it was possible to color code the highest

priority so that it stands out? Currently it's all the same. Thank you very much.

JOHN LAPRISE: Jonathan, you wanted to intervene.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just wanted to, before we get too far away from Sébastien's point, as mentioned at the beginning of the video, this is based on bottom up process, where there were surveys of the RALOs of the priority issues and they were prioritized based on the frequency with which they came up across the RALOs. The identification of the issues was in fact a bottom up process and not a top down process. One of the complexities though and I think part of the job that we have within the At-Large, is to make sure that we keep the issues on which we focus within ICANN's remit.

There are all kinds of issues that can be of interest to individual end users around the internet but we are specifically focused on ICANN policy and therefore restricted to ICANN's remit. I think it's perfectly possible that we missed something that is within ICANN's remit, I just want to make sure that that is the ruler that we're using and not just how important it is to the world or how much it matters to us personally, but that we make sure that we apply that filter. If we've applied it incorrectly, welcome being corrected about it. I believe that

it's critical that we apply that filter, in order to be taken seriously within the ICANN community, which is where we need to do our work.

Some areas where that comes up, one has to do with gender diversity and so the question then becomes one of refining what we mean by that and what that means in the context of ICANN's remit, whether it's gender diversity within ICANN processes, which I know is something that is very important to Sébastien, we heard about yesterday at NASIG etc, then let's have that conversation and figure out the best way to approach that but gender diversity say for example in the internet around the world, is not necessarily within the remit of ICANN and therefore, not within the remit of the At-Large. It's just about applying that filter and I welcome help in applying it.

As far as the second question about the process for refining it. Again, welcoming feedback, that's why we're doing it. Please come back to us with things that you'd like to change and I can certainly look into highlighting things differently. Like I said, it's just a PowerPoint, so that's easy to go back and do that and change some things like highlighting the text. The conversation we most want to have now is whether the bullets ended up in the right place, so we'd love your feedback on that before we go into creating the pros of this document because eventually it will be a document but now it's just a PowerPoint. Alright, thanks.

Platform

JOHN LAPRISE: Dev, I've got you in the queue; if you want, grab a seat in the front and I will call you when your time is on. Ricardo, you're next in queue.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I will take the time to speak Spanish because you already have time. I will leave a bit the focus subject of the presentation, thank you Jonathan for your presentation and also Joanna, thank you. I can see that this presentation and the podcasts that are in progress are focused on Jonathan's -- well Jonathan's effort is behind this and I wanted to suggest that somehow, we will take some funds for these to be made professionally, the translation of the podcast.

What Jonathan says is the important thing, anyone can translate this but he made the first proposal in Spanish, where someone translated and a friend of Jonathan's translated it and in the middle of the translation you hear a phone call answering in English, then it's been edited but I think that kind of thing, when take it to people, for people to understand them, actually these podcasts are really useful, these presentations are useful too. Let's do it right, let's not ask a friend to translate it for us.

I think we can make use ICANN's translation service, for them to translate the one or two minute pieces. They have just translate the presentation, we could have recorded it and we have Jonathan's presentation translated but that little money it costs will help us to do it right, to reach more people and for people to understand your good ideas.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Ricardo, and thank for your feedback and for listening to that first attempt. We made the decision to use the simultaneous interpretation. I made another version of that previous video you're talking about, that's not my friend but that was using the interpretation and the feedback I got from Eduardo and others is that, that sounded good and was fine and so I'm trying to make this the least amount of overhead if possible and the point was with the simulations interpretation, paired with the video, people found that one very easy to follow and to listen to, not the one that my friend did, where he was trying to interpret along the way.

That's what we just did now, we now have a recording of the translation of this and we use that recording to be the translated version of this and we don't have to wait for translation services to come back or something because we already have a recorded translation. I've already followed your advice I guess is what I'm saying, in some way. That's how we're going to try to do this going forward, is find the call that has the most interpreters on it, play the video and then take those recordings and we can make these available to everyone very quickly and not wait for other people to deliver for us. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

I have Tijani, Dev and Joanna in the queue. Ricardo, could you drop your card. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA:

Thank you very much. First of all, a big thanks to you about this draft platform. Really, I appreciate very much what you are doing, the draft charter, this draft platform, it is a way to frame the work and to organize it. Thank you again. Two points about that, the first one, this is DNS Policy Platform, it is not a policy platform At-Large because I want to make this point and I made it in the charter also, my comment on the charter, the charter is about the charter of the CPWG, which is the DNS Policy Working Group, it is not any policy, any ICANN Policy Working Group because the other issues are treated elsewhere, otherwise we can make an equal between ALAC and CPWG, which is not right.

Second important point, you made a bigger fort separate two kinds of end users, the business and the registrant but you made a lot of these kinds of groups, such as for example Board Member End Users, such as registry end users. Everyone is end users. If you make these difference, this may lead us to say, “We don’t speak about those, we speak only about the rest of them.” Which is, in my point of view, a big mistake. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Tijani. I think it’s going to an ongoing challenge for us. What I said in the video, in the narration is that we want to represent all individual end users and that we are all individual end users and that only in the context in which there was a conflict of interest between

the two would we make that distinction, as we have had to do in the EPDP because right now, there are in theory, eight or nine people representing the interests of registrants and two left to represent the interests of non-registrants. There are going to be times when we have to make that distinction because we're the only people speaking for non-registrants, but it's not our desire to only speak for them, generally, but to be aware of that dichotomy when it arises and when conflicts exist.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thanks, Joanna and Jonathan. What's been proposed is an evolution of the ALAC document that was done about five years ago on key policy issues of the At-Large community and why should end users care? Generally, the topics there are -- this new policy platform is refinement, update of that document.

One thing I mentioned when you presented it on the LACRALO call was that you need to make this accessible. I shared with you a way how that was done for the community onboarding slides, which too ALAC document and presented in the terms of, this is what the issue is, this is why the end user should care and here's how you can get involved within At-Large. I would suggest something along those lines, so that it's mobile friendly as well. I'll say that the wiki is not mobile friendly.

There's the At-Large blog concept, Google slides, those things are more mobile friendly than the Wiki.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, and I did get your email and I think that as we develop this, finding the best way to make it available to people is definitely part of it. I think those Google slides that you shared is a good way. That's certainly one of the final stages of this, is making it accessible. Thanks.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. Just a few brief points. First, thank you to Jonathan for getting me involved in this effort, I think it's a good way to approach both capacity building and policy making as way said in previous parts of this meeting, we cannot get involved in policy if we don't have informed members. This is a shared effort to on one hand get the resources online, get the resources accessible, get them distributed as broadly as we can.

On the other hand, to fuel policy advice, policy making in respective that was presented by Jonathan previously. I wanted use my two minutes, I think I'm on a timer. I wanted to use my two minutes to make this into a call for volunteers. As Jonathan said, it's an open

idea, it's something we're working on but we will not be able to do this alone. I know we have people in the room who are newcomers to At-Large, who are looking for an angle, how to approach this, how to do it. I think it's a unique opportunity. This is where you will learn but this is also where you will contribute to the community.

On one hand we want you to come on board and try to figure this out. What is it? What does At-Large do? The themes, the topics that Jonathan presented, are exactly an attempt at identifying those themes. On the other hand, you will help us work this through, make these more accessible and more visible to the community. I wanted to use this opportunity to make it into a call for volunteers. If you're looking for your place within At-Large, come -- am I on a times? It is a call for volunteers. Sorry, I'm getting excited, that's when I speed up.

On the other hand, I wanted to say that it is, as Jonathan indicated, I wanted to emphasize, it is very much a bottom up process. I specifically appreciate Sébastien intervention on certain issues. I like gender diversity, so certain issues that need -- presentation, equality, that's what you said, on getting represented in this platform. This is why we have chosen themes that are broad and inclusive. Gender representation, equality is a part of the human right elements you will see there, so it is non-discrimination.

I'm happy to have that conversation with you but I do believe that whatever ideas are in this room, around this table but in this room generally, they can be fitted into the policy that At-Large is supporting,

developing. I agree with Jonathan, we need to look at those issues through the ICANN remit lens, this is done with the CPWG.

If you do have an idea, you want this to get included, as already said, this is a very much bottom up process. Come to the CPWG, come talk to us, get involved and I believe that the themes are as broad and as inclusive as to have all the individual interests within the At-Large community attend. I'm going to stop here by as I already said, it is a work in process, it is a work in progress. We welcome any input from the community that is available. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Sergio.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you. I'm going to speak in Spanish, please use your headphones. Good morning everyone. I would like to take something that Tijani mentioned before, opposite to his position, I believe that it is really important to have divided individual users from commercial users, that distinction is worth making. I believe this is a positive thing we have in this presentation. I say this because not long ago, in our region, we passed out -- we approved our operating principles and one of the items contained in the operating principles reads that those members that in our region should state if they have a conflict of interest because they are registries or registrars or if they are a government representatives and why we do this?

Because in a Multistakeholder Process, where we have multistakeholders with different interests, it is highly probable and I am not mistaken that companies, even though they are a small companies, they will have representation within ICANN in some other place. This is not the place companies. This is the place for end users. For those who have no place discuss. No chamber or association -- companies have a business chambers, we do not have those chambers, groups us. This is our space where we can work and discuss on topics that are of interest for end users. Thank you very much.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Yrjö.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO:

Thank you. Of course, we have to keep ourselves within the limits of ICANN's missions that's very clear. However and unfortunately, the biggest problems for end users today and increasingly so, are not in ICANN's limits, the biggest problems, as everybody knows, are that end users are more and more degraded raw material for the platforms to make money of their dates of their data of their willingness to play the game so to say. My simple thought is that, whether -- could we try to find, could we try to identify such issues within ICANN's remit, which somehow have an impact on the ability or platforms and other players that cause big problems for the end users. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you. I must respectfully take issue with Sergio's perspective. An end user might own a business and they might not. Regardless, they are welcome here and they have a point of view. It's come upon us in At-Large to recognize what shoes someone is wearing when they are speaking, that's part of the discussion. I think this is space for everyone essentially. If you have a more specific interests -- I have multiple hats as well. I could be in multiple AC's and SO's if I chose to be.

I choose to be here because this is where I feel most at home and most aligned with both my interests and my predilection. At-Large is a place for everyone, regardless of where you come from. Thank you. I see a flurry of tags. I'm going to give Sergio the privilege of response. Then we'll go around the table. Jonathan, Yrjö, Abdulkarim, and then with Daniel, and then Siva. We are on a one-minute queue. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Just to make it clear, if we leave that position open, if companies, registries and registrars may come here, that will be wonderful but what we are doing is reaffirming that there is no concrete space for end users to speak openly. This is place for business lobby and that's why we are always suggesting that a vision between companies. Many of us do work in companies, in internet related companies or registration related companies but this does not mean that we, the

owners of companies sitting here, discussing issues that should be discussed only by end users and that is the difference I want to make.

We cannot have an open space for companies to sit here just because for them to make lobbying on their interest. This is my idea; we have to come here to discuss topics that are important for weak users or the weak teams of the power change. That link is the end users paying for the registrations and the end user has a place here to discuss ICANN's positions.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, and I apologize that the audio wasn't particularly clear in watching the video, some points probably got lost. I think one of the most difficult concepts to grasp, for all of us, the one of the most essential concepts for us grasp, is that individual end users aren't a particular person. The truth of the matter is, it's a set of activities, it's how we are behaving in a particular time. Even though I'm a software developer, when I'm making restaurant reservations, I'm being an individual end user.

When we talk about the interests of individual end users, we are in fact talking about all of our interests but the kind of activities we are engaged in. It's not about admitting or excluding anyone as an individual, as person, but instead the specific activities and roles who

interests we are trying to preserve and enhance. Yes, there are some people that are only individual end users but the reality is, we are all individual end users most of the time. The key here, is to make sure that when we are forming our policy positions, we're talking about making sure those individual end user activities are as easy and as safe and secure as possible on the internet.

I think that's our objective and it's very difficult to wrap our minds around but I think once we put into practice it becomes easier and even somebody that runs a business, can still talk about an individual end users interests that's specific to doing a particular type of activity. We should make it about people, is all I'm trying to say.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Yrjö, is your card still up? No? Okay, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:

Thank you very much, this is Abdulkarim for the record. I wanted to tell you I agree with John and I also agree totally with Jonathan on the issue of end users. I want us to take this one step further because I think that particular slide is a bit misleading, the way it was presented. I would probably want you to again look at the slide. Probably take out that particular slide from the presentation or make it a bit more informative so that's going to be crystal clear. Thank you.

Platform

JOHN LAPRISE: Daniel. And Siva's next and that's closing the queue because we're out of time.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: I see the whole discussion that is going on is about who an end user is. If we go back to the bylaws, the bylaws clearly demarcate what each of the respective constituencies is. If we continue the deliberation of what an end user is, we might end up taking the discussion to begin discussing what are the respective constituencies are, what is the mandate of the ALAC and representing the voices of the end users, what should they do, what policies should they do, what advice should the end users talk about? It's a wide scope. Probably, let's leave this discussion to the small group to clearly deliberate on the respective points regarding to the specific slide. Thank you, back to you.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you, Daniel. Siva.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Sivasubramanian from ISOC India Chennai At-Large structure. There was a comment from Sergio which was responded by you, that At-Large could include or welcome business participants, but not only business participants but some form of government presence here as well. When we talk about government, it's preferable that we have quasi governmental organizations that have a role in end user interest, and also when we talk about business presence here, we

could invite the participation of the public interest side of business. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

I will return to Jonathan’s description about the role we take when we are online and that’s the guiding principle for us. I rather like that, so thank you, Jonathan. I’ll turn this over to Maureen now.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you and thank you everyone for a wonderful introduction to this week’s discussions. I think what we’ve done today in this session has set the stage for what is going to happen during the week. I really appreciated that the audience has been part of it as well. Please, always feel free to, our meetings are always open, you’re free to participate.

I think one of the things this last discussion has actually raised is that whole area of resource development. It’s something that’s going to come up later on in the communications session that we have with ICANN Org and the GAC are part of that discussion. How do we present our information, the information that we want to get out to our members, our communities, how do we do this affectively?

What that session will about, is actually, what is ICANN Org doing, what can we do in collaboration with ICANN Org and the third group is what we can do as an organization ourselves to create resources that are going to be meaningful, informative, explanatory, really to help

our member organizations be more -- to learn more about what the issues are and how they can present it to their communities. I think it's a really good start and thank you very much, you deserve to have a coffee break. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

We are back here in session at 10:30, which is in 15ish minutes.

GISELLA GRUBER:

The coffee break is just outside, if you go out through the blue door at the end, just take a right and a left and you're right at the coffee stand. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]