ICANN67 | Virtual Community Forum – At-Large ICANN67 Wrap Up
Thursday, March 12, 2020 – 13:00 to 15:00 CUN

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN67 virtual meeting and the At-Large ICANN67 wrap up session on Thursday the 12th of March 2020 at 18:00 UTC.

The Zoom room audio is in English, and in order to access the French or Spanish audio, please join the French or Spanish streaming via the link on the main ICANN67 website. All details were sent out on the ALAC Announce list with all relevant names. Details for these connections can also be found on the ICANN67 At-Large Wiki agenda page.

We will not be doing a roll call today for the sake of time, but ALAC members, RALO leadership and liaisons' attendance will be noted. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment in English, French or Spanish, please type it in the chat by starting and ending your sentence with question or comment. French or Spanish questions will be translated into English and read out loud by a remote participation manager, Yesim Nazlar or myself, Claudia Ruiz. Staff will put periodic reminders of this process in the Zoom room chat.

If you're in the Zoom room and wish to speak, you may also raise your hand and staff will manage the queue. A kind reminder to please state your name when you speak, not only for the transcription purpose but

---

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.

also so the interpreters can identify you on the audio streaming. Please also speak clearly and at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, are governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. I have put a link in the chat to those standards for your reference.

So without further ado, I will hand the floor over to Maureen Hilyard. Thank you, Maureen, you may begin.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Claudia. I assume the agenda's going to go up very shortly. But good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the final At-Large leaders working session and wrap up.

You'll see very shortly on the agenda, but we'll start with a brief introduction to our policy platform as well as give the policy session speakers from this week an opportunity to summarize their takeaways from the sessions and anything that they'd like to raise. And then we'll welcome our ICANN guests, Maarten, León and Göran who I believe are on the call already, for a discussion about what is emerging as on top for ICANN from this week.

Then we'll have Alan Greenberg and his report on the work that the ALS mobilization team has been working on, and then we'll finish with some reminders to everyone about what we'd like help with as we lead up to the next ICANN meeting, wherever it or you may be.

So let's start off with Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Can we bring up the policy platform slides? Yeah, these will do. So as many of you—perhaps not all of you—know, Joanna and I had been tasked with creating a kind of platform of key policy priorities for the At-Large, and this was a result of a bottom-up process in which we did surveys at the ALS level that percolated up through the RALOs, and then based on where the emphasis was in the surveys, like who voted most for which item, it led to a kind of prioritization of them. In addition to that type of prioritization, there's also sort of the immediacy of the issue within the ICANN ecosystem as well.

So one of the big issues for us in 2020 is about DNS abuse and taking that on and trying to take some ownership of that discussion within the ICANN community, because we're in kind of a unique position that's a little less adversarial than the relationship between the businesses and the contracted parties.

So we've had a number of very well received sessions over the last few ICANN meetings because they were more cooperative and more informational and people have come away very satisfied with how that discussion went.

And this meeting was no different. We had a meeting that involved contractual compliance and one of the registrars, GoDaddy, and just had a back and forth looking at some scenarios for compliance and how they might be better served, and it really helped bring to the

surface where some of the problems lie in a cooperative way. I think people felt very positively about how that went.

So I think that helps to underscore that we're in a very good position to take the leadership on this topic as well as some others. Another thing that's interesting is that this virtual meeting that sort of came up at the last minute led to a lot of people to really cut up their agendas and really minimize the things that they were trying to discuss under this new virtual format because it felt unpredictable to them.

And the people on the ICANN67 At-Large planning committee under Maureen's leadership decided let's get some of these cross-community things to happen anyway and see if we can make it work in a virtual arena. And the net result is we were the ones really talking about policy during this meeting and we were the place for everyone to show up.

So Joanna's session on DNS abuse, cybersecurity in the context of geopolitics nearly hit the limit of attendees in the Zoom room, at one point being as high as something like 265 members in the meeting. So I think that this meeting has really been good in many respects for the al community, both in terms of increased participation but also increased attention on the work that we're doing.

I gave a session that was sort of a DNS abuse 101 session and a call to action that was really intended for just the At-Large to establish a vocabulary between us in terms of what represents DNS abuse and what some of the things mean and some of the statistics around it,

and then we announced that not only would we be making this a policy priority but we'd also be making it an outreach priority.

And we don't have a plan in place for that yet, but I think we drew a line in the sand and said that we're going to leverage our deep structure of RALOs and ALSes, etc., in order to really reach out to the public and do some education around it as well. So I think that session went well, was received well. We still have more work ahead of us than behind us, but I think it went over well.

What I'd like to do is ask Holly, who led a session on DNS over HTTP and other sort of encrypted DNS technologies—that was another panel that was incredibly well received, and what I wanted to do was just hand the microphone to her to give us a little bit of a summary of the key topics and what our next steps might be in taking a leadership role on that topic. So hopefully, Holly, you were prepared for me to pass the microphone to you. I will let you take over.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, I am.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fantastic. Yes, this was a really good session. it started off with me saying, look, we've paid a lot of attention to privacy issues about the GDPR, but we have not discussed a very important privacy issue which

is about what Jonathan spelled out, DNS over HTTPS or DNS over TLS. We explained what those terms mean, but essentially, what it does mean is we're talking about the traffic sent between computers over recursive resolvers which is unencrypted.

And what these two technologies do is the use of encryption, using those technologies—now, we had two speakers. The first was Paul Hoffman, he's a senior technologist with ICANN. He's written a paper, it's about 12 pages. There's a link to it—or there should be a link to it in the chat. There was doing my session. And what he did was explain technology and then started to talk about some of the issues that are raised by that technology.

I'll mention the other main speaker, who was Barry Leiba, he's the senior standards manager at Futurewei Technologies, but he's also in the engineering taskforce and part of ICANN as well. he did not have slides but actually talked a lot to an SSAC paper that has not yet been published, but it's SSAC 109 and very useful when it is published. I've actually read it.

Between them, what is clear is these two technologies—and there are other technologies that are spelled out in the SSAC paper—are two technologies that enhance privacy simply by encrypting the traffic in the lookup process. But they've raised serious issues. They prevent the network administrators from using DNS as a way to do things like enforce content access and other control policies.

Examples would be for instance if you're a parent and you are the administrator and you can control your child's access to certain

content you don't want them to see, doesn't work. But one illustration that hit me particularly—and this was in Patrik Falstrom's session with the [one world] discussion was governments think you can actually block content and that ISPs can do it. But these technologies actually mean you have to think differently.

And the advantage of both Paul and Barry's discussion and Patrick's discussion in the [one world] discussion was there may be other technologies, but we have to rethink the way in which we look at the information, its encryption—or it's now being encrypted—and what that means in terms of how we do things that we thought we could do, we can't do, and there are sort of lots of issues.

Jonathan, I'm not going to go into them because I know you've got about five minutes, but I have to say I think this is an important issue going ahead, and I think we're going to have to work with SSAC and anybody else who's interested in making sure that by achieving more privacy, we actually haven't done other things in terms of the ability to control the kinds of things like the content, like access, or other control policies that seem to be put in jeopardy by the introduction of these technologies.

So with that, I can comment the link to Paul's paper, the link to Paul's presentation, and the SSAC paper as soon as it's on the SSAC website. Any questions?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Holly. Thanks for this summary, and thanks for organizing such a terrific presentation. As with everything we worked on, there's more work ahead of us than behind us, and one of the biggest challenges that we face working inside of the ICANN community is finding time to spend on strategic issues while constantly being engaged in sort of [inaudible] response to public comments and recommendations from review teams and things like that.

So we need to find room for this and figure out what our path forward is and the role that we're going to play in helping to uncover some of these tradeoffs. So I'm counting on you to try and find a way to come up with the baby steps so that we can engage in parallel to the fires that we're constantly putting out. Thank you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks, and I'll just say there will be a way forward, but we're going to have to work with SSAC and Paul and Barry and Rod. And it's a long journey, but we'll get there. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Thank you. Next, I wanted to call on Joanna who had our most popular session and brought up some really big issues associated with fragmentation of the Internet around the world, jurisdiction and all kinds of issues, and to give us a similar little update on what took place and [what's on our path,] some takeaways and what some of the baby steps forward might be as we try to approach this form a strategic perspective as well.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thanks, Jonathan. Thank you so much. I'm glad to say the session did enjoy some popularity among the community, but let me start off with emphasizing that this was a joint effort, so the session that Holly hosted the day before it was directly linked to the conversations we've had, and it's thanks to Holly that we were able to provide a broader focus.

And the same goes for your work, Jonathan, when we are talking about DNS abuse, we had comprehensive narrative around DNS abuse, we had the background around the DOH-DOT technology or protocol that allowed us to take this conversation a step further yesterday evening or morning depending on where you're located.

So indeed, we had a conversation around this motto that stands behind everything ICANN does: one world, one Internet in the context of fragmentation. We made sure to provide a comprehensive background while staying within the picket fence that ICANN is, as per its bylaws, obliged to stay within.

We had an introduction coming from León reflecting on the board's strategic plan for the next five years. That includes a narrative on geopolitics, local, regional, national regulation that might impact the way that ICANN operates, and our policies and the way that we produce those policies. I welcome that wholeheartedly, because that would be exactly the scope of my interest when we look at GDPR or national laws in certain countries that impact the way that we do certain policies.

I was also thrilled to welcome Veni Markovski who published just a few days prior to our meeting a report on the work that's going on within the UN. That would be the open ended working group and group of governmental experts who are both parallel processes focusing on cybersecurity—more than cybercrime, that would be a different UN committee. And there is the paper you will find or the links in our agenda that focuses on those processes. I particularly like the fact that Veni emphasized what Microsoft is doing in the sense of business presence in those dialogs, and he was kind enough to indicate the way forward for ICANN to build capacity among diplomats when it comes to making sure that the Internet remains at the disposal of end users the way we know it right now. He also indicated a few small things that we as the At-Large community could do while working on the ground.

We had an interesting presentation from Milton Mueller who produced a book on fragmentation, and we welcomed a very community-oriented perspective on how to look at sovereignty and fragmentation. And we welcomed a certain consensus that Milton and Patrik Falstrom presented during that meeting indicating that this entire narrative around fragmentation might be based on false premises whereas it is not possible still, regardless of new technologies, to provide a fragmented service.

Long story short, all the presentations are available also in eBook forma, thanks to Glenn, on the agenda. I must admit that I've received rich feedback from that session. it seems that it rose some interest

across the community. In that sense, I believe At-Large is well placed to continue that dialog while staying within the picket fence.

I must admit it was Patrick Falstrom who initiated this dialog and indicated there might be need to have a coherent narrative around why it makes sense to talk to ICANN when you're introducing national regulation that deals with the internet backbone or the public core, however you wish to call it.

In that sense, I understand that the baby steps forward would be to continue this discussion. We have extended an invitation to the GAC, to individual members, the GAC leadership. Unfortunately, no GAC members were available to participate in the panel. We are hoping for that to change in the future. We would also welcome an opportunity to take this discussion outside of the ICANN community and present our coherent narrative to other for a.

I'm going to stop here, I'm taking too much time. I apologize, Jonathan. I'm happy to answer questions. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Don't apologize, Joanna. Thank you so much for your excellent work on this and for having the vision to bring this issue to the forefront. And again, congratulations to the ICANN 67 planning committee for standing our ground and not putting off these sessions for what might end up being two meetings if we end up with another virtual meeting. I think that that really played to our strengths and demonstrated that not only were we able to fight some fights on the ground but show

some vision for the future as well and be a great neutral meeting place for folks that often have a little more animosity within the ICANN community. And I think that's a really good look for us, so I congratulate all of you for being a part of that branding inside the ICANN community. I think it's great for the At-Large.

With that, Maureen, I think that's it for our policy update. I put it back to you. Oh, Sébastien, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Jonathan. First of all, I wanted to add one point about GAC non-presence in the joint workshop. It was at the same time that they were writing the communique, and you know the communique is so important that they can't do anything else. I really tried hard with French representative and I didn't succeed, so sorry for that, but I guess that next time, we will be able to have someone from the GAC for sure. I think it's important.

I wanted to make a general comment on all those efforts. A lot was done, but I would like to suggest that you organize a meeting with having, one taking care of running the meeting and one taking care of giving a point of view of At-Large. I am very happy when we gather people, but I think it could be also useful to have someone talking on behalf of us at the same level that the others are talking. It's something was missing here.

And even if it's to say that we don't know yet what is our position, because it could be one way, but it's also important to raise some

issue in some way. And from what I heard during these four or five meetings, it can't be the same person. It's too much work, and that was something that was from my point of view missing.

Once again, it's not at all a criticism of what was done, but just to suggest for enhancement in the future. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. I think that's a great suggestion and something that's easily forgotten, because the role of a moderator doesn't always lend itself to being an advocate. Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Under At-Large policy platform, I see several blocks, but one block I don't understand, which kind of policy is it, which is At-Large partners.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Tijani. We've gone through these slides a little bit in the past, and we didn't end up with a lot of time in this meeting. It's more like we are—it's part of the implementation side of the policy, I guess, that we are looking actively to find partners within the ICANN community to add strength to our voice on the other issues. So it's not a policy perspective per se as much as it is a part of our strategy for evangelizing our policy by identifying others within the ICANN community and being overt about partnering with them to present those ideas. Thanks for the question.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

That seem to be all the hands. Maureen, back to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Jonathan, and thank you very much to Holly and Joanna as well for all the really great presentations that were made on the policy issues. And it is one of the things that we actually focused a little bit more on over the last year or so, and we've greatly appreciated the work that's actually being done by the CPWG who've contributed majorly to the way in which our policy discussions have actually sort of evolved, plus the contributions that they make to the statements and advice that is distributed from At-Large. And I really do appreciate the work that's been done.

And also, just taking note too that the discussions that have taken place are very much aligned, I feel, to the core objectives of ICANN's strategic plan. I think it's important that we are always mindful of these objectives as we are carrying on with our work within At-Large.

And of course, most of our focus for 2020—I'm just using a bit of time here because I know our guests aren't due for another three minutes, but to sort of say that At-Large is very much focusing on what we're mandated to do, and policy may not have featured as much as other people would have expected, but I think that what we've shown this week and in the work, in the quality of the outputs that have come from CPWG—I should say it in full so that people understand what I'm talking about, but the Consolidated Policy Working Group has I think truly contributed to enhancing probably more of our image in the

outside of the At-Large community, and I really do appreciate the hard work that's been done within it.

Okay, I have a message to say that Maarten, León and Göran actually are here, so perhaps we can pass a little bit earlier on to Maarten and his [followers.] Maarten, would you like to start your contribution to this discussion?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Maureen. Thank you for having us. Always a pleasure to speak with you and to speak for At-Large. I still remember seeing all your faces at ATLAS in Montréal, and now I'm looking at the screen but also an interesting list of names, many good people in this room.

We're very happy with how actually ICANN67 worked out taking into account that it's first virtual public meeting and that it was very short [inaudible] the fact that we've been developing this. So also a big thanks to specifically the At-Large community for your flexibility and participation. And as Jonathan said, go and make the best of it seemed to have been a very wise choice taking into account more recent developments on COVID. Banking on that it'll be over soon is maybe a dangerous strategy at this moment.

So I understand you would like to hear a little bit of what I thought were the highlights of ICANN 67, what we achieved and how it all went. So let me expand on that. I think from the board's perspective we've seen significant policy discussions across the community. Two public forums, one special one, and the one this morning that was more in

the traditional style but then remote that really helped engage the full ICANN community, board and organization, and the constituency day session were also very vibrant and interactive.

Overall, excellent remote participation with good discussions and much more use of the Zoom chat than normally would take place, which is an interesting development. A lot of attention of course on .org, but also, as was already the case in Montreal, I think we really progressed the DNS abuse session. Jonathan referred to the session that ALAC had done that was an excellent session, and it wasn't the only one.

And I think rightly so, it's both within the SOs and ACs but also SOs and ACs together to work around what it actually means and what we can do best. It's great to see that moving and we follow it with high interest.

Of course, also interest in next rounds of TLDs. That was across the board interest as was just also said about legal impacts, geopolitical impacts on our work, which is reflected then in policy activities like EPDP, etc.

Overall, I think that I'm most happy with the demonstration of resilience of the community and the ability of ICANN Org to adapt and continue to make progress on the challenging circumstances. So I think that that is mainly on my mind.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Maarten. Any questions? Not at the moment.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: So let me then also for sure express that—be also clear that this is the first remote meeting and we don't know how the future will work out, but we will consult with the community and together with [inaudible] management team look at the situation of the coronavirus to determine what will happen with the next ICANN meeting.

I should note two days ago the World Health Organization announced that COVID-19 is now a pandemic, and I also heard yesterday about the measures relating to travel between Europe and the USA which is heavily hampered for the coming 30 days to further confine the virus. And in the Netherlands, in my hometown where I now live and work and participate from, today it was announced that meetings for more than 100 people are now cancelled.

So a lot is happening at the moment and we need to all consider that. So taking the circumstances into account, I think it was a successful meeting and I'm very curious also to find out how ALAC feels about it, how it worked for you so far.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well, we have one hand up. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Maureen. I'm sure everybody is tired of hearing my voice at this point, so I apologize, but I wanted to congratulate the board on making what at the time I'm sure was a very difficult decision to move

the meeting to a virtual format. I think a lot of people were dismissive of what this virus represented and what your motives might be. I know that the board takes a lot of abuse from the community. And some of it is justified, but that wasn't. I think you were very prescient in making that decision. I think it was very smart to make it virtual rather than moving it, which has happened in the past and would have had much different implications.

And the other thing I wanted to really make sure and commend ICANN Org on is that the At-Large, and to some extent the NCSG, really stressed the importance of adding French as another language. And I don't know what it took to do that, but you guys delivered that and I think that was really important for allowing the level of participation that took place in this meeting.

So I just wanted to pass on our thanks that you listened to us about the language issue and actually made that happen, even given the short turnaround time you had to do it. So really appreciate it, and thanks a lot for that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks for that understanding. I still remember when we took the decision, that was not that long after COVID had come up, and at that moment there were not that many organizations yet who had taken action on preventing the spread. And it was difficult but very clear to us because bringing so many people to one place for a week from so many countries, and then fly them back again, it's a potential spread

stimulus that we didn't want to do, nor did we want to put staff in that position to have to support that.

I was at that moment at domain [inaudible] which is a community event for the German community in Austria, and of course, people were very curious to find out what happened. And it was a lot of personal disappointment because people had also planned holidays, they were looking forward to see each other, catch up in the corridors, and all that has not been able to happen. But there was already at that point a broad understanding.

Unfortunately, further development of COVID has just underlined that it was the right thing to do, and it's followed by many. But appreciate your appreciation, and it's both ways. This could haven to worked without an organization that is so well prepared to go deep and act, and a community that is so willing to work with the organization to make the best of it. So appreciation both ways. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Maarten. We have Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I guess I'd like to echo the last words and say, yes the board made the right decision and it took some guts at the time. But I think it's proven it was clearly the right thing to do. But I appreciate the effort that the board put into that.

To answer your question, I think our meeting has been spectacularly successful, partly because we cut the agenda down to a number of essentially public presentations and they were all very well prepared. And perhaps due to the lack of other meetings, we had marvelous attendance. I'd like to think it was because of the subject matter however.

So from our point of view, this meeting has been really successful, largely due to the people who did the planning. And as former chair, I sat out of that completely, so I take off my hat to those who did it, and they did a marvelous job of readjusting our meeting.

That being said, I think as we go forward, assuming this may well happen again, I think we have to think about how we cover the things that we couldn't do. As I said, our meetings that we held were largely public meetings. They were not really working meetings. The working meetings we held—certainly I participated in both subsequent procedures and EPDP—were not at the same level that they would have been if they had been face-to-face. And the ALAC did not do some other administrative type things that probably should have been done.

I think we're going to have to think about how to cover those things. We can certainly make the meeting interesting remotely, but it's not the same meeting as we would have had otherwise. And I think it's going to take some real hard work to figure out how we compensate if we have to continue like this. Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think Göran and León can talk about that, will talk about that too, but basically, we do look forward to learn and to make sure we do better next time, and we do look forward to the time where we can have this face-to-face again because frankly, as such, that is our policy and we're committed to it. Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. Thank you. Yes, Sébastien.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Göran wanted to make a comment. Can we let him go? Since it might be a response.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Göran.

GÖRAN MARBY: My comments are very close to what Maarten said, but I actually want to build a little bit on what Alan said, because I agree with him. We shouldn't be blinded by the fact that we had a very successful remote meeting. I see a lot of—we have things that we can probably learn from this and bring into the sort of real meetings as well, but I don't want to jump—and I know that the board doesn't want to jump in to say that this has been so successful, now we should rearrange everything we do. Because I personally believe that to meet in the ICANN meetings is a part of our DNA and we should be very careful—

and sort of building on what Alan said, that we have to be very careful to treat this in any other way. That's what I believe in.

I've been here now for four years and despite everything else, I actually enjoy the ICANN meetings a lot and I think they are necessary for the discussions in the corridors, the engagement with people. I think it's part of the policymaking process, it's part of the knowledge building.

But we have a situation right now—and I agree, we were fairly early to make this decision, and we got a lot of support for that and the board was very engaged in this discussion, very supportive of the discussion. But we are facing some times now where there's a lot of uncertainty. Especially in these times—you can see that from a political standpoint and everybody else, everybody wants to have an answer. "What are you going to do now?"

And the answer is that we have to discuss it and we have to discuss it with you in the community how to handle this situation. I would like to postpone all discussions about changing of the underlying meeting formats, which actually belongs to you in the community, until we're through this process.

I agree with Alan on the fact that we have to think about some of the other meetings and the work that has to be done by the community while we have to do it remotely. But I don't want to see the success of this meeting leading us automatically into discussion we're going to change how we do meetings. the physical meetings of ICANN people is

too important for me. I'm probably speaking more than I should now about this, but this is what I believe in.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for that, Göran, and I think that going by the chat, everyone's agreeing with you. Let's have Sébastien, and then I'd like to come back to you, Göran, to get your views on what your takeaway is from your virtual—apart from what you've already mentioned. Sébastien, briefly, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Maureen. One other from the old guard taking the floor. I will not repeat what Jonathan and Alan have said. I agree with them. But I want to take my old hat as a chair of the new strategy meeting working group, and I want to say that what At-Large have done in the session was my dream to have this type of session before a meeting to allow the people to discuss the topic and not to spend time together to have a lecture.

Therefore, I think it's a very good preparation of the next face-to-face meeting we have done here. It's not a joke. I think we need to take into account what's happened, and as you say, Göran, to try to take the good part and see how we can embed all that. But yes, we need to also find a way, if we are going to not have face-to-face meeting—and it will be the case for some very important work to be done, ATRT3 is one but there are other topics like that—how we can really work on virtual

meeting to deliver some hard work who for the moment are only possible when we are face-to-face.

That means that maybe we need to find tools, we need to find way of doing it, but the answer can't be," Oh, just spend five times three hours each week to finalize your document." It must be something else. I have no answer for that, but I think it could be a good way to discuss what we can do, and it's urgent. It's not just about Kuala Lumpur meeting or Paris meeting for GDD, it's also for, is it the 5th of April that ATRT3 need to deliver the final report? That's a very big question mark for me. Thank you very much.

GÖRAN MARBY: Can I give a comment to Sébastien? And then you asked of my other observations. Sébastien, we have started, the week before an ICANN meeting, nowadays we do the webinars which build on the same sort of idea, to be able to share information and have some discussion and to build knowledge going into the ICANN meeting. And we've been doing that for a year now, I think, and the participation there has been very high. And we actually used a part of that experience thinking about how to do the actual ICANN remote meeting as well.

But one thing I really liked with this meeting was that—and I think it's not only the remote meeting setup, it's that always when you go into ICANN meetings, I learned to expect that a couple of issues sort of surface. It seems like there's always a trend of the meeting. From the board and my perspective, we realize that because we get the same

questions from all the constituencies all the time. We can repeatedly answer the same question in 20 different meetings.

Here, it was fewer of them, actually, and more focused. You brought a lot about [inaudible] discussion. We had .org on the agenda as well. but it's been fewer things, and that I don't think has to do only with the actual remote meeting part, it's actually that the community is coming around certain issues and think now this has got to be important.

But there is one thing that I've seen that I think—how many people are on this call right now? It's 151 people. One of the reasons, I think, that it's been progressing so well is because people have now had the time of going into other sessions, and I think that's been—that has helped and engaged the discussions.

So you took it down from 320 sessions to about 75, 80, which is probably a too skeletal one, but it gave people the opportunity to participate with our discussions, which I think has been very good for helping people to understand, taking up things, and it's helped me— and I think I speak for the board as well—we have been able to answer questions once or twice instead of 20.

The last observation—it's fairly technical, and we talked about it after the open session this morning and asked after we did the .org session, is that by having one chat that everybody goes onto, that actually creates a very interesting dynamic.

What usually happens—we've been sitting in front of the open sessions—is that someone comes up to the mic and someone talks in that mic, and the board has to answer. And the community sits in their own chats, and they're all commenting on that.

But having one chat that a lot of people commented on, what suddenly happened is that there was a discussion. People said, "Oh, I agree with that," "I didn't agree with that." And that I thought was very helpful for the whole sort of discussion during the open sessions.

So one of the takeaways when we go live again, how we go to have joint chat rooms when we go into sessions where people share in a more collaborative way, because I could see someone started saying A in one corner, and then someone said A plus one, no, it's B. And you can actually see the involvement of the discussion in the chat. And then there came new questions to the board and the board sort of became—so we answered something and then reacted on that.

And that was something that—this is probably one of the best things I've seen with this meeting. So I'm really negative to have remote meetings in general. This was not our intention, and I can tell you that when the board made this decision, we didn't really want to take this decision to go remotely. We did it because we didn't have any other choice.

But as I said before, we should hold any discussions about ICANN being remotely after we pass through this phase of this virus, and then to engage with the board about lessons learned from the whole

experience, because I don't want just to jump on another ship because we have now something that worked this time.

It will take a couple of months before we see the things we missed. But also, we now need to engage with the community, how do we do it the best way now until we can have a physical meeting again? Because as several of you have said, there are things that we have to address in timing, in things—[written bylaws] that we have to be able to figure them out.

But we will, because we're ICANN and we do these things together. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much for that, Göran. I have to agree about the value of the chat, and I like your idea of when you have forums, to actually have a single chat room. But somebody did mention that some of the most interesting discussions have actually sort of happened within the chat participants, and it's been valuable for saving and looking back on to get a little bit more understanding about what the community is actually feeling about a particular topic.

And I think too, in relation to something that Sébastien said earlier, about getting the view of At-Large in a lot of our sessions, At-Large has actually contributed some great discussion in the chat that gives their view of what is actually happening in the presentation.

So the remote situation has given us a lot of different ways in which we can look at the meetings, and so that we're probably going to have

to set up another meeting working group or whatever Sébastien was involved in before.

And I'm just wondering whether Sébastien's hand is up because he has another question or whether that's an old hand.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, it was just to say two short things. Yes, Göran, it's good to have the prep webinar, but the difference between that and what At-Large have done is that we as the community organized something. We need to mix the two, I guess.

And the second point, be careful. Yes, the chat is great, but it's just for anglophone people, and the ones listening in French or Spanish were not participating there. It's not to say that it was bad, but we need to find a way to incorporate them too. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thanks for that. We have just a few minutes left, and we do have one other person, a very important person for At-Large, and I'm just wondering if León would like to give us what his takeaways from this week have been. León.

LEÓN SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Maureen. I will make it short to not delay your agenda. I just want to thank you first for organizing so many [inaudible] sessions. I believe that they were very well organized and very well attended. The topics that were touched upon those sessions

were compelling, were provocative, and were very well led by those chairing the session. so I would like to commend the ALAC and everyone involved in organizing the sessions, because [inaudible] did it really well.

Another topic that I would like to highlight here is that, yes, language is important. Me not being a native English speaker, of course, I appreciate the benefits of having translation and interpretation services, and I would like to of course try to let us think about the situation that led us into where we are now for a bit.

This was an emergency. No one expected that this would happen, and of course, I think that Org and the tech team did impressively well in managing our completely virtual and remote meetings. So I would like to give them a little bit [inaudible] on this and of course also congratulate them on the very successful effort that they undertook in holding this virtual meeting.

I'd like to maybe give you a heads up. We had a session in the Latin America And Caribbean space, and in that session, we piloted a feature from Zoom room in which we were able to actually hold the session with interpretation in French and Spanish.

Of course, that was only a test, that was only being piloted. I'm not saying that this will become widespread to the rest of the virtual meetings that we could hold in the future, but it is definitely a feature that is being explored, that is being tested, and if it is successfully of course tested, then I would expect it to be included in other virtual sessions. So that is to ease a little bit of the anxiety and the pain that

we feel for not having the benefit of simultaneous interpretation, and this is something that Org is looking into and that, as you are aware, there are many technical limitations into the technology that we're using as with any other technology, but this is something that is on top of the tech team and of course the [administration] and the board.

And finally, I would like to encourage us all to contribute to providing feedback on our experience in this virtual meeting. I have been following the chats of course. I am aware that many of us want to provide as much input and feedback on how we thought this virtual meeting went, and I think it is really important that we get your views and feedback on this.

There is an e-mail that has been posted to the At-Large Skype chat several times on how to provide feedback, but I would also encourage you, if you have the time and energy of course, to maybe build a document coming on from the At-Large community as to how everything went, how we could improve this experience. Of course, being mindful that this is the very first time that we hold a fully virtual meeting as we did, and keeping in mind that this of course cannot substitute in any way face-to-face meetings, and that is absolutely not the intention going forward. But yes, providing these areas of opportunity in which we could improve the way we held this virtual meeting.

So with that, Maureen, I think we are on a schedule and I would like to thank you again for having me, and of course, I remain open for any comments or questions that you may have, and of course, as usual, I

am a click away if you need to talk to me or to make any comments or have any doubts. Thank you very much, Maureen. Back to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, León. We have one hand up, and I'm hoping that Abdulkarim will be very quick. Yes, please, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much, Maureen. I'll be very quick. My question is actually directed to León because I'd wanted to ask this question or to make this comment. I think [inaudible] talked about the success of this meeting, but I think we need to also think in the direction of making a quick decision regarding the next ICANN meeting. Either it's going to be postponed or it's going to be virtual meeting. It's better to have a decision in time rather than wait until probably a later date. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Abdulkarim. And yes, it is something that we hope we will get a little bit more warning next time if it is going to go down this track, and we've just been sort of talking about that. So thank you very much, Maarten, Göran and León for coming along and sharing with us, and we have really appreciated that and we know how busy you are. So we really appreciate you being with us. Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. Thank you for inviting me.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Göran. Okay, we're going to now move on to a report that has been provided by Alan Greenberg and his ALS mobilization team. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Before I start, I'll make a comment that no one else has commented on. We seem to be able on these meetings to have kept on time spectacularly, far better than we ever do on regular remote meetings or in face-to-face meetings. I think we need to figure out what it is we've done and replicate it, because I can't remember any meetings that have ever gone on time as well as these have, with people showing up at the beginning and staying on time as we proceed. So however we've done it, we should try to do it again.

I'm a little embarrassed that this is perhaps the only At-Large meeting that is not really related to policy and ongoing work, but it was scheduled and we will go on with it. This is a report—and I do note it's the chair's report. Although this report is almost exact copy with appropriate wording changes from the approved documents that the group has done over the last couple of months, it's not a report of the group. They've seen it just as of yesterday, but it is my report so I take full responsibility for any mistakes or errors that might be in it. Next slide, please.

All right, the At-Large review independent examiner basically recommended that we abolish ALSes. That wasn't quite the wording

they used, but that was the net effect. At-Large disagreed strongly, and we went back to the rationale for why we have ALSes. The large part of the rationale was that ALSes give us access to a large number of people on the ground in various countries and different localities, and it's those people that we're trying to mobilize.

And that was the reason why we had ALSes to begin with. And what we've done is decided to basically go back to our roots and make sure that we are using ALSes to achieve their original function, that is allow us to communicate with real users, real people distributed around the world.

Now, I'll note that the ALS mobilization project is not the only thing we need to do. One of our aims is to find individual people who want to work on ICANN policy. They may be parts of ALSes, they may be unaffiliated members. We have a lot of work to do to make sure that when they self-identify, we welcome them and make sure that they can be integrated into our work. That's not the focus of this group, but it's a very important thing that we need to do, and it relates both to being able to have the work that we're doing be useful and deal with the unaffiliated members who we also have in all RALOs now.

So we basically said we're going to go back and make sure we're using ALSes effectively, we proposed that to the board, and in a rather unusual set of circumstances, the board essentially rejected the external examiner's report and took our recommendation in its place. And now we have to deliver. Next slide, please.

I'm just echoing here the bylaws and the existing words in our rules of procedure that justify what we're doing. In both cases, they say we're here to get access to individuals so that they can participate in ICANN processes. The bylaws go back to 2001, our rules of procedure go back to 2007, so this is nothing new. We're just talking about actually making these live documents instead of just having them words. Next slide, please.

What we started with is the ALAC chartered a taskforce about four years ago that was starting to look at these same things. We got a little bit sidetracked with the IANA transition and accountability, and then the At-Large review itself, and never quite went back to it, but a lot of the work that we're doing right now is the finalization of ideas that came out of that group. Next slide, please.

Okay, the work party is made up of 21 members from the five RALOs. We did open calls for anyone who was interested. These are the people who volunteered. We didn't reject anyone, we didn't pick the ones we wanted. These were the people who put their hand up. And I was appointed chair, and Maureen and Cheryl are there ex officio as chair of the ALAC and the At-Large review, and Cheryl is the other leader in the At-Large review. Next slide, please.

What I'd like to do is go through these all and then take questions at the end just to make sure that we don't run out of time. All right, so the first thing we have is a set of expectations. Now, each of these has been—what I'm presenting here is what has been approved by the work party. That doesn't mean it won't change, things may be

reopened as we go ahead, and certainly feedback from this group may impact us. But at this point, these are the things that have been approved, and we have a set of expectations and then a set of criteria of how do we recognize an ALS.

So these are the things we expect of an ALS once they're approved. And by the way, since everything we're doing is based on the original bylaws and the original ALAC procedures, this applies not only to new ALSes but to the existing ones, although there will be transition period.

So we will request every two years—and this will cycle so the staff don't have to do them all at the same time— a report from each ALS that will outline such things as who the leadership of the group is, who their representatives are, some measure of their membership in terms of size—maybe demographics too, we need to discuss that—what their linkage is to ICANN, why are they an ALS, why do they care about the things that are in ICANN's remit, what activities they have done recently in relation to ICANN, details of how expectation two will be addressed—and we'll talk about that one in a minute—and whether they are an organizational member of some other pat of ICANN.

We know that there are ALSes that have been parts of NCSG, and we're not talking about the people, we're talking about the organization. And there have also been examples of members of the Intellectual Property Constituency and various other groups in ICANN.

Lastly, the status of ICANN—those last two bullets are a repeat of each other, so that's an error. Next slide.

Expectation number two, an ALS must either distribute information that we send or give us an e-mail address that we can send it out, and this is expected to go to all of their members. So this is the key point, that we want to be able to reach out to their members, not just to the representatives but to their actual members.

The distributions are not our normal mailing list entries which many people consider spam. They have to be aimed at people who have little or no knowledge of ICANN, its terminology and its buzzwords. They'll be delivered in ICANN's official languages—the ALS can select which one they want—and they'll be relatively infrequent.

We talked about perhaps once a month. There may be occasions where they're more often or less often. But we don't want them so often that they're considered spam and people just delete them.

There will be exceptions. There are ALSes that have a very focused issue that they look at. It could be phishing, and their members have no interest in anything but phishing, and the tradeoff is that if they're an ALS like that, then they have to commit to talking to us and working with us when and if we're working in their areas. Right now, we're looking at DNS abuse. If we have an ALS like that, they would commit to working with us. So again, we're looking for something in return for being an ALS. Next slide, please.

The ALS must reference ICANN and At-Large in its website. We're relatively vague: we say in the home page or a secondary page, or somewhere. The intent is that anyone looking at their website or trying to find it sees an acknowledgement that they're working with

ICANN. We do have ALSes right now and we have examples of ALSes where essentially, although one or two people applied to be an ALS, the rest of the organization has no knowledge of it. That's what we're trying to fight here.

If an ALS doesn't have a functioning website or Facebook presence or something, we will create a Wiki space for them that will be populated based on things [inaudible] application. They will have an opportunity to update it should they choose. Next slide, please.

When specific issues are brought—this is the counterpart to the "We will send out interesting stuff to you periodically." If we have an issue that we want to be more proactive and say, "What do you think about this" or "What can you contribute to this" or "Are you interested in working on this," they need to respond. We need to be careful not to flood ALSes with things, because again, anything that comes out too often is going to be spam and will not be looked at.

They need to provide an e-mail address or a weblink so that a prospective ALS member can contact them. Right now, if you look at our website, we say "Here are ALSes. Consider joining one of them if they're in your town or country," yet we give them absolutely no information about how to do that and we're simply saying that an ALS must provide a contact point.

An ALS must designate between two and four representatives. Right now, they must designate at least one, many do two, some do more, and we're simply saying that they must give us between two and four. One will be designated as the prime and it's just to make sure that we

have someone to contact, should the first person disappear. However, an ALS may choose more if they wanted to [inaudible]. Next slide, please.

That's the full set of expectations. There'll be some other ideas that we talked about as possible expectations and rejected them. I'll talk about them in a few minutes. but essentially, if an ALS fulfills those nine expectations, then we consider them an ALS in good standing.

Accreditation. The first accreditation rules are basically our current ones. They may be reworded or some of them definitely will be reworded based on other things that we're adding into the expectations. But the first several of them are essentially our current ones. The first one is they commit to supporting individual users and participate with us. In the expectations, we've now gone into more detail, and that'll be reflected in a rewording but essentially we're saying the intent of this one stays the same. Next slide, please.

This one says it must be organized so that participation by individual users who are citizens or residents of countries within geographic regions will predominate in the ALS operation. We're not expecting any change in this, with one condition. We are looking at ALSes that might span regions. In the past, we've had several ALS applications and several accepted where there isn't really a home region.

We've finessed it so that they've become ALSes, but this is an attempt to essentially accommodate them so that we don't reject a really good ALS just because they happen to have a real presence in multiple regions. This one may require a bylaw change, and we'll be looking at

that to see if it does require a change. It'll certainly require board approval, because it does not follow the exact words of the current bylaws. Next slide, please.

Don't rely on ICANN funding. We've reworded this one because we said you must be funded internally, and in fact, some ALSes are partially funded by other groups such as ISOC. So we've reworded it to say exactly what we mean: don't expect any money from us, and that one hasn't changed.

Number four is essentially an echoing of the "Have an Internet presence." And again, we'll be rewording that one or integrating it into the expectations. Next slide, please.

Current rule, assist the RALO in performing its function. That was a rather general statement, and we haven't discussed this in the work party, but I suspect that we will find that once we word the other expectations, we'll find this one is not really necessary anymore because we will have been more specific. But that's just my guess and I learned not to put any large bets on what the group will decide, because it doesn't always agree with me. Next slide, please.

New criteria: ALS application submitters and future representatives do not need to be organization leaders but an ALS application must have leadership support and knowledge. That is in recognition of what I referred to before, of we had groups join as an ALS without their leadership really knowing about it. That's something that we don't feel is appropriate. If the ALS joins, it has to be done as a formal action. Next slide, please.

No minimum number of members for an ALS but it must be more than the representatives and the ALS leadership. Not assigning a number implies we're going to have to use judgment calls, and that will involve staff, RALO, possibly the ALAC, in deciding whether a given ALS is large enough. The rationale is simple: if there are no additional members other than a handful of people who are leading the group, then they can't fulfill the prime role of giving us a pool of people we can talk to, and we have to look at whether that is in fact a valid ALS or something that may have just been formed so it has voting rights.

You'll recall in the past being an ALS also gave you travel privileges to our general assemblies and ATLAS meetings. So we know that there are cases in the past where a group became an ALS just for travel purposes. But that's not longer a rationale so we don't really have to worry about that one anymore. But nevertheless.

There was some discussion on whether we should have a fixed number. Someone I think mentioned that ISOC says there must be 25. And we decided that setting any specific number is not likely to be satisfactory. We're dealing with small countries and territories which have very low populations, some that have very large, and setting absolute numbers inevitably, if we set the number at 13, someone's going to come to us and say we have 12 but we're really active. And this avoids the question. It does mean a judgment call will have to be needed however. Next slide, please.

Again, a clear statement that why they want to be part of ICANN. If you go back to how ALSes were recruited going way back, they were

recruited because they had some interest in technology, in computers, and it was just assumed that if they're interested in computers and technology and the Internet, they're interested in ICANN. That's clearly not always the case, and we simply want to go back and make sure that it makes sense that this organization is an ALS. And this'll not necessarily be a hard one to pass, but we do want people to think about it.

And lastly and most important, they have to certify that they'll indeed meet all the criteria that we're specifying and they intend to satisfy our expectations. And I see that there's an active chat going on. I'm not looking at it, so once we open the floor, if anyone has any questions, then we'll address it. I see we have some hands up. The presentation is almost over so we're just continuing right now.

We had two items that were talked about as expectations and rejected as expectations, but they had merit, and we decided to preserve them and make sure that we offer them to ALSes as possible things they can do. One is that we should do a survey, that ALSes should be asked to consider doing a survey of their members—not just representatives—as to what their skills are so we can call upon them. This is something that EURALO has done very successfully and it has felt a worthwhile thing to do to replicate in all regions. There should be some uniformity so that we can collate them all and use them effectively, not just restricted to a single region. And there was a strong belief that we can't demand that they do this. Some ALSes for various reasons may feel they don't want to or can't, but it should be something they should consider.

And lastly, we spent a lot of time on the wording of this one, so I'm going to read it out verbatim. It's participation in Internet governance, multi-stakeholder activities is often complementary with involvement with ICANN and At-Large. ALSes may wish to consider whether such involvement makes sense for them.

We were very careful to not recommend that they get involved, because an ALS that for instance is actively involved in open source or in teaching people how to use computers in their area many to have any interest in our larger governance issues, but they might. So as said, we spent a lot of time on the wording, but I think we had a formal agreement on everything. Next slide, please.

We had talked about some things as possible expectations that we decided explicitly they were not expectations. The first is ALSes must vote. In other words, if there are votes within a region—and some regions don't have many votes—that the ALSes must vote.

We decided that at the ALAC level, this is not a criteria. We understand that some RALOs may choose to include it, and for instance some RALOs say if you don't vote, then you go out of active status. You're still a valid ALS, you can still participate, but you cannot vote or you cannot do some other things. And that's within their rights, but it's not a formal ALAC requirement.

We will not track ALS—and I'll say carefully—ALS participation in our various activities. We will track individual participation, and since in many cases we know what ALS people belong to, that will imply we have some participation. But the lack of participating in our meetings,

if you are still doing the other things in our expectations, and specifically doing the biannual survey and sending things out to your members, you're still considered a valid ALS.

And we will not expect ALSes to produce active participants. Although the reason for having ALSes is to find them, we understand that some ALSes may not have a new person every six months or a year, and in fact, if each of our ALSes produced one person a year, that would be 250 people that we have to integrate into our work, and I'm not sure we can handle that kind of load. So although the target is finding new people, it's not a metric. Next slide, please.

A couple of notes. We're not looking for 100% certainty. One of the questions that was asked a number of times is how can we be absolutely sure the ALS is distributing our information or how can we be absolutely sure they're not lying about something.

Well, there's a chance, but we're not going to worry at that level. If there are things reported, we will investigate them, but we're not worried. If people certify things, in general that would be good enough unless we have reason to doubt them explicitly.

Although working group members felt that RALOs should not make rules related to ALS participation. The group decided we'll be silent on this. We felt it's important enough that we need to get these new rules approved and done quickly and put into place, that we don't want to start that civil war with some RALOs that may feel strongly that they want to do this.

ICANN 67
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM
7–12 March 2020

And lastly, on the ground activities, an argument that we've heard regularly is this ALS is doing marvelous things, but the marvelous things are completely unrelated to ICANN's remit.

The discussion we had was an interesting one, and an issue came up that really had never been mentioned before, and that is on the ground activity gives an organization credibility, and it specifically gives the organization credibility in their own region and area. And if they choose to get involved as an ALS in ICANN activities, that credibility has great value.

So if they're involved in Internet governance issues locally, the credibility they get from on the ground work is a great bonus. It doesn't help ICANN's work as such, but it's something that is important. Next slide, please.

And timing, we're looking at—as soon as we can get this approved—and that's going to take some time, worded and approved, and we're looking at about six to 12 months to put it in place. I suspect we're going to find that the expectations that we are asking an ALS to put in place will not be that onerous, and I'm hoping we can cut this down to six months. Currently, we're talking about 12. But after that cutover period, we will presume an ALS is doing what they're supposed to, we'll start the cycle of biannual reports and proceed from there.

And that's the full set of the report. I've taken a little more time than I'd planned, but we still have a good 20 minutes or so for questions. And I see we already have two hands. Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan, and thanks for your work on this. I think this has been a really important topic, especially as we are trying to at least do some experiments in sort of bottom-up issue identification and prioritization and things like that, whether it's surveys or something else. I think creating good bidirectional working relationships with these ALSes is really important. And I guess I don't know whether or not I see in those requirements the idea of feedback or something like that, to create kind of a feedback loop as opposed to just a conduit to potential participants.

And I may have dismissed it, but is there some way to determine which of them are interested in not necessarily hardcore participation but a webinar to understand regional interests or something like that to get some more on the ground intel about some of the representations we're making on behalf of end users in the ICANN context?

ALAN GREENBERG: There are a couple of things. First is, yes, the target is to get people who will put their hand up and say, "I'm interested," and the challenge will be to send things out that they can understand and that attract them. We're essentially trying to lure them in. We're hoping to get some number of people who might not even have known enough about ICANN to know they're interested before, and that's part of the challenge.

One of the expectations is, should we ask specific questions that the ALS has an obligation to try to come up with an answer? And in some cases, that will probably mean surveying their own members or getting feedback from the ALS. Moreover, all of this is what we're talking about at the ALAC level. we still have the RALO level that can also have involvement and interaction with their ALSes.

So we're looking at a number of different opportunities, and we're talking about what to start with. Once we get the communication channels open, we may decide that we're going to use them in ways that we're not talking about right now.

As an example, you're talking about DNS abuse and you said earlier in this meeting that part of the rationale for why we're pushing it is we got information from the ALSes that this is of interest to them and this is important.

But we didn't necessarily go back to the ALSes to do the detailed work, because we're getting our marching orders and now we put together groups of people who look at the detailed work and try to—whether it's put out the video that you did or do other work going forward.

So it's going to be a combination of all of these things, and once we have the communication channels, we can look at different ways of using them, but this should be opening the channels and putting an obligation on the ALSes to make sure that they respond, and hopefully we will not inundate them so much that they consider us spamming them. I hope that answers the question. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: While it is about the possibilities to have people from other countries to ours, but now looking back, I have done this for many years in this region to accommodate new members for small countries that had no ALS and were eager to participate.

So we had very good examples of people that join initially with my ALS but live in another country. At that time, I believe it could be some people from all the regions, but think about it now, I believe that only for the same region, but we should do that to allow them to participate at least in our region until the time we have possibility to really receive independent persons, individuals, not ALS.

But we here still believe in that ALS and it's important to reach out persons out of the one person that [inaudible] just participate in ICANN. So I do believe that we should give the opportunity for some regions to really accept other people from small countries and those that are eager to get together with others and participate as member of something already organized as [a node] ALS.

For instance, that was what happened in my region. Even when you have the possibility to have individuals, many people prefer to be part of something more organized to expand their activity in their own country. Not by himself, not by the people itself that sometimes cannot be accepted as representative of some RALO or something, but being a representative of one well established ALS can help them in other countries to refer to that ALS and be accepted as active member of our [inaudible] and do something with that respect.

So [just a] statement to think about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Vanda. Our rules currently allow—there are no rules about participation from people from different countries in a region. So from an At-Large perspective and an At-Large perspective, we are talking only about regions. Any rules about countries are internal to a RALO. So that's not an issue. If someone from Peru wants to join a Brazilian ALS, there is no such prohibition anywhere in the ALAC, At-Large rules.

In terms of regions, there are also no rules, and the bylaws explicitly do say that I as a North American can join a European RALO and vice versa. There are no rules against it. The only rules right now are that people from a particular region must predominate and control the ALS, and that is what we are saying there might be an exception to. The other rules, there are no rules that prohibit participation in an ALS, should someone choose. And of course, all regions now to some level have individual members, but that's a personal choice.

Tijani, please go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I appreciate the work done, and I know that you worked before on it and you are continuing, so thank you very much, you and the whole team. Several things. First of all, I understood from what you said that if an ALS doesn't attend the RALO monthly meeting, doesn't attend the ALAC meetings but just has a

single interest in for example universal acceptance, and contribute a little bit in this area, they're considered as active.

Also, you said that vote is not an issue. In this case—and it happened to us—we may have the nonvoting ALSes blocking the voting process because we don't have quorum because they don't care. It is not important for them, and with what you said, it will not be important for anyone. So it might be a problem for the quorum also.

There is another issue, very important in my point of view. So far, we don't have any rules or any mechanism from the ALAC to the ALSes to evaluation or to manage the ALSes. It is true that the ALAC is accrediting and decertifying the ALSes, so the criteria of accreditation is well defined. So this is something, and the new report, there is also things about the accreditation criteria. I think that that must be also decertification criteria so it will not depend on the RALO or on the comprehension of people, etc. It must be, in my point of view, criteria [inaudible].

But I don't think that it is in the remit of ALAC to control the ALSes. The ALSes are more linked to their RALO, and they think that the work you are doing—and thank you very much for doing it—you are doing it with the RALO people, and I think it should be implemented at the RALO level. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll try to answer very briefly. We only have six minutes left and we have four speakers, so I ask any future speakers to be as brief

as I'll try to be here. In terms of monthly meetings—and if you have a group that focuses only on universal acceptance, yes, you have that correct. That'll be sufficient assuming they actually participate.

In terms of quorum, if they're not voting, you have the ability within the RALO to say if a RALO doesn't vote regularly, then they're excluded from the quorum. That's fine. That's not of concern.

And in terms of overall participation, we will have rules and the criteria are the rules that will be used for both certification and decertification. It works in both directions. Yrjö, please. In the queue we have Yrjö, Seun and Greg, and Abdulkarim, and I'm closing the queue. But I'm not sure we'll have time for all of these people. It'll be up to Maureen. Yjrö, please.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. At this virtual meeting, there came up a couple of issues that are relevant for the ALSes potentially. One is DNS abuse. I think that it was mentioned somewhere that on an ALS level, there could be a role for educating end users on issues relating to DNS abuse.

The other issue relates to the geopolitical discussion. I'm very happy and thankful that Joanna managed to get that put on the table in that [inaudible] session where GAC however was not participating, and I can understand why, because as somebody said, I think [Veni] said that the GAC people are actually not related—they're [not] from ministries of foreign affairs.

If we want to reach the cyber ambassadors whom many ministries of foreign ministries have these days, we have to find them in the capitals. And there is an opportunity, again, if ALSes get involved in the local Internet governance discussions and Internet governance multi-stakeholder structures to actually reach out to that part of the government that is more concerned with the Internet in the political sense. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Yrjö. I'm told that Maureen closed the queue after Greg. And Maureen, if you want to step in and say our time is up, please just speak up. The overall meeting is yours. Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I'm going to be brief as well. Just two things because others have been mentioned. The first one is I think in one of the slides [inaudible] saying that there was actually a concentration for RALOs not to [inaudible]. I think that's strange that the group was actually considering that in the first place, because —

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, you're fading out. Can you try to speak closer to the phone, perhaps?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. I just wanted to make the point first that I don't think [inaudible] consideration of whether the group is silent on RALOs making rules.

RALOs, we always make rules. The most important is that it's within the scope of At-Large itself set by ALAC. So we have operating principles, so the rules will always be obeyed by RALOs. I really think that should be a point of discussion.

The second point is I want to confirm, has there been consideration of the administrative implications to this? There's something that we normally do within [RIR policies,] which is called staff assessment. Just for this particular [inaudible] I feel that there would be some administrative overhead from the staff side. Have you considered how this impacts the staff budget, maybe there'll be need for more staff? Has that analysis been checked? because I think that is important as well. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not sure I understood the second question. You were fading. In terms of the first one, the group at this point is saying they do not believe the RALO should set rules regarding criteria for being a valid ALS or for filling its expectations, but we have chosen to be silent on it, so nothing is changing at that point, although I am noting that the group almost uniformly—I think 100%—felt that the RALOs should not be setting rules but we're not going to take that one up at this time.

The second one, I didn't quite get the understanding, but the process that we'll go through—which may address the question—is whatever we recommend is recommended to the ALAC. The ALAC has to approve it, and since we're talking about ALS criteria and certification,

the board has to approve it. So that's the process we have to go through going forward.

Obviously, we have ALAC members who are from the RALOs, and the RALOs will clearly need to be involved, and that'll be done through their ALAC members. Greg, please, last question.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. It's very good to hear about these criteria for ALSes, both in terms of bringing them into the fold and having them meet certain minimum standards. My concern is with the individual members. It seems to me that it's far too lax. It seems like there's almost no standards, and indeed, some of our individual members use the fact that there's no particular criteria or standard for our individual members to attack the credibility of At-Large. And that's distressing.

I think that needs to be its own task, is for at least members to have a sense of what the mission and format is. Whatever the specifics are, we can go into that another time. There's zero time left. But it's really important that our individual members also have the same sense of mission and purpose and meet standards that go there .Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Greg. This group is looking at ALS mobilization, period. Your point is well taken, and the ALAC needs to do work on individual members. The ALAC needs to decide with its RALOs whether there are ALAC- and At-Large-wide rules on individual members or they are

purely set by the RALOs and can be set as lax or as tight as the RALOs want, which is the current case.

It also will involve memorandums of understanding with the RALOs. There's still a lot of work to be done that relates to this, but that's not this group's job. But that's not to say it's not an important thing that we must do. Maureen, I turn it back to you and I apologize I'm a minute and a half late.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's quite all right. Thank you, and I note Abdulkarim put his hand down. Thank you. we've just got a few more minutes left, and just a few more items to go. The next one is really just a reminder. I guess it's a little bit of a next step, but things that we really do need to sort of work on between now and the next meeting in June, wherever or whatever it is.

The first thing, of course, is the At-Large review implementation activities. I think when the report was written, we had one activity that was 100% done, and I note that Cheryl has her hand up and she's the boss so we really need to get her say on this one. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Maureen, there's no way on earth I'm the boss. I was simply going to [inaudible]. There was more than one that was 100% done, by the way, but that's all right because everyone will agree [inaudible] and everyone will have memorized the beautiful graph we produced. But back to you, Maureen, and I'll just follow on.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Thank you for that, Cheryl, and I would like the leads for each of those items to have a look again, see what needs to be done—I know myself, I'm not one of the 100% ones finished, and there's some things that I know that I've got to get done over the next couple of months.

If you need any help, let us know, and if there is anything we'd like to have done by end of May because the report's got to be finalized and sent to the board by—as we had promised—June 30. So if we can get that done, that'll be great.

Joanna, do you have anything to add about capacity building and what you'd like your team to be doing over the next few months?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Maureen. I won't take up too much time since we're almost at the top of the hour. I reported briefly on the work Alfredo and myself have been doing in the capacity building working group. Here on the agenda, we have the ICANN Learn course that is indeed in the works. We are in touch with Betsy. Thanks to Jonathan and the Consolidated Policy Working Group, the processes have been amended. We have provided a curriculum to Betsy and we are on the verge of filming, so to speak, so the next step will be to have our presenters from Kobe actually providing a short presentation, a video recording. We're just deciding on the very pragmatic details. I see Alfredo in the room. If there's anything I'm missing, I encourage him to step in.

So that would be the item that we have here on the agenda in terms of the ICANN Learn course. I'm hoping for that to happen as soon as possible. It's just the technicalities, we've managed to provide a methodology that Betsy found sufficient, and Alfredo is wonderful with all of the technical support we might be needing. So we might just need to decide how to do it.

There are a few other capacity building efforts going on. that would be the webinars that Hadia has been wonderfully leading. There's a small working group that's focusing on providing regular webinars on themes of interest. The other small team is working on the onboarding that will likely feed into the policy platform, but that is a different discussion that I believe we do not have time for right now.

So there are specific teams we are pursuing within the capacity building working group. I'm happy to answer questions but I'm just going to stop here. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Joanna. My fault, I didn't actually mean to just put down the ICANN Learn course, but it was just a bit of a rushed agenda presentation here. But yes, do take note of the other things that are actually happening, and I know that Hadia is doing a great job gathering people [inaudible] for the webinars. A brilliant idea.

I think that one of the things I have to mention too is that we have some action items from this week which we will probably send out to everybody and get some feedback on, and the final thing that I want

to raise of course is something that Evin may be able to introduce first off.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Sure. Thanks, Maureen. As most of you know—I think everyone knows—there was a social media Twitter competition during this virtual ICANN67 meeting, and it was modeled after the general ICANN social media Twitter competition which requested people to use #icann67, but for our At-Large group, we used #alac67 and requested our community members share a photo of themselves attending the meeting from where they were all around the world.

We had a lot of really great engagements, so it was really fund to see. These photos will be posted both on At-Large social media and Flicker album as well as the general ICANN Flickr album. We had photos from all around the world. North America, Africa, even Afghanistan.

That said, the criteria was the most retweeted tweet, and we had a tie for the top three in terms of numbers of retweets, so we then determined based on the number of likes and hearts how to rank those three.

So the number one winner of the Twitter competition is Sarah Kiden. I'd like to [inaudible]. Yeah, Congrats, Sarah. This is the winning tweet from the river Tay. The second winner of the competition was Satish Babu. Congrats, Satish. And the third winner was Shreedeep Rayamajhi.

The winners will have their picture with the tweet and the screenshot on the Social Media Working Group workspace and will also be announcing this in their regional newsletter. So congrats to all and thanks so much again. This was a really successful competition. Back over to you, Maureen. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Evin. And I think that that just really added a lot to really helping to promote us. I just have to say I was really heartened by the many At-Large participants who were engaged on Twitter and Facebook as well as keeping discussions going in the Skype chats. I so enjoyed that, especially for example this morning, I must say the forum—but while I was actually doing my own work, which was not ICANN stuff, I was getting these popups with every single conversation that was added, and it really did give me an idea of what was going on and how it was impacting on At-Large.

But I really think that the messages that we were getting—and this is what's been so important about our At-Large communication strategy, is that we want to get messages out about what we're doing in At-Large and how we're contributing to the work of ICANN.

And I really think that this messaging, through the work that's being done with the Social Media Working Group and through other activities that are going on, it's really helping to build our community and it's sending out messages that are promoting and supporting the sessions that we're involved in this week, plus what we're actually doing in our normal work within At-Large. And it's particularly

important for this very first virtual ICANN meeting. I think we were just taking advantage of that opportunity that's been offered in this particular setting as a new setting for us, and I'm sure that they really helped, contributed to the high attendances that we've had at our sessions. And I think that that's really great too.

But before I go, I hope that you'll all be able to attend the Q&A session that Göran and his team are going to be involved in in about 45 minutes, and of course, the final board meeting session which will conclude the meeting. I think that it's really important that we show up as At-Large in force at those meetings.

But I just want to, again, thank everyone for being with us this week, and it's been really good as I've gone through the list and sort of counted through, seeing how many At-Large people are at some of the bigger meetings, which has been excellent. I look forward to seeing you all in our next At-Large meetings online, which will be probably starting next week. Or maybe not next week because we don't have interpretation. There'll be probably just a few meetings going on.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: SubPro will be meeting, you can all come to SubPro.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Probably won't be any At-Large meetings, we'll all be at SubPro. That'll be great. Okay, thank you for that reminder, Cheryl. But thank you again and have a good morning, good afternoon, good evening wherever you are, and bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you Maureen. Bye.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Closing cocktail.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If only. Got a couple of hours yet.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Maybe Jonathan will [inaudible].

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]