
ICANN76 | CF – At-Large Loop
Saturday, March 11, 2023 – 16:30 to 17:30 CUN

YESIM SAGLAM:

This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Hello and welcome to the At-Large loop. My name is Yesim Saglam and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

Interpretation of this session will include English, Spanish, and French. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session.

If you wish to speak please raise your hand in the Zoom room and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English.

When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

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.

This session includes automated real time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view real time transcription click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign using your full name.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC chair. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, yes. Wow, I'm hoping that the camera will find it's way up or I'll have to – I was hoping to stand during this, and it seemed like it was working before. So thanks everyone and I appreciate this indulgence. I was recently made the chair of the ALAC and I was in my comfortable little spot as the sort of head of policy development in the At-Large community and it's been a big learning curve to begin to take on this notion of sort of all the things that are going on inside of At-Large and play a coordinating role.

It's interesting because I felt substantially less in charge now than I did before. And it's an interesting phenomena to get a promotion and feel less in charge. And I think it's good in a way though because much like the At-Large community itself, it's not about power but about influence. And so when I am asked by others, and I'm asked by many, what my objectives are for the AT-Large community, my number one objective is to increase the influence of the At-Large community within the ICANN community. It's really that simple.

I have the benefit of being retired, so I don't have any other kind of policy agenda that's very specific. It really is one that's about us figuring out the best way to gain that legitimacy that Yan was talking about, but within the universe of ICANN itself. That's what I think we need to work on the most. It's what I think we have been working on. But that ultimately, I think, is my biggest goal, is what are the things that are going to increase our legitimacy and therefore our influence within the ICANN context?

And so also those of you that know me know that I sometimes try to noodle these things out, I think about them via slides. I try to think about visuals for understanding the things that I'm trying to talk about. And in this particular case I'm trying to think about how to reduce down, boil down some of the things that we do, who we are, and what we're trying to do in a way to kind of simplify. Because what's happened over time is this huge amalgamation of committees and sub committees and sub teams and different goals and objectives and vocabulary surrounding the At-large community. There's so much that we do, there's outreach and engagement, there's policy development, there's group participation. There's a lot of things that we do. And I wanted to kind of take a step back and think about who we are and what it is that we're trying to do.

So that's actually my first question, is who are we? And it's interesting because we're a pretty eclectic bunch of people, right? It's not a homogeneous group. It's not like the IPC that I used to be a part of where everybody but me was a trademark attorney, right? I felt very out of place there, I used to call myself the mascot of the IPC because I was

the one that, while and advocate for intellectual property, was not a lawyer for example.

So we have a very eclectic group and on the one hand that's incredibly valuable. Study after study shows that better decisions are made with diverse inputs. If you hear from people from more places around the world, if you hear from people from different ethnicities, if you hear from people from different genders as part of your input into the decisions you make, whether it's in corporate America or in the work that we do, you make better decisions.

If more people are involved in the creation of those decisions, then they tend to stick better. In other words, if there are more people involved in the consensus building that we do, the more likely it is that we'll be able to stick to it and move forward and really implement the things that we decide to do.

One mistake I think it's easy to make, and that I think we should be very careful of, is I don't think we're specialists at end user interests, right? We come from all walks of life, but I don't think we come to this with any special knowledge about the interests of end users. And I think it's dangerous and arrogant to believe that we do.

So, who are we? What is it that in fact ties us together other than the fact that we decided to get together and say that those are the interests that we're trying to protect? What is it that ties us together?

This is a little bit of a hack job on a formula I actually just saw yesterday as part of the leadership training. What we're looking for, if it's not legitimacy the way that Yan presented it, it was presented yesterday as

trustworthiness. We want the ICANN community to trust that when we lay something out there as the interest of end users, that we have a good basis for doing that. And that's a function of credibility and presence.

In other words, are we credible in the voice that we've created? And are we persistent in it? Do we show up for meetings? Are we reliable? Do we do the work we say we're going to do? Are we part of the community in an active way? And this formula, then, the denominator is self-orientation. Do we have an agenda that's somehow individual and not related to the overall health of the ecosystem?

And so I thought this formula was interesting as a way to kind of boil down what makes a group or an organization trustworthy. A trustworthy advisor was, in fact, the actual formula.

So luckily, we don't have a lot of self-orientation in this group. If we're trying to hold up the subsequent procedures around, it's not because somebody in this room is going to make a bunch of money by that getting delayed. That's powerful because we do know there's a bunch of people that are going to make money by it happening sooner. But we can stand firm and proud in the decisions that we reach because we don't have the self-orientation.

So if you think about it, one of the things we have is that we're unconflicted. And nothing's 100%, but most of us don't have an agenda that's based on some kind of divergent interest. We aren't conflicted in the discussions that we're having. Now, we all have bias, right? Everyone has bias. Unconscious bias, conscious bias, we have different backgrounds.

Like I said, I came from 20 years at a trade association that advocated intellectual property. I'm probably a bigger fan of intellectual property than a lot of other people that are in the At-Large. But I make it very apparent, I try to at least, and give the basis for it. But on the whole, we're not conflicted. And I think that's powerful. That's one of the things that ties us together and makes us appropriate for that work.

The other piece of it is rigor. We commit to a rigorous process in representing those interests of end users. And that's what differentiates us from the rest of the community. Not special knowledge, but our willingness to engage in a rigorous process that others are not engaging in in order to determine those interests. Because it's a pretty hard thing that we've set out to do, right? There's 4 billion of them and we, on a typical week, speak to eight of them, right?

So it's a tough thing to make. And so the rigor of that process is what adds to our credibility, and therefore our trustworthiness within the community and ultimately, hopefully, our influence.

So end user interests, that's what we're meant to represent here. So if we think hard about it and we think about what our real mission is, it really boils down to two things. And it's not the two things we always think of, at least in my little model that I'm trying to put together for you today.

The first is to identify end user interests. That's our number one job, is to identify those interests, and to do that with some rigor. And the other is to amplify, which is hidden under the choice of language, I guess, on your machine, amplify those interests. We identify and amplify end user

interests. Everything else we do is in service to those two tasks. That's really it.

But now, the interesting thing about that is that it's not static. The interests, the prioritization of end users have to do with differences in trends. It has to do with more research, more discussion, more information. All of these things can change what we've previously identified as end user interests, and we have to have the reasonability and the flexibility to adjust those interests as we define them, and re-identify them, and then go back out and amplify again. Two things, identify and amplify.

So I wanted to talk a little bit about the idea of a feedback loop. And probably everybody has heard of this in some form or another, but it's this idea, you often hear about it in products, right? That I put out a product. There's reviews on the product, there's a couple of lawsuits on the product, things happen. I come back to product development, I revamp my product, and I put out version two of the product, right?

Well, our product is ideas. And that same process needs to take place. So fundamentally, if you think about it, a feedback loop is where the output is a function of input, which is in turn a function of output. It's this circular operation that happens continuously. As we amplify end user interests, the act of doing that leads to more information that leads us to make adjustments to the interests as we've identified them, right?

So I decided, for lack of a better term, call it the At-Large loop. That may have been partly the result of a science fiction show that was on Prime at one point called The Loop. But the idea is this internal feedback loop, which is that rigor that I'm talking about. If we commit to a feedback

loop in the work that we do, that makes us honest about it as a result and makes us more credible and therefore more trustworthy as we try to represent the interest of end users here at ICANN.

So in some measure what we've been trying to do, and me personally, but the group as a whole within the CPWG is what I might call a lateral feedback loop. You know, the PDP 3.0 efforts came out with different forms of work group participation, et cetera. And the one that we latched on to was the representational model.

And what we've tried to do is get to know an issue early, help prepare our volunteers for that issue by doing some of the work of identifying what the relevant end user interests are, arming them with those interests, sending them into the fight, into that work group. And then they come back because they hear something that contradicts something we thought we knew. There's a question, there's a compromise, there's something that needs to happen that brings it back to the CPWG or the OFB, which I think I added here. Yes.

So there's this back and forth that's happening that causes a revision, and we send the volunteers back. And there's this kind of lateral feedback loop, while not perfect, but it's what we've been working on and trying to use over the past couple of years. And I think that we have, in fact, increased our credibility, and therefore trustworthiness, within the ICANN community because of the rigor with which we've been operating this. That's the reason that people from outside of our community are on our calls et cetera, because we've taken them seriously and we're being rigorous in our attempt to identify end user interests, as well as amplify them.

So when I think about what's next, this is ongoing. It's not done, but when I think about what's next, it's the vertical part of this, right? We are pretty unique from the other constituencies inside of ICANN in that we have this incredible infrastructure in place that will allow for a different type of feedback loop.

So we have interactions between ALAC and ICANN, we have bi-directional interactions between ALAC and the RALOS, who in turn have bi-directional communication with the ALSs, who in turn, in theory, have bi-directional communication with their members. That's incredible. That's a deep bench if you use a sports methodology. Nobody else in the ICANN community has this, right? And that's powerful. And it's another opportunity for rigor, or what you might call another feedback loop. Another aspect of the At-Large loop is this vertical loop through this system.

And again, we still are trying to identify and amplify end user interests. So when we think about engagement, the terminology that we've used to date, there are two reasons to engage this loop, to engage this infrastructure we have in place, to engage the individuals that ultimately represent the people at the bottom tier of this.

The two reasons to engage them is feedback and outreach or amplification, right? It's the same two things. And those are the reasons we do engagement. Outreach is a little bit different activity that I'm leaving out of this for now that has to do more with getting more people involved, to be part of this group, to take on this rigorous activity. But if we think about engagement, it's still the identification and amplification of end user interests.

So if we think about how we might, in this vertical context, identify end user interests, we have a lot of techniques that we've been using. One of them is to think really hard about it. And it sounds like a joke, but the truth of the matter is we're all end users. And if we apply rigor to the way that we think about it, we have the capacity to understand and think about what all is in the best interest of end users, because we all are. No matter how technical we are, we spend 90% of our time making online banking, airline reservations, and trying to use the internet as a user.

So it's not like that's a foreign concept to us. It's not a special concept for us, but our willingness to think really hard about it is part of what makes us special. We debate about it and try to reach consensus about it. We bring in diverse opinions, gender, race and ethnicity, age, et cetera, into the determination of our own consensus or our conclusions about those interests.

And again, that power comes from the inputs into that process. Ideally, the output is more singular, right? The idea is not to just spend ICANN's money to have all of us show up to meetings to be completely independent individuals that are just sort of saying what they want to say. The idea is to go through this rigor so that there's a consistency and a reliability to the At-Large voice within ICANN, because that's what increases our trustworthiness.

Regional feedback, we can go beyond the committee's that we have in place and reach out to the RALOs to get feedback from RALO leadership on this issue. In particular, if it's one that they've seen in the regional level, we can get regional feedback as part of the identification of end user interests.

We can do community surveys. We haven't done a whole ton of them. One of the ones that we did, I may have made too complicated, but we did one on geographic names, right? And so the idea behind that was not to reach out to end users as a general community, but to see how deep we could reach into our infrastructure to get as many perspectives on geographic names because we were having difficulty reaching consensus on it when we sat in one of these rooms at an ICANN meeting trying to discuss it.

One of the biggest issues is, were we trying to protect geographic names on behalf of governments or on behalf of communities? It wasn't obvious. That's something where having more voices can give us more confidence in the conclusions we're reaching when it's not obvious. I mean, the meeting we had on it fell apart. We needed to hear from more people and then start to let the majority sway us to a particular point on that.

And to the extent that we had legitimate results from that, it appeared as though not all of us, but a majority, a small majority of the group really felt that communities were the people on behalf we were trying to protect these names, more so than sovereign governments.

We know the most vocal person within our community on this issue is Christopher, right? But he's very focused on sovereignty. And so this is a very hard issue, but we need to make decisions within our own group and can reach consensus and adhere to that consensus to the outside world that we're more focused on the community interest in those geographic names, while not uninterested in sovereign governments as well.

We can do end user surveys. We had an ABR and additional budget requests that we did in order to do an end user survey on IDNs because we were trying to understand a little bit more about what the interest was in IDNs, what the peculiarities of that interest were, and also a little bit about how to reach people. We asked questions about do you hear most of your news on the radio? Do you hear most of information in print? How do you use the internet? Is it on the phone? Are you even using domain names or are you just using apps? Those kinds of things help to inform the efforts that we're trying to do around universal acceptance.

So that was actually an attempt to go to end users. Now, that's only going to be true for a few of the issues that we do that we can make them that understandable to the everyday citizen. But when we can, we should think hard about asking those questions because think about it, our credibility, and therefore our trustworthiness, will benefit from that rigor. If we do the work to try and actually ask the people that we claim to represent, we'll have increased credibility.

Here are some things we can do to amplify. Once we've identified those end user interests and we wish to amplify them, here's some of the things we can do, and that we have done. Global webinars, right? So the At-Large can do webinars, generally, to try and get word out about a particular end user interest. Regional webinars, we've seen those. Local webinars. I mean, one of the things that's starting to happen in the universal acceptance is local webinars and local seminars. The distinction I'm making is between online and offline, like in a room, right, that's a seminar.

So we did, as an experiment, tried to really motivate the At-Large community down the tree into the ALS level, motivate them to apply for the funding to do these local events related to universal acceptance. And that bore fruit. And that was a very informal effort. Very informal and last minute. But there's still, and I don't know the final number yet, but it might be like 40 of the 60 that are happening are because of our efforts.

That is powerful, right? That's a demonstration of what it is that we're capable of. And that's powerful within the community as well. We can do mail and email campaigns, phone campaigns, social media campaigns. These are all things that we can do to amplify end user interests out vertically into the end user community, whether it's to get more feedback on an issue, to identify or to amplify an issue to educate people about DNS abuse, make people aware of things that are happening that might affect them, amplify those interests.

So here's where it gets exciting. We have the possibility of ALAC talking to RALOs, who in turn talk to ALSs, who in turn talk to their members. This is the know your customer version of this outreach and it requires retail work. In other words, people calling people they know and asking them to call people they know, or email people they know, that's how that works. It doesn't work by sending out a tweet or an email to a big list. It involves people leveraging relationships they have, knowledge that they have, and asking those people to do the same and working their way through this infrastructure.

And in my mind, that's the best way for this to happen, is through the infrastructure that we built. We also have RALO individual members,

and reaching out to them, that's what that second arrow is. And more recently, we have created new policies around individual and ALS mobilization that look more like the ALAC mobilizing the members directly.

And so I don't know what's best there. I know that it sort of steps on the toes of the RALOs to think about things that way. Maybe it's a mix, or maybe we find a way to really make this infrastructure work better than we have through the more retail kind of outreach to those members.

Now, one of the things that's been making this interesting is that ICANN, through its GSE, has sort of taken over RALO mobilization. And so there's almost a kind of a lateral outreach from the RALOs. And it takes less regard of this infrastructure in this vertical infrastructure and it's almost lateral. And I think we need to be careful about the messages that we take from that and make sure that we have input from ALAC et cetera to GSE, so that we understand that they're helping us to get out the amplification messages that we've created, and that we haven't just created a situation where ICANN has an agenda and we're serving that. Or if we are, then there ought to be a cost to it. And I don't mean money.

As we are involved in negotiations all the time about many things in terms of policy et cetera, one of the things that's coming up and the reason this legitimacy project is critical, is this whole [inaudible] project. The legitimacy of ICANN itself is one of the messages GSE wants the RALOs to put out to the world, right? That we'd be doing that at the same time that we are internally fighting for better representation, et cetera inside of the multistakeholder model.

So let's not take that easily if that's the message. If it's not our message, let's make sure that we do what we need to to make it our message because that's what this infrastructure should be used for.

So I think this is the part that requires more discussion. But I want to see us talk more about this idea of how we can make use of, over the next couple of years, how we make use of this vertical infrastructure that we have in place and really show what we're capable of. Just a small test that's so informal and so late on universal acceptance day, I think really is incredible. And if we really start to use it to help identify interests, to get feedback on things that we can make understood by others, if we can use it for outreach, whether it's tweeting about something et cetera, I think that could be incredibly powerful.

And so that is my objective as the ALAC chair, is to really explore and delve into this. I think the RALOs have the potential to be the most important part of what we're trying to do over the next couple of years if we really want to leverage this vertical infrastructure because I think it's exciting that we have it. It's amazing that we have it. And right now it's something that's a resource that's underutilized.

And so that's what I want to talk about in terms of the At-Large loop. And so, what I thought we'd do next is discuss. So thank you for your time and your indulgence in my thinking about what we might want to be doing next as the At-Large community.

ALFREDO CALDERON:

I just wanted to share with the audience and those that are participating online that one of the North American regional At-Large organizations

or an ALS, which is in Puerto Rico actually, the ISOC Puerto Rico led at one time by Eduardo Diaz, now we have a new precedent. But we actually, Jonathan, started doing activities where we ask the participant if they want to become an individual member of At-Large, of NARALO. We actually have a question in our webinars or our seminars, even in the activities that we're planning for the near future, we're asking them if they are interested.

Now, how do we do that? We give them sort of a chat about what ICANN is all about and how they can get involved. And if they want more information, then we are eagerly contacting them on a one-to-one basis to make that happen. And as I guess most of you know, when I was a mentor, I did actually a keep on conversations with my alumni, which are now alumni. And some of them have actually got involved in At-Large in some working groups and in other cases and other constituencies. But they are involved actively in ICANN.

So I have to agree 100% with the concept that you're presenting. If we pursue that and if we work hard on it with our free time whenever we can, we can make it happen. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Alfredo. And I know we've got the beginnings of a queue. I didn't know how many slides to throw at you. And one of the things that made the universal acceptance day thing a success, is the work that the Universal Acceptance Steering Committee did to create what are essentially packaged events, right? It's like a kit. You decide you want to do a half-day seminar on universal acceptance, here's a video to

promote it, here's the PowerPoints, here's the script. All of that is there. Here's it is with a bow on it, right?

And so I think that part of this effort would be to do the same thing, to really start to standardize some of the messages that we're trying to put out as part of an amplification message, which is part of the reason that I constantly harassed ICANN Org about ITI. Because there's a ridge content management system that's been built that needs to find its way to us, but we could have standardized presentations in multiple languages on multiple issues, so that if somebody at an ALS level wanted to do a little event and tell their members about something, we had something to hand to them. Or if the RALOs wanted to do something, they didn't have to start from scratch, they could do an event at a regional level and we could just hand something to them.

And so we have committees in place to produce some of these materials, but if we got sort of rigorous about standardizing what some of these things were, then the we'd get to yes quicker than if somebody has to just start from scratch. But it does require the participation of others. And it's not all us, we have to stay on them to facilitate that.

I see I have Sebastien first in the queue here. The online queue, I guess.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Jonathan, for your presentation. I think it's a good start for discussion. And I would like to express where I have disagreement on your image of what is the current situation. If we can go to your slide where you have ICANN on top, ALAC and the RALOs, it would be great.

There are many things, and I am sorry. But when you write ICANN, you don't talk about ICANN. You talk about staff or board, whatever you want to call. But ICANN is all of that, including us. I am not outside of ICANN, I am inside of ICANN, therefore the way you show, for me, it gives a trouble in terms of image. Here I don't know with whom ALAC is talking, but it's not talking to ICANN. It's talking to whatever you want, but ICANN is also all the one you are in this image.

So second point is that whatever is ICANN, fortunately, ALAC is not a bottleneck. Fortunately, the RALOs, and even some ALSs have contact with what you call ICANN. So therefore the arrow can't just go from the RALOs to ALAC and then the ALAC to outside. Yeah, fortunately, we, as chair of the RALOs, we discuss directly with the CEO of ICANN, therefore it can't be a bottleneck.

The other point is that – And it's also fortunate, you need to add arrows between the RALOs because we are coordinating each other. And my last point on this image is I don't think that ALAC is on top of us. It's with us, it's that the same level, but it's not on top of us. You are not our boss. And I have got different position in ICANN, therefore when I say you, it's not you. It's ALAC is not the boss of the RALOs. We are selecting two [inaudible] of the ALAC, but we are not selecting those people to be our boss. We need the work done by ALAC to have consensus, to have discussion, to have policy proposal and so on and so forth. But you are not our boss.

Now if we can go to the –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can I break this up a little bit and address some of it or do you want to give a speech? I mean I'd like to address is as you're going, that's why I'm asking.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, the question is that the other image you have, it's on the line with that, but go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So these are obviously rough images. And so, obviously, I understand that ALAC is part of ICANN. At the same time, there's ALAC and there is the rest of the ICANN community from whom we need to try to gather respect and achieve credibility so that we can influence the rest of that community, which is the other constituencies and the board.

So I could list out all the constituencies and the board as separate entities that we're trying to gain credibility with, and I just put it as ICANN as shorthand. So I understand that ALAC is part of ICANN, but that was the reason for the first part of that. Okay?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I get your point, but please, it's not ALAC who is but ICANN, it's At-Large.

JONATHAN ZUCK: In fact in the bylaws it is in fact ALAC that has the responsibility to represent the interests of individual end users inside of ICANN. And so,

ultimately, the messages come out coordinated by ALAC within the ICANN community.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. Then, Jonathan, I stop to organize readouts. I stopped to organize any meetings for RALO, I will leave you to do it. It's not because it's written like that in the bylaws. Yes, it took me 20 years to understand that it's not the right way to write and to talk about the house of end user is At-Large, it's not ALAC. The 15 people can't be our house, but it took me time to understand that and it could take time for others. But what I say, if you consider like that, I really will stop to organize things because –

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm talking within the ICANN context. I'm not talking regionally.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: When I do a readout, we are talking about the ICANN context. Okay, it's organized in Europe, but it's not getting context. But we can't split that, sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, I think that we can. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. But by the way, I do agree with Sebastian, that should have said the rest of ICANN, just to be clear.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, agreed. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I didn't take those arrows as being exclusive. I took those as pathways that can be used for communication, not necessarily the only pathways. And in reality there are so many arrows there that you couldn't explain them all. So maybe you just weren't clear or maybe not everyone has my perspective. There are businesses in the world where you can only talk to your manager and your manager can only talk to his or her manager, and you get fired if you try to skip a level. I'd like to think our organization is not like one of those.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, these are the arrows meant to support the proposal that I was trying to make, that's definitely the case.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, I'm not criticizing your diagram. No, I'm talking about in general. The communication paths, whatever works to solve the problem is what we need. And sometimes we will skip levels, sometimes we will use the hierarchy, and sometimes both. Many of you know I was heavily involved in the last At-Large review and the what we call the mobilization efforts for ALSs and individuals. When the original bylaws were written in 2001, they were written with some intelligence. Unfortunately, we never used a lot of them. And we have, not intentionally, but erected barriers over the years to make things more difficult for us to achieve the kind of dialogues that you're talking about.

We had rules saying if you are a member of an ALS, for some obscure reason, you can't be an individual member and participate directly. We're removing those rules. We're trying to streamline things and encourage communication. I think what you're talking about is great. It shouldn't end up in another rigid set of rules, but essentially say we need to work together to make sure we increase our credibility and increase the effectiveness of what we're doing. So thank you for doing that, let's try to move forward.

And yes, the diagrams are going to be rough, but let's not focus on the details. What RALOs do can be really important. What the ALAC does is really important. They're not necessarily exclusive and one doesn't replace the other. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think that what we have to face, and we are not currently succeeding at this, we have built a dysfunctional structure. And we are kidding ourselves if we think otherwise. And that is why the review concluded that we should just switch to individual members and get rid of regions and things like that. And so we don't agree with their solution, but I think it would be unwise for us to believe that we have a working situation now, because we don't. And so we need to figure out what those challenges need to look like in order to have a working situation.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Jonathan, I'm going to interrupt. That doesn't mean nothing is working, it just means we need to improve.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Yes, that's definitely always going to be the case. Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Jonathan. I will go by the essence of what was presented and I personally agree that the At-Large community can be utilized in a better way to not only send out messages but also be somewhere where the end user interests can be collected and brought in so that more substantial information can be given in terms of tangible things that this is the research we did, and this is what we got, and this is the basis on which we are saying this.

So I kind of agree with it, I will not get into procedures. There may be different ways, but I think that's a good way to do. The UADA definitely is a good exercise, but perhaps what we could do as an alternative or a side thing is try to gather information of how people actually look at the concerns which are there in the universal acceptance or something. Perhaps something which we could look at in case we're looking at surveys we want to do or other things, have some kind of structure plan that these are the critical things which is being discussed in policy in ICANN and these are the small surveys which we can do or group discussions which we can do so that we get information which we want, which we can use as proof or I would say substance basis, which we do so.

Primarily, I go by the sense of what you are proposing, and I think that has value. I'm not getting into procedure. And there may be multiple ways of doing, but this is definitely a more structured way to get information and pass it on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Carlos.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thanks, Jonathan. I feel more comfortable speaking in Spanish because sometimes I have a lack of words to express my ideas. So thank you to hear me in Spanish.

This is Carlos speaking. Jonathan, I thought that these bilateral exchange was never ending. I think that we need to hear everyone's voice. You touched on many points in your presentation, I share many of the points you raised.

First off, you asked, who are we? I believe we are a group of people that is really willing to work really hard. I believe we are dedicated, we are committed, and we're working really hard to accomplish our goal. Sometimes that is not enough and we need a little bit more.

And you also touched upon engagement and participation. For many years, more than 10 years ago, I chaired the participation and engagement group and I was a speaker in ICANN 37 in Nairobi. And back then I said that this commitment calls for good outreach, significant outreach, and interesting and understandable at the same time because most end users do not know and do not even know what is it that we do here.

So we need to let them know in a clear and simple way what is it that we do so that then with that information they can engage in discussions among themselves and with other parties. And only then will we get

their commitment because they will feel that they belong. And this is what we need to accomplish.

You suggested asking questions. You mentioned the action of amplification. You mentioned webinars, email campaigns, et cetera, et cetera. But this boils down to how we are going to ask these questions of the end users.

We need to ask questions that are interesting to the end user and that they can understand what is it that we are asking them, because if not we will not get any response from them. And this goes hand in hand with legitimacy, with ALAC's legitimacy, and it is also tied with what Sebastian was just saying, and I tend to agree with him.

I also understand Alan's position when he was trying to explain what you meant because I understand that we are dealing with a structure and that we need some kind of levels within the structure. And that it doesn't mean that ALAC is, for lack of a better word, the boss of that structure.

This morning I joined a meeting, it was a capacity building meeting that is related to your presentation. This was a GAC capacity building session. Someone made a very interesting question, this person said that the GAC gathers government representatives, a government represents the citizens of a certain nation. ALAC gathers RALOs within At-Large and ALAC represents the end users. So these participants, this government representative actually, wondered what if ICANN's board does not accept GAC advice or ALAC advice? Does this mean that the board resolutions are not taking citizens or end users into account?

That was a really interesting question. And it is tied to what you were touching on legitimacy, commitment, trustworthiness that is ALAC's present visa vie the board. And it is also linked to working hard. And it is also linked to acquiring knowledge. However, that hard work and that knowledge go hand in hand with the improvement of the multistakeholder model because each of us here working willingly and with so much dedication, each of us has to be recognized or rewarded. It might not be a monetary reward, but we do need a space, we do need the opportunity to grow and develop. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Carlos. I'm not going to be able to respond to all of that in the time that we have left, but I will spend time on all of this. And I will simply say that I want to implement some structured communication into the infrastructure that we have. I'm not trying to overhaul the entire infrastructure that we have, but begin to implement some structured communication into that infrastructure. And that's really all that I'm proposing here. And I think I agree with almost everything else that you said, but I'll continue to try and absorb it and incorporate it.

So next is Satish.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Jonathan. I think this is a good starting point and we have to continue to evolve it. I have a couple of comments on the so-called end user interests. We've all been using this phrase everywhere, but I have a couple of questions on this. Now when we do things like community surveys or end user surveys, what we get are individual or group

opinions and not – What I was saying is that when we do a survey, what we get are opinions, not the end user interests themselves because those are more strategic, those are more kind of high-level and therefore there's a gap in treating the opinions as interests. So, there is an additional step that is required to convert this or evolve this opinions into what can be amplified as end user interest.

The second point is the extreme diversity of At-Large makes it hard to arrive at a single point because you can amplify that. So unless you have some room for the diversity, it becomes harder to amplify what is just one part of the views, not the others. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Matthias?

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK:

First of all, I think the slides were a perfect trigger point to start a fruitful discussion. And, obviously, I also think that on pictures you do not always address everything in a very detailed manner. So this is just what I want to say as a start.

With regards to the ALAC and my role, I would say there is a clear obligation as stated in the bylaws as an ALAC member to make the vote on various documents focusing on end user interests, and I can do and vote in my own – Let's say, I have my own opinion on that. But I still see my role, I would say, as a person which represents the RALOs. So in my case, NARALO, and there I would say neither [inaudible] is my boss, nor I'm his boss. And obviously, you should try to work together. But in fact, I would say I think that was a bit of a misunderstanding.

So I think it's definitely good to improve some things, there's always a way to improve. But at the end, it's also clear for me that the ALSs are selecting the ALAC members and so, obviously, I also need to serve the community and also need to serve in their interests. So that's why I think this is more what maybe was the point before. And from your opinion, I think it was more like, look, let's say I try to make an overview, try to represent or present my view, and then also try to improve some processes, which is also very important, I think.

And in terms of engagement, I just want to add I also fully agree that it's very important, the effective ways the personal way. So it's obviously a lot of work, I know it. When I'm talking to next gens it's always they address you then, for example, as a person when I was speaking at the last webinar, the pre-webinar for the next ICANN meeting, obviously then you get suggestions or even questions and say, look, this is too hard to understand, or okay, can you help with this or that? So it's always the personal context, which is obviously a lot of work. But I think this is the only work that really works, at least this is my experience. Yeah, this is what I want to say, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

We have to finish on time because it's a hybrid meeting. And let me just finish by saying that I'll go back to what I said at the very beginning, I have no power. So this is simply my idea of something that we can do and should do to increase our credibility and therefore trustworthiness within the ICANN context in policy development conversations with the board, is really focus on the identification and application of interests and apply some rigor to that process. And not be haphazard about it,

which it's not about creating rigidity, but it's about rigor in assessing those end user interests. And so I agree with Satish, information data needs to be processed, but applying that rigor to the process, I think, will go a long way to increasing our credibility within the ICANN context.

So I'm sorry that we ran out of time. I'm happy to continue to have conversations with everybody. It's a two-year plan.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: 10 seconds, Naveed here, Jonathan. Yeah, just 10 seconds please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But there's four people that want 10 seconds is the problem.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I just want to suggest that back some time we used to have a two minutes timer, If we can limit ourselves speaking, it will provide more opportunities for everybody to participate. I think we should implement that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good idea. Sure.

TOMMI KARTTAIVI: Yeah, thank you. I'm going to be very brief. Thank you very much for this presentation. It was comprehensive analysis, diagnosis of what we are and what we should do. I hope that the main thing here is not seeing who is the boss of the other bosses or whatever. I mean, to my mind, these arrows represent not command lines, but flows of information up

and down. And the most important of those to my mind is information flows coming up from the grassroots, from the ALSs, from the independents. These should be synthesized and coordinated by RALOs and finally come up to the ALAC level where our positions will be made, because I think that we need to base what we think the end user interests are, they should be based on facts, something that we get as evidence from the grassroots. So, good luck.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I agree completely. Thanks, everyone. Thanks for listening and let's continue the conversation. With that this particular meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]