ICANN76 | CF – At-Large Leadership Wrap Up
Thursday, March 16, 2023 – 13:15 to 14:30 CUN

YESIM SAGLAM: Hello, and welcome to the At-Large leadership wrap-up. 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 for 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.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the 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 this session if you do not sign in using your full name.

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

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good morning. Welcome, everyone, to the wrap-up session for ICANN76. It's been a great week. We've gotten a lot of positive feedback on participation by the At-Large community in various sessions. We even had Sebastien as the moderator of the plenary discussion, which I think is a very big deal. So let's thanks Sebastien for his great job on that. And we had a good meeting with the Board that I think went well. So lots going on. We're going to get various reports from different meetings, but I just wanted to give you all my thanks for making my very first meeting as Chair not completely a terror. So thank you. I appreciate that.

And then we also had a great general assembly for LACRALO, which I think went very well, and some great events associated with that that were a lot of fun. I'm a little bit surprised I didn't win anything in the singing contest. We'll have a discussion about that later.

Finally, what I'd like to do before we get started is ask everybody to unwrap their cables, their headphones, plug them in, and choose their channel so that there's no delay associated with anybody wanting to make an intervention in the language other than English. So just be ready so that it's not a delay. It shouldn't be anything anybody has to think twice about doing. Okay?

So let's jump right in to the agenda in terms of what's going on. Let's talk about the Chair liaisons. Is Justine here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's still going on?

So I'm going to go to Joanna. We had some great meetings with the GAC. So I'm excited to hear your report.

JOANNA KULESZA: Great. Thank you. We did hold the usual bilateral with the GAC, which from my understanding, went quite well. We agreed on three topics. There is always a need to include more, but time is scarce. This time, we agreed to further discuss the joint statement that focused on the access to ICANN documents and complements to processes around the ITI.

And that first agenda item led by Alan raised a lot of interest. We have received instant feedback, a positive one. It seems to be a topic that is of mutual interest and one that will likely be further pursued.

We've agreed to hold an intercessional meeting where we could discuss how the data that is already available in those documents in the ITI could be best resourced.

We held a brief working meeting with Sally to see how we can synergize the efforts within the ITI and a follow-up to that joint statement. So that was quite optimistic and hopefully will result in tangible effects. And these are non-controversial. Everyone wants to have better access to information and documents. So the instructions are there. The [quests] would be relatively simple.

The second agenda item focused on further developing the multistakeholder model with regards to the WSIS+20. It was meant as an introduction to the plenary that happened yesterday. And clearly that is another theme of mutual interest.

I'm very much looking forward also to the afternoon session organized by the Org on regulatory advancements. And that will likely be complementary to what we discussed with regards to the multistakeholder model. Well, I'm certain we all follow the plenary, so those arguments about the need to ensure further development of the multistakeholder model and making sure it remains relevant were raised during our panel or bilateral as well.

And the third standing topic, which we unfortunately had very little time to discuss, was DNS abuse, a standing item on the bilateral agenda. We have managed to join the GAC's Public Safety Working Group meetings on a series of occasions, and they do remain a standing platform for the two communities to discuss and agree on our positions when it comes to DNS abuse. The GAC is drafting their communique, so the DNS abuse section will also be of particular interest. There was also a capacity-building session that the GAC held on DNS abuse. So that is clearly one of the themes where we both shared positions and indicate high interest.

So that's the bilateral. There clearly is more work to do. We will work on those items that were identified, and we have received a warm welcome from the incoming chair. So hopefully this is a work in progress, and a bilateral intercessionally is to be expected.

That's all I have for now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Joanna. Two observations from me. One is I think the At-Large community is very lucky to have, among its members, somebody who gets excited about a session on regulatory advancements. So I think we all are in awe.

And then the other is I'm very excited about the new GAC chair because he's as much a fanatic about metrics as I am. So it won't be a lone voice in the wilderness anymore on that particular topic.

So do we have anybody to talk about GNSO? That's still wrapping up, so I guess we could circle back on that and just keep moving forward through the agenda.

What's next?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Session reports.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is session reports next before the LACRALO?

Okay. So let's go ahead and head into the session reports.

Do we have a list of names or do we just …

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No I think it just [rolled] out and you'll see [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So we started something that's been tried before, but I think we had some success this time around in terms of getting folks to volunteer to provide reports on various sessions that they attended that weren't the At-Large sessions. We made an attempt, at least—it's always difficult—to keep the At-Large-specific schedule light so that people could participate in the other sessions around the meeting. And we got some good reports and the document on that.

What I guess I would like to do is invite those of you that submitted reports, if you have something specific you want to draw this group's attention to from that meeting as an action item or something like that that we really should take note of. I ask you now to raise your hand let us know.

Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Jonathan. This is not about the sessions reported already. It's about a session that was convened at short notice. We had Bill. We had

Justine. We had Hadia. This is on a request from dot-quebec on the fact that they wanted dot-quebec with an accent to be treated exactly the same as dot-quebec. The problem currently is that the Latin Generation Panel's work … I mean, they have, in their wisdom, decided on a certain strategy which does not let this happen. There's no way to make it happen under the current policy. So dot-quebec has asked us basically if ALAC can take it with up with GNSO as a separate … I don't know what that particular [inaudible] is, but they have actually do that. So this small group that met will be giving you a note on what we think should be done in order to enable this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Yeah, I heard a little bit about that. It's a little bit of a catch-22 because it's not treated as a variant but it's also not treated as a confusingly similar string. Or if it's treated as a confusingly similar string, then they might not even be able to both be registered. So we'll have to—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay … have to continue to work out this catch-22, for sure.

And Bill Jouris, go ahead.

BILL JOURIS: The best thing I think we can do is … For the next round, the plan is to have the Similarity Review Committee look at proposed TLDs to see if they look too much alike over and above what's blocked because [they're] variants. And it wouldn't be that big a stretch, it occurs to me, if they also looked at things which are used interchangeably.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

BILL JOURIS: The case of dot-quebec, for instance. You can get the same thing with Spanish words. And I think that's probably the simplest and easiest tweak to make to the whole process to address this kind of issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

BILL JOURIS: I don't know if we can prevail upon the—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, so let's take that up. I think this meeting unfortunately … You are already deep into the substance of the issue. So it's clear that it's something we need to take up and come up with a position on and then make a recommendation—the GNSO as well—on this.

Yeah, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: A couple of things. I just want to follow up on what is Bill is referring to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Get closer to the microphone.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I just want to highlight we had a meeting with Sarmad to create a working group on indigenous languages, particularly northern Quebec, with [Misaool] as well, as well as in northern Canada. So we hope to move that script along in the next year.

I just want to do a quick report on the NextGen presentations. As you noticed in the general forum, one of the students was upset that none of the Board members were going to their presentations. I've been going to the NextGen for years, and I was a Fellow assess[or]. I actually evaluated the Fellows for a few of them. And this year, we had more people attend than every at the NextGen presentations. Those were all quite good.

So it's pretty tough for the Board to get there, but I talked to Ergys, and he says we're going to work out lunch, provided by ICANN. And the NextGen will be providing the presentations. So you can come and get a free lunch and free information. So that'll be, if not in the next ICANN, definitely for Hamburg.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great.

As far as liaisons reports, Lianna, are you available online to give us any action items that anything you need to showcase for us for ccNSO?

Lianna?

[INTERPRETER]: Lianna?

ALAN GREENBERG: While we're waiting, I'll point out there is a queue in …

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you.

And then Andrei , SSAC.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you. It was a great meeting, and I'll be very brief about the recent SSAC activities at this conference. We had a joint meeting with ALAC and also there was a public session of SSAC.

So let me just briefly cover the topics which we uncovered. So there are project, like NCAP, which is the Name Collision Analysis Project. We gave a presentation on the pre-final stage. There is a certain process which may pause the process of obtaining the gTLDs. So the request[ed] string will be most likely checked against the name collision traffic logs.

Now we have a couple of work parties, and one of them is the Evolution of the DNS Resolution. This group goes after the new technologies which are alternative and might be or might not be correlating to the traditional DNS methods. This is a very interesting group, actually, because it goes beyond the regular DNS but researches different resolution methods which are not DNS-based.

There is a group about domain system registration automation, which looks up on the best practices of the registrars and how to make life easier for the registrants and how to deal with [inaudible] providers and other parties involved, for example. And the most important aspect is how to automate the DNSSEC signature management.

Overall, that's probably the core subjects of the meeting.

And what else? For the NCAP, for the name collision, the timeline was presented. We currently are at the stage of completing the research.

There was also a couple of interesting meetings. We met with—how to say it in English?—IANA, of course. And it was very interesting to hear about their list of features that will be represented for the top-level domain managers, such as extended authorization, management of the roles of the technical and administrative contacts, and a lot of nice, interesting features which they want to implement to manage the top-level domains.

What else? That's probably it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Thank you.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We've got some hands up in the queue. Maureen first.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I was just wondering. Alan is after me. Alan, was yours going to be a comment on something that had been said earlier? I wondered.

ALAN GREENBERG: A comment on Satish's comment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Go ahead, then. I mean, again, this isn't the time to discuss the substance of it. That's all. So …

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to comment that, if there' a further discussion on that, I would like to be involved.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Excellent.

Yes?

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: My important point I forgot when I listed the slides is there's also a [trish] program and progress. So it's important that it was presented here during the meeting with ALAC. Julia was presenting. So SSAC is always looking for good candidates for this work party. So this is important to mention.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, great. Thank you.

Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Jonathan. We're actually doing a presentation, if that's okay, about the GGP—Sarah and I.

Yesim, have you got—yeah. Cool. Okay. Right. What we thought we'd do today—I'm going to go zooming through just an introduction … And then Sarah is going to present what we actually did during this meeting, which was an advancement of what we've done in the past. So I won't go through these too slowly because the presentation is actually in the agenda.

For those people who haven't actually been part of the CPWG, where we've actually done a bit of a presentation, I'll just introduce you to the fact that the Applicant Support Program, which is what the GGP is all about, is another one of those GNSO inventions, a process for a particular purpose. And of course, this one is to provide guidance to the implementation review time that just put together the applicant support manual.

And one of the interesting things about this particular working group is that we've being given a set of tasks, but they're very specific. And they're listed in the SubPro. Our purpose is to basically expand on those recommendations and guidance that's actually in the SubPro. And there's no new policy or anything like that. We don't have to worry about that kind of thing, but it does restrict us in what it is we're going to be doing. And we're focusing on the metrics and the qualifications that actually are going to be part of the applicant manual anyway.

Next slide. These are the tasks that have been set. And we've already done Task 1 and 2, which were mainly introductory. And Tasks 3, 4, and 5 are actually to do with the actual SubPro recommendations and guidance. Task 6 is something that's actually going to be done mainly by staff because that's actually going to be looking at the finances that are going to become available. I haven't finalized what that's going to be, whether it's going to be the same as it was in the first round or an adaptation of that.

Next slide. Whatever that is. Next slide, please. This is the work plan. You could actually see the thing in the other, the real set. As I said, we're up to March already. We've actually got to get the whole draft ready before ICANN77. So we've spent quite a bit of time just coming to terms with what it is we have to do. So this meeting was really, really important because we've actually got something to actually work from. And Sarah is going to explain that. So we're going to be going flat tack between now and ICANN77 when that draft report has to be done.

Next slide, please. I don't know if anyone has read through the SubPro final report, but of course it's full of all these recommendations and guidance things. Section 17 has to do with the applicant support. And 17: the recommendation and guidance. It's Recommendation 17.1, Recommendation 17.2, and I think it was 17.3 and, in guidance, 17.4. So it all goes in numerical order.

But we're going to be focusing mainly on 17.3 because this is all to do with getting the information out to prospective applicants. So it's outreach/awareness-raising, the evaluation of the applications program, evaluation elements. All that kind of stuff is in that particular recommendation. So that's been our main focus.

And as well as the recommendation, we get these guidance. And Guidance 17.4—I mean, 17.3 and 4—are the ones that we're actually focusing on. You'll notice that it says Guidance 13.3. That's actually not one of ours, but Section 13 is about communications. And Guidance 13.3 actually relates to the applicant process. They actually set a metric us for by saying that it should begin at least six months prior to the beginning of the application submission process. So this is obviously important to us. And therefore, it's included in the metrics that we'll be looking at for our own guidance.

Next slide, please. This is all to do with 17.3 as well, just to show you the other guidance statements that are made within the SubPro doc. But this all relates mainly to the dedicated implementation review team, which is going to use the work that we actually do. And all these are guidance mainly for them—so not for us—but it's still part of the Applicant Support Program.

Next slide. When I first came on—because I came onto this working group late … And this was the first document I saw, and it was like, "Okay, this is the framework." So I was really grateful to be able to take to the CPWG and say, "Hey, this is what we've been given. This is going to be working with. What do we do with it?"

And—next slide—fortunately, we were able to work through the key questions. How do we collect the data? How do we measure it? What approaches do we use? And there's four main areas, which are, of course, outreach, education, the business case development, and the application evaluation. Those are the four areas. So we looked at those things. And one of the things that really came out … And what we did is I think it was Jonathan who said, "Let's focus on what represents success."

So—next slide—from the CPWG, we came up with this whole set of the sorts of, "What are the factors? What are the features that we actually see as representing success in some of those key areas that were already listed?" And we started up a list, and this really caught on with the other members of the working group. So they finally had something to work on, and they started adding to this list.

Now, what has actually happened is, from the time we presented this list and then to this meeting—it's been, like, three weeks—the staff—that's Julie Hedlund and Steve Chan—have actually put together a format now using this information in which we can now work on developing the guidance for our draft report.

But then I want to pass that on now to Sarah, who's going to tell you what we did in our meeting quickly. Thank you.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi, everyone. Next slide, please. Yeah, I think Maureen has talked about this, so next slide, please. So in terms of outreach and awareness, one of the things we were discussing this week was that the priority for outreach events should be for underdeveloped and developing regions because of course the developed region is already well covered, so we didn't need to do outreach for that. And our working group is in agreement that this is what should happen. Some measures of success will be around how many events have been organized for these underdeveloped and developing regions. And if you remember, during the public forum this morning, Lauren said that some people from some regions were not even aware that this problem was there. So we think that there should be more outreach and awareness.

Next slide, please. Another goal … We actually had a bit of discussion about this particular slide. So basically the goal is around targeting not-for-profit social enterprises and community organizations over more business-oriented or commercial entities. So we discussed this a little bit. There are people who felt that, if you are a small business from a developing country, maybe you should also be a target. But I think the general agreement about this is that outreach should be open to everyone, but the support should be strictly for not-for-profit or community organizations.

Next slide, please. So also we talked about—this also is still related to awareness—creating awareness generally about the New gTLD Program and not just the Applicant Support Program.

Next slide. So those are some indicators of success: the number of events, polling and doing surveys to get feedback from applicants. But I'd just like to call your attention to Bullet Point #3, where we said that 0.5% of the applicants for the next round would be supported applications.

Next slide, please. And these are just some metrics to measure success, but I will not go through all of them now.

Next slide. So this is another goal around self-service resources. I think we recommend that ICANN Org curates documents, resources, and puts them in a place where you can direct people to. Whether it's ICANN staff attending an event or community member somewhere, they can be directed to a particular repository.

Next slide, please. So these are just some indicators of success. Again, it's polling surveys and how many people have inquired about the program.

Next slide, please. So in terms of the business case, we also got some goal related to this: providing people with information and then giving them enough information so that they can decide if they want to proceed with an application or request support or just leave it altogether because sometimes you just find out that you actually don't need the support. And to potential applicants access to—[inaudible] applicants so they can get either pro bono support or to other people to assist them with putting together the application. So that's what this goal is about.

Next slide, please. So this is another element.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm so sorry.

SARAH KIDEN: That's okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This level of detail in a report is unfortunately more than this meeting can handle.

SARAH KIDEN: Okay. That's fine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So we need to have this report, for sure, so let's get it on the agenda for CPWG and maybe even the ALAC call. I'm very sorry to cut you off. I'm just worried about timing.

So, I mean, I'm very excited to see the metric about the 0.5% of applications being … because that's something concrete that I think is a very important metric.

But thank you so much. And thanks for all the work you're doing on this. And let's make sure that we get this report out. But I'm going to cut you off just today, alright? Thank you.

I need to go back to the queue, which has disappeared on me here, which is now Hadia. So that same admonition goes to everyone, right?

What's the real takeaway for this group and what we need to do next? What elevates for this meeting?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. So I'm going to report quickly on the ccNSO universal acceptance roadmap and how this relates to what At-Large is doing. So the ccNSO in ICANN75 embarked on a mission to define the ccNSO role in universal acceptance. And for that, they formed a small committee in order to develop a roadmap. And also they sent out a survey which was conducted between December 2022 and January 2023.

So one of the very important results of the survey showed that lack of adoption is due to lack of demand. And for that, definitely outreach and awareness is very important. And here is where I see a role for At-Large. So they formed a universal acceptance committee. And one of the roles of that committee is actually to work with different stakeholders within the ICANN community. And for us, I think it's good to work with that committee on awareness and outreach. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Next in line, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I wanted to two sessions. One is the CPH DNS abuse outreach. And CPH means Contracted Party House. I'm not going into the details of what was discussed there, but it takes from the meeting is that there is a couple of tools that end users can use or anybody can use to report abuse. One of them is the ACID Tool, and it's located in ACIDtool.com.

ACID means Abuse Contact Identifier. So they call it ACID Tool. That tool you use if you need to report abuse and you know where to report it. You put the domain name there, and it gives you who the hosting services are and their e-mails. It provides you the mail server of the company that is providing the mail service and their e-mails. And then it provides information about the registry and registrar information if you want to report it. And you get the information from there, and they have e-mails. And then you report the DNS. So I think that's a takeaway from this, and I have recommendations on what to do with this.

And then you have heard about the NetBeacon tool from the DNS Abuse Institute. That's another reporting tool, but what you do there is it requires you to put a lot information about what you're seeing and this and that. But then, once you fill out this information, they will take care of sending it to the right registry or registrar is, whatever the problem is.

So those are the tools that are available to everyone you should use to report abuse. So it's important for us, for ALAC, for the At-Large, that we pass this information to our users so that they are aware of these tools and they can report if they can report.

So those are two important things that I got from this meeting.

But also, I don't know if you know, but the contracted parties—the registries—are doing the registry agreement negotiations, which are called the RAs. And also, the registrars are doing the registrar accreditation agreement negotiations. And both of them want to standardize this thing about reporting DNS and mitigating [DNS] from the registries' and registrars' point of view. So they're going to make sure they're putting some wording in the contract for everyone to mitigate abuse under their abuse definition that includes spam and phishing. It's a narrow part of the abuse, but at least they're going to put more in there for everybody to work on the mitigation of this abuse across the board. So that's very good news for the end user, even though it's not direct. It's indirect, but it will help in mitigating.

And also, if you go to the NetBeacon page, or DPR, Institute of DNS Abuse, you can go there and they have newsletters that you see every month. You can see all the drafts and how many malware and spamming and abuses like that are occurring. And then you can see what kind of mitigation all these registries and registrars are doing. And you can see they're doing a lot of it—not 100%, but they're doing more than 50% of what they are getting. So those reports are available for the public. Now, they have other reports that they provide to registries and registrars.

The other meeting that I went—oh, by the way, the next steps: I believe we should send a memo to all the chairs of [inaudible] RALOs, asking them to pass this information about these tools and a note about these contract negotiations—but not only should we do this and they should send this across their ALSes and membership, but add what are our registrars, what are our registrars, and what do these negotiations means, so people, when they receive this at least have a context of what has been sent to them.

And the other meeting that I went to is the DNS ccNSO on DNS abuse … I don't have the thing here. The ccNSO is a very peculiar organization, so they're inward-looking. So they did a survey across their ccTLDs, and they were expecting 100 people to respond. They just got 35 about DNS abuse, and I found it very spotty on the information that they sent. But there is no [updates] or anything that would affect us. In fact, they said that, if you report, to many of the ccTLDs, abuse to them, they will not act on them unless they get the report from somebody with authority. So if I send an abuse [report] to a ccTLD, they may not do anything. They say that. Thank you so much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you.

Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Two minutes. First, I think the proposal from [Ed] is very interesting, and maybe you can take your proposal about how to spread the word, taking this message … It will be a good try, a good test, a good idea. At least that's my suggestion.

A few points. First, your At-Large rep will have a lot of work soon regarding the terms of reference of the pilot holistic review. As we heard during the public forum, we will reword the terms of reference. Therefore, it's a lot of work.

I went to the ISO and [ball] meeting just by hazard because I was in the room. Very interesting. I think I would like to underline that we need to recall the night with [inaudible] in each region. And I feel that it could be interesting to have an At-Large/ISO session in the future. It could be online or it could be in Hamburg. Whatever. But I think we need not to just concentrate on domain name but sometimes on some IP Internet protocol issues.

NextGen. I think we need to support the fact that having a [plenarization] to allow them to present on their research will be a good move.

Regarding the [plenarization] this time, how we want to follow-up the discussion there (the discussion going on among the speakers) …but how we want to be involved as At-Large. And I hope that we will have a follow-up plenary session during Hamburg.

And the last point is that we have heard about search of ICANN CEO and president. Really interesting exchanges. I suggest, if you were not in the room, to listen to the recording. And I will add into the chat the link to the resource page about the search for the CEO. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sebastien. Thanks for attending that session. I'll also mention that Leon dropped by to say that they're planning to have another CEO listening session on April 27th. So one of the things we should do as a group is convene internally to come up with a consensus view on what we would like to see in a new CEO. We've remained largely silent on this because we haven't really discussed it, but with another listening session coming up, with enough notice like this, we should be able to have an internal meeting and discuss what we think would be best characteristics for the new CEO.

Steinar, go ahead.

STEINAR GROTTEROD: Hi. This is Steinar. I'm the At-Large rep in the Transfer Policy Review PDP, and I'm giving a short minute from the two sessions held at ICANN76. I have to admit that I wasn't able to be there in person. I was also unable to attend the sessions directly. So my report is totally based on listening in to the recordings. There were two meetings, one on Saturday and one on Sunday.

And the takeaway is I think there's two important things. The first thing is that we have discovered that the transfer dispute resolution policy does not allow a registrant to initiate a dispute in the present policy. And I think that is definitely something that we at At-Large should try to force into the new policy.

So what I've done is I have drafted a letter as a response to the early input sent out by the chair to the Phase 2 shorter questions. And one of the things that must decided by the At-Large leadership is whether we should respond to that in a formal way or should just take that into the working group deliberations more informally. I will actually recommend doing it in a very formal way in an At-Large statement because then it makes some sort of volume, and it gets more attention. So that is a take on that one. And the staff and the leadership to have [inaudible] later on.

The other thing is that we need to focus on—and the At-Large members in this working group—the change-of-registrant discussions that are coming up in the next meetings because this in conflict with the present privacy-proxy stuff, the GDPR. And there are things in the present policies that need to be fixed in a good way.

So, finally, the thing is that the PDP working group has done a project change request, and that summarized that we will have, up for the public comment, the total package in August 2024 and then hopefully then have a new policy by February 2025.

So that is my minutes for this. And the rest is on the screen. So thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any more liaison reports? Anybody else available? I didn't hear Lilian last time.

So let's move on and get a social media summary and our contest winners.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LUQUE: Hello, everyone. I'll share a report for the Social Media Working Group. First, the [inaudible] communication 153 [inaudible], 54 participants. And the views on the videos on the promotion—tweets—almost 4,400 views. Only At-Large Twitter account. The video most viewed—Jonathan Zuck—2,000 views.

And the winners of the contest are Harish Chowdhary. Number one is Harish Chowdhary. Second place: [Vanda Scartezini]. And in third place is a three-way tie but was decided by the message of the tweet: [Boku Lauernti]. Surprised face. All Fellowship programs.

Thank you so much. And thank you for your support, staff, working group members, and all—all the community and At-Large. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Lilian. Thank you for all your work on the Social Media Working Group. And we continue to expand our influence. And my takeaway from this is I need to spend more time on Venice Beach. So that's the moral of that story.

Next is a NomCom update.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hi, everyone. Nice to—

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [inaudible]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I'm the official person.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm giving the NomCom update for the outreach.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: [inaudible]

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, exactly. So thanks so much. This is the NomCom update. As you see here, we are looking for leaders. We have a number of positions that are open. Just a little bit of information about the NomCom. The NomCom is an independent committee tasked with filling open leadership positions in the Board, the PTI, the At-Large Advisory Committee, the GNSO, and the ccNSO. And we function independently from the Board as well as from the SOs and the ACs. And we're looking for, as you know, people who can advocate for the entire global Internet community. Within At-Large, as you know, we advocate for the end users, but in the other ones, for the GNSO you're also advocating for their positions, and the ccNSO on theirs. The duties of these members that are not independent ones are listed in the ICANN bylaws. NomCom delegates do not act in the interest of their own group. They're supposed to be acting in the interest of independent observers to the group that appoints them.

So as you see here, these are the types of people that we are looking for: critical thinkers, cultural awareness, knowledge of the Internet, relevant experience. Pretty much anyone could apply to this if they are interested in engaging with the entire community.

Next slide, please. So—next slide. So we are looking for two members for the ICANN Board of Directors. The applications are open until the 23rd of March. So those two members are going to be independent. It's likely that it's not going to be a European member, but that will be discussed later because we're running up against the number of directors that can be from a different region. But pretty much all the other regions—African—we would love to get a new African leader—or Latin American and Caribbean and others.

Next slide. We are also looking for a member of the PTI Board. Now, you have to have certain very technical characteristics to be a member of the PTI Board. And on the NomCom webpage, we list all those very detailed qualifications.

Next slide. Thanks. Now, I neglected to say most of all the leadership positions are voluntary positions, except for the Board. The Board can get paid an honorarium or a certain amount, but they also could not get that amount. They could choose not to get paid. All the other leadership positions that we offer, including the PTI Board, are non-paid leadership positions. And each of these positions are looking for members who can really make a difference. In the At-Large, we are looking for three leaders: one from Latin American and the Caribbean, one from the Asia-Pacific APAC group, and the other …

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALES: Africa.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Africa, yes. And the other one is from Africa. And so if we could get three great people, if you know anyone, please remind them to send in applications in enough time so that they [get it in before] March 23rd. And if you could fill out the information, it'd be really helpful. If you know people who are … In At-Large, as you know, English fluency is not required. It is promoted and especially useful, but within the other ones, it is required because they do not have translation. And so, as we heard in the Board meetings, that is really essential. For all of these positions, we need critical thinkers. We need people with knowledge of the Internet ecosystems.

Next slide. So we need two members of the GNSO. So one of them could be from the contracted party side, and another could be from the non-contracted party side. So it's a wide range of skills, and that person would be on the GNSO Council, unlike the others.

Next slide. We need one person from the ccNSO Council. So usually what they decide is they don't want someone with ccNSO direct experience or has been a member or leader on the ccNSO because they are looking for independent advice with the ccNSO. But the other ones are not regionally specific. At-Large is the only one where we're regionally specific. So that's why incumbent to get others around. Again, the application deadline is on the 23rd of March at the UTC of 23:59.

Next slide. So to repeat, two members of the ICANN Board, one member of the PTI, three members for ALAC, two members of the GNSO, and one for the ccNSO. And again, I'm reminding everyone about the deadline. So please do it because we may not extend it. It all depends. So don't just think, "Oh, they always extend it. I can apply later." Don't come with that thought. And apply now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, we all agree not to come with that thought. Thank you, Judith.

And the next update is from Humberto and Silvia on the LACRALO general assembly.

MARITA MOLL: Hand up. Can I have a question on the NomCom?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No. Yes, Marita, you can. I'm just teasing because you're remote.

MARITA MOLL: Oh, thank you, Jonathan. The problems with remote. In fact, this may not be the right place to ask this question, but I have had some experience with the NomCom application last year. And I had sent in some comments and questions to the NomCom (I guess, to the staff), after the whole thing was over and had kind of hoped to have had some kind of response or reaction to that before the next round of NomCom stuff is coming up.

So I guess that didn't happen, so maybe I can get some idea from our NomCom reps here—I'm not asking for specific information—on how anything was resolved, or if anything was ... Or should I ask this question elsewhere? Just some guidance—

VANDA SCARTEZINI: You can send an e-mail me if you want to directly.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah.

VANDA SCARTIZINI: I can answer right now.

JUDITH HELERSTEIN: Yeah. And also, if you have any questions about the NomCom process, send it to the NomCom staff. And send it in because we always try to improve the process and get responses back to people.

MARITA MOLL: Well, that's what I was …

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: And I'm sorry you didn't get a response back.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. So you guys take an action item to follow up with Marita instead of asking her to reach out again.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That'd be great.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. This is a year back. So I'm surprised, if you're taking that kind of input, that I haven't heard anything. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Marita.

Alright, let's hear about this LACRALO general assembly.

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to stop raising my hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to note, on the ALAC, despite our having translation, English is a requirement for that position.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes because we have the … It's not because of that. It's in the bylaws that … because in the process, we're going to interview people. And the people that will do the interview will be speaking English. So people need to have this capacity to understand and answer in English to be considered because, without that, feedback will be impossible.

ALAN GREENBERG: That notwithstanding, it's in the ALAC rules of procedure and in our NomCom requirements.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you for the clarification.

Humberto and Silvia, you have about five minutes to give us some summary about what went on in the GA.

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Well, I'm saying hello from Chile, and I'm suffering from [inaudible] right now, but I want to talk about that we are very happy about the result [of] the general assembly. We worked very hard for two days, and we connected new people and old people for an hour RALO. We are working in a base of three [countries] to reconnect [inaudible]. When we talk about reconnecting, this is particularly relevant because we suffer from the pandemic. Then it's important to connect again with the LACRALO people. And we need to [inaudible]. And this is about trying to do some politics in ICANN. And we were talking about data protection. And also, we were talking about [inaudible] standard for DNS and name security, which is very relevant for everybody.

And finally, we were working on our statement. We decided to continue discussing this topic because there were a lot of opinions. We are going to keep open the assembly until we have this final statement.

This is a summary of what happened in our general assembly. Thank you very much, Jonathan. That's all.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. And congratulations to everyone involved in the LACRALO general assembly for another successful GA. So that's great.

Alright, Greg Shatan gets 30 seconds to tell us a little bit about NARALO's plan for ICANN77.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. We're all looking forward to welcoming you to Washington, D.C., for ICANN77. And NARALO will be the host RALO, of course. We are planning to have an exciting social event. We have NASIG coming up beforehand at American University, which we're helping to move forward. So there are still slots there. You can sign up for that. We are looking forward to hosting you, and we're going to have perhaps some hidden events and perhaps even—although this is not strictly NARALO—bring back the GEMS band live.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, everyone. Thank you so much. I had a one-on-one session—this meeting with Tripti—and she's a very intelligent and engaging chair and really challenges us to be action-oriented and to accomplish things between meetings. So I challenged her too. So it was a very engaging conversation, and we have some great actions and some things to try and get done before that Washington meeting. And then we'll party like it's 1999.

So thanks, everyone, so much for another great ICANN meeting. Thank you all for your support. With that, we'll call the At-Large portion closed. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]