
ICANN77 | PF – At-Large Leadership Wrap-Up
Thursday, June 15 2023 – 15:30 to 17:00 DCA

YESIM SAGLAM:

Hello, and welcome to At-Large Leadership Wrap-Up session. 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 will include English, French, and Spanish. Click on the interpretation ICANN in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in 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

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.

transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANNs multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to 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 in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC chair. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

What? Oh, yeah. Okay. Thank you. Welcome everyone to our final session. This is the welcome and aim of the meeting. I'll say that the aim of the meeting is Northeast of here. That's where my house is. So, I'm very excited. This has been a great meeting. I'm also very excited for it to come to a close here as well. But I do want to tell a little anecdote that you may or may not have noticed. Greg led a session in here in which we were discussing applicant support and the issue of localization of the pro bono support came up. It began with Sebastian, and it was discussed. The idea of incubators came up. And I don't know if you noticed, but when we were in our auction session, it was just smoothly integrated into Becky's talk who was not in that session of Greg's. Because it's already gone to the Board. The Board thinks that it's important issue to bring up, and it's now part of their parlance, and so when they met with the GAC, they brought it up there too.

So, I just wanted to say that what you say here matters, people listen and sometimes this, I don't know what to call it, loop works and leads to good effects. So, I wanted share that anecdote in case you had noticed that she just smoothly built localization into her discussion and

she hadn't even been here in that session. And it was because of it. So, congratulations. So, we are going to talk about some highlights from the session and do so through our liaison reports. So, who is first? Who should we get? Justine to go first? Okay. Who's our other liaison? Oh, we've got Lianna. Why don't you go first? I don't know where Joanna is. Oh, she's in the GAC. Interesting.

LIANNA GALSTYAN:

Yes. Hi, everyone. Lianna Galstyan, ALAC liaison to ccNSO. I just put the report actually in the report page with the samples that we had. If we can pull that up, I would go through the basic highlights. The ccNSO Council meeting just finished. That was the 197th if I'm not wrong with this number. I think the staff is pulling that up. The basic and one of the big achievements that has been done and adopted was the ccPDP3 review mechanism. If we can Zoom in. No, that was for today's meeting, 15th. Yeah, because it just finished. So, a little bit further. Yes, that's the Council meeting.

So, that was the ccPDP 3 review mechanism report pertaining the decision on delegation, transfer and the retirement of ccTLDs. That was already adopted. That was a very long process of PDP. And then the whole ccTLD community was voting. That has passed and the Council has adopted it. Now the review of that report is ready to go to the ICANN Board for adoption for the further implementation.

Then the Council adopted the proposed timeline for ICANN Board seat 12 nomination process. So, in ccNSO, the process starts quite early, and now that has been the talent has been adopted. Then the next approval and the adoption that has been done is the Council election timeline.

That also has been in place. If I may bring this. Then there are other discussions on the customer standing committee selection timeline, and the representatives. There was approved also the council roles and responsibilities, that there was another process for that, accepting the roles and responsibilities of all Council members and that has been approved already at this meeting. There is another discussion about the rebalancing of the NomCom and ccNSO Council supported the process to start preparing for this discussion, what that would be and the cross-community discussion in this topic.

And also, they discussed the potential ccNSO submission regarding PTI bylaw and change. They are thinking that it would be really good to have the discussion on the budget, first of all changing the timeline to five years, which will be in line with the ICANN strategy, a 5-year strategy and also to have the budget set before going that through discussing the ICANN org budget. So, these were the basically the main things. Another progress was done in terms of reference for Universal Acceptance Committee. And not to make the confusion with the other groups in other constituencies of the Universal Acceptance. They just named ccNSO Universal Acceptance Committee. So, drafting the terms of reference in this group as well. So, these were the main highlights of this Council meeting and that is all from me. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you very much. Any questions from anyone? That's a great update. Thank you very much. I guess we're not going to hear from Joanna. Your time your prep time is up.

JUSTINE CHEW:

All right. Thank goodness I can do two things at one time. GNSO. Okay. Lots of things happening. I'll just probably try and focus on a couple of things, and hopefully that would jot my memory. Of course, the main thing, the main agenda for the next few meetings is going to be the Next Round, all the issues about the Next Round. I suppose I don't really need to repeat it, but you know that there's been a bunch of recommendations that has been approved by a Board. That has gone on to the SubPro implementation review team, and that's ongoing now.

The 38 pending recommendations that the Board is still deliberating on, and it's using the mechanism of speaking to GAC, speaking to GNSO, and I suppose speaking to us as well, to see how we could resolve certain things. And it's come to the point where GNSO has a list of those further actions to be taken, and some of them include involve GNSO putting up clarifying statements. So, the Board has accepted that some of these can be resolved through a clarifying statement by GNSO. There are some where it's probably going to fall into the group of being non-adopted by the Board.

And the one that I need to highlight is Recommendation 17.2, which is the one that has to do with applicant support. Don't worry about that. Actually, I see that as a good thing. Because as I said, if the Board does not adopt it, then GNSO has the opportunity to rework the recommendation through one of the procedures called Section 17 of the whatever. Let's not get into that. But that is the plan. So, GNSO has in mind to rework Recommendation 17.2 regarding applicant support. And at the moment, it's going to throw those tasks back to the Small Team on subsequent procedures or they call it the 38 pending subsequent procedures recommendation. I'm on that small team. I will

remain on that small team. That will be one of my parties on GNSO Council.

And in so far as there is ability to input into how that Recommendation 17.2 is going to be reworked, and that's what I talked about earlier in the session where Greg-- Oh, was it yesterday? It was yesterday. I can't remember. Anyway, so Greg talked about incubator. So, I'm using that as an idea that if you have an idea of how we could increase the breadth of support that we can give to applicant support, qualify applicant support applicants, please talk to me or we could even organize a session on CPWG or something where we can discuss it. I can put a baseline background and we can talk about it in kind of ideas.

So, that's one. So, what I'm trying to say is there are mechanisms in place in GNSO by which by hook or by crook, I'm going to stick my head in there and make sure that we have an avenue to provide input. So, there's going to be a coordination between myself and leadership in CPWG, I guess, to find a way to make sure that our inputs get in there. The one on PICs, there's a bunch of recommendations that deal with PICs and RVCs. And theme there is about enforceability of PICs and RVCs. That one, the latest when I reported at CPWG was headed towards a possible limited bylaw amendment by the Board.

But what has happened since is the Board has said that no, it's only one mechanism that they they're looking at. It's only one possible mechanism, and they're trying actually now not to go to that mechanism. So, they're trying to find a way by which to resolve it, but not using a bylaw change amendment, bylaw amendment. So, things

are still moving, and I will have to find a way to give a proper update. That's 38.

Moving on to DNS abuse. So, after our session, our bilateral with the GNSO, in terms of DNS abuse, there are two outstanding-- I use the term outstanding loosely in here. Two outstanding issues regarding DNS abuse. One is the contractual amendments, so Spec 11 3(b), I want to say, which is supposed to be addressed through these contractual negotiations between ICANN org and the CPH, the Contracted Party House. So, that has gone up for public comment and I think we need to spend time looking at that public comment, and in particular, the ICANN advisory that goes with that. Because the contractual parts of it is one thing. The idea is that the CPH wants to clarify, what is it that the obligation is supposed to mean. But the ICANN advisory, as I understand it, is where ICANN and particularly contract your compliance is relying on to actually monitor to see whether it's being enforced or not. So, we need to look at both in tandem to see whether we are happy with it or not.

I've also gotten a commitment from Council to keep the DNS Abuse Small Team open. Before that, I should talk about the second element. Second element is about the bulk registrations, the role of bulk registrations in DNS abuse, which is something that we, LAC, has put on the table. And the conclusion there is that GNSO does not believe there's enough data or evidence to take a policy approach to bulk registrations. And they are going to look at what happens out of the informal project, the new project that ICANN org has announced that's been under the CTO's office.

But in tandem with that, I have gotten a commitment from GNSO Council to keep the DNS Abuse Small Team running still, using the fact that I think I mentioned that I think Council needs to examine what happens out of the public comment process for the contractual negotiations. And to see whether it actually completely addresses all the concerns that we have received through our outreach mechanisms. And if there are not, if it's not completely satisfactory, then Council should still look at the possibility of having policy around the gaps. And they've agreed to that. So, that's good news. We just have to keep our foot in the door so as to speak.

NomCom rebalancing. So obviously, that's a hot topic within GNSO. I can't tell you what is going on because they are making comments, and now they've decided to set up a small team to discuss it. I don't know what they're going to discuss exactly, but they are now so used to the successes of small teams. They are creating small teams for everything. So, they've asked to create a small team and they're asking for volunteers to go into small team and try to trash out the issue. I don't intend to volunteer for that small team, because I'm not going to get into the-- I don't think it's worth my time to get into the midst of those. But that's happening. What else is there? I think those are the key things that really deserves to mention. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Great. Thank you very much. We've got a hand up from Marita.

MARITA MOLL:

Yeah. Hi. Marita Moll speaking. Thanks, Justine, for that. Oops, sorry. Thanks for that, Justine. On the issue of applicant support, I know that there's been quite a bit talk here saying, okay, this is not going to include any money going to anybody, right, for hiring lawyers and all that, is all pro bono. But I was wondering while I was listening to that and maybe I'm behind on this and it's already happening, is lowering the fees for applicants support applicants, people are looking for community applications, is that part of it? Is there any fee reduction as a pro bono?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. I think you're mixing up a few things. So let me clarify. One is there is a call out at the moment for interested service providers to provide their services on a pro bono basis to applicant support or people who are interested in becoming applicant support applicants. That is proceeding, so that remains unchanged. There is always going to be pro bono services offered. And that doesn't involve any money obviously because it's pro bono. The issue now is, in terms of Recommendation 17.2, there was, the recommendation basically said that apart from the pro bono services that's ongoing, that stays, it stays part of the program, the recommendation also talked about the possibility of increasing the range of services that could be supported through the applicant support.

So, the pro bono services providers list typically involves things registry back-end service provider, so the technical stuff, which is because when you submit an applicant application, you need to be able to name who is going to be your back-end registry. So, they need to be able to pick

somebody to put in the application. So, that is the part that has been done through this pro bono service program.

The Recommendation 17.2 talks about increasing the range and we're talking about things like legal services. So, when you actually put the application together, you need help writing the application, you need help understanding and navigating the application process. What do you look for? Do you need legal services? Those are the sort of things that we thought would be useful for an applicant support applicant to have. And those are the things that are not pro bono, and those are the things that we were seeking funding for under the applicant support program.

The Board's concern was that the way the recommendation was worded was open-ended in terms of how much funds are we talking about, and number two, what sort of service providers are you talking about in addition to legal and writing. Because the way the recommendation was with, for example, so it's not exhaustive. So, the Board's concern was, oh, do you mean I have to pay somebody who cleans the whatever kind of thing. So, I mean, that's an exaggerating example, but it's valid because it's not exhaustive the way the recommendation is worded. And they are also worried about paying third parties.

So, basically the Board saying, do you mean that if you were to apply and you engage a lawyer, I have to pay your lawyer? That is that is what they're concerned about, the third party bit. But as far as SubPro and probably IRT is going to be concerned with is, there is no recommendation that says that the Board has to pay the legal firm. You

can pay the applicant, the applicant can pay the legal firm. So, some things like that could be worked out.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

If I can add. This is something Leon brought up with us when he met with us at the beginning of the week because he is one of the dissenting voices on this particular topic about whether or not the applicant support program can include more than just discounts. Because right now, it's just discounts and the management of a pro bono program. But we've requested and the GNSO had requested that the program itself actually include money spent to help applicants and what would that look like. And there's some fiduciary complexities that Leon is actually trying to contradict. So, Aubrey was covering one side of that and Leon the other that was happening when they were here together. So, that hasn't been resolved yet, but that's a discussion taking place in the Board.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Can I just add one more point about the registry fees? Because Marita mentioned registry fees. So, I can tell you for a fact that registry fees reduction was actually discussed in the PDP, and there was no consensus to it. That's why there is no recommendation to it. But I am actually quite hopeful that it may come back up again, because I'm reading the room in GNSO, they seem to be quite amenable to that now. And this is recorded, so I have to be careful what I say.

We haven't quite worked out, GNSO Council hasn't quite worked out how that reworking is going to happen exactly whether it's going to be

managed by council, whether Council is going to open it up to other non-council people to come in and help write it. But the point is that if we have enough numbers at that level to push through a registry fee reduction and mind you, GAC is also asking for it, so we have support in that respect, then it is going to be a possibility see.

MARITA MOLL:

Okay. That was the question. I didn't know if anybody had brought that up. I was asking for it because I thought, well, that could be legitimate pro bono, like kind of not the same thing, but something. My other thing is about the RVCs. Thank you. And I'm talking about that later, because I heard some interesting stuff about that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Thank you. I will be speaking French. I must say that I am not understanding anything anymore. Absolutely nothing. In the previous bid for the support to candidates, there was a decrease in the fee for the candidates. There was the pro bono element. And in the pro bono element there were legal services, technical services, and many other things. So, when I am told that wasn't there, we're going to add this, I don't understand anything. The other thing is that from what Avri said, I understood that for fiduciary reasons, they did not want to decrease the cost of applications.

That's why I asked, does it mean that when we were in the Board, we made this decision, does it mean that we were contradicting our fiduciary responsibilities? So, I am not sure I understand what is being said here. I'm sure that I am a wrong, but I wanted to say that I do not

understand where we are at. I apologize, but I can imagine that people who are further away from here than I am must be falling into the swimming pool right now.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you for the question or the comment, Sebastien. What I understand is the application fee reduction is still in place. That hasn't changed. There is a recommendation there that stands that they're supposed to get application fee reduction if they qualify. So, they have to get through that qualification process first. So, that's one question. I don't know about legal firms being on the pro bono list the last time, but the pro bono program didn't work out to begin with in the in the last realm. So, there's something that has to be fixed and I think ICANN org is looking into fixing that.

In terms of financial support that the only thing that the applicant support, if they qualified, got was a fee reduction in the application fee. And that is not a financial transaction because you don't pay. If you apply and you're supposed to pay \$100, if you qualify, you only pay \$50. So, it's a reduction from what you would pay ICANN. It's not a reimbursement. If the registry fee reduction, and I'm not talking about application, so application is at the application site. Different fee. Correct. Application is pre-delegation. It's for if you get the TLD. Registration fee is an annual cost to a registry. So, if you got the TLD and you're operating, it is an ongoing support. Nothing to do with application. So, that is one aspect that we're asking for to support qualified applicant support who have gotten their TLDs so that they

don't-- they have some kind of buffer to operate for maybe one or two years down the road. Thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have no problem with the last part, but I want to be-- I am not understanding the same thing about fee reduction because the argument given by the Board member is that program must be, how to say, even for ICANN. Therefore-- But that's the application fee. If you reduce the application fee for some, you increase for the other. But, yes, yes, because total amount must be at no cost for ICANN.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I can answer the question, but talking about two different fees and the fiduciary question is about spending money, not about fee reduction that Aubrey was bringing up.

EDMON CHUNG: Edmon here. Hopefully, I can help and not confuse further. So, there's fee reduction, and I think the concept is any kind of fee reduction is something that would make sense than the other. The problem is out of pocket cost. I want to point you to an important point as well. The Board actually accepted 17.1, the Recommendation 17.1, which includes a bit multiplier. So, it the applicant support-- What do you call that? No. The applicant that got the applicant support goes into a contention set for auction. Of course, that is not implemented yet, but the Board has already accepted the 17.1, which includes this as well as other types of fee reductions. So, I just want to add that part as well.

The amount is actually more than just the applicant fee currently already.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Greg.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. 2Twothings. First, I think one of the appeals of the incubator model, although it obviously hasn't been fully sketched out, but for those who can get the analogy, the incubator staff, if you will, would be there available on for a certain number of hours to each applicant. There wouldn't be kind of this direct payment for services problem. So, you can put together a series of support skilled support people with different skills that would be available. And ICANN in my moment, ICANN could, in essence, fund that and then say that each applicant could get 20 hours of accounting and 50 hours of technical and whatever it might be. Without it being kind of this direct financial, we're paying your bills type of situation.

Secondly, I think one of the problems with the pro bono thing is that the obligation to do pro bono work or really the definition of what pro bono work is for a lawyer in the United States at least, it's either work for people who don't have much money at all, usually, indigent or poor people or it's for organizations that are designed to help people of limited means or it's for organizations that are seeking to protect civil rights, civil liberties, public rights, where the payment of standard legal fees was substantially, deplete their resources. So pro bono.

And there are times-- I've done like starving artist work for some who were weren't even that starving, but it might fall apart where you're being asked to basically work for a medium-sized business so that that may be the issue why you don't get a lot of people doing it because this doesn't really fit into a pro bono. It may be more just—It doesn't really fit the pro bono for the for the public good model. That's what pro bono publico means. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. Thanks. We got to move on, but thank you for the update and the commentary and we'll continue these conversations to make sure that folks have clarity. I think next is Joanna. Tell us a little bit about what the GAC did this week.

JOANNA KULEZSA:

Sure. Thank you very much, and I apologize for coming in late. Just in terms of formalities, this is Joanna Kulesza for transcript record. We have been granted a new ALAC/At-Large liaison from the GAC who is Kristina Hakobyan. She is the Armenian representative on the GAC and she will be our point of contact for planning ICANN78, for example. So, in terms of process, we will be focusing on planning that bilateral hopefully a face to face one at ICANN78. In terms of recap, as you I'm certain recall, we have held our bilateral online as a pre-event to ICANN77. We covered themes of mutual interest which included the joint advice dating all the way back to 2017. We talked about DNS abuse and we did talk about SubPro. And that brings me to the discussion on substance.

It seems as if the both advisory committees are closely aligned on all of these topics. I do note that Justine grabs the initiative to directly contact GAC leads on those specific topic topics and that is a good practice to be shared. So just a piece of information or encouragement to other topic leads if there is anything the liaisons could do to facilitate that direct exchange on a topic that you're leading on behalf of the At-Large, please be sure to reach out and we will make sure that that happens. That offer is also open in terms of intercessional bilateral meetings. That is something Kristina, myself and Nigel, who has kindly promised to keep supporting the bilateral cooperation have talked about.

In terms of intercessional meetings, which have also with time become an element of good practice, we are looking to hold a capacity building session, something that was raised during one of the recent sessions of the GAC was a proposed capacity building session on emerging technologies. That was proposed by Netherlands and I've initiated a conversation on us joining that specific capacity building session. I was acting under the assumption that there would be interest from the community to take part. But what we would love to see happen would be a series of those dedicated intercessional meetings or the two constituencies would be able to discuss issues of mutual interest. Suggestions for such issues are always most welcome.

One might think also of a more general capacity building intercessional meeting that would focus on the multi-stakeholder model itself. Nigel kindly suggested, we might wish to think about introducing the At-

Large community to the 40 new GAC members. GAC has 40 new members and their awareness of the multi-stakeholder model might be concerningly low, so we were thinking that might make sense.

Themes of mutual interest is already noted include the SubPro and it seems as if we are fully aligned there, and I do leave it to Justine to fill in the gaps if anything needs to be added there. It seems as if we are all so closely aligned on the issue of closed generics as being both of high interest to both communities but also quite challenging in terms of definitions and execution. The third theme of continuous mutual interest includes DNS abuse. There was a small working meeting, held with representatives of the GAC's Public Safety Working Group.

It seems as if both constituencies are satisfied with the proposed registry agreement amendment that addresses the concern of DNS abuse. And I understand that our community, our constituency will be looking to approve of recommendation of approval of that amendment being introduced. We do not flag any specific concerns with neither the process nor the substance, and that is also a position shared by the GAC. So once again, both parties support the DNS abuse amendment to the registry agreement as it is being proposed.

The invitation to cooperate with the Public Safety Working Group on DNS abuse-related issues is open and that collaboration will be continued. We thought it also might make sense at some point once Org is ready to provide us with the details to do an outreach on how the redress system might work and there is consent and eager engagement from the Public Safety Working Group members to make sure that at outreach informing the community of how the system might work will

happen. I have noted no action items regarding the 2017 joint advice also following our intercessional or pre-ICANN77 bilateral, but I'm glad to stand corrected. So, if there's any interest to continue that discussion including, for example, Org representation in it, I will make a diligent note thereof.

And further action items include a kind request to community members to indicate topics of mutual interest that might be discussed at ICANN78 and possibly themes of a joint capacity building exercise to be held intercessionally. That's all I have on my list, but I'm always glad to answer questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you. Thanks a lot, Joanna. I'll add that I've had the-- after our auctions session there was a kind of crystallization around some things that we really agree on with the GAC and so there have been a number of GAC reps that have talked to me about potentially doing a joint piece of advice on auctions, which I think could be very powerful, the 2017 joint advice notwithstanding. This might be the time. This might be the one that could really be influential. We have a hand up here from oh, that's Andrey probably. Andrey, is that for your update, or was that a question about the GAC update?

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV:

It's my update.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, let me just make sure the queue is clear of any questions for Joanna, and then I'll turn it over to you. Any other questions about the GAC? All right, Andrey, go ahead, please.

ANDREY KOLESNIKOV: Hello, again, everybody. It's Andrey Kolesnikov speaking. Just a quick follow up. After the joint meeting between ALAC and SSAC, I just returned from the wrap up in the SSAC and we just discussed this meeting. And there are some thoughts about how it was going. The delivery of the items which we just saw an hour ago was pretty much the same traditional. There is nothing else to add to that, but what we've just discussed in SSAC that there is, I would say, the digital divide between some of the topics between SSAC and ALAC in terms of level of understanding of what was delivered by the SSAC, especially the DSO automation group. That's a hard topic.

And what we've just discussed is that probably for the next meeting, we should spend some time between the chairs or between the speakers, just to make sure that the interpretation of the certain work parties are good enough at the level appropriate for the clear understanding of the message. And there are a few topics I should say, as an example. For example, the name collision projects, which is going for a couple of years already, as I can see, as others can see by the reaction of the ALAC stakeholder group, is that this project is quite clear for understanding, and most of the people understand the issues, and what the name collision is, and what the impact and what are the actions will be taken prior the acceptance of the certain applications. That's pretty good level of interpretation.

On the other hand, the GS automation is important because this part is missing and prevents the distribution, the wide adoption of the DNSSEC. So, in terms of overall architecture and security and stability of the Internet, this topic is important, but the technical realization of this project, in details, it's really hard to explain to the people who's not IT professionals in a big way. So, we've decided to spend some time trying to make this presentation, to make this delivery easier for understanding.

Another issue, which Patrick, of course Patrick raised is a name collision, not in in a root zone, but the name collision in the characters. When the certain combinations of characters is acceptable for the TLD and in the second-level domain, it may cause some confusion. This topic is also very clear for most of the ALACers, as far as I understand. So, this is another topic we probably should raise up as a joint topic between SSAC, ALAC, etc. So, the proposal probably will be like before going into the joint meeting, to make sure that the level of presentation is acceptable for the most parties. And also, yeah, I think that the liaison role, at least the next liaison role would be bringing much of the ALAC topics back to the SSAC so they'll be synchronized from both sides prior to the joint meetings. So, the discussion will be going much easier. That's my two cents for the follow up for the wrap up. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's great. Sort of fresh in our minds since it was our last meeting. Thank you. Any questions for Andrey? Okay. Vanda, let's do a NomCom update. It's nice to see you out in the open. That's coming up.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Thank you very much for having me here. We just finished the 12 [inaudible 00:46:19]. So, thank you very much. And as we cannot share the names of the winners, but just full information about that probably in amounts. They finalized the due diligence and they will publish. Of course, will be for the candidates themselves to talk about that if they've been formed, they can talk. It's not for us. But just to give you, we have a record of application this year, 155, application, 39% from Africa, 25% from Asia Pacific, 9% from Europe, 15% from Latin American Caribbean area, 12% for application for North America. 20% of application are female and 59% are male and 14% did not disclose.

So, what we have done is two members to the ICANN Board of directors, one member for the PTI Board, three regional representatives for this group, ALAC from AFRALO, LACRALO and APRALO. So, two for generic names for GNSO, one for a contracted house, the other for a non-contracted house, and the one for a country code name. For each position, we have one alternate person in case there is some problems with the person that was selected or people cannot apply or move the job, a lot of things could happen. And a lot of things could happen and people cannot accept the application selection that we have made.

So, it was a very intense task, but very good. We change during this meeting in the beginning of this meeting most of our previous staff, so new one come. And I'm pleased to share that they have been very, very good ones. And inter-running is not easy, especially in a group like that with a huge process to follow but they did it very well. And the former one, Gia, was with us and helped a lot. So, thank you very much for this and we hope all the new selectees from our region here for all of us will be the best candidates that we got in this lot. And, yeah, they made a

very good presentation, they made very good applications, and we are happy to have them to our group in ALAC. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks so much. I look forward to meeting the new ALAC members and the new Board members. Any questions for Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Everybody happy? Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. All right. Excellent. I think next is Hadia talking about sessions and session reports.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hi. This is Hadia. So, I will start with the first session on Monday, which was the joint session ALAC, GAC and GNSO facilitated dialogue on closed generics. And I don't want to put Greg or Alan on the spot but if you could report on it, if not, that's fine. I will put the name of one of you on the list and then maybe you could fill the report later. Is that good enough? Okay, great. I will put your name, Greg. And then we have the second session was the At-Large Policy Session: A User Perspective: The next gTLD Application Window.

And quickly, so we had two Board members, Avery Doria and Leon Sanchez, they talked about how the Board is looking into different options through which support can be provided to applicants. So, they mentioned in addition to a reduction in the fees of the application or

having the application fees waived, there could be some money put aside in order to provide other sorts of support, like for example, support in relation to drafting the application or other forms of support it.

Also, some concerns were discussed related to the providers of the pro bono services, mentioning that those mainly come from rich countries or from Europe and America and if there could be more inclusion. Some ideas for applicant support were discussed like having for example an incubator model for applicant support. Ideas for promotion, for example having ambassadors for the new gTLD round, similar to the Universal Acceptance ambassadors. Thoughts included the need to have a transparent eligibility process. Of course, that will be provided through the SubPro recommendations. Possible three stages application support, like a pre-application support that would be for promotion and propagation of information, and then application support and then post-application support for resolving any post-application issues. I'm just listing the thoughts or ideas or items or elements that were mentioned during the session.

Also, another thing mentioned was a regional At-Large playing a regional role in identifying possible contentions that could happen in order to eliminate those kinds of contentious before they happen, like for example, something like the .Amazon. If we could spot any possible contentions that could happen and try to address them before. The importance of course of Universal Acceptance for new gTLDs, planning with the GSE team in terms of having outreach activities in various regions, the inclusion of ALSs in the promotion of the New Round and the promotion of the pro bono services. Finding people in every region

that are capable of providing consulting services and helping potential applicants.

So, the takeaways, general takeaways. Promotion is not only needed for the New Round, but for the services provided as well as such as the pro bono services. Exploring new ideas like, for example, having ambassadors for the new round. The need for organized collaborative promotion and awareness campaigns. Exploring ideas like the incubators and others mentioned during the session.

So basically, that's a summary of the session. I will stop here and now hand it to Satish. Satish, do you want to--? Oh, okay. On Monday also there was the first of four EPDP session for IDNs, that one discussed the IDN variants. We continue to discuss the IDM variants at the second level, proceeding with the foundational issues. Just a second. I'm sorry. Of what principles apply at the second level and what principle at the second level could be similar to those of the top level.

There was another session on Monday for it's the New gTLD Program Next Round Implementation Status Recap and Q&A. I'm not sure who should be reporting on that. Justine, would you?

JUSTINE CHEW: This is, sorry, which?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: It's the Monday. It was on Monday, the new gTLD program next around implementation status recap. I could just put the name of-- You don't

need to report now or it doesn't have to be even you, like anyone who attended the session--

JUSTINE CHEW: It's not the IRT. It's the other one.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah, I know. Okay. So, it doesn't have-- Anyone who would like to volunteer to report on that session, I will put his/her name. Justine? Right. Okay. Here you are. Let's go to the Tuesday sessions. We had the GAC and GNSO session, and Tommi reported on that. Tommi, would you like to quickly walk us through your report? Thank you.

TOMMI KARTTAIVI: Tommi Karttaavi, on the record. Sorry about that. Yeah. There were a lot of things covered in the session. Am I too far from the microphone? Can you hear me all right? Okay. I'll get it closer. Better now? So, on the agenda, there were DNS abuse mitigation, registration data request service and the New gTLD Program Next Round. Also, AOB, they discussed the GAC communique on issues of importance to the GAC.

So, I think that maybe the specific takeaways from this session for the At-Large were that it seemed that the GNSO Council thinks that implementing some of the GAC advice, especially on private auctions, would significantly delay the new gTLD process in the current timeline of which is 96 weeks, but they said that that's a best guess. And it could be longer. So, that's it from me.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Tommi. And now we go to Bill, I think. So, there was another session. The second session on closed generics and Greg or Alan, if you don't want to report on it now, I would put your name again, Greg?

GREG SHATAN: I can report briefly and Alan can amend and extend my remarks, we had two sessions of the closed generics facilitated discussion. The first session was largely a rehash of how we got to where we got and some of the disagreements or differences of opinion between different people. That's not what the session was planned to be, but that's what it turned out to be. The second session concentrated more on the actual proposal, the framework that the group has now put out for public comment. We went through a number of the different pieces of the proposal relating to applications, evaluation, post-delegation, etc., and had lively comments from various members of the group to provide some additional information regarding some of the issues.

The public comment is very important for At-Large to come back on. And in addition to comments from ALAC there could certainly be comments from RALOs and from individual members and structures as well if needed or wanted. I don't want us to make a din, but I think it's important to come back and comment. There are some people who think that the model is unworkable, others who think it's perhaps too easy or too hard. The bottom line is whether this is a workable method for limiting closed generics to substantial public interest goals. So, I'll let Alan go next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess they're very short summaries. And At-Large has never come to a definitive position on closed generics. Those who feel it would be a bad thing will probably be somewhat unhappy with this report, the framework. Those who think that, yeah, why not what's wrong with closed generics would be reasonably happy with it. It remains to be seen whether the GAC is happy with it. Remember, the people on this group were explicitly told you do not represent your organization. You're just here try to find a path forward. Therefore, it is not a given at all that the GAC will accept or not accept the framework. We'll see where it goes.

The staff proposed a way forward, which included the ALAC, the GAC, and the GNSO having to approve the framework, the final framework once it's refined after the comment. There was a comment made during the meeting that that's ridiculous. We can't wait for people to approve it. We have to start EPDP. The final conclusion is the GAC at the very least has to approve it. Whether that's a formal approval, a tacit non-approval or the lack of non-approval is not clear, but clearly there is no point in going forward with closed generics which the GAC objected to start with, if they're not happy with this plan going forward. So, we'll see where it goes.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. Yeah. Go ahead.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Just to add some color to it. There were questions asked on the GNSO Council as to whether anyone needs to approve the framework for it to go on to the EPDP. And I don't have a definitive answer for you. Some people seem a thing that the answer is yes, some people seem to think the answer is no. So, what I'm suggesting is perhaps we might need to prepare our minds for EPDP. And mind you, some of the people in Council also question whether EPDP is the right way to go, but they don't have any-- Because they do not have any proposed alternative, looks like it's going to be an EPDP. And the commitment is there by Council to say that the EPDP is going to be open.

I don't know what that means exactly and how that's supposed to progress the work from the closed generics. And the EPDB is scheduled to run for 96 weeks as a maximum timeline. But at this point in time, that isn't still what they call the critical path that's holding up the next round. That mantle is currently held by the IDN CPDP. But that could change in time, in which case, closed generics might become the critical path and it may actually force Council to think about holding back closed generics as a dependency, which is what I suggested earlier. Go back to the Board and say, just move on with the Next Round without closed generics.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will comment that, and I'll use names. These are both public meetings. Jeff Newman as a member of the civil head dialogue and a representative of the GNSO at the meeting on closed generics said he didn't believe that approval was necessary. At the GNSO Council

meeting, Jeff Newman, as liaison to the GAC, made it clear the GAC believed they had approval rights. So, that's where it goes.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you, Alan. And now we have Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: There was some discussion in the corridor. I wanted to understand if there is an agreement by the three bodies of framework. Is it an expectation of the closed generic or it's just an expectation of the process to discuss it? It seems that it's not clear, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you're talking about what may have to be accepted, we're talking about the contents of the framework, not the process.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Let's imagine that the framework is accepted by the three bodies. Is it a long start to have closed generic or it is just a possibility to open a PDP to decide if we closed generic or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: If the framers is accepted as close to what it is now, then the PDP will decide on the rules. There's no question or framework provides for closed generics and the PDP would have. That would be within the charter of the PDP. No question in my mind anyway.

GREG SHATAN: Very briefly, it's possible the PDP could fall apart and not come to consensus, in which case, it wouldn't happen either.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. And let's move to the next session. If possible, I would skip to Wednesday because Naveed needs to leave and he wants to report on his session. So, Naveed, it's the GAC discussion on DNS abuse and emerging technologies. Please go ahead, Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Thank you. This is Naveed. Apologies for that. I have to be somewhere. This session has actually four agenda items and part of it we discussed in this morning session already. So, one of them was the discussion on the proposed amendment on the contract amendments on registry. So overall, GAC was for this amendment, but they had some opinion about, as we have discussed, about the metrics that there is some vague language in that like prompt or appropriate action or something like that. So, through public comment, they want to emphasize it to be measurable. So, that's the overall outcome of this one.

Then there was an interesting presentation on .EU, where they shared their experience about having this abuse prediction mechanism through an engine that they've developed. So, I mentioned the name of the engine here, which is A-P-E-W-S, which is Abuse Prediction and Early Warning System. So, that tries to detect or predict that this domain is going to be as abusive based on some machine learning

algorithms, and they presented that 4 out of 5 times they were correct in predicting that this is going to be abusive. And for the one that has a false positive, then they manually check it and make sure that they don't go wrong. And they intended to share it with other ccTLDs in Europe to start with, right?

So, then there was a small discussion on the public comments around contract amendments. And they concluded the session. It was not very long, but there was a start of discussion on emerging technologies, as Joanna mentioned already. They highlighted three emerging technologies. One of them was artificial intelligence, blockchain and alternative DNS. So, the AI, they were not much interested as accepting it as emerging technologies related to DNS, but the other two, most of them that participated in the discussion wanted to have session, detailed session on that in ICANN78. So, I hope they will do it and we look forward to that. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Naveed. And we will have to move swiftly back to Tuesday because we are running out of time. So, we have the pre- and post-pandemic ccTLD registration trends and I guess you reported already on that, Lianna. Oh, do you want to--

LIANNA GALSTYAN:

Actually, so the report is on there because we don't have much time, I wouldn't reflect on this report this day. You can read the main takeaways that end users and a specific ccTLD to be aware of the measures carried out to provide security and quality to obtain

registration. So, that was an interesting session actually, but you can read the report. I will skip it. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Lianna. And then on Tuesday also there was a session about DNS negotiations, a Contracted Party House outreach session. And Bill Jouris, do you want to report on that?

BILL JOURIS:

Very briefly. In the grand tradition of people toiling away in the arts for decades in order to become an overnight success, the Contracted Party House and ICANN have come together on some amendments to the basic contract to address DNS abuse. Those are up for public comment until middle of next month. I'm not sure there's anything constructive that we might do in the way of comments, but they're out there.

More interesting to me was the draft of the advisory from Compliance on how they proposed to enforce these amendments if they come to pass. That's not the kind of document that gets public comment, but they indicated they would be open to suggestions and comments at any time. So, we might want to at least take a quick glance through it. It's 15 odd pages and see if there's anything we want to talk Compliance about that's it. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you, Bill. And then there was--

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just briefly. We do have Alan actually composing a short public comment on this topic, basically congratulating them and approving these contract changes. But we should take it on perhaps as a CPWG topic to see whether or not we want to do correspondence or something with the contract compliance over their advisory. So just add that onto your pipeline, Hadia. Thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Hadia for the record. And then there was a session about the new gTLDs, the title was New TLDs Need Digital Inclusion: Universal Acceptance Readiness is Just the Beginning. So, that's was moderated by Naela from ICANN org. Senior Vice President Engineering and Chief Information Officer of ICANN Org talked about ICANN's journey for Universal Acceptance Readiness. It's a journey that would take seven years. So, this for me was like-- Universal Acceptance challenges and experiences related to UA Readiness-- Well, they mentioned many challenges. I don't think we need to go through them because we've mentioned them many times, but they did mention the Universal Acceptance Day, which was successful. About 50 events were held over 40 countries around the world.

I think the one new thing-- two main things we can take from this session. One is to start looking at Universal Acceptance from a digital inclusion perspective. And the other takeaway is to start also looking into having Universal Acceptance by design. Like we have security by design, privacy by design so let's also have Universal Acceptance by design. So, trying to always fix what's there is not working that good. So maybe those are like the main takeaways of the session.

Then on Tuesday also there was the guidance process for applicant support working group session. And I will put Maureen there. Maureen will be reporting on this. And then I have Satish now. He will be reporting on the second EPDP second IDNs working group meeting. Satish. And he will make also an announcement.

SATISH BABU:

Right. So, thanks, Hadia. Satish, for the record. So, this week we had four sessions on EPDP. The second session basically continued discussions on the same entity constraint at the second level. Because the phase 1 report is out, that is a top level. Right now, we are working on the phase 2 questions, and this is at the second level. And it turns out that the second level becomes even more complex when you look at the lifecycle of the labels and trying to wrap our heads around the problem. We have made some progress, and the progress has been generally made by pushing it downstream to the registries, saying that we won't make policy here at the top, let each registry create policy. We will consider a few overriding cross-cutting concerns, but leave the rest to the registry. That is basically what's happening.

Now, I have an announcement here which is time critical. We are running up across a deadline of 19th of June for the phase 1 initial report. So, actually, we had a plan and everything is ready, but we had a dependency there in the plan. And that was that the previous session, SSAC session, we had to get something from SSAC, so we had actually put an agenda item there. But unfortunately, we couldn't discuss that. We ran out of time that session, and we had to basically relay them on the corridors to get some information from them.

I can't report that it's been completely satisfactory. There are still some gaps, but we have not been able to kind of fulfill those gaps. The good news is that we are about 95% done, and hopefully 100% done, but we don't have much time. So, what's happening is we were actually working on the last bits of it. It is now 99% complete, but before this evening, we will send it out to staff for the voting. And the voting should take place in about 48 hours, but we realize that people are traveling so we do have a bit of a problem. The final deadline, and also this is not just a plain statement, it's a very complicated table with about 68 recommendations, each of which has got to be entered separately. So, the idea was that we'll give it to staff, and staff will enter it into that in the template. But they'll require at least a day for that.

So, when you work backwards, assuming that this tonight, we're able to send it out, 48 hours for voting, and then it goes to staff and they enter it. So, this is the plan right now. Apologies for the sudden push and trying to do this while people are traveling, but we didn't have much choice with this. I'd be happy to answer any questions on this latter part.

HADIA ELMINIAMI:

Okay. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. Sorry about the SSAC meeting. Certain things got off going long. I think we'll have to look at this. I don't think anybody's going to have a substantive comment now about this big matrix, but we'll try to be efficient about voting on it. Do we know if it's possible to apply for an

extension for a couple of days, given the deadline proximity to the end of the meeting? Okay. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. Thank you. This is Hadia for the record again. So now we go to Wednesday, and the first session on Wednesday was subsequent procedures, IRT. Justine, I don't think you need-- Do you want to report?

JUSTINE CHEW: In my opinion was pretty much a waste of time.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. So, I will still put your name in here if you would like to put some points in the report.

JUSTINE CHEW: You can put no comment in that box.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Okay. No comment. And then we had the third IDNs working group meeting. And again, we continued discussing the second level, the variants at the second-level domain. And I think the one important thing that we need to take care of is not touch or to preserve the registrant's choices, competition and open markets because there were discussions, if an applicant has one variant and another applicant has another variant, and we are grandfathering this situation, but we don't

want it to hang there forever. So, should we restrict the registrants from transferring to certain registry--? Okay. I'm not getting into the--

JUSTINE CHEW:

Let me help you out, Hadia. So, essentially, the problem that we see is we are making policy for future things that haven't been registered, which we can now control by policy. So, if we stipulate that only the same entity can register a bunch of domain names at the second level that belong to a set, that's not an issue because if that's becomes policy, then the registries and the registrars can handle that. And they are part of the policy-making process anyway.

The issue is that because second-level domain names have already been in existence for 20 or years on the IDN side, it is now a question of do we want to impose new policy on existing registrants, which now get caught in a group of what we determine to be domain variants. So, the idea is that we say, no, new policy applies to new fresh situation, whatever's in existing, we grandfather, and we try to preserve their right.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Yeah, it's about the grandfathering existing domains. So anyway, this was part of the discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Where are you? You know we have five minutes left is the problem. So, where are you in your sessions? Maybe we need to revert over to written

reports at this point just because of interpretation. Those poor people need to be able to leave. We're really running up against it.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

So, this is Hadia again for the record. So, we are on Wednesday, the session about the IDNs on the IDNs working group session. And the discussion was about the second-level domains, the variants at the second-level domains. The following session was the GAC discussion on DNS abuse and emerging technologies, and Naveed already reported on that one. Following is the IANA governance proposals. I'm not sure the PTI/IANA governance proposals. I'm not sure who attended this session and who would like to report on it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Maybe follow up with people after and we'll get some written ones because I don't think we have any time for any more session reports.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

No. We have you we need you to report on your session.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

It was so good. It was the best session ever. No. I mean, I think a lot of people have come up to us and enjoy the sessions. People learn from it. We even have a Board member here in the audience that was become a convert as a result of that session. I think it will suggest a path forward with potential joint advice with the GAC. So, I think it served the purpose it was meant to serve, and I'm very excited by that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you so much and now we are done with the session reports.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Awesome. Thank you so much, Hadia. I know it was a lot. So quickly, let's move to social media updates and the awards and we'll wrap things up.

LILIAN IVETTE DE LEQUE BRUGES: Okay. Thank you, Jonathan. Lilian for the records. Quickly. First, thank you so much to the ALAC for the opportunity to be mentor. My chair finished in this meeting, ICANN77. Welcome to the new mentor, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi. Second, three winners of our traditional Twitter contest. Shadrach Ankrah, most tweets. Shadrach is here? Oh, Shadrach. Second, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, influencers and good promotion. And the third winner is Gerardo Martinez, who is online for most retweet. Thank you so much for participating.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That was great. That's the best update ever. That was awesome. I know we have to let the interpreters go very soon. I have just a quick announcement here at the end. See Gisella, make sure all of the logistics to get to these evening's festivities and where the shuttle will be and when and things like that, but it's 6:30 some place. So be prepared for that and looking forward to seeing all of you. There's not any more time. Okay. Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry. At-Large is also the RALO. RALO have done a lot of works and you will follow the work within the RALO. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. The At-Large is also the RALOs and I apologize that we need to make this session longer if we're going to do so many things. One last thing that I wanted to announce, I wanted to wait till the end so that we wouldn't be mournful the entire meeting and distracted, but Chantel is leaving us. Yes. I think it's a secured to a sway to rejoin the BC. So, I'll let her talk to each of you individually later on this evening, but please join me in thanking her for all of her hard work and be and begrudgingly wishing her the best in her new endeavors. Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, thank you very much, Jonathan. I had a lovely speech prepared, but thank you for putting that out there. I do want to thank Chantelle. She has come in and this is a position, I just want to back up, this is a position that has seen a lot of turnover, and that's because we train them very well. So, we have sent them to other teams within the policy department. We've sent them to other departments in ICANN. This time, we are really losing her from the organization. However, she's going to mention that she's not gone forever, but even within our work from internally and with all of you, she has made such a mark already with process and mechanisms to make things much more efficient that will carry on.

So, I also want to announce that I'm going to step in with Claudio in the interim, but we already are looking for not a replacement you can't be replaced, but someone to help you on your continuous journey and policy advice. So, I'm going to turn it over to Chantelle.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, Heidi and Jonathan. I had some lovely remarks and anecdotes prepared as well, naming a few of you in here and just the memory we've made. So, I'll keep it short and I'll try to share those this evening but Greg, I think I'm going to be following you again. Thank you again for your membership hopefully as a NARALO individual mentor in the future. And Jonathan, thank you. Hadia and Olivier, thank you, Gisela, Yesim, Heidi, Silvia. And a big thank you to Claudia who onboarded me and set me up for success this would not have been possible without her as well, but I look forward to continuing the conversation tonight. So, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you all. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]