
ICANN77 | PF – At-Large Leadership Welcome to ICANN77
Monday, June 12 2023 – 09:00 to 10:15 DCA

YESIM SAGLAM:

Hello, and welcome to ICANN77 and Talking Points 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 session will include English, French, and Spanish. 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.

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.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder 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:

Thanks, Yesim, and thanks, everyone, and welcome to ICANN77. It's hard to believe there's been 77 of these meetings. At some point, I'm going to ask chatGPT to summarize the talking points of the last 77 meetings and find out the five things that have been discussed at every single meeting. Welcome to Washington, D.C. My home since graduate school. We should have an excellent meeting here. As you might imagine, a big focus of this meeting, especially as a policy forum, is the next round of new gTLD applications. There's a desire on the part of the community to get that round started as soon as they can because it's been a long time since the last one. If there's any mantra, it's from us. It's that we're on board to get it done as quickly as possible without sacrificing the interests of individual end users.

The way that I've described that to the board is the prevention of the unintended consequences of the last round and the promotion of the intended consequences from the last round. Unintended consequences might have to do with the rush of DNS abuse, might have to do with the kind of gaming that was associated with auctions, the failure of the safeguards, some of the inconsistency of string confusion, etcetera., etcetera. One of the primary intended consequence was to

open up the idea of applications to a broader spectrum of the global community. And if nothing else, that has to be described as a loss for the previous round. So those are probably our two big issues is let's look at what went wrong in the last round and what didn't go right and try to correct both of those things for this round.

So I think that's going to be a theme for a lot of our sessions and a lot of our work. But that's enough for me by way of introduction. So I will, with this moment, actually just introduce our old friend here, our representative to the board, Leon Sanchez, who's going to tell us how he's fighting for end user interests on the board and what to expect for the meeting. Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Jonathan, this is Leon Sanchez, and I will speak in Spanish to take advantage of the interpretation services, if I may. Leon Sanchez speaking. Welcome everyone to Washington, D.C., to this ICANN77 meeting. As Jonathan was saying before, it's a pleasure to welcome you here in the home of many people because here there are many colleagues and friends living in Washington. Effectively, one of the topics of this meeting and the topic of many other meetings was the new round of new gTLDs. And of course, this is a huge topic that the board has been discussing extensively. During our workshop that took place before the ICANN public meeting, as it is the case in every ICANN public meeting, we devoted two full days out of the four days for our workshop, we devoted two days to discuss the pending topics in relation to this new round of new gTLDs.

We discussed the pending recommendations that are approved by the board. Some of these recommendations are classified as recommendations needing some aspect or some clarification by the GNSO, some others are classified as recommendations that might be accepted provided that small modifications are being made for them to be feasible, and there are some other recommendations that are being classified as rejected because the board thinks or feels that those recommendations might not be in favor of the community interest and the global public interest. So within these categories, we have some of the topics that Jonathan mentioned before, namely the auctions, how to solve the issue of auctions and avoid the issues that came up during the first round and that were difficult to foresee.

But now, after the experience we have gathered, now we will be trying to avoid to repeat situations we had in the past, in the previous round. And of course, we are aware of the fact that there will not be a perfect round. We will be learning from our experience, we can improve things, but I am fully sure that this is not going to be a perfect round. A very specific topic that we have been discussing, and it was the topic of one of our sessions, was the applicant support issue, that is to say the support for applicants.

And part of the support that is going to be provided is similar to the previous round. There will be discounts in the application fees, perhaps to exempt applicants for some fees. And ALAC provided advice to the board regarding this topic, and if I am not mistaken, the idea was to provide financial assistance or aid to applicants requiring that aid in order to have more applications coming from those regions in the countries that are developing regions or applications coming from

developing countries, mainly Africa, Latin America, some areas in Asia. The regions might need this type of support.

It was a controversial issue within the board, but at the end of the day, the topic I wanted to convey, the message I wanted to convey, I think is aligned with the concerns that we all have here in this room. And this is that if support is going to be limited to give discounts or make exceptions, then the support is going to be very limited, because for us to be able to get to that point of exempting people from paying fees or discounting, it means that we have undergone a satisfactory evaluation process.

But if people or applicants do not have the necessary resources to be able to file their applications and to file all they need in the application and they cannot apply, so they will never get the support. So this is a sort of loop. We are not receiving the applications because there are no applicants, but there are no applicants because they don't have the support.

So I am trying to advocate for providing a certain amount of money to provide funds since the very beginning for people showing or proving that they need that support. Because we have a real problem, and this is that we do not want to have an application pool requiring the support. But at the end of the day, we are just financing other activities, pretending to be an application and pretending to request for support. We don't want an industry of people trying to advocate for applications with the only objective of gaining or getting that support. So I was asking my board members, my fellows, to provide support, and your support will also be very valuable for me, because we need to start

thinking about a mechanism to have a sort of limited amount of resources.

Resources are always limited, but we need a limited amount of resources to be assigned to provide these financial supports for applicants and the criteria that people requesting this support should meet for them to be able to access these benefits. And we need to understand that the mechanism is not going to be perfect, of course. Resources may be assigned as they are requested, and they need to prove that they really have the need of those resources, that the applicant belongs to a region where the resources are needed. It's a complex issue to deal with, but as you can see, we have been discussing the topic for 10 minutes at least now, and in our session in the board, the session took many hours to discuss. So we spoke about, and I think I need to change my mic, sorry for that, and I see myself on the screen.

Other topics that we were discussing were the advancements in the CEO Search Committee. Tomorrow we will be holding a session where the committee and the board will be reporting these advancements to the communities. Unlike other sessions, tomorrow's session is not going to be a listening session, as it was the case in the past with different parts of the community and external stakeholders. However, there will be room for questions, but the goal of tomorrow's session is to provide you with a report about the advancements and to give you an outlook of the timelines we are planning the next steps, and of course, we will try to address any concerns. Within the comments at the at-large Skype chat, I circulated those comments with the board members, and I was able to read all the concerns expressed in that chat, and they are being addressed as well.

Yesterday, we had an ordinary board meeting. We discussed some topics in the consent agenda, and we also had a discussion about an independent review resource that was started by NAMETIP against ICANN due to some limitations or due to the price caps for.info and.org. So there was a resolution being issued by the board, and the board instructs to perform the market study to determine where there is any predominant, if.info or.org has any predominant power. And once this study is ready, the BMC, which is the accountability committee, and the review committee will review all this information, and with this information, a recommendation will be delivered to the board. The resolution we passed yesterday is just a preliminary resolution that requires further analysis and further assessment by the committee and by the board.

So this is what we have been doing so far during our retreat in the board workshop. Today we will be discussing other topics. We will continue discussing the next round, and particularly we will be discussing the future venues for next ICANN meetings. So probably you will see some resolutions being passed. So with that, I am open to your comments and questions. And once again, I thank you for being so kind with me and for inviting me. Again, that it's a pleasure to come back home and to be with you. Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Leon. And as we learned here, Leon is our guinea pig. The microphone dictates where the camera is going, so don't reach too far away from yourself for a microphone. And those that are having difficulty finding interpretation because you're on a tablet, it's under

more. It's the things I'm seeing in the chat. I'll take the opportunity to ask the first question or make the first comment, Leon. Thank you for your support, ongoing support, on the issue of applicant support.

If it helps at all, I will remind you to remind the board that when we, the At-Large, had a session on application support and there was a survey of the audience that included Becky and Avri on what would constitute success of applicant support, and the choice was a much better outreach program that we could measurably see reached more people or actual new strings that were the result of applicant support, even if it was only one or two, the answer was the new strings.

And that sentiment, if don't, and Maureen, correct me if I'm wrong, but that sentiment is reflected in the work of the small team on applicants, I forget which the letters are, GGP or whatever, for applicant support. That sentiment's reflected as well, that one of the key criteria of success is in fact someone making it all the way through the process and a string existing so the map doesn't look the way that it does now. So hopefully those two incidences are, give you fuel for the arguments that you're making.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Jonathan. They definitely do. And I'm going to switch to the other microphone. So no, that definitely helps and that's actually the message that I was trying to deliver to my board colleagues. It is not enough to say that we are going to support applicants if we don't have them have a successful journey that ends up being a delegated string. That's how at least I see success and I think that we share that view.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks very much, Jonathan. And thank you very, very much, Leon. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I tire, and it's not just because I'm getting old, I tire because I'm constantly hearing this dare I say, insert a couple of letters and nonsense about the risk of gaming with applicant support. For heaven's sake, we built such a belts and braces and cross-checked and quadruple-checked and made it so difficult last time that, gee, surprise, combined with less than ideal communications and really too little too late outreach, it wasn't a success.

Come on, are we building to succeed or building to fail? Not happy vibes coming, but it is vital if we are going to get underserved and underrepresented communities to take the risk. So I'm going to implore you, my dear board member, to implore the rest of your board members to, I am so tempted to say what you think I'm going to, but I won't, and take the risk, put in the checks and balances, and our own community has shown that it will be the toughest judge of all, and dare I say, take it beyond just delegation. These risks of gaming can be looked at beyond just delegation. So this whole, oh my heavens, it will become an industry, come on. You might help them to see my point of view. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Cheryl. I fully get your view, and actually I was kind of surprised that one of the board members, whose name I will not repeat, said that there was a risk that at some point the process would turn overly burdensome for those applicants who didn't have applicant support. So I was like so how come? So it ties up to what you're saying. Are we building it for success, or are we building it for failure? So of course, my energy focuses on building it for success and not otherwise. So this is very useful in that as well. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It might be worth noting that the only record of gaming that we have from the last round is from the standard applicants when it comes to auctions, when it comes to trading offline, when it came to the acquisition of reserve names. That's where we saw the gaming in the last round, so let's make sure that's our focus for preventing gaming in the next. Sébastien, you're up next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I wanted to support what Cheryl just said. And since Jonathan just stole my thoughts, I'll say something else. Those who are fighting against gaming are those who are gaming. So at some point, you have to stop it, the most dangerous ones. And if we go and look into our documents, we see that those that were against gaming are the first ones who did so. And usually, they have a lot of money in their pockets. So let us support those who need to be supported, and let's stop playing this game of wondering whether this is the right way to proceed. Jonathan said it.

There are so many things that went wrong because of those who were talking about things going wrong. The little ones are the ones suffering. And it is not normal for ICANN not to be supportive. And I would like to say that this is not the only place where things go that way. I feel that ICANN has become an extremely bureaucratic organization that doesn't take into consideration the needs of people. And we lack humanity. And this is a shame.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Sébastien. I couldn't agree more with you. And I note your input, and I will take it back to the board as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

One could almost argue they're gaming now. I'm trying to keep my eyes open and not hog the cue. One additional thing that I really wanted to draw your attention and by proxy the board to is the issue of DNS abuse. And I think that there's an active desire by those who are most anxious for a new round to decouple what we want from what they want. And the net result of that in the past has been waiting 10 to 15 years for something to happen. So right now what we most recently saw happen was an amazing update to the contracts. And I think we're all very excited about it and really want to applaud the efforts of ICANN to help drive that and to do those negotiations in such a short period of time.

The fact that it came up in 2010, it should be telling though. That's the first time that came up. And it was raised in fact by the head of ICANN contract compliance. So the other thing that's been recently announced by ICANN is the INFERMAL Project, which is a study of the

causes of the migration of DNS abuse and what incentives exist out there for DNS abuse. And that also was a very welcome announcement from ICANN that that study was going to take place by the same guys that did the European study. And I think we're very excited about it. It's very much reflective of the recommendation of SSAC114 and our corresponding DNS abuse advice. Excellent.

The question that we need an answer to and that we feel strongly about is that that study happens and that policy happens in such a way that the results of that study are able to be reflected in the applicant guidebook and the next round. Because when things get done is when there's an inflection point like this. That's why the contract change is happening and that's why that will happen. If that study and our response to it and everything like that flips over the launch in the new round we'll be talking about the results of that study 15 years from now.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks Jonathan. Yes, DNS abuse was another topic that we discussed at length. And at some point I think that the board is fully on board of addressing DNS abuse and looking to creative ways of how we can address it, how we can improve things in terms of DNS abuse. So I think that there is no difference in views as to what we need to address. Maybe the difference in views is how. That it's always the how we address it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Or the when.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Or the when, yes. So as you say, and as Tripti has said also, ICANN is now at an inflection point. And this inflection point compresses many aspects of ICANN and its policy making processes and internal life, etcetera., etcetera. And while we were discussing the DNS abuse issue, at some point I just asked my board colleagues, I said, "Guys, what we have here is a potential next GDPR." If we don't do something meaningful to combat DNS abuse and to address DNS abuse, then someone from the outside is going to issue a law that is going to force us into doing something with all the consequences that that would have. So it's time for us to stop being inward looking and start being outward looking and be realistic about what is happening in the outside and what will happen in the inside if we don't listen to those outside.

And if we don't, I don't want to say go along with those who want to take more aggressive action, but if we don't address those points that are calling for more aggressive action. So I'm not sure if that message permeated to the rest of the board. I think that many board members actually felt identified with that message, but I think it's still something we will continue to discuss to the point in which we can have an agreement as to how to proceed, when to proceed, the best way to proceed, and again, trying to prevent having someone from the outside impose something on us that otherwise could have been prevented if we had taken action enough to address those issues.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right, Bill, I'm sorry, I think we've got to move on with the agenda because we got started late and everything like that, but let's make sure

that we capture your comment and get it to Leon and move forward. I'm getting the cut sign here from staff. Thank you so much, Leon, for coming. We appreciate all your work on the board and your membership in this family. So thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ: No, thank you, Jonathan. Thanks, everyone. And I will need to run to another meeting, but I'll be jumping in whenever I can. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sounds good. Next on the agenda is Hadia, discussing the talking points and the sessions that we have coming up.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Hello, everyone. This is Hadia for the record. So we will be discussing At-Large talking points. So the talking points are about the messages that we want the ICANN community to hear from us, the topics that we as At-Large currently participate in and focus on because we think they are of interest to the Internet and users, and the key messages that we would like to convey to the wider ICANN community in relation to each of these topics. The talking points are to help us focus and remain organized while spreading At-Large key information to the ICANN community.

So this first slide lists the topics that At-Large currently focuses on and participates in. We have divided them into policy-related topics and governance-related topics. You can also find a link to the At-Large resources on the slide. Could we have the next slide, please? Thank

you. So the first topic that we are going to address is the subsequent procedures PDP, and our elites here are Justine Chew and Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

This is about having a systemized and ongoing mechanism for applicants to propose new top-level domains. It builds on the existing policy requirements from the previous route. At-Large focus now is on supporting inclusion and bringing more communities online. How do we support applicants that would bring new TLDs that serve the needs of specific communities? How do we support applicants who bring new language communities online? How do we promote the new round and the applicant support program?

Inclusion and online diversity is our key message in relation to SubPro. On the right, you have the list of ICANN77 sessions ongoing related to the new gTLD program. If we could have the next slide, please. The GNSO guidance process for applicant support. So here we carry the same message from the previous topic, inclusion and diversity. We want successful applications from underserved communities, and we need enough money to be able to support applicants who need help. So those are the key messages. Again on the right, you will find the ICANN77 session related to this topic.

If we could have the next slide, please. Internationalized domain names. Again, it's about inclusion and diversity. And that's our interest in supporting internationalized domain names and their variants. But we have one more interest here related to users' online experiences and avoiding possible failure of connections or misconnection. So how do we bring new local languages and user communities online? And the

measures that we need to take in order to reduce the confusability of the users and maximize their online safety. On the right, you have the IDN sessions going on. You have every day a session in relation to IDNs. And you have also the sessions related to universal acceptance.

If we can have the next slide, please. Closed generics. So most of gTLDs are open, which means that anyone who subscribes to the requirements of the registry and pays the subscription fee can establish a second level domain under the gTLD. Closed generics means the gTLD registry controls registrations of all second level domains of the generic name of its business or industry. For example, .cloud could include all cloud companies but nothing else. This kind of practice could lead to some sort of market monopolization and could distort an internet user's view of the market for goods and services in these areas. We need to pay attention to the public interest here and maybe gTLD registries could be required to undergo a public interest test.

On the right, you have the sessions related to closed generics going on during ICANN77. There is one session that's ongoing now and then there is another session tomorrow. If we can have the next slide, please. DNS abuse. So users may face different kinds of DNS abuse, varying from phishing, malware, farming, botnets, and spam, if it serves as a delivery means for the other forms of DNS abuse. In May 2023, Google launched eight new top-level domains that included file extensions as top level domains, .zip and .mov. This could lead to hiding malicious URLs behind legitimate websites.

So what are the best practices that individual users can take in order to protect themselves from these hazards? How can we minimize the

number of users that fall victims to DNS abuse? And how can we minimize the severity of incidents? First, we are concerned as At-Large with users' education and developing the skills of common internet user in order to remain safe and secure online. Also currently, as Jonathan mentioned before, ICANN is updating the contracted parties' contracts. So this will allow ICANN compliance to go after non-compliant actors. And also it requires some security measures from the registries and registrars, such as mitigating DNS abuse and reporting.

On the right, you have the sessions that are going on during ICANN77 related to this topic. If we could have the next slide, please. The transfer policy review policy development process. We have a session related to this topic on Thursday. And again, it's all about the simple, safe and secure. Our interest is in having a simple, safe and secure inter-registrar transfer and change of registrant updates. If we could have the next slide, please. Holistic reviews. So ICANN bylaws specify review processes for ICANN and its stakeholder organizations. Reviewers aim to evaluate the health of the multi-stakeholder model, ICANN transparency and accountability, organizational effectiveness, and the security and stability of the DNS.

At-Large, interest lies in having an impactful and inclusive end-users voice at ICANN and ensuring internet end-users have secure, safe, and excellent online experiences. We don't have any sessions scheduled during ICANN77 in relation to the holistic reviews. If we could have the next slide, please. ICANN governance and operations. At-Large work is all about volunteers. Volunteers devote significant time to find material and understand communication and reports related to ICANN. How do we make this easier for them? Therefore, At-Large prioritizes

participation in ICANN operational and governance initiatives. At-Large prioritizes as well the ongoing evolution of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

If we could have the next slide, please. So key messages. Those are the messages actually that tie all our work together, our participation, its inclusion and diversity, and internet end-users education and awareness. If we could have the next slide, please. Now we are going to talk about At-Large ICANN77 policy sessions. So during ICANN77, we have three policy sessions. The first one is an end-user perspective, the next gTLD application window. The second is about the challenges of auctions. The third is an internal workshop for At-Large.

If we could have the next slide, please. So the next slides, they give a little bit of details about the policy sessions. So we have one ongoing today. So please join us. It's all about the RALOs preparation for the next round, their experiences, what went wrong and we don't want to happen again, and what went well that we actually want to build on. If we can have the next slide, please. So it's about the SubPro unfinished business auctions. That one is on Wednesday, 14th of June. So again, please join us.

The next slide, please. And that's the internal new gTLD program next round prioritization sub-team update and that's an internal workshop. Thank you. If we can have next slide, please. Thank you all and enjoy your ICANN77 participation.

Sorry. So this is Hadia again. And now we are going to talk about the ICANN77 session reports. So the idea is to inform the at-large community about the sessions that you attended and think are of

interest to the At-Large community while focusing on what At-Large should do in terms of next steps. The reports are going to be presented at the wrap-up session on Thursday. So go to the At-Large session reports form for ICANN 77. This is linked to the agenda. Put down your name in front of the sessions that you would like to report on. You can find a reporting template on the workspace. So the template, you will basically say what happened during the session, what are the At-Large specific takeaways from the session, and what are the At-Large specific action items or next steps.

So please go ahead and fill in the form if you would like to report this Thursday on any of the sessions that you are going to be attending. Again, this is linked to the agenda. And thank you, and see you on Thursday while reporting.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And I'll add that Hadia will be trying to track down volunteers for these sessions if they don't appear in this document. So think liberally about which ones you're going to be attending and you're willing. It's really just bullet points, these session reports. Don't let that scare you off. Next thing on the agenda is a little bit of a further sort of update discussion on the concept that we talked about at the last meeting, which was the At-Large loop. So it's a long-term plan, and I'm sort of trying to extend while the slides appear. So it's very incremental, and we're just continuing down a pathway to implement what I can best be thought of as a kind of efficient feedback loop throughout our communications infrastructure.

So next slide. Next slide. So just a reminder, our activities in many respects boil down to the identification and amplification of end user interests. And so this is what the loop is about. Next slide. This is a feedback loop, and that's what we're essentially trying to create. That's where the term loop came from.

Next slide. So this is a diagram I shared last time about what this feedback loop might look like. Next slide. There was some confusion. It's not an org chart. It is in fact just a communications pathway, and it is the communications pathway of interest to the ALAC. So there's many, many of them, but this is the one that the ALAC itself is focusing on as a communications pathway. So it's not a reporting chart, but a particular path of communication.

Next slide. We talked a little bit about the things that we do to identify end user interests. Just a reminder, these are some of the things that we've done in the past. Next slide. And some of the things that we've done to amplify those interests. Webinars at the global level, regional webinars, local webinars, and then more recently, because of UA Day, this idea of local seminars, mail and email campaigns, phone campaigns, and social media campaigns. These are some of the tools at our disposal. And so the question ultimately is, what tools to use when, how to organize ourselves around the use of each of these tools. That's the idea.

Next slide. So yes, I think I'll add it there, is that the local seminars was a big UA Day success story. If I can remind you, we organized the very last minute on UA Days and still managed to deliver half of the 50 sessions that were part of that. So we all deserve a round of applause.

And I think in particular, AFRALO on executing on a kind of last minute campaign to really go out and reach out about universal acceptance. And so I think there's some lessons learned there that we want to take on for ourselves.

Next slide. So we recently had an ABR, out of budget request, accepted to develop something called a Campaign Playbook. And so the idea behind that is to write all this stuff down. And so the process that I would like to propose for the coming year, FY24, is a series of experiments and refinements to the way that we engage in each of these forms of communication back and forth. Continue to pursue some infrastructure investment on the part of ICANN in the At-Large's ability to use some of these tools and to create resource libraries, that's ITI. To look at incentive development, one of the aspects, one of the lessons learned, I think, from the UA Day activities was reaching out to the ALSs with a few hundred bucks for food and things like that. And creating this sort of prepackaged event was successful.

So what are the incentives for participation? Event, funding, visibility, capacity building, training, those could be some of the benefits of being engaged in these campaigns. Formalize and document our processes of developing campaigns. And then the last stage with the playbook is potentially to get some outside consultants from people involved in grassroots. And I know we have some among us too, so that's not at the exclusion of our own expertise, but we might seek outside help, grassroots specialists and those also involved in channel marketing because it's a little bit like how we're structured.

Next slide. So speaking of session reports, our first experiment is actually the result of a session report from Eduardo Diaz in which he saw a couple of sessions in which some tools were being demonstrated to facilitate reporting and identification of who the responsible folks are related to phishing attacks. So for lack of a better term, the type of experiment is an amplification effort. The shepherd for this is Eduardo, and the models that I think we're going to try to experiment with in this context is an alert, a seminar, and ultimately some standing resources. So this is our first experiment associated with it.

Next slide. So the alert side of this is to just do an informational exercise via email. So to construct a very tight and pithy email that we try to promulgate out through our communication channels that showcases these tools that are available. And the three big tools are the Google Phishing Quiz, which helps you to identify phishing, and then Ask It and NetBeacon, which give you something to do about it when you do identify it.

So a lot of people, identifying is enough and they just know not to open that email. But if they want to take that extra step of being engaged in this process and say, damn it, do something about this and who that person should be, those tools become useful. We've had demos of both the Ask It and NetBeacon tools on the CPWG calls that were recorded and videotaped so that we can in fact publish videos of demos of those tools and make links to them in this email update. And then hopefully this email update will have some kind of call to action so that we can do some sort of measurement, whether it's go out to social media with it or something like that, so that we can do some measurement of reach and reaction of this experiment.

Next slide. The next experiment associated with the next model, if you will, is this local seminars model that we saw executed so successfully by the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. So the idea would be to create a seminar kit, much like they did, which would include a fixed presentation, a video of somebody delivering that presentation, and then maybe some customized promotional video that they can use to advertise this seminar. We can construct a video in PowerPoint that they can easily go and add their name instead of ours and promote it as their presentation.

Recruit seminar organizers, RALOs and ALSs. This is again like the exercise we did quickly for Universal Acceptance, but that we try to figure out how to do in a more organized way for our own campaign. Identify some funding for catering, etcetera, as they did. Perhaps include a FAQ, a question and answer document for them, anything we can do to best support them delivering on this seminar. And maybe this includes a little webinar where we train them on how to deliver it. Execute this within a specified date range. I think that was another potential lesson learned from the UA Day activities. And then again, try to measure reach and reaction. So that's the first one's the alert, and the next is this idea of local seminars. So that's the fishing concept that Eduardo is going to be shepherding.

Next slide. A future experiment that's unconceived and yet at this point does not have a shepherd, but the other reason to develop this loop is for feedback. So identify a topic of broad appeal that's understandable by people further from this process. So we're all the lifers and we understand all these issues. There's another level of understanding at the RALO level. There's another level of understanding at the ALS level.

Try to identify something that we can go deep into our infrastructure to get feedback on our position. Build discussion parameters in the CPWG and then somehow push that discussion out to the ALS level and then look at the best ways to go about doing that. To get that feedback from a broader community of people on a position.

So some things that have happened in the past are things like geo names, where it was something that it was possible to, it was difficult for us to make a decision in fact about what our position on this should be. And so we tried to go to a broader audience to try and understand what people's priorities were. And so and then look at what is the best way to broaden this outreach and what is the sort of retail activities we can do to get more people? Is it a webinar? Is it surveys? Is it focus groups at the ALS levels? That's the next experiment.

Next slide. And then another future thing that ICANN is very interested in is our participation in the promotion of the next round. And that promotion is starting sooner rather than later in a lot of different ways. So they're trying to get ahead of it much more so than they were in the previous round. So again, this is an amplification effort. It needs a shepherd, but we need to identify what our end user messaging is going to be associated with the next round and then develop alerts, webinars, and seminars to do that outreach using the tools that we've been developing and the experiments that we have been engaged in.

Next slide. In the long term, this should result in a library of presentations or seminar kits, etcetera, in multiple language with demonstration videos and then potentially a mechanism for people to say, I'm going to submit a proposal to conference XYZ to deliver a

presentation on topic X. And if it gets accepted, then give me funding to go and deliver this paper, for example. But we've armed them. The presentation's already built. The notes are already there. The script is already there. So all they're doing is the effort of getting it into a conference and being willing to go to that conference and deliver it. So that's kind of the long term goal. That's why we continue to press ICANN for their part of this, which is providing us the tools for this content management and things like that.

I think next slide is probably just any other questions slide. Again, I'm being reminded that our time is tight. But if there's any quick questions, I know we're going to be discussing this in RALO meetings and everything like that. I just wanted to give you a kind of update to my thinking and some of the things that have gone on with the ABR, with Eduardo's project, etcetera, to advance this notion. Any comments, questions, keep them tight. Sébastien, of course.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Just to share the last experiment I have with ABR, with diversity, I wanted to organize a face-to-face interaction about this topic and the answer was, oh, the board decided that it was only online. Therefore, and there are budgets, there is no problem with budget. The budget was not touched. I am really in trouble with the way ICANN is working with us as volunteers. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sébastien. That continues to be a challenge. I think we're going to take a nibble at this problem and a lot of funds through GSC,

etcetera, exist for some of these small asks that we're doing. But that's an ongoing challenge. Other questions and comments? All right, so I'll now hand it over to Gisella for housekeeping messages.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. Wishing everyone a warm welcome, as you haven't heard my voice yet. Just to say that we have our next session in this room, which is the first of the NARALO sessions, but open to all and everyone is encouraged to join us. It is the At-Large roundtable with the topic of government efforts to expand broadband access in the U.S and Canada. And we have some guest speakers joining us. Just a kind reminder that the rooms may not be monitored when we're out for the coffee break, but -- and please to keep your headsets as well. Don't take them out of the room, but if you do, remember just to take them every time you join the room again.

And there will be coffee outside, so please do enjoy coffee. And we will start promptly at quarter to the hour. That is in 29 minutes. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Let's have a great meeting, everyone. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]