
ICANN78 | AGM – ALAC Anniversary - Brainstorming on the Future
Wednesday, October 25, 2023 – 1:30 to 3:30 HAM

YESIM SAGLAM:

Hello and welcome to the ALAC anniversary brainstorming on the future 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. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom. You can 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:

Happy anniversary. 20 years of the ALAC. That is amazing. We have some incredible speakers up here to share their real experience with their history. But because I don't have that experience, I'm making some up. So there's a children's book called the little engine that could.

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.

It turns out that the original story, though, is in the public domain now, because it's been 100 years, so I decided to take liberty with it to show the alternative history of ALAC, the little engine that could. So, bear with me.

Okay. This is The Little Engine That Could by Jonathan Zuck and illustrations by Betsy Zuck, At-Large Booster. Many of you met her at the barbecue. Okay. The land of ICANN. Users stood here, a land to cross, but they felt fear. Over the hill looked safe and sound, but on the ground hazards abound. How their hearts did pound. To the business engine they first did plea, please take us over the hill, past the hazards we see. That hill's too high, the engine replied, but good for business is good for you. The user sighed. We're not sure that's true. Next to the government train so grand, will you help us across this land? The engine shook its head dismayed. Way too much red tape to lead the way. We will find the way around. Our plan for you is safe and sound. Good for us is good for you. They answered, we're not sure that's true.

Next to civil society, the engine spoke with all due piety. That hill is far too high to climb. It's rights, not interests, we must mind. Good for registrants is good for you. It's shared with compassion and care. Its intentions bared. The users exchanged a doubtful view. We're not sure that's true, they whispered too.

Lastly, they asked the registrar crew, can you take us over? Can you help us through? Our margins are narrow. Our choices are few. There's just no way to carry you. But what's good for us is good for you, it voiced,

with a tone that left the users feeling poised. The users exchanged a doubtful view. We're just not sure that's true.

Just as hope started to fade away, a purple train arrived to the break of day. It wore the colors of ALAC so bold, and finally the smile that never grew old. The purple train, said with a hopeful cheer, I'll give it a try, there's nothing to fear. With determination, we'll reach the peak. Together, we'll overcome what seems so bleak. I think I can, they chanted with glee, as the purple train climbed wild and free. Higher and higher, they reached for the skies. With each passing moment, their spirits would rise. I know I can. They shouted with delight, as they conquered the hill bathed in the light. The At-Large community had shown the way. Together, they triumphed, come what may. With hearts full of joy, users came round to the other side, safe and sound. We thought we could, they all agreed, for the At-Large community had met their need. I know I can, they declared with pride, for on this journey, they'd found a guide. With unity and strength, they'd won the day. In the world of ICANN, they'd found their way. and have it in their hands Good job.

And you all get a commemorative hard copy of the little ALAC, the little engine that could. And we also have, if you haven't gotten them already, the anniversary pins that celebrate our anniversary and say the... I know I can and you now know what the source of that is. So Heidi's passing out the pins so if you haven't got one get one of those.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE: I would express my special thanks to the real time translation here. They did a very good job in keeping up with your poem and made a good translation live. That's incredible. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So thank you for indulging me, my one current chair indulgence here. Let me now re-share the screen and grab this. And now for the real story, we have a bunch of luminaries here in the room. I went looking for caricatures of everyone, but a couple I was not able to find on ICANN Wiki, so we'll update the slides when people track down their caricatures.

So I wanna call this section Milestones and Memories. There's been ICANN wide sessions like this, but I think it's important for us to remember some of the important things that have come before, how things came to pass, and things that were accomplished by the At-Large community during those 20 years. This is where things get slightly less organized, but I was hoping to go out to folks and maybe start with Cheryl, and maybe we'll go in kind of rough chronological order in terms of when they participated and bring up a couple of things that matter most to you in just a few minutes. And so if we can kind of within the next 20 minutes complete this, then we'll jump into what we're doing next session.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. One of the current, in inverted commas, generation, if I can use that term, of surviving chairs. We have many other people in the room, however, that

go back to the very early history of the At-Large Advisory Committee. But it's around my time coming into ALAC as opposed to At-Large that we clicked over, and I'm sure others will talk about this, to our final form with the design of the 15-person ALAC with two regional At-Large organization member-appointed and one nominated-appointed person per region. So with that context, I just wanna step back a little bit before that. Looking at that scary caricature, that was actually done in Wellington. That's a few years ago. And it was very much at that point in time when, as I'd been interested and part of the DNSO, so back from the year dot, but I was very much involved in the ccTLD community. And this thing was happening around a far corridor past the cleaners, up and down a few stairs, into a disused ballroom, where in fact there wasn't even tables set up. The half a dozen people literally took the chairs off the table, sat around, and that was the meeting of At-Large. At which point I thought, we can only do better than that. So from that, that's what certainly brought me in and the rest is history. So a couple of minutes, I just wanted to put that context. There was a real need to bring what you've just shown us, that desire to have end user interests well represented in the model that was being designed. And we're a long way from being put in the broom cupboard, which is where we were then. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And thank you for getting us out of the closet, Cheryl. So what's best in terms of chronological order? Is it Sébastien or? As far as the order in which they were. Chairs, all right, then go ahead. We'll do chairs first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, so chairs will speak. So thank you, I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond. And as you can see from my caricature, I used to have a cliff on top of my head, which has now gotten eroded with time. That's what happens with the wind and everything else, the travel, this sort of thing. There are two things which I recall. Well, a lot of things which I recall, of course, from the time that I was chairing At-Large. The first thing was the being blessed with such an amazing community. And you don't get paid, but you actually get paid back with the sheer energy that everyone devotes to the cause, and the cause being a very just cause, indeed, in ICANN. So it's one of these things that you carry, not only during the time that you're a chair, but during the rest of your life, effectively. And when I tell people back home, oh, you know, we did this and we did that, and they're like, wow, you people are amazing. Okay, well, you know, so we are amazing, apparently, each and every one of us. So thank you, you know, you guys have to give yourself a round of applause on that one.

But apart from this, the two, well, there are a number of things. First, Cheryl putting me into the deep end very quickly, starting, so the handover was in Columbia, and so that was south of the equator. So we were, everyone was upside down, as you know, and of course, Cheryl coming from upside down, she was fine, I arrive upside down, and what happens, I have to put it all back up. Anyway, it was a very rough meeting, and that Cheryl opened the meeting and said, I'm no longer chair now, so here we go. Welcome, Olivier, you're chair, boom. I had no notes, nothing at all, and that was, you know, that's pretty much how we mostly started At-Large, I think each and every one of us. There's been more documentation now, but the things which I recall were real

successes during the time that I was chair, one of them was, of course, the last round of new generic top-level domains, where the ALAC by itself, having suddenly been blessed with something that it had never done before, which was an actual piece of operational work, the objections process, actually put together a complete process to try and file community objections, and it was all self-organizing. We didn't have any kind of consultant, which ICANN loves consultants, they like to take people and pay them huge amounts of money to tell the community what the community has already designed, but at least, you know, they say, well, it's fine. So that was one thing where the community did this, and it was really amazing how this whole bunch of people came together into a working group. Dave, who unfortunately isn't with us, was leading this, and they came up with some really cool processes, bearing in mind that all of the processes we have in At-Large have evolved over the years and have been self-organized by this community, which means that you, in taking part in this community, will continue to be able to evolve these processes.

The first one, of course, the first ALAC summit or At-Large summit was in Mexico City. I went there with only one idea, IPv6. IPv6, IPv6, IPv6, and I'm glad that 20 years later, I still have that one idea, IPv6. Not many other people have it, but there you go. And so I still remember that, but the second At-Large summit also came up with a resolution that was built in a bottom-up way, and there was a lot of, you know, when you have over 100 people, 100 At-Large structures that come together, it started out being all over the place with so many topics, and we still managed in one week to put some sense to it, put it all into recommendations, and those recommendations, for the most of them,

were not only drafted, sent to the board, sent to our community, but implemented as well, which is really great to see. Really amazing to see a group of people who come from so many different backgrounds from around the world, different languages, and they're able to work together, and they're able to come up with pretty amazing stuff. So yeah, well done.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I am next. I'm gonna talk about three things. I'll be brief on all of them. They're all, interestingly enough, related to the ICANN bylaws. The first one is, in the ICANN bylaws, any advisory committee can initiate a GNSO PDP, or at least request one. No one ever had. When I came into ICANN in 2006, I'll be very kind and say we weren't necessarily regarded very well. However, for reasons I won't go into, there was a phenomena at that point called domain tasting. That would allow someone to acquire a domain name, test it to see if it could be monetized, can you make money out of it, and if not, throw it away for free. And this was being done millions of times a month. It was found to be objectionable by everyone, and no one would seem to want to do anything about it, and for reasons I won't go into, the ALAC decided we can do something about it. We requested a PDP. It ran, it was probably the fastest PDP that ever ran, and it eliminated domain tasting. That essentially gave us a level of credibility that we hadn't had before, because ALAC had actually done something, and something crucial. So that's number one.

Jump forward a bunch of years. In the bylaws, it says ALAC can give advice to the board, and we periodically did give advice to the board. But that's all that happened. We rarely even got an email

acknowledging that the advice was received. The advice was never acted on. As far as we know, in many cases, it never even got to the board. But we were following process. The accountability review, the second one, made a recommendation saying, the board actually has to respond. And if they don't implement what we're asking for, they have to explain why. And that actually happens to this day now. And that again, increased the credibility of us, and increased our ability to influence things.

And the last one I'll do, I'll mention, is the IANA transition and the accountability exercise. That was a long, laborious process. If you look at the history books, you'll see the ALAC had a couple of members in both of those groups, and our attendance was okay. If you look at the unwritten history, the ALAC participants in those groups were absolutely instrumental in getting the outcomes that came out of it. We played a lot of go-between roles and a lot of other things under the covers. And I can say with some level of assurance, if we hadn't participated, the outcomes would have been different and not necessarily better. So I think we've made our mark in many ways over the years. I can keep on going, but I'm gonna turn it over to the next chair. But even though these things may not seem important, they have increased us to the point where we now have credibility. And I think we have a good basis on which to go forward for the next 20 years. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yes, and I was next. I have to sort of say that my very first fellowship was in Columbia and I got involved At-Large because in the room next door

to the fellowship room, there was always laughter coming out of it. I couldn't believe, I wondered what was going on and because we, in this fellowship room, we were very serious. And anyway, one day we were allowed to sort of go out and I snuck into the room just to sort of find out what was going on. I couldn't understand a word that they were talking about, except that I happened to go in at one stage when there was a changeover of the chair. And so this was when Olivier mentioned he was being-- Inducted. Yes, inducted. And he had absolutely no idea what he was getting into either as I sort of like found later on. But I must admit, that really hooked me into At-Large and I wasn't to realize that sort of like five years later, when I still really didn't really know what I was doing and At-Large, I was inducted myself into the chair. And one of the things that I sort of really had thought was really important that I did as the leader was to sort of like solve the sorts of things that I had actually had problems with. Like, what did we actually do and how did we do it and who did it? So that one of the things I did before I came into the chair and I remember taking the draft of it to a meeting with Alan and the board chair was an organizational chart, which I know that Jonathan hates. But it was an organizational chart that sort of like basically showed who the ALAC were, well, who the ALAC were for a start. Because people always used to call us the ALAC, and we had to explain several times that the ALAC were just the 15 members who were elected within At-Large to sort of like make decisions and pass them on to the board or whoever. So that was one of the key things, but also organizing what we actually did and how we did it so that we had the three core streams of policy operations and outreach and engagement.

So once I sort of like, I mean, my day job focuses on organizational management. So it was important that I understood what it is that I was in charge of and hopefully the people who were working within it also understood how they worked within At-Large. So my claim to fame while I was sort of like leader of At-Large is hopefully that, you know, everyone's got pretty good idea of why they're here and what they're doing. Thanks.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Just before Jonathan takes back the microphone, I just want to point out something that I hope was obvious to you all with a little vignettes you've got from each and every one of us. And I could say going all the way back to the very first appointments in the interim ALAC, the leadership of the ALAC, not just the ALAC itself, but the actual leader of the ALAC, and these days it's a leadership team, and that in itself is an important pivot point, bring something different. They're there to make a little incremental change, a little specific thing gets rectified, and that then acts as a platform for the next step, which of course is a perfect metaphor, back to Jonathan and the little train that does.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, thanks Cheryl, and one thing that I got to be a part of is a decision that Alan and Maureen made to really focus on policy being an ongoing rather than an ad hoc exercise, and I think that that has added a perception of rigor to our policy work in the ICANN community that has helped with the reputation that both Cheryl and Alan talked about, and that's why its board members were paying attention to it and things like that. So I think that decision by Alan and Maureen to really make policy

something that we do every week and that we really get into deeply as opposed to just when we need it, that was a big change that I thought was very important. There was one, do you want to say, where'd he go, somebody was going to say something about another chair. He's here. Oh, yes, do you want to speak quickly about the—Wolfgang. Didn't you just come up to me and ask if you could speak for a second?

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I just want to remember that one of the first chairs of the At-Large Advisory Committee was Annette Mühlberg. Remember that in [inaudible], she overtook the position and was very crucial in making the ALAC work in the early days. Unfortunately, she's very serious ill and struggled with illness and I contacted her a couple of days ago. She would love to be here. She sent her best greetings and she would be very happy if we could set greetings back to her, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. And Eduardo, the slides are just about who's here. It's not all the chairs or anything like that. It was just the ones that we had on hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: But before we go ahead, Vittorio Bertola, who was the chair for the first three and a half years of the ALAC, is in back, stand up.

VITTORIO BERTOLA: Thank you, yes. Yes, I happen to be the first chairman of the ALAC and actually one of the people that were there in the At-Large Organizing

Committee, which predates the ALAC. It was basically a thought by a number of people, some of which, I mean, including Wolfgang, are still here, to actually get the At-Large Advisory Committee because it wasn't granted at all. So actually there were a couple of years between 2001 and 2003 in which a group, a very small group of people that traveled the world and came to ICANN meetings on their own money when they could to actually ask the board, which was going through a reform process to have an At-Large Advisory Committee. So I mean, of course, we would never have imagined in those first like three years in which I was the chair from 2003, 2006, that it would have grown up so much. We would hope for it. We imagined all this structure of regional organizations and At-Large structures, but we just saw the beginning of it. And so it's really a pleasure now to see so many people coming and many new faces that I didn't even meet in the following years that are now here and putting energy into this committee. So thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you. We also have some At-Large appointed members to the board with us as well to share some reminiscences. So I think I'll start with Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Merci. Thank you. It's very good that we spoke about the ALAC chairs from Europe. I would like to add the last name that wasn't mentioned. Jacqueline Morris was the chair of the ALAC. She handed it over to Cheryl. She ended this interim period and Cheryl started the final period, let's say.

A few elements from my story that can maybe link to the big history. My first meeting of ICANN was in Melbourne in March of 2001. And I think that just like anyone who started one day, I haven't missed a single meeting since then. In 2007, the RALOs were created, EURALO from my side anyway. And as soon as we finished creating EURALO, one of the first suggestions that I made was that it was great to work in each of the regions, but we should find a way to work all together. And from that was born the idea of a meeting of all the ALS. And Wolfgang, who's really good into defining and finding words, said it should be called ATLAS. And from then, we have created ATLAS 1, 2, and 3, and I hope ATLAS 4 maybe soon. In 2007, I was elected at the ALAC. And in 2010, Wolfgang, who was president of the NomCom, called me and said, "You were selected to become the ALAC nominee, not from EURALO, but from the NomCom." There's normally a voting process for the board. And honestly, I was flabbergasted. I was elected out of everyone. And in 2010, I started. And I was the only member of the board that went through the whole mandate of four years, because I did six months before I should have been part of the board, because there was a reorganization of the mandate. And I did another six months afterwards. So I did a mandate of four years in total. The board at that time was very different from what it is today. It really evolved. On the one hand, thanks to an action of all the chairs that were selected by the ATLAS, me included, but also all my successors, because today Leon can come and speak to you without any issue. And I was not allowed to come and speak to those who had elected me.

So a few elements. We've heard that Olivier became chair, I think in Columbia. And today this would not be possible anymore, because he

was out of the NomCom. He was elected in ALAC. And then he was elected ALAC chair in 24 hours. Today it would not be possible. But at the time, I think it was really helpful that we could do that.

So to end, maybe looking forward, I hope that we will be able to have a second member at the ICANN board. That was the recommendation that was made when we had the At-Large review a long time ago in 2009. The board gave us only one position and transformed the liaison role that existed. And it became an electing member, but they did not give us a second member. And now it's high time that they do.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Okay, thank you. Hello everyone. I'm Rinalia Abdul Rahim. For those who don't know me, I'm from Malaysia. I came to the ALAC as a committee member in 2011. And I don't tell this story very often, but the NomCom chair reached out and said, "Rinalia, please consider a leadership position in ICANN. "With your profile, you could be considered for the board "or the ALAC, which would you prefer?" And I said, "The ALAC." And my first meeting was in Senegal. It was a very challenging meeting for me because I got sick at that meeting. But I experienced the challenges of the ALAC members and the At-Large basically in ICANN at that meeting because I could tell that it was difficult to get a good understanding of ICANN itself, what it does, the policy process. If you come in mid-process, it's difficult to catch up and get context. What the ALAC now is quite different. People get good onboarding when you come on board. There is training, you have mentors. So the people who come after us have actually benefited from all the things that we have worked to improve, the systems and the

processes within the ALAC and the At-Large itself. So please consider yourself a little bit lucky in that regard. There is more ways to go in terms of improvement, but we have come a really long way.

I will mention one thing that I considered as significant while I was an ALAC member, and then I will move on to the board stage. When I was at the ALAC between 2011 and 2013, I was privileged enough to participate in something called the Root Zone Label Generation Rule Set Development Process. This was quite technical, but it led the way for everything that is discussed today in ICANN on IDNs, in making the languages of the world with the various scripts just available on the DNS. It's still not finished, but great progress has been done. And I think that the ALAC and the people in the At-Large community actually showed leadership in this. We have an IDN working group. I see Satish here. I know Justine has been working on it as well. So this is quite important and continues to be important. And I was really happy to be a part of that and to be at the beginning of it.

Now onto the board thing. I think Alan mentioned it best. For me, I became a board member. I was elected by the At-Large and I was so happy, and thank you so much for selecting me. It was an amazing journey. Fadi was CEO at the time that I started, and it was the year that IANA Stewardship Transition started. And just to give a sense of how hectic it was, the ICANN CEO was taking calls in the shower. This was how challenging it was at the Fadi level. The board was catching up, of course. Everyone was overwhelmed during that time. Everybody, the ICANN staff, even the community. And this was on top of normal business that we all had to do, right? Regular policy processes, etc. And I remember being extremely proud of the leadership that the ALAC and

the At-Large community members showed in that process that Alan talked about. Because I think that we all made a difference. And we all came out as a part of the empowered community that has a significant role in the governance of ICANN itself that's enshrined in the bylaws. This is an amazing achievement. It took a lot of slog and effort. And I think that we can all be proud of it. But it couldn't have been done without the people that were around at that time. And we would want the future and the next generation to carry that torch and to see, because there will be evolution in ICANN. There will be challenges that come in from whatever corners. And we have to be prepared to step up, to be fit for purpose, to be relevant for the interests of the end users. So thank you very much. And I appreciate it being a part of the At-Large community.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. I want to not go on too long with the looking backward part of this. But Vanda wanted to say a little bit about the fellowship program.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

No, it's just to remember that before the vote, members to the board, there was liaisons to the board, because we are not allowed to be vote for someone. So before me, it was Vittorio. And then I was there. But for me, it was the most important thing. I have the opportunity in the board, because in that time, it was my second time on the board. But in that time, I was representing ALAC. And it was my role there to represent ALAC. So I think about fellowship. So I designed the fellowship, proposed the fellowship program, and the board approved it. And since it was 2009, and out of there, chair and myself, we create DNS Women,

following the same general idea. So it was always great. I was starting the ALAC back in 2000. In the end of the general assembly in 2007, I was leaving the board the first time. And George Sadowsky convinced me not to reapply to the board, but go to the ALAC. They need much more than the board persons that are energetic for do something with the chair. So we went there. It was Cheryl, Sébastien, Alan, and myself. So I'm very happy to be here for so long. And still, we're seeing this big energy in this. So happy anniversary.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And last but not least, our currently selected board member from the At-Large community, Leon Sanchez.

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Jonathan. And I'm going to speak in Spanish, just to take advantage of the interpretation services. Well, it's always good to come back home. And I say that every time I come to ALAC. Evidently, I'm very thankful to all of you for your continued support throughout these years and the next three years. Because I've been fortunate enough to say that I am now going to have a third period, which starts with this General Assembly now. As you all mentioned, Sébastien, Rinalia, I believe that there is a pretty positive evolution for At-Large in the ICANN community. You were talking about the transition phase and the leadership that was displayed by At-Large and ALAC as part of the work that was delivered to sustain such transition. And I was fortunate enough to be given your trust and to come up with a cross-community working group and the ICANN accountability. And I remember that we had a session with the board. And we were so happy because we had

already solved everything. The plan was already designed. And we wanted to achieve this transition and be able to have the ICANN accountability tools ready for the community. And with this, also show the government that we were at this mature stage and we were ready for the next step. And the meeting was a bit chaotic. The board came here and said, nothing that you are proposing is feasible. We're going to, again, go back and work on this and design it again. And so it was a pretty strong shock for all of us there, the ones that were working there. And at the end of the day, we were able to bring it out. We actually went over the number of calls. In my case, it was until the middle of the night that I was there because I had my colleagues in Europe. Matthew was one of them. And coincidentally, they set the calls at that same time. Even though we did rotate, most of it was handled during the night. And it was somewhat even happy because I remember taking most of those calls in bed with my wife sleeping right next to me. And we had a colleague that was very lively from Iran. And I really do respect him a lot. His name is Kavouss Arasteh. Some of you might know him. He's had several interventions. And my wife would usually wake up and say, you know what? Just give Kavouss whatever he's asking for. So that was something that my family had already acknowledged.

And now going back to the central topic or discussing what At-Large and ALAC have attained during this last 25 years, the thinking here is that I was able to engage actively in all this. And for me, that's great. It's really a way in which this community and the ALAC have given me that space, taken me into account with a serious way to go forward in our communities. And I'm sorry that I'm going to say it like this, but I have to. This is something that was said from us. We were told that we were

a traveler's group. And we were able to put together this part of the community that showed that with hard work and discipline, we could attain something that was good for the future. And today, we are taking advantage of such fruit. So I am really happy that I was able to help with the transition process to materialize it somehow.

And today, we have to look at the way in which the board caters to every advice that we get from ALAC. Several years ago, we didn't have a specific process in place to follow up with that or to give that advice that was coming only from ALAC. GAC had a different one. And that is the one we used to follow up with. I want to thank the policy team that Heidi is with, that David, all of us is working with, because we were able to set up a record and a follow up. And there is traceability in terms of how this council given to us by ALAC is actually working. And we were also able to fine tune anything that is probably not clear. So that's another accomplishment, because it reflects-- it talks about the seriousness that we are looked at when it comes to matters related to the board.

Now, it's up to us to continue with this positive trend. And this is in order to keep on building. And this is the way in which ALAC is integrated with other community working groups. And it talks to us about how the community is looking at us. So needless for me to say, congratulations for the first 20 years. And I really want to thank you for all of your kindness. You know that I have been quite fortunate to count on your trainings and the lessons that you have taught me. So everybody in this room has always taught me something. And because of that, I'm very thankful. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks to all the panelists. I'm sure there are many more people that need to be thanked and stories that need to be told. And we may need to make some kind of project of that. It may have been overly ambitious on my part, but I was hoping to spend the lion's share of this thing looking forward. So it's clear that we have the shoulders of giants on which to stand as we try to invent ALAC 3.0 here or something like that. But what I want to do is get some conversations going about what our priorities should be in the next 20 years, basically. So let me see if I can get my slides back up here again.

So the next 20 years, or five if that's a more reasonable goal. Where should we focus our efforts? On whose behalf are we working? This is a question that comes up from time to time on our lists. And how do we get the most bang for our effort? We have a finite number of volunteers. And how do we have the greatest impact within the ICANN community?

We talk about individual end users. And I've tried to sort of propose the idea that this isn't a group of people. There isn't someone who is and someone who isn't an individual end user, but is instead a series of roles. Things that you do as an end user, which most of us do most of the time. And so it's about those end user activities.

So email, surfing, banking, reservations, social media, that's what we do most of the time. And so our job is to try and identify the implications of ICANN policy on those activities. Does it make it harder or does it make it easier? Does it allow more people or fewer people to do them? That's really the issue. And I'm not inviting anybody to intervene at this point, if that's what that's about, because we're trying to steamroll through here at this point. So we identify the implications of those

actions, and we try to prevent degradation and continuously improve that experience whenever possible. So we talk about end users. There's a lot of end users, but it's reasonable to suggest that there's a distinction between individual end users and business end users. And there's, in fact, a group within the ICANN community whose remit it is to keep track of the interests of business users. So we try to look at the interests that are unique to the individual end users and then stick within the ICANN remit. And both of those can be challenges for us when we're trying to decide which policies to work on.

And so we have this conversation about who are our constituents. There are registrant end users. There's non-registrant end users. Do we represent both of them? And if we do, what do we do if there's a conflict? Historically, we've said that if we represent both of them and if there's a conflict, we err on the side of the non-registrant end users. But the question has been raised, are registrants covered elsewhere? Do we even need to worry about things that are specific to registrants? So something like the registrar transfer policy is something on which we've worked a great deal. Do we need to take that up? Or are there others within ICANN that can take up the interests of registrants? It's an open question. I don't have an answer.

And how far do we go for indirect interests? Because the other thing that we're famously good at doing is finding a way that end users are affected by a policy, even if it involves going down three flights of stairs, out an exit, across the street, into a restaurant, ordering a specific dish. And then here's an impact on end users. And we need to ask ourselves if we should be working so hard to find an impact on end users or focus more of our attention on the obvious things.

And then the other question is, how is our role different from governments? Those governments, the GAC, believe that they are here to protect the interests of end users when you think about it. Sometimes they're trying to protect sovereignty. But I think on the whole, if you look at the Public Safety Working Group, et cetera, they're working for end users. And how do we distinguish ourselves?

So how best to determine those interests? Intuition, right? That's how we do it most of the time. My experience as an end user is XYZ. Therefore, I think this is in the best interest of end users. We debate about that. Hopefully, there's a difference in experiences that helps. But that still happens at a very high level. Sometimes we push it further into the community through internal polling. And then other times, we've even hired an outside firm and done external polling. So when do we do which of those things? How hard do we work to identify? What rigor do we apply to identifying individual end users? And which issues lend themselves to bringing more people into that decision-making process?

I had the opportunity many years ago to have media training. And there was an interesting piece of this that I think has great application here. So I want to know if anybody knows the answer to this equation here. 9 times 1 is equal to what? Does anybody know an answer? 9. Does anybody think it's anything else? Okay. The correct answer is 0. Okay. Here's another. 3 times 3, what does this equal? You guys are still so confident. It's 1 or 2. All right. Math doesn't always work the way you think it will. 9 messages delivered once, nothing gets through. 3 messages each delivered 3 times, sometimes something does. That is a fundamental law of media training. And it's something that I think we need to focus on. And so what does that mean? It means that we should

have fewer messages and deliver them more often. And deliver them in a consistent way so that it is, in fact, the same message being delivered over and over and over again. And that is how you get your voice heard. If we always have so many messages that they don't get repeated enough, then they don't break through the noise. Fewer topics, discussed more often.

So one of the things we started to try and do in the CPWG was come up with the funnel. And the idea behind this is to be aggressively trying to get out of commenting on an issue. Not trying to find a way that we need to comment on it, but trying to get out of it. So that we are really focused on what matters most. And so this funnel, as it exists in the ICANN Learn course, is it within ICANN's remit? If it isn't, we get out of it. Is it a policy issue or not? Then it goes over to OFB. That was the CPWG thing. Is there a unique individual end user perspective? This might be more controversial. I made the recommendation at the time that if we don't have something specific to end users to say, then maybe we don't need to be involved. Or maybe we can be involved in a much thinner way by just endorsing someone else's statement, because it sounds good for everyone. And so this idea of this reduction of issues is one of the things that I think we need to think about. So how to limit? What are the key criteria? What are the questions we ask before we take on an issue? Where do we draw the line? And are there different levels of engagement, something we dive into deeply, participate in the work group, or just do a public comment, or just endorse somebody else's public comment?

Finally, there's this notion of outreach and engagement, two of the most amorphous and poorly defined words that I've ever heard inside

of the ICANN community. And no one has successfully put them out as definitions that make sense to me. So I want to propose a definition and draw a distinction between them, rather than always using them in conjunction with each other. It is my belief that it behooves us to separate them and to assign meaning to them. So outreach is communication of the uninitiated. In other words, people that don't know ICANN policy don't know that ICANN exists. And it's about recruiting, and it's about getting messaging out to people that are not insiders on the topic. Engagement is the mobilization of the people we have recruited, engaging the people that are part of our community, either to get feedback on positions that we're developing, or again, on amplifying messages out to the uninitiated. So it's the mobilization of that community.

So what is the best approach? What's the best pitch when doing outreach? And who are the best partners in trying to reach out to do this? Those are open questions. Engagement-- what issues should we engage on? What messages should we be trying to put out there using the community that we have? Is it all about coming to the board, submitting public comments, and expanding that the way the domainers do? Is it about getting messages out to more end users? So we've talked about issues like phishing, DNSSEC, applicant support, community applications, universal acceptance. Are these all messages that we want to take on for amplification through our network? So that was meant by way of introduction. I don't know if we have enough time, but I thought we would try to break into little groups to talk about these three things, these four things.

So four groups. One is, whose interests are we here to represent? And how specific can we be about that? How do we identify what issues? What questions should we ask? What criteria should we use whether to take on an issue or not? And then the issue limitation and the indirect effects, like how do we limit the number of things that we do? Whereas issue identification was like, how many people? How do we reach out to find out the issues in the first place? How do we find those interests? And then finally, outreach and engagement and what we should be doing there.

So what I thought I would do is if your birthday and your birth year both end in even numbers, then you are in the work group thinking about whose interests we represent. If your birthday and birth year are both odd numbers, then you're in the issue identification. And how should we go about-- what's the best way to determine what those interests are? If your birthday is even and your birth year is odd, then you're in the what questions should we ask to limit the things that we're doing? And if your birthday is odd and your birth year is even, then you're talking about outreach and engagement. Does everybody know enough about when their birthday is to determine which one you're in? So we have whiteboards.

ALAN GREENBERG:

And what if you really don't want that particular area? What if you don't like where the one you've been put into? Are we allowed to self-select?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

As long as you're willing to apply for a new birthday, you can change groups. All right, so we'll say group one there. Group two there. Group three there. And group four there. Group two there.

All right, settle down. So how many people lied about which group they joined? I just want to know the answer to that. Because it certainly should have been more equal than it was. It was supposed to be a completely random set of people, but this group in particular ended up very, very small. So maybe that's a statistical anomaly. Thanks everyone for participating in this experiment. I really wanted as many people as possible thinking about this as we go forward and what our priorities should be. Because it's easy to just be on autopilot, right? And talk about the same things, the same issues, make decisions the same way. At the same time, I'm a fan of making decisions. So what I'd love to do is we get to answer some of these questions, in particular about how we assess interests and whose interests we represent, that we then abide by that and not continue to discuss it until it's time to discuss it again. Because we need to leave decisions behind in order to progress forward. But this is just the start of this process, and I really appreciate everybody participating. So what I'd like to do is just get a little bit of a preview. And I know that nobody's got final answers on anything, but I'd love to go to each of the groups and get a sense of where they ended up in their thoughts on these main questions.

So group number one had this question of who do we represent. And who would like to be the rapporteur for that?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I will try. This is Hadia for the record. So we thought, well, the obvious answer is written actually in the bylaws, which is the interests of end users. However, to look at it from a more practical point of view, we decided to write down what issues would we be sort of concerned with. So we wrote users access, users privacy, users online safety, users inclusion, users-- so this is what we thought could be the answer, although it does not really answer the question whose interest. Another thought we were thinking in your introduction, or would I stop here in order to--

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe. Did you address the question about registrants, whether we need to include them? And by that, when they're being end users, they are included. But what I mean are registrant-specific interests. Do they need us to represent them, or are they well-represented elsewhere?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Well, sometimes we would defend registrants, I would say maybe business or site, but not from the registrant's business point of view, but from an end user's point of view. So as an example, if a very popular web search site is not accessible by some users and everyone else is using that site, so would we go and say, well, yes, we defend that. I would say-- I don't want to mention names. We did have specific names, but I do not want to spell out specific examples. But the short answer is yes, we could actually defend registrants at some time, but not because of their own business, but because of the end user's interest in their business, of the impact of their business on end users.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Because that's very specific. So if I ask the question-- and this is not to detract from any of the fine work that our volunteers have done-- but if we took the example of registrar transfer policy, that is something that is specifically an issue that impacts registrants, people that own domain names. So my question is, would that make the cut based on your thoughts? And then maybe the people that participated didn't want to say-- if not for them, that some issues wouldn't have been raised. I don't know the right answer. But would that make the grade if it's something that's really about being a registrant? Did you talk about that kind of thing is what I mean?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: We did not talk about this specific issue. But yes, sometimes it could affect end users, and some other times it does not affect end users. It depends on the circumstances. So yes, transfers could have an indirect impact on end users, depending on the situation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you. All right. Group number two, how do we identify the interests of individual end users?

MICHAEL PALAGE: So what we did is we started off-- we wanted to go down two tracks, methodology and output. Unfortunately, we only got to the methodology. And one of the first things that the group focused on was all of the people that we may not be accounting for. So we looked at

from the underrepresented in the community, either from a geographic, cultural, financial, linguistic, or from a disability. So one of the things that we really focused on is, in the initial decision-making process, who may not be at the table, and how best to account for that. So that was one of the first things we focused on. One of the next topics we discussed was timing. Olivier talked about how we had increased the window. I think it was 21 days. Now it's 28 or 30. We talked about, do we necessarily need more time? Because with the approval of the ALAC, there are definitely some built-in times. We decided not necessarily to go down that route, because if, in fact, we missed a window, ALAC can still, nevertheless, submit a comment to the board so our voice would be heard. One of the comments that was proposed, though, was the idea of a centralized calendar, or something that could be better-- it would really help if the other communities and SOs would work to give us a heads-up on what is coming down the pike. So that was something that was discussed. We also talked about the aspect of being proactive or reactive. To Alan's point, when does ALAC want to submit something to the board, as opposed to us commenting? So we acknowledge that there is a difference there, but we talked about, well, maybe we still use the same funnel. The final point of discussion was, in making these decisions, in going down the funnel, is a lack of consensus? What is the gating function as to yay or nay? Is it rough consensus, full consensus? And I think the group generally was erring on the side of, when in doubt, perhaps, to let it in, and not necessarily have a rigid thing. So we really didn't get into a full discussion there, but we were concerned about a rigid interpretation that may block things from consideration. So that is what we achieved.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So that was a consensus on what position to take, you mean, or whether to take the issue?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Just to take the issue. Again, we only did the methodologies. We didn't get to the output side. So that was just to --

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I mean, because that's also an interesting question, is, if we take an issue, if we don't have consensus on it, should we be speaking on it?

MICHAEL PALAGE: Yeah, so what happens is, it was just the initial taking on the issue, not what the position on that issue would be.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Great. Thanks, Michael, and thanks, Group Number 2. Group Number 3, this was how do we eliminate issues? How do we boil it down to the most important ones? Who's the rapporteur for that, for Group Number 3?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. We decided that the first issue that we need to look at is whether it's within ICANN's remit and mandate, and because, you know, like, what impact is the issue going to have on ICANN overall? Then, like, impact on the end-users in relation to -- and we're not -- but we really - - yeah, and then the impact on end-users. We're looking at validating

the issue, making sure that we're, you know, got measures, that there's ranking done within the -- you know, that we would actually do that, refining it a little bit more, looking at potential time frame, like, but that would have an impact on sort of like how much involvement the people who are in the group would be working on, limitation of resources with regards to people who -- volunteers who are available for the working group or whatever, and expert knowledge, the experts who would be required, are they available to basically inform people appropriately within the group, but ultimately in order to get buy-in from the community to actually be involved and sort of see the purpose and the value of the issue for them as end-users to actually participate. That's basically what we argued about. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. Thank you. That's a great start. And then group number four, I heard completely went off the rails, to use a train metaphor. So who is speaking on behalf of group four?

GREG SHATAN:

I have my notes here on my iPhone Pro Super Max. This is the latest. Made with titanium. That's what they call a phatlet, I think. Yes. So we decided that we pretty much knew what outreach and engagement were, but we need to decide the how, what, where, who, strategies, what things we need to do better going forward in a nutshell. One of the things we thought that was most important in terms of outreach was to simplify our communication. We need to make it more understandable to more people. Following on your talk, Jonathan, have messages that are repeatable and that get repeated and that get understood by, you

know, more and more of the 7 billion. We need to, you know, refine our messaging strategy. We need to find ways to make more connection with people we're outreaching to. Otherwise, we just sort of bounce off. You know, outreaches, if outreach is fishing, the hook has to get into the fish. It's also important to be localized and not think that every message, you know, is universal. A couple of strategy ideas was to do more local outreach next to ICANN meetings. We've done that sometimes. And I think there may be one coming up in Puerto Rico, if I'm not mistaken. But it should be something that we internalize. You know, what have we brought to the end users of Hamburg while we're here? Maybe a little bit of money. That's about it. So thank you. It's important also inclusion, accessibility for people with disabilities, multiple languages. We really need to make sure that our outreach message can go everywhere and isn't being diminished because we're communicating like white American, European, English speaking people. Which is really that's not where—Our next billion members aren't there. I don't think we have our first billion members of At-Large. But we need to be diverse in our outreach. So last but not least, it's always better to divide something into four parts. Actions and strategies. We decided we need to do outreach to people who do not know we exist and also to people who do know we exist. And we need the resources to do it. Preferably in small unmarked bills. In engagement we need to promote ourselves through the fellowship process. We need to do more engagement. We need to work more on onboarding. And marketing and promotion. We have a lot of good content as everyone always says. I can't learn is great. We have lots of stuff at large is produced. But we need to do marketing and promotion better. We need to not just hide our light under a bushel basket so to

speaking. If anybody's ever seen a bushel basket. Strategies, more personal touch. Again, simplifying and connecting more fluid communication. Lastly, improve our use of social media and email without spamming everyone. And also, website. Websites are a great way to communicate with millions and millions of people. Is our website a great way to communicate with millions and millions of people? I don't think so. Arguably, it's decent to communicate with the people who are already here and who are awake on day five or whatever day this is. But we actually should have an outward facing website. That's pretty. And that communicates clearly what it is that we bring to the table. Lastly, we should be trying to gain analytics through websites, through polling, through whatever it might be. We need to have more metrics, more data, more dollars. Somehow that came up again. So that's it. And lastly, we're all invited to Ireland. Thank you. Not by me.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I walked around to all the groups and everybody was really earnestly involved in these conversations. So I really want to thank you. Sometimes breakouts are when everybody starts to break out and wander out to the coffee break or something like that. And I saw people really engaged. And I really appreciate it. Because we really need to refine what it is that matters most to us, who we're trying to reach and how we're trying to reach them. And what it is we're trying to accomplish inside the ICANN community as well. And get as specific as we can so that we can repeat it as often as we can. So I appreciate all of you very much. I'm looking forward to continuing to serve as your punching bag for another year. And we've got a lot to do and accomplish. But right now, all that needs to happen is to have cake. So

we have a cake. And I just want to tell everyone, happy anniversary. It's been great learning so much about the last 20 years.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]