
ICANN80 | PF – At-Large Leadership Wrap Up
Thursday, June 13, 2024 – 13:45 to 15:00 KGL

GISELLA GRUBER:

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Leadership Wrap-Up session. My name is Gisella Gruber and I am participation manager for the 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 will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom, on-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Interpretation for the session includes English, French and Spanish. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Please speak at a reasonable pace. With that, I'll hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, chair of the ALAC. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Gisella, and thank all of you for being here. We made it through another ICANN meeting. It's funny, this is supposed to be a short meeting, but somehow it feels like the agenda was the same as it was in a long meeting. We just crushed more things into a fewer number of days, but I think we made it through okay. So, thank all of you for your continuing participation.

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.

The purpose of this meeting really is to review what took place at the meeting, get people to report on things that they saw, issues that they saw come up that we might need to address. When we talk about reports, we really want to focus on things that might lead to action for this community. And we're going to learn a little bit about the Internet Governance Forum Support Association from Amrita, and we will hear from our workgroup chairs about work that's relevant to them. Then we'll talk about the next steps in the strategic plan that Maarten will be discussing with us as well. We've got plenty to talk about. So, with that, I'm going to just give the microphone to Amrita to talk to us a little bit about the Internet Governance Forum Support Association.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you so much, Jonathan, and thank you for wearing my Internet Governance Forum Support Association hat for this opportunity to share a bit about ourselves. Before I begin, I personally know many of you have been participating in IGF, but how many of you are associated with a national, regional Internet Governance Forum? Can you raise your hands? Either local, national, regional or-- Okay. Thank you so much. We will be presenting a bit about IGFSA.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Can whoever is running Zoom clear the recording dialogue box that's covering up Amrita's face?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

So, obviously, we are presenting a bit about IGfSA, and we would also have an ask at the end of it. For those who have heard it earlier, my apologies. But primarily, for most of us, especially At-Large also, the IGF has been a home where all stakeholders meet together to discuss on issues which is important to them on an equal footing, and obviously, take back the learnings from there. You have government coming in, civil society coming in, you have businesses coming in, regulators coming in, so that it inspires people to go back to their communities and also inculcate things and also bring back the learnings from there.

It was started in 2006 after the WSIS Forum, but IGF Support Association was formed in 2014 by the late Marilyn K. Tarek Kamal, who are known to the ICANN community. But our primary objective is to support the national regional Internet Governance Initiatives, which is also known as NRIs, especially from the developing countries, including the youth initiatives.

So, why we support the local IGFs, and here we are only speaking from the ICANN perspective, because we are at ICANN, is primarily to-- While there are many discussions which are happening at the IGFs, which is digital in nature, content or intermediate reliability, there are also discussions on the domain names, even the names and numbers, and also to differentiate the discussions. For example, if we are talking about DNS Abuse, there is a content part of an issue, but there are also certain things which happens at the infrastructure layer, which is kind of different. Also to kind of build the understanding of the influencers, the regulators who are participating, the slight difference between these discussions, so that they are better informed.

Currently, the national regional IGFs are spread over more than 160 countries. It's not 130. Our grants from the support association ranges from \$500 to \$3,500. It depends upon the kind of support which is being given for youth initiative, regional initiative or the national initiatives. But we have a pre-certified process wherein we work with the IGF secretariat to understand whether it is a legitimate initiative, so that we can support and there is no double dipping.

For many who may not be aware, the IGF also supports national regional initiatives. However, since they are cash-starved at many times, especially now, this year they haven't been able to support most of the NRIs who have applied and that's when we come into the picture and we support rather more than they do.

So, there are various discussions which are happening, but some topics of interest from a few of the events which we have been tracking is on DNS operation, the interoperability globally, DNS Abuse mitigation, obviously data protection, content regulation, online public safety is important, AI is a big topic these days. But just to give you a flavor of what is being discussed, but since many of you are involved in your local initiatives, you know more than me about what's being discussed locally.

So, as I mentioned, we actually support the national regional initiatives. As I mentioned earlier in the slide, why people should be supporting it is try to differentiate between the infrastructure and the protocols of the internet from the other topics which is happening, reinforcing the multi-stakeholder forums because many of you may be hearing a lot

about the various processes at the UN which is happening, which obviously since technology, internet and digital has an impact in our lives, it could not be just the governments who make the decisions. The views of all the stakeholders including end-users needs to be considered and this is what we are trying to emphasize that, if you want to support the IGF and the multi-stakeholder model, this is also a way to support it.

So, what we do is, obviously, we support the events annually. We do quality control supervision. For example, when applications come in, the secretariat, Fio, from the secretariat is with us but Jennifer is also there but we are having to speak in two events, two sessions today so we are kind of divided. We do the quality control looking at who are the people, what is the content. Though we don't get into the content, we definitely look at what is the program all about. We act as a clearinghouse. For example, when we spoke to SSAC day before yesterday, they suggested that they can support with speakers and topics so perhaps we will have a section wherein in case any of the NRIs want speakers from that region, we could support them or with topics if they want, and obviously get back to our donors and supporters.

How you can be involved? Well, you can be involved and this is asked. You can become an individual member of IGfSA. The annual membership fee is \$25, and this is the website, igf.org/become-a-member. You could also volunteer to be a speaker, panelist and spread the word. Many from At-Large may not have that kind of financial strength but you may know organizations who may want to support this. If you could kind of spread the word and if you have some

suggestions of whom we can reach out to, you can write to Chris Mondini. His email ID is given.

So, yes, we look at your support to reach out, inform people about the Internet Governance Forum Support Association and how people can contribute. Even 25 people supporting with \$25 would support one NRI. So, that's the kind of thing. The amount may be small but that goes a long way to support some initiative in some developing country.

This is the executive committee. You must be knowing most of them. They are from the ICANN world, most of them. So, this is the end of my presentation. In case you have any questions, queries, I would be happy to respond to them. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So, Amrita, it's Jonathan. Is the primary purpose of the association to support the creation of new IGFs in smaller underserved communities? What is the primary work of the association?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

So, the primary work of the association is to support the IGF and the national regional initiatives. Many times we also support the IGF when they do not have funds. For example, many times like they wanted some kind of accessibility in terms of captions, etcetera. We funded that. Sometimes they have interns who need to go to meetings. They aren't able to fund. So, we do that. But primarily, we help the ecosystem. The national regional initiatives. We do support EuroDIG.

We do support many of the-- in fact, I think 256 is the number, right? We have supported over the years. So, yes, we support these initiatives.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I see Avri is up. Go ahead, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, hi. This is Avri. And I just wanted to add something. I was part of the IGFSa when it was first formed. And indeed, everything that's been said is the case. The reason it was formed, though, to help answer is to create a possibility for regular folks and people that aren't big institutions to donate. Because going through the UN's funding procedures is really quite arduous. And so, this was created to have sort of another easier to use, easier to access method. And I recommend you all join. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I think that's it for questions. Amrita, thank you so much. I hear Chris is not doing well. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see your card. Go ahead.

REMMY NWEKE: All right. Thanks, Jonathan. Remmy Nweke for the record. I work with DigitalSENSE Africa, it's an ALS in Nigeria. And thanks, Amrita, for the presentation. I have a few things I would like to get cleared. From the presentation you made, the support association only supports IGF as a national IGF or just IGF initiative. So, I would like to have a clarification made on that.

Because if you take, for instance, Nigeria, we are very large as a country. So, having one IGF may not be the best, and that's also one of the things that inspires our DigitalSENSE Africa when we started. And what we do is to organize events around Internet governance for development so that people get to know what is happening in that sector. And then at the national IGF, which we are also a member, we try to put up reports of what's going on.

And I think the likes of DigitalSENSE needs to be encouraged so that they can continuously engage in their outreach. So that if you look at Nigeria as an instance, it will help to galvanize people, go far in closing the gap within the DNS industry as an objective, so to say. So, I don't know if there is any way the support association could support this kind of initiatives running on their own and also feeding into the national platforms. Thank you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you so much for your question, Remmy. Unfortunately, we depend upon the funds we have. With this kind of funds, we can support only the national regional initiatives, including the youth, which are registered with the UN IGF. We would love to do more because there is a scope for supporting most of the developing countries or even the ALSs in their activities. But unfortunately, at this point of time, we want to focus on the NRIs, at this point of time.

What we gave, we want to increase the funding. And that's the reason why we are reaching out to all of you to spread the information and to take us to sponsors. If we have more money, we would want to support

more, but this is what we can do. I know we can do more, but we are trying to do as much as we can. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Amrita. I guess that's all. I think that's everybody's question. So, thanks for bringing this to our attention and I encourage everybody to join. Let's go right into the liaison reports, starting with Justine Chew, unless she's simultaneously on a GNSO call as we speak or something.

JUSTINE CHEW:

No, I'm not. Hi, this is Justine. I'm experiencing a power outage, so I'm not going to turn on my camera. I'm running out of battery power. So, in terms of GNSO, actually, I thought this month's meeting was actually quite boring, to be honest. There wasn't anything significant to the At-Large that's worth reporting. So, I'm just going to leave it as that. The reports are up. I've already written up my report. The links to that are in the At-Large group of reports anyway. So, I'll just leave it as that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Very efficient, Justine. Thank you. And I know Laura is actually in the ccNSO wrap-up meeting right now. So, she's submitted a written report. Do we have more from Matt, SSAC? Oh, there you are. Thanks.

MATTHIAS HUDOBNIK: Hey, Matthias Hudobnik speaking for the record. So, I will be also quite short. We had our usual working groups meeting. You can check the recording online. What was very interesting, we had also a session related to AI and DNS security, a bit checking in how much things can be automatized. And furthermore, we had a very successful session, I would say, also with At-Large community and cyber safe campaign. And hopefully, this will also be something which we can push further and then also make use of it and also help end users to, let's say, raise awareness and that they can apply this knowledge then on their personal use. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All this efficiency. Who else? Is there any? What other liaisons we have? Is that it? Joanna, are you prepared to be on the call?

JOANNA KULESZA: Hi. Yes, sir. Thank you very much. Just briefly, as previous speaker. Joanna Kulesza, for the transcription purposes. In terms of our cooperation with the GAC, that is as always running very smoothly. We've had a very successful session yesterday, although it's always quite brief, with wonderful input from Jonathan himself. Thank you very much for taking the lead on that. It seems as if, once again, we are fully aligned on the needs to protect the interests of end users.

There has been already a joint communication. Another one might be in the works. We are focusing on contention resolution. We are focusing on private auctions. And there seems to be still much work to

do, both in terms of raising awareness of why these seemingly complex issues are of direct interest to both end users, but also governments, as well as a need to build capacity on the complexities behind those items. So, the key takeaway from yesterday's session would be for us to work together to raise awareness about why it is very important to seek solutions to potential contention that is well-suited to end user interests, as well as how to efficiently raise awareness.

We have a lot of expertise in this room particularly. I already see Alan's hand being raised. It's just a question of how we might wish to efficiently scale it. So, maybe this is an opportunity for us to finally meet together somewhere intersessional, online, offline, and try to better grasp, particularly for the newcomers. Well, we have in the At-Large community a significant group of those as well. But particularly for the GAC, a large group with a very thorough rotation, they always very much appreciate the input from the At-Large.

And the Communiqué is being drafted. So, I will sign off swiftly and try to present the report that will include that communiqué. I'm certain there's more to be added. And as already said, I see Alan's hand being raised. Thank you, everyone, for your support in organizing the bilateral this time around. I regret I could not join you on the ground, but supporting local ALS engagement is equally time-consuming and equally important. So, thank you very much, everyone, for your support. And I felt as if I was there with you, even though participating remotely. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Foreign language 00:21:30]. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just a very brief note. One of the outcomes of that meeting was the desirability of submitting advice to the Board on disallowing any sort of financial adjustment for contention that is allowing only auctions. And the general wisdom seems to be we should do that within a week. So, we're going to have to have someone draft that and get it to the ALAC pretty quickly. And we expect the GAC to do something similar.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, thanks, Alan. The time is certainly getting tight on this because it's coming before the RT on auctions. Just briefly for this group, the study that was commissioned by the Board of NiRA I think was fairly pessimistic about the ability to prevent gaming if we permitted joint ventures. And so, while joint ventures came out as a kind of de facto recommendation of the subsequent procedures, not a proactive one, but a de facto one, and is an approved resolution of the Board, we do have a sticky wicket, as we say, trying to figure out how to unwind that.

But as Alan mentioned in the meeting yesterday, the dearth of joint ventures in the previous round suggests that it might be much ado about nothing, but it is still an approved resolution of the Board. So, I think it's something we're going to have to work out. Lars, who has a job that I would not envy, buttonholed me today in the hallway to talk

about this and community priority evaluation, which are things that we need to address in our advice.

But I'm still inclined to be assertive and try to help the Board find a way around what seems like a procedural barrier in the case of joint ventures, as opposed to really a substantive one. But that's just my personal opinion. I'm happy to hear from the Board if they want to speak up, too. Did you have something else, Alan? Your finger's poised on that button there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No. I just wanted to say that the indications I have is advice from the ALAC would be timely and useful.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Avri, you've got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks. Avri speaking. Just to be slightly pessimistic on it, if we do send a letter, it should probably suggest how they can do it. Because trying to prevent means of passing advantage from one to another to get somebody to drop out. It just gets pushed way behind the scenes. So if we can think of a way in which they can stop it being a-- in other words, while keeping it open, as they said, they do want to keep it open for cooperation of some sort, so that things can be resolved.

And they did add a little bit of perhaps people can change their names. I'm not quite sure how that's going to work out to fight contention. But

telling people that they can't flip a coin and have a pot of money waiting in the hotel room is going to be difficult to enforce. And so in making a recommendation, I think we're really going to have to look at how practically we think they could do it, in addition to recommending that they do prohibit. A prohibition that can't be enforced is just an invitation to gaming. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Avri. And I couldn't agree more. And that's why our advice, as it's currently drafted, actually suggests a closed bid system as part of the application process, so that it actually takes place before the names are made public, and that would allow that gaming. So, a lot of it is trying to prevent a context in which gaming can occur, as opposed to outlawing it, which is, I agree with you, would be difficult.

But doing it that way does make difficult doing joint ventures. And I think, again, that feels like less of a substantive problem, and does make community priority evaluation more complicated. And so we need, as the At-Large community, to figure out what our proposed solutions are to both of those things. But our solution to the issue you raise, Avri, is that we take it out of the public eye and simply make it a private bid auction that happens as part of the application.

ALAN GREENBERG:

To be clear, Avri, we're not talking about trying to limit it to only certain kinds of private resolution. We're saying no private resolution, period. And the way you make sure that is, is you have penalties, that if you

become obvious that something like that happened, they can lose the TLD.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's fun stuff. It's fun stuff, for sure. Any other questions or comments about that? Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA: If I can, it sounds like a wonderful opportunity for ICANN to become a police state. So, decide which is the worst evil at a certain point. Is a private auction really a worse evil than ICANN becoming a more effective policeman? And also, this would involve going against the recommendation. So, yeah, it's an interesting task you've set yourself.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, indeed. It's fun. Certainly, again, as the advice is currently drafted, because I think it's really important we all say the same thing when we're talking about it. We are not talking about an enforceable prohibition on private resolution. We are trying to take the opportunity for private resolution off the table. So, it's not a police state question. It's literally a question of resolving the contention set through a closed bid system as part of the application. So, there isn't a compliance part of that. It's simply a question of never even knowing you were in contention in the first place.

So, that has its own advantages and disadvantages. But just so we are all clear as a group, that is what we are proposing, is making it happen

as part of the application so that people aren't even alerted to the fact they're in contention. I didn't mean to go off and down a whole tangent on that, but it's certainly one of the big discussions we have in front of us here. With that, I guess I would like to have Olivier/Avri, however you want to handle it, talk about the policy-related issues that were raised here and that we need to be thinking about going forward other than this one. So, Avri or Olivier?

AVRI DORIA: Is Olivier here?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No idea.

AVRI DORIA: I do not see Olivier. This being the first one of these leadership close-ups I've been up since getting involved in this, I was hoping to dump it on him, but it doesn't look like I can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Completely understandable. There's no grading system, though, Avri, so just do whatever comes to your mind and we'll all appreciate it.

AVRI DORIA: I figure that At-Large and I are still trying each other on for size. So, if I fail miserably, I'll just wander away. Anyway, so I'm really not quite sure

what gets covered here. I've looked through the reports. I'm very grateful to those that have written them as of my accounting before this session started. There's like five different sessions that did not get a volunteer to report. So, that's something where I'd recommend, hey, look through it if you were at one of those sessions and have something to say, please do.

Now, did you want to go through and have these folks that took the effort to write something say a few words about them or for me to just sort of hand wave my way through a couple of the issues that I've seen while reading through these and such and then have them volunteer to add stuff to it? Or how is it done? I have never received on before.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Well, just as you are trying out the At-Large, the At-Large is in a state of evolution on this very topic as well. So, we've had people give reports and that has often gone on too long. And so, if you'd like to try your attempt at hand waving, I think that would be welcome.

I think in particular we're looking for color that says that, hey, this is something we need to pay attention to because it's a policy thing we need to be engaged in or that it's going away that we don't like. Something that kind of relates, becomes a sort of action item for us, I think is what we really want to have our eyes open for, Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. So, in which case let me go through just a couple of little points quickly and then what I'll do is invite anyone who thinks that something

important happened in the session that they took an effort to write up about should add to it.

I mean, one of the bigger things that happened, and we saw that I guess at first appeared in a Board-GAC meeting but then showed up in others is sort of where we're going on the RVCs. And that looks to me like one of the issues that we're going to have to unpack and think about some in the CPWG. Because the Board has basically looked at it and gone down a legal path that has told them that there is no way even having a third party external non-related arbiter to basically take the responsibility away from ICANN of being responsible for it and therefore it would put ICANN in the position of judging based on content.

Now, that being the case, does that leave enough RVC for the uses that the recommendations wanted to put it to? So, I think that that's one of the pieces of work that's going to be going on and that does, I think, fall into the bailiwick of the strict narrow bailiwick of At-Large only looking at user-centric issues is because many of those things are indeed in the protection spaces and such. So, what can be done with the registry voluntary commitments to protect the users? Will it still be a viable tool?

And so that's one thing I think that is probably worth looking at. I think within the IRT, and I do think that there's enough going on in the IRTs we saw at this one, that we really perhaps want to look at our ongoing meeting format and sort of say IRTs seem a thing like we should really be paying specific attention to and not having them fall somewhere between, well, it isn't a comment period and it isn't a working group

that's being liaisoned, and so what do we do. So, I think we need to start looking at some, and there's definitely issues there.

Now, I think a lot of the time in the IRT was spent on, gee, how much it's going to cost and how dare you charge us this much and how can you be doing your billing this way or your accounting this way. But there are still some issues there, especially in the applicant support area, in the discount. We've got GAC who we support sort of say 30%, 85%, 50%. Why isn't it free for these applicants? And then issues of what are the qualifying areas for.

So, I think within the applicant support world, there's a lot of discussion going on, how it would work, how we do-- This came out in some of the outreach meetings. How do we help do outreach? That was the meeting that you had with Sally from communications is how do you help? How do you make sure that there is enough spread of the news and such? So, that's good. Oh, good. Justine, why don't you jump in there?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Oh, hi. You can finish if you like.

AVRI DORIA:

I'm wondering, I'm doing a hand wave. So, you saved me from my next hand wave, but now please go on and then I'll go on.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Okay. I'm going to turn off my video. All right. This is Justine for the record. Avri is absolutely correct in saying that there are heaps of things going on in the IRT, the SubPro IRT. And there's a few things that we need to pay attention to and perhaps do some work on. In fact, I would highly recommend that we do some work on.

Firstly, in terms of the fees that are being proposed for the RSP, the registry service provider evaluation, it may not necessarily have a direct effect on end users per se, but it could impact on the cost that an applicant that we might want to see. For example, an applicant who is seeking applicant support, it may impact the ability to actually go ahead and run a TLD. Because even if they rely on a third-party registry service provider, if the registry service provider is passing back the cost down to the clients, in which case it's the applicant support applicant, then there is a factor there that would impact the ability of the applicant support applicant to actually run a TLD.

So, that's one. Same argument and even more direct is the gTLD evaluation fee, which is still at this point-- Everybody's sort of like shocked to say the least at the high level of it. It's around \$200,000, right? So even with that, and even with a minimum 75% discount for applicant support applicants, that figure may still be out of reach to many entities that we are hoping to join the fray.

The next point about ASP is the bid credit or the multiplier. So, the discussion at IRT has begun on that. ICANN org has proposed two mechanisms. We will need time to examine the efficacy of both. I have basically thrown out a challenge to the IRT to see if we can re-look at

the whole auctions issue. They wanted to discuss the bid credit independent of the auctions, and I said, well, the two are intrinsically linked, so you can't really look at one without looking at the other.

But nevertheless, we have been invited to try to unpack the two mechanisms that have been proposed to see whether we like certain elements from one and other elements from the other and do possibly a combination. Because I think somehow one doesn't work as well, neither does the other one work as perfectly as we would like it. So, we're going to try and look at a combination that works better than either one of the two mechanisms proposed.

The third thing that I want to mention before I forget is that we have been invited to provide an updated copy, I would say, or version of the ALAC procedure for filing comments and objections. So, that is coming directly through to me and Cheryl. It hasn't gone to the IRT, so we have been given the first option to update that because it is an ALAC procedure at the end of the day. So, we'll have to take some time to look at what we had done in the past in 2012 and see whether we need to do an update or at least do a date update, really, and then submit that back to the IRT. So, I will stop there. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. That worked quite well. I think I'm coming close to it. Another one where there was some discussion, and it looks like there's opportunity that has to do, was the whole CPH work on fighting DNS abuse. There was a discussion on how people can file reports, and that

goes beyond the big companies that know how to file a registrar report, but looking into how many reports are filed badly.

So, there is certainly something in there in terms of this is an active pilot. If we think it's something that users could use, like my spouse used to use to check on companies she was going to order from and other normal folks, not companies could-- I guess, not legal folks, but natural folks could use, there may be room for At-Large to contribute to that effort in terms of specifics, in terms of doing things. I don't know.

In terms of looking forward, in terms of there was meetings on RDRS, there was something on PPSAI that we should probably care about. I'm not sure I got my letters in the right order. But there were no alarms raised, so I couldn't tell from the write-ups whether there was an issue. So, if anybody was at either of those two that has something concrete to add to it, other than, yeah, it's going on. Just like the review of IANA. It was a review that says, yes, it's moving along, it's looking into these points, but it didn't raise any flags.

So, in that case, and then perhaps there's stuff for the OFB talking about the multi-stakeholder, but I'll stay away from that. If so, I think I've covered it unless somebody has something to add to it. But I don't see any hands going up, or do I?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I don't see any either, Avri. I know the other issue that came up in our discussions with the GAC that had to do with the Applicant Support Program was about first-come, first-serve and the arbitrariness of that,

particularly in a world where there's going to be many people whose languages are not among the languages that the applicant guidebook is translated to in the first place. And there's real implications for a first-come, first-serve type of program.

So, we may need to discuss that, although the amount of money has gone up so considerably since when it was \$2 million, it's now between \$10 and \$16. But it may be moot in terms of how many actual applications there are for support. But that's certainly something the GAC has raised some concern about.

AVRI DORIA:

And I see Alan has his hand up, but I want to throw one thing. And we had been discussing that in the IRT that because of the way they were doing it, I mean, it isn't a first-come, first-serve, and I think it's a misnomer to call it that, but it has some of those bad values in terms of that. And people had said, well, then it just becomes another opportunity for archery. And I don't think it's anywhere near that bad.

And I think the other thing that GAC said-- Oh, I'm losing my voice. And the other thing that GAC said was that, well, if that's not enough money, maybe the Board adds more money. And indeed, this Board at the moment, of course, who knows what Board we'll have in two years or whatever, does look at when pressed on there not being enough money, they came up with more money. So, if we did have a lot, then it would. But Alan, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I just wanted to mention the PPSAI IRT did kick off this morning. I believe I'm the only member from At-Large. It's going to be a heavy workload for, I'm guessing, for at least a year and a half or something like that. Anyone else wants to participate? Do so. Otherwise--

JONATHAN ZUCK: You're overselling it. You make it sound so attractive.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm being honest. There's no point in someone signing up and then just disappearing, as people often do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

AVRIA DORIA: I was in the first incarnation of that way, way back, and I wouldn't touch it. So good luck. Anyhow, that's about it for me, unless there's questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's it, Avri. I'm going to hand it over to Claire.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Hello, everyone. I am Claire Craig for the record. As you all know, this is a policy meeting, so there's very little for us in the OFB. But for those

of you who are new to ALAC and At-Large, let me just give you a brief introduction of what we do in the OFB before I have-- Oh, that one is, Jonathan. Okay. Right. Okay.

Before I have the distinct pleasure of handing over to Maarten Botterman from the ICANN Board. So, what we do At-Large, the operations, finance, and budget working group, as the name suggests, we deal with the operations of the organization. We are tasked with preparing statements and requests related to the ICANN finance and budget strategy, the operational initiatives, yes, and the ICANN, as well as the PTI. We also prepare statements related to the organizational reviews, including things like the continuous improvement program.

So, this year, particularly since December, we've been very busy working on-- The meeting started today with Amrita's report on the IGF, and that falls under the purview of the operation of the OFBWG. At-Large IGF meetings, we've discussed our involvement in the WSIS+20, as well as NETmundial. This has taken and continues to take a lot of work on our part, and that is the ATRT3 Recommendation 3.6, which deals with the continuous improvement program. So much so that when I was invited to be chair of this working group, to be co-chair of this working group, this was a monthly meeting. It went to every two weeks, and now it's actually a weekly meeting.

And what we have also been doing is planning and preparing for engaging with the Pilot Holistic Review. So, those are some of the things that we are involved in. This is an open membership group, so any member of At-Large, feel free to join and share your expertise as

well. But it is a mandatory meeting for the 15-member ALAC. So, thank you.

And at this point, I will turn the meeting over to Maarten, who will provide us with our next steps for the ICANN five-year strategic plan, because I know he's been saying to me, yes, we need to hear from ALAC. We need to get you all involved. You need to come on Board. Well, not come on Board. We are on Board, but we need to be part of getting the strategic plan up and functioning as quickly as possible. Thank you. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yes. Thanks, Claire. And thanks, ALAC, for having us. Chris and I co-chair the Board Strategic Planning Committee. And what you'll hear later today as well is the output from the Board committee, not from the entire Board. But we really would like to use this opportunity to hear from the community, get first feedback, get some thinking before we finalize the full draft for formal public comment. Leon is also part of our committee. Thank you for supporting us here.

If we can have the next slide. So basically, it's embedded in our bylaws that there is a five-year plan. The people who worked together on getting the 2016 bylaws to support ICANN going forward have made this a clear part of that. And it will be presented both with a five-year operating plan, but also with the notice that they will be updated annually. We don't think that the coming five years will be predictable as such.

So, we've been working diligently to develop that draft strategic plan and we're getting closer. We based it on the 21-25, the current annual plan, strategic plan, which, as you know, has been updated annually, listening to the community, seeing what is fundamental change needed or slight corrections in course needed in the operational plan that accompanies it.

But also, on the environmental scan for input, we collected from throughout ICANN. And for me, ICANN isn't only the Org, but it's really the community, the Org and the Board together. We are one ecosystem. We are ICANN together. And from that perspective, also sessions, even in the organization has contributed to the insights on which we've been updating or building the new strategic plan. So, the current timeline aims to deliver it for Board adoption, not later than March 2025, because it needs to be in place before July, 2025, when it starts the fiscal year '26.

A quick overview of the timeline and also showing this to remind you that actually, this is not something that comes out of nothing. It's really based on work with you, facilitated by the organization since 2023, where we began with the environmental scan, in which many workshops were held, both online and at ICANN meetings to collect input. Now, where we are today is that we are in the final part of getting this plan ready for public comment. And we expect that to be launching shortly.

First update of first feedback we've received during the prep week session in which some of you were present, really appreciate it.

Yesterday, we had the opportunity to talk with the ccNSO, put a process in place, and I expect that it will trigger a good response from throughout that community that will help us to move from the draft plan to the final plan as well. And then, as you can see, the public comment is really planned from July to September.

The next one. Here I show for you the draft vision statement. We put this on the table as a working statement in January. And it has held the content for so far as being very reflective. One thing different than the current plan, what we try to do is be very succinct, come with statements that people can remember and can identify with in that way. Because with the current plan, which we embrace, we see that maybe with the new plan, we should even more embed it in the way we work. So, we don't only look at what's ahead of us the coming weeks, the coming months, but put it in a longer-term perspective of this plan.

And we hope that in five years' time to achieve that as the trusted steward of the internet's unique identifier systems, ICANN is dedicated to strengthening the single globally interoperable internet for all. We recognize in this statement that we are not just a steward, but also need to be a trusted steward. Thanks, Chris. And it's the unique identifier systems, DNS and more. And we are not doing that by ourselves. We're doing that in an ecosystem, both within ICANN and with other players like the root server operators, the RIRs, et cetera.

So, these are the four areas that we see as our strategic objectives. For those of you who know the current plan, you may remark there's five right now. Looking at it, rethinking it, it came down to these four based

on what we think are the crucial strategic objectives to which there are goals, to which there are strategies to achieve them. So, the first one is on sustain and promote ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, an inclusive internet governance model. Recognizing that ICANN's model is unique, it's embedded in the bylaws and that's why it says ICANN's model rather than a multi-stakeholder model. And it's really about creating the environment where we can function together and work better together, both internally within ICANN as externally with our partners.

The strategic objective two is on enhanced organizational excellence. There's increasing demands and not so much increasing means to meet those demands. And this pushes us to even be more sharp on pursuing a sustainable future, where we look at improving our agility and adaptability, make sure that when needed, we can move faster together. Where we look at preserving our financial sustainability, seeing that we're now in a period for the first time where we haven't easily met our spendings because costs go quicker than the income that raises.

And the other one is to also enhance our global presence and impact, both in terms of the workforce serving the world in a sustainable way and in an effective way. And last but not least, questions that come up with people within the organization, within the community, within the Board.

And also, the outside world is moving towards ESG reporting, in which ecology is something that we haven't embraced yet. And we are now committed to addressing that as well. We do see that this world needs

to be treated well and do our best in that as well. So, that is a new action line. You may also have seen the CEO goal related to that. It starts with putting a baseline in place on which we can start moving and know that we're improving and know that we're doing better time over time.

So, the last slide, because I hope I kept it to five minutes, but I can get very passionate about this. You will see that things about this are continuously published. There is a publication of the environmental scan on the internet. And we cannot do this without you, both in terms of creating it, and thanks for your input so far. And we really look forward to the input also later this afternoon, when at half past three, we have a full session to which more comments are very welcome.

But also, during the public comment period, we've listened to you, we continue to listen to you. And this needs to end up in a plan that we all can embrace, that we all can see as a point at horizon to which we're working together. So, thank you for your interest. Thank you. I've seen many of you and I've heard you talk about it even in the group as ALAC. And I really look forward, really, really look forward to your further input. Once the public comment period which combines up and beyond the document, we will also organize webinars to discuss it as it is.

So, hope this helps for now. If you allow me one more remark, please note that the actions we've taken, also some relating to the new round, are published now and on the internet on the Board site. And some of these relate to the points you discussed before, that's why I mentioned

it. So happy to answer any questions and more space for questions later this afternoon in the public session.

HANNAH FRANK:

Hello. Hannah Frank for the Record, ICANN fellow. Thank you so much for your presentation. Related to that, I know yesterday was a session of the ccNSO related to Sustainable Development Goals. And you talked about recently, well, Sustainable Development Goals are the ecology or the climate action is a part of Sustainable Development Goals. And it's the goal number eight of this fiscal year.

There is not about the only the meetings we have here or the flights and the pollution we cause all of these meetings or this cup from plastic and so on. We need to talk about too, about how the internet infrastructure pollutes the world. Sometimes we think that because everything is in the cloud, it's not polluted. But you know that the cloud is a big infrastructure of servers that has consumes millions of millions of energy as well as water. And the majority of these data centers are in places that the population lack of water of these natural resources.

I am mainly researching about this. And I also consider that ICANN can carry out some actions related to its webpage, how much carbon dioxide consume ICANN's webpage and the social media, as well as the sponsors you have. The sponsors that are many of them has data centers around the world are greening, they use renewable energy are concerned about this issue or is just to say, oh, well, I am sustainable. I embrace the sustainability, the green actions because I don't--

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry, Hannah, we should probably have an internal conversation about this. Reach some consensus and make it part of our public comments to the planet.

HANNAH FRANK: That's what's my point. Thank you so much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, just very shortly. We are aware of that. We are beginning to develop a baseline so we understand where the costs are made. And there's three parts. One is how we organize ourselves, organization, Board, travel. Second part is how we work with the community. Many of you are here because you want to agree together, but you also traveled here. And ICANN funds a big part of that too.

And the third part is where with the rest of the world, we also interact like with the IETF, who's also looking at how to be more efficient in things. The data centers, we're looking at, in the first part, our own data centers, but ICANN data centers is just a very little bit of the world. But I agree with your concerns. And we're all concerned and we're all committed. So, I look forward to your comments.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, I see other hands up. This unfortunately isn't the time that we can do a substantive deep dive into this issue. That's why he came is to announce the fact that there's this public consultation going on. So, let's make sure that we speak up at that and then work internally to develop some consensus view for public commentary. So, I'm not going to call on Pastor Peters or Pari right now because we just don't have time. I'm sorry.

Sorry. Okay. I want to give I think now five minutes maybe to Hadia to summarize a little bit about what went on in the AFRALO meeting.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Okay. Thank you so much, Jonathan. So AFRALO had two roundtable discussions. The first was about enhancing the infrastructure in Africa, the DNS infrastructure in Africa. And the second one was about an inclusive multilingual internet. We had very good participation and attendance to both sessions. We also came up with recommendations from both sessions and those recommendations fed into the AFRALO African statement, which was also about a multilingual internet.

So, I will read the recommendations actually that came out of the two roundtable discussions and were incorporated into the statement. So, the first was building legislative capacity. So, it says ICANN can assist policymakers and legislators by enhancing their understanding and ability to advocate for necessary policies in Africa. Another one was about raising awareness and infrastructure expansion. And it said with the next billion internet users projected to come from Africa, it is crucial to raise awareness and increase the number of root server instances.

The third is about improving DNS infrastructure. And it says the DNS infrastructure is heavily dependent on the underlying internet infrastructure. Enhancing this by creating more exchange points, increasing cross-border links, and expanding the number of root server instances and resolvers will significantly strengthen the DNS system. And we have another about engaging in capacity building programs, especially those that support universal acceptance of domain names and email addresses adoption.

And finally, fostering collaboration. And here we mentioned the association of African universities to leverage their expertise and resources in promoting universal acceptance. So, I think also we had one experiment in both sessions which went very well. So, we got feedback from our At-Large structures about both topics. So, last month we sent out a survey to At-Large structures asking about their opinion with regard to both topics. Of course, we submitted very specific questions.

We got the feedback and we were able to submit the feedback of the At-Large structures during the roundtable discussions. This went very well and people were interested actually to see real data and opinion from the At-Large structures. So, I think also going forward, this is something that we will continue to do in our meetings. With that, I would like to thank each and everyone who has actually participated or took part in At-Large and AFRALO sessions. I would like also to thank of course ALAC and the broader At-Large community for all the support that we were able to take. I would like also to thank ICANN org staff for all the support

and of course the interpreters and everyone who has helped us succeed. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Hadia. Good update and a great set of sessions for sure. Denise, just a couple of minutes.

DENISE HOCHBAUM: Hello everyone. I have to summarize something regarding to NextGen. I think everybody here participated in the process. NextGen, this group from Africa, brilliant group, connected with the tech future from the global issues. So, it was very pleasant to work with them and sense the basic grassroots to the presentation. And the most fun for me, most important that I'm more proud that in 40 days, they left one entire scope clear about what they desired for the future. I think it's so interesting.

And then, they were very committed with the warm welcome from the whole community. Everybody was ready to talk to them and pretty much the Board was present. So, for them, it's very, very important. Now we have, I have in my list, 8 students. From the 12 students, I have 8 students that they are ready to apply for the fellows and also the individual members. It's wonderful because at the moment that they started to individual members inside the community, they are able to follow programs, follow work groups, and then be more and more into this community.

So, my report is simple, it's just this. They are here in Africa, the same way that in other regions, it is the most interesting possibility to outreach because they want to do something different. They want to achieve another level. And I think ICANN has to be, it is a good community for they have this proposal. So, it's it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Denise. Shreedeeep?

SHREEDDEEP RAYAMAJHL: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. So, during this meeting, the fellowship, we had a different approach. So, this year, this meeting, mentors were not assigned to the fellows. In fact, all mentors were available to all the fellows. All thanks to Siranush and Ergis that they had many hands-on sessions, which had great speakers and great discussions.

The first session during the pre-meeting was hosted by me. The first meeting was challenges and opportunities and engagement in ICANN community, where the fellows opened up and shared a lot of their problems, challenges, and ideas. I have the report on me, and I'll share it with you. Everything is done. And during the meeting, we had our early breakfast meeting where fellows came in and we kind of help them in ways where they were like deficient and they wanted some suggestions and ideas.

A few of the fellows have shown interest in doing outreach after going back. And a few of them have shown interest in going towards the policy committees. And as you know, a few of the fellows from the past

are stepping into the ALAC and different others are stepping into the leaders. So, I think it's a proud moment for all of us, all the mentors. And all thanks to Siranush and the team. And we had a wonderful time. And I'll be out with the report and I'll be sending it to the whole community. So, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Shreedeeep. And I'm sorry for rushing everybody. We're on a tight schedule. And we'll do a follow-up call with both NextGen and-- Oh, hey, you're back. Okay. We're just very tight on time, so keep it short. Okay, thanks. ccNSO, go ahead. I guess that's why you had your card up, right? Okay.

LAURA MARGOLIS:

Well, thank you, Jonathan. And first of all, I would like to thank Hadia and all the African-- Sorry, Laura Margolis for the record. I would like to thank Hadia and all the rest of the African colleagues because of being such a great host for this meeting. And I also would like to say sorry, I was not able to be reporting, but the meeting, the Council meeting of ccNSO is at the same exactly time as this one. So, I will send you back the reports later. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks. Bukola, tell us a little bit about social media, quickly.

BUKOLA ORONTI:

Yeah. My name is Bukola Ronsi for the record. And based on the plans we had for social media for this meeting, I'm happy to say that the engagement was impressive and the activities also was an eye-opener for the newcomers. So, that was encouraging. And also, for the social media composition, we had three winners. The first person, Nebert Ashaba. I guess they are all on site. So, they will see staff later for their gift. So, the first winner is Nebert Ashaba. The second person is Bendjedid Rachad Saonussi and Third, Mutageki Cliff. These were done based on the two hashtags that we're using for this meeting on social media and on Twitter. So, that's all for me. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, everyone. Sorry for the quick ending of this meeting. We get down some rabbit holes sometimes in our conversation. I want to thank everyone. I have an announcement myself. As many of you know, I retired from my trade association in 2018, which is when I joined the At-Large community. I had previously served in the IPC when I was professionally engaged in these issues. Now I just do it for fun.

But what I've been trying to do behind the scenes is get a chance to direct a feature film. And so, some of you have heard me talk about that. And I'm finally getting that chance. So, I will be going directly from here, actually to Malta, to direct a movie. So, I will be completely unavailable for the next 45 days. So, both Claire and Justine have agreed to pick up the slack. And my guess is you won't miss me even a little bit. So, I'll come back and everybody will be like, oh, you're back. So, I'll see you

in August. But I'm going dark for the next month and a half to try and make a movie. So, thank you all.

Great meeting, everybody. Lots of great discussions. I think we just continue to improve our reputation in the ICANN community because we're being more and more rigorous with the work that we do. So, I want to appreciate you personally and express my appreciation to all of you. Thank you. Yes. Oh, yes, sure. Heidi has an announcement, I guess.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Yeah. Thank you, everyone. I wanted to another announcement that is going to affect you all. And that is Claudia Ruiz. There's a staff transition. Claudia Ruiz, who has been supporting At-Large for years. I'm not sure if many of you know that she's also supporting the ccNSO. And due to a need in the ccNSO, she is going to be moving full time to support the ccNSO. So, we'll be transitioning her out of At Large. So, if we could maybe give her a thank you for all of her amazing work.

And what we have already been doing to fill that big gap that we will have is we're already training a very experienced person who's been working with other groups in ICANN. Brenda Brewer will be joining us as a temporary support for At Large. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. Once again, thanks to everyone. This meeting is adjourned.

LEON SANCHEZ: Sorry. One last thing. May I?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know if we'll still have translators. Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: No, it's actually to thank our translators, our interpreters, and our technical team.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. We couldn't do without the translators because we wouldn't be able to communicate with each other. Thank you so very much for the hours you spend in those boxes. Thank you. And to the team here sitting endless for hours, fiddling with buttons and computers, technical. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]