ICANN81 | AGM – At-Large Open House: Talk with the ALAC
Monday, November 11, 2024 – 13:15 to 14:30 TRT

YEŞIM SAĞLAM: My name is Yeşim Sağlam, and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. 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. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Yeşim, and thanks, everyone, for coming to the meeting. This is an experiment because we have a lot of experience of people saying, "Hey, can we get 10 minutes on your schedule?" and we end up trying to cram it into our Welcome session or our Wrap-Up session, and that never works. So we created our own equivalent of the public forum, but called it an Open House so it's not to confuse anybody. These are a bunch of little conversations that are unrelated to each other, but a

chance to check in with different members of the community on different issues, the first of which is the ccNSO, sharing a little bit about the second DNS abuse survey that they've done. I think without further ado, I would pass the microphone over to Nick and Bruce.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thank you, Jonathan. Thank you, Chair. I know we started slightly late, so can I just have a quick clarification on the time we've got? Because I can pace it appropriately. Twenty minutes? Okay.

First of all, I'd like to introduce my colleagues from the ccNSO's DNS Abuse Standing Committee's Subcommittee on Survey. To my left, I have Bruce Tonkin and we have Angela as well. We are very excited to present a little bit of the initial findings from our second survey, so thank you for having us.

This is a little bit of a slide deck, I hope, which will help. Well, we're just doing that, I should just say. The ccNSO has been looking very closely at the topic of DNS abuse since 2022. In order to give our discussions some findings in terms of objective fact and discussion points, in 2022, we conducted the first survey on DNS abuse. This is a survey of the full ccTLD community, not just the ccNSO. That is some 180 ccTLDs globally. It's an extremely diverse group, geographically diverse and linguistically diverse.

In terms of our reference, we have terms of reference for the DNS Abuse Standing Committee, it's very important to emphasize at an early point that ccTLDs are all independent of each other and they're independent of ICANN. So this is not a forum in which we set policy.

This is more information sharing, best practices, and socialization of good ideas and sharing experiences of things which have been attempted unsuccessfully to be lessons to the rest of the community as to what not to try.

As you can see here from this slide, we don't formulate any policy or standards. We specifically share information. We really want to promote understanding of the subject. We are extremely open in terms of our dialogue and working methods. Although we don't have a policy remit, let's be under no misunderstanding that actually, yes, of course, we want to reduce DNS abuse. We want to mitigate its impact. We want to prevent it happening. And one of the ways to do that is actually discuss the topic and to socialize where we are. If we have the next slide.

We have provided resources to the CC community in terms of an Abuse Library of Reference Material. We have a dedicated e-mail and contact list for sharing information. Those are the tools that we provide. Obviously, people don't have to take those tools, but we provide them as a resource. As I started saying initially, we conducted our first DNS Abuse Survey in 2022. The reason for me coming to talk to you here today is that we've just concluded our second one, so two years later. Sorry, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know whether you'll come back to it, but when you say the tools that you have, the library, etc., are those best practices? What kind of tools, kits do you provide for them?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It could be anything. Any sort of resource. Some of which is public domain. Anyway, but it's a place to collect it into one convenient place so that ccTLD managers have a one-stop shop, which is an easy place to access information and resources. I love the ALAC cat, which is coming to your meetings. It's basically a self-help center for the community. Since I started talking about DNS abuse in our first survey, I've been asking other parts of the community and also my own ccTLD community, "What are the things that you would find useful in terms of workshops and discussion in relation to this important topic?" We've had two specific workshop sessions. One, the first one there, you can see there on tools and measurements. We had presentations from NetBeacon, presentations from ICANN in relation to their DAAR projects in terms of how do you measure abuse, how do you define it, how do you take steps to mitigate and prevent it. We tried to cast our eyes outside of our specific community into what's happening in other parts of the ICANN ecosystem and we had a workshop on the DNS abuse clauses amendments to the ICANN contracted framework. Bearing in mind, of course, that none of that applies to ccTLDs unless we think it's a good idea and we voluntarily choose to adopt it. We've done those. If we move on to the next slide.

We learned a little bit from our first survey in terms of process, I guess. We refined some of the questions. We were cognizant of developments outside of the industry. For example, AI has changed hugely the landscape in the last two years. We asked some questions about AI and we tried to make it easier for people to fill in the survey. One thing

I do notice, and this is probably no surprise, is that people like a deadline and giving them more time to respond to the survey didn't actually help. Basically, we got most of the responses in the last week of the survey or even after the survey had closed. So we gave people a shorter timeframe to do that. We move on to the next slide.

Again, we invited all ccTLDs. They didn't need to be a member of the ccNSO as such. That includes the ASCII ccTLDs and we also have 61 IDN ccTLDs. The results are presented in a collective manner. There's no attribution to any specific ccTLD. It's anonymized. But the point is it's supposed to provide a picture of the landscape in the ccTLD world. Next slide, please.

It's interesting just to highlight, there are 316 ccTLDs including the 61 IDNs. There's some ccTLD managers who manage more than one ccTLD. For example, India has, I think, about 11 IDNs as well as the .in. What was good, I guess, is that the 10 largest ccTLDs are all part of the survey data set. That's indicative that this is a useful exercise. Some ccTLDs, because they're governmental organizations or there are other reasons in terms of internal governance that some are not members of the ccNSO for their own domestic political governance reasons and some don't participate in these sorts of things. Anyway, next slide, please.

This is I think a very helpful and useful slide to remind the community, if they needed reminding, that ccTLDs form a significant part of the total domain name system. We have 39% of the global domain names registered and 7 of the largest TLDs are in fact ccTLDs. You can see there the list of the order of the top 10 TLDs and the 7 ccTLDs which

feature in it. It's an important representation of what's going on in the broader industry context. Next slide, please.

Like I said, we're very geographically dispersed and diverse, very independent of ICANN. The registration models are separate from the ICANN framework and the diversity in terms of numbers and scale is extraordinary, actually. Many of my favorite ccTLDs are small but perfectly formed. But we have a range of different legal systems and environments depending on which territory you're legally seated. When we come look in the data, you'll see one of the common factors with ccTLDs is that we don't have a huge amount of abuse. Next slide, please.

The survey results. Move on. These are our initial highlights. There's something like 50 questions in the survey. This is just a quick highlight for you guys. If we move on.

The first thing to do is to just check when we're comparing the results of the first survey and the second survey is that they're broadly comparable in the sense that we are looking and comparing an apple with an apple, not an apple with an orange. We were pleased to see that you can see from this representation of the survey participants that it's basically comparable. I'm trying to therefore make the point that it's a fair point statistically or in terms of analysis to compare the results of the 2022 survey with the 2024 survey. There's a slight variation in geographical participation, but broadly speaking, the number of responses is the same. That's the first point.

The second point, please. You can see here the amount of abuse that ccTLDs report in their registries. What I wanted to focus on here is the left-hand column. You can see that almost 35% in 2022 gave us quite a surprising answer, which is they did not know how much abuse they had in their own TLD. Which for us was a bit of a warning signal in that how come they don't know how much abuse they have in their own TLD since it's an important part of operating a responsible registry operation. I referred to it earlier in terms of our work, because we knew that tools and measurements was an area which people were very interested in. We did hold a specific workshop in the ICANN Hamburg meeting, in fact, where we had several presentations from people like NetBeacon and the ICANN DAAR team and from some of the ccTLDs who do a lot of their own measurements around that. One of the first conclusions, which is very pleasing to see, is that over the past two years, we still have some saying not sure, but it's a significant reduction in the number of ccTLDs who were not aware of the amount of abuse they had in their own backyard, in their own registries. If we move to the next slide.

The second point from the highlight survey data. We need to look at this in the sense that it is self-reported, so this is not a sort of academically rigorous, and it was never intended to be. But this is honest self-reporting on an anonymized basis. Is that the amount of abuse which people thought they had is reducing in the last two years. You'll see that in the second left and the third left columns, less than north 0.05, from between north 0.05 and north 0.1, that in 2022 amounted to 49%, but now it's 69%. There's an increase in the very lowest measurable amounts of abuse that people report. You can see

on the far right, we had a small number of people with over 0.2% in 2022, that's now down to zero. There seems to be an observable trend of reducing abuse within the ccTLDs in this period.

We can speculate about the reasons for that. There have been some industry trends, but I think broadly speaking, ccTLDs have got more awareness of how much abuse there is and have been doing things about it. I should also say that one of the very common reasons that ccTLDs answered, or when I spoke to ccTLDs, and I asked them, "Why is it that you don't know how much abuse you have?" This is confirmed by, for example, independent benchmark reports from places like NetBeacon, the amount of abuse they had was so small that it was not possible to measure it. Single digits of domains in registries of several tens or hundreds of thousands, single digits per month of abusive registrations, or sometimes zero. It's an interesting take home point on that.

I'm very happy to talk a bit more and to take any questions. If we move on to the next slide. That's it for me. I know we only had a short period of time. There's a little bit of time left for questions and discussion. I should say that this is a cut down version of a fuller slide deck of about 40 slides, which we're presenting over a 75-minute session tomorrow afternoon. It's one of the major ccNSO sessions. But this is a sort of a sneak peek. You're the first guys to see the first survey findings. There's a lot more to be had and a lot more to be discussed. But in terms of highlights, then I think what we're trying to get across to you is it's a picture of relatively good health and responsibility, and generally, it's all gone pretty well. There are many more things to be

talking about. We did, as I said, ask questions about the use of AI. Lots of ccTLDs are starting to use AI in their anti-abuse mitigation mechanisms. That is 15 minutes of an overview about what we did. I'm very happy to take any questions and very happy to let my colleagues chip in if they've got any further points they want to make. Otherwise, we're at your disposal. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't see hands up, so I'll take chair's privilege and ask the first question. Oh, okay. Come up to the table.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Hello. I'm Claire Craig, co-vice-chair of ALAC. Thanks for this presentation. In one of your earlier slides, you spoke to the issue of having a DNS abuse library. I was just wondering what type of information is in that library and who is it available to? Who can access it? Thank you.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It's a good question because it's been a topic of discussion as to do we keep this confidential, would this be a useful resource for criminals and bad actors if we make it too easily accessible? It is a resource for the ccTLD community. But if there's interest in it, we can probably provide access to the wider community if we are thoughtful about that. But it tends to be studies, tools. For example, a lot of people are having difficulty measuring or understanding how much abuse they have. There's a wealth of free resources available for doing this sort of

thing. It's just lack of education or lack of being able to find things easily, which is the problem. That's why we set up this resource tool to help people be able to help themselves more effectively. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Fairly low levels of reported at least DNS abuse. I guess by that, we're talking about maliciously registered domain names in terms of the vocabulary we've been using inside ICANN. There are three stops on the DNS train. One is, are people trying to register malicious domains? Are they being stopped before they're registered or are they being quickly mitigated? I guess I can think of those three things. And I'm curious about where this falls. I know there were a lot of early efforts by .eu to do predictive analytics and things to stop things on the way in. But are you also finding that there's fewer people attempting to register or is there just greater effectiveness in the tools and faring them out when they do?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Okay. That is an easy question to ask and a difficult one to answer. That's purely because of the sheer diversity of the dataset that you're looking at. Some ccTLDs have a very controlled nexus requirement. For example, in Australia, you have to have an Australian presence and company registration number. Same in many ccTLDs, your registration is not possible to complete without some basic information, including proof of presence in territory. That means you need to be quite careful about talking about these sorts of things. I would say—

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible]

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It depends. Sometimes it's very strictly validated and sometimes it's less validated. In the UK, we have no nexus requirement, for example. You can't really compare the Australian one with the UK one, with the Norway one, with whatever. But I would say where we have open registrations, for example, if we pass all of our new registrations for suspicious characteristics, the domains are created but they will not go into the zone file unless further checks have been completed. And that is quite a common feature in many ccTLDs. Perhaps that's why I'm answering the question, it's like it's a bit of friction or road bumps in the registration process for high risk or suspicious looking domain registrations, which is quite a standard part of abuse mitigation in many ccTLDs. Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN: Just to add further comment. I don't think the ccNSO distinguishes between malicious versus compromised. In other words, those stats represent the combination of those things. It's a phishing attack, whether it's been a compromised site or whether it's been deliberate. It's just abuse in general with phishing or malware. The other thing is, as Nick says, I think there's been an improvement. If you're saying why is the abuse got better, I think it's a combination that registries tend to do various things either just before a registration or just after a registration to look for suspicious behavior, let's say. The other thing I'd say is improved is the processes for reporting abuse. There are a

number of bodies that aggregate reports from a range of sources and provide those to CCs. ccTLDs have got fairly efficient at distributing those reports to their registrars. I think that the overall efficiency of that reporting and taking action has been improved over the last couple of years.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: I do have a slide actually for the fuller session tomorrow on trying to understand a bit more why is it that ccTLDs on many different insights into levels of abuse have an order of magnitude less abuse observed than gTLDs. I've spoken about this many times and many times in many forums about this. Lots of discussions between my friends in the gTLD world. I don't think it's all ICANN's fault in terms of the contract arrangements and the mechanisms, because as I said, within the ccTLDs, there's a huge range of registration models.

But I think if I'm a criminal bad actor wanting to conduct a fraud on the Internet or to do a phishing attack, perhaps the largest addressable market is through a gTLD rather than a country specific one. Maybe country specific ones are inherently less tempting in terms of being a vector for attack. For the same dollars, you can get a global addressable market as opposed to registering a domain name in Liechtenstein. It's a tiny population and probably not—as I said, there could be some linguistic bias in terms of IDNs, in terms of what people are measuring. Because we're talking about observed abuse. I think a lot of the tools and companies do it in the English language. There could be abuse which is like an iceberg below the water in terms of different languages, different scripts, which people are not measuring

because they're minority activities. It could be that we're not measuring it properly.

I would also say ccTLDs, and certainly in the case of all of us, we've got strong relationships with our national legislation government and also the security services. We have strong relationships with the law enforcement agencies and I think that could be a factor. These are just hypotheses. We don't know for sure. We can see that there's a massive difference and we don't know whether there's a correlation or causation between these various different factors. But ccTLDs have different governance models. We tend to be nonprofits. Is that also another factor? Are we just more proactive than ICANN Compliance in terms of the national countries take a very responsible attitude towards protecting the citizens and maybe we're more proactive than ICANN can be on its compliance clauses in its contracts. Taking a little bit of the sneak preview of the side that we have in the fuller session, but the conclusion is we're not entirely sure, but it is a subject that we're going to do some more investigation and research on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, thanks a lot. There's going to be—sorry, I didn't see. Go ahead. We just got to be quick because we're—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I'm going to be quick, but not so quick for the interpreters. Thanks for the points you've just made. They're very interesting and some of them a bit controversial, I guess, in some way with regards to DNS abuse, but fair enough. I gather you have these

results also tabulated on a per regional basis or per country basis. Because in the At-Large, of course, we are in the five regions and I think it might be very helpful to see if there are regional trends also, as opposed to just having every CC globally.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks for the question, Olivier. I think we will do a full analysis of all of the questions in the regional breakdown, but this was in the time of... The survey just closed, so this is just the first findings that have struck us as being important and to socialize. We intend to do a webinar before the ICANN82 meeting where basically we will go into the full detail of all the questions intersessional and outside of this. But this exactly is the sort of thing which is very interesting to look at. Thank you. Nothing strikingly different changed on a geographic basis between the two surveys. Otherwise, I would have mentioned it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, guys. Thanks for joining us. We'll check out the bigger session when we have it. Appreciate it.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Thanks, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think we're going to go right to you, right? We're going right to Ombuds? Okay. All right. Thank you. We have all been anxiously awaiting the hiring of a new Ombuds for ICANN and there's been a lot

of discussion within the At-Large community about that role and you probably have heard some controversy over some of the process that had been planned on that wasn't quite executed in terms of community involvement in the selection criteria and things like that. Everybody's very excited that you're here and at the same time have a lot of questions about whether or not you've really been given the authority that you need to do your job that was described not in ATRT3 but in Work Stream 2 and the change of reporting and things like that. Please keep separate our incredible excitement that you're here from everybody coming at you with difficult questions about the role. But that's just by way of introduction. I thought I would let you go first and just say a little bit about yourself, and then you'll probably get peppered with questions.

LIZ FIELD: Thank you. This is Liz. I'll speak in English. I'm Elizabeth Field. I go by Liz. I'm Geneva-based. I'll cover just in my introduction two things briefly. The first is a little bit on the role of the Ombuds for those who don't know, and a little bit of my background. Additionally, I will share with you very briefly three principles that I have for evolving the office, so there is an opportunity for discussion afterwards.

Just for those of you who would like a refresher or who don't know, the role of the Ombuds is set out in the ICANN Bylaws. It is to handle complaints from community members who believe that they have been treated unfairly. I also handle complaints under the Anti-Harassment Policy, and I have a role to play in the Request for Reconsideration. In the Bylaws, as well, I am an advocate for fairness.

What this means is that I am also working on the promotion of an environment of fairness and dignity and respect.

In terms of my background, I have 20 years' experience working as an Ombuds, a conflict resolution practitioner, and in organizational development. That's working at the system level. I am a mediator, a conflict coach, a restorative justice practitioner as well. I do group process work. But I think what's important to stress as well is all of my roles have been in the context of global, international, intercultural, multilingual organizations. I have experience working with a similar organizing model to ICANN. Bottom-up consensus building, volunteers at the heart of it. I worked with Amnesty International, which is a human rights organization. I've worked with UN agencies, private sector, and UK Civil Service.

In terms of where we are now, where we'd like to go, there is a solid foundation, a position of stability in the Office of Ombuds to take the work forward and develop it. In terms of development, my development will be based on data and the needs of the community. This is in terms of my three principles for evolving the office. One is very much a focus on communication and engagement with the community. Your inputs, your needs, and responding to your needs is very important to me. Second principle is taking a data-driven approach to the NIS2, developing a strategy with prevention at the heart of it. Preventing the behaviors that harm and hurt and ultimately influence negatively performance in the organization or the ecosystem, rather. Finally, I'm thinking the third principle is really around dignity, respect, and evolving the office around the promotion

of the desired behaviors and values in the community, as well as the response. I'm also looking to communicate that in addition to just supporting the community with complaints, I am also available to support the community with a range of other things in terms of advice, guidance on conflict and behaviors. Working collaboratively is my aim, so I'm really looking forward to working with you all. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. Don't be shy. Ask your questions. One of the questions that came up is whether or not it's your sense that you have the structural autonomy, reporting structure, etc., that allows you to be sufficiently independent for the role as you imagine. Obviously, this is all new being at ICANN. But given your experience, do you feel like structurally, the office has been set up at ICANN for you to do the job you need to do?

LIZ FIELD: Thank you. Thank you for the question. I think it's a great question and I am glad for the opportunity to share my provisional views. I say provisional because I'm basing it on the information I have to date. Of course, with new information, my views may change. Basically, information I have available, that is conversations I've had with stakeholders, including the Board, including many stakeholders within ICANN Org, etc., and what's in the Bylaws, the structure is very sound. There are numerous protections within the Bylaws, the way that I've been contracted to protect me and give me the scope to act independently. The other part of that, of course, is how I discharged

that duty, and that is very important to me. I think the structure is sound and I have a code of professional and personal ethics that will guide my behavior around this.

I may want to clarify. I report into the Board which in the International Organization of Ombuds, the emphasis is on reporting to the highest level within the organization. Previous roles that I've held have been different levels and different types of powers. This is, as far as I can see, structurally sound.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What do you feel like your first steps will be? Your first 100 days as we talk about, what do you think needs to happen based on—I'm sure you've heard all kinds of stories and there's a lawsuit going on. There are all kinds of things happening. Without revealing anything that's confidential, what do you feel like you need to do to get started?

LIZ FIELD: The first thing I need to do is I need to connect with people in the community. I really would like to take this opportunity to invite people from the community to be in touch with me. Because data is the foundation of being able to have a responsive and appropriate set of services in the office and approach. For that, I need people to be in touch with me, share their stories, share their experiences, their ideas. Communication and engagement, really part of that first 90 days, but I'm really inviting people to contact me. I speak French and some Spanish. You can contact me in those languages. I invite you to come forward in multiple languages. Data is very important. Working

obviously with cases that come up and continuing that service is very important and the communication and engagement piece as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Questions for Liz? Claire, please.

CLAIRE CRAIG: Hi, Liz. Nice to meet you. I'm Claire Craig. The Office of the Ombuds has in the past been kind of inundated and had quite a lot of issues to deal with. How do you see your role and your team being able to manage the work and to do it efficiently and effectively moving forward?

LIZ FIELD: Thank you, Claire, for the question. That's a great question. I think the first thing is there is an importance to handle the cases, handle them as quickly as possible with responsiveness at the heart of it. There is also on top of that a piece of work on prevention. This is something I'm very keen to stress, is that you have both the response and the prevention. I think the caseload based on my previous experience is quite manageable. I have plenty of resources. I have an adjunct Ombuds, Linda Mainville. Say hello. I have an independent counsel. I have resources. I think it's a question as well of bringing the strategic approach, which I'd like to do. Thank you for the question.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hi, Liz, a pleasure to see you with us. I do like to see if you can explain which are the limits of the work of Ombudsman? Maybe you can come up with some examples.

LIZ FIELD: Just a clarification, Vanda. Is that limits on the role or limits on the work?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The limits of the role in your position here in ICANN. For instance, someone complained about the CEO or the chair of the Board or the staff, what is the framework that you are working on that?

LIZ FIELD: The Bylaws set out the structure and the powers and where I formally have responsibility. I think informally, which is where in my experience, you have the most—what's the word I'm looking for? You have the most impact. Thank you. You have the most impact is informally. And that is very broad. Informally and confidentially, I invite anyone to come for advice. We can problem solve, we can look at options. Those options might be formal options. Those options might be you taking action. Those options might be you taking action with support from me. That could be support as in mediation. It could be other forms of support. There's a lot of scope, I think, in the role. But in terms of what formally I have, that set out in the Bylaws, but informally is very broad. I really invite people to come to me, not just

with complaints but questions, concerns, things that you'd like advice on, etc.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We should take some advantage of the fact we've got Krista here as well, who I'm sure was happy to hand over half the files on her desk, having had to play both roles for quite a while. Maybe it's worth, since there's a lot of new people here, to talk about what the difference is between your two roles as well.

KRISTA PAPAC: Thank you, Jonathan. Happy to do that. Hello, everybody. Krista Papac, ICANN Complaints Officer only. As many of you already know or maybe do remember, I've been acting as the interim Ombuds for the past year. But my real job, as I like to call it, is as the Complaints Officer at ICANN. Myself and Liz now, the Ombuds role interact, but we really have mostly separate scopes. The way I like to explain it is my scope as a Complaints Officer is to address issues of operational nature. It could be community members, but it could just be end users, people who don't engage in the ICANN space. If they're having issues with accessing ICANN or its service, ICANN Organization or its services, if there's a process that they're using to get travel support or file a Compliance complaint or whatever those things may be that seem broken, those are the things that come to the Complaints Office.

I report through the Org. As opposed to Liz, who already mentioned she reports directly to the Board, which makes sense. I'm an operational mechanism, right? So I'm coming in through the leadership of the organization, whereas, again, Liz deals with fairness and issues coming from community members directly about Org, Board, and other community member issues. I am only dealing with issues people have that are operationally related. The reporting structures are different.

I think the other thing I would really differentiate as somebody who's kind of done—well, not kind of, who has done both roles, to me the difference has been, again, as a Complaints Officer, I focus on operational issues, what's broken, how do we fix it. People raise them to me. I go back to the Org, "How do we fix those things?" Liz is really dealing with issues—I won't speak for you, this is my own experience—but interpersonal issues that affect community members. So the community is essentially her customer. If you guys are having interpersonal issues with each other, the Board, the staff, whatever, those are the things that come to her. To me, I'm like the "How do we put it in a box and make it work right" person and Liz is the "Hold on, let's make sure we can all work together. Where are we having issues? How do we come together?" person.

I hope that was helpful. I don't know if you want to add anything, Liz. I do want to just say—because I've really gotten to know a lot of you over the last year. I've been around ICANN a long time, but I haven't known all of you that closely. I've enjoyed getting to know everybody. I've learned a lot from you guys, and I appreciate that learning that

you've given me as well. I gave you a lot more than you asked for, Jonathan, but you offered the mic.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I take full responsibility. Lillian, please go ahead. Oh, Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANDON-ORR: It's me pretending to be Lillian.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That was clever.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry about that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I never would have called on Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly. A pleasure to meet you, Liz. Look forward to working with you as I've had the pleasure of working with, I think, every Ombudsman since we had Ombudsman. That being said, I wanted to ask a question on a modality that you may or may not be comfortable with, just so some of us who operate in a chairing or a facilitation role in groups. This is often when things can start to go wrong, and there are warning signals that can occur. Something that some of our leaders have done

in the past, and it may or may not [inaudible] know, may or may not have been useful, so check with her. But there's been an ability to alert the Ombuds Office that in this space at this time, a concern isn't being raised by a complainant but by a facilitator in that conversation and that they would like to make sure that there is an awareness and perhaps, some prevention that can be brought into play. Now, is that a modality you're comfortable with or is there a modification? How do you want to operate with that kind of level?

LIZ FIELD: That's a great question. I am, first of all, very comfortable with that. I think if prevention is at the heart of it, this is prevention. Just to be clear, when I talk about prevention, I'm not talking about the prevention of conflict. Conflict is healthy. It brings the different points of view. What I am talking about is the prevention of escalation. What you're describing to me is a really good scenario where there are opportunities. Even before maybe I get involved, there are things we can do. I can support you with resources, ideas. I've worked for 20 years with groups like yours in terms of the leadership. It's a great opportunity to empower the facilitators and the chairs and the leadership of groups and bodies to lead inclusively and to identify and work on themselves, build their capacity for addressing issues, and looking at options including attending sessions. There are many, many options. I appreciate that and would invite and encourage people to do that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anyone else have a question for Liz? Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I will speak in Spanish. There is another participant. Thank you very much. It's very interesting everything you've said. I would like to know if you could share with us your contact information, your e-mail address because we didn't get them on the slides. Thank you very much. Thank you.

INTERPRETER: There was a comment off mic by one of the participants.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Welcome. Do you have any mechanism to protect someone who places a complaint when statistics say that when someone raises a complaint, then everything goes worse for that person? That is to say that harassment or whatever happened becomes worse. What are the mechanisms for that person who raises a complaint that does not see himself or herself more prejudiced? Thank you.

LIZ FIELD: Thank you for the question. In terms of statistics or data, this is something I am gathering and I absolutely must have as part of my plan and my strategy. I will be looking at things like that. Data says what are the outcomes? How are they handled? Obviously, respecting the privacy of individuals. Protection of people who come to speak to me is critical and everything that comes to me is confidential. We

discuss on a case-by-case basis. If somebody wants to report and raise a complaint, we discuss risk and what the risks are and how to manage that risk. People's safety is absolutely essential. On the one hand, data, yes, I will be looking at that. On the other hand, mechanisms for protecting people, risk is assessed. I also want to hear from people about issues in terms of protection so that if I need to look systemically, I can do that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I think that's it for hands. All right. You're just moving around. Is that who you were pointing at? I don't know the order anymore. Olivier and then also Kathleen. Then we got to probably close of queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. You are effectively performing a handover from one Ombuds to another Ombuds. Could you let us know—I'm not sure whether it's meant to be known and so on—but how that handover will take place? I was going to say hangover. Not a hangover. A handover will take place as in I guess you'll be working together for some time for how long and then when will that be completed and Liz will have everything in hand?

LIZ FIELD: Thank you for the question. First is to say this is the best handover I have ever had in any of my roles. It has been phenomenal. I had had a great accompaniment from Krista. Right now, we are working as a

team. The transition, it's Krista, Krista and Liz, and then it will be me. We're looking at around the end of November. But we have been working together and I feel very well prepared for picking up the role from Krista. Anything to add, Krista?

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Scoggin?

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN: Hi, I'm Kathleen Scoggin. Nice to meet you. I just have a very quick question on whether you've had a chance to engage with the Fellows and the NextGeners so that they can see your face and know you. Those can be some of the most vulnerable members of our community because they're new and young and don't necessarily have other people to lean on. Just wondering if you had a plan to engage with them and continue to engage with them.

LIZ FIELD: Thank you for the great question. I have, because I'm very excited. I think it's a wonderful program. I introduced myself at the induction, the first morning. I introduced myself. I also went and joined the networking event, got to speak to some of the NextGeners. Really phenomenal group of people. I appreciate that question. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Well, join me in welcoming Liz. Hopefully, we won't scare her away. Thanks for coming on board. CADE, who's speaking on that? Adam, go ahead.

ADAM PEAKE: Perfect. Good afternoon. Adam Peake, Global Stakeholder Engagement. I'm going to speak on behalf of the CADE Project. Before I do, I want to just apologize to friends who are speaking in Spanish. I didn't use the headphones because I'm trialing new hearing aids and the feedback from these deafens me and the Bluetooth isn't connecting. I don't like not doing that so my apologies for that.

CADE Project, as it says here, is the Civil Society Alliance for Digital Empowerment. It's organized by the Diplo Foundation. You might know that the Diplo Foundation was quite close to Marilyn Cade. I have no confirmation that the acronym is the source of that, but I like to think that it might be. We can hope. I'm sorry, the colleagues from CADE, from the project, are not here but they are holding a meeting on Wednesday lunchtime in the room CB1 Hamidiye. Anyway, you will find it and I will put it in the chat when we finish talking.

A little bit of background about the project. It was a very large project, open bid for civil society organizations organized by the European Commission. I don't remember the funding but it's 48 months, which gives you an idea of the work involved. There are 10 civil society organizations led by Diplo Foundation in this. It's a four-year project that began in January of this year. The goal is for these organizations to come together and look at the challenges and opportunities for civil

society organizations to participate in Internet governance processes. ICANN was named in the bid as one of the target organizations.

The goal and what I hope in my role as someone who takes care of civil society engagement is we will see them coming to ICANN, talking to us about the opportunities for increasing civil society organization participation, not just in ICANN, where I think we have some good structures, which they can learn from, but also about general opportunities to increase capacity for civil society, to increase engagement, particularly from the global south, global majority as we talk about it, and strengthening cooperation between civil society organizations and other stakeholders, which again is something that I think ICANN can be useful for them to see as an opportunity.

The organizations that are involved—I'll give you a quick run-through. Diplo Foundation led the consortium and I think many of you will know the Diplo Foundation. The European Center for Non-for-Profit Law, which is a set of human rights-orientated lawyers who work globally on various issues and they were speaking at a human rights impact session that was taking place yesterday. Forest International, which is a network of over 22,000 civil society organizations globally. Organization called CIPESA, who we used to see participating in ICANN about 10 years ago. Based in Uganda. KICTANet, which is still active in ICANN. You may remember the name Grace Githaiga, who was a GNSO Council member. She's a member of the project. Then there's more. There are people from the Middle East region, from the Asia Pacific, from, again, Middle East, the Pacific Island chapter of the Internet Society, PIC ISOC, which I believe we have people involved sitting right

there. There are participants very much globally. They're talking about how to improve civil society participation in these processes, capacity building around these processes. I think the At-Large, I know there's somewhat of a discussion whether the At-Large is civil society or whether the At-Large is an inherently multistakeholder. But I think some of you may well be interested, so I hope there will be future opportunities for you to meet them. I can be a liaison between them, which is something I'd be very happy to do.

Let me put a few things in the chat so you can find more information about them. As I said, Wednesday, lunchtime in a room on the third floor, which I again will put in the chat to make sure we can actually read it correctly on the maps out there and you'll find your way there, rather than relying on my mispronunciation. Thank you very much, Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Adam. Any questions for Adam about the CADE Foundation? Definitely, the At-Large community is a mix, a multistakeholder group, but there are a ton of civil society organizations that make up a large portion of the At-Large community. When you go level down, there's plenty of that. Any other questions?

All right. Well, thank. Look forward to the session on Wednesday at a mysterious room on the third floor. Thank you. Thanks for coming, Adam.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you to everyone. Just a reminder that the ALAC have their joint session with the Board at 4:30 today in the main room. Please all be there. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That concludes our very first ever At-Large Open House. I think that was a success. Thanks everyone for coming. I think we'll try to do that at every meeting, bring in little speakers. Thank you. Enjoy an extended break.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]