
ICANN81 | AGM – At-Large Leadership Welcome to ICANN81
Saturday, November 9, 2024 - 10:30 to 12:00 TRT

GISELLA GRUBER: Could you please all take your seats. The session is about to start. Please take your seats. We will have time to network during the lunch session. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Gisell, you can't tell people to take their seats without telling them where to take them.

YEŞİM SAĞLAM: This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Hoş geldin. Hello and welcome to At-Large Leadership. Welcome to ICANN81. My name is Yesim Saglam, and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and 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, French and Spanish.

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. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a

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.

reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you, Yesim and I thank all of you. Welcome to Istanbul and to ICANN81. It's exciting to see you all here again for the annual general meeting. This is our biggest contingency of At-Large volunteers in one place because it's a transitional meeting where we have folks that are outgoing and people that are incoming. And so, we have a whole bunch of people here more than usual. So, it's really exciting to have the whole gang together in one place once a year like this. Thank you for coming out.

There's a lot going on around this time because we're really starting the outreach around the Applicant Support Program for the new gTLD round. And so, the RALOs are getting very engaged in working with GSE to help to evangelize the Applicant Support Program and identify potential applicants for support. So, there's a lot of discussions going on there. The IRT is doing a lot of work to finalize things related to the round itself as it goes forward.

And we just had a crazy election in the United States. And I think everybody that I've met here so far at the ICANN meeting has that on their mind as well. So, we may need to carve out some time to talk about that so that we're not distracted by it all the time, which could happen. I feel like many of the hallway conversations are about the US election right now. And so, it could be that a focused conversation will be the right path forward. But we'll get through it. We'll get through it.

So, we've got a lot to do at this meeting, a lot of interesting conversations going on that I hope that you'll all participate in. And we are active participants in the ICANN plenary, which is exciting. We had a real leadership role in the creation of the ICANN plenary, as well as a couple of discussions that we're holding ourselves that involve the broader community and will be sort of plenary [light] in that they might be conflicted, but they'll still be of interest.

So, we have a very active schedule this time. Staff has informed me that there are 22 At-Large specific meetings here in Istanbul, so that's quite a few. So, we've got a lot we're going to be discussing about how we work ourselves, about our transition, thanking people for their service, and really digging into what's going on coming down the pike in terms of our own outreach and engagement. But while we've got them here, I'm going to give the microphone over here to León very quickly.

One of the things that I think is always worth mentioning is that the At-Large community has become a very good home for newcomers, whether it's the next gen or the fellows. If we look at those programs and we look at which parts of the community are most welcoming and most able to incorporate folks from those programs into the work we do, I don't think there's any comparison to the At-Large community. We have fellows that are on the ALAC itself and that are active in various work groups, communities. We have a former fellow that's actually our representative to the board. So, I mean, these are—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're always a fellow.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Huh?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're always a fellow.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, once a fellow, you're always a fellow?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Maybe not everybody's old enough to know Gilbert and Sullivan, but this starts to feel like the beginning of a Gilbert and Sullivan musical or something like that. When you're a fellow, you're always a fellow indeed or something like that, but anyways. So, those programs have been particularly beneficial to our community, and I think we have been particularly beneficial to the people that are participating in those programs in terms of giving them an entry point into ICANN.

So, I say that in context because our always a fellow and always a good fellow, León Sánchez is here to tell us a little bit about what he sees coming down the pike for this meeting and beyond. Go ahead.

LEÓN FELIPE SÁNCHEZ: Thank you very much, Jonathan. And yes, you never stop being a fellow. You're always a fellow. So, I'm not a former fellow. I'm still a fellow. I will continue to be so. And well, if I may, I will speak in Spanish. We do have

interpretation in Spanish for this meeting. Good. So, if you allow me, then I will switch to Spanish now.

As usual, it's a pleasure to be back home. It's a pleasure to be in At-Large and in ALAC with my colleagues. And being here again in Asia. Of course, we are in the European part of Istanbul, but for the purposes of this meeting, we are in Asia and it is always good to go back to this region.

Let me speak about some of the topics that are important, particularly for this meeting. And even though the groups have already been working on the topics, I think this is the first meeting we're going to have face-to-face for some groups. And the applicant guidebook is one of the main topics and it's a fundamental topic. And consequences, if well attended are going to be positive for the community and for the organization. I have been appointed by the board as a liaison between the board and the working group for the Pilot Holistic Review. So, this is important.

Another important topic, particularly for our end-user community is the next round of new gTLDs and the Applicant Support Program. I believe that there are some issues that we need to still work on. And of course, this needs to be a sort of trigger, if you will, so that we can have more players in the ecosystem, particularly coming from those regions that are not well represented or that do not have a critical mass of registrars. So, the idea is to strengthen the establishment of new registries in these areas that are underrepresented.

Another important topic for our community is the grant program. As you already know, this is an ongoing program. And in this first phase,

the goal is to learn. Once this first phase is closed, we want to receive feedback from the community so as to be able to improve this program. This is not a program that is already defined, if you will. I mean, this is an ongoing process. There is room for improvement. So, we need to take this opportunity, the opportunity that we have ahead, to see if there are things to improve if we are going to apply the program. And of course, we need to strengthen the different aspects that might represent a challenge or an issue for the applicants, and help them improve the program so as to reach more people and more organizations. These are funds that are available for them and the [inaudible] promote projects that are good for the community and for the ecosystem.

As you already know, the board holds a three-day workshop before the beginning of a public meeting. Today, we are on our second day. We started yesterday. In our workshop, we discussed some issues. For example, risk assessments. We talked about different topics such as the new gTLD program. And we have a very busy agenda, a very robust agenda. There is a post by our chair, Tripti, about this workshop where you will see the topics in the agenda for this meeting.

And we will say goodbye to three colleagues that are ending their terms in the board, Danko Jevtović, Edmon Chung and Harald Alvestrand are leaving the board. And we already have the incoming members that will replace them. NomCom selected new members for the board, Miriam Sapiro and Singhal. And from the IETF, we have David Lawrence as the IETF liaison. So we will see how the board is being renewed. Regional representation is changing. And of course, we will continue working, to

work all together. We will work in order to have a robust discussion in order to have supported decisions.

We also have the expectation, as I guess you have expectations as well, to hear from the incoming CEO. Kurtis Lindqvist has been appointed as the new CEO. His term will begin in December. But he will be here with us during this meeting so that he can start learning about the different topics of this discussion. And of course, he wants to start engaging with the different stakeholders of our community. So, I invite you all to welcome him and to start creating or building bridges because the better performance he will have, the better it will be for the organization.

So let me again thank you all for allowing me to be here and for giving me this time. If you have questions, I am open to replying to your questions. I don't always have the answers to your questions, but I am really pleased to help you. And if I am not able to reply to you in that moment, I will give you the answer later. So let me now apologize because I need to go back to my workshop. As I said before, we are on our second day of the workshop. But, of course, there is always room for—and I only have time to go back to my home, the end-users, and share with you what we are doing. Thank you so much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Anybody have a quick question for him before we let him go?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet in Español. Can you please say something about the new ombuds because this has been one of the new board decisions, and we are going to face it as well. And another question I have is the following. Yesterday, there was a meeting with the GNSO Non-Contracted House. We might have the same meeting with At-Large, so please say something about it.

LEÓN FELIPE SÁNCHEZ: Thank you, Sébastien. Yes, indeed. We have a new ombuds person. In this case, it's an ombuds woman. And this is the outcome of a selection process conducted by the board.

Good. Sorry, so I'll turn to English if that works better. Yes, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: I do apologize. This is Gisella for the record. Just to say interpretation, they are just rebooting the system, so apologies. So, if we could maybe just speak in English and slowly. Thank you. It will be back momentarily.

LEÓN FELIPE SÁNCHEZ: Thank you, Gisella. So, the new ombuds person has been appointed after a thorough selection process by the board. She is a person with huge experience, very diverse experience in the international arena. We just had a meeting with her this morning. It was a brief but very substantial meeting. I think she understands very well the role that she will be playing. And one thing that I would definitely encourage us all is to build the trust that we need from her and that she needs from us in order for her to perform accordingly and to deliver in her mission.

She told us that she wanted to build this trust within the community. So, she knows that it's not that she has just been designated as ombuds, but that she actually needs to build that trust within the community. She is very aware of that and she is willing to do so. So, again, I would encourage us all to work with her and try to build this trust, so that we can help her deliver in her mission.

And the second comment that you made about the meeting we had yesterday with the non-commercial, yes. Well, Patricio, my colleague, asked the question with the difference between the NCUC and the ALAC. He mentioned the ALAC and not At-Large. And I think that needs to be, of course, cleared or clarified at least that when we say the ALAC, we mean the body of 15 representatives that come out of the At-Large community and the NomCom. And the At-Large community is larger than that, of course.

I understand the sensitivity and the importance of making the difference. I have reached out to Patricio to explain again and remind him the way we are formed within the At-Large community and the ALAC. He has recognized that, and he is grateful for the clarification. And I think it's something that we need to continue to work on, to socialize and to make people aware that when we say At-Large is something larger than just the ALAC.

And an analogy I'd like to say that maybe speaking of the ALAC might not be the best analogy. However, I think it helps explain. When we say the ALAC and just the ALAC, it could be when we say the GNSO Council and we know that the GNSO is larger than the GNSO Council and so, is the case with At-Large and the ALAC.

So, point taken, Sébastien, and explain to my colleague, and I will continue to work with them so that they can better understand where we come from and how we are organized. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Any other questions for León? Oh, go ahead, Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

Hi, Avri Doria speaking. CPWG co-chair, I guess. I have a quick question for you. With the new ombuds person coming in, has the board done a review of the charter for the ombuds in the bylaws and determined that it's appropriate to the task that you want her to do?

LEÓN FELIPE SÁNCHEZ:

Thanks, Avri. I believe that the group in charge of selecting the new ombuds went through that review. I would need to check with them to accurately provide you with an answer on that. So, if you could allow me to go back to them and ask the question accordingly, because I was not part of that group. So, I think they did carry that review and that they selected this ombuds person because she met all the criteria that is in the charter. But I would definitely need to go back to them and ask the question on whether they actually performed this review and they were certain that the designated person is in line with what the charter states.

AVRI DORIA: Please forgive me, a quick follow-up. I didn't mean was she appropriate to what you wanted. Is the charter in the bylaws appropriate to the task that you want her to do?

LEÓN FELIPE SÁNCHEZ: Oh, I understand. Well, I don't have an answer for that right now. Again, I would need to go back to this group and find out whether they did this review and whether they find that the charter needs to—well, is okay as it is or whether it needs to be reviewed and maybe updated to the new challenges that we face as a community.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not exactly on point with your question, but related. I met Ms. Field during our break and asked the question about systemic challenges to her independence and autonomy and things of that sort and whether she felt like the structure that she had been presented with addressed most of those types of challenges. And she believed that it had, but is still trying to learn the position, et cetera.

So, there were some things about reporting that changed I think that to give her more autonomy and discretion and agency to act. I don't know anything. I didn't even know to ask about the charter, but certainly, the systemic barriers or challenges that existed have been addressed at some level and she seems to be, for the time being, happy with the changes that were made.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes, Judith Hellerstein for the record. And building on Avri's question, and I haven't looked at the charter again recently, but I know there's been always questions in the past on the independence of the ombudsman, ombuds person, because in other organization, an ombuds person is totally independent from the actual organization. But in here in the past, the ombudsman has not been independent and issues that were brought to the ombudsman that were thought to be personal were released to the organization.

And I don't know whether it's because the charter needs to be changed or whether the board committee needs to look at this and figuring out how to do that because that heart goes back to the issue of trust. But if it's a charter issue, then we need to look at it differently and figure out how we change the charter to make sure that it doesn't go back to the questions that don't go back to the organization itself may go to the board or may go to something else, but there's a really independent look.

Otherwise, the ombudsman, it's not—ombuds person is not doing the responsibilities that people think they should be doing based on traditional methods of an ombuds person. Thank you

LEÓN FELIPE SÁNCHEZ:

Thank you, Judith for your comment. And I agree, the ombuds person should be independent. Our bylaws state, if I'm not mistaken, that the ombuds person reports directly to the board, not the organization. The organization provides support to the task that the ombuds person delivers, but the ombuds person reports directly to the board.

And to that end, I think that the board's duty will be to guarantee that the ombuds person is able to perform her duties in an independent way. And I think that's part of the oversight that the board should exercise over the organization. And you are exactly right, I think we need to make sure that we provide all means and tools for her to perform independently.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

She came from Amnesty International, which surprisingly enough, has a fairly similar structure to the community that we have here. So, I think she's had a lot of experience in developing the tools that she needs to be independent. So, it should be interesting. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I just wanted to add that maybe one part of the answer to your question is implementation of at least one part of the Work Stream 2 recommendation. We are still pending. And the goal of those recommendations is exactly what you are talking about. Therefore, let's struggle for the Work Stream 2 recommendation to be implemented as soon as possible. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So, as I mentioned, we have a lot going on at this particular ICANN meeting. We are involved in the main plenary of ICANN in a deeper way than normal because of the work of Joanna and Pari. We also have APRALO organizing some plenary sessions ourselves. I don't know, Amrita, if you want to take one minute each to—I don't know where you

ended up sitting. There you are. You want to take one minute each just to talk about objectives for those, but don't go on too long.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Thank you, Jonathan. And hello, everyone. So, we have two At-Large sessions, which are planned for ICANN81. One of them is on the ICANN strategic plan and how the At-Large looks at it from the different perspectives. The other is to see how we can collaborate with the different SO/ACs and the GSC for the next round. So, both would be more interactive sessions where we would have some brief overview given, but then the groups would work together and come out with some plans.

So, these are the two key sessions for ALAC. Apart from it, we have the APRALO AGM, and I think I stop at this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Perfect. Thank you. The other thing that we have going on is a series of development sessions as well. Because we have a new incoming ALAC, we tried to build some sessions in that are designed to kind of get the ALAC up and running. And we'll be talking about different things like how we engage in policy development alongside the GNSO and the rest of the ICANN community, how we engage and work together as a community as far as anti-harassment and cross-cultural boundaries and things like that we'll be talking about. So just different sessions like kind of a track for the incoming ALAC to come up to speed with how we work and what our intentions are going forward.

We also work in the areas of policy and operations and governance. So, there's going to be a CPWG meeting, the purpose of which is kind of give people an overview of how those meetings look and feel and the topics that are hot and what's coming up there. So, Olivier and Avri will be helping guide us through that.

There's also a number of joint meetings that we're having that are policy-related with the board, with the GAC and the SSAC. There's different issues that the SSAC wants us to pay attention to and potentially help evangelize. We're working together with them on some sessions and outreach to end-users related to DNS abuse. We've been partnering more and more with the GAC on different things related to the new round, and I think we've had some real success in trying to influence how contention resolution is going to happen. And as we work through the things with the applicant support, our alliance with the GAC has been very powerful I think as well. So, a number of different discussions there.

The other area is the operations, finance, budgets and governance sort of work stream if you will, that's managed primarily by the OFB working group that Claire and Marita co-chair, and there will be a meeting about that too. Again, kind of gets you used to what those meetings are like and the types of discussions that take place in that as well.

And then, finally, we're talking a little bit about outreach and engagement and we'll have a session on this [inaudible], this new thing about community mobilization and we'll do some launching of that meeting here to talk about what that development, that global development might look like. We're going to be meeting with the

NextGen and the fellows, et cetera. So, there's a lot of things, discussions that we'll be having and getting organized for the year to come.

I don't want to spend too much time in this overview. There's RALO coordination meeting. There's this APRALO kind of hybrid annual general meeting. There's a EURALO hybrid general assembly and then there's the AFRALO African meeting that happens at every ICANN meeting where they present a statement to the ICANN board.

So, a lot of things are going on, but there's also things going on in other communities in which we want to engage as well. So, for that I wanted to pass the baton over to Avri, I think, to talk a little bit about some of the sessions that others are holding in which we are interested and engaged and may want to participate in and report on as part of this meeting. So, I don't want to put words in your mouth, Avri, but I'll just hand the microphone to you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. This is Avri speaking. Happily taking words in my mouth since I'm still figuring out. Can we get the presentation that you have, Andrew, for this up to give me a guidance on it. Now basically—oh, it starts with there. So let me let me ramble a little bit about what the CPWG does and what this is all about. There are lots of policy development processes and others and the implementation review teams and others that come after the policy where people have things that they want to comment on. People from At-Large have things that they want to comment for.

And I should notate that I'm sort of new to—I think of myself as a newbie in the At-Large world. Although I've been an ALS member since way before I got involved with ICANN so that membership persists. But anyhow, so we have all of these different issues and you really should look at the talking points paper that is available to all of you and hopefully you've read it because it does several things. It not only discusses the topic, but it then gives some discussion on talking points. Now most of the talking points, in fact, I think all of them to a certain extent, come out of discussions that have happened either in the CWG Consolidated Policy Working Group or the OFB or general ALAC meetings or discussions on lists.

So, these are not generated out of a whole cloth. They're not blank sheet things, but they're basically an accumulation of what you all have been saying, asking, caring about and such about these issues over time. And on each of these issues there is at least one member of ALAC, At-Large, whatever, that is the point person on it. Sometimes called liaison, sometimes just the point person on it. And they're the ones—now, this session has sort of said that it's me and the appointed people. But I haven't coordinated with any of the appointed people.

So, I'm going to ask whenever I get to one of these topics and this is the first one here, so this is the expedited PDP, policy development process. And for anybody that's new, I won't get into explaining the lore and history and mystery of expedited as a term. Even though that is one of my favorite things to do is to look at some of these terms we use and see what we really mean when we talk about it. But it's the expedited

policy development process on IDNs, on internationalized domain names.

Now is there anyone of the allocated person and I don't have—let me see, who does my list tell me is the—is anyone? Please, Satish. Did you want to give us a quick look at the talking points?

Satish Babu:

Yeah, I think, point number one—I'm Satish for the record. Point number one and four have already been repeated several times. So, I'll just touch upon number two and number three. Basically, ALAC has argued for some mechanism by which an end-user, whether he or she is a registrant or not, can discover all the variants given one of them. And this was a little contentious because the registries wanted to push back on it. They didn't want to create a public mechanism for that.

But in the end, we have kind of convinced the PDP that there should be some mechanism, whether it is INR-based or some other extra registry run kind of a process whereby given a single variant, an end-user can discover the full set. And that's what number two and three are. One and four are often repeated, so I'll not get into that. Back to you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. This is Avri again. Does anybody have any questions, clarifications or issues with the talking points? Things that they'd like to have better explained at the moment before we move on to the next topic? The other thing I'd mentioned on each of these things, especially where there are sessions, there needs to be session reports written and

we'll get into that a little bit at the end. But look at these things. And if you are attending one of these sessions, even if you're not the delegated session attendee, you can add notes to the session report with questions, with queries, with interest. Yes, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Just because a lot of people in this room are new now, there's a real blend between the issue of IDNs and the issue of universal acceptance. And Satish, you're involved in both of those things. And I'm wondering as a practical matter, as we go out as part of the new round to evangelize the availability and the newfound flexibility of variants and things like that associated with IDNs, are we selling a deficient product if the universal acceptance hasn't sufficiently caught up? Where do you think we're going to be timeline-wise when the folks might be making a decision whether to invest in an IDN?

SATISH BABU:

Jonathan, Satish for the record. So, I think, at least for the newcomers, maybe an update is warranted on the current status of both IDNs and UA. If there is a 10-minute slot somewhere during this meeting, then we can provide an update so that everybody is on the same page on this. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. Avri again. Anyone else have a question? Yes, please.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay, thank you very much. I just wanted to—

AVRI DORIA: Name please.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Oh, sorry. My name is Abdulkarim for the record. Just wanted to follow-up to Jonathan's question, that the EPDP has completed its work. And I'm sure the implementation is going to be as soon as possible. So probably by the time the next round is happening, I am sure some of these things would have been implemented.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri again. Sébastien, please, you have a flag up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was well before, and it will wait for the end of your intervention. Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, anyone else on this? Yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Please, I want to speak in French. Yes. This is [inaudible]. My question. Maybe we can have 10 minutes to explain to the newcomers the difference between IDN and UA. Maybe we should talk about it within the ALSs and the users. A lot of people, the people who know ICANN, even those who know ICANN, do not know what the difference is between IDN and UA. I know that every year there is a day for UA, but we don't talk about the IDN during this day. I would like to know if outside of this room we could have a session to explain exactly what the difference is outside of this room.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Avri again. Hopefully, people in this room know. One is sort of at the protocol element or the network elements, and one is how you actually implement it, and making sure that the world is actually implementing all the pieces. I think having a session that brings that all together and gets into it clearly, not just my hand waving style, that basically looks at it. But it's very similar to the notion of, you have protocols and all the elements and the tables and all the things that protocols use. And then, you have to build a world that actually uses those things. And that's the basic difference between implementation and policy.

But I think it's a great idea, and Jonathan and all the people that schedule meetings can do that. I don't know that we could get more into it in this meeting at the moment. Hopefully, the way I could characterize it between the two did not leave any of the people that are deeply involved in it with [inaudible] or anything like that. Okay. I don't see any other— Sébastien, you still have your flag up. Oh, this is for

some other topic later. Okay. So, you'll put your flag up and down again, so that I'll know when we've actually got the right topic. Thanks. Sorry to be so picky.

Okay, let's go on to the next one, the next topic. The IANA Naming Function Review. This is one of our regular reviews and At-Large supports the continued review. Who's doing that one, and do we have someone here that would actually speak on it quickly? I don't see him. So, it's one of the accountability mechanisms that is basically every several years there's a look at it. It's one of the critical pieces of the transition that ICANN went through several years ago and it's basically one that the IANA, which is often seen as one of the most important parts of ICANN by many people, especially those outside, does not actually belong to ICANN. But ICANN is the protector, is the shepherd, is the caretaker of that function.

And a critical element of the transition was to see whether every couple of years, ICANN was doing its job well enough. ICANN deserved to keep this stewardship function, or whether there's another process that would be started that looks into whether it needed to be transferred. This is the regular periodic, is everything going well, and such. And as far as I understand, everything is going fairly well at the moment. That view is going periodic. We get periodic reports on it in the CPWG that says we've done this, and it's going well. Yes, Satish?

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Avri. Satish for the record. So last ICANN80, I had attended the IANA Review Session, and I had found that it is Carlton who is normally

following it up. But I found it to be exceedingly technical. Technical, very technical. It's very difficult for people to understand. So, some kind of a de-mystification for the newcomers later would be useful, as far as what is it trying to do, and how is it trying to do it, et cetera, would be useful for a later date. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thanks. This is Avri again. That should be an interesting discussion as one of the people that worked on authoring this during the transition. That would be a wonderful thing to participate in because I think very few people understand not only the technicality but why is it so important to ICANN and to the network infrastructure at large that this be done, that this be taken seriously. Because when you get right down to it, IANA is the core of the internet. Lots else is going on, lots implementation that are critical and important, but really, at the very core, if the stewardship of IANA falls apart, which is almost inconceivable, then we have an issue.

So, yeah, I think all of these tutorials, but I think if we keep coming up on each topic, it would be good to have this. We're going to get to a point where we have to have a tutorial week, or perhaps something that's done online over a period of time, et cetera. Which almost fits sometimes with one of the things that I had thought, and this is an aside. And forgive me for an aside, is one of the things that we see in the CPWG, the Consolidated Policy Working Group, is that we don't necessarily have enough time to talk about the issues, to have people ask their questions, to delve into the answers.

And one of the ideas that I've been toying with going to the powers that be at some point is that we have to—yes, we have our business to do at each meeting to keep the comments going and the reporting going, but that we schedule a regular set of off weeks, where we delve into a subject. Maybe we have a little bit of time for catch-up on business, anything critical, and then go into 45 minutes to an hour on IANA. So that's the kind of thought I've been having. Otherwise, we are needing to think about how to institute a tutorial program.

Okay, there's at least one meeting to attend. I suggest that people attend it, and especially anybody that thinks of themselves as slightly technical. It'll feel like dessert. For those of us that either started out as technical people or still think of ourselves as technical people, IANA is dessert. I mean, it's really good stuff.

Okay, let's move on to the next one. Actually, I didn't ask if anybody had questions, but nobody did. And if you did, I apologize. Okay, the next one is the new gTLD next round. Lots of sessions going on on this one. Lots of stuff to talk about. We're in the implementation phase. We're in the process of waiting for the next application guidebook. We've got the beginning of the Application Support Program upon us. So, a lot is going on.

I know Justine is not here because she's in one of those sessions. She's in the session two of five of the SubPro IRT session. Is there anybody that wants to report on this other than me? Lots of things to write sessions about. Okay, I'll just go into a little bit. So, this is a program that is adhering to a very tight schedule, and the staff within ICANN is really working hard. The community that does the SubPro IRT sessions. IRT, I

think I've already translated it once, but it's the implementation review team.

We've got policy now, and the policy was agreed to by any number of people. And now, we're into staff is actually implementing it. And this is a period—just a slight bit of background. At the last round, before IRTs were created, before implementation review teams were created, those of us that had created the policy were kind of upset because the implementation did not look like what we thought the policy would look like. The staff had done a very good job of interpreting it and doing their best to interpret it, and they had built an implementation, but when we who had done the policy looked at it at the end of the day, we said, “No, that's not what we meant.”

So basically, at that time, there was the creation of this whole notion of the implementation review teams, so that the policy people could sit with the technical people that were implementing things and actually talk, what does this policy mean? What does that policy mean? I think personally, the IRT is one of the most important accountability things that we actually do. It's the place where we take the policy that is the multistakeholder output. That's what the multistakeholder produces is the policy, and then, it takes the implementation, which is more of a corporate production of how we actually do work and brings them together and makes sure that they account for each other.

So, looking at that, looking at the expansion of the namespace, there is a pent-up demand at the moment, or at least people believe that. So, trying to not build that further. Lots of issues, contention set, one of the big issues going on. Several people apply for the same name. How are

you going to decide who gets it and who doesn't? Lots of different facets, lots of different rules there. The commitments that registries make when they apply for something. They say, and we will do A, B, C, and D. Well, that A, B, C, and D has to go into a contract.

And at that point, those become commitments, but then we have the extra issue of, but those commitments can't be about content because ICANN doesn't do content. Lots of different discussions on content, and what does it mean that ICANN doesn't do content? We do content here, we do content there, why don't we do content here? So, there will be lots of discussions around that. Lots of opportunities for people to go in and report on sessions because each of these sessions merits some kind of report, and many of you may get to those, okay. This is a way to be involved. Even if you are just beginning to be involved, going to a session and writing down a question that occurred to you while you were doing it, good way to be involved.

I could go on talking about this forever. My history is, I was the chair of the group that came up with the first rounds policy, and I've been dabbling in it ever since. So, I got more than enough that I could babble on. Are there any specific questions or specific points from someone that is following this that you'd like to add on to my general verbal? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I mean, I have participated in the CPWG, and I have seen all these algorithms of things that, you do this, and this is if, and this and that. So, when we go out, and this is out there and gets implemented the way everybody agrees to, so how are issues going to be managed? Because

this is very complex. I mean, there are many forks that it will take, so how is that done? Is it done by one person, a group?

AVRI DORIA:

I'm not sure I fully—I mean, certainly the ownership of this at the end of the day is orgs. Basically, they build a program. At the moment, they're building the program, the program sort of culminates in the application guidebook. The AGB that people talk about, because that's the thing that anybody that's going to spend money, a big sum of money that I keep forgetting about, but anybody that's going to spend money doing this, that tells them what the rules of the game are. What they can do. What they can't do. What will happen, et cetera. That has to be agreed upon.

So, at the moment, in the IRTs, in the implementation review teams, each one of those paragraphs and sentences and whatever, and they do have a team. They have a very competent team of people that are taking that through. And then, it goes through from there. And we will get a chance. There's at least two reviews of each of the parts of it. There's the initial review. Some of them have already gone down. They're doing them in small chunks. And then, at the end of the day, there'll be a review of the AGB, the application guidebook.

Once that's there, then what happens is, you've got the application, you've got various appeals mechanisms, you've got various accountability mechanisms that follow up to make sure it's okay. Lots of people working on it. Hopefully, that was helpful. Anybody else have—yes, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, Avri. This may not be a reasonable question to ask, so I apologize in advance, but this is a large and kind of overwhelming area for our community. And I think that there's sort of buckets here of things that are interesting like curiosities. Things that have very little effect on the goals of the At-Large community with respect to bringing new people into the registry community or getting communities more engaged, et cetera. And then, there's things in which everyone seems to agree.

Is there any way to surface or highlight areas where there are still debates going on in which you think that members of this community might want to focus because of our stated positions or end-user implications generally that would be good for some of these folks to focus on among this kind of morass of conversations that are taking place?

AVRI DORIA:

Avri speaking. I think part of what's up there starts—the contention set resolution, especially given the importance that At-Large and ALAC give to applicant support and how applicant support applicants should not be disadvantaged by contention set procedures. So that is one of the issues that you've always cared about, that At-Large has always cared about since I can remember and such.

The other part is registry commitments. When you get to some of At-Large's, what you call your evergreen of the DNS and the registry requirements commitments. What commitments are they making that basically keep those things from erupting at various times? So, I probably think that with the variety of interests that one finds here,

almost any topic, I think they're all exciting topics. But the namespace expansion, you say it must be conservative. What does that conservative mean? How do you keep it conservative? What are you trying to conserve there? Making sure that those concerns are understood by the people that basically see pent-up demand of people that I want my TLD. I want my gTLD for my business purposes, et cetera. So, I think in those things.

And by the way, I'm talking too much and somebody's going to have to fill me in on where I am at time at some point because I thought I had nothing to say, but then my mouth starts moving. Yes, please.

Amrita Choudhury:

Thank you so much. Amrita for the record, Avri. Just to pick up on that and what I mentioned earlier, from At-Large, we do have a session, as I mentioned, on the next round. It's primarily where the groups, and it's not just At-Large, but we are inviting all the SO/ACs to come for the discussion to actually, within the regions, brainstorm and see what works and try to come up with at least two things, which may work for them, because each region is different. I mean, every country is different, but within that, also, how people can actually think of collaborating rather than trying to work in silos.

Also, identifying what could be the challenges or even places where there could be some traction of working together, at least to get people thinking about it.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks. That's good. And that also serves as part of the answer to Jonathan's question is, go to that meeting, listen to it, and that should show you the things you care about. The thing I do want to add about the implementation review teams is they are not siloed. I mean, unless you're going to talk about staff, implementation people versus the community, but they're really not siloed. And even though there is a division between people that have been sent as representatives and those of us that attend as observers, I'm an observer in it, there's never been a case where they've had to go and say, "Okay, observers, be quiet now. We want to hear from the representatives."

So, anybody that's really interested, you could sign up to be an observer and you can participate to your heart's content on any issue that matters to you. Okay, anything else on this one before I move on? And how am I doing on time? I was given 45 minutes and I think I'm blowing it. Huh? I have 15? Okay, great. How many slides do I have? Never mind. Let's just go to the next one, please.

So that's it, as I say—find me around here, I'm always happy to talk about new gTLDs. As I said, it's the one project I've been on since I first walked into ICANN in 2005. Okay, next slide, please.

Is there a next slide? Ah, there it is. Okay, this one I don't know as much about as many of you do, so hopefully someone will jump in and talk about it. It's the Registration Data Request Services, or the RDRS. And it is the culmination of many PDPs and yet not really a policy development process, and yet not really a culmination of all. There was a design of a very expensive, very complete thing that everybody says, wait a second, we don't know if that'll work. We don't know if we should

spend \$9 million on it. We don't know. I happen to be on the board at the time that this was talked about.

So basically, they decided to do a data entry, a system entry into it first, and start looking for data, start looking to understand. Does this mechanism work? Do people use it while staying within the rules of data privacy and such, the variety of rules on those? And we can see that there's several sessions on it. I think one of the ones that, if my understanding of At-Large sensitivities is big, is accuracy, perspectives on accuracy. What does it mean and can it be achieved?

There's the discussion of the service that's called WHOIS, even though the protocol called WHOIS no longer is current, the service remains, and just wanted to bring that out since people do get confused. We heard WHOIS went away. No, WHOIS is as a service, didn't go away. It's just that we're using RDAP. It's the protocol, and I don't remember what the letters stand for. I remember it's RDAP, but I didn't—it's one of those things. People say that the acronyms are so hard. They're easier to remember than the names for some of these things sometimes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The Registry Data Access Protocol.

AVRI DORIA: Something like that. Yeah, the P is definitely protocol.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The Registration Data Access Protocol.

-
- AVRI DORIA: Okay, thank you. As I said, I really have to work to remember what an acronym stands for. I'm totally comfortable with acronyms.
- UNIDENTIFIED MALE: When you are talking, use a microphone, please, because there are people online. Thank you very much.
- AVRI DORIA: I thought I was using my microphone.
- UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, you but not the others.
- AVRI DORIA: Oh, sorry.
- UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was not for you, Madam [inaudible].
- AVRI DORIA: Sorry, sorry. I'm used to being wrong. But anyway, does someone wish to speak on this that's been involved in it? Yes, Jonathan? Use your microphone.
- JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm happy to defer to anyone that's been directly involved in it, but we've had a number of conversations about it, and there is a little bit of

a breakdown in terms of the community's expectations from this experiment. Some believe that the purpose of the RDRS system would be to measure demand for a centralized system for data access, and it certainly has been the contention of the At-Large community that this is not a good proxy in its current form for the demand for such a system for a number of different reasons. One is the unpredictability of the responses, and also, the voluntary nature of participation in the program.

And so, a lot of folks who may have tried to access the data, when they didn't get data back, stopped using it, but that's not necessarily indicative of demand if the system actually led to a more efficient access to restricted data. So, that's why we have some of the talking points we do, which is that we need the system to remain in place. We wanted to keep going until it's replaced by something, but that replacement should probably have two things that are currently not in the current system. One is authentication, and the other is mandatory participation by the contracted parties.

So as far as talking points, that's why we want this concept to persevere even if this is considered itself to be kind of a failed experiment because of the lack of those things. So, authentication and the mandated participation are the sort of big talking points for the At-Large community in the context of the RDRS.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I've got Hadia. I also had—somebody just brought up that that second meeting there, they couldn't find it on the schedule. But Hadia, please.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Thank you. This is Hadia for the record. And Jonathan said almost everything that I was going to say. And as you actually said, that the RDRS was there as a mini form of the standardized system for access/disclosure that was developed through the IDN-EPDP for gTLDs. And of course, the main purpose for that, for the standardized system for access/disclosure or the SSAD, was to replace the WHOIS service. So, currently, we actually do not have a replacement to the WHOIS service. We do not have a system through which individuals, users could actually submit a request and know who's behind a specific domain name.

Of course, when we say this, the disclosure of data needs to adhere to all laws and rules. But still, we do need a system to do that. And as Jonathan rightfully pointed out, I would say the RDRS even failed as an experiment. So, it's not even a good experiment on which we can rely and make decisions based on it. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Avri again. One thing I was just reminded to mention, I've mentioned it a couple times already, but I don't know that I've been specific. Each of those bullets under session is something that needs a session report. So once again, the thing comes. Hopefully, there's someone, the people that are actually doing registration data request

service tracking will actually be the mainstream in writing those session reports. But I really do encourage any of you that go to one of these, write your impressions, write your questions, contribute to the session reports. The more people contribute to them with their questions and their issues, the richer they are and the more we can follow up as time goes on.

So, I should probably mention on each slide, anytime you see something in blue there, anytime in that bottom row of bullets, those all need session reports if we can get them. And there'll be a file that will be brought up that everybody can contribute to that does that. Let's move on. Unless there were questions on RDRS that I ignored.

Transfer policy review of policy development processes. Lots of talking points. One session, which is today and the GNSO Transfer Policy Review, PDP Working Group. Oh yeah, that'll be during your third development session this afternoon is when I think that one occurs. So, there's been a lot of specific points to be made here that's going through on transfer policy. Transfer policy PDPs are pretty much persistent. There have been transfer policy PDPs pretty much since the beginning. I don't know if you wanted to say anything on any of this or to put you on the spot, Steiner. But if you do, you're the one that knows the talking points inside out.

RENE STEINER:

Hi, this is Steiner for the record. I'm the representative from At-Large on this PDP. And I think in this session, I would like to say that the goal, the objective we have is actually to find a policy that is secure. But I also

would like to add is understandable for a person or an entity that have a generic domain name in the process of transfer, a domain name from one registrar to another registrar. And that's the freedom of choice that we really want to appreciate.

We have been discussing this for three and a half year. The initial report that was out for public comment is not being discussed in a working group and we are approaching the end of that discussion. And hopefully, we will have something to be delivered for the GNSO.

From At-Large point of view, I think there are two elements that we have particularly concern about is that the registrant of record have a possibility to actually enter a dispute. We don't have that today. The only way to dispute a transfer is to go legal and civil way. And the other one is whether there should be some sort of locking period when there is a change of registration data. So that's the two elements that we have a little bit concern about and hopefully, we will have overview put into the final document and so on. So, thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you for that. Any quick questions before we move on? I know I'm running out of time. Okay. So, I don't know if any of you will make it to that session today, but if you do, you can always contribute. Although, Steiner has been great at giving us reports on all the meetings. It's probably one of the best that I've seen. Okay. Yes, thank you. Totally consistent. I mean, really amazing.

Latin Diacritics Policy Development Process is one that's just getting started. It's got a meeting on Wednesday and At-Large supports the

initiation of the Latin Diacritics Policy Development Process. So, anybody want to say anything on that? Satish, please.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Avri. Satish for the record. So, the current state is that we have the preliminary charter for the PDP process because the last time the report came out, there was a public comment and ALAC also responded supporting it, saying that we need a PDP for it. So currently, the final report after incorporating all the public comments is now out. I don't think personally that we will need to review the report, because it's a standard GNSO process. What is being proposed is that the council will vote during ICANN81 on starting off the process, and we don't have a team yet. But we will provide an update during our CPWG on 27 November on the details of the actual report.

We may not need to kind of go through it and put a public comment or anything, because there is no provision for that. As it is, the council is ready to launch this whole process, and hopefully, it will come up shortly. I think during ICANN81, they're going to formally decide, but the vote will happen on December 19th. So that's where it is now. Thank you and back to you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Avri speaking again. Let's move on to the next one. Oh, no, you've got a question. Before we move on to the next one, Eduardo, please

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can I just say quickly, let's not dive too deep into any of these things because we really are running out of time. It's to draw attention to things, but I didn't mean to pick on you, Eduardo. You know you're my favorite, but I just want to move to the process—

AVRI DORIA: Let's not dive deeply into the discussion on diving deeply.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

AVRI DORIA: Can we move on to the next slide, please? Pilot Holistic Review. At-Large supports enhancing continuous improvement programs. That the Pilot Holistic Review is a piece of that program and implementation of review team recommendations. Anyone want to say anything about that? I have no idea what anyone would want to say about that. Anyone? Yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We had a meeting, and we don't have a meeting in this ICANN81. Of course, we have done the first movements on comparing the CIP, C-I-P, and how they will fit and not fit into the holistic review. So, we have some points already on the slides. We can do that in the end of this last session if you want to, but I can share with you to see what we have done. But it's still in the beginning. We're still in the beginning, and

we're going to discuss this more deeply on CIP versus holistic review process during the next week.

So, it's not inside here, but after we go back, we're going to have another meeting. So, it's just beginning. But the work is done very well, and I believe we can share the slides, and we can discuss other issues during the last section in ICANN81. Okay, thank you. Eduardo wants to add something.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. One of the things I want to say is, we're almost out of time, and I should give Claire the ability to add anything she wants to these, because if you notice, it's the little OFB that's lit up there. But we've got now four more slides, I'm told, to go through. Lots of time to talk about this. Okay, so we should move on. Just so you've seen all of them. Okay, the next one.

Continues Improvement Program Community Coordination Group, CIPCCG. Claire, I don't know if you want to say anything quick on this one. This is going on. Go, please.

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Yes. Again, this is another ongoing project. Well, not project. One of the areas that the OFB is working on, and we have had a number of meetings, and as you can see there, there's a meeting tomorrow, and there's one on Wednesday as well, and I am sure that you should be able to attend as observers. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. And as you notice, Avri speaking again. There's two things in blue there. There's two sessions. They need session reports. Next, please.

Strategic Priorities and Operational Planning, a huge thing that goes on every year and constantly. Claire, no sessions. Claire?

CLAIRE CRAIG: Claire Craig for the record. But I would like to remind you, if you can attend the OFB session tomorrow morning, it's 9:00. Well, 9:00 local time. And there will be a session by the planning team to talk to us about some of the initiatives that are happening there. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Yes, Hadia.

HADIA EL MINIAWI: Hi. Hadia for the record. I'm sorry to go back to the CIP topic. I just wanted to note that during the RALO coordination session, we will be—the RALOs will be also discussing or briefly presenting their CIP documents. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. I see that Sébastien's flag is up. I know there's just one more slide to show, so if it's okay, show that slide and then, I'll go to Sébastien.

Internet Governance Forum 2024. Anybody? Claire, anybody want to say anything about that? No? You, Judith? It's happening. It's a pain.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yeah, I'll say a couple of things. This is Judith Hellerstein for the record. The IGF is going to be in Riyadh. There's a lot of interesting sessions besides individual At-Large sessions. We have the Policy Network on Meaningful Access. We have the Policy Network on Artificial Intelligence, and then fragmentation, and others. Many different other sessions, and some of the sessions, I know the Dynamic Community Session is going to be involved around the global digital compact, and there are high-level and other sessions going on. If you have any questions, let me know. I will be there representing my other hat, which is as the co-chair of the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability.

AVRI DORIA:

Thanks. I was told there might be one more slide. Yeah, Internet Governance Forum is great for sound and fury. If anybody's really into sound and fury, that's the place to go and that was a terrible expression of my own point of view. But anyway, was there another slide? And then, I want to go to Sébastien and give him pretty much the last word since I'm already over time. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

If I may, I'm going to speak in French. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Like you say, I have nothing to say about the pilot review. We have

nothing to say about continuous improvement. But if we do not decide on a place where we can have a collective debate, I said collective, of all of us, all the parties of At-Large, we're going to have an issue in those two groups. We absolutely need to talk together. We don't have the time to do so now, but I wanted to say that I'm very happy that when people explain to me on what I did participate in the past, during the ATRT3, this is quite funny. We don't have the same story. This is an issue with ICANN. Thank you so much.

AVRI DORIA:

And yeah, we should have that discussion at some point. Were there any other slides that I didn't get to? One more. Okay. Put it up, please. Oh, WSIS. Yes, World Summit on the Information Society. Next year's big event. Anybody want to say? Claire, anyone want to say anything about that?

CLAIRE CRAIG:

Claire Craig for the record. It's just for information. Everything is on the slide, and you have the links. There wouldn't be any sessions at ICANN81, but you can follow us on the OFB. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, so yeah. Be ready to watch it because it will be all the news next year. And were there any other slides? No. Did we have a slide of the review, the session reports just to show? Oh, they're in this one. Okay. Oh, there it is. So, what happened at the session? What the At-Large takeaways are from the session, if you understand what takeaways

mean? What specific At-Large action items come out of the session? So, reports will be talked about at the wrapped-up session, and people really need to do those and volunteer. Yes, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Tijani speaking. I would like to support what Sébastien just said about the coordination between all the RALOs and ALAC about the CIP program. Because I am a member of this group representing another constituency, but I don't see this common opinion that should be highlighted inside the CIP. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you. Avri again. And Amrita, you get the last word because we are over time on this.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY:

Yes, thank you. So, Tijani, just to respond to you, as Hadia was alluding, we have a RALO coordination session tomorrow. One of the questions is, how can the RALOs along with ALAC coordinate better for CIPCCG? And that's what all the RALOs and hopefully, ALAC will respond to.

AVRI DORIA:

And I lied when I said the last one. I hadn't realized. But please, quickly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you, Avri. This is [inaudible] for the transcription purposes. Just to highlight, WSIS+20 is on our joint bilateral with Amrita and Marita

taking the lead. And so, is DNS abuse, which you have on file here and we haven't discussed. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

Thank you and thank you all for this. Apologies for having talked too much and too long. And I turn it to—Gisella has hand up.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you. So, I literally will take 30 seconds because we're running late. And I was going to start my housekeeping in a different order. But just here, please be on time for our sessions. I know there's a lot of networking. There's time to do networking in the hotels. Most of us, if not all of us, are at the same hotel. In the interest of time and to respect the tight schedule of our interpreters and tech staff, we are really aiming to start and to end on time. Any overrunning has an impact on the interpreters and the tech staff on their rest time. And as you can well imagine, they need to rest in between sessions. They're sitting in these little booths the whole week. So, it's really, really intense. We've got different accents, different speeds of speaking, et cetera, et cetera. So, we all, please, please, let's try and start and end on time.

Coming back to another few points, the daily e-mails are sent out usually the afternoon before or the evening depending when I get to it. Please do scroll through them. I do put information in there, which could be useful. And also, attendance is noted for all our sessions. So, if you are at another session, please do send staff an e-mail just to let us know that you will be an apology for a certain session.

And last but not least, tomorrow morning at 5 past 9:00 in the morning, we will be having a minute of silence as Turkey is commemorating the great leader, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Turkey, who passed away 79 years ago. So, we will just have that minute of silence during our session. And I will provide you little daily updates on what's happening to keep it short and sweet. Thank you very much. Our next session here is the At-Large development at 1:15. Please, do be on time and enjoy your lunch. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]