
ICANN82 | CF – At-Large Leadership Welcome to ICANN82
Saturday, March 08, 2025 – 9:00 to 10:00 PST

MICHELLE DESMYTER

Thank you. Hello and welcome, everyone, to the At-Large Leadership. Welcome to ICANN82. My name is Michelle DeSmyter 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 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 today 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, 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.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you, Michelle, and thank you everyone for showing up to the 82nd meeting of ICANN, and we've got a lot going on this week, a lot to do. It's another long meeting where the first day comes in the middle, and so for some of us this is already our second day, but we have a lot that we're working on in terms of the Applicant Support

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.

Program and Community Priority Evaluation, and there's just a lot that's happening related to DNS Abuse and many other things.

Do we have León here yet? Okay, so I think we'll skip past him there for the first time, and I'm going to just go ahead and hand the microphone over to Avri to get things started as far as some of the upcoming sessions and talking points, and we'll give the mic to León when he makes it here. Go ahead, Avri, thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, but I think Olivier has the first part of our talk.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Okay, thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and so the first part is going to be about the At-Large, is that the At-Large talking points? So, I haven't got them in front of me and so on, but I guess we have to put this over on the screen and start having to look at them. Who is going to do the presentation?

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, we never talked about who is doing--

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

The actual presentation, yeah. I figured it might be you, Jonathan, as the chair.

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, you're the one that gives us our marching instructions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Mic?

JONATHAN ZUCK

I'm talking to myself. All right, well, let's roll right on through. This is a presentation about some of the high-level, just a little bit of history. For a number of years there, we did a talking points presentation, which was a few, three points about a number of the things that we're going to be dealing with at a particular meeting, to kind of get everybody in the same frame of mind as we went out into the ICANN meeting. And that grew and grew and then became a document, and that document has grown to be almost like a briefing package for like all of our positions, all of our thinking on a variety of issues. So, it's sort of your catch-up document to read on the airplane, and Andrew's done a lot to prepare this document, but it's a lot to absorb as part of a meeting.

And so, the idea is, can we take that a level up and get back to the basics of what do we think is going to be the focus points for the meeting, the particular meeting that we're in, right? And that's the idea behind the talking points. And so, as we were thinking about what the sort of big topics for this meeting might be, DNS Abuse, I think is going to be happening in a number of different fora.

We're going to be talking to the GAC about it, to the SSAC about it, to the board about it, and the Contracted Party House is going to be sharing some of their work in that arena. And we're hoping to

move toward a partnership with the GAC to pursue some kind of reform with respect to so-called bulk registrations, and maybe take that to the Contracted Party House and see if we can find a balance or a compromise there that helps to mitigate some of the malicious registrations that seem to be associated with registering in big numbers, right? You know, people just getting like domain 01, domain 02, domain 03, etcetera, and getting a thousand of them. That seems to have a high correlation with the abusive behavior, it turns out.

So, DNS Abuse. The next round, obviously, that's on the top of everybody's mind because there's a lot of aspects to it. We continue to be focused on the areas that we consider to be most aligned with end-user related issues and cultural issues, cultural diversity, economic and demographic diversity, and trying to broaden the registry community beyond the usual suspects in the so-called global north, the developed world.

And then finally, reviews. We've reached a situation where a whole lot of reviews and talks about reviews are crunched together at the same time, and so trying to sort this out in terms of what the priorities should be, what the critical paths should be. In other words, are there some things that are dependent on one thing happening before the next thing can happen, or can these things all happen in tandem, and how would that work?

Clearing up some confusion because there's some lack of consensus on some of the review teams as to what the scope of their work is. So, there's just some, almost seems like

housekeeping associated with the reviews that we have in front of us, but we consider them important, and so I think that's going to be a big conversation in the hallways and in a number of the sessions here as well.

Next slide. So, the INFERMAL report was a report that was commissioned by OCTO to look at some of the indicators of malicious registrations. Now if you recall, when we talk about DNS Abuse, we've started to talk about a distinction between maliciously registered domains, in other words, I've registered the domain for the purpose of bad actions or illegal activity, versus I've managed to, through a hole in a plug-in or something, gain access to an existing website, and I've buried deep in that site like a farming page, someplace that I direct redirect people to, that looks like Bank of America.

So, if you go to the home page, it looks like the website for a florist, but you go to the deep link and it looks like it's the website for Bank of America, that's called a compromised domain, and there's this idea that we might want to deal with these two things differently, and we go back and forth on it. It's one of our sorts of age-old discussions with the Contracted Party House. I mean, should you shut down the florist because their site has been compromised and has a farming page on it, or do you need to go to the host and get them to shut down that page, right? And where are the efficiencies and where's the equity in those decisions?

So, the INFERMAL report was sort of looking at what are the indicators, what are the things that seem to correlate with high

incidence of malicious registration, so upfront indicators that this might be a maliciously registered domain, and there were a number of fairly strong correlations in that report, in particular to the use of Bitcoin as the currency for registering the domain, the heavy use of APIs and bulk registrations, so getting a lot of domains at once was also highly correlated, and we've been talking about bulk registrations for quite some time, and there's been a little bit of data that came out of an inter-isle study that was commissioned, I think, by Meta, and so it was always under a cloud of suspicion by the Contracted Party House, but this is a fairly objective study that shows sort of high correlations between bulk registrations and malicious registrations.

And so, the idea that I think that is being suggested is adding a little bit of friction, not saying they're illegal or anything, because there are legitimate uses for bulk registrations for special purposes, but maybe an extra validation of an extra field, a phone number, something like that, that just slows the process down is enough to be a little bit of a counterbalance to the ease with which those kinds of registrations are made. So, we need to keep working with the Contracted Party House to see, to sort of find out where that balance can be and how we can bring about some reform in that area. Next slide.

So, the next round, we're going to focus on communities and underserved regions. We're trying to look for an effective Applicant Support Program. I think it's one of the things that we're most worried about. In this particular case, the program, the outreach program, the marketing program, if you will, for Applicant Support

is much more significant than it was in 2012. I mean, there's an enormous effort started much earlier than there was at that time. It's still a question whether or not that's going to be sufficient to bring about an applicant pool that will result in some strings added to the route from underserved communities.

And so, is it enough? Is the discount on the registration enough, or do more resources or more aid needed to get off the ground? Is the pro bono support process, which is also more robust this time than it was in 2012, enough? That's going to be a question, and that's one of the questions I think that's going to be part of Avri's plenary, is about the applicant support program, right? Is that one of your issues?

AVRI DORIA

I don't think of it as my plenary, but yes, at that plenary, the top two topics, that was one of the ones that was included.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right, excellent. So, at our plenary that has Avri's name next to it, we will be talking about both the DNS Abuse, I think, and the applicant support program, and is it enough? Because I think there's a lot of question about whether we need another round, right? And so those that are huge fans of having another round have kind of put out there as a rationale, oh, expanding the registry base, IDNs, a lot of the things that we like, right? It's sort of like the bait for us, the catnip, for At-Large to say, okay, oh, let's get a new round because we'll get these things that we've been after. And so,

the question then becomes whether or not those will in fact take place, or it'll just be, have been a good excuse to have a new round.

And so, we have to keep sort of being vigilant about whether enough is happening to make the things that are important to us, the opportunities that a new round represents, are fully exploited. And contention set resolution is something that we're still trying to work out as part of the next round so that smaller players don't get boxed out of contention sets too easily.

And then the other issue that remains somewhat foggy is this idea of registry voluntary commitments, right? So, there was this idea of Public Interest Commitments in the previous round in 2012, which was a blurred line between some public interest commitments that were sort of suggested by the GAC and then Public Interest Commitments that were built into the contracts by the applicants themselves. They were both called PICs, but in this particular case, PICs are reserved for the GAC related public interest types of commitments, like commitments around highly regulated strings, etcetera. And they started calling the voluntary ones, registry voluntary commitments.

And so, there's this question that if I make volunteer to put something in my contract, what role does ICANN have in enforcing that commitment? And how is that managed? Because it could become part of the GAC in particular, but also the At-Large being okay with that string being added to the route. So, if it's not enforced, then it becomes a false promise. So, that's something that we need to figure out so that ICANN doesn't have to be too

deeply involved in areas way outside of his expertise related to these commitments, but at the same time the commitments are somehow taken seriously if they are part of the decision-making process. So, that's the next round.

Next slide. And then the reviews. The poorly named Pilot Holistic Review, which is really sort of the holistic review design phase or something like that, is something that has been a little bit sluggish in its early stages, I think because of a lack of consensus among that team about what both the purpose of the Pilot Holistic Review is and ultimately what the purpose of the holistic review is.

With that, with some disagreement about that, it has dramatically slowed down the Pilot Holistic Review. Another area that has caused some delays in the Pilot Holistic Review is a question about whether or not the work that we're doing on Continuous Improvement, because each of the SOs and ACs are doing, putting together a Continuous Improvement Framework for ourselves that has some, the same basic five principles, but then some customization, right? And so, we're all working on that independently.

There are some within the Pilot Holistic Review team that believe that until that process is complete, they're not in a position to design a review if they don't know what they're going to be reviewing. I think that it's certainly the consensus of the experts, if you will, on our group, the folks that served on ATRT3, such as Sébastien and Cheryl, that we don't need that level of certainty in order to design a review program, because part of that review could

simply be to evaluate the framework as well. So, I think we're inclined to move forward with the Holistic Review rather than holding it up for the Continuous Improvement Frameworks that are coming out piecemeal from the rest of the community.

And then the last question is about ATRT4. It's been pushed later and later, and some would argue that some of these changes that are going on could affect ATRT4's mission and mandate and structure, but I think there's, again, among our community, the idea that if we have a narrowly focused ATRT4, just focus on the accountability and transparency aspects that are kind of left out of the other things that we're doing with CIP and Holistic Review, that it should be able to go forward sooner rather than later. But it's a lot. We've got a lot going on, but those are some of the conversations that are happening.

Next slide. And then there's some At-Large resources that I won't read to you, but are in your agenda, so you can click on them to see some of what we're doing. What's next? Sorry, what are you pointing at? Oh, Olivier's got his hand card up. Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I was just going to add just one point regarding the talking points. I think they can also be seen as what you can call a song sheet because, obviously, as a community, we have to be aligned in what we think, and this is, of course, the result of, I would say, many years in some cases, many years of discussions and of

push and pull in our community, and these are the points that we ended up agreeing on, I guess.

And I think it's important because we are at an ICANN meeting, and we don't only just go around tables and so on, but we also meet other people of the rest of the community in corridors. We have lunch, dinner, and often the discussion comes up, and there is a thing of, oh, what do you guys think about this specific topic?

And this is why I think it's important that all of us review those. I even have to review those, and it's good because sometimes topics evolve, and so as to be able to give a clear message to the other communities out there, because if we go in all different corners or if we say, I have no idea, that doesn't reflect too well. So, thanks. Thank you. Exactly. And using a mic is even better. Mic.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you, Bill. All right. So, yes, if you have no idea, then why are you here? I think that's the mantra. No. So, yes, that's that briefing document, that broader briefing document. Hopefully, you took a look at it early. If you haven't, try to take a look at it this evening. Really familiarize yourself with the positions that we've worked hard to build consensus around because you will get asked questions, and we do. I mean, every time we have a meeting, we get asked a question about something in particular, where we stand on this, how we think this is such and such is going, et cetera, and being up to date on that is really the reason that you're here, is to help evangelize those positions around the community.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

It's Olivier speaking, and if you're unsure about something, actually, don't hesitate to ask. Many of us have been around for quite some time. That's where the coffee breaks are for. Come over and ask and say, I don't really know what this is about. Tell me about it. I'd be more than happy, and I'm sure colleagues would be more than happy to share some thoughts.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Any other questions about some of these sorts of hot topics? All right. What's next? Still no León Sanchez. Okay. So, then the next, who would like to handle, and hopefully it's not me again, this question of the session reports? A lot of what we try to do is get out of this room and get into the other sessions that are happening around the community, because those discussions on these very same topics are taking place in the GAC. They're taking place in the business community. They're taking place in the Contracted Party House, and understanding where those other groups are coming from helps to inform where we have opportunities for partnership, where there's potential problems or conflicts, et cetera, or maybe even places where we need to rethink a position we've taken.

So often, understanding what else is happening in the community, the discussions are taking place, result in Action Items for us, so that when we do reconvene, we can say, this is what's going on in the Contracted Party House. It's clear we won't succeed with strategy A. Let's figure out what strategy B looks like. And so, participating and being in the audience for a lot of those other

sessions is critical to our work while at the meeting. That's why we're here. We meet with each other all the time.

And so, we do some meetings together, but the idea is to get out into the community. And so, hopefully, the idea behind session reports is to say, hey, this is what's going on, and this is how it impacts the positions we've taken and the strategies to which we've committed. So, that's the idea behind session reports. Is that an Andrew thing, or is Olivier or Avri on top of that?

AVRI DORIA

This is Avri. I'll say something on it. Yeah, no, it's definitely a thing that Andrew has put together for us and helps keep us on track on it. But it's fallen sort of to the CPWG and others to sort of make sure that those are done and OFB when it's related to one of those topics, to try and get everybody, including ourselves, that if you go to a session, just jot down a couple words. If you think about having to write a status report on it, that's too hard. But if you think of it as a form that's got a lot of-- it's a template. You fill in a line here. You fill in a line there. You have an impression of something. Just put it in there, because that's one way to get it shared and to create a record of it.

So, at some point as the meeting goes on within these meetings, somebody will start nagging and sort of saying, were you at that session? Could you please jot down a couple words? And that sort of thing. But it's there. There're the forms there. Don't worry about it as a proof that you can write or a proof that you heard it all correctly. Just jot down the notes that occurred to you. While

you're listening to something, all of a sudden, a thought comes into your head. Good thing to get jotted down. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thanks, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. I'm pointing on your mic, Jonathan. You have to-- no, but I just wanted to add on top of that that, I know some people are having problems with the wiki or grappling with the wiki. If you do, then just send, we have Andrew. He's fantastic. Send to staff@atlarge.icann.org. And in the subject, just put session report. That goes to all staff, and whoever is available will actually be able to update the wiki. So, there's no excuse of, oh, I don't know how to use the wiki. Staff@atlarge.icann.org. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Is Andrew participating remotely? Is he online? Oh, you're here. Do you want to talk a little bit about sector reports? I hadn't seen you yet today.

ANDREW CHEN

Hi. You told me to sit up front, and I didn't listen. I've learned a lesson. Hi, Andrew for the record. So, yeah, the session reports, if you do have troubles reiterating what Olivier said, please email us. There is a templated form. If there are sessions that you attended and you want to report on that aren't on there, do let me know, and I'll add it. On top of that, if you have additional questions, just reach out to us, and we'll take care of it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

And you'll make Andrew smile as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK

That's not so tough. All right. I've gotten a note that León is on his way, and will be here shortly. What else do we have on our agenda? Were we going to try to do any sort of asking people to volunteer for sessions, or...?

ANDREW CHEN

Andrew, again, for the record. Generally, yes, please volunteer for these sessions. Again, you can come up to me after this session, or email me that you are volunteering for a specific session. I'm more than happy to know your name. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right. So, we have just torn through our agenda here a little bit. Do any of our primary committee chairs want to bring up things to draw people's attention to at the meeting? So, either Olivier and Avri or Claire, and then maybe Marita is online? I don't know.

AVRI DORIA

This is Avri. We have a session on those coming up later, right? So, I guess I'll just say that's right. So, I don't know that that would sort of be redundant to do it now. The one thing that I was curious about on the talking points is, I was really curious as we were going through it, that no one had any questions about any of the

positions, and wanted to dive into them deeper. And so, I was kind of curious about that, and wondering whether if you want to spend some more time while we're waiting for León, it's not that we get to leave because we have to wait for León. So, it may be worth putting up those slides again.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Who is--? Greg? Oh, okay. Yes, maybe. I guess Greg has his hand up in the Zoom room, which I wasn't looking at. So, Greg, go ahead, please.

GREG SHATAN

Thanks, Greg Shatan. I just wanted to take a moment to remind people about the NARALO-sponsored sessions on Monday. The last two slots of the day, we're going to have a fascinating roundtable discussion on the role of artificial intelligence and DNS Abuse, both on the offense and the defense side, or I should say the offensive side and the defense side.

And as well, our NARALO town hall, where we will have sort of a public oriented and yet typical monthly NARALO session, covering topics of interest. And as well, NARALO is having a get together this evening. Sorry, I can't invite everybody, but we have a headcount limit. But we're going off and going to embarrass ourselves playing ping pong at Spin Seattle. So, if you're part of the NARALO coalition, hope to see you there. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Greg. So, following on Avri's suggestion, do you want to put the slides back up, I guess, that we were using for the--

AVRI DORIA

It's Avri again. Or if anybody had any questions about any of the other issues on that long and wonderful document. If not, do we have any sessions where we actually get into talking about, I should have read the schedule, so I know the answer to this question. But do we have, even if I had read it, I would have forgotten, where we're actually going to discuss where PHR is at and such, because we've got those, then it'd be again, redundant to bring it up here. So, if we have discussions where we're going to do that, then that may just be redundant.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, there's definitely. I have my microphone left on. That's what works best for me. There're discussions going on all over the place. I don't know that they're ours in particular, but there's discussions about the Pilot Holistic Review and the state of that that are taking place here. And hopefully we can participate.

And again, hopefully our experts on this, I think we have some highly involved ATRT3 members who can speak to this in more detail than I am able to, will participate in those sessions and help make our voice heard on them. I think there's a view that a lot of time has passed without much getting accomplished on them, and what can we do to light a fire and get past some of the questions that are being asked.

The current status of the PHR is that the SO and AC chairs have made a request of the chairs of the PHR to come back with concrete questions that they think they need answers to in order to proceed. It seems like there's like four questions. One is about the CIP process and whether that needs to be complete, and other is just about what the process might look like for the recommendations. In other words, when a team recommends a structural change to ICANN, what does that look like? Who does that go to? How does it get approved? Is it the board? Is it the empowered community? Et cetera. I think they're looking for more detail.

I think some of us believe that it was their job to answer those questions as opposed to someone else's job to tell them the answers before they started. But at the very least, we're trying to get clarity on the questions they think are holding them up so that we can come back to them with some concrete answers. Claire, go ahead.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Claire Craig, for the record. Just to answer your question specifically, Avri, there are no specific sessions on PHR at ICANN82. However, at the OFB meeting tomorrow, at the OFB session at 9 a.m. tomorrow, we do have a slot where our representatives on the PHR will be speaking, and Jonathan will also provide feedback on the meeting that the SO/AC chairs would have had with the PHR chairs. I also want to state that as well, the Continuous Improvement, there is a meeting this afternoon, I think it's 13:15, where we are going to be discussing the CIP.

So, that's with the RALOs as well as the ALAC CIP members. So, that's another session where it would be good if persons can come attend so that they can be aware of what is taking place in those areas. Because those are really two hot topics at the moment, and they are topics that I think we need to continue to pay attention to so that we can be not just informed, but that we can be aware of what we need to do if there is anything that has to be done in those areas. So, I will stop there, unless there are any other questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Sébastien, quickly, and then we'll go back to Léon.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you, Jonathan. I will try to be short. It's, of course, for the people participating to the CIP community group and the Pilot Holistic Review are two different, very important topics. The fact that all that, it's in the end, now of the same staff is of concern to me, because we used to have different staff and therefore different way of doing things. And now it gives the impression that as it's a standalone people doing everything, they will be mixed up at one day or the other. That's a result of the firing of some people earlier, at the end of last year.

I feel that the role of the chair of the SO/AC is very important, because questions were sent to the Board, the Board answers some of the questions. But just to point one responsibility of the chair of SO/AC, they pick up the co-chair. And my personal point of view, and I don't want that to be recorded, it's that the fact that those

people were chosen, it's part of why we are in this bottleneck. Therefore, it's very important when we pick up people, we pick people who can deliver the work and be open to the different point of view. Once again, it's my personal point of view.

The last point is that Pilot Holistic Review is at risk, because we are supposed to have 14 months, and we are almost two-thirds of this 14 months. If we stay with 14 months, we will never deliver. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thanks, Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just as a layperson, I'm not saying I don't know the difference between the two, but I think I've often heard people ask and say, but what is the difference between the CIP and the Pilot Holistic Review in the whole, because it's such a mishmash of so many reviews seemingly happening at the same time. Are they related to each other? And of course, now that Sébastien has mentioned that it's the same staff member now supporting everything, why is there so much cross communication between it? What's the difference?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

If I can, Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Very shortly, the CIP is meant to evolve the organizational review. The pilot, no, sorry, the Holistic Review is meant to be a new, specific review. Therefore, yes, there are some connections, some links, because, for example, the output of the CIP must be sent to the Holistic Review. But that's

it, I will say. But now people consider that everything needs to be reviewed by the Holistic Review, what is done in the CIP.

The CIP is a review in itself. The Holistic Review, it's a review in itself. And there are some links, but not all need to be done together. I want to try to explain to you why it's important and why we are in trouble. Because in 2002, ICANN went through a reform. Fortunately, we didn't spend two years, five years to decide how we will do the work. But at the end of the day, what's happened? The split of the DNSO into GNSO and ccNSO, the disband of the protocol supporting organization, the creation of Interim ALAC, and so on and so forth. Therefore, do we need, because we are 20 more years later, to have everything decided before we do the work?

Frankly speaking, if we want to be an agile organization, let's do the work, and we will see how it happens, and maybe there will be a correction. But we have already different bodies, the Board, the chair of the SO/AC, and so on and so forth. Why spend too much time to decide if we can do this path or this path, or how we will do? I am very concerned that in ICANN, we spend more time in deciding how we will do things than doing the things itself. Thank you.

And I hope it's helped your answer, Olivier. If not, I can try to answer not here, but we have no time. But if you have questions, me and my colleague from the Pilot Holistic Review, two of them are in the NomCom, therefore you will not see them today and tomorrow. Therefore, there is Bukola and myself in the room. Please ask us if you have questions, and we will try to answer. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, so it's a good question, Olivier, and a good thing to be clear on. And we'll pick this up after we've had a chance to hear from León, because he's arrived here. So, we'll press pause on this conversation of reviews, and maybe hear what the board's been talking about in that regard as well, because the board got the letter from the co-chairs of the Pilot Holistic Review. So, without further ado, León Sánchez.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ

Thank you very much, Jonathan. And I'm going to switch to Spanish to take advantage of the interpretation services, as I usually like to do. I'm going to switch to Spanish to take advantage of the interpretation services, as I usually like to do.

Thank you so much for inviting me once again to my home. This has always been my home and shortly it will be again, my home. This is a very important meeting. On Tuesday, we have a meeting. It's a one-on-one meeting with ALAC and with the At-Large members. Yesterday we held a session with the LAC leadership and it was a very proactive, a productive meeting, particularly from a particular point of view. And this is helping my colleagues at the Board to understand where is ALAC coming from, who are the ALAC members, who is the ALAC community, how members work. And even though they work together, ALAC and At-Large, there are certain autonomy issues among the parties.

And of course, we're able to understand the feedback being provided to the ICANN policy development process. One of the questions that came up yesterday, it was legitimacy, the legitimacy of ALAC and At-Large regarding this declaration of representing the interest of End Users. And Jonathan replied very well the question, because at the end of the day, nobody wants to say that we have represented 8 billion people. We are trying to represent the interest and the points of view on the, of internet end-users. We are representing users from a democratic perspective.

And they provided a very complete definition, Jonathan, Justine and Claire. They provided an overview of what they are doing at ALAC and At-Large, how works are being coordinated between the main working groups that are now in the structure, how ALSs are a key part of the process of hearing end-users at a very vital level and how they take a user's point of view to the upper levels, how they take the user's point of view to the RALOs, so that they can contribute to the policy development processes and to the statements that are sent to the Board for the Board's consideration.

The result was really positive because most of my colleagues now understand very well ALACs and At-Large functions within ICANN. And I see that they have a better understanding of the value that this community is providing to the work of ICANN. Of course, there are some pending answers from both sides, but perhaps on Tuesday, we might be able to go over those questions and get more details.

Once again, I am really happy to be here with you and I wish you a very fruitful meeting. We are now holding our workshop. As you know, we have a workshop that is prior to the ICANN meeting. We started yesterday. Today, we're having our second day and we will be finish finishing our workshop tomorrow. And on Monday, we will be officially kicking off the ICANN meeting.

The topics we have on our agenda are not different from the ones that you have already mentioned. We have the CIP topic, the Pilot Holistic Review, the Next Round of New gTLDs, the Applicant Support Program, the Applicant Guidebook. I mean, we are discussing all the progress being made on those areas and I apologize for being late, but I was attending a session on Internet Governance, WSIS+20 and all the things that are taking place in the ecosystem. As you know, we are seeing interesting changes. So, I was participating in that session. That's why I came here late. But as I said before, our agenda has topics of general interest. And of course, I am happy to hear from you any feedback that you may have so that I can take it to the board. Once again, thank you for your invitation. And again, I wish you a very fruitful meeting.

EUNICE ALEJANDRA PÉREZ COELLO Hello, this is Eunice speaking and I will speak in Spanish. León, thank you so much for your comments. I saw that you were holding this meeting. So, my question is also for those of you who were able to participate. Could you please indicate if you have any recording, can you share the links? Because we have many of us were traveling to the meeting.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ

Eunice, León Sanchez speaking. Of course, Eunice, this was a public and open meeting. Sébastien was there with us. And I understand it is recorded. I don't have the link handy, but of course I can ask for the link and once I have the link, I can share the link with you so that you can go over the recording and check what was discussed in the meeting.

EUNICE ALEJANDRA PÉREZ Thank you so much.
COELLO

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

I'm going to speak in Spanish. León, we had a very fruitful discussion yesterday with the Board. But I think there is something missing that was not in the objective of the meeting yesterday. And it is the responsibility of the ALAC leaderships. And this is where our representation comes from. You know, saying that we represent all end-users, well, we need to check members.

And this is something that we don't want to know. But Board members need to know where we come from, where ICANN comes from, and why ALAC was created. ALAC was created back in 2002. And Board members change every three years. So, this is good to have a it is good to have such a conversation.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ

Okay, let me add something. The question was more on a cultural perspective rather than on a political perspective, or the idea was not challenging ALAC legitimacy as part of the community. It was a rhetorical question, if you will. The idea was to share with us the idea or how the idea of legitimacy is being transmitted for you to be able to represent end-users. But let me insist on this. It was not a question to challenge the legitimacy of this part of the community. I want to make this point of clarification.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks León. I don't see cards up or hands up in Zoom, in the chat. Oh, my goodness. I'm waiting for Pony Express to come. Okay León, could you, do you want to--?

MICHELLE DESMYTER

I think that was the same question that was asked by Eunice.

JONATHAN ZUCK

We can talk more about the meeting that took place yesterday. All of the seven structures of ICANN have been asked to come and give a kind of orientation briefing to the Board. The SSAC has done one and I think the ccNSO have done one and we, the three of us showed up to do the At-Large orientation or the ALAC orientation to the board in which we talked about both the ALAC and the At-Large community as a whole. And the question that Sébastien raised and León was speaking about I think is a very practical one which is how do we imagine that we can represent the interests of

these billions of users and how can such a small group and even our comparatively large community hope to represent those interests.

And I kind of went through the different levels of rigor that we tried to go through to represent those interests. Because in many instances the end user interest is common sense. We're able to sort of logically determine those interests and other times we try to go out with a broader survey of our own membership down through the RALOs and the ALSs and try to get as many people involved as possible to understand what the end-user interests are.

And then in some instances we might even go all the way out to a public poll as we did with IDNs in India, for example, to understand what the role of IDNs and the demand for IDNs might look like where we couldn't just figure it out with logic. And so, a lot of it has to do with the particular issue and whether or not it can be described in a way that a broader number of people can be made to understand the question even being asked. Because some of it is so technical or ICANN specific that it's difficult to ask your colleague at work or something for an answer. But when the question can be framed in such a way that a broader audience can have input, it is up to us to try to find a way to get at that broader audience and find those answers.

So, they seem satisfied with that answer, but I think it's a critical question because when the Board does not take up a recommendation by the ALAC, the question has to be why. Because if we are in fact have the credibility to represent the interest of end-users, then one would argue that the interest of

those end users should have significant weight relative to other constituencies inside of ICANN, frankly, because we're all here, frankly, to work for end-users.

So, I think it's something that we'll continue to discuss and something that we as a body will continue to push the Board on because if you accept that this is in fact the interest of end users and those interests might be in conflict with, say, the contracted parties, then where should that balance fall? And I think we would certainly argue that that would be the end users. And Olivier has a card up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thanks very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I was just going to add that I've sent a link to the Board members on the chat. Just to let people know, don't be concerned about talking to these people. They're not aliens. They're all pretty nice, maybe nearly as nice as León is, but they're all pretty nice people. And I think on top of that, there's also Byron Holland, who seems to be missing from the published list at the moment.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ

Yeah, that's because he just joined the Board and I am not sure if he will be officially seated after this meeting. I mean, I am not sure when he officially starts. He was designated by the ccNSO recently and he's joined our meetings already, but I'm not sure as to where he officially is seated in office.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

And he's also a nice guy.

JONATHAN ZUCK

They don't want to talk to the public until the chip has been implanted though. I mean, now's a precarious time when they're already in on the Board meetings, but haven't quite been brainwashed. Any other questions? We're here at the end. All right. Thank you, León. Thanks for joining us. Have a great meeting and we'll see you in some other sessions. Thank you.

LEÓN SÁNCHEZ

Thank you, guys.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]