
ICANN82 | CF – At-Large Leadership Wrap Up
Thursday, March 13, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 PST

MICHELLE DESMYTER

Hello, and welcome, everyone, to the At-Large Leadership Wrap Up. My name is Michelle DeSmyter, the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and 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, onsite 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. Please speak at a reasonable pace as well. And with this, I will now hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you, Michelle, and thanks, everyone, for another exciting week. It's been a lot of fun. We got here very early and had a meeting upfront with the Board to explain who the At-Large was and how we work and how we operate in order to clear up any

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.

confusion they might have. And then we had a meeting with the board to reinstitute any confusion that we may have lost in the previous meeting.

So we have some homework to do to clean that up, I suppose, but that's just the ICANN way. But a lot went on, we had a lot of interesting sessions that we put on, and there was interesting conversation that went on around the meetings. So I'm excited to hear from folks that attended things. Let's jump right in and hear from our liaisons. So I don't know who would like to go first. Joanna, do you want to go first?

JOANNA KULESZA

Yes, of course. That's why I'm sitting here.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Perfect.

JOANNA KULESZA

And we color matched. Yeah, amazing. It's the Polish impact. Thank you very much, Jonathan. This is Joanna Kulesza for transcription purposes, the current ALAC liaison to the GAC speaking at a reasonable pace. We have had numerous interactions with the GAC during this meeting, which I am happy to report. Most significantly, we hosted the usual bilateral, which focused on two themes.

Our standing theme is the WSIS+20 dialogue, and our positions are forever more aligned on that topic. We're looking to engage more

deeply on the theme. We have hosted dedicated regulatory development session. We're looking to coalesce more around the input to WSIS+20, the GAC has a standing working group, which we are looking to work with more closely, and those ties were strengthened during the bilateral and throughout this meeting. And the other recurring theme is DNS Abuse.

This time we focused on the INFERMAL Report, which was umptly presented by Jonathan Zuck, the ALAC chair, and commented on by our colleagues from the GAC. There were certain open issues left, hence we're thinking about hosting one of the regulatory development session, sessions devoted to DNS abuse and the INFERMAL Report itself, whereas the Org did organize webinars devoted to the report and devoted to DNS abuse. However, that remains an evergreen theme.

Action items do include planning for two meetings between here and the Prague. We have managed to find workable formats of hourly meetings once a month to help us discuss policy related issues as opposed to capacity building that's done by both communities independently. There is will to work together on capacity building as well when it comes to WSIS+20 related processes, and I will be happy to report as we progress with regards to those.

The GAC communique is still being drafted, so with your kind permission, I will report on the final contents after the meeting in writing in the dedicated GAC liaison space. I think that's it, but I'm happy to answer questions. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Joanna. I'll get that started. It seemed like there was some nuance to our conversation about WSIS+20 and the GAC willingness to sort of come to consensus around that and how we might have to work with individual members more closely rather than the GAC as a whole. And I didn't exactly know how to come up-- what the action item was out of that. Hopefully that was clearer to you from that discussion.

JOANNA KULESZA

This is Joanna Kulesza for transcription purposes. The WSIS+20 process is a common theme that is of high relevance both to individual governments and to our regional communities. I know Amrita is somewhere the table, so if she wishes to take the mic, I'm more than happy to share the floor. But just for me to provide feedback before Amrita provides us with details. I think we're on the same page, it's just a question of how we wish to approach it.

There's so much going on around WSIS+20, it might make sense for us to work more closely, hence us trying to link with the dedicated GAC Working Group on Internet Governance and WSIS+20. And that is in the skillful hands of Amrita on our side and Ana on the GAC side, they do happen to both be on the MAG, looking forward to the MAG meeting, and we might be able to get more closer cooperation both regionally and at the ICANN level.

But then again, WSIS+20 escapes, if you will, the picket fence. There is so much more than just DNS related issues. So for us here

in this community, this is a focus on how WSIS+20 impacts multi-stakeholder model of governance with regards to the DNS within the picket fence. But for individual communities, it's so much more, right? There's discussion about sustainable development, there is discussion around accessibility. For many of us, it's a global discussion about geopolitics and where international wishes to take us.

So we will work more closely with Ana and that dedicated group. This could be a meeting, this could be a mailing list, this could be a communication that Amrita will take the lead on if that happens, but I fully rely on her expertise to guide us what will be actionable and will not lay a too heavy burden on this community. Again, I'm happy to share the floor, but I leave it to you to decide where we might wish to take the conversation. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Well, we should keep rolling through the agenda and then we'll come back and grab people's observations about different things that things as we go along. So Laura, do you want to tell us what's exciting going on in the ccNSO? Is Laura here?

LAURA MARGOLIS

I don't, but if you ask me, I will do it.

JONATHAN ZUCK

There you are. Oh, I feel like I just sort of send things out into the ether and Oprah voice respond. Go for it Laura, please.

LAURA MARGOLIS

Okay. Well, this is Laura Margolis for the records. Well, many things went on at the ccNSO, I will only highlight a little bit of that, and then I will send you my written report as usual. Well, Byron Holland took the seat number 12 on the Board and he won the elections held last February. And he started his position right during this meeting. Also, just the council meeting just ended half an hour ago, and also the chair was reelected, Alejandra Reynoso and also the vice chairs, Biyi Oladipo and Jordan Carter, were reelected as vice chairs.

Well, then regarding some of the working groups, the Policy Gap Working Group, it was created last August in 2024, and it ended, its first conclusion, that group looks for policy gaps, and the group ended its first part of in January, and two recommendations came out of that group in order to make two different study groups. One was the IANA Public records for ccTLDs, what would be the purpose, the data accuracy, and maintenance.

And the second one is the IANA role if any, in the disaster recoveries for ccTLDs. So those two items will be turned into deep dive, so I will keep you informed about that. Then also, the DNS abuse group will broaden its content to more things that only DNS abuse. So they are discussing on that, and maybe they will change, including the name of the group to a more broader one. And they are also starting to integrate with other parts of the community.

Well, then there was a very interesting session between the ccNOS and the GAC, which discussed at the beginning, they introduced

these results I just told you about the Policy Gap Working Group. And the second part was an interactive session regarding the engagement session on the ccTLDs models. Well, then there were, of course, discussions on how we meet on PHR and CIP, which I will include the conclusions maybe in my written report. I think this is everything for now. Back to you, Jonathan. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Any questions for Laura? Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks, Jonathan. This is Justine doing the GNSO Liaison report. I'm just going to highlight things. Council had this meeting yesterday, and among the things that got off the council's table is the fact that two things, one is Greg DiBiase, who is the current GNSO chair, has been confirmed as the GNSO rep for Board seat number 13. And the other thing that got off the table of GNSO is the fact that the transfer policy review final report recommendations have been fully adopted unanimously by GNSO council.

So I already sent a note to Steinar for his good work. So that will go to the ICANN Board now for consideration, pending one little thing, which is that I think GNSO is now actively trying to introduce the use of two checklists. One being the Global Public Interest framework checklist, as well as the second one is the Human Rights Assessment Impact checklist. So there's two checklists that is now being kind of integrated into the PDP process.

So each new PDP, and in fact, the Diacritics PDP, the Latin Diacritics PDP has that. So in future PDPs, the charter or the working group leadership will be asked to make a considered effort to consider the two checklists as they come up with the recommendations, as they develop the recommendations. So the things that are still remaining on GNSO Council's table are quite a lot. In fact, we discussed not only things pending, but also things that are cropping up. And one of the things that was cropping up or couple of things that is cropping up is DNS abuse, that's still up in the air.

The other thing that has been put onto Council's radar is if you remember, Transfer Policy Recommendation 33, the availability for registrants to initiate a dispute process within the transfer process. So that has gone onto Council's radar. I think they want me to stop talking. Registration Data Accuracy is one of the things that's still on the Council's radar. So we looked at all the inputs. I think we received nine inputs from nine groups, including the ALAC, and there wasn't anything conclusive. All the inputs sort of either overlap in some parts or were totally divergent in other parts.

So what's happened is they're going to convene a small team of Council to fix, I don't know, look into the mess, I suppose. And I'm still trying to figure out whether I need to be on the small team. So nothing new on that front. DNS abuse hasn't been on Council's radar recently, but because at the GNSO GAC Bilateral, the GAC asked after, Hey, what's happening with DNS abuse? So I think the GNSO Chair was kind of compelled to say that, yes, we will restart the DNS Abuse Small Team and that will get going.

And I was on the previous small team anyway, so I'll continue to be on the small team and try to push that thing along. There are other things like urgent requests, which aren't really on our radar, but that's something that GAC is really pushing. The urgent requests in terms of the registration data request service where the GAC has been saying that if a request is made on the basis that is an urgent one because it's a life-or-death situation, then we need to have a mechanism to cut short the review process by the registrar and get the data out.

From GNSO's perspective, they are saying still that's fair, but it boils down to two things. One is that if the GAC can come back to the GNSO with a way to verify the requester, so for example, is a legal enforcement agency or a particular government, and you can verify who that person is, then that cuts down one aspect of it, which is the verification of the requester, but the other aspect of it is they still need to have time to review the request.

So it's not necessarily going to be automatic despite the fact that it's an accredited LEA, Law Enforcement Agency that making the request. So that's an ongoing situation. Let me talk about what happened prior to-- sorry, at the wrap up session, which just happened half an hour ago, I'll just talk about the fact that I mentioned that Council has got a lot on its plate, so I think they're going to go through a prioritization process on the potential work.

I think there's going to be a staff recommendation on what we would want to concentrate on, and I guess that will come back to Council for deliberations, and ICANN will certainly be part of that

conversation. They had an issue on the timing of the bilateral meetings, but I won't get into that. Reviews, the thing is GNSO as a body doesn't necessarily have a single opinion or single position on reviews because GNSO is quite-- it's been broken up into the SGs and the stakeholder groups and the constituencies.

So it's very rare that GNSO comes to a single position on anything. But I think I can safely say that many groups within the GNSO are still quite confused between what the CIP, the Continuous Improvement Program is trying to achieve versus what the Pilot Holistic Review is supposed to do versus what the Holistic Review is meant to do and the scope of the ATRT4. So I think they're trying to sort themselves out and they're trying to find someone who, who will be actively monitoring all these things so that you'll keep Council abreast of all these discussions and what is what.

And the last thing I want to mention is the fact that the Latin Diacritics, and Satish can probably add some color to this, the Latin Diacritics PDP. they had the first meeting at ICANN82, and one of the things that cropped up was the fact that I think some people were asking for the ability to shorten the PDP or at least come up with initial set of piece of work that could potentially have recommendations that could be incorporated into the applicant guidebook.

From Council's perspective, I think they are open to suggestion, but I think the general position that is, unless you can complete that piece of work that you want included within one month, it might be very difficult to include into the AGB because we are looking at a

very tight timeline to complete the Applicant Guidebook, and bearing in mind that the Latin Script Diacritics PDP was never meant to be prerequisite for the next round anyway. So I'll stop there. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Any questions for Justine? Oh, Satish, go ahead. Do you have a question?

SATISH BABU

Not really a question, but a comment. Actually, two comments. One is that the name of the PDP is now not Latin script but just Latin Diacritics, because otherwise the acronym becomes LSD, and people said, that's not good.

The second point is actually a kind of hygiene factor which is probably important for us in At-Large, nothing to do with the actual policy, but Sergio here raised an issue during the PDP meeting that he was not able to follow because there's no translation. PDPs don't have apparently a translation, but it is a genuine problem. Sergio, do you want to add anything here?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO

Gracias, Satish. I'll speak in Spanish, please. I'm going to speak Spanish. I attended the Diacritics, and I was really disappointed because you would assume that the language and the issues to be discussed are for Spanish speaking, Portuguese, and French speaking countries, and there may be some more.

The thing is that those that are discussing this typically communicated English. So what can they do with people who do not understand what we call an accent is? I have explained in a previous meeting that the word revolver and stirring in Spanish are written the same, but except for the accent. I shoot with a revolver, and you can stir a pan. The word is the same, but of course, the meaning of the word is different according to the context.

So now, I was going to talk to the Ombudsman to request for interpretation services. I sent an email and I was replied that no interpretation was extended there. So I'm going to go to the Ombudsman and explain some things that, why it's so important to have the Latin Diacritics in operation in our language. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

This might be a case where it'll just be easier to change the Spanish language. I don't know, but Laura, go ahead.

LAURA MARGOLIS

Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I just made a joke. It's okay. Not worth repeating. Laura, go ahead.

LAURA MARGOLIS

Thank you. This is Laura Margolis for the records. It's a thing we always discuss in our region regarding the translation, and I think

when there are very small groups, it's very difficult to have translation because ICANN is not going to give us translation for small groups. I don't think it has resources for that, so I don't know what will be the solution in this case, but I don't know if going to the Ombudsman, maybe it's too much. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO

Sergio for the record. It's over 20 people working there, and it's not a three or four people group. It deserves to have, especially because of the relevance it has for Latin languages speaking people to have interpretation in that group. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW

This is Justine for the record. So I agree with Laura, I don't think this is a matter for the Ombuds. I think you are overreacting a little bit there. So what I can do is with the help of Satish who is our rep on that group, we can make a request to GNSO to see if they can have interpretation service. I don't know the composition of the group whether we can take this offline.

But if there are people who are on the PDP Working Group itself who require interpretation services, then I'm happy to take that request back to GNSO and ask them if they can do something about it. But yeah, if the people who are on the PDP can work with English, then there may not be a need for this request, because you are at the ICANN meeting, so the interpretation services is provided here. But with their weekly meetings, there is typically no interpretation. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I don't know how many of you attended the session on how we meet, but I will tell you that interpretation and language services is one of the things being evaluated generally because a lot of the services being provided are not being used. And so what your experience may be pointing to needing to come up with a new way to evaluate when to use them.

Because right now there's a volume of interpretive services that are going unused, but if they may be being put in the wrong places, that may be part of solving the problem. I don't know the answer, but I do know it's one of the things being discussed as part of how we meet, and I know this particular issue is of particular importance to us in the At-Large, and so we'll need to find a way to balance those.

But maybe figuring out, as you say, where there might be a particular instance where it's important has to become part of that solution. I have no idea the order, so I'm going to just go back and forth. Okay. Hadia, go ahead. Oh, okay.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Actually, my hand in the room is the first.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Let's not worry about it.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Yeah. Anyway, I was happy to wait and I'm still happy to wait.

JONATHAN ZUCK

No, I'm happy to have you go forward.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

My question was to Justine with regard to the scoping of accuracy and if groups who haven't submitted their comments yet, is Council still going to consider their submissions?

JUSTINE CHEW

Can you give me an idea which group you're referring to?

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Oh, there are some groups, but I cannot give you a list, but I can-- yeah.

JUSTINE CHEW

Can we take this offline? Because Council set a deadline for it, so that's that, and I don't know whether we are taking more comments or not.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Okay, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

And we seem to have a long queue may be on this issue of interpretation. So one thing I may do is ask Claire to put that on the agenda for an OFB call, because I think that's where we as a group

would probably try to work out our position on it. This meeting is not going to-- we're not going to reach a conclusion, so I'm just going to ask that everybody who has a card up is very efficient in their intervention. So I'm going to switch sides. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN

Someone has their microphone on. Okay, so it's Judith Hellerstein for the record. The Ombudsman is not the correct place. No, but I'm just saying what we also need, and I've been talking to language services about this, is according to what we need, they don't have enough data on what that needs thing. So maybe what we want to do is, but before we start the PDP is, do a survey and see who requires what and what they require, whether RTT could satisfy or language and like have a screen or something like that, and a stream text link because stream text links are very easy and they don't require a lot of bandwidth, and people who are doing remote may have a bandwidth issue with that.

GREG SHATAN

I'll try to be brief. Greg Shatan for the record. I think it's ironic that this PDP of all regarding the Latin Diacritics is the one where this is an issue. And I would say that this should be pitched to GNSO and language services as a special case. I think their concern is probably a slippery slope, which is adding language services to every meeting of every PDP every day, every week, is going to be prohibitively expensive.

JONATHAN ZUCK

No, they're already talking about cutting.

GREG SHATAN

Yes, exactly. But this is kind of the exception that proves the rule. The very purpose of this PDP is to discuss non-English languages that use Latin scripts. Therefore, not only should the group be extremely sensitive to this issue, or else they're in a hole and they keep digging. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Avri.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Avri speaking. I actually think that we've got to start rethinking, because at the moment, the whole language translation thing is dominated by the early settlers. And for example, we had that one example of someone who was speaking a language, I didn't know what it was, but basically saying, how come I don't have access?

The technology exists now to basically integrate something with Zoom so that a myriad number of languages could be held on any meeting. And if we're going to start talking about, especially this is the pro language translation group, if we're going to start talking about that, let's talk about making it advance as opposed to just the settlers getting more and more places where their languages, the early settlers are translated. Thanks. I want some Italian.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Merci, Sebastien Bachollet. I would like to support what Greg said. The idea is not to know who doesn't speak English, but the topic we are working on is Latin languages. So let us leave Latin people to talk about this. If English speaking people want to take part in the works of this group, well they can, but it would be just as like asking a cyclist to define the rules for driving on the road. We are making mistakes here.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Excellent commentary. So staff, hopefully you've made a note that we're going to try to put this topic on the OFB agenda. Do we have Mattias here for a update from the SSAC? We don't. Do we have any other liaisons? No.

AVRI DORIA

Did they figure out who was going to chair or what the process is for the next GNSO?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Go to the Board.

-
- JUSTINE CHEW Well, he was termed out anyway. So the short answer is no. The timetable for the election for the chair has been announced.
- JONATHAN ZUCK All right, great. Thank you.
- ANDREW Excuse me, Jonathan. Sorry. Just a reminder to everyone, this is Andrew by the record, to please share your name.
- JONATHAN ZUCK We're looking for interpretation data accuracy here, so. All right, a little bit from the working groups. So I think with CPWG, I'm going to call on Avri.
- AVRI DORIA Thank you. So we had the CPWG meeting. I should go? Do you want to go? I thought you said I was going to go, and then you were going to put stuff--
- OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND Avri was going, and I'm adding at the end, so I've got a mic here. I'm cool. Yeah, we've sorted it out.
- AVRI DORIA They were correcting me for being wrong. Good. Okay. So we had the meeting, we basically, and I'll go through this fairly quickly, we spent much of our time talking about the review of the fourth

proceeding of the proposed application guidebook, and I think I got a go ahead to basically continue doing comments on the topics that had been raised. I think that's where we got to at the end. The other topic we had that we didn't quite finish-- oh, I don't need to hear myself translated.

The other topic we had that we didn't, was on the whole thing of the topic drives within the CPWG. And basically, the impression I had is that people liked them and we should figure out a way to continue with them, but if I'm wrong, we can bring it up at the next CPWG meeting to talk about whether they continue or whether they don't. I think that's about it, unless you got something else to throw in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah. Thank you, Avri. One thing, I think you think you're in Australia. Your name card is upside down. Avri Doria, check it out, it's upside down.

AVRI DORIA

Were you able to read it?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, I can read it from here. You can see it over on the screen. Look at it, it's upside down. Anyway, no, just one more thing. We have been informed through the meeting list during this week that the Transfer Policy Review Policy Development Process, PDP, has ended and been voted by the GNSO Council. So I just wanted to

thank Steinar Grøtterød, who has been providing us with regular updates every week regarding that process.

Bearing in mind he's not quite free yet since now we're moving into the implementation part of it. He'll just have someone else asking him the questions every week. And then finally, of course, do join the mailing list CPWG, Consolidated Policy Working Group mailing list, and we have weekly calls. And yeah, that's it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yes, thank you. Everybody's expected on those calls. Claire, go ahead.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Hi, everyone. Claire Craig for the transcript record. I know Marita is online, so I don't know if she would have anything to add, but just wanted to say that at this meeting, we really only had one OFB Working Group meeting, which was on Sunday morning. The topics that we dealt with were the CIP, the Pilot Holistic Review, as well as the Draft Operating Plan for Specific Reviews.

Specifically on that last topic, we have now completed the public comment, and it'll be available for viewing on the Wiki, and it goes to the ALAC for voting on Monday, voting closes on the 20th, and then it will be submitted on the 21st. The interesting thing though is that a lot of the topics that we dealt with at the OFB were discussed in other sessions. So as Jonathan said, initially, they

were handled with the Board and they were also handled when we spoke with the NCSG.

And there was a specific session for the CIP where we dealt with the RALO coordination with respect to the work that has been done by ALAC on the CIP. So that's it for me, I don't know if Marita has anything. Okay. Marita, go ahead, please.

MARITA MOLL

Hi there, everybody. Sorry, I did have my hand up, but the system automatically takes you down in three seconds. That's a new one. Yeah, being here, I didn't actually attend everything, but there were quite a few meetings that did deal with the multi-stakeholder with the WSIS+20 and legislative and regulatory stuff. There was one today, specifically public session which was quite good.

And the other thing I just wanted to mention was that I did attend the NCSG discussion with the Board, and they had a very interesting discussion going on about indicators of success of the multi-stakeholder system, which I thought would be a really good thing for us to revisit maybe in an OFB meeting. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

That was a good idea. Any questions for Marita and Claire? All right. Yeah, we also had a good meeting with the NCSG and got some real support from them on the work that we've been, but in particular, Alan's been doing on the operating standards for specific reviews and our concerns over how that process is going. So we'll be doing

more and perhaps collaborating with them on that topic. Amrita, do you want to talk a little bit about ACEs and how that went?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thanks, Jonathan. Amrita for the record. Yes, we did have an ACEs meeting. The points which were mainly discussed was to make the charter of the group. There were a lot of discussions on what should be there, what should not be there, but primarily we agreed that things should be at a higher level and it should not be too restrictive for people to participate, et cetera.

In terms of activities, which we thought we would be focusing on, were three. One is on a UA Drive Initiative. Obviously we are trying to fine tune what we want to do out there. The second is to promote the phishing program, which Jonathan is designing. Once he finishes it, he would be sharing it out for comments, and once finalized, we could rule it out and it should be work in progress.

That is something which we decided because I think that's urgent in need in the community and there is an appetite for that course, I would say, at this point of time. And the third would be on the new gTLD round, especially related to Application Support Program. After this meeting, Jonathan and I are expected to meet Sally to know more about what ICANN's next round team is planning to do and where we could collaborate. So I think we could give more information on that later. That's about it from me. Jonathan, if I missed something, please feel free to add. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks. Yeah, no, I think it was a good meeting and we got a sense of some of the kinds of activities we go in. We also went over a charter that Eduardo did some work on drafting, and I think that was a great start and we're going to maybe do some simplification of that. But I think that was a good basis to work from. So I think we're on our way there. The message from the SSAC I think was everything we're doing could always be better, but we should just start. I did an approach which is a big thing in technology industry as well. So let's get an MVP out there and then just keep evolving the product as we go. So the next piece in the schedule is the session reports.

What I really wanted to do was just open it up to people that attended sessions that they believed had action items or topics that we really should focus on, action items for us, things we should be concerned about, et cetera. So nothing boring, anything that's just like exciting for us to get engaged on. So just put your card up if you've got something like that. I'll start with Naty.

NATALIE TERCOVA

Thank you. This is Natty for the record. I'll take the opportunity of not having Mattias, if I'm not wrong, still with us.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I think he's going to come.

NATALIE TERCOVA

I joined the SSAC Joint Session with the Board, so I can just chip in with a few of my insights from there is that some of the issues that were raised by them were in line with what we presented at our joint sessions with them, starting with the importance and call for more in-person meetings. As also, SSAC is struggling with having just the virtual participation that so many issues take way too long and could be easily solvable when dealt with in in-person settings.

And they also stress that they would like to work more closely with, for instance, us with the GAC and maybe also with OCTO, so that the SSAC can more closely address what maybe the board needs and how we can help each other and not have specific closed up conversations, maybe sometimes on the same topics. But rather than have more of these joint meetings together.

Then there was another key discussion about the bylaws and reviews. So they said that the current bylaws require efficiency in reviews, but often they need much more time to ensure that they're effective. So the outcome of this was that if certain review processes do not fit their intended purpose, there may be some modifications required, which was actually acknowledged by the board. And it was stressed that it's definitely possible to do some modifications if we all are in line.

So that might be also something we should monitor and focus on if such conversations will appear. And I can just end with that SSAC confirmed that they will submit a response to the public comment proceeding on the draft applicant guidebook, and it's going to be specifically to request clarification regarding name collisions. So

this is something we can also focus on from the end user's perspective as well. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you. I saw Sebastien. Oh, okay. I saw Sebastien's hand up and then I'll go to Maria.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Just short, I wasn't in the meeting of the ISPCP when they talk about the Pilot Holistic Review and I think they could be aligned with our position.

And the second point is that maybe in this list of topics, we can add cross-RALO meeting just to say that we had one here where we coordinate and we had exchange with the GSC, we presented what's happened in different region, and we are still working and we will be working for the next meeting too. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks for the update. Marita, do you want to go ahead? I'm just switching back and forth, I guess. Bukola, sorry.

BUKOLA ORONTI

My name is Bukola Oronti. Concerning the CIP meeting that we have the session, so based on that, we were able to-- like during the session, RALOs identified their top three priorities, and with that, we are looking forward to having another CIP ALAC call shortly after this ICANN82 meeting, and then we'll be able to move to the 15

ALAC full members with the small team, and then going forward, we able to report back to the OFBWG call for the way forward on that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, that sounds good. Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

With regard to the SSAC, as Natalie mentioned, ALAC and SSAC are aligned on most of the topics, but maybe the PHR is one topic that we are not aligned on. The other thing that I wanted to mention that the SSAC is currently having those lightning talks, and those talks are actually open to the entire community. We had several of these talks during ICANN82.

I wasn't able to attend all of them, but one of the talks that was really interesting was a summary of all the research and publications that were done with regard to the DNS in the past year. All those presentations are published and are linked to the agenda, so you can take a look at them if you want. And the other thing I wanted to mention is about the Applicant Support Program. And we had a discussion about that during the AFRALO session. Jonathan, you were there.

And I think one of the takeaways for the At-Large community is to work more with the At-Large structures in order to be able to promote the program as well as promote the Applicant Support Program and also promote the idea of going forward with or

looking for partnerships in order to be able to make benefit of the program. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Hadia. Eunice.

EUNICE ALEJANDRA PEREZ
COELLO

I will speak in Spanish. This is Eunice. Today we had a very interesting session about the grant program, I don't know if you were able to participate in this session. We've seen some results about the topics presented such as universal acceptance, security of DNS, participation, inclusivity, and something important is that the regions from where the received applications were mentioned, Latin America is well below regarding the geographical distribution, we're talking about 7% of applicants.

And there was a discussion about if the reason why there's no application from this region, maybe the language. When they tried to submit their application, maybe they don't understand correctly the subject matter and they cannot fill the application properly. I think that's it regarding the grant program.

I would like to share or to support what Sergio mentioned to say that sessions, even though they are technical, it is important for them to have interpretation into Spanish and not to look for statistics as to who is actually participating, because maybe they're not participating because they are held in English. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Let's bring that conversation back up on OFB. Okay. Thank you. Greg.

GREG SHATAN

Thank you. Greg Shatan. Just English. In any case, just to report briefly on the NARALO events or programs. We had a very good NARALO round table with the GAC Portugal representative Ana Neves, Jeff Bedser from SSAC, and Tim Moore, who's not an ICANN person from Microsoft, who's an excellent digital policy person, thought it was well attended, covered some new ground, got some new voices, and we were quite pleased.

The NARALO round table also went well, CIP became a subjective discussion as well as other NARALO items. And last but not least, we had an excellent NARALO social event on Saturday at Spin where Caleb Ogundele beat Jonathan Zuck in the final of our cutthroat ping pong tournament, which means Caleb is the new chair of ALAC, apparently. No, thank you for your service, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I knew there was a reason I threw that match. All right. So I think what we have left is-- oh, okay. Okay. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG

We've only had our cards up here for 20 minutes or so.

JONATHAN ZUCK

20 minutes. All right.

ALAN GREENBERG

Just a very quick one. There was an RDRS working group meeting this week. Normally when I report on that, I say things are sort of boring, nothing's going on. We seem to maybe have turned a corner, and I think it's probably an opportune time for us and perhaps others to say what we want to see as a replacement for RDRS and or SSAD. So I'm going to start putting together something, anyone else who has some knowledge of the subject, I appreciate input when I do that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Let's get that in front of the CPWG sooner rather than later. Go ahead, Satish.

SATISH BABU

Yeah, Satish, for the record. So there were a number of UA sessions, but I want to raise or flag one particular item that happened yesterday. The ccNSO meeting on UASG, there's one presentation there, which launched a new initiative called Coalition for-- what is it called? CODI, Coalition for Digital Inclusion. Now, the interesting thing about this coalition is that it actually is overlapping with UA in a big way. It is being launched in Washington on 20th of May as a UA Day event. So there is actually going to be some kind of overlap. I'm not sure what it's going to be, but this has happened and it's been launched. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

That's excellent news. Let's quickly go to the updates from the mentors of the fellows and NextGen, whoever would like to go first.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI

Okay. So this is Shreedeeep Rayamajhi for the record. And this meeting, we had around eight fellows, out of which four could not make it. One opted for virtual meeting, and four were here. So apart from that, we had a series of leaders who came in and talked about their experiences in the At-Large. And apart from that, I will prepare a report, which I'll send to the community.

Plus, I have a small suggestion that I think we have to look into a formal way of how we will induct these fellows, maybe have a certain session, formal session with them about understanding their perspective in terms of the session that they did, just as you did with the ALAC members. And I have just a session in the last, just one paragraph of each of this, sharing their experience so that they kind of like get into it. And I think that will help a bit. So I guess that's about it. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Great. And NextGen?

ROBERTO GAETANO

Yes, thank you. Roberto Gaetano for the record. NextGen, there were 12 NextGen, and unfortunately, two had last minute problem, and they couldn't join us. So it was 10 people. Unlike the Fellows,

the NextGen come here for the first time, the first-time exposure to ICANN, and they are all from the North America region, from the region where the meeting is held. We had the presentations that were very interesting.

They were spanning all over the scope of ICANN, very diverse. Sometimes getting also a little bit outside the picket fence, that could be also bringing new ideas and widening our knowledge. Yes, these presentations, one thing that stroke me is that if you go in the corridors 50% of the time you hear people speaking about the new gTLD program, and out of the presentations of the NextGen, there was only one that was related to TLDs and all the others were about different topics that are still part of our scope.

The problem that we have now, and then I have to apologize, I was caught up in the wrap up of the NextGen, is exactly what to do now that we have done this investment, how to make something that to get some value out of it. Actually, for the little story, it seems that my intervention at the public forum has led some impression because we had at the wrap up of the NextGen seven Board members who wanted to meet better the NextGen.

Personally, since the next meeting is going to be in my region in Europe, I take that as a personal commitment to try to make something in order to prepare already well before the meeting on how to welcome the NextGen in Europe, and how to bring them more effectively and efficiently within the ICANN community. And if there are questions, then offline, I can answer questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks a lot for that update. And I'll say that the Fellows Program and NextGen is one of the things in the radar of cost measures and things like that. So anything we can do to showcase the value of the program, the contribution made by fellows and NextGen, the presentations, we need to do more to keep integrated into what we do and make it less of something that's happening on the periphery.

We'll be having a call with NextGen and Fellows as a kind of a call back to figure out how your experience was and get your feedback and help you decide what you might want to do next, and things that we'll be in the next few weeks, we'll schedule something to talk that through. I think at this point we are done with interpretation.

We may keep talking a few more minutes, but thank you very much for all that you do as well. We really appreciate your work. We really appreciate our own staff here as well, the At-Large staff work very, very hard. And it's Alan's birthday, so happy birthday to you, happy birthday to you, happy birthday dear Alan, happy birthday to you. Hey.

ALAN GREENBERG

Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Let's have a war of language versions of Happy Birthday. All right. Thank you everyone. Oh, tech support too, thank you very much. Yes. So many people working behind the scenes.

ALAN GREENBERG

I thought you said cake.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, thanks everyone, for a great meeting. We have some takeaways from this, let's not lose sight of them and get back on top of these issues. There's a lot of topics coming out of this meeting that we need to get our ducks in a row on before the next one. Thanks a lot. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]