
ICANN83 | PF – At-Large Leadership Welcome Session
Monday, June 09, 2025 - 9:00 to 10:15 CEST

YESIM SAGLAM

Hello and welcome to At-Large Leadership Welcome Session. My name is Yeşim 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, and 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 please speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you all for joining. And now I will hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Yeşim. Thanks, everyone, for being here at ICANN83. I wonder how many of you are familiar with the ICANN Standards of Behavior. We talk about it every time that we start a meeting, but do you know what they are? What are some examples of things that

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.

are in it? Raise your hand if you know something that's in the ICANN Standards of Behavior. Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN

It's treat everyone with respect and dignity they deserve because we all are colleagues here.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right. That might be good enough. I thought we could just use a reminder. We get passionate about different topics, we get frustrated by things that other people are saying that we disagree with, but let's try to make sure that we treat each other with respect and dignity. We let them finish. We try to disagree without ad hominem responses. We don't storm out of the room. We don't pound the table with our shoe while they're speaking. Let's try and make sure that we're able to disagree without being disagreeable, if possible.

Also on that note, please unwind your headset right now and pick your channel in the translation device so that it is fluid for people to switch to their native language. It shouldn't be any friction associated with that. If you've got a laptop and you're in Zoom, you can plug your headphone right into your laptop and choose your interpretation.

ALAN GREENBERG

If you do that, it's going to be delayed by several seconds, and you'll be very confused.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, no. See, now I want to say Alan gets confused easily, but I just said, we have to be more respectful. All right. So, thank you for that. Everybody's ready with that. So, let's go ahead and get our meeting started. We've got a lot going on at this meeting. There's a lot of discussions at which we are at the center. One of them is DNS Abuse. Has sort of come back to the foreground after spending quite a bit of time kind of in the background of activities that have been worked on by others, contracted parties, contract compliance, etc. And we're back discussing what's next for DNS Abuse, both in the Contracted Party House session and then in our own session that Justine is running. And she must be in the GNSO session right now. So that's something that is going to be a big deal for this meeting.

There are other conversations that are going on that are more hallway conversations, I suppose, at which we are also sort of in the center. One is the community's concern over the change in language and a couple of the ICANN website pages related basically to equal opportunity employment. And these are pages that have changed before without incident, but these are not normal times. And those of us from the United States recognize that, and I think folks from outside the United States, in some ways, feel it even more acutely. So that argument, that discussion, and what, if

anything besides airing it needs to happen, I think it's going to be happening in the hallways as well.

There's also the issue of the future of reviews that we've gotten ourselves into the middle of as well, and what's happening with ATRT4, the Pilot Holistic Review, etc., and the fate of that. Those are conversations that are taking place around the ICANN community as well. And I'll get more into that briefly. But so those are big, big discussions, as well as the Applicant Guidebook now being out for public comment. How We Meet is now out for public comment. So, there's a number of community-wide discussions that are taking place.

But to give us a little bit of a Board perspective on where we are and what they've been discussing, because they've been here since Thursday, I think, or Tuesday, I've forgotten, is none other than Leon Sanchez, our representative to the ICANN Board. Take it away, my friend.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you very much, Jonathan, and welcome everyone. Good morning. Buongiorno. Buenos dias. I will speak in Spanish. So let me thank you for being here today. I'll say good morning to my interpreters this morning. They are the ones who give us the voice in the different languages. And so, as Jonathan was saying, we had our workshop on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, and we had different kinds of discussions that are relevant.

There were several sessions with our president and CEO, with the staff as well. Some Board sessions, some internal issues were discussed. Those are the exercises we conduct, both for integration and discussion of the different topics. We analyze the goals for the FY26 for our president and CEO. We have also talked about DNS Abuse. We have given a look to reviewing the different results of the different changes that have occurred in the agreements, the registrar agreements in connection with combating DNS Abuse. We have also looked into some issues related to the next round, the next gTLD round. As you know, our intention is to start it in April or May, if I'm not mistaken.

And then there is also an update on the finance status in our organization. As you probably remember, some months ago, we started a review stage of our finances. There were some figures that were a bit concerning. However, we have taken some measures that have allowed us, as we say in Spanish, to straighten the boat. And nowadays, our figures are showing positive results with these measures. And so, this is obviously something that is positive for the organization and for the community as well.

We have also seen some discussions on some mechanisms that are being proposed by the ccNSO, and we have talked about the issue of the reviews. This is an issue that is nowadays at the top of our agenda. It is definitely a priority for this group. I'm sure there will be questions about this, and I will be glad to answer them all. We have also had two information sessions with the ASO and the

ccNSO. These sessions are aimed at attempting to help all the members of the Board--

I'm being told that there is no interpretation in the Zoom room, so I will switch back to English so that our colleagues on the Zoom room are also able to follow the discussion.

So, as I was saying in Spanish, we had two informational sessions, one with the ASO, another one with the ccNSO, and the objective of these informational sessions is to try to get all the Board members up to speed as to getting to know the community and what each constituent body does within the community. So, we had these two informational sessions, which I think were very fruitful. It allowed us to better understand what role of the ASO and ccNSO is within the community, which are the policy topics in which they are working nowadays and, of course, their relationship with the Board and with other constituents within our community.

We also received some updates on the WSIS+20, the sessions on the IGF, the status of that, and we had also a public Board meeting in which we passed some resolutions that you might review in the corresponding page. We approved two meetings for summer 2026 and summer 2027. The venues for 2026 is Seville in Spain and the venue for 2027 is Vancouver in Canada. So, we're going to visit North America, too.

And I would also like to highlight that I see many of my colleagues in the room. So, it's good to welcome you all, Board colleagues, to the room. I see Amrita. I see Chris Chapman, too. And I'm pretty

sure I see Catherine over there. I might be missing someone else. And, of course, former Board member Danko, too. So, welcome. Welcome everyone. And I think that speaks to how the At-Large community has become more relevant in in in the space and how it has sparked interest by many Board members to come and join us in these sessions, which Sebastien might remember. It wasn't the case long ago, but step by step, we've been able to have them being interested in our community and what we do.

So, with that, I would like to open the floor for questions. I know that there are at least two topics that are top of mind for you, and I will be happy to establish a dialogue. Yes, Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you so much, Leon, for everything. Amrita for the record. As you know, the community is quite concerned with the removal of the words "diversity inclusivity" from the website. And speaking on behalf of Asia-Pacific, APRALO I would say, which is pretty diverse linguistically, language-wise, etc., we are pretty concerned about the removal of the terms. While we do understand there may be pressing concerns, geopolitical concerns, etc., but removing the words and suggesting that removal of the words do not mean it in essence is pretty grave, at least for most of the world which looks at ICANN as a multi-stakeholder body, which is quite independent from any governmental control, though it resides in a particular country's concerning.

It could reflect in different ways, also in the terms. So, while we would be submitting our request to the ICANN Board and the CEO, it is concerning for the global public, especially concerning this year, as in, it is concerning also because this year is the WSIS+20 review. What is the kind of message ICANN wants to give to the world? When everyone is so concerned, even the Board is concerned about the WSIS+20 review, and it talks about an inclusive, people-centric information society. So do look at the repercussions also, which may come from changes in word, even though the intent is not that.

So, we would definitely look and request the ICANN Board and the CEO to relook at the words, perhaps have it in. If there are tensions, they could be solved in different ways also, or having the words put in in a different way. But removing hard-earned battles, these words are very important for the global people. It may seem very minor, removing it, but it has greater implications. So, we would definitely request the ICANN Board and CEO and the Org to re-look at this, because it's just not for one country. ICANN aims to serve the entire community and the multi-stakeholder model. This is not the right message. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you very much, Amrita. And I can tell you that the Board is cognizant that this is a very sensitive and important topic, not only to the Board and our community, but the community at large, as you say. It goes beyond ICANN's sphere, I would say.

And as Jonathan was saying in his opening, the changes obey to complying with US laws. In the end, we need to recognize that we are headquartered in the US, and we need to comply with the laws in each country in which we have offices. This is not, of course, only for the US. It is true also for the offices in Singapore, in Uruguay, in every country that we have an office. We need to comply with the laws.

And in regard to this change of language, we have been told that it obeys to compliance with the US laws and the new guidance that the, I don't know what's the right name of the office that handles labor law in the US, but they offer some guidance that while--

JONATHAN ZUCK

Equal Opportunity Employment Commission.

LEON SANCHEZ

Exactly. They offer some guidance as to the use of language for equal labor opportunities. And, well, all the companies and organizations within the US follow that guidance, and in that way, they comply with these laws. There was a blog issued by our CEO that clarified the intent of these changes, explaining that it was in compliance with US law, but that didn't take us away or move us away from the underlying principles that, as I have repeated many times, I do believe that in our diversity lies our richness, right, and our strength as a community.

So, rest assured that, even though the words have changed, to comply with US laws, that doesn't mean that ICANN is moving away from its commitment and from its core values to diversity and to inclusiveness.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

I just have a follow-up question, Leon. You mentioned labor laws, but what does the multi-stakeholder community have to do with labor laws because we are not employees of ICANN? It could be the ICANN employees. And if that be the case, it could be addressed in a different way, taking out staff from the particular text and having the global community in a different way, which is understandable. As in, if it is Labor laws, as you label it, it could be managed in a different way. We do not definitely fall under labor law.

LEON SANCHEZ

I completely agree with you. The community doesn't have to do anything with labor law, but nevertheless, ICANN has to comply with labor law in the US, and to the extent that we operate in the US, we need to comply with US law. It's a difficult equation to balance as to define the reach of the content in the website, whether it applies only to staff or whether it applies to the full community. That's hard to differentiate or to set the limits. We are where we are, and we are mindful that it is a sensitive topic and an important topic. And I think the organization has continued to work in finding ways to achieve that balance.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I might be able to help because I spent much of yesterday talking about this issue. There are two pages on which this updated language took place. One is very clearly a labor-oriented, a staff-oriented page, a hiring page. The other is a community page in which lawyers perceived it might have implications for staff also. And so, Justine yesterday made a recommendation to the CEO about trying to split that page in half or something like that, to differentiate the staff-related issues from the community-related issues.

So, it is just those two pages. One very clearly is just about staff, and one is more ambiguous, and the lawyers are just being conservative. So, hopefully, Kurtis will take Justine's recommendation back to the lawyers to see if it's possible to bifurcate that page and remove the HR-related language from the community page.

LEON SANCHEZ

And just to add to that, the language in the rest of the content that is out there, community pages, websites, policies, etc., has not changed at all. There's only two places in which the language was changed. The rest remains untouched.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, go ahead, Avri. Sorry.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Avri Doria speaking. I want to ask a question, and I want to bring in sort of a historical perspective. One of the big issues when we were going through the transition, which was an important period in our life, though, we do seem to be putting it behind us more and more as time goes on, was that remaining domiciled in the US would never put us in this position.

Now, in the first three months of a four-year period, we're already taking little step here, little step there, little step in the next place. And so, you say, this one is only a little step. The next one will only be a little step. Are we now going to take a second look at the fact that we're domiciled in a country that does not respect the same values that we are committed to, and that, therefore, it is something that we need to start looking at again? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Avri. I think we've seen situations we never imagined to see before. I agree with you on that. And maybe it's time for us to start looking at alternatives, options, and start reflecting on whether it's a good idea to revisit that topic. So, I'm fully in agreement with you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

And again, just because I learned up about this yesterday, this language comes from every jurisdiction in which ICANN has employees. So, it has nothing to do with ICANN being domiciled

per se as a US corporation. It has to do with the fact that ICANN has US employees. So, there is similar language that comes from every country in which there are ICANN employees and all those are mandatory to include on the website. So, I don't know if that makes a difference, but changing where ICANN is based wouldn't have changed this situation. It would have required not having any presence whatsoever, I guess, in the United States.

LEON SANCHEZ

Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you, Leon, for being with us today. This is Hadia for the record. I just want to add my voice to what Amrita said. Honestly speaking, editing the policy documents in order to remove EI from it doesn't look good, especially that we're looking forward to launching the New gTLD Program, we're looking to promoting the internationalized domain names. We already know that there is an infrastructure gap between developed countries and less developed ones. So again, that does not send the right message to the community and does not also reflect good on the multi-stakeholder approach that ICANN operates on. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Hadia. Just to repeat what I said. None of the policy documents have been changed. I mean, that's not something that the organization or the Board can do. A policy needs to go through

the bottom-up multi-stakeholder process in order to be changed. So, none of those policy documents have been changed. Good. Any other questions, comments? I see Sébastien, Amrita and Harold. Sébastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

This is Sébastien. It seems that I need to speak in English because of the Zoom room facility. Okay, I will try. I will speak French then. Thank you, Leon, for being with us today. As Jonathan said it in the introduction today, there is a lagging theme on the table since May 8. It is the decision of the Board. The Board has to take a few decisions, decisions that are linked to the recommendation made through ATRT3. It was the review on Accountability and Transparency of ICANN. It seems that it is a very deep discussion we have to get into.

The Board decided to talk about it at the next ICANN meeting when the decisions are already made into laws, when water has already gone under the bridge. It has been used since this review was completed. The propositions that were implemented, even those that were accepted by the Board, were not implemented, the one that was agreed on by the Board was not implemented. Why is this that ICANN is not flexible enough to start this discussion here now, during this meeting? Because it's an emergency.

It is an emergency because IGF, World IGF will take place in 15 days. And at the beginning of July, WSIS+20 will be in place. So, we really do need to discuss it. We need to discuss this in detail, in depth. It

is very important. There is a lack of understanding. We never had a chance to explain things after ATRT3. We never had a chance to explain the proposition that was made through that revision, that review. When somebody at the Board said to us now, oh, we have to go back and reread what was already written, for me, it is a sign that nothing was taken into account prior. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ

Okay. Since interpretation is up and running again, I would like to speak in Spanish. I do understand this is a sensitive topic. I can provide some background in terms of the discussions we held during the Board sessions. As you know, we received the ATRT3 recommendations, and we set up the Pilot Holistic Review, because back then the Board considered that recommendations were not clear enough to be implemented. Hence, we launched the Pilot Holistic Review effort.

Finally, the group in charge of the Pilot Holistic Review was unable to reach consensus in terms of the goal, the initial goal, so they went back to the Board to seek a solution. It was then decided to postpone the launch of the ATRT4 and launch a dialogue with the community to find a new way forward. Personally, I can share that I did not agree with postponing the launch of the ATRT4. I do understand all the work it took for us during the transition. I do understand the need to perform these reviews in a timely manner, in line with our bylaws.

However, I understood at the end of the day that the Board and the organization have a responsibility, and that meant making a pause before launching this new review, to have the opportunity to engage in a dialogue with the community in line with our multi-stakeholder model, so as to review the reviews.

I do understand that it is expected of the ATRT to perform a review of the reviews, but the fact is that the ATRT is a community effort, as it should be, and it cannot have a pre-established goal or objective. Hence, the Board considered that it would be more convenient to engage in this dialogue with all the community groups so that all these groups would set the new expectations and also decide on a new way forward, so that the solutions we came up with back in 2016, though not perfect, would be practicable. That is the objective of this decision.

Clearly, we do not want to go against our bylaws, we do not want to indefinitely postpone the reviews. We, as the Board, want to find a new way forward, and we want to work with the community to find new mechanisms that will result in an effective accountability to the community, and to work with fewer resources and more expediently, in line with what the community expects from the Org and the Board. Thank you. I think Sébastien has a follow up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

The Pilot Holistic Review leaders are the ones that addressed the Board, and not the other way around. It would be very interesting

for the Board to engage in a dialogue because not all of us have the same point of view.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you, Sébastien. I think Avri, Amrita and Alan wanted to take the floor and Harold, of course. Sorry, Harold. Okay. So, Avri, you have the floor. Go ahead, please.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Avri speaking. I appreciate it and I learned a new word this morning and that's relearning. And so, I guess I'm relearning what it means to have bylaws. What it means to have bylaws that are perhaps a little inconvenient at a particular time. I'm learning that our bylaws no longer have the power of consensus, the hard consensus that was gone through to get them. But if there's convenience or there's one or two groups that perhaps don't want to do something at a particular time, then the Board has the power to sort of say, no, don't worry about the bylaws. The bylaws no longer count.

And in any other issue, I've been in various meetings since the decision where somebody says but we've got bylaws. Don't worry about it. All you have to do is convince the Board that it's convenient to go around these bylaws, and they will because bylaws are no longer the supreme rule of this.

Now, we had an ATRT. There's absolutely no problem with the Board having said the last ATRT blew it. Rethink it. That's your job.

It's the job of the ATRT to review what the previous review did. So, if the Board has done a U-turn and sort of said, no, what we approved once. is no longer valid because of this, this, this, and this. Fine. Tell the ATRT to rethink it. That is their power.

But to sort of say, no, it is no longer convenient for us to do this. We're going to decide what to do next. It doesn't matter if there's a historical consensus that was recorded in bylaws. It's not just another consensus that one group did and then it was a-- This isn't the bylaws. This is announcing both to all of the participants here and to the world that ICANN bylaws are merely bylaws when they're convenient. And I think that this is a much, much bigger issue than just yeah, doing ATRT is a lot of work. We don't like what happened before.

And also, I understand that that the Board and the core corporation can sort of say fiduciary. We've got a fiduciary. Please explain why this would be. Because yes, the Board does get to overrule things every once in a while, because of fiduciary. It's that magic word they can use whenever they want. But then they should actually explain why. Why was this a fiduciary explanation that you had to basically destroy the standing of the bylaws for convenience's sake?

So, I really have trouble understanding. I mean, it's nice words. It's a nice sentence. We use words like consensus. Oh, there was a consensus in the community that doing and ATRT was too hard. That is still less. That's a temporary consensus that hasn't been

tested, that hasn't been welded into bylaws. That's just a feeling at the time. So, I really do not understand and I'm really quite despairing because now every time I hear someone, "I was in a GAC meeting and they talked about the consensus, they talked about the bylaws that gives them a voice". My question is, what if it's not convenient for you to use your voice at that point, we can just go around it. Because it's just a bylaw. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you, Avri. I think that as a starting point, even though it might be interpreted that bylaws are followed only when convenient, this is not the case for this resolution, although I am fully aware that it may be interpreted that way. You mentioned the word fiduciary. Okay, fiduciary responsibility. This is exactly what the Board is doing, being responsible. And we are acknowledging that launching a new ATRT4 would imply investing a lot of resources from the community and the Org. That would not lead to the desired effect, probably.

We have been very bad at communicating this, and that is our fault, our responsibility, and we assume that. We take this responsibility. That's why we are working on being more accurate when communicating this message now and we are working in order to convey what principles led us to once again postpone the launch of the ATRT4.

As I was saying initially, I did not agree on this decision. However, when my colleagues presented their arguments, their rationale, I

changed my mind and I voted in favor of postponing this review on the condition that we would engage in this dialogue and with the community as a whole, we would reach this new consensus. And eventually, if we agree on amending the bylaws to accomplish the goal we set in 2016, that is having an accountable organization, well, we believe that is the way forward.

I understand your confusion. I hear you. And I also understand that this might be interpreted in different ways. But let me reiterate the underlying principle. The principle underlying this resolution is to try to find this way forward, to find a solution.

ALAN GREENBERG

Thank you. Alan Greenberg. And I'll try to be quick. As Sebastien said, the Board did not meet with the Pilot Holistic Review and make a decision. You met with the leaders of the Pilot Holistic Review. I've chaired a bunch of groups and I think, in many cases, it is fair to meet with the chair or the leaders of a group to hear what they're saying. That's not the case here for a whole bunch of reasons that you're probably aware of and if not, I'm glad to make you aware of them in another form. But that was a very different thing from meeting with the group. And that, I think, changed the outcome significantly. As you just said, you listened and then changed your mind. I believe if you would listen to the group, you might not have changed your mind.

Number two. You said the ATRT is a community effort and the Board cannot give it direction. Technically, that's true, but the

Board is part of that community. And in fact, the ATRT is one of the very few things in our organization where the Board actually participates, not just watches. If we had a whole bunch of examples in the past where the Board asked a review to please limit your scope to something and the review said no, I'm not going to. Turned up its nose. Then you would be well-- it would be a reasonable statement for you to say you can't do it here, but you've never tried it.

We've had several other reviews where it has been suggested that we ask the review to have a limited scope and if the Board agrees and all the chairs of the ACs and SOs put members on it agree, it might well happen. You've never tried it. And having chaired one of those reviews where we wanted a limited scope and didn't end up with it and spent an immense amount of time wasted by the community. I'll leave that one alone.

Lastly, as you know, I strongly support looking for new processes that are efficient and effective instead of the bloated processes that ICANN often goes through. But here we're suggesting building a new process to build a process and adding years to the thing where we have something that might have done the job effectively. And if it wasn't doing the job, the Board has the ability to stop it. New processes are good. Yes, I know we're a bottom-up organization, but building a new complex process, which we've never used before, to build a process, I think is yet another time-wasting effort. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thanks, Alan.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

I'm going to different things, Leon. Amrita for the record.

HAROLD ARCOS

Yeah, thank you. After you.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

If you're speaking on the reviews, go ahead.

HAROLD ARCOS

No, okay, it's part of the reviews. But it's okay, Amrita, after you, it's okay.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Okay. Amrita for the record. Just a small point. You don't have to you revert on this. I would request the Board, actually, and the ICANN Org, to look at. We have our meetings timed well in advance. Many people have not got visas to come here. I know visa is not an ICANN issue, but if it is known well in advance, people can try applying for visas, get it or whatever. Perhaps ICANN Org obviously cannot give a visa but can facilitate much better. Those could be

looked into. I don't want you to revert, but the process would definitely help.

LEON SANCHEZ

I can tell you we are definitely looking into that. We have Board colleagues that have suffered from not getting visas and we are looking into processes or rather ways, not processes, ways in which the organization can be of better help, so to speak, to help not only Board members but everyone within the community to try to obtain a visa. And as you said, it's not up to ICANN to decide who gets a visa or not, but they can surely help in the process. And believe me, we are taking it at heart to make everything possible to help everyone to have the easiest path to obtain a visa to wherever we go.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you. That's appreciated.

LEON SANCHEZ

Harold?

ALAN GREENBERG

Just very quickly. Leon, it's a shame that it takes Board members not getting visas to trigger this concern.

LEON SANCHEZ

No, but this was far before. Let me tell you that. I just added the Board member factor because it's true. But you know that I personally have been dealing with this from a long time ago. It's nothing new. It was not motivated by my colleagues not obtaining visas. It was aggravated by that. That may well be the case. That maybe will be the case, but that's not something that I've been working on just recently and you know that.

ALAN GREENBERG

It's the aggravated word that triggers action amongst some parts of this.

LEON SANCHEZ

I think it has been going on before that, well beyond that. And Harold.

HAROLD ARCOS

Thank you. Harold for the record. Sorry, I'm going to switch to Spanish.

LEON SANCHEZ

You don't have to apologize.

HAROLD ARCOS

Let me talk about the issue that we are discussing right now before going to the other topic. The Board has a plan B. In spite of all the arguments and all the situations we have heard, and we thank you

for sharing this with us today, we really are incurring a bylaws issue. If somebody would like to act legally as the situation is, is there a plan B? Does the Board have a plan B, an action as a community? We probably should know about this, and we need to know what the discussion is indoors, but then the ecosystem and the model need to be defended so that we can ensure this engagement and participation space that we have at a global level. So, is there a plan B? And if so, what are the characteristics, if you can share that?

And then let's go to another topic. You talked about certain figures that show good results. You mentioned there are figures that show good results, that the boat is on its right path now. So, can you please share those figures? Where is this being reflected in such a short time? And what does these figures include? What are the areas where this can be reflected in our community so that we can really conclude that the boat is on its right path? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

All right. First, about our plan B. Our plan B is to continue with this dialogue with the community. Of course, as you mentioned, the community can choose, as I believe it is happening in some policies, to exercise some kind of action so that the Board can reconsider its resolution. And that's right. They have the right to do that. And we would need to follow the right procedure to make a resolution. I know this sounds a bit contradictory, the fact that we need to comply with our bylaws, but that's the case. We do.

Now, as for the figures, the financial figures, I'm not really sure. I think there might be a session during this meeting. But, of course, this information is public. Oh, okay. So, it's the next session. This is what Claire is telling me. It's the next session right here. And I am sure the person who is going to present about this will share the information. I do not have really fresh figures, I'm really bad with numbers, but I do remember that the outlook in connection with what we have projected versus the expenses now show a much better situation compared to what we had when these adjustments were made.

So, I insist, in the next sessions, you will receive the information. And if this is not enough, you know you can come to me and I will very gladly contact you with the right person within the organization so that you can get that information. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I can't remember what day it is. Okay. So, thank you, Leon, thank you for joining us. As always, we always appreciate you coming and being the punching bag for the entire Board when the Board goes off the rails

LEON SANCHEZ

I'm fluffy.

JONATHAN ZUCK

These are serious issues and so appreciate you participating. And as you mentioned, we are in the contemplation phase about what action we may take with regard to the issue of reviews and adherence to the bylaws, so stay tuned. Thanks a lot for joining us today.

LEON SANCHEZ

No, thank you. Thank you very much, everyone.

JONATHAN ZUCK

With that, I'm going to just go ahead and pass the microphone directly to Avri because we're running behind.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Yeah. And because we're running behind and while the slides are coming up, this is Avri speaking, the first part is the talking points. Now, we've already covered, I mean we basically had three but let's go through the slides. We had the DNS Abuse mitigation, and that was already mentioned in Jonathan's opening bit. And we had reviews that we've certainly given its first bit of exercise for the week. Hoping it gets a whole lot more exercise than that. But we've started it.

And then we mentioned briefly the New gTLD Program Next Round and Applicant Support Program where-- Do we have other slides on the talking points themselves in here that we should just at least

look at before going into further so if we could go on? The New gTLD Program Next Round is certainly imminent.

Okay. So, on the DNS Abuse mitigation, the talking points that are set out. And I'll read through them just so they're not given short shrift or some other such expression. DNS Abuse is a challenge faced by end users and leads to eroding confidence in a single trusted interoperable internet. So, it's one of the ICANN places where trust in us as an organization is dwindling. There are significant correlations between registration volume and lack of validation to malicious registrations based on the INFERMAL report published by OCTO. And that report is a very rich resource of discussions that I think we still need to have. I see in that various beginning discussions that we've never sort of worked all their way through.

Continue to explore options regarding usefulness of narrowly scoped and define PDPs to address bulk registrations. One of the problems that we seem to have in ICANN, whether it's in PDPs, reviews or everything, is we put everything in. And we always have a huge basket as opposed to let's take a narrow topic, dwell on it, solve it, move to the next topic. So, this is basically explore the options of how do we limit it? We're naturally expressive. We naturally want to open up the topics to a broader scope. But how do we get work done, and is a narrow scope the way? So, looking at that. Friction is needed to mitigate DNS Abuse. I got to admit, I

don't really understand that one. So hopefully. Jonathan or someone will.

JONATHAN ZUCK

It's friction in the registration process that's related to volume registrations. In other words, if somebody's coming in to register 10 000 domains, maybe validate the phone number, maybe do a little bit more extra work than you do normally for one, that's the friction. As opposed to prohibiting volume.

AVRI DORIA

I didn't understand the word friction and its use in the sentence when I was preparing on the plane coming here. I was saying friction, friction. Thank you. At-Large would like to find ways to embody practices of good registrars. In other words, we have seen there are registrars out there that really have a very good regime for handling it, and there are some that perhaps less so. So, try and make the good sort of the ambition as opposed to the exception.

Okay. I'm not going to go deep into any of these, but those are the talking points. And certainly, just like I asked the question on friction, if others have a question on understanding it, now's a good time before I go on to the next slide. Okay. So, I was the only one with difficulty. That's good. Okay. I'm sometimes slow, I admit that.

New gTLD Program Next Round. The Next Round must focus on communities and underserved regions. If you've been reading all

of this stuff, you may have questions on whether that is indeed the case at the moment. At-Large continues to advocate for an effective and broadly based Applicant Support Program in hopes of expanding the registry pool. Again, looking at some of the statistics that are ongoing on there. There may be questions that people would like to talk about and resolve further on whether this is indeed going to be effective.

Namespace expansion must remain conservative in order to minimize the risk of end user confusion and associated risk and harm. Contention set resolution mechanisms must not disadvantage Target Applicants. And registry commitments must serve as effective safeguards and should not be reduced or rescinded without strong reasoning. And that's the various mechanisms that we've got to enforce, comments that people make about what they're going to do if after the fact they're just empty statements because you can change them at will, then there's a real issue.

Anybody want to ask or make any comments specifically on any of these bullets before moving on? Yes. Please, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA

Thank you, Avri. I love your two first bullet points. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Okay. Anybody?

JONATHAN ZUCK

I just want to mention briefly that we are having a plenary that Justine has organized with members of the Business Constituency, members of the Contracted Party House, both the registries and the registries, as well as Graeme Bunton from the NetBeacon Foundation, who have taken that INFERMAL report and generated a report about recommendations for possible well-scoped PDPs. So, they don't speak for the whole contracted parties by any means, but they've done some of that analysis of what could be done and what could be taken on as targeted issues.

And this thing at the bottom about registry commitments, they're now called registry voluntary commitments. And unfortunately, that word voluntary, I think, always confuses things because they're voluntary until you make them. Once you've made the commitment, they cease to be voluntary, and they need to be part and parcel of the enforcement of the contracts with those registries. And I think that's the point that we're trying to make. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

So, in other words, we probably should have called them registry voluntarily made commitments. Right. A missing word in the expression. But we can hear it. Perhaps if we just get used to feeling that when you hear voluntary, you're hearing voluntarily made. So that perhaps should be our point. Okay. Unless any

other questions before moving on? Okay, move on to the last of the talking point ones, the reviews.

And before we start this, I want to make one statement. The statement that I made in my blog was purely me. The fact that At-Large, ALAC is looking at some other thing is a separate action, and I just don't want them to be blamed for my words because they didn't approve my words before I published them. I didn't ask them if it was okay. I just did it.

Okay. ATRT should proceed on schedule. I think we've talked about that. We should note that the schedule that it's on now is in breach by many years. And I should probably admit that I was probably one of those that helped vote for the first time we postponed it. So, I am confessing my sin and trying to repent. ICANN's Board's recent decision to defer ATRT4 disregards the bylaw requirements and the principles of continuous accountability and transparency. The ATRT process is a fundamental accountability mechanism designed to ensure that ICANN remains responsive to its community and operates in the public interest.

Postponing reviews directly and adversely impacts the effectiveness of the review process and community's ability to hold ICANN accountable. Postponing reviews circumvents the bylaws and erodes the community's accountability and trust in ICANN. ALAC is considering filing a request for reconsideration. Any questions on those? I mean, we did talk about it to a certain extent.

Certainly, each of those bullets opens up its own paragraph. Yes, and there are hands up. So, I'll start with Sebastien. Is he the first?

By the way, I apologize. Between looking at flags and looking at raised hands in the thing, we don't have the good policy that some other organizations have, where it's only one order, the order of the Zoom tool. There aren't any Zoom. Okay. Sebastien, pardon me for that. Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you, Avri. A few points. The first one is that should proceed as soon as possible, on schedule. There is no schedule. We need to, I guess, change that. And we need to be a little bit more precise on the postponement of the review, because ATRT3 stopped reviews, and it was their duty or their possibility. Here, it's a Board decision and that's different. Therefore, we need to be precise that. It's because it's the Board who decides that. Because if not, we will have the answer, but you stop ATRT3, stops the SSL and the RDS reviews. But it is in the possibility of the ATRT. And my last point, I know that you are focused on ATRT4, but I would like very much that we say things about all the things put in the garbage by the Board regarding the ATRT3 recommendation. Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I appreciate that. Yes, I think in the first bullet you're right. We would be talking about ATRT5 if 4 had proceeded on

schedule. Not quite, but almost. Okay. So, any other questions on the bullets? Oh, Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I was just going to take the opportunity to briefly say that we had a meeting, the SO and AC chairs had a roundtable meeting with the - I don't actually know what the group should be called, but it's a couple of members of the Board, the executive committee. I guess that's what that is. Heidi, was there a title for the group we met with?

HEIDI ULLRICH

It's the SO/AC Chairs roundtable.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Right, but who are the ICANN people we met with? Is that a group that has a name?

HEIDI ULLRICH

The executive team.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Might be the executive team, something like that. But anyways, and so we had a fairly extensive discussion. We had one about the DEI issue as well, and we also did about the reviews. And I will say the Board didn't reach this decision easily to postpone this and believe that their intentions were good. And what was difficult

about that meeting was the fact that we can agree with literally everything they said every time they spoke up and still be frustrated with the postponement of ATRT4.

So, what took place yesterday is what's known as a straw man argumentation, which is that one after the other, every member of the executive committee reframed my argument to something that was easier to defeat with a straw man version of it. And at no point was the fact we were in breach of the bylaws actually addressed. And so, I would love to hear at some point from the Board that a lawyer came and said, "Look, yes, there are risks associated with being in breach of your bylaws." Someone could go to the California AG and raise this. It could be an issue of credibility and we waited against this other issue.

But instead, it was just this reassertion of the motivation for looking for something new. And I think most of us can agree that looking for something new might be a very good idea. I think the Board is very idealistic that a group can come together with any kind of alacrity and accomplish that, which is part of what Alan was trying to say. Because those of us that were there during the transition only had the task of taking a pre-written document called the Affirmation of Commitments and translating it into bylaws. And that didn't happen quickly.

So, if we're talking about trying to redevelop how we hold I can accountable, which I think is a laudable thing to do at this point, it's a CCWG that will take a very long time to do its work. And so, I think

that the problem is, while it's not intended as this indefinite postponement of the accountability mechanisms, that will be the effect. And I think we need to face that reality. And that's the point I tried to bring to the executive committee yesterday. So that's just a report from yesterday's meeting.

AVRI DORIA

Sebastien, but one thing, and this is a pressure that I'm feeling silently, is that we have at least one other thing that we're going to have to get to, and I'm not quite sure how we pull it off. But Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Maybe we will have other time to discuss that. Maybe, I don't know. But here, I have discussions with people, and one of the reasons not to have ATRT4 is to say that they will not be able to evolve the review as they are today. And my counterpoint is that ATRT3 evolves the Organizational Review to Continuous Improvement program. And therefore, we can, or in ATRT, whichever number, could do the same for RDS, for SSR, for whatever. And ATRT3 create a new review, the Holistic review. Okay, the Board put it in the garbage, but ATRT is able to do everything that is requested to evolve the reviews. Therefore, we don't need all this community-wide. Let's do ATRT4 and let's do what the Board wants ATRT4 to do. Review the review. It's the job of an ATRT. Why not? Why invent another process? Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Okay. I love this conversation, and I could do it forever. However, I think the agenda has other things for me to do. But first, I want to make sure that there's no more questions on the talking points. We certainly talked to the talking points a bunch, and now we'll hopefully talk the talking points elsewhere, not just amongst ourselves. Should I move on to the next thing? But do we have time? We're at the 15 mark. Should I keep going?

HEIDI ULLRICH

This is Heidi. I wonder if we could just take a look at the session reports. We have a slightly different format, and then we can end maybe in a couple of minutes.

AVRI DORIA

So, in other words, not do the walkthrough the schedule that we did. Okay. That works. So, anyhow, so what's happening is you are probably ready for me to entreat you all to go away and be productive and write little reports on every meeting you go to. I've been informed that so few of us do it that we've decided that we're not going to ask for such reports anymore. I have a feeling that if you want to write something because it'll remind you, because you want to tell people about things, because writing is your joy, you can keep writing. Sometimes it's my joy. It's the only way I get to say what I want to say.

So, right. But instead, what we're going to do is we're going to go through the agenda we were going to go through it at the beginning and get volunteers for that. And then at the end, when we're doing the wrap up, those volunteers would be asked to speak a couple words about the session that they were at and especially bring up anything that could be an action point, a direction point, a target for our discussions, what have you, for the future. And the most important part of that is not to summarize the session you are at, but it is to pass on anything that's important that At-Large, ALAC know about moving forward.

And that that's really the emphasis. No one's asking for a book report. No one's asking for a session report. People are asking for, you went to this, you heard what's important. Now you tell the rest of us what was important. Now, what we were going to do if we had time was walk through the sessions. I know I spent some time last night marking off all the ones that I thought were important and collect those. But we're at coffee break time now, and coffee's more important.

Right. You're right. I could certainly send out a list of the ones that I marked and that other people could then list the ones that they marked. Did I just get an action item? So, what you're saying is everybody can just go to this table and that's good. No, that's even better than what I thought you had said. And then I can add the ones that aren't there. But basically, the table is there. Add your name, volunteer. I'm personally one of the ones I'm going to list

this. No, I won't list it now because it's not fair for me to include my favorite, and you guys not include yours.

But the RSS CWG has a series of many meetings it would really be good to find a volunteer for. But anyway. So, that's it for me. And I pass it on to closing and housekeeping to Gisella, unless there are any questions on what I went through very quickly. And thank you for the recommendation. I didn't think of that.

GISELLA GRUBER

Thank you very much. This is Gisella for the record, and I'm going to keep it short, and this is part of the housekeeping. We really need to end on time, please. We have interpreters who need a break between the sessions. We have a tight session throughout the week, and we have our tech team. But I'm just going to run you through this. Otherwise, I know I'm going to have the questions. So sincere apologies for this session, but I promise we will stick to timings.

So, I just wanted to welcome everyone here to Prague for the ICANN83 Policy Forum. Just a few logistics. To join us in person, please note that only Door 5 of the conference centre will be available to use to enter. The weather is going to be dry and warm for all of the week, so enjoy the stroll over to the hotels. This South Hole 3C is the At-Large room for the week. It's accessed either via the staircase or if those who need an elevator, it's at the back door, and it is very close to our meeting room. There are free transport tickets available at the information desk, an app to download with

a unique code, so don't try and steal the one from your neighbor at the table. It won't work. For those over 65, it is free, but that was just something that was told to me earlier.

For those who need food to purchase at lunch or during the snacks, please note that at the same area as the coffee breaks, the community networking sessions, there is a bar that is on the second floor where you can buy food either with cash or credit card. Nespresso truck located outside of Door 4. Access again through Door 5. And if you do need food, there is also the Towers Hotel. They are providing a buffet-style lunch.

Coming back to the sessions, which is very important, please download your sessions from the main schedule in order to have all the participation details. Zoom links are only posted 24 hours prior to the sessions. All our At-Large sessions are on the Wiki agendas. I'll put this link in the Zoom and on the email lists. All our sessions are held in English, French and Spanish, with interpretation here. And please do refer to the Wiki agenda pages for the most updated agendas.

Policy forums are a kind reminder that we have networking events in the evening one hour every evening. So please do come. I will provide an update daily on what is happening. The coffee is available on the second floor. Please don't get too distracted. Please be back on time for the sessions to allow us to start on time and not run over like we have today. Sincere apologies and wishing

everyone a very successful ICANN Policy Forum here in Prague.
Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]