
ICANN84 | AGM – At-Large Leadership Welcome to ICANN84
Saturday, October 25, 2025 – 9:00 to 10:00 IST

MICHELLE DESMYTER

Hello and welcome, everyone, to the At-Large Leadership Welcome Session. My name is Michelle DeSmyter. There we go. All right. Well, again, my name is Michelle DeSmyter, I'm the Remote Participation Manager for this session today. 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 the session today, 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. I will now hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you much and thanks all for coming. Thanks, everyone, for coming here to Dublin and for ICANN84. My first ICANN meeting

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.

was ICANN24, so I just hit 60 meetings the same year that I turned 60. So, anyways, it's a little bit crazy.

We've got a lot of the same conversations going on that were going on then, and some new ones. And we've got a lot to go over and a lot to discuss. I created a little diddy for you to get the juices flowing here. So let me -- There you go. All right, Leon, follow that.

LEON SANCHEZ

It's gonna be hard to even try to follow that, but I'll try to do my best. So, I'm gonna switch to Spanish if you don't mind. And by the way, hello to our interpreters. Thank you for letting us have a voice in different languages. All right, so, welcome to Dublin. We've been here 10 years ago, and it seems nothing has changed as Jonathan was saying, we still continue having the same kind of discussions in some fronts, some other discussions in some other fronts, but we can still see how our community has evolved and how our organization has evolved. And we are just about to meet 10 years since that transitions that we conducted, that was sort of the supervision of the IANA functions in 2016.

Next year, it's gonna be 10 years since that happened. And I think this is an important juncture because right now, we are about to start this CCG group work, as we have called it. This is the review of reviews. And I think it is important to reflect on this exercise and this effort that we are engaged in because when we conducted this transition in 2016, we designed or redesigned our bylaws, our organization bylaws with the goals that were valid and were

enforced at that time, and today, they're not necessarily aligned with the priorities we may have as a community and as an organization.

That's why there is a need, and that's why it is important to make a step backwards and to have a wider perspective and see where it is, what we are standing today, and check whether those bylaws that were enforced 10 years ago and incorporated some changes, if they are still up to date and if they still respond to the needs and the challenges that we face as a community, as an organization as well.

As you know, this group was created, I am part of that group on behalf of the Board and Avri is one of our co-chairs in this group. And we also have participation from other members, they are both participants and observers, and probably there will be a lot of discussion around this group and its activity in this meeting. So, I would like to invite you to participate in plenary sessions and in individual sessions where these issues will be discussed.

Right now, and Avri probably talked about this before, but we are on a stage where we will define the main goal, the statement, what it is that we are going or what it is that will orient or encapsulate the efforts of this group. As the Board, our goal is that the result we would like to get from this group is that any review conducted in any framework where this cycle of reviews is conducted should be a simple framework that will allow any person who is not a member of ICANN to very easily explain and understand, and it should not

take them two or three or five years to be able to learn what it is that we are talking about when we talk about reviews. And so, this is a mission that seems simple, but it is actually quite complex, and this is where we ask for your participation, for your support.

Because with this collective view, I think we can build a better framework that will allow us and help us to set the new generation of reviews. And also, to have this approach with an open mind, with a fresh view in the understanding that there are evidently essential elements that we do not want to change, we do not want them to disappear, that probably our approach to these essential items is not aligned with the needs that we have today as one organization. And so, we are trying to have a different approach, fresh approach that will allow us to cater to those essential needs and also to recognize the limitations of resources, of volunteers, limitations in terms of time around these review cycles.

As you know, by the end of this general assembly, the last year of my term will start, so I'd like to thank you all as a community for all your support. I really have no words to thank you all for your support and for the work we have done together. I have always said, and I am convinced that what I do in the Board is not necessarily product of my effort, it is a collective work where you of course are included, you are represented. And I will continue giving the best of myself in this last year.

I still have, and whoever will be my successor will have a task to fulfill. And I would like to repeat from this time on whoever that

person may be, whoever the person will be assigned, I would like to express my unconditional support so that in this transition time, I can introduce him or her to the Board tasks and to continue building even outside the Board. Anything that I may help with, I will be there to provide my support.

Our agenda as the Board for this meeting is probably the most demanding of the three meetings. The general assembly is the most saturated meeting in our agenda. We have bilateral meetings with almost all the groups, the constituents in our organizations. We are right now in our workshop, and the main issues are the ones that I have just mentioned. The review of reviews, we are very focused on that, we would like the end product of this group to be very successful, and we would like to continue with our obligations in terms of transparency, accountability, continuous improvement, that are already being shaped by this CIP, this continuous improvement group that is undergoing.

So, I'm really glad to be here again, thank you very much for your support, I am very, very thankful for your support throughout these eight years, and also I would like to thank you for the support that you will give me in this last year of my term. I am of course, very open to any question you may have. I can stay here some 10 minutes more, and then I will have to apologize because I will need to join the Board workshop session. So, Jonathan, thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Leon. And does anybody have any questions for him before we let him go? We always appreciate your visits to bring us up to date with what the board's up to and our inside man, a little bit into the star chamber. So, any other questions for Leon? All right, then I think we'll keep rolling because we have a pretty full agenda, but thank you so much, Leon. So, feel free to hang out as long as you can. You may take your leave as well. All right. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you, guys.

JONATHAN ZUCK

And so next on the agenda is talking a little bit about the meeting. This is always kind of a funny part of the agenda. At some point, I'll have to make it more specific, I guess. But the aims and objectives of the meeting, and if we look high level about what's going on at the meeting, there's a little bit of everything, but some real areas of focus for us, there are accountability, and I don't know applicant support or accessibility or something like that.

The review of reviews is probably gonna be the most talked about thing at this meeting, and it's one of the things that we need to focus as a community on with great effort over the course of this meeting and in the near term to make sure that the underlying charter and purpose document of that effort is fit for purpose and for our objectives as a community. So, that's gonna be a big effort.

Another thing is we have ongoing discussions with the Board about the Applicant Support Program and what we regard to be some of the concerns and weaknesses associated with that program. We continue to be hopeful that that program can be successful, and in fact, there has been a big increase in the number of applications at the very least of late. And so, that's a good sign and we're gonna keep pushing forward on some other initiatives.

I'm sorry, are you trying to grab my attention? Oh, okay. We're gonna push together with the board on some other initiatives on that. DNS abuse is something that we continue to talk about, and it looks like there might be a couple of PDPs starting before too long on some issues that came out of the issue report.

One being bulk registrations and APIs and the other being kind of a know-your-customer issue of when someone's registering, check what else they've registered, and if that's malicious, then maybe be suspicious of the one that's being currently registered. At some point, I'll come up with a pithy description for that, but I don't know what it's.

So, I think those are some of the big things that we're gonna be talking about at this meeting. Really excited to have you all here. The AGM is a big meeting because we have both the incoming and outgoing leadership of At-Large, and so it's good to have everybody here.

I hope very much to the outgoing leadership will do everything they can to mentor the incoming leadership, and we're excited to have

everybody here in one room. So, thank you for that. And with that, I think we'll move on to the talking points and some of the session descriptions. And for that, I'll pass the microphone to Avri. I don't know, do we have Olivier as part of the online or anything? Okay.

AVRI DORIA

Wait, you have a hand?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

I'm gonna be speaking French. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I believe there's also another topic that we need to add to the items we will discuss, it's ICP-2 and the relations we have with the IRRs.

I would like to seize this opportunity to congratulate the members of the AFRINIC board who have finally been elected, and especially as Aziz Hilali. He's now a member of the AFRINIC board and he was elected as vice president of the board. So, I believe it's very important for us to keep supporting the developments with AFRINI and ICP-2 specifically. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you.

AVRI DORIA Okay, so now it's back to me.

JONATHAN ZUCK Oh, do you want to say--

MICHELLE DESMYTER Oh, no, another question.

JONATHAN ZUCK Please.

AZIZ HILALI Thank you. Thank you very much, Sébastien. Indeed, this was a long fight and we've had a long difficulty year during the last four years. We now have a new board. Aziz speaking. So, we've had several meetings already. We have established technical committees already and we hope that all of the problems of AFRINIC will be solved and we hope to have the opportunity to discuss all of this next Tuesday during the IRRs meeting. We hope that thanks to ICP-2, we will be able to solve our problems for all of the IRRs. Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA With great trepidation, I try to start again. Okay. So, now looking at the review of the At-Large talking points, and I'll start from those and if I could have that particular set of slides up. Talking points, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK Or maybe move your microphone closer.

AVRI DORIA Really?

JONATHAN ZUCK Yeah.

AVRI DORIA Closer enough?

JONATHAN ZUCK Yeah.

AVRI DORIA Thank you. Okay. So, on the talking points, there's actually three listed there. I actually think we end up with four. But anyway, the first one is the DNS abuse mitigation, then there's the new gTLD program next round, and Applicant Support Program, and then there's the review of the reviews. Let's go on to the first.

The first note there is the note there, but if we can move on to the next slide, is that, of course, when you're expressing your own opinion and it isn't the collective opinion, you need to announce that fact. On DNS abuse mitigation, now, it says that I'll be aided here by the specific representatives on the topic, and as opposed

to me reading through these bullets, you can all obviously read through them yourself. Who is it that wants to speak on the DNS abuse mitigation that is an appointed representative on this topic?

JONATHAN ZUCK

I think Steinar is.

AVRI DORIA

Is Steinar, are you the one that speaks on it or just say, I'm happy to read the bullets, but it's not one that I'm particularly involved with. Justine, you?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Me? Okay.

AVRI DORIA

You. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right, yeah. I guess I'm historically well associated with this topic. But as I mentioned at the top, there was an issue report and we responded with a public comment about it for some refinements associated with what we thought should be addressed. But I think the net-net of all of it is that there's likely to be a couple of PDPs.

And one is on bulk registrations and the use of API, and the other is on checking the other registrations of a registrant, basically. And

so, I think those will be two separate PDPs, not one because we're really trying to get more tightly defined, more finely scoped PDPs, if we can, out of the GNSO so they don't take years to complete. That appears to be the indication.

And feel free to correct me, Steinar or Justine, if I say something wrong here. And I had a discussion with Jamie Headlund yesterday, who's very supportive of these particular efforts because he knows that even though there've been some improvements associated with the contract changes, that usually by the time that the problem is mitigated, the site's already come down, the damage has already been done.

And so, the prevention on the front end is really where the solution needs to lie. And so, we're hoping that both of these will be beneficial and we will before too long be calling on volunteers to participate in these one or more or two PDPs, and we hope that you'll be up and available to do that. Steinar, go ahead please.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD

Yeah, hi. This is Steinar for the record. I just want to point out that tomorrow at half past 10, this session that is where the GNSO small team will discuss this, if you have read the At-Large input, I think you will find the discussion most likely very fruitful and very understandable. There's a complexity here. I think there is a good path forward, but it needs the consensus between the contracted party and also the feedback from the ICANN Compliance will be

essential in that discussion. I hope ICANN Compliance will sit at the table. Justine, are you-- No?

JUSTINE CHEW

Sorry, Steinar, I just heard my name, I couldn't hear the rest of what you were saying. So, did you ask me a question?

STEINAR GRØTTERØD

Yes, it was a question whether ICANN Compliance will sit at the table tomorrow at the discussion when we do discussing the outcome of the DNS small team.

JUSTINE CHEW

Okay, I can't answer that question because I'm not the organizer of that session, it's a GNSO thing. And as far as I understand, the session is actually to progress towards the initiation of a PDP. In normal practice now, ICANN Org typically has what we call liaisons to a PDP, so they're not a member in the sense that they don't participate as a full member, no voting, that sort thing.

But they are expected to pay attention to what's going on in the PDP and kind of advise as to feasibility costs and that sort of element. So, if say for example, we were to come up with a recommendation that maybe is too complex to implement, they might have a say in something like that. But of course, any recommendations that the community makes is the right of the community.

AVRI DORIA

Okay. Thank you. So, basically, read through those and please talk to someone if you've got questions on any of them. Let's move to the next one. I've just been told my time limit. Please. Okay, on the next one. Now, this one, actually before I even start talking about it, reminds me of something else that's come up, and that's the whole thing about your statements of interest and what involvements you may have.

And because this one comes up, I happen to have a personal involvement in somebody that is applying for applicant's support. So, whenever I speak of it, I'm speaking of it perhaps colored by some of my experiences in doing that. And that's something that we really need to do and it's part of the new decision on making sure we should hear people more and more at the beginning of every session saying, tell us about your conflicts of interest.

Anyhow, we're working on this in terms, again, not reading the bullets. Justine, did you want to add anything here? Are the bullets adequate?

JUSTINE CHEW

Thanks, Avri. This is Justine. Yeah, the bullets is pretty much a summary of where we are and what positions the At-Large has taken. The most recent one is the last bullet in terms of protection of INGO identifiers. I think that's still something that's being sorted out. In fact, there's an IRT session now that I'm heading over soon.

But in terms of the applicant guidebook, the draft, the full version has closed for public comment.

The only one that's remaining open at the moment is the second public comment for the base registry agreement of which we will be discussing at the CPWG session tomorrow. The word that we received is that the Board is preparing to approve the draft AGB at their board meeting on Thursday, I believe it is. So, as far as ICANN is concerned, it's all systems go.

We are still trying to slip in something for ASP, and that's something that we, we are gonna talk to the Board about, although they have already kind of rejected our advice on that, but that's a different story altogether. So, moving forward, once the AGB has been approved by the Board, that would be the trigger for the standing predictability Implementation Review Team to be convened and start its work or at least start operating, and that's the SPIRT. Okay, it's spelled S-P-I-R-T.

So everybody says SPIRT, but it's actually pronounced as spirit. And there has been a call for volunteers, I believe it's still open, so if anyone wants to volunteer for that, please respond to GNSO secretariat. The role of that group is actually to consider non minor operational issues that come up when the round opens in April.

And the other thing that we should probably start thinking about mobilizing is the At-Large group that is going to be responsible for developing ALAC comments and objections to applications, because once the application round opens in April, there will be

some leeway because there needs to be administrative checks. When it opens, it will open for the window for application will open for, I think it's 12 to 15 weeks or something like that.

So, after that, there's an administrative check, then it will be a reveal day and that's when comments will start to be received for applications. So, we need to be prepared for that if we are going to make any comments. Other than that, as I said, it's all system go, and yeah, we will be expecting the launch to take place in April of 2026. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And to make a comment that's purely a personal comment and not an ALAC comment, the fact that we have something that is spelled spirt and is pronounced spirit is a good example of what was being spoken about earlier of making everything simple and clear at ICANN so that people don't need to spend a year trying to understand what we're talking about.

Moving on, please, review of reviews, and I guess I'll take this one myself unless I want to pass it to you. Just pointing that this is a fact now, many of us, and we had long campaigns here to try and do something other, like stick with what we had and make it simple. We've created this new process, it's a fact. It is the current path back to anything we think is important in terms of reviews.

So, looking at history is probably not helpful. One of the things that we have to do, and this will come out in the next piece, so I'll talk

about that more, is if the things that the holistic review that we were fighting for is important, then make sure that the purposes of that review are indeed included in the purposes that we are talking about today.

And again, one of the points that we've got is that ATRTs are important, they are needed to be taken seriously, and that is one of the positions as I understand it, of At-Large and ALAC, and that the absence of ATRTs that are taken seriously is something that would harm ICANN and harm our governance. So, I think that's where we're standing in terms of the bullets. Still so much to be talked about on those, but I'll get to it later.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, we have a whole section on that.

AVRI DORIA

We have a whole section, so I just wanted to cover those points. Now we had--

JONATHAN ZUCK

Sébastien, do you want to wait until we are doing the full discussion?

AVRI DORIA

No, he wants to....

JONATHAN ZUCK

Okay, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA

A little point.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Yes, thank you very much. Yeah, first of all, I think that it's three very good bullet points. I just want to raise one issue in the second bullet points. On complaints from the review teams members, I was a team member and I disagree with that, therefore it's not with, but with some or with the majority or with whatever you want to say, but it's not all the team members. I will say that it was more the leadership team than the rest of the team, but up to you, but not them, please. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Okay, thank you. I think actually in English that works out. That says there were complaints, but it wasn't the review team as a whole, but we can certainly look at massaging the wording a little to make it not look like it was the whole team, but that there were complaints from amongst the team.

So, perhaps adding that word among or amongst, depending on which language you're speaking. Let's go to the next slide. And this was one that wasn't listed in the heading of three, and that's the fiscal year 26 strategic priorities and operational planning. A, I

don't know how much time we have left, B, I don't know who wants to speak to that. It isn't me.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Hi, yes. I'm Claire Craig. I'm one of the co-vice chairs of ALAC, and tomorrow at the OFB Working Group session, we will be getting into more of this section. But basically what it says there, we've reviewed the public comments on the strategic priorities, we have identified ALAC's three strategic priorities for the upcoming period, and we are working with the RALOs to determine what are the activities that we are going to be focusing on, and tomorrow we're going to be at the OFB session.

We will also be doing a session on mapping some of the ALAC strategic priorities into a tool of the CIP framework, which the continuous improvement framework. And we will get into a lot more of that at tomorrow's session. So, thank you, unless there are any questions.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Not sure we have time for questions. Next slide, please, and that'll be the last slide in this section. Okay, here's the resources. The one thing I want to point out to is the session reports. We've had a long saga on session reports, on who does them, when they have to do them, who has to do them, does anybody have to do them? And I'd like to ask Andrew to give us a

quick recap of what our status on those is and what the expectations, if any, are on all of you. Thank you.

ANDREW CHEN

Hi everyone, it's Andrew. So, the session reports, everyone's favorite thing to do is an opportunity for us to provide notes or action items on various sessions that aren't necessarily driven by At-Large, but for us to see where we can provide continuous actions on those and follow ups on those sessions.

So, if there is a session that you attend and would like to provide notes and action items on, please feel free to email staff with the session and the notes that you would like to provide. And then we can put that on the wiki page and go over it either at a following meeting or at the At-Large wrap up session pending time. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Yes, thank you. When people actually go to the effort of doing those, I think it's important that we talk about them, and if people noticed, last time we went through several CPWG meetings, catching those as we could. So, if we don't manage to fit them in, because timing on meetings is always way too tight to actually talk about stuff.

But we'll fit them into CPWG meetings so that people do get a chance to make their report, and hopefully last time everybody did get their chance sooner or later. That's about it for this. I'll pass it

back to you. Don't know if you have anything else you want to say about it.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I think that's right. I'll just follow on. What we're really trying to do is make sure we have coverage of the meetings that are going around ICANN generally, and we take any action items from them, we should address this, we should send a note, we should participate in this group that's forming, et cetera.

That's really the issue, not summaries of what went on, but really what should we take away and what should we do about it and keep it tight. And it'll happen at CBWG or OFB calls if we don't get it done during the wrap up session. Our next discussion is now about the review reviews.

AVRI DORIA

Me again.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah.

AVRI DORIA

Well, it's actually the two of us.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah.

AVRI DORIA

Well, it's actually the two of us.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Exactly. So, however you want to handle it is fine.

AVRI DORIA

Okay. Thank you. This is me again, Avri. And I guess I do have a interest in this one as I am in the role of one of the three co-chairs. It's an interesting group of co-chairs. I want to point out that all of our co-chair meetings are recorded and anybody can go listen to them. So, we're hopefully not doing anything in secret. We've got several documents out.

One of the most important things we've got for this meeting is the purposes of review. The reason I bring that up and bring that up at this point in this session is, this should not say what reviews we want to do. It should say why are we doing them? But any review that we think is necessary, needs to be able to find its root, it's cause, it's why are we doing it in this document.

Now, at the moment, what we've been doing over this is basically stripping this down to its minimum so that we've got the points there that people could say, yes, this review is fulfilling one of the purposes, and therefore, it's a review that needs to continue and it needs to continue in this manner.

And those are the issues that'll be talked about in later phases of the project. And I apologize, I seem to always stare at the folks on the right these days and not at the folks on the left, and I really apologize because I really do prefer the left. But that was a personal statement, that had nothing to do with ALAC.

Anyway, these are the purposes. There's four major ones, and one of them has sub-bullets, the other ones don't. So on the first one, which is the commitments and articles of incorporation, bylaws, strategic plans, financial and operational plans, et cetera. So, basically, we went through those documents and sort of look at what are the elements within those documents that need to be reviewed on a periodic basis.

And periodic could be every couple years, it could be every decade, it could be once in a lifetime. That's not being determined here. Okay, I should probably bring it up so I know what I'm talking about. But basically, things that do need to be reviewed over time. So, I'd ask people to look at that if we can get it back. Let me see if I can get it back. And say, does A, the set of documents that are listed up there, bylaws, mission statements, core values, et cetera, complete set.

Are there documents that we're not looking at there that should be considered, should be talked about? These are things to bring up, not necessarily here, but in the meeting on Monday or the meeting on Thursday to basically make sure, or in comments, to make sure that we are not leaving out anything that we need to be reviewing

from our foundational documents, and that's basically what this looks at.

And it does include the yearly or the five yearly strategic plan, financial and operational. So, I'll stop for a second here as opposed to reading through all of those bullets, although perhaps they're worth looking at, activities, processes, and culture. This one, I kind of like, the second one, Board officers and senior management remain accountable to the global multi-stakeholder community, and it says empowered community.

Now, one of the interesting things here is, if you look at the bylaws, and this is coming out of our discussions there, if you look at the bylaws, what exact powers the empowered community has to deal with any of these issues is kind of an open question. And it's a question that people may want to look at some point in time later because we're saying ultimately the authority is the empowered community. Beyond the Board, we have the empowered community.

While they're not quite the end of the story necessarily, they're an important part of the story. Do they have the powers they need? It's a question that's open. Are we meeting our stated goals and objectives? Now, stated means things that we say inside meetings, but it also may mean the things we broadcast to the world. When we broadcast an image to the world, when we say we are this, are we actually meeting those goals? Are we something where

someone can look at what we say and what we do and say, yep, ICANN, yeah, they do what they say they're gonna do.

Are we maintaining more necessary robust mechanisms for public input, inclusiveness, accountability, and transparency? That's part of what ATRT was accountable for, for looking at. Again, we're not saying what reviews we've got at this point, we're saying what the reviews need to be reviewing. What are the purposes? Why do we do reviews? Outcomes are in the public interest, transparent and accountable to global multi-stakeholder community. Again, the empowered community stands sort of in the stead of that. They're the final arbitrators, vis-a-vis ICANN of those things perhaps in accordance with the IANA stewardship transition. That was an important thing to include here.

A couple years after the transition, some of us-- well, there are actually new people here that don't even know about the transition, let alone some of us that are quickly forgetting about all the things that were fought for there. Oops, I'm starting to speak too quickly, I'm sure. Channels are effective and accessible, outcomes are purported clearly and openly, and that goes to Leon's, can what is said, be understood by people.

Do you have to be a three-year veteran to understand what a report means, what a communication means? Or is it clear to anybody that happens to come along? And do we duly take into account public policy advice of governments and public authorities?

So, that's what we have in those. Again, look at those. Is anything that is important from our foundational documents missing from there? If so, it's really important that it gets said and it gets said this week or in comments that come out of this week. I'll stop briefly here. I know I have limited time, but I do know that A, I spoke a little fast.

JONATHAN ZUCK

12 minutes. You're good.

AVRI DORIA

We got three more bullets. Four more bullets. But anyway, three more bullets. But anyway, I just want to check and see if there's any-- ah, yes, Sébastien. I don't know if you were first, but you're the only one I see.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I'll be speaking in French. Thank you. I have a few comments in no specific order. First, I would say that the global empowered community is not the people who have the power, the empowered community does not represent everyone. So, I'm a bit surprised that we wrote the multi-stakeholder community, global multi-stakeholder community here, and then we say in brackets empowered community.

I believe we need to work on the wording here. Second, we are at the At-Large, and I believe that we need to write somewhere that ICANN needs to take into account all of the comments, all of the

pieces of advice that are given by all of the communities and not only the governments. Otherwise, we are not equals anymore. These are my first comments after reading this document that I have not read the details of. Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you very much. Very good points, and I hope to hear them represented in our meeting. I wrote them down so I can remember to bring them up, but really, I do, and that you, as the other member can remember to bring them up. But please speak them aloud in the meetings. Anyone else have anything they want to add at this point, or I'll move on to the next ones?

JONATHAN ZUCK

I guess I'll say something briefly. I'm trying to be Avri's assistant on the review of reviews and to try and advance our interests there. I think my problem with this process may not be legitimate, but there's like a buzz in the back of my head that says that I can read this document, and in my mind, justify every kind of review I think needs to happen, but I can't guarantee that a group of people get together reading this document would reach the same conclusion.

And so, that's part of the issue. Like, I can interpret those words to say that there should be a holistic review, for example, but I can imagine people looking at those same lines and saying, there's nothing about that there, or that's not what it means, and so I don't know the answer.

And that's because when we look at the original affirmation of commitment reviews, there were sort of umbrella issues. There was a accountability and transparency, there was the CCT review, there was the security and stability review. So, if you take something like the security and stability review, it crossed areas, they could make recommendations that were to the board, they could make recommendations for policy, they could make recommendations for Org to do things differently, et cetera.

It had a broad mandate in that way, and I don't know that looking at this, and maybe we don't need to continue to have security and stability reviews, but if we do, I'm not sure this list gets me there with any certainty. In other words, again, I could find the rhetorical basis for justifying it.

And so, I think that's part of the issue is it's sort of like in legislatures or parliaments, you have this idea of legislative intent. We may need to try to bring up examples or something as things go on, because this is gonna be a fight later on that people are gonna base their decisions about what reviews there should be on this document. This will be a clutter for anybody wanting something or not wanting something, and so that's why it's such an important document.

So, I'm just expressing that concern. It's like a little bee in the back of my head that I continue to try and work on myself, but I welcome other people looking at the language and making sure, just as Avri

said, I'm being repetitive, make sure that something you imagine being important would reliably derive from this list.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. One thing I want to point out, and I totally agree, is that the bullets on A are not the only points. There's also B, C, and D. Pari, please.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you, Pari Esfandiari speaking, for the record. So, I see the word fit for purpose few times repeated, but the word purpose, to what extent we are gonna go deep, because to my observation, usually purpose means functional and procedural less of the value concepts. And I wonder if in this review, we are gonna allow to go into the values, we decide that what are the values that we want to promote, or are we, again, as usual, focused on functions and procedures and just try to improve those sorts of things. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. It's a good point. Fortunately, we do at least mention the values of the bylaws as one of the points that we do base things on.

PARI ESFANDIARI

I think the values of bylaws itself maybe should be debated because time has changed. We are talking about over 20 years of

time period. So, my question is how deep we are gonna go in these reviews. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. So, depth. Again, I recommend that any points you make here, you make sure that they get made on Monday and such. I'm writing them down, I'll probably remember, but... Okay, shall we move on to-- yes, Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Yes, thank you very much. I wanted to say agree with you Jonathan, but few points. The first one is that one of the goals of this meeting, it's maybe not just to come with something I think about or Jonathan think about, but we collectively agree on, and that's a little bit different that I would like to see your points raised. Yeah, I have no trouble to raise my point, but I would like very much that we raise collective points.

And that bring me to the second point of my intervention here is that talking point, we need to see if our talking points are embedded in this document, and I am not sure that it is. And therefore we have to work on how we'll be sure that what we say in our talking point could be the result of this document. And it is not, from my point of view. And the example you take about the holistic review, it's quite clear, there is no way here if people disagree to have an holistic review. Because we are talking about what reviews we are doing before we introduce the holistic review.

And for example, we talk more about what the different structure are fit for purpose, but not the inter relationship. I know that it's written overall structure, but it's much more than an overall structure. It's how all the piece work together. Therefore, I don't know if overall it's enough to be sure that we will include a holistic review. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Haven't quite gotten to see yet, but I'll get back to your point when we get to see, and actually listening to you can think of another word to add to C. But anyhow, let me go through B, C, and D because I am gonna run through it out of time, and then I'll open up again if I can. So, for B, and I'm not -- oh, no Hadia, you had your hand.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

I can wait.

AVRI DORIA

You can wait, okay. Because I want to get those listed in what we're talking about is that the results of SOs/ACs and NomCom continuous improvement programs as they relate to each of each other. So basically, reviewing the continuous improvement program. While one of them we didn't go through it here, but it was, we are not reviewing the continuous improvement program, that is outside the scope of this particular review of reviews, but we are able to take into account the fact that the continuous

improvement will have outcomes, will have results, will have whatever, and that those things are indeed subject to review as time goes on.

Next is C, is the one that that applies to I think the point that Sebastian was making and certainly has been talked about in the context of holistic reviews, and that's whether the overall structure, and then after a week of very intense discussions at some point, we added N components of ICANN and its SOs, ACs, and NCs are fit for purpose. As I was listening to Sébastien, it occurred to me perhaps we need to add the word structures, components, and interactions or some such thing to cover all of the meeting that Sébastien was putting in that. So, that would be another object.

And if you can, when arguing with these things, I would recommend recommending changes, not just the principles of why you want to change, but if someone were to agree that interactions belonged in that sentence, I'm taking the position of talking to you all here as opposed to wearing the chair's hat, then you would argue for, hey, we recommend that you add the word interaction or some such.

Then D, whether the ongoing reviews in the future are fit for purpose. So, the reviews can review over time are these reviews fit for purpose? That was indeed something that was within the ATRTs province, but to make sure that it stays there. I don't know how much time is left.

So, then it says, recommend any other changes, and now I'll look at hands. And I saw Judith with a hand. I already had Hadia from

before. Oh, you weren't raising a hand, you were just telling me five minutes. Thank you very much. Hadia, please.

HADIA ELMINIAWI

Thank you. And this is Hadia for the record. And I have two points here. One is related to what Pari was just stating with regard to the fit for purpose and which purpose. So, I assume that we are making this review and our foundation or starting point are the bylaws. So, if we actually, and thus, the purpose will be the purpose that's stated in the bylaws.

If we start to question the bylaws, then we have no starting point. So, this is my first point. The other is related to points B and C, and I think that points B and C could be one point because the continuous improvement program, one of its purposes or, let's say, its mission, was actually to look at the SOs, ACs, and see if they're fit for purpose.

And the continuous improvement program is not part of the bylaws, and again, to conduct the reviews, we need to have a reference point. So, what's our reference point? And then I think it is good to include the continuous improvement program, but as a standalone point, I don't know. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. One point I should reply in response to that is because we are out of conformance with our bylaws at the moment, something this group has spoken to the Board about a lot in the

past, they are now looking at bringing the bylaws into conformance with what is actual practice now while this is ongoing. So, the bylaws, indeed the bylaws, and these are on, as they say, parallel tracks and relying on each other.

So, it is a very interesting thing to keep a watch of. And thank you for saying what you said, because that's something I noticed yesterday when I realized that the bylaws were being worked on at the same time. Okay, great. Okay. I had Pari and Sébastien, I have no idea who was first. You're both pointing at each other, so Pari, please.

PARI ESFANDIARI

Thank you. I agree that it's always good to have a starting point. Having said that, on a topic such as review of reviews, we need to go deep into the heart of the bylaws and question bylaws. The word has around us has changed, and I think even far less critical organizations, time to time reflect on what they started that organization.

For ICANN, as I said, the word around it has changed tremendously, and I think it's time for us to look at the values, look at the purposes and question those as well. Otherwise, if we keep on just following what is there and how it has been interpreted for whatever politics reasons and necessities, we may be forcing the organization in wrong direction. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And so, I start to see that from the other question we ask, and we're not gonna get to those questions now because I'm told I'm already out of time, is when we ask, are we heading in the right direction? Your answer is no. Okay. Thanks. Sébastien, I think you're gonna get the last word because I've been told I'm-- oh Pari, you wanted another word?

PARI ESFANDIARI

Just one word. I'm not saying no, but I am saying it's time to reflect.

AVRI DORIA

Time to reflect. Okay. So maybe... okay, thank you. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you, Avri. We have to be careful not to go in a circle because the result of this work will be changed in the bylaws, therefore, you can't consider the bylaw will not be touchable because we are doing the work to change it. In any case, there will be change, including the CIP, including the holistic review, whatever decision is taken will change the bylaws.

So, second is, I would like... because it was a struggle of ATRT3 and the discussion within the CIP, it's a result of the SO, AC, and NC and substructure continuous improvement program. It's not just the bottom, but it's the top, but it's also, for example, the RALOs and the constituency within the GNSO who are to be taken into account in this CIP. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Good point. Thank you. So, again, I appreciate, and I do, one other point you made, and it's not one for necessarily this session but for the ALAC itself to figure out which of these statements become your consensus statements that should be pushed in that sense. I turn it back to you. I'm done for now. Always willing to talk about this more in the hallway though.

JONATHAN ZUCK

The hallway's next. We're gonna close the meeting, but don't get up right away because there is a little bit of housekeeping announcements that Gisella needs to make. So, stay seated, but for now welcome to Dublin, to ICANN84 and this particular meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER

Yes, you may stop the recording. Thank you. If the interpreters do have two minutes, you can interpret. Otherwise, I understand we need to end our sessions on time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]