
JOHANNESBURG – GAC and ALAC Meeting
Tuesday, June 27, 2017 – 10:30 to 11:15 JNB
ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Please take your seats. I know that we had a very short coffee break but time is a scarce resource these days. We only have a very short time with the ALAC, so we should start in about a minute or so. Thank you.

All right. So this is our usual, and every time unusual, session with our colleagues from ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Committee. We have -- as I said, this time we have only 45 minutes. We can go over maybe a few minutes into the next session because that one may not take the time that was foreseen fully, so we -- from our side, we have a little bit of flexibility.

We have mainly three things that we prepared or agreed that we would focus our discussions on.

The first one is how to make the GAC/ALAC cooperation more concrete, more effective. As you know, we are very happy to have, since a few meetings, our dear friend and colleague, Yrjo, as the liaison from the ALAC to the GAC, and we are still looking

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.

for enhancing our cooperation, to use a word that is forbidden in the U.N. context --

[Laughter]

-- since 2005, and how to make best use of common shared interests or concerns, and in particular, also through intersessional contacts.

Of course the challenge that we all have is the workload in the ICANN system, but many of us have also other things that they are supposed to spend time on. So that is Issue 1.

The second issue is the approaches to subsequent new gTLD procedures where I think we have a lot of issues to exchange.

And then the third one, which is also something that we realized is actually a missed opportunity if we don't cooperate more closely, and that is work in and for underserved regions.

So these are the three main issues. There may be other things that pop up.

Let me give quickly the floor to our colleagues from ALAC to present themselves and to start the discussion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much.

I'm Alan Greenberg, chair of ALAC.

Maybe we can have the other ALAC people on the podium, anyway, introduce themselves very quickly.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC vice chair.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez, ALAC vice chair.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yrjo Lansipuro, the ALAC liaison to the GAC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, the ALAC leadership team. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On the first item, as long as I've been involved in At-Large, I have periodically had discussions with people from the GAC saying we should work closer together, and it rarely has happened on an operational level.

Our meetings together, I think, have gotten a lot more productive and we have actually cooperatively worked on a

couple of issues, and particularly protections for regulated gTLD strings, but I think we need to move it to a new level.

And I have one suggestion. It's not something we could implement today, but very soon, I hope. We have -- the ALAC has a number of working groups that essentially track what is going on in things like gTLDs and RDS WHOIS. Both of those working groups, to a large extent, became defunct, nonexistent, when we spent all of our time over the last couple of years on accountability and IANA transition, and more recently the At-Large review, but we have a pressing need to reactivate those committees. And I'm going to suggest that once we do get them more active, that the GAC identify a couple of people who we can invite -- and they're not obliged to come to every meeting and we can certainly brief people ahead of time on what the subjects will be -- but that may be a way of getting more exchange, at least of knowing what the thoughts and actions that are planned within At-Large are on the key areas. And if you have something comparable, perhaps we can do the same in the other direction if you feel that's appropriate.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Alan. Just a question for clarification. When you talk about us participating in your meetings, are these mainly teleconference calls intersessionally or are you talking about

meetings, physical meetings, as part of the ICANN meetings, or both?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm talking primarily about teleconferences, although we may consider asking ICANN for funding for travel for meetings once a month.

[Laughter]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Okay. As long as you go to nice locations, I think you will always find somebody from the GAC that will join you.

[Laughter]

No. The thing is, I think this is really like the usual problem, everybody is agreeing that we should engage more, cooperate more, but then when it comes to actually doing it, there are a number of barriers that prevent most of the people from actually doing it, and the key barrier is just the resource of time.

So I think we should definitely try and go deeper with this cooperation, and one thing would be that we should have a follow-up in the GAC, and please tell us what you think from ALAC's side and from the GAC's side on this proposal to identify maybe a number of people that are willing to spend a little bit of

time in participating and listening into the discussions in the ALAC and then maybe report to the GAC.

Again, the willingness to do it and the ability to do it may not always match.

What would help, probably -- and I'm just thinking out loud now -- is that if we are informed about the meetings that you have, plus the agendas, in advance so that we can share this with the GAC or with these people or with the whole GAC list, so then people can see, "Okay, I'm actually free for this hour or these two hours, I can actually join," or if people can't, then at least we can either communicate some ideas to you in writing to take into account into your discussion or we can be informed about the results of your deliberations and that would then pass, like, by email or in a written form to us so that at least we can take note and then we are informed.

So I think we have to try both things. One is encourage and allow for participation in conference calls, and that may work more or less depending on the other issues that people have on their plates at a given point in time, but also, let's say, exchange written elements of information that people can use and react to and give feedback at the moment where they have time.

So if that's something that you think may work. But please, yeah, contribute to the discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, as I said --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: -- with other ideas.

ALAN GREENBERG: -- both of the key working groups are not very active right now, so -- but as we go forward, they also have mailing lists and usually those mailing lists are moderately active, at appropriate times, so inclusion of people in those also.

We're probably pretty bad about setting agendas way ahead of time. We do try to schedule the meetings well ahead of time, though.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, that's at least something.

[Laughter]

But the mailing list is -- I don't know about others, but to be part of full mailing lists with one person saying something and then getting 50 mails in return is something that is more and more getting difficult for many of us.

But we'll have to see how things go, but I think let's try and keep each other informed about conference calls that we have whenever agendas, even if it's a day before. Sometimes you can also imagine what the agenda may be because of some things that you know everybody is discussing. And then also try to maybe gather some information in digestible amounts, like a short abstract or summary, instead of 50 emails that you need to crawl through. I think, yeah, the way -- the way we present our deliberations to each other helps people also digest this.

Other ideas or comments on how to strengthen cooperation?

Yes, Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yeah. Yrjo Lansipuro.

Yeah. In addition, I think that it would be good to use the occasion of these meetings, of the ICANN meetings, physical meetings, for just having those people together who are leads for certain processes in the ALAC and GAC, and -- on items that we think that they could be -- we could be going forward with cooperation. This is -- this would be highly informal, but perhaps would help to bring about this other cooperation. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Yrjo. That's a good thing. That's something that happens, like, occasionally by accident, but to encourage it to -- a little bit more strategically to informally meet in coffee breaks or at other occasions, whenever there are slots for people to meet, and with small groups, it may be easier to arrange something than if we have to try and get large groups together. So that's another good proposal.

Other ideas or comments?

Yes, please.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, ALAC, North America.

So the GAC talks about not having enough time, so then I'm curious: What consumes all the time? And maybe somewhere in that time there are specific things that we could cooperate on.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Well, I guess it's -- in addition to other dossiers and institutions that government representatives normally have to follow, I guess it's probably the same issues that consume your time, like the follow-up of the ICANN reforms, gTLDs, nice things like geographic names and so on and so forth, so -- yeah. But the thing is how to actually find time, in addition to your so-called

silo work, to actually have that exchange. But the substance will probably be largely overlapping, I guess.

Other questions or comments?

If that's -- yes. Par?

PAR BRUMARK:

Well, it might be an idea with these mailing lists to instead of sending a mail to a whole group, try to start with sending the mail to one responsible for the group so they can look at it. Otherwise, you get these mass replies and...

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yes. Thank you.

So the whole mail management is probably a challenge for all of us where we need to still find our way.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

For those people who have been participating in a number of GNSO PDPs recently, specifically the gTLD one and the RDS one, that is not an example of our mailing lists, where you can find exchanges between three people that will occupy your full day

reading them. That rarely happens on our lists. You don't -- the fear is not -- should not be quite as high as that.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

That's useful to know.

Okay. I think we can move to the next item.

And of course like the -- the third item about cooperation with underserved and -- in underserved regions, it may also contribute to what we just discussed.

So the next one is, let's say, more substantial. It is about subsequent new procedures.

Let me maybe also give the floor to Alan to start this.

ALAN GREENBERG:

This is -- this is a difficult one. It's difficult because when we look at last -- the last round, ALAC was very active in the -- we were not active in the PDP because at that point PDPs were done in a different way, and other than the liaison, there was no actual involvement, but clearly in the development of the infinite number of applicant guidebooks, we were very active and we had lots of pointed comments.

This time around, because the PDP is a much more open process, it's going to be a lot more difficult to, after the fact, say,

"Oh, we don't like what you've done" because it's -- if we're not active in the process and don't speak up early, it's a lot more -- it's a lot harder to have credibility. And we, like you, I suspect, are finding it's really difficult to get people to commit the time that those PDPs are taking. The number of meetings is large, the mailing lists are intensive, and the subject matter is very complex. And I know we're missing things that we will not like in the final results, and I'm not quite sure how we fix our problem.

And the GAC, too, I think is going to be in a much more difficult position giving advice to the board after the -- after the fact, where the GNSO can say, "But nobody made any comments along the way."

And I -- I don't know how to fix that problem. We're having the problem with our own people, who will certainly react to the final results if they don't like them, but contributing all along is a really difficult process.

And it's made more difficult. The GNSO is meeting this morning in the gTLD PDP. Well, we had a meeting about our At-Large review and now I'm here and I'm not there, and who knows what tentative decisions they're making.

So even the sessions that are face-to-face, it's almost impossible to participate in.

So it's a real difficult situation and I don't have any magic answers, but it's going to be -- it's going to lead to a confrontation that I'm not looking forward to.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Well, I think the solution is very simple. We just need to wait until we have 3-D printers that can create clones of ourselves and actually physically print us out wherever we are needed, and then we just need to see how to get a connection between the different brains, and then the problem will be solved.

[Laughter]

No. But to be serious, of course this is -- on one hand, of course it is a positive development to see that these processes are open, that there is a chance to engage and to work with this.

On the other hand, of course there are two things that we should not forget. One is that actually the current bylaws define our role as giving advice to the board and the role of the GNSO and so on to make recommendations to the board, and so the whole pyramid is actually having the board in the center.

So if we want to actually seriously go down that road, which I think makes sense, to have the early engagement, we may think about starting with ICANN 3.0 reform, as Wolfgang Kleinwachter and others call it, to actually reflect this in our structures as well.

Because formally we don't have that role but we all agree that we should engage early, but then there are a few things -- given, again, the resource discussion and the workload discussion, there are a few things that we have to look at, in my view, and we'll bring this up in the priorities session tomorrow afternoon.

One thing is you can't have 50 parallel processes that you can expect people that are having other things to do in their lives than to work within or for ICANN processes to follow this.

So you need to somehow assess work streams and implications of it. Like if you start a new gTLD round discussion, then you may have 20 subprocesses that this triggers that you need to be involved in, and so you may need to prioritize things and say, "Okay, we'll deal with this now and we'll deal with something later," because otherwise, it -- you may not get the inclusive participation that you want at an early stage and thus, the result may not be very likely in the public interest but in the interest of those who have the resources to participate in these processes.

So this is something that if ICANN wants to be inclusive from the beginning of its processes and expects people to participate, it also needs to organize these processes in a way that actually people have the chance to participate.

That includes also the way that things are communicated, the way that documents are prepared, the way that things are

explained in a digestible way that also people who don't have the resources to be insiders actually can give meaningful input into processes at every stage.

That includes also doing maybe the public comment periods differently because that is a tool that would allow those who are not able to be at every meeting to come in an aggregated -- or in a moment aggregate what has happened and then give meaningful input. But then we need to discuss is 30 days or 45 days really enough, in particular for those like us who are supposed to consult with your government and other stakeholders.

And is the documentation that we're given understandable enough that we can just jump on it, or do we -- what happens many times is that we first need to spend an hour to try and understand ourselves what this is about. And then if you're supposed to consult somebody else and you need to spend an hour with every person to explain it to that person. And so there are things that can be done to actually lower the access threshold of engagement into the processes. So that's two elements that we're bringing up. One is prioritization, and the other one is lowering the access threshold for meaningful participation and engagement in processes. And I think that may help. We're happy to hear your participation in that priority session as well.

With regard to substance, I think we should maybe try and use a few minutes also to discuss a substance. You may remember that it was the GAC that was in 2009 and '10 requesting ICANN to introduce categories because we believe that a brand TLD would be completely differently in terms of risks, in terms of use, in terms of economic aspects, and so on from a geo name or from, let's say, a true-sense generic word that was considered as delaying the process. I'm not sure what ex post we would have actually been more efficient if we would categorized things a little more. This discussion will come up. And I think it's one of the fundamental discussions for future rounds that now with the experience of the first round, that we actually see some patterns or some categories where it would make sense to distinguish them a little bit more clearly than the allusions to categories that we had or the distributed elements that we had in the guidebook but they were maybe not developed enough. I will stop here.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have got to get you to attend some of these meetings.

Two very brief comments. There is a meeting later on this week on how are ICANN's priorities set, which I think will be rather interesting. I have some pointed comments to make, I know.

We've set ourselves up with a paradox. The GAC's mandate is to advise the board, and we have now established quite clearly that the board cannot change policy in response to it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Let me -- no, we have not established this. This is the board that says it can't do it. That is an interpretation that the board has, but not necessarily --

ALAN GREENBERG: The new bylaws actually make it moderately clear. But, regardless, the board does believe that, whether it's in the bylaws or not. And that becomes problematic.

Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to make matters worse, talking about subsequent procedures and time lines, subsequent procedures, we're just trying to get our head around it. But the sorts of issues that you're involved in and we're involved in, I mean, it's about PICs. It's about geo names. It's about reserved names. It's about everything. Now, they're meeting. They've already had the first round of public comment. They will have two more iterations. But they've got -- they've got four panels. Only one of them

actually has worked on the issues I've raised. The others -- but they are in the process of making decisions. And the way we were briefed yesterday by Avri, what she's saying is, look, the assumption is that we will go ahead as the guidebook says unless -- in other words, the status quo is what's accepted unless we can be convinced otherwise.

And so it turns out you have to convince them otherwise in that committee that's going on. And that's the sort of time pressure that we're all under to say: Well, how do we undo some of these assumptions? How do we actually say we've got some concerns about the whole structure of PICs, the whole structure of the complaints handling system relating to that, the issue about geo names, reserved names? Those are big topics. And they're being decided in one of four panels, and it's happening. And it's putting a lot of time pressure on us and I'm assuming you, too.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think I've already made comments on this. Maybe we invite others to take the floor.

Yes, Brazil.

BRAZIL: Thank you, Thomas. And thank the ALAC for being here with us.

I couldn't articulate better than Thomas has done in regard to the concerns of the GAC in relation to the constraints regarding participation in development and trying to influence processes within ICANN. And I think Thomas was very clear to differentiate the roles of -- the different roles and what is expected from the GAC.

But we have a very strong concern about the fact that the way the system is designed as of now leads the GAC to participate at a very late stage and in a way that is not seen as a legitimate way of participating the development of policy. And I think this is a problem because if the system is designed for us to participate in that late stage and at that late stage we are not considered to be legitimate and we cannot influence, it's a fatal flaw of what is -- as someone has said yesterday, I think we are faced with some deficiencies in the multistakeholder model.

As we understand it, the multistakeholder approach implies that the different stakeholders participate fully in their roles and responsibilities. And they have the means to exert their roles and responsibilities. So I was very much concerned. And, of course, I take the point that was made by Alan that the bylaws moderately -- I think that's the expression -- indicate that it is not legitimate for us to make -- or to suggest policy. And the board cannot take on board things that would change policy. So what are we doing here as GAC trying to make our inputs? We --

as Thomas has said for us, government officials, we are -- we think of these, of course, I think all of us, as a part-time job. We have many other responsibilities in our government, and we try to be accountable to our governments. So it's very difficult for government official to participate in a process that is designed for governments not to have a say in the process.

So I think this is something that should be maybe raised with the board because I think the shared interest we have is to make sure that our inputs as any other group will be filtered and will be inserted in the process in the appropriate way.

So I think the discussions we had -- and very recently what happened around the issue of the two-letter codes, deals in the second level, illustrates the kind of problem we are talking about.

The board has made a decision in a way that seemed to be apart -- in despite all the explanations that were done, it's not transparent and -- for the whole group. It's not one or other countries. I think in regard to the procedural aspects, the concern was expressed by the group as a whole. So there was clearly at least a miscommunication. But that led to a situation that led to a fait accompli. It reversed completely a policy that had been followed since the beginning in a way that was seen as inappropriate.

So what can be done about that? It's not clear. Possibly nothing can be done. So we are facing a situation which decisions are made against or in spite of everything we can do and nothing can be changed.

I think it's not fair to expect that governments will accept this and be very glad and just follow and say, no, since there is nothing to do, let's just move ahead and be satisfied and be happy about that. So it's not the way we are tasked to be accountable before our governments.

So I'm very much concerned, and we look forward -- I thank the ALAC for being with us and exploring ways through which we can be assisted with your work and work together to improve the system.

I repeat, from my government, Brazil is very much interested in making the system work, to improve it, to make it a better place, one in which we would be comfortable to work. And we are very much concerned about those developments that are taking place. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have a brief question. I rarely have the pleasure these days of attending GAC and GNSO meetings and GAC and board

meetings. How do these issues get addressed in those meetings? I presume they come up.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yes, they do. I'm just trying to remember whether we already had the meeting with the GNSO or not. I think -- there's so much going on, so I have to -- I think we have it this afternoon or tomorrow, right? So with the board meeting is tomorrow morning, and the GNSO is tomorrow morning as well. So we haven't had these meetings.

But, yeah, I think Benedicto made it very clear. And we may actually -- since this is, like, getting more and more clear where the elephant in the room lies, bring this up, use the two-character codes maybe as an example or bring this up the channel, this group, between the expectations and, let's say, the setup of the institution. Thank you for this.

Other comments? Indonesia.

INDONESIA:

Thank you, Tom. First of all, I would like to appreciate our friends from ALAC to be here with us and sharing our problems, of course.

And I think the most important is -- for us is to follow the development in the policy development process, the PDP, and making all the bylaws. And with ALAC, we can get kind of information and we can follow up. We can know the process in advance before it is decided.

I think this is the most important point that we can tell back to our -- when we go home and tell our decision makers at home.

It is very important because today in ALAC meeting, perhaps I will say something. And tomorrow I may have (indiscernible) shuffle at home and the boss has a different idea. And we can come to the ALAC meeting with a different -- different points. So it really -- because we don't fully talk on behalf of ourself. We talk on behalf of the ministry's point of view.

But whoever are the decision makers at home, it is really important for them to know what is going on in advance so that we can make some sort of plan. If the decision is like this, then that is what we have to do. If the decision is like that, then this is what we have to do.

I think from this point of view, I would like to thank ALAC that we can get more information in advance to let decision makers at home to decide what we should do. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Ashwin.

We have about eight minutes left. As I said, we can from our side go over a few minutes. I have Sebastien Bachollet, South Africa, and Egypt on the list.

Sebastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I will be speaking French, if you allow me to.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, of course. There are interpreters and everyone has their receivers.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Okay. So I have a number of comments. First, I would like to know what CBA is other than commonwealth. I mean, there's Australia, which is -- .AUSTRALIA is a TLD but what does that mean? Okay. Hold on. I'm not clear about what I was going to say. I will get back to you later.

But I have a second question. I just heard what our Indonesian colleague said. And I would like to tell you that you shouldn't get your hopes up. Don't expect too much from ALAC. We have a hard time doing our job, and it is really hard. So briefing

others and helping others, of course, we could try and do that. But we have a hard time doing our own work. So if we add to that, it's even more complicated.

When it comes to priorities, who will finally decide what the priority is? Today we're under pressure. So the priority is to do the At-Large review, to focus on Work Stream 2 for ICANN's accountability enhancement. It's new gTLDs. It's a number of things. But it's impossible to follow everything. So we can either make up our minds and choose one thing and it might be interesting to consider this by ALAC and the GAC together. They might not waste time focusing on matters that are not of interest today.

Do end users really need new extensions in 2009 or 2020? Will they need them in 2030? I mean, I think we can wait a bit to do that. I'm not a government, and I'm not speaking on behalf of my government. But maybe this is a question for you, and you could answer that. And if we all agree on one answer, it would be interesting.

Excuse my chauvinism. But perhaps we could go on strike if we could not reach agreement. Strikes are a very French thing. And then we will go on strike if someone raises the question before 2020, for instance. Because at a given point in time, we end up doing a bad job as representatives of end users when we focus

on a matter which is not of interest to the people we represent. So someone could do it but not represent who they are supposed to represent.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, Sebastien. I think your comments are completely appropriate, very relevant. So in order to be inclusive, I think we should give time and resources to people so they can have a significant participation. If it's not the case, do we have the right structures? Is that going in the same sense as the principles that our colleague, the ambassador of Brazil, was saying? So I think you're quite right about what you're saying.

As a Frenchman, I would say if going on strike is the right answer, I would ask my Swiss colleagues what they think at a national level. But certainly what you are saying is completely appropriate.

So South Africa.

SOUTH AFRICA:

Thank you very much, honorable chairperson. Can I also take this opportunity to thank ALAC for coming.

Chairperson, I just wanted to reflect a bit in terms of what has been said about the exchange. I think from the South African side, the exchange I think is quite important and I don't think that the exchange of views should only be viewed from a perspective which relates to our regulations and policies but rather also should look at it in terms of what you benefit from each other from the cooperation, not per say what we as GAC can take to the board only because I think it's important that we give advice which we take to the board. But there are other fundamental issues which are being discussed within, you know, the whole structure of ICANN.

And to be more specific, I would like to say that you have these information presentations and so forth which come out. And one of the things that came out pre this conference was the fact that the discussions that will take place, you know, in terms of ICANN will be -- with the ALAC specifically, will be those issues that we will be discussing of public interest, like you mentioned, the gTLDs and so forth and DNS abuse and so on.

And I think that gives us, you know, a leeway to actually say when you have those high-level calls between GAC and ALAC and others. At this level, what do we want, for instance, from a government angle in terms of public interest? What is of interest to us so that we can discuss it further? In terms of that particular cooperation, I think that would really assist so that we have, you

know, something concrete when we're saying that we are engaging in an exchange.

And I appreciate the fact that there is now that liaison that was appointed between, you know, ALAC and GAC. And, you know, that resource is a resource that we can engage with to ensure that some of the concerns that we have, especially from a public interest point of view, we share, you know, and we take forward.

I just wanted to reflect that, chair. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you, South Africa. And that would actually be the perfect link to the last item, which is to have Switzerland and Egypt. So very briefly, and then we need to spend -- and U.K. We need to spend a few moments on at least starting the discussion on how to use or unite efforts with regard to underserved regions. So briefly, Switzerland and then Egypt and then U.K.

SWITZERLAND:

Thank you for giving me the floor. Jorge Cancio for the record.

Thank you for being here, ALAC.

I just want to be very specific referring to the sessions we are having here in Joburg on geo names.

Two questions. First one: How cross-community has the preparation been after sessions? Second question: What is your initial reaction to a strawperson? Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Quick reaction on this one, maybe, from ALAC side?

ALAN GREENBERG: The lack of reaction may be a measure of our participation in the process and our doing our homework. (Laughing)

I --

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Is that the answer to the first or the --

ALAN GREENBERG: That's my personal answer. I don't know if anyone else has any input on either the process leading to the session or on the -- what someone else in another group called straw bunny since bunnies aren't gender sensitive.

I don't think we have a reaction.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think we're waiting. I'm very interested to attend the discussion on geo names to see where we're going now. It's been of interest to us for many sessions as to how that's resolved. If it is resolved is probably a better way to put it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Egypt.

EGYPT: Thank you, and thanks to the ALAC for being here.

I also support the comments by South Africa, but, actually, I initially requested the floor to support the comments by Brazil as well, and to support raising this with the Board in our joint session.

And while I have the floor, and please excuse my ignorance, I would like to know how the process is in ALAC. I mean how the input of ALAC and advice is within the process.

Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's supposed to be a chart posted outside soon that will define it.

Essentially, once we decide we're going to make a comment on something or have a statement, then we look for lead people to draft it and we solicit input from the rest of the community, and we do it on an iterative process. So how much input we get depends on how interested people are. There's opportunities for anyone to comment.

Generally, to be honest, not a lot of people participate in any given statement.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. UK, very briefly.

UNITED KINGDOM: Thanks. Chair. Yes, very briefly.

I just wanted to pick up specifically on mitigating DNS abuse. We welcomed the appointment of Bryan Schilling as a consumer safeguards director, and he came to a meeting of the Public Safety Working Group and explained his role and that it was very much early stages as this is a newly created post. So I would expect the GAC and the ALAC would have shared interest in ensuring that his role evolves in a way that's going to serve the best interest of consumers.

And I think, in answer to a question I raised with him about outreach to consumer representatives across the world, he referenced the ALAC as a sort of networking opportunity for that, for delivering on that. And of course we in governments, we have our consumer protection authorities and agencies. We -- And online and complaints about online consumer issues is something that is very much to the fore of a lot of our consumer bodies.

So I think the GAC and the ALAC can share views on how we contribute to the evolution of that role and generally ensure that the community-wide effort to mitigate abuse is maximized.

ALAC has a comment on that, it would be very useful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We met with Bryan, and we, too, find that the whole concept that they're even considering this as something they should have a person being responsible for is refreshing. They've also now hired someone who is supposed to care about registrants, which I thought is also a rather new, innovative thought.

Certainly we are interested in working with him. If he actually said, "We are the conduit to consumer organizations," he didn't say that to us and I think we would have pushed back because

we are -- you know, a few of us have contacts in consumer organizations, but we're certainly not an official path to them, and I would hope he would be reaching out directly.

But, yes, we certainly have a great interest and a great amount of hope that ICANN will take responsibility for recognizing that domain names are used in all sorts of abuse, and look at ways that that can be mitigated. So we find it very positive, and certainly I think we should work together on that.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Just to point out that some ALSs, At-Large structures of the At Large, are actually consumer organizations. So that is another way which -- where we could cooperate. Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Thank you for raising this.

I know that, Argentina, you raised the floor also, but let me first -
- because we have to wrap up and concentrate on the -- on the underserved regions, and see very quickly -- and, Olga, you may take the floor also with trying to focus on that one -- what can we concretely do to improve, let's say, our cooperation or services to stakeholders from governments but also users from underserved regions, that they have better access to ICANN's discussions or that they profit in whatever way more than it is

the case currently. I think that's probably the essence of the last question.

And let me maybe start quickly with Olga and then give the floor to one or two other persons, and then we need to wrap up, I guess.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Chair. My question was about the straw document, straw person document that is going to be presented in the common cross-community session today. We in the working group have been reviewing it. It is very preliminary because it was distributed a few days ago. So it has some comments made mainly by myself based on other suggestions by colleagues. So I can share that information with you. But very informally because it is not endorsed by the working group or the GAC. Just for you to have some notes. If that could be useful. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

On underserved regions, I think the first thing is to make sure that the GAC representatives and At-Large -- active At-Large people in their own regions are talking to each other. I know it certainly is happening in some areas and it happens very well. Others, I suspect they don't even know who each other are. But

comments from people within underserved regions may be applicable.

Maureen. (Laughing)

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Yes. And one of the also, probably, low-hanging fruits could be that the GAC has started, with the support of ICANN, to hold some regional workshops on specific issues and to actually open these up not just for government representatives from that region but also from -- for civil society and also business, if you want entities from that region. That helps them to connect. That helps them also maybe trigger dialogue on national or regional level. Maybe there's more ideas what could be done.

Maybe Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. I think maybe responding to Alan's question, they are responding to each other, and they know each other very well.

I think that what is happening now, what is done by the GAC for the -- for Africa and -- it is perhaps a good thing for the government representatives. But it will not help the region to -- to be not underserved in the future. I think it is much deeper,

the problem is much deeper. And we spoke about that before we had a session, and I think I don't know -- which meeting it was. And I don't think it was -- it will be done through meetings like this or something like this.

We have first to do the investigation, to identify the problems. And they are more or less identified. And to find the right solution. And the right solutions are not easy at all.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Yes, but that means we need to start somewhere and build on what is feasible.

One more comment. I have Alice and then a gentleman from over here.

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, ALAC. Thank you for bringing this up. As one person helping with the underserved regions and co-chair of the underserved regions, I must say we have been working quite well with ALAC, especially with the first session of capacity development events that happened in Nairobi. ALAC was quite well represented. And then this one that happened in Fiji as well. We have other departments -- other constituencies. The SSAC, for example. And as the chair mentioned, industry representatives as well.

So I think it's continuing along those veins. But most importantly, what we're trying to do as well, is to also, you know, work with the DTPS, ICANN, to make sure we're evaluating as we go along in terms of identifying what the challenges are and changing the approach as we go.

As you rightly said, some of the challenges are much more deeper than, you know, than on the surface. And so we'll continue doing this, and we'll continue reaching out to other ICANN constituencies and ICANN departments to ensure that we have a holistic approach to capacity development and to reaching our outreach and awareness creation for underserved regions.

Thank you.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. We can have one more contribution. Thank you.

GUYANA: Chair, briefly. Lance Hinds from Guyana.

ALAC has an outreach working group, and there may be synergies between that group and what's going on in our Underserved Regions Working Group.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think that was a very useful exchange. We need to stop here. So I'm looking forward to follow up on this, on all the three elements, of course. So maybe we can, as the next thing, schedule a call between the leadership between the -- and we keep track of what is going on somewhere in the next months.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thanks.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for inviting us. And I look forward to our next meeting when we can summarize all the progress we've made.

[Laughter]

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: So that will be a two-hour meeting, then. Okay.

[Laughter]

So this is it. Thank you, ALAC.

May I ask the chairs and co-chairs and everybody who is involved in the work of the Working Group on Human Rights and

International Law to come up and to proceed with the next session.

Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]