KOBE – At-Large Leadership Working Session
Sunday, March 10, 2019 – 12:15 to 13:15 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

MAUREEN HILYARD: So, when we go into the board meeting, they'll be asking us for our suggestions and then they will also deal with the questions that we have actually posed for the board, as well. No, we're not going to look at those for the moment. If I could just have this next slide.

Okay. In the letter that Cherine sent us from the board, he mentioned that what they're actually after is some comment and support for the three different documents that they put out for public comment, and I think in the discussions that I had with Cherine he really impressed on the fact that – I mean, that he's leaving in October. So, for him, the strategic plan 2021-2025 is really, really important because it's going to set the … He really feels that it's important that the direction that is actually in the strategic plan is one that's going to take, maneuver ICANN through what is currently a difficult time.

When all said and done, I think that what came out of the discussion was that there's actually not many groups that actually refer to the strategic plan very much, and I did say to him that if there is anything that is being done by the RALOs, we have

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.

to justify requests that come, that we make for any funding or any activities that we do. We actually have to justify it according to the strategic plan and how it fits in with the strategic objectives. So, for us, the strategic plan is actually quite an important document.

Then, of course, there is the two-year budgeting process which we had that little bit of a conversation yesterday with Becky and Shani, and of course the operating plan and financial projections.

But I think for us, the key issue is the strategic plan, and what we've got to do, and I mean actually a suggestion that they made was that they need to get some suggestions as to how we feel they can successfully implement their strategic plan.

First of all, the vision. This vision, apparently, at one of their retreats, they went through as a board … And I don't know how different their version is from the current model. Does anyone know? Does anyone know what the current version is? Is it that, to be a champion of the single, open and globally interoperable Internet, and the trusted steward of its unique and identifiers? Isn't that what it is now? Because, apparently, when the board was looking at their version, they went through it and that is what they believe is what ICANN stands for.

I mean, this is something that we could be discussing for a start. And, of course, along with the version, there are five important

objectives, and the others, although the others are to do with the unique identifiers and the technical aspects of the strategic plan, for us and At-Large, I think that the most important objective, of course, is to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model of governance, and the governance side of things is something that is also seen to be of importance, which is there is that session that Brian Cute is going to be running, and I think we should all be there to make sure that we're offering any support that we can give.

But I think that when it comes to … The whole purpose of this, sharing a lunch together is to workshop how to get into smaller groups, but to discuss how we and At-Large feel that we can contribute to improving the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model of governance. I know, for example, that the multi-stakeholder part of it is also seen to be a problem within ICANN, and the effectiveness of the multi-stakeholder model is seen to be at risk. So, how can we strengthen that? What are our recommendations for governance?

So, we need to, and if we go through effectiveness … We're looking at deconstructing that objective, there are certain things that we could be looking at, and so we can look at how we can improve its effectiveness, ICANN's effectiveness, how can we improve the multi-stakeholder model, as well as what

improvements can we see that we can make to the governance area. Pardon?

HOLLY RAICHE: [off mic]

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. Excuse me, you're supposed to be telling me that there are people where the cards up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, so, no. No, so that what we're going to do, that's the start up. So, I'll take the questions, but really ideally what I would like people to do is to get into groups and actually sort of like come up with some – thank you, are they in the right order?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I will go by the order that I have been given. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I disagree that that's our most important objective. It may be the one that we can contribute most to addressing, but that's very different. I mean, one of them is the security and the stability of the Internet and look at what we were talking about in our last session. So, wording is important here. To say it's the most important to At-Large, I'm not sure I would want to say that. It may be the one that we can contribute most to.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No. This is from my perspective, and I was also looking at the fact that the governance side of things, governance and multi-stakeholder and effectiveness of those sort of aspects were considered to be mine. But I think that when we get into our groups, definitely, and I think those sorts of things need to come up. This is, again, and as I said, a personal thing, looking at governance because in my discussions with Cherine, he felt that At-Large could be probably the best contributors of ideas and suggestions that might actually support that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't disagree with that, but the wording there doesn't say that.

MAUREEN HILYARD:	Yes, of course, that's mine. Olivier? Oh, my gosh, really? I reckon. He was complaining last time he never got a chance. Jonathan ignored him. Go, [inaudible].
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	I just want to play the martyr.
HOLLY RAICHE: :	Actually, he's too busy eating, and the truth of the matter is that the food is far more important than the rest of us, right? Okay, starting with the suggestions, I'd like to go back to, ages ago, the GNSO review which was before our review, when part of their recommendations were in fact, they needed to do better outreach and better inform people, including us, and they haven't taken it up. Maybe we should just say go read your review and work more with ALAC when it comes to policy issues. I've often thought why couldn't they develop, for example, a webinar, at two different times to accommodate global differences, when there's a PDP coming out and have something joint so that, in fact, our capacity working group includes and have more joint kind of discussions. Or, indeed, build on the sorts of regular … We meet three times a year with SSAC. That's all. So, have we looked at how we might be better informed and contribute, particularly to the policy development part of this, from day one? Just a thought.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can you write that down, good?

HOLLY RAICHE: Evin's written it down, haven't you? No, Evin's eating, but that's [inaudible]. She's just written it down. I will refer back to the GNSO review, and the GNSO review, one of the things they recommended was they have initial webinars on policy issues that are coming up. Well, wouldn't it be nice if they actually had worked with us so that when we've got the Consolidated Policy Working Group, there's a webinar, from them, that actually introduces the issue and work with them and the policy working group?

MAUREEN HILYARD: So, is it a suggestion from the community?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, that's … I can't see in the corner where Jonathan is, as to whether or how he feels about that, but that's just top of my head. Olivier, are you going to let Jonathan go before you?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Always.

MAUREEN HILYARD: He hasn't finished his meal.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll remember that, I'll remember that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll remember it. So, I guess two things, and it's related to Holly's recommendation. I think that, as Alan said, end users are actually explicitly mentioned in the strategic plan, and I think that's a window for us, a wedge to get in and talk about a lot of these kinds of issues. So, I think that we can beat up on the GNSO about doing more information, etc., but I think that another part of the exercise for us is our review implementation and getting our ducks in a row as an organization, and not just wingeing about our role in the multi-stakeholder model. I think we haven't done that.

I'm a photographer, and I have a friend who is also a photographer, who has spent considerably more money on camera gear than I have, and he's always trying to get me to get a better camera. I keep telling him that my photography is not yet

limited by my camera. In other words, there's a lot I can do to improve my photography before I need a new camera to take it another step further, and I sincerely feel that about the At-Large, that there is more that we can do to play our role in the multi-stakeholder model and to get our ducks in a row before we need to be trying to make structural recommendations or something like that.

And so some of these things that we want the GNSO to do, we should make sure that we're working in conjunction with them, we should be … These are all tie-ins for the future of EPDP, and some of the stuff in the strategic plan about protecting end users are windows of opportunity to get in with the board and discuss these things in the context of their own strategic objectives. I think that's the best plan forward for us.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And I'd be very interested in hearing any suggestion on the different ways in which we can, as At-Large, improve our own role in the multi-stakeholder model. Oh, oh, here we are. Sorry, Yrjo, he's taking it back.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Go, go.

YRJO LANSIPURO: I would say that the multi-stakeholder approach starts at home. That is to say it's easy to implement multi-stakeholder principles on an international level if we have nations and countries where they know what the multi-stakeholder approach is all about. And, of course, there are countries where multi-stakeholder governance is alive and well.

So, what I'd like to suggest is that the ALSes should, they could have a key role in actually getting the multi-stakeholder approach going on a national level, for instance, being actively part of the national IGFs, and also perhaps, since both the GAC and the ALAC both have their feet on the ground in more than 100 countries, so that's sort of direct contact on that level, with the GAC reps and the ALAC people, or At-Large people would perhaps lead to something. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. So, a couple of points. First, with regards to what's on this screen, the most important objective for

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

At-Large is to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model of governance. Obviously, we do have a very important part to play in that. If you are going to have a multi-stakeholder model, it needs to be balance, or balanced as much as possible and so on. But the question is how do you do that? It really depends on how far we want to go. Do we want to go as little as saying, oh, we need to have one more person traveling at every ICANN meeting and that will actually improve the multi-stakeholder model because it will re-establish the balances? Or do we want to go as far as saying that the current structure is wrong and needs to be turned totally upside down, pretty much along the lines of the paper that was published a few years ago Evan Leibovitch and others. And this is one of the questions which I think that we need to ask ourselves.

Such a discussion was actually held by the board this weekend, I believe. I think it was with SO and AC chairs, and some responded that the potential, that if one were to completely rejig ICANN and change the positions of SOs and ACs, that would very probably start a civil war within the GNSO because there are some parties that are happy with the current way.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It was actually they were talking about changing the GNSO.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And so, the question is, at that point, if that starts a civil war in the GNSO is it the right time to open such a debate? Will there ever be the right time to open such a debate? It's a number of questions we have to ask ourselves because if we decide that it's not the right time and that maybe we shouldn't, and we have to play with what we have in the moment, then we should stop bickering about it. But, if we do decide that it does have to change because of the current limitations, the structural limitations that we have, it makes it pretty much impossible for end-user voices to have a significant impact at ICANN, then we have to work on that and we have to find other allies on this as well, and it's a very, very big exercise at that point, pretty much the same sort of tsunami that happened between ICANN 1.0 and 2.0. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Ricardo?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right now, I have in the queue Ricardo, Holly, Jonathan, Alan. If I'm incorrect, then people. … Holly is down. Alright.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: About what Yrjo just said. I totally agree with what you say that, at the local, at the countries, we must be part of the multi-stakeholder model, but also it has also to come from ICANN, or

ICANN can help because in some countries it's not easy to establish the multi-stakeholder model, and maybe this is a place where almost all the actors are, from almost any country, so maybe it's an idea for ICANN to help establish the multi-stakeholder model at local and regional levels because for much as you try as an ALS to establish the multi-stakeholder model, if the government doesn't want to be an actor there, it's almost impossible for you as a civil society to engage. I'm not asking ICANN to force government but to put a place where the actors can talk in a neutral place like this one. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. A little story. I was involved in some attempts by the Department of Commerce in the United States to engage a multi-stakeholder model for some certain discussions, and the first one was about what app makers should do for privacy notices, short-form privacy notices for app makers. Well, app makers are about 80%—or at the time were about 80%—small business, right? And so, I remember standing up at the time and saying I really appreciate the multi-stakeholder model, but right now I'm feeling a little bit like the steak because everyone else is here for dinner.

So, part of the issue is trying to get the right people engaged at the right time, and I think one of the perennial problems with the multi-stakeholder model is not a broad-strokes representation,

but the ability to mobilize experts and interested parties on a case-by-case basis so that it's not a binary question of are you a lifer devoting all of your energy to learning all the ins and outs of ICANN or you are out. Are there ways to break down public comments? Is there a way to reach out to a broader community? And I think that's something that we could help with, for expertise and for advocacy in particular areas by particularly affected parties, and I think that's part of the answer to some of the volunteer burnout. It's part of the answer to representation.

It's not about ALAC versus others. It's about people that aren't engaged at all, and there is a way for it to not be all or nothing? Because, increasing the number of people that are willing to be all-in is a slog, right? I mean, if we can get three people a year to be all in, we're going to consider that to be a huge success. But, if we can say, look, devote two weeks to this or something, this aspect of a policy problem that specifically affects you, that could be interesting and could lead to true multi-stakeholderism.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fascinating discussion. With regard to that last comment, you do realize there are strong pressures in the GNSO that have identified these people who have a specific interest who aren't part of our community, as the problem, not the solution, and we're looking at actions to try and make sure they *can't* get

involved and disrupt our otherwise nice processes. So, interesting world.

Olivier asked is this the right time to have a revolution? From the point of view of those who are in power, it's never the right time to have a revolution. From the point of view of those who aren't in power, it's a very different question. So, I'm not sure who you want to ask of whether it's time for a revolution. I do agree with Maureen, don't miss Brian Cute's session. Brian, by the way, for those who don't know, has an interesting history aside from his job history. He chaired ATRT 1 and ATRT 2 and has a little bit of knowledge of the history of accountability and issues within ICANN. Just a little bit.

With regard to what is our involvement and stuff, one of the strategic initiatives is make sure the DNS works. I'm rephrasing. I think we're meeting with RSSAC later on this week or some people today? Okay. One of the past chairs … There's a discussion, and if you look at the last RSSAC report and the self-study that they did, one of the interesting questions is who are the customers of the root servers?

Who are the customers? Well, a lot of people think it's the registries because the root servers are dispensing information about where the registries are. One of the past co-chairs, he had a slightly different opinion. His opinion was the customers of the

root servers are the end users. The people out there who are relying on the end users, on the root server system and the whole domain name system to direct them to the right place.

That may not be the people paying the bills, it may not be the people contributing the information, but those are the ones that are using the service, ultimately, indirectly. There's a strong contingency that says it's not the end users. It's the ISPs because the ISPs are the ones that direct the point to the root server system, okay? But I like the opinion of it's the end users. We are why the Internet is there. Yes, we couldn't do it without Google and Amazon and all the big players, but they only survive because there are people at the other end of the wires, so keep it in mind.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: This is an interesting debate and discussion after we have a long fight to push and empowered community model to implementation, and now we are in the same arena, at the same table, and we are complaining that our voices are not well-recognized. So, we need to look back and see why our voices are not recognized. Is it an issue of our messaging? Is it an issue of our argument? Do we need to have better lobbying skills with the rest of the empowered community stakeholders that we know? We need to build allies.

But I think using the word structural changes, it's really, I don't think that's the time. We all fought for a certain time to implement certain measures that have been now in the bylaws [inaudible] things on others. Yes, ICANN is almost a regulator in the sense that there's an industry that's paying for the organization and operational costs and we, the end users, are the customers. If we are complaining about the influence of those being, let's say, regulated business to the regulator, so I think that we just need to ensure that with the rest of the stakeholders we could have further power and influence. So, we need to have, let's say, friends who are supporting our positions, rather than talking about structural changes to accommodate our … Ensure that our descending voice is heard.

This is my take on it. It's about us and how we can package our message and ensure that our message is delivered in the right way. We have the skills and the expertise, even at a smaller number. It's not about the quantity. It's not about … Yes, we have handwritten representation of ALSes, global coverage and all that, but what are the skills that we are bringing to the table? I think that's what makes the difference. And allies, whether it's governments, whether it's the non-contracted parties in the GNSO. We need to think differently in how we build our allies, but I don't think any structural changes will help us unless we clean

our home and ensure, really, we have the clear messages of what we need.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Indeed, very interesting discussion. I heard today the experts. I heard the right people in the right places. I heard people who are missing the system. Several things, and now I har or see also skills and experts, etc. Multi-stakeholder model doesn't have to do with any of this. The multi-stakeholder model is the people … Anyone that has an interest in the Internet has to get the opportunity to express himself, and to influence the decision. This is the multi-stakeholder model. If we try today to reduce it, or to try and put limits to it ….

I come from a country where we were under an authoritarian regime, and now we have had the revolution, and now we are under a democratic regime, and they can tell you that democracy doesn't have only advantages. It has also several problems, exactly like the multi-stakeholder model. We like it, or we don't like it, but we don't have to regulate it, and when I feel that we are going to something like regulation of the multi-stakeholder model, I feel really frightened because it will kill it.

What we have to do is to be fair with everything, and everyone should be fair. When someone in this system tries game it, we

have to stop him, and that's all, but the multi-stakeholder shouldn't be regulated in my point of view.

MARITA MOLL: Yeah, lots of interesting comments. I keep wondering where to go from here. The most important objective for At-Large, improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. Is that too big a chunk to chew? Do we not need to improve our effectiveness in the multi-stakeholder model? Look inside and see what we can do better in order to make the model work better.

We can't, on our own, fix the model, but I think really, we have to look inside ourselves and see what we can do. We have to help grow the model. We have to improve our own credibility and our own effectiveness. Again, someone was talking about allies. Build our allies, build our alliances, and build up our groups in our own areas.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I think what we do, and how the fact that we need to participate as At-Large, I don't think, well, we have challenges with getting people to participate, but I think that does not define multi-stakeholder. Even if you put the voice there, how that voice counts is what really will define multi-stakeholderism. People participate. I'll give an example, the GNSO, the policy discussions.

The fact is that, yes, we are putting the voice there, but it still gets voted by a different set of people who are not in this room.

So, would we require a structural change for that? I think we will definitely require a structural change if we really, really want to put into practice what true multi-stakeholderism is. At the moment when the discussions on policies within the GNSO, we get reminded that we are [adversaries] and that is the fact. We are [adversaries] at the moment, in the bylaws.

So, they're actually saying [inaudible]. How do we then, on the fact that we want to participate, we want to have a voice, to be heard, but the foundation that actually settles up has already set us up on the wrong course, in the way that the voices really don't matter in the long run. We only get support for what they also feel they should give to us, and that is the fact. I don't think that's a true multi-stakeholderism. We only get away with what they feel comfortable with, [by doing]. This is not the At-Large versus others s kind of sentiment I'm trying to create. I'm just trying to emphasize the fact that we don't have a true multi-stakeholderism yet. We will need to really, really think about the structural change to really have that become a reality. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, I don't think that during this discussion, I had the sense that anyone is trying to regulate the multi-stakeholder model, and I don't think that there is any kind of contradiction between having all interested people in the Internet part participate in the multi-stakeholder model and having actually interested also people in the Internet with skills to participate effectively in the multi-stakeholder model. I don't see the contradiction between those, and I don't see this as trying to regulate the multi-stakeholder model.

Participating, in itself, for all stakeholders is important, but it's also important to have participants who are involved effectively and efficiently. So, maybe part of the problem is that you have participants in this multi-stakeholder model that are silent participants, and maybe that's why what sometimes we look forward to doesn't happen and we end up saying we are being ignored. So, maybe we are not being ignored. Maybe we are not being there effectively and that's why our voice is not really heard. And, maybe I would like Shani to elaborate a little bit on why does he think that we don't yet a multi-stakeholder model. Yeah, I didn't really get the actual point. It's my mistake.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, thank you. I think to illustrate and perhaps that will help you understand what I'm saying. How is it going in the EPDP for instance? We've got two members from At-Large. We've got six from GNSO. When it comes to voting, because you may have to vote, right? In cases of perhaps if it comes to … I mean, the charter allows that, if I'm correct. Okay, if not, the GNSO in the long run will still need to endorse, the GNSO council will still need to endorse whatever comes up from the EPDP. Am I correct? And are you on the GNSO Council to be part of that endorsement process? We are not, and that is the fact.

Even if our views make it through the EPDP, for instance, because other members on the EPDP support it, the reality is that some members of the EPDP, there are still members of the council who can still say no to it in the long run, and we don't have a voice at that level.

So, for me, I think that multi-stakeholderism, true multi-stakeholderism is determined by those who make the decisions. Who are those who make the decisions? Are we part of the decision-making people? It's not just about the voice. The voice is one part of it. Those who endorse the voice is another part of it. And if my voice and your voice is actually equal, then it means that both of our voices should be, and does [inaudible] and not just one of the voices and doesn't mind. In the long run, we need to come to—and permit me to give an example, to use the [RIR]

as an example—in the [RIR] PDP processes, the voices are equal. The culture is only just observed, and they just declare consensus based on what they hear on the floor, but in this environment, the vote comes, and the voters are only the GNSO, and we have to face that reality.

Until we start facing that reality, some people will spend a significant amount of time contributing on this, and in the long run, things that they have said, that they have contribute, get truncated, who get discouraged. I encourage Alan, I encourage … I'm very, very encouraged by [Hadia's] strength as well, but [inaudible] or myself, to want to continue persevering in this, to me, imbalanced environment that we have at the moment. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alright. We're just running a bit short of time, and we've got a short queue here. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The concept of multi-equal stakeholder has occurred twice in ICANN's history. A past CEO raised the issue and said that's what we should aim at, and he stopped saying that pretty soon, and now we have a band named after it, but that's as far as it goes. We are not going to be multi-equal stakeholders. We

should be more equal than we are now. Should we have a seat on the GNSO? I think so, but we heard Olivier say now that it may not be the right time for that revolution. Maybe it is the right time for that revolution. Several have said come to the session on Thursday.

We are where we are right now, and we have to see can we make our position better? You know, Marita said we need to get our own act together. Well, we're talking about the At-Large review. The whole concept of the implementations that we are doing is to try and get our act together. Are we going to be perfect? No. Are we going to be better? I hope so. But Seun is right, we're not going to convince a lot of people to put huge efforts into it because it's not always rewarding, but sometimes you win, and those wins are what keeps some of us going? So, if you can't accept that, then this isn't the right home right now, but that's where we are.

HOLLY RAICHE:
Seun i is of course right. Alan is right. Thank you Alan. I think we can spend a lot of time saying structurally we are, or could be, irrelevant. Or, we could spend a lot of time saying let's make ourselves relevant. I was agreeing with Jonathan as well.

In terms of enhancing what is a position that is not multi-stakeholder, it's simply advisory. The reason I started to talk earlier was how to strengthen our links with SSAC, how to

strengthen our links with GNSO, and how to use our position to go out in to the community and listen to the community.

Now, I'm not bidding, I'm not saying we're dreadful. I'm saying we could do a good job of actually becoming more important because we can listen to our many, many constituents and that becomes a very powerful voice, even if structurally it isn't. Thank you.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I will speak in Spanish, please. To be honest with you, I would say that I fully agree with Seun. He is my friend from AFRALO and he's expressing what happens in Latin America because we have almost the same point of view. I remember in March 2007, in the Mexico meeting, we discussed the issue of the balance between the representation of the board level, and that had to do with a stronger participation by users within the board. So, 12 years after that situation, we are in exactly the same situation. So, that's true. When people look at us, they will feel discouraged, but we may think perhaps that our multi-stakeholder model is not working, or that it is weak.

However, let me say that in my region there are certain ALSes saying this not long ago. I would say that 15 days ago this issue was raised, and we fear that some of those ALSes will stop participating in the region because they believe we have no

influence on ICANN policies and they have seen advancements in these great structures, and that somehow they are putting aside the power of Internet users when it comes to debates.

So, I would like to encourage the multi-stakeholder model and that it works, but I believe that with this scenario we need to take into account this issue and we need to be stronger at the time of discussing our points of view, and we need to validate our views in the debate. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Jonathan, and then we're closing the queue. Sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, sorry, I guess I don't want to be redundant. The idea of representing end users is a very complicated one. There's not innate about the At-Large that makes it the representative of end users. It's just a bunch of people who have decided to join the At-Large and people can be in other parts. Because it's an advisory committee, people can be in other parts of ICANN and also be members of At-Large.

I think influence has far less to do with the voting and more to do with making strong cases. Maybe it's going out and talking to end-users more and coming back with that type of information. Maybe it's having a philosophical framework we use to reach the

conclusions that we do. But, right now, the idea that end users are not represented, and if only we had a seat on the GNSO then they would be, I think is going to be a tough sell to anyone. We don't really have the evidence for that, and I think that that's a lot of the work that we ought to be doing as part of our reform.

I think that there's a lot that we could do to be more influential, and I'm very interested to hear what these ALSes are doing that they're thinking about stopping doing, and because I haven't had a lot of exposure to that. Instead, I know there are all kinds of people that represent the At-Large in review teams right now that I've never seen in this room. So, we have a lot to sort out to make the strong case that we are, in fact, worthy of being the representatives of end-user interests, not just because we say we want to be, and I think influence can be gained in many, many different ways, and we're going to have to make a hard case. And, right now, I don't think that we have the facts to back it up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much for this discussion. It's been really, really very valuable. We're being forced to take a break. We have Heidi telling us what we're going to do this afternoon.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So, Maureen, if I may, I think the last item on the agenda, and I'm just going to take two minutes, is just about the [GCSC] reception today. So, again, that is a formal invitation from the Japanese Ministry of the Interior & Communications, and in terms of protocol-wise, Maureen and Leon will be walking into the room first. That's the way the protocol is here, and everyone else can follow, then. And I think we're going to be leaving here at 5:35 PM. The reception begins at 5:45 PM. It is imperative that we are at time. It's a big insult if we are even a minute late. So, we will be departing from the meeting with the ccNSO a little bit early. They have been informed about that. Maureen, anything else on that point? Gisella, thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, just before Alan, very important by-invitation-only. So, if you've heard this, but you haven't received the email from staff inviting you, then you're not invited to attend this session. Apologies, but it is a closed cocktail. Thank you. Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you instructing Hadia and I to leave the EPDP meeting to be there on time?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm asking a question. They overlap by half-an-hour, if I remember. No, they overlap by 45 minutes, but we will be able to show up if we attend the meeting, but we will not be there at the beginning. Or, are you giving us instructions to leave the EPDP? Simple question, yes or no?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I'd rather [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think that one of the things that Heidi is saying is that if we're going to go, we go together. So, if you're going to be … Like if you want to leave the EPDP and come with us, you have to be here at 25 to, but I would like you to stay and show your voice, have your voice heard in the EPDP, myself.

ALAN GREENBERG: At least one of us needs to stay, in my mind. I'm happy to stay. I'll skip the reception and Hadia can be at time, as an ALAC member.

EN

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, that's very nice of you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: But you are now instructing me I should not come in at the end.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. No, we have been told that we should go in together and that we shouldn't be coming in, in dribs and drabs.

ALAN GREENBERG: That means if you go to the washroom, you can't come back in.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Probably not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, how are they—

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alan, you just have to show up dressed as a waiter.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll skip the reception.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Just a quick note. Today at the EPDP we have the Technical Working Group, and they are just going to brief us on what they've been doing, and the draft report is already out. So, I'm just saying that, and not much debate today, and the draft is—

ALAN GREENBERG: The decision is made, Hadia. You are going to the reception. I will stay in the EPDP because I believe we need to have our presence there.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Sorry, excuse me. Sorry, Gisella, you said something about an invitation. Is it going to be a card that you are given, or is it an email?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You have the email in your—

SEUN OJEDEJI: It will be sent later?

ALAN GREENBERG: It was sent. Either you have it—

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Or, you don't.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or you discarded it, or they've excluded you among all the ALAC members.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It's the ALAC and the ALT-Plus, the normal people in the ALT-Plus. Plus there's a Japanese group coming with us, as well, ALS. The other thing was, too, when we have the board meeting, who is going to be up on the table with the board. I especially want Holly and Jonathan because they've got some questions that they want to ask the board, and the ALAC senior team.

HOLLY RAICHE: So, the ALT.

MAUREEN HILYARD: The ALT.

HOLLY RAICHE: Plus, Holly and Jonathan.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Plus, Holly and Jonathan. Yes, that's right, [inaudible], one, two, three, four? Isn't there a fifth one?

HOLLY RAICHE: Five, six, seven. We have seven.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sebastian, that's right. He's not sitting at the table with us. Sebastian and Jonathan and Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Perfect.

MAUREEN HILYARD: That's perfect, yeah. Okay, is that it? Thank you for these points. If you've got anything else that you wanted to ask and add to the discussion, to the contribution that we're going to make with the board, please let me know. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Maureen, just to tell you that I like this discussion, the previous discussion to continue because that is something that we have to be clear about. I think we have a different way to see who we are, how we have to work and what is the multi-

stakeholder model. So, we need a dedicated session to discuss this point.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We don't have any time. Yeah, I was going to say … So, we have to close the session because we've got another one starting very shortly. Thank you. Thanks to the interpreters, of course, and to our technical. Oh, my gosh, what?

GISELLA GRUBER: And a very happy birthday to Jacques our French interpreter sitting in the booth.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And heads-up, next session begins in eight minutes. Here.

HOLLY RAICHE: And just to let you know, we have Rinalia Abdul Rahim joining us again in seven minutes, in her new position with ISOC. Please do join us for that. That is followed directly with the session by the SSAC. After that, when we do meet with the GCSC we are going to be doing some formatting up here. There are going to be 11 people up here on the head table, and there are going to be 20 seats reserved right behind us. So, we will be making those changes in two sessions from now. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, with the ministry conversation, we're going to have at least 20 minutes with ccNSO or we're not having it—

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]