
MARRAKECH – At-Large Review and Summit III Updates and Reports from Regional Chairs

Monday, June 24, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 WET

ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, everyone. Sorry we're running a bit late but we'll get started, if you wouldn't mind getting yourselves organized and sitting down quietly. Thank you.

For this particular presentation, this session we're going to be doing an update on the At-Large Review Implementation plus on ATLAS III. As well as that, we will have the RALO chair reports. Just an update, a status update, on what's happening in their RALOs as soon as those people sit down and are quiet. Ricardo? And then of course later on we will have the ICANN board chair, the CEO, and At-Large board members coming as well. What we may have to do is we may have to shuffle our sessions around a bit if they come in early so that we're not holding them up. Next slide.

At-Large Review Implementation. We actually said right at the outset on December 23rd when the board gave us permission to move forward with our implementation. We had said that by June 23rd we would send away our first interim report. Over the last probably month or so, Cheryl and Heidi and myself, minisculely, had been working on getting the information that people had been putting together on their dashboards to put together the At-

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.

Large review. And it really does sound good. I think it does anyway.

But that review, I posted it on the 22nd so that they had it in their hot little hands by the 23rd. So, we were right on task.

What we have to do now is just continue with the implementation as planned. We have until December 31st to do our next status report.

So, we're all up to date with that with the implementation plan at the moment. If you have a look through that particular document, you will see that some of the eight items that we did are actually quite advanced. There are two that aren't. Unfortunately, one of them belongs to myself and Alan Greenberg on ALS criteria, only because it's probably one of the hard ones and also because we've actually been a little bit busy. But we will, after Marrakech. And having now completed this particular document, we will be able to move forward with that. Next slide.

The At-Large Summit. Just a recap. The ATLAS program is divided into two core areas. One of course is the Leadership Development Team and the other is the Program Working Group. I am just going to be reporting, first of all, on the Leadership Development Team and then Eduardo can give an update on the Program Committee. Then, Joanna on the capacity building. Then I can just give you an update on the selection of the travelers after that.

When it comes to the LDT, the Leadership Development Team, the members themselves actually devise the criteria by which the travelers would be assessed and they created some hard criteria which, when applicants filled in their form, if they did not fulfill the hard criteria they did not progress to the next stage which was actually the assessment of their active participation in At-Large or ICANN in general.

But hard criteria. First of all, they had to be an At-Large member, either an ALS member or an individual member. There were five core subjects that they had to study, so that we actually had a benchmark of knowledge at ATLAS. The third thing was of course that they had to have been actively engaged in At-Large. The whole point being that we're looking at leadership – policy leadership – and we needed to know that people had an idea of what ICANN was all about in order to progress with that. Of course the members within that team developed the online application form.

The next thing of course was the fact that we needed a selection committee in order to do the assessment side of things. So, the RALOs all appointed one person from their area to participate in the actual assessment process. I have to say that I'm absolutely thrilled with the quality of work and discussion and the eventual result of their work, which we're still working on at the moment.

They had to give scores for all the applicants and I think we had 70 – how many applicants did we have, Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: Applicants? 86.

MAUREEN HILYARD: There we go. We had 86 applicants. Various people. We excluded some who by the time we got to the assessment, they had actually picked up paid travel for Montreal because they had new positions. So, that meant they didn't require to have travel paid for them. There were those sorts of things, so it reduced it a little bit.

We actually have the names of 60 people but we're still going through and just doing the checks and balances for the scoring criteria, but I should be able to tell you by the end of this week who those 60 people are.

Eduardo, have you got slides for your presentation?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. You mean for the program part? Yes. Basically, the group that Olivier and I are helping with the program, Joanna and Vanda are people that really did this work. I just got your mail and put things that we're planning to do. Basically, this is an area or case study

that will be developed to do through the three days of ATLAS III. Is it three or four? Three days.

Basically, the idea is to be able to better communicate the At-Large position with regard to pertaining to policy issues within ICANN. The way we want to do this is to engage ATLAS in roleplaying of different – to become different constituencies within this case study and try to present or debate this scenario, this case, from that perspective and then have some kind of debate, and at the end have some kind of debate and come up with some kind of consensus or [inaudible] or whatever. The case that we're going to use is EPDP, right? Yeah. Okay. So, the next one, please.

As part of this case study, these are priority of the things that we wanted to teach the people who are going, develop skills during the ATLAS III which are the ones over here. The next one, this is really to look into the leadership. You can go to the next slide.

This is really skills to develop when you're doing group leadership type of environment and other optional things that I don't see there, if you can move the thing up. We can do before or after ATLAS III. So, this is the priority of skills that we want to cover during the thing. Please, go ahead. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: The idea, in general, is that the members will sit around and play positions in each position, and in this roleplay, someone will do the writing, someone will be the leader, then they can rotate. That is the idea of the dynamic, that we expected them to test their skills and exercise the kind of behavior they have been inside the group, etc. That's the general idea of this work, that we work together with one consultant that really gives us some good feedback and we are now waiting for the [inaudible] they will give to us. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. Next slide. Basically, this information, we are using a consultant. I forget his first name. I'm sorry. David [Cole]. We sent him this information June 19th and responding to our mail. He says we have an ambitious agenda. He's going to work out how we can get this done in the three days. Once we digest this, we will have a meeting and go from there. We'll have some kind of timeline because we have to prepare this case and the things that we want to do for the three days. Those are the next steps. Basically, that's my report. I don't know, Joanna, if you want to add anything to this.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Eduardo. I actually have the next speaking slot so I will be talking on all of this in more detail in a moment. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I know that one of the things that we were discussing in the selection committee this morning was the fact that in the past we often had people who came along to our event and decided when they wanted to just attend or not attend. One of the things that's very important for this session is that I know the program team is actually working very hard to ensure that people are going to be busy in assessed type of work. It is going to be really important that they are full time during this particular ... And very important. It isn't a holiday. It is there for development. We're going to have experienced as well as newbie people in this team and we will rely a lot on some of the expertise that will be part of the group. But at the same time, we want to ensure that the people who are traveling and being part of this program are going to add value to At-Large in the future.

Joanna, can you just follow on then from what Eduardo was saying about this program?

JOANNA KULESZA: I would be happy to do that. Thank you, Maureen. I will try to make this very brief. I have a few slides thrown together here.

First, on what has been done already. In terms of ATLAS III preparation, we, the Capacity Building Working Group headed by the co-chairs – myself and Alfredo – have organized five webinars that accompanied five ICANNLearn selected courses. We decided together with the Capacity Building Working Group to select the courses that we found were most useful for those coming to ATLAS III.

As you can see, the list here, those are issues that are relevant to anyone coming into ICANN. So, we had the fundamentals on domain names. We had a webinar that accompanied an ICANNLearn course on GNSO, ccNSO, the GAC, and cybersecurity basics.

The potential participants to ATLAS III could either go through the ICANNLearn course, or should they find that logistically challenging – because the courses were provided in English only – they could participate in [the obligatory] webinars that they did not participate in the ICANNLearn course, they were supposed to participate in the webinars. My deepest thanks goes to our wonderful staff who have been tremendously helpful in setting up the webinars, monitoring participation. We could not have done this without you, so thank you so much.

So, those would be the five leading [themes] we selected for anyone wanting to come to ATLAS. That's the fundamental

knowledge that we have made sure that they have obtained, either through ICANNLearn or through the webinars. Both of those had elements where either questions would be asked or questions would be asked to the participants for them to provide answers.

So, that would be the five webinars. We held them in two time zones. So, overall, ten meetings. Many thanks to the volunteers from the community and to members of ICANN staff who helped us with setting all of that up and providing the presentations.

Then we moved on to trying to figure out what we want the participants to do once on the ground in Montreal and that's the part when Vanda was kind enough to guide me through the perplexities of capacity building on that context and I had the opportunity to work together with Eduardo.

As Eduardo briefly mentioned, this part of work includes two elements – two parts. David [Cole] is going to be commissioned, I understand, for the Montreal training where our ATLAS III participants will be invited to join him for a session. That comprises of two elements.

The first part of the training will be the leadership skills training. David requested, and we have provided, consulting with the working group a list of skills that he will focus on during the training.

Now, I did have the opportunity to participate in the Leadership Academy that David has been running for I have for a few years. I participated in that in Kobe and I can provide personal experience of that training being particularly useful.

So, we've indicated a few areas that we find would be useful to the incoming leaders or members of the community we will have in Montreal. We want to make sure that David helps them to resolve conflicts, because those are unavoidable in this particular community. Not At-Large, but ICANN as such. We want to focus on inter-cultural communications. I think that is something that is most useful and, as global environment that At-Large is, to better understand each other and to learn how to best listen to one another. Or more specifically, inter-cultural awareness, how to make sure that we talk about the substance and not cultural differences.

We want to make sure that the participants learn to manage their time. That's something I'm trying to do here as well, of course. And as you can see, we have a list of skills we want them to focus on when it comes to the leadership training but also we want to make sure that those who do not want to be leaders but just want to facilitate the process also get something useful out of that training.

The feedback we got from the Capacity Building Working Group for ATLAS III was that we should focus on writing and that's what we have put up here in number one. We want to make sure that the participants understand how the process works and get a chance to actually do some writing or see how that writing takes place, what it looks like.

Then, we have a few other issues that we thought would be useful. For example, coaching or delegate, learning to work in the group. The slides will be on the page or around the page. I'm going to move on here. So, let's just move on to the next slide, please.

Then, there is the case study that Eduardo briefly mentioned. The training that David [Cole] offers includes the team being separated into smaller groups which proves very efficient and being tasked with policy-related exercise. so, that exercise we decided as a group from among various proposals – and my thanks go out to Eduardo who was instrumental in providing those proposals. The choice was to focus on one of the more pertinent issues which is privacy and security. In the title, we have provocatively put those as opposing values. We hope for the participants to look at that and think whether we can prioritize both privacy and security.

What we would like to do is we would like to have those participants divided into roughly five groups. That's on the next slide, if we could just move on. We would like them to be split into five groups and provide each other and all the participants of that training with a representation of the stance that has been taken by each group in that EPDP process.

How we will do that, we will try do that by providing them with policy documents that have been produced by individual constituencies in that process. We will be looking up to Hadia and Alan to help us best prepare the participants for that process.

But the point of that exercise is to get better understanding of how the community works. It's not just about defending your own view, as Jonathan was saying this morning. It's not just about defending the community's view. But it's about understanding others and trying to facilitate consensus, hot topic or priority if you will. I believe At-Large is also willing to facilitate.

In that sense, we will have the participants split into groups. We will make sure that they understand where different communities within ICANN come from and we will help them fundamentally just battle it out, so we will try to help them reach consensus, provided the arguments that have been presented by different constituencies.

So, that's I think all I have. The next slide is just the last one. Thank you so much. I'm happy to answer questions. I hope that was in some way useful. That's the work that has been done so far and we're looking forward to working with David on making sure that training is actually useful. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sebastien first and then Alan I see in the queue.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Maureen. Thank you, Joanna, for this presentation and for the previous presentations as well. First of all, overall, my feeling is that we are less and less in an ATLAS meeting and more and more in a training mode. I don't have any metaphysical issue with it but that's not at all what ATLAS I and II were. It's something completely different. It's a different creature.

So, my question is the following. Is it only the 60 people that we talked about in the beginning who are concerned by this or are we all concerned by this?

One of the reasons why I'm asking this question is that, as Maureen said, several people were applicants and are not applicants anymore because they were elected at different positions and it is a pity that they don't benefit from it, at least for them to benefit would be good. A lot of us would also benefit from

this training. So, that's my question. Is this for the 60, for the 100, for the 120 of At-Large?

Also, to add something to this question, to be very clear there will be local people who will be present who did not apply because they didn't need to travel and to be paid to be able to travel or to have money for lodging. Should they be included? Should they be left aside? How do we do this?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Just to answer that for you, Sebastien. We always knew that once we were given funding for 60 people that this was going to be a different ATLAS from any other ATLAS that had actually been held before. There was considerable discussion that actually looked at how we were going to make it an effective ATLAS and something that was going to add value to At-Large and what we wanted to do within At-Large and to encourage more participation which is a very strong focus for us.

We have focused this ATLAS on – there is a considerable amount of training. But at the same time, it is training with a purpose and I think that what we are going to have in the end ... As I said, we've got some experienced people and some not so experienced. We're going to have people learning more about the multi-stakeholder involvement across ICANN, so that as Joanna explained, people are going to actually learn about the different

perspectives of the different communities. It's going to be quite unique but I think it's going to special. It's going to be important for how we progress in the future.

I'm just remembering, too, that the purpose of choosing the 60 people was purely for travel. That means that they are being selected to be paid for to go to this particular ATLAS. But at the same time, they have been selected specifically to take part in a program that we are targeting a particular group of people that will be of value to us in the future.

There will be others that are going to be able to participate in some activities because we understand that the breakout rooms that we want to hold group activities in aren't optimal for large groups. In fact, they're probably about 20-plus. So, we're going to have to limit the number of people who can actually participate in the breakout groups and that kind of stuff.

Still a little bit more work to be done on the logistics of it, but once we have done that, we will probably offer registration for people who want to also be part of the program.

We have included amongst our normal ... I think we're actually looking at about 100 just basic, 60 travelers plus about 40 extras from the ALAC and other add-ons. Then there will be a smaller number – not 100 – but there will be a smaller number that will be included into the mix.

Probably more on that as we get more information about the logistics and how we progress from here. But the program I'm really looking – it's a fantastic program and I think that they've done really, really well to come up with something I think is going to be fun. I think I gave you a little bit of information. Sorry, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Us has-beens are always forgotten. I'd like to assume that if you're not a trainer or a mentor that you're a trainee at this thing. I hope the breakout room sizes will not constrain that. We'll see.

I think it's important to remember that, although this is a different beast, we are living in a different world right now and what we're talking about is closely tied to the At-Large Review implementation and is an adjunct to getting a jump on that. And although I have no magic inside information, I'm not sure we would have been funded for ATLAS III if it wasn't tied to the At-Large review.

I have one comment for Joanna. I don't know where she is. Is she still here? There she is. When you say privacy versus security or privacy versus something, I think it's really important to say privacy for whom versus security for whom because we're talking about different apples and oranges and if you want me to just debate privacy versus security, they're both absolutely crucial but we're not talking about your privacy versus your security.

We're talking the security of one group versus the privacy of another group and I think it's important to frame it that way because it becomes a much more interesting debate. And perhaps a more important debate, also. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you. Just very briefly, that is duly noted. The title is supposed to be controversial. We're looking forward to people actually discovering what you already know all too well. So, it is supposed to be this controversial and we will see where it takes us. It already created a debate, so good title there. Thank you, Alan. That's most carefully considered. Thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

The people that were selected, those names are going to be published somewhere eventually?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

My understanding is registrants are end users and we are here about the interest of end users. A registrant who is an end user, we care about his privacy and also his security. So, Joanna was right saying that. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

The general idea was come out when we started to discuss about different perspectives from different regions of the planet and what is really important regarding the privacy and regarding security for one and others, and how those can be connected and pay attention on how they will work in the same environment with different perspectives.

So, the general idea, like Joanna said, is to raise the idea, to debate these really different perspectives from each region, persons from different cultures and behaviors, and use that as a base for the debate that we are talking about, the EPDP and the issues ICANN is facing to get into the GDPR and all the others lost around the world. That was the general idea that took us to this position. I believe everybody agrees. I believe that it will be interesting. Thank you.

WALE BAKARE:

My comment, actually, is about the issue about privacy versus security. These words are being used interchangeably. Sometimes, you will say security and some people say cybersecurity. These issues of security or cybersecurity is just a different landscape entirely in IT or ICT. So, it actually depends on what we want to use in context. For instance, we can say we want to discuss security, safety, stability, and resilience of Internet. For that, we can also break this down to different teams or different

areas. We can also have data security and we can also mention professional people with regards to privacy, because okay, I want protection of people and also resources on infrastructure. We can also categorize this into stability and resilience, [inaudible] infrastructure in that perspective.

But it's something, the words we are using on the [inaudible], different but it is different [inaudible] cybersecurity. You can even frame your security objective or strategies around different models. Thank you.

RUDI DANIEL:

This is Rudi Daniel from the Caribbean. I'm also an ICANN fellow. Clarification, please. The participants of ATLAS II, are they drawn equally from across the regions or is there any weigh-in of each region perhaps depending on the perceived development that you think might be needed? Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I did say that we were actually going through checks and balances, but I can actually tell you that there was a request that there was equal representation and that a call was made that there should be a minimum of ten people in each of the RALOs. We probably would have had that across all the RALOs if we had actually had the same number of applicants, but I have to say that

for EURALO and NARALO there were not very many applicants but those who did apply, the majority of them did get in. For LACRALO, APRALO, and AFRALO, there was definitely – I can say that there were 12 in each of those equally. That’s unofficial until we go through those, but it’s pretty even, which meant that more people from those regions had actually been assigned to fill the gaps that were leftover from the others. More on that later.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We have one comment in the chat.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. We have a comment in the chat.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Thank you. This is Evin Erdogan speaking on behalf of Jahangir Hossain. He has a comment. “We are going to have to make this fundamental trade between how much do we value end user security and protection versus how much do we want to behave in a free society for end users.”

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for that, Jahangir from Bangladesh. Are there any other comments or queries?

JOHN LAPRISE:

I was the selector from NARALO on the selection committee and I want to commend my peers on the committee. Great work under a tight time constraint, so thank you very much.

One of the things that came out at one of our final meetings – and this came out earlier in the conversation – which is the experience of ATLAS II which is where we had funded travelers not participating in ATLAS II despite their application. One of the ideas that's been suggested is applying ... If we have members who are ... If we have people attending ATLAS III who do not participate in ATLAS III, so they vanish during the course of ATLAS III that they be not allowed to apply for funding for some period in the future for failing to participate under selection circumstances.

However, this is not a hard-and-fast decision at all. This is just something that was floated and it's something for consideration for the group. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay. Well, we are very privileged to have our guests arrive and I think what we may do is give them the privilege of addressing us first and then we'll have the RALO chair reports because I know their time is precious. But what we would like to hear, Cherine, when you're ready, is what's [on top] for you and how can we help?

CHERINE CHALABY: I don't know. I'm at your service. I'll leave when the questions become difficult. I've got 20 minutes or so, 15 minutes.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Well, you just get yourself organized. I'll talk to Leon. You can start to tell us what's important to you.

CHERINE CHALABY: I'm okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Do you want to start?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yeah. Thank you. I think you all know that I love coming here. I have, since my early days in ICANN nine years ago, a very special relationship with ALAC and At-Large. The reason is because of end users. In my prior professional life, everything I did in terms of building systems or processes or training or change management, activities that I did when I worked for a company called Accenture, it was all about end users and how we should care about end users and everything we do was end users. I think you have that same objective here and I always felt in the world of ICANN, we must never forget that end users are those that need

us, that need us most, if I may say, and we should represent their voice whenever we can and think about them. That's very close to my heart.

The other thing I have to say is that I thoroughly enjoyed coming to the ICANN meetings towards the end of ... The ALAC meeting at the end of the ICANN meetings where we sat in free format. I now know this has now expanded to have the entire group which is even better and I feel very privileged. I don't mind being grilled at all. I think you guys do a super job of being straight and frank. I enjoy that because it makes me think as well. It makes every person in my position previously – the previous chair and myself – find this as invigorating environment and sometimes you don't have the answer, sometimes you do have the answer. So, very grateful to be invited. It's actually the privilege is mine to be here, not yours. The other way around.

I really wanted to maybe share with you what are the board's priorities, what is occupying us at this stage, if I may. Every year we begin right about now finalizing the priorities for the following fiscal year. I'm going to give you an insight. These are not finals but these are top of the mind. I may have missed one or two things. Forgive me for that. That doesn't mean they are not priorities but it means that it's what has occupied my mind over the last few weeks.

The first thing is the completion of the three major plans that we have that will guide us over the next five years and those are the strategic plan, the financial and operating plan, and the governance plan. And those three plans really are going to be ready by the end of this year and hopefully they will form one integral roadmap for all of us. They will be the documents that bind us all together into a direction for the future. I'm going to work hard between now and end of November at the AGM when it will be the end of my term because I'm now in the third year of my third term, and therefore as they say termed out and will have to leave the board. So, I'm going to put all my effort in ensuring that those plans are in place. The plan now is to have them all out for public comment in December and hopefully begin implementing those 1st of July next year.

You should know that the strategic plan has been adopted already by the board, but in line with our commitment to everybody, is that we've passed three resolution. The first resolution is to adopt the plan. The second one is to allow for changes to take place towards the end of this year because we always said the strategic plan that is not costed out and without any financial support is no more than a dream. It has to be reality. We have to know we can afford it. So, Goran and all his team are working on producing the financial and operating plan supporting that strategic plan. They issued a higher version of it

just recently for the community to comment on it and then the full version will be issued in December next year. We will know ahead of time what the changes are, whether the plan we've all put together is affordable or not.

In parallel with that, one of the five objectives of the strategic plan is improving aspects of our governance model. You know that Brian Cote has been facilitating this objective for the community, this work for the community.

So, that's the first thing is completion of the plan so we have something solid. Also, it's not enough to have those plans completed. It's very important to make sure that they will be implemented successfully. The question is what does successful implementation mean? Really, there are responsibilities that fall on all of us, the community, ICANN Org, and the board and all of us have to work together. So, we have an initiative within the board to begin understanding what does it mean to [inaudible] those?

If you really think about it, the last plan that was done was magnificent. It didn't have a financial plan associated with it and most of us, frankly, didn't go through a process of keeping that as a living document as updated, and revisiting it on a regular basis to make sure that our work is aligned with the strategic plan. We want that to be different this time.

Just to tell you the board is already in the process of updating the charter of all of its work and its committees to ensure that everything we do is aligned with the strategic plan. So, we have a financial committee, we have a governance committee, we have a risk committee. We have a variety of committees and all of them, their charter, as we speak now, we are going through a process of changing this to make sure that all of our work is aligned to the strategic plan.

I hope that the strategic plan will also be taken into consideration in the strategy of the individual SOs and ACs that [inaudible] to your work is aligned to the strategic plan.

The question is how do we get everybody's buy in? I know we all work together in producing it, but do you really believe in it? Do you really have the buy in it? I hope you do and I hope you will continue to have that buy in and continue to commit to making it work. That is very important. That's on the first priority.

The second priority, in no particular order, is to do with GDPR, particularly Phase 2, the work that's taking place. I'm sure Goran will update us on how his work is going to inform and help with that work.

The next one is enhancing the effectiveness of review recommendations and implementation. We started the discussion in Kobe about the prioritization and affordability of

reviews. At the moment, there are many reviews taking place and the board is sitting there receiving from one review 112 recommendations. From another, maybe 200 recommendations. From another, 60 recommendations. They all cost money. They all can't be implemented at the same time.

Collectively, we need to find a way of making sure that these recommendations are prioritized and affordable, because we're all fighting for a central pool of resources that is limited. We have a small number of volunteers. We have ICANN resources, staff, and we have some money. Those are the three things in the middle and everybody needs part of that and I think, at the moment, we don't have enough volunteers. The money is limited and ICANN resources are limited.

So, how do we prioritize everything we do? Given it's a supply and demand. We have a limited supply and almost a limitless demand. How do we get that discipline and that synchronization between these two?

The next priority is actually nothing to do with the recommendations themselves of the reviews, but the structuring of the review and the cadence of them. There are too many that take place in every year. How do we organize them in a manner that is efficient, digestible to the community, but then the reviews themselves come up a recommendation that are acceptable by

the organization – for example, At-Large or anybody – that makes sense to you, that they are actually implementable recommendations that really adds value rather than the sheer recommendation? And they should not take too long – five years or something – to come up with recommendations that don't make sense to you. So, we need to look at that.

The next one is to do with the IRP, the new updates to the bylaws. We have a team called the IRT Team. That team, at the moment, has stalled a little bit. It needs to be repopulated. It needs to be re-injected with new life, a new energy, to get it to finish in time and we're working with the GNSO and other members of the community to make sure that this is being done and being done very quickly.

Also, we need to populate the standing panel because this is a very important plank of our accountability mechanisms. We said we would always have a standing panel to go parallel with the IRP process and most of those are delayed, so we need to put a lot of oomph and make this happen. That's a priority.

The next priority is to do with the root server operators and the root systems. We received advice from RSSAC in terms of the proposal for a new governance model for the root server operators, so we need to work on those. We already put a

document out for public comment and we're following this very closely.

The next one is to do with name collisions which was a big issue with strings like home, corp, mail, for example, and I think with the help of Goran and our technical community we have managed now to advanced the ball and respond to the SSAC advice to us. We broke the work into multiple phases. The first phase is out and it's now going to be resourced properly and Goran is committed to putting all the right resources in it to move it forward.

The last one I can think of at the moment is succession planning, which will be the board chair that will replace me. I said this openly in my blog. We, as a board, have appointed an external facilitator to work with us through that process and hopefully we will start with defining what we see the requirement and the profile of what we want from a new chair, and then based on that profile, the board members who are candidates who want to aspire to become chairs will submit their application to the board or statement of interest based on that profile, and then when we arrive in September or closer to the AGM we will also, with the help of the facilitator, work on evaluating all the applicants, interviewing them, and then make a decision. So, that is a real top priority so that the board remains collegial, remains – and I'm communicating with you this because I think it's important to be

open and transparent and everybody knows what we're doing. To me, I think we have a strong board and all our processes have to be institutionalized and we're going to work very hard on making, hopefully, the right decision and move forward. So, those are things in mind at the moment.

Before the AGM, we will publish every year, publish a blog with the FY20 all of our activities, all of our priorities, all of our responsibilities so you will have all of this documented and written out. At the AGM we will formally announce and vote publicly in front of [inaudible] on my successor on the new chair and the new vice chair and all the committees as well. Is that okay?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

That will do. I think what we'll do is invite Goran and Leon to do their presentations, but if you have any questions, have them ready because they don't mind being grilled.

GORAN MARBY:

I mind being grilled. Could I just say one thing? Last time I was in Marrakech was the first time I ever joined an ICANN meeting. I came here just after I got announced. The reception from the board was very well. They just forgot to book me any dinners. So, I decided that Rinalia was going for dinner, so the first official

dinner I ever had with anyone in ICANN was with you guys. That shaped my ... Remember that, Alan? We ended up talking about routers.

So, for me, coming back to Marrakech and meeting with you guys makes a lot of sense and I'm grateful for it. You gave me a very good lesson [inaudible] about your importance and your expectation of a CEO. I think I understand your expectations but I probably haven't been able to fulfill them. But I was very grateful for it. But let's start the grilling.

CHERINE CHALABY:

There was one thing I forgot to say. I wanted to say both thank you to Alan and Maureen for the support they've given me. I cherish very much every time we have one of these ICANN meetings I have breakfast with Alan. We used to sit down and chew the fat and it was very good and I continued the same tradition with Maureen. It's extremely helpful. It opened my eyes on the issues and I'm very, very happy with that tradition. I think it's a fantastic tradition. By the way, did you guys decide on ATLAS on who is going to attend all of that or not yet? You selected the 60?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

We'll make the final decision by the end of the week.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, because I think that's a very important summit, so I'm glad you guys are getting organized for that. Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I can talk about routers again.

GORAN MARBY: We have things like the Expedited PDP, ITU, whatever.

LEON SANCHEZ: Do you want to give them an update on UAM?

GORAN MARBY: Alan has a question. He's helping us.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm going to make a comment first before I do anything with you. This is for Cherine. I'll point out in my four years of ICANN meetings, I met with a lot of people – formally met with a lot of people. The meetings with the chair, the board, are the only meetings which were completely unscripted, no required agenda

ahead of time, no formal outcome from it but very, very effective. I hope Maureen is finding the same experience and I'd like to thank you for that.

I'm going to refrain from grilling Goran. Grilling has a lot to do with barbeques and things like that, so it could be challenging. Other people have their hand up, so I'll let them go.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you for coming and speaking with us. Most recently, ALAC issued advice on the strategy. In our discussions on email one of the issues that was raised – and I raised it – was the idea that throughout the history of the Internet, altruism is an underlying thread if you go back through the very beginnings and that was something that we should all keep in mind. In fact, especially here in At-Large. It's something that we bring to the table at some level all the time. I would implore you in your consideration of succession and the board that when you are bringing things to consider for leadership on the board that altruism is actually one of those characteristics that you're looking for.

GORAN MARBY:

Thank you. Noted. You are in the Expedited PDP, so maybe you're interested, maybe not. I got a statement earlier today in the GNSO

and if you want to, I can repeat that statement. Are you interested?

ALAN GREENBERG: I haven't heard it before, so I'm interested.

GORAN MARBY: Let's see if I can find it. Give me a second.

CHERINE CHALABY: John, in terms of characteristics you brought, I think it is important and, from my own experience, as a chair, it has been a true privilege over the last couple of years. In fact, I'm really grateful to Steve who, in his last year, also delegated to me pretty much the operation of the board. So, I've been doing this for two years formally and one year informally, so about three years. And I think competence and ability to do the job is one part, but I think character is another part. I think you have to be selfless and care about everyone in every community. You cannot have preferences. I think the only way you can trust a chair is if a chair has this equanimity and this balance and fair view and desire to help and support every organization, every constituency. That's essential, I think, in a person. There's no doubt in my mind. So, thank you for reminding us of that. Thank you.

GORAN MARBY:

Coming into an ICANN meeting is always interesting for me because you receive a lot of questions and we spend a lot of time trying to put in what we are actually doing into that conversation. So, we decided today I'm going to do our take on where we are in the Expedited PDP work.

So, our assumption is – and this is fairly technical. Our assumption is that the only way to create a unified access model based on a TSG is to take away the legal risk for the contracted parties for providing WHOIS data through the unified access model. I'll repeat that because it's so essential. The only way to create the unified access model is to take away the legal risk. That's our theory. That is the possibility that we are now testing through the work of the – and I'm sorry for this, I always come up with strange names, the internal project name – the Strawberry Group.

If this theory turns out wrong, there is no possibility for unified access model. The UAM means that someone else than the contracted parties decides who gets access under what circumstances and for what purposes and safeguards. So, the decision has to be moved away from any given contracted party to be able to for that to happen.

So, we are going to the DPAs in Europe, with the good help of the European Commission and we will need a clear answer for them, to make sure there's no risk for the contracted parties providing WHOIS through the UAM. That answer will be given to the Expedited PDP. The board, or the Org, cannot create policy. So, with that answer, yes or no, the Phase 2 can continue its work about a UAM.

And just to give you how important the board thinks about this, they reconfirmed this commitment by giving me a one-year goal to go and do this. That's the statement, Alan. Questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: First question is are you really expecting a yes/no answer from the Data Protection Board?

GORAN MARBY: As the European Commission has stated publicly, and in this concept, it's actually the European Commission who wrote the law, they are helping us to formalize the questions. The European Commission has also said that there is a possibility to build a UAM based on this context and based on the purpose they provided to the Expedited PDP. What they basically said – and I'm sure this is technical and boring, but what they basically said, if you have a purpose like this, you can build a UAM. If you have another

purpose written, you can't do a UAM. Does this answer your question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Enough for this group.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hadia?

GORAN MARBY: Anything else? You're so nice to me. Thank you, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you Cherine, Goran, and Leon for being with us today. I put my card up before you mentioned the letter. Basically, I had my card up in order to ask you about the board communication with the European Commission and the European Data Protection Board, to ask you about if you have any new information in relation to the Expedited Policy Development.

GORAN MARBY: I'm happy you asked this question. I have not talked about the WHOIS system with any DPAs since June last year. If I would do that, I will tell you and it will be open. The reason for that is we're now in a process of actually coming up with the suggestion. The

European Commission's last time official was the letter they sent to us about the purpose and potential for UAM. We do work in the Strawberry Group – and you'll have to excuse my bad sense of humor. We are working with them to be able to formalize the questions. But that is sort of the practical work. I know that the Strawberry Group are meeting the Expedited PDP on Thursday, I think, to go through where we are in the process. Thank you.

HADIA ELMINIAMI:

Just a comment with regard to the European Commission comment on the report because that comment was actually received differently with different groups. For me, of course, it was clear what they really meant. I don't know if you have an agreement on what they meant by their comment because some groups found it disagreeing with previous comments which of course I don't agree with.

GORAN MARBY:

To give the ICANN or me personally the power to tell the European Commission what to do, I can't do that. My simple answer to this one, the funny thing is that inside the Expedited PDP sits a representative of the European Commission and I always say why don't you ask the European Commission what they think instead of coming with more theories? I think he is perfectly willing and

able to answer any questions about that letter and how they see it. I will grill him. He's a nice guy. Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you for raising that issue. Building on that, debates you've been having with the board and with the Commission, I know that privacy advocates are somewhat dissatisfied with the way that the GDPR has been implemented or is being implemented but I'm also well aware that law enforcement is almost equally unsatisfied with the way that GDPR has impacted the WHOIS system.

So, I would like to hear your feedback on whether there are any discussions with law enforcement. This could be Europol, this could be the Council of Europe which has the Cybercrime Convention. I've heard very critical feedback coming from law enforcement circles saying that the changes that have been implemented into WHOIS significantly impact the way that law enforcement can protect us. I'm not taking sides here, but since we're talking about the satisfaction of the privacy advocates, I would like to hear your comments on the dissatisfaction of law enforcement. Thank you.

GORAN MARBY:

My answer to the police is that it's not me, it's the law. They should speak to their own countries if they have problems with this law and they should probably ... And this is repeatedly said. And I think that at one point in the meeting I said I think I'm going to put up a T-shirt saying, "It wasn't me. It was you."

This is a very good question. It's an extremely good question because neither Cherine, Leon, we don't take sides in that discussion. We have actually said several times that the community decides and we would love to see, but that's more me. So, have a privacy discussion inside the ICANN community, whether you can balance those things.

Right now, we're having a how to implement the legislation sort of thing discussions where everybody has different opinions about that. But we don't take sides and we shouldn't because it's not our role and it's not our job. So, I listen.

One thing I can say – and this is more personal – is that fact that when GDPR, when we started to work with GDPR, most people know we didn't have a process for it. How do you handle a legislation that we, as an institution, has to, at one certain time, comply to? We didn't have that process. And I know that we're – not all of them, but especially some registries that wanted to have this in a private conversation with compliance and it should not be a community-wide discussion. So, we set up with a poetic

name the [inaudible]. Yeah, I have a bad sense of humor. Actually, I think I'm really funny.

We actually did take – and I took a lot of heat and we took a lot of heat for setting up that process by inviting everybody into the community. That process led to the temp spec. That temp spec led to the Expedited PDP Phase 1 who actually accepted about 90% which came up through the [consensus] process.

The reason we did that was because it was so important for us to have everybody on the table. But we don't judge between you but we fight for the right for everybody to be there. Was that an answer to your question? Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

May I ask in Spanish? I have two questions. One on the elections of the European Union. Do you expect any changes on the DPA response you might receive? And the second question is, until now, we have been discussing data protection within the European Union and that is on everybody's mind. But this is not just the only place where there are privacy laws, an example being the United States. We are trying to see how the [inaudible] fitting together Brazil, California, Texas so that tomorrow we don't have to introduce new changes.

I am aware that it is not the board or the Org who sets the rules. However, they must be following these issues I guess, right?

GORAN MARBY:

You all have really excellent questions, as always. There is no scripted answer to this one. So, yes. I'm sorry to say that ICANN as an institution, as an entity, is now under what I call threat. Our possibility in the future to make policy is threatened by legislations around the world. It doesn't to a surprise to you guys that I believe that the ability for us to make policies is much better than individual countries making legislation because that actually fragmented the user experience of the Internet.

So, one of my roles is to defend the institution, is really to make sure that we can help countries to understand that it could be non-beneficial for them to implement certain types of legislation, that it's better that we do it. That are reasons why I think to have a privacy policy within ICANN would be something that would be beneficial not only for the institution, not only for the end users, but also in discussions with governments. Can I just finish off and then you can say where I'm wrong?

The second thing I'd add. Recognizing that, we are now for the first time tracking legislative proposals. You can find that on our website. So, for the first time, we're really looking into different countries, now trying to, for instance, look into GDPR, to at least

tell them that there are some problems which are fairly simple to fix with this legislation. For instance, it doesn't make a difference between Internet itself and platforms on top of Internet. We are placed in the same corner – and I'm not [inaudible] anything – companies like Facebook, Netflix, Google, whatever it is – who are not the Internet. You use the Internet to get to them. Unfortunately, technically, we are in the same bracket which creates some of these problems. We are a public interest organization. We are not a for-profit organization.

So, the second thing on that, we came up before – a couple of months ago, we came up with a charter for interaction with governments which we presented which really says that what we want to talk to governments about is only what we call the technical merit. We will not go into discussions if we think privacy laws are good or bad but we will try to go in and say just understand that if you enact a legislation in a certain way it could actually disconnect you from the Internet.

We have seen legislative proposals that prevents routing. We have seen legislative proposals that can actually prevent the distribution of IP addresses which would solve this privacy problem on the Internet because there's no [inaudible].

The next [phase] of that is also look about the forum we engaging with governments, and therefore we are joining the ITU because

that's one of the places where governments actually come together and talk. ITU is not ... They don't have any powers. The only thing that happens in the ITU is that countries come together and engage there, and therefore we are joining, for instance, RIPE, ISOC and everybody else [inaudible] there.

So, we're trying to figure out – and this is why it's such a long answer to your question – this small [inaudible] organization. We are 400 people. Together with you guys, we are many, many more. So, we're also looking to how do we engage with the community so that we can have community interaction not only checking what we do but we can use the community for outreach in their own countries.

So, this week, just a couple of minutes ago I think, we also proposed to use the cross-community working group for Internet governance something as an interface between us and the community, so we can educate the community about what we're actually doing and we can be transparent in the interactions we have with government, because I think we have the same goal, to preserve the ability for you guys to make policies worldwide rather than having local legislations that only affects certain parts of the world because that can splinter the Internet.

Sorry for the long answer but I had to from A to ... Thank you. Leon, now you can correct me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Leon, go ahead. We apologize for not giving you some time earlier, but go ahead and speak, please.

LEON SANCHEZ: Just to respond to Ricardo, when it comes to elections, we cannot predict what is going to happen. Of course we have to be aware of that and paying attention to that.

When it comes to the initiatives, the legislation initiatives and regulation initiatives that are being addressed in different places, Goran mentioned before that, and I'm coming from a meeting between the CCWG-IG which is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance and the Governance Working Groups which I preside over.

So, the proposal that we had presented is to [perform] an active tracking and an ongoing tracking on all the initiatives for us to be able to see the topics that may be impacting on our policy development at ICANN and the way in which we comply with our mission and with our activities and the way in which this might impact on the multi-stakeholder model in terms of Internet governance and the domain names industry.

Here, what I have presented together with my colleague at the board is that we do need our community to be aware and to have

a wider scope regarding these fields of action. It is not the same having the eyes of the Org on the board and different scenarios and initiatives, different events. It's not the same as having our community because our community has an active participation on many fora and that's why that help us, that contribute to ICANN work. So, this is the invitation for you to participate, engage in these efforts. And whenever you see that there is an initiative or whenever you see that there is a new initiative being discussed at any other place and that you might think that might impact on our mission on the way in which ICANN works on policies or might impact on our governance model, you need to inform that to us and we need to focus on that and pay attention to that.

Part of the discussion has to do with this. Well, on many occasions, those efforts do not translate into a concrete legislation. But my answer to that statement is that it doesn't matter how we value the probability of that because with that we can detect trends. If we see, for example, that there is an initiative, there is another initiative appearing in some other place, that implies that there is a trend.

And even though none of those initiatives might be translated into a regulation, this means that there is a topic that needs to be discussed at ICANN. The idea of revitalizing this working group is that the three layers that compose ICANN – I mean, the board, the

community, and the organization – we need to work together so that we can react accordingly and to follow-up all these challenges. We need to avoid the issue that we have with the GDPR. This is very related to what Cherine said before. Cherine was talking about the strategic plan and he mentioned the board strategic program which has the objective and this objective is to work together so that we can be coordinated.

So, the same applies to this. The same applies to the follow-up of governance issues and proposals. We do understand that we might not have a consolidated position or point of view on some occasions and that's okay because it reflects our diversity and it reflects the diversity of cultures at ICANN. But the important thing here is that we discuss that, that we exchange ideas, and that we know about our common points and that we, therefore, are able to create and construct things. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We just have a question from the audience, if you'd still like to ask.

MATAGORO JABHERA: Thank you. I have one question and I appreciate for good answers from Goran. I've seen a number of issues which read into the Internet fragmentation. We have been working, bringing more users to the Internet but which if it comes to [inaudible] Internet

fragmentation we have seen due to legislation, due to policies, due to different disagreements among the countries. I know that ICANN has a number of remits dealing on such kind of issues but [inaudible] member of the [inaudible], I need to hear the statement from the board on that. Thank you.

GORAN MARBY:

I think that we are sometimes forgetting what ICANN is. And I'm not going to talk about this in political terms. I'm going to talk from a technical perspective. ICANN provides a service to the world. We provide the identifiers. What comes out of us is the numbers, the addresses, and the domain names. That's what comes from us.

The way Internet works is it's delegated. ICANN is the only place that is non-delegatable. All delegation starts from us. So, every time you go online, you hit us in the form of the domain name or IP address. That's where we come in.

For this system to work, there's a lot of other ones. For instance, we don't distribute the IP numbers. That's the RIRs. Then you have the ones who produce the physical, the ISPs which are the physical connection, wireless or anything else. Or the application providers like Facebook and Amazon or whatever they do. We have no connection to them. And we shouldn't have.

So, when things happen which affects that, [inaudible] other avenues than ICANN because we're proud to produce the extremely important service we do which we, for some reason, often forget. We work with DNS security, we work with DNSSEC but it's all related to the simple fact that out of us – and that includes you, sir, because we remember all of us are doing this – comes all the identifiers. But not technically [inaudible].

I believe, which I think I share with everybody else, that ICANN, to be able to do that, should be a very non-political organization. The reason I also think that is because there are so many better places to have that discussion than in ICANN. Thank you. A passionate answer. I think I have someone on my left side here who would like to ask a question now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I actually think it's been answered. It's a question I asked downstairs at the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. In teaching Internet governance, one of the questions I actually said to the class was what impact does the Christchurch Call have on Internet governance? Some of that is going to be a legislative response which is not what you would do. Some of it may be technical. For other reasons, there are technical pieces of legislation, such as what Russia has done. It seriously is a question when you listen to the Christchurch Call

and you see maybe misguided legislation. Can you stand back? I just heard your answer and I think you can and I think you should.

GORAN MARBY:

First of all, the terrible events there shocked the world. I don't think there is anyone who walks out of that feeling nothing else than despair. What happened on a particular platform on top of the Internet is another discussion about the identifiers.

So, of course everybody wants to help. Everyone wants to do this. We see our role in that discussion, if it comes up, to say, hey, guys, what do you want to do on that level is not our work. But remember if you have a certain type of legislation, that can actually prevent your people [inaudible] traffic actually get access to it.

The good and the bad with the Internet and why it's been so successful is that the parameters are set, and if you break the parameters, you won't have any access.

To be honest, we're working right now with narratives around this because we have to be better at it. We have to be better at explaining it. For a long period of time, we shied away of talking about the technical part and how what we do actually makes sense. We had layers and we had stuff. Now when we're engaging with governments and [inaudible], I'm actually saying it's the IP

addresses, it's domain names, it's numbers. That's what we do. This is how it works. I had a minister meeting a couple of years ago and me and him ended up on the wall writing stuff and it became engagement. So, we are going to back where you guys started all of this.

It's important for us [stay], I think, as long as you, community, [inaudible] should change direction and do something different. That is the [inaudible]. We are only in the room to say, "Okay, you're going to break something." Also, if you want to break something, that's okay for us as well, but you should know about where you break.

One of the threats which I talked about before is actually well-intended legislation that have very severe effects and we have not been very good at being in that room and saying that, but to be able to do that, I need to engage you guys.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I was going to say you [inaudible] Australian room [inaudible].

GORAN MARBY: Just invite us. I will send Terri.

ALAN GREENBERG: Microphone please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'd have done a lot stronger than [inaudible]. I'd have actually sent in very strong troops.

GORAN MARBY: I've never been to Australia.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, guys.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I want you to come armed.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you to the board chair and CEO and Leon for their interesting discussions this afternoon. Of course, it just means that we've actually had to scrub one whole section of our meeting but it's not often we get these guys coming in to speak with us and share. Thank you very much. We hope to see you again sometime. The rest of you have got a one-minute break before next. Okay, 15 minutes. So, we'll be late for the next one. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually, the next section starts in 20 minutes. It does. You have a break for the interpreters and we have an extra five mins to

stretch your legs. No coffee. Next session at 5:20, 17:20. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]