ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – At-Large Leadership Welcome (30 min) followed by At-Large Policy Session: Recommendation Prioritization (90 min)
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 – 09:00 to 11:00 CEST

YESIM NAZLAR: This session will now begin. Please start the recoding. Hello and welcome to At-Large leadership session, welcome to ICANN 69 and recommendations prioritization. My name is Yesim Nazlar. Interpretation for this session will include French and Spanish languages and will be conducted using both Zoom and the remote simultaneous interpretation platform operated by Congress Rental Network.

Attendees are encouraged to download the Congress Rental Network application following instructions in the Zoom chat or from the meeting details document available on the meeting website page.

If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room, and once the session facilitators call upon the name, our technical support team will unmute the participants. Please state your name for the record, and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English.

When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices, including the Congress Rental Network application. Please also speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

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.

Finally, this session, like all other ICANN activities, is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Please find the link in the chat for your reference. In case of disruption during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Maureen Hilyard, the chair of ALAC. Over to you, Maureen. Thanks so much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Yesim. Welcome, everyone. Terribly sorry about this, I can't get my video to work for some reason, so you won't be able to see me, but I'm only on for a short while anyway. I really would like to give you a warm At-Large welcome to ICANN 69. This is Maureen Hilyard, the ALAC chair, and I'm going to introduce you just to a few things that we're going to be covering this morning. Next slide, please.

Okay, the things that I'm going to be talking about, first of all, are going to be just to introduce some of the new ALAC, to name a few people that we're going to be welcoming and some we're going to be farewelling. And then to give you a little bit of a reminder of our prep week session we did last week, just a reminder of some of the At-Large activities that we're going to be presenting during the next two weeks with special mention to the board meetings and the plenary sessions and the actual ICANN week, the conference week, which is week two, and then I'll be passing you over to Jonathan Zuck who is our vice chair of policy, and he's going to be talking about some of the

important messages that we are promoting within At-Large about some of our policy issues. Next slide, please.

Okay, this is one of the key things about our AGM meeting, is that we do have a bit of musical chairs that happens at the end of an ICANN meeting. We're going to be welcoming four new members to the ALAC table, and also to the ALT team, which is the ALAC leadership team.

But our new ALAC members are Sarah Kiden who has come through the ranks of fellowship and through regional leadership and has made it into the ALAC. We really welcome Sarah from AFRALO to our team. We've got Pari Esfandiari who is brand new. She's representing EURALO. Sindy Obed who's from Haiti and she's from LACRALO. And Greg Shatan, no stranger to our policy section already, who's now a member of the ALAC. And the other members that I have noted there are the new leadership team members who have been approved on each of those regions.

We do have some farewells, but these will happen at the wrap up session at the end of the second week, close to the time that we actually have the final board AGM meeting, and that's when our new members take their seats, but it is the time that we actually farewell, for example, longstanding ALAC member Tijani Ben Jemaa from AFRALO and Humberto Carrasco who has also been a member of the ALAC leadership team.

We also lose Bastiaan Goslings from the ALAC table, but he has actually been appointed as the NomCom delegate for EURALO, so he's

not going very far away. And also, Javier Rúa-Jovet who is transferring from the ALAC to the ccNSO council. And in a face-to-face meeting, they'd just be next door, so he's not moving very far away either.

But one of the things that I did want to mention is the color scheme I've got on this particular slide. Just for those who are unfamiliar with our color scheme within At-Large, purple is actually the color for At-Large, and you will notice that for example, on the logo in the top right of the slide, around the ICANN logo is the purple halo, and there are five flares and they're all different colors. Those five colors represent the five regions within At-Large. So that's how we have our At-Large logo, and the five is AFRALO orange, APRALO red, EURALO blue, LACRALO green, and NARALO yellow. I wanted to explain that because not many people would actually realize that the colors on the At-Large logo are quite significant.

Moving on to the next slide, this is just a reminder slide. It's a slide that we used during the prep week last week just to highlight what the different activities are that people—I'm really thrilled, we've got RALO chairs, we've got members of the At-Large community, as well as ALAC members all taking part and leading sessions during our At-Large presentations, and it's really pleasing to see that everybody is involved.

But just to give you a heads up, Ricardo is actually doing his session straight after Jonathan and I have done this introduction, and then Joanna has a session later on, so there's two of those people presenting almost immediately.

But the others, we've got Jonathan and Seun on tomorrow night, and Sébastien, Amrita and Daniel on Thursday night, and Hadia and Olivier are presenting along with Joanna next week. So again, that was just a reminder. Next slide, please.

This is also just a heads up to our community of the activities that I think it's really important if you can try to get to. During week one and two, there are board activities. It's always handy to find out what the board is up to. But I think one of the important sessions that's in there, it's a board and Org one, is the session on Monday, community/board focus on ICANN meetings.

I'm just giving you a little reminder here to my At-Large colleagues that you've been sent a survey today on ICANN meetings. it would be really handy if everyone could fill that in so we have a good understanding and giving a good understanding to the ICANN board about what our feelings are about ICANN meetings, both virtual and face-to-face, whenever that might happen.

On Monday, there's the welcome ceremony. That's pretty important for us as well. But on week two is when we will have our ICANN plenaries, and so I think that these are really important sessions. We'll be involved [inaudible] anyway, so it's really good to go along and support those sessions and put forward your views if you want to.

I also want to mention on week two that there's session on Tuesday remediating universal acceptance. That's been one of our core focus areas as well, so it's good if we could be there for that. And I think I've

used up the time I was going to allocate to myself, because now I want to pass you on to Jonathan Zuck who's going to be giving us some important messages that we need to be taking note of with regards to the next two weeks. Thank you, Jonathan. Take it away.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Maureen. Welcome, everyone, to the first ever virtual annual general meeting. We've had a chance now to experiment with all three types of ICANN meetings in the virtual meeting and improve them incrementally as we go along. So by the time we've really perfected the virtual meeting, perhaps we'll get to meet face-to-face and that'll be exciting.

What I wanted to talk to you about briefly today are our talking points for the session. We have a document that we've circulated, and I imagine the staff can circulate a link in the chat as well. And this is a new practice that we've done for the last few ICANN meetings, which is to circulate some talking points which are positions that the At-Large community have reached consensus about as we've dealt with issues in-between meetings and over the past couple of years, the idea being that if you get the opportunity to talk to someone in the hall, so to speak, you'll have a sense of where the At-Large stands on a particular issue and a little bit of background about that issue to help fuel your discussion.

In other cases, if you're feeling a little bit more brave, if you're in a session and there's an opportunity to make an intervention because it

seems like one of the points that we are trying to stress would be useful into the conversation that's taking place in the Zoom meeting that you're attending, then raise your hand and bring up one of the talking points. Get it on the record.

A lot of the idea behind influencing a slow moving, large organization like this is repetition and having people hear from us the same messages over and over again. And in the case of ICANN, sometimes over the course of years hearing us over and over again say the same things because it keeps things to the front of people's mind, etc.

So we try to circulate these talking points at every meeting, and they're meant to be tailored to the things we think will be discussed at the meeting so that you're best prepared for the meeting itself. So this isn't all of the issues that we deal with, but really just our positions on the issues we think will come up during ICANN 69.

So one of the issues that is a frequent issue right now is DNS abuse. It's a complex issue and one that has a potential to divide the community a little bit and pit the users of the Internet against kind of the service providers of the Internet. I think we've got to constantly be looking for ways to cooperate to improve the situation around DNS abuse, but sometimes Zoom can be a very confrontational environment, unfortunately. But DNS abuse is a serious issue for the individual users, the interests of whom the At-Large is meant to represent.

So our talking points on DNS abuse are that ransomware, including phishing techniques with fake system identifiers, is on the rise. This is

ICANN | 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

in a great report that came out of Microsoft recently called the defense report where they really backed this up with some data in terms of what they've monitored going on in the Internet.

The At-Large is also committed to end user education. During ICANN 67, we made a commitment to make a two-pronged approach to our issues around DNS abuse. One was to pursue policy objectives inside of ICANN and the other is to find an avenue to make use of our huge community to actually educate individual users about how to protect themselves from DNS abuse.

So we're going to start brainstorming in a session later in the meeting to talk about how we're going to educate end users and figure out how we're going to do it.

We're focused mostly on the registries and registrars with high percentages of abuse registrations, which isn't very many of them. A lot of the folks that you'll meet at the meeting this week and next are not the service providers that are the thorniest. Those are the ones that don't show up to the meetings. And how to better enforce the rules over those outliers has really been the focus of the At-Large community.

We support the SSAC recommendations around defining DNS abuse and finding kind of a community-wide cooperative solution to some of the DNS abuse issues.

There's a couple of sessions, there's domain name abuse, everything you want to know, ask or discuss. That's on Monday. There's a plenary

EN

session on DNS abuse on Tuesday, and then as I said, we're going to be doing an end user education session internally as well. Let's scroll down to EPDP and GDPR compliance.

So as many of you know, the Europeans passed something called the General Data Protection Regulation a number of years ago, but really started enforcing it more recently than that, just a couple of years ago. So we had to unfortunately very quickly spin up on the regulation and try to understand it so that we could change the way that we published information about people that registered domain names, the so called WHOIS database.

It's been severely redacted now to the benefit of those registrants, but there are some downside consequences in terms of the people that normally make use of the database. There are some bad people that make use of the database, but it's mostly used by people like law enforcement, cybersecurity researchers, trademark attorneys, etc., that would legitimately use that data to try and quell DNS abuse, lawbreaking, trademark violation, malware, etc., spam protection, all those things folks have used the WHOIS database to try and protect.

So if this topic comes up, it's a complicated one, but we're likely to advise the ICANN board to reject the most recent recommendations from the Expedited PDP working group that were about building a very expensive ticketing system. I think we're likely to recommend that they just build a ticketing system in their existing software which is Salesforce, which they could do much more cheaply than the projected costs associated with building something from scratch.

There's still no clear path for nongovernment actors to get at the data they need to do their jobs, so that conversation is ongoing. And consumer protection has really been the At-Large community priority. Because we're focused on all individual users, the number of users that are not registrants far outnumber the registrants, so really, we are the only voice of the interests of those folks who don't have domain names that just use the Internet for their day to day work. And it's those interests that we seek to protect when we're talking about DNS abuse and access to data about registrations.

Next is human rights. During the transition away from the United States government that took place a number of years ago, where the US government sort of gave up the last thread of their control over ICANN in the so-called IANA transition, we developed a fairly extensive framework of protection for accountability and transparency for the organization, including the creation of something called the empowered community, which almost makes ICANN into a member organization that allows all the groups to have some say over board decisions and budget and some other areas.

As that accountability discussion continued, one of the topics was about creating a human rights impact assessment. In other words, when we enact a policy, do we look at what the implications are of that policy on human rights? And that has been progressing along, but slowly. So we're going to be doing a joint session with the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. The NCSG and the At-Large are getting together to do a session about the human rights impact

assessment, where it is, and whether we can kind of get to a meeting of the minds.

So these talking points are sort of about where there's potential disagreement that we need to start to work out in a session. We support generally the idea of a human rights assessment, but we also think that we need to consider the rights of non-registrant end users as we discussed before, and right now, the human rights impact assessment doesn't take those int consideration because they're consider too big to be in scope.

And the third point is that human rights include more than just privacy and free speech. They also include safety and property. So a lot of things that we find ourselves advocating from a consumer protection standpoint also fall under the United Nations declaration of human rights. So those are just some of the conversations we'll be having there. This joint session, you can see here on the schedule, is Tuesday the 13th at 2:00 PM in Hamburg time. So hopefully, you'll catch that one as well. Down to subsequent procedures, please.

So subsequent procedures is a working group that's been working for a number of years on what the next round of new registrations for new generic top-level domains will look like. It's kind of an esoteric name, but it's basically, what will the new rules be associated with opening up for even more names that come after the dot, like .com, .net. We now have things like .photography and .gallery, and there are many that want to add even more of those top-level domains, and what those rule should look like.

What we're interested with in the At-Large primarily is avoiding downside consequences of it growing too quickly, moving to that program before we're really ready because we don't think the market's demanding it, we think it's more of a supply side demand for this, and so we want to be cautious about entering into a new round.

So in this particular case, we're concerned about having more people involved in the program. The last time the root was opened up for more names in 2012, we had some programs to help those underserved regions with support for the application fees, a mentoring program for applicants, that didn't really work or get used very well. So we want to see improvement to that, so we want to see that applicant support and community priority are things that survive the system a little bit better than they did in 2012.

We remain concerned about abuse of geographic names as well, because a lot of cities and regions around the world are not paying that much attention to what ICANN is doing, and before they know it, their town or their region or their river or something has been registered as a domain name by a commercial enterprise that might seek to later rent it to them or sell it to them for a profit or something like that, and we want to make sure that the rights of indigenous communities and others are preserved in the context of a new round as well.

And finally, in terms of the process running smoothly, there was a lot of money being made by applicants giving up their names to other people, etc., and there's a concern that the system might be gamed

this time around. So we remain concerned that these private auctions that took place in the 2012 round lead to some of this gaming of the system, especially now that people know how they work. So we're hoping to limit access to these private auctions and make everything more public and transparent in any subsequent round. Next slide, please.

Finally, there's going to be a lot of talk, and in fact a survey, about virtual meetings generally. So while it's not really a policy topic, it is something that we find ourselves talking about and that will come up in a number of meetings that will take place over the next two weeks, and in a survey that will be circulated. So we wanted to mention a couple of things.

One is the ICANN board instituted a pilot program to subsidize folks temporarily increasing their Internet bandwidth so that more people participate on Zoom and not just via telephone. So we'll see how that goes, but we're very appreciative of that pilot program.

There's also another pilot taking place which is that a few of the sessions will not only be broadcast over Zoom but they'll be restreamed with about a 30-second delay over YouTube as well, which means that folks that really don't have the bandwidth will be able to watch the visuals of these presentations more efficiently than they could with Zoom. Zoom is kind of a resource hog and YouTube is a much more efficient way to get the information.

So we're going to be letting you know when those sessions are happening and we really hope that you'll go and click on that link and stream the YouTube link and tell your friends to do it, etc., to demonstrate to the organization that the availability of these sessions over YouTube is something that the At-Large community really needs.

So if you're for example just on the phone for this meeting, then I really highly recommend you use the YouTube streaming option to watch the pilot meetings that are going to be restreamed over YouTube, and we'll make sure and let you know that as we go along.

There's some things we still want to work on. We want to see some additional tools to make use of in virtual meetings, including Zoom breakout rooms so that we can have a little bit more intimate brainstorming sessions the way that we do when we're face-to-face. We want to start using Google Jam Boards so that we can do better collaboration online. We want to see use of threaded discussion tools like Loomio or Slack so that we can do better consensus building offline, and then greater use of machine language translation when our great interpretation is not available. So the new interpretation system is amazing, but when it's not available to us, we still want to have a solution. We don't want it to be all or nothing. So those are some of the meetings that we'll be having about virtual meetings and some of the talking points that will be worth bringing up.

Finally, there's universal acceptance. The idea behind universal acceptance is really about websites being able to accommodate all of the new top-level domains and the internationalized domain names,

ICANN | 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

the ones that are done in non-Roman characters like Cyrillic or Arabic, or Chinese.

Right now, there's still a minority of the public databases that accept those non-Roman domain names when you're being asked for your e-mail address, for example, on a website. So there's constant work to go on to get the system upgraded, because there's just a lot of old JavaScript code out there running these webpages that hasn't been updated to accommodate these new longer domain names and the more complex or non-Roman character domain names.

80% of the websites are still noncompliant. It undermines ICANN's credibility for them to be noncompliant, and it must be addressed prior to any new round. That's something that we're pretty focused on as well.

Finally, some other sessions that might be of interest to you. There's community/board focus on ICANN meetings, there's the welcome ceremony on Monday a week from today, there's a public forum on Thursday a week from this Thursday that I think you'll enjoy, and I hope that you'll get a chance to do that.

So that was the talking points that I wanted to go over. I was given ten minutes and I guess I probably took longer than that. I apologize. But I'm happy to take any quick questions if anybody has them. Holly Raiche, please go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: When are we going to talk more about DNS abuse? And the reason I ask, we had a session In Australia about digital platforms, and believe it or not, there was Donna Austin, sounding very aggrieved about how ALAC kind of doesn't understand the business case of the registrars and they're being picked on. Is there a way that we can slightly rephrase that? Because part of the problem with DNS abuse is we actually don't know who the bad actors are and put a bit of pressure on Compliance to say we actually want these people identified and shamed. Can we stress that a bit? Because let's just say I caught a lot of, "We're being aggrieved by the ALAC pressure on us poor industry." Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Thanks, Holly. That's a good point. And I think that the contracted parties have a little bit of a legitimate argument to make in that regard, because many of them are working very hard on DNS abuse, and the worst actors are in fact not the ones that we talk to every day, the ones that are involved in meetings, the ones that are involved in policy. And I think there's a concern that as we try to pile constraints and rules on them, we're simply increasing their costs without really addressing the problem, because the people that are breaking the rules now are just going to break the new rules. And I think that's something that is a legitimate concern.

So we have, in some of our sessions previously, tried to find ways to focus in on those bad actors, identifying them and building, for example, DNS abuse thresholds, like percentage of abusive

registrations in a registry that would be well beyond the norm for the industry and would really just identify these outliers. And as you say, one of the things we've also asked for is for earlier in the process for ICANN to identify the bad actors so that individual users could decide not to work with those domains as well.

And some of the reputational databases are perhaps a little bit too aggressive about just deciding to block an entire domain. So that's complicated as well. It gets a little bit like credit agencies are in terms of their aggressiveness. So it's not a simple issue but we do want to see more transparency from Compliance earlier in the process. Really early in the process, they're trying to be cooperative and work it out with a registry and a registrar, but later in the process, it would be good to know who these outliers are before ICANN is driven to disaccredit them. Because the reality is that takes quite a long time and a lot of folks could be abused in the medium term.

So it is a complicated issue. I will say that for this meeting in particular, we're going to really try to stress what we're going to try to do about DNS abuse, because we promised to do it in ICANN 67 six months ago and I think we really want to get launched this end user education campaign, because the real solution to this is for folks not to click on bad links in emails or download bad attachments, to recognize phishing scams when they come. The more that we can empower individual users to protect themselves, the less that we'll have to make it into a kind of institutional burden to try and figure those things out in an automated way, which is much more difficult.

ICANN COMMUNITY DAYS 69

So I hope that answers your question, but yes, there are things we're trying to do, both on a policy side, but we want to try and stress, I think this meeting, take it on and say we're going to try to be part of this solution as well.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. Good to be here, wherever here is. Just two quick points to add to the last point that Holly raised. One, to some extent, the contracted parties brought this on themselves in the sense that a group of them came up with their own definition of DNS abuse which is an extremely narrow and technically oriented definition which excludes many of the types of DNS abuse that are actually of the greatest concern. Which is not to say that the ones they did identify are not concerns, they certainly are.

And secondly, there's a long piece by Reg Levy, I believe, in CircleID, which probably summarizes many of the same talking points that Donna Austin showed up and delivered orally. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg. Abdulkarim, you're next.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. I just wanted to mention that identifying the bad guys might be a very difficult task because definitely, the bad guys, it's not like if you identify one, that's all. There are so many bad guys out there, and it's extremely difficult to identify.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But Abdulkarim, it's not the criminals that we want to identify. Obviously, we want to identify them too, which is why we continue to press for the right people to gain access to registrant data. I just mean the very few, very small number of bad registrars and registries. That's a very small number. The great majority of them would not fall in the category of bad. We might want them to do more than they're doing, but they are doing, they are trying.

There's a few that aren't trying, and that number is actually very small. I think it's fewer than ten. If you look at the DAAR report, which his the domain abuse reporting tool that ICANN puts out, you can see that they exist but they're not named. So those are the names that we're trying to get, not the name of every cybercriminal. That's the work of someone else. It's just that if there's a registrar that is allowing way too much domain abuse to happen, it would be good for indivudals end users to know who they are and maybe steer their business elsewhere. That's the idea.

Okay, I'm being told that I'm eating into the next session, so what I'd like to do is introduce that session. Thanks for your questions, and feel free to e-mail me if you want to talk more about the talking points.

The next session, we called it a thresher session, and a thresher is a machine that separates wheat from chaff on a farm, the useful from the un-useful on a field on a farm. So we're talking about a recommendation thresher, because what's happened in the last number of years is that a number of different groups, review teams and working groups have come out with recommendations for changes and reforms to the way that ICANN does its business.

So now there are a few hundred of these recommendations. Some of them contradict each other, some of them have become more relevant than others because overtaken by events, we sometimes say, and so there's going to be, before too long, a communitywide effort to look at the recommendations and see which ones should be let go, which ones should be prioritized higher and worked on first, for example before a new round, and that process is going to happen in the community. So what we want to do as the At-Large community is start the process ourselves so that when the communitywide process launches, we've done our homework and we kind of know what our priorities are.

So it's going to be a long conversation that we're just starting today, but we wanted to get that conversation going and get that brainstorming going within the At-Large community. So without further ado, I'd like to introduce Ricardo Holmquist who is the chair of

the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group that deals with many of these types of recommendations who's going to moderate a session on all these recommendations we deal with and begin the discussion, the brainstorm about what a framework for understanding them and prioritizing them might look like.

So without further ado, Ricardo, please take it away.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Jonathan. The [areas], as Jonathan mentioned, is to look at the different recommendations we're having in each of the different reviews, working groups, comments, even in the multi-stakeholder process that's being handled by ICANN. Next slide, please.

As you can see, there were about 100-something recommendations from Work Stream 2. About 35 recommendations from CCT RT, 35 from SSR2, multi-stakeholder model are about five, ten recommendations, but [it varies] if it was next steps or original ones. ATRT2 were 46 recommendations, ATRT3 were five recommendation, RPM, the recommendations came in seven procedures. Next slide, please.

For example, the Work Stream 2 have over 100 recommendations, but most of these recommendations were approved by the board, were already implemented. Some still need to be implemented in the different recommendations, in the different working groups. For example, ATRT3 is in the way, approved by the board but not yet implemented.

Some of these implementations, we didn't like the way they were. So in the next review, we asked for some kind of recommendations. But without [inaudible]. The other thing is, why this thresher is coming our way is sometimes we make recommendations in line of, for example, more transparency. More transparency means ten years ago more reviews, independent reviews, every SO, AC, ICANN needs to be reviewed, and very frequently, because we felt maybe ten years ago that it needs to be done very frequently. And we find out in this year and a half, two years ago, that we are doing so many reviews that we didn't have time to review, to recommend, to look at it because in our side, the At-Large side, we are volunteers and we don't have time to do a review every two years and see what's happening.

So we might go back and say, hey, we might do this instead of two years or three years every five years, we're still very transparent, we're still looking at what's happening in the other SOs, ACs, different parts of ICANN, and we'll have the time to do the reviews. So the idea is to look at that. Next slide, please. There's one more. No?

[I feel like in the voice program or something like that where I have two coaches asking me to sing Bohemian Rhapsody or] [inaudible] at the last days, and I feel like I didn't sing even the words of the song. But fortunately, these two coaches give me [a rock band,] so I went through this and the first one of this rock band is Cheryl Langdon-Orr from the ATRT3. We'll have Greg Shatan and Jonathan Zuck, Laurin— sorry, Laurin, for not having your last name—speaking about the different reviews and what you might think is the ideal for ALAC, the

ideal for At-Large, the ideal for the end user, for this to be the high priority.

Sometimes, we're immersed in a working group, we're dealing with GNSO and their different IPC, BC, Noncommercial Stakeholder Group, and all these groups are—GAC, and we find a consensus among this working group. But it's not necessarily the best for us as end users. It's not our priority sometimes. And the idea is to hear them to find out what they think is the real priority for us as end users in this process. So without further ado, please, Cheryl, go ahead with the ATRT3 recommendations. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Ricardo. I just want to very briefly set the scene before we jump into what ATRT3 recommended. Next slide, please. With this—and you've just had a good introduction to what the problem is from Ricardo—what we discovered along with a number of other groups in ICANN, including the MSSI group and indeed the board who are deeply concerned about all these issues is that in layman's language, there are a great number of recommendations, many of them with many sub-parts, that have come from several sources over several years, and some are not yet or not at all implemented. And Ricardo's given you the scary numbers associated with that.

There are various limitations or resourcing issues associated with the implementation. Ricardo mentioned the human resource issues. There are many resources, not only monetary and budget provision

ones. Volunteer aspect, the work aspect, and there's a queueing aspect which we also need to look into as we consider all this prioritization and what we are going to be threshing.

There's also a great number of these recommendations, some of which are fully implemented, some partially implemented, some haven't been implemented at all yet—notice there's a theme running through what I'm going to be saying that—that, to be honest, have been utterly and totally overshadowed or superseded by what's come to pass since they were made. And there are many recommendations which, whilst they're yet to be implemented, we really cannot now work out what the intent was, what the problem was they were trying to solve, what the outcome was they were aiming for. And that in itself has a real problem when it comes to how we can possibly measure success of such implementation. And of course, there's a whole heap of them that are just no longer relevant in today's ICANN. Next slide, please.

ATRT3 made some fairly significant inroads into discussing and considering all of these issues and indeed many more. And to that end, ATRT3 recommended, under our section ten, which all the gory details are in the slides and you'll have those later so you can click the links and go to the original documentation, but basically, we recommended particular guidance for ICANN Org saying that what they needed to do, in our view, was to create a community-led entity that needed to be tasked with operating some form of prioritization process for all of

these recommendations. Those in the past, those current, and those in the future.

And with that, we also went to particular lengths, a great deal of discussion and interaction with the ICANN community, to look at what could formulate a good set of guidelines and principles, including how to create it and what rules of engagement it should follow for such a community-led sifting and sorting tool.

Now, we're here in a thresher meeting, but the last slide, I just wanted to introduce you to a little concept I'm particularly fond of, and that is, of course, my favorite term, triage. Triage of course is a word nowadays mainly associated with [nurses,] but it does come from very early use which I've outlined here.

And to that end, if we can stop now with the slides and just go back to your agenda for now, I just wanted to suggest to you that as we're moving forward, what ATRT3 did was [set out an option, an opportunity] to be managed in a community-led—is perhaps preparing ourselves to be fully participant and quite expert in such a process. We have tools, some of which have already been mentioned, that if we use things like the jam board, things like even the Zoom whiteboards where we can agree on prioritization of what we must do, what we should do, what we could do, we could use colored buckets, numbers, we can do all sorts of things to sift and sort and to agree upon a way forward will be a huge benefit to all. That's it from me. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I don't know if we can start the conversation with Jonathan about the CCT RT recommendations. I understand Jonathan doesn't have a presentation. If we can have on the screen the CCT RT recommendations produced that we have in the spreadsheet, that will be great. Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Ricardo. I had the great pleasure to chair the first ever review of the new gTLD program to look at the extent to which it increased choice, competition and consumer trust in the DNS. We also were tasked with looking at the application process and the safeguards that were put in place last-minute in the 2012 round.

It turns out it was quite a bit remit that we had a look at, and in many ways, we had to look at it very quickly compared to the speed at which things were moving in that round. So not even all the names were delegated at the time that we were doing this CCT review.

But we did our best to look at what was happening in the market at the time to see if there was an increase in competition. Certainly, we saw a big increase in competition in the speculative market in that there were a greater percentage of new domain names being registered, etc. About a third of the new registrations came from these new gTLDs.

So there was some competition and some choice, but the two big things that we discovered through our process, if you will, is that there was a real lack of data to go on, a lack of availability of data to really understand the competitive landscape and the impact that the new gTLD program had on competition, and we saw pretty much a complete failure of the safeguards that have been put in place.

So a lot of the DNS abuse that had previously existed in the legacy TLDs simply shifted into the new ones, which is the opposite of what should have happened if these new safeguards in the new gTLD program had been effective.

So I would say that of the 40 recommendations that the CCT review team made, the two biggest buckets were the araciality of more data going forward for ICANN to make data a more significant part of all policy development an evaluation, and there was also some findings with respect to DNS abuse and some of the things we might want to do going forward to quell that and deal differently with public interest commitments and other things.

So we created some 40 recommendations, and to add to the complexity, not all of the recommendations we made were things that could be immediately implemented by the board and instead were meant to be things that the board directed others within the organization to look at or execute on. So there's a high dispersion of the recommendations from the CCT review.

So there's the beginning of some of the implementation that's taking place, but some of that is still very initial. The recommendation one about making data a part of ICANN's culture and really identifying an office or a person or someone like that to be in charge of data availability for policy development and program evaluation is still in its early stages. So some of the things that we thought were high priorities that we thought should take place right away have not come close to the timelines that we had laid out, but of course, we laid them out without regard to the other hundreds of recommendations that were on the table, but we still think are a very high priority that ICANN needs to ensure that more data is available.

And there are some things that have been done with the marketplace indicators for example to allow more data, Contractual Compliance has made more granular data available but needs to make even more granular data available. But this idea if really creating a data-driven culture inside ICANN is something that I think still required a lot of work and is something that should really happen and be real before we really launch into another round of TLDs or make another significant change to the organization, because any change we make should have a measurable reason, outcome, because as Cheryl said, during the ATRT3 review, there are a lot of things where we had lost track of why a recommendation was even being made.

So the extent to which a measurable outcome can be identified for a recommendation and then measured later to see if the recommendation worked to obtain its desired outcome seems even

more important in the context of identifying the success and failure of individual recommendations.

So we at the CCT review team still believe that most of the recommendations have been not implemented or underimplemented thus far, and still remain a priority for ICANN going forward. So certainly, in a thresher operation that's communitywide, I can imagine that the members of the CCT review team will be there to try and fight for those recommendations to remain a high priority among the many others that are going to be discussed. I'm happy to answer questions about them as well, and it looks like there are some hands up. So I will go ahead and take those questions if they're aimed at me. Holly, go ahead.

HOLLY RAICHE: One thing from the CCT report which was difficult to measure but considering our constituency, maybe we can think about, is how do you measure consumer trust. That was the third item in the CCT. But measuring trust is a hard thing, and I don't think we've sat down— we've tried years and years ago. I don't think we've tried since, and I don't know how you'd measure it.

So before we get the statistics, should we be thinking about, are there some kind of indices that we haven't thought about that maybe would help that particular rubric that we just haven't addressed very well? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. I think I'll get in trouble if I allow the conversation to drill too deeply into the CCT recommendations themselves.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Because we're trying to do a prioritization effort. But to answer your question, we did make some recommendations about some potential ways that we could measure trust by for example measuring commercial activity by users. In other words, if it's a domain on which users are willing to give their credit card information or their other PII, medical information, banking information, etc., then that's at least a signal of trust.

We did a survey on consumer trust where we just asked people, do you trust these TLDs? And that's a little bit tough question to answer, especially at the time we did it, but if we can look at their behavior, we might be able to derive trust.

And the other thing that we started to recommend and that we did ourselves was we came up with another category of trustworthiness. In other words, were there some indications of whether or not a particular domain should be trusted? That became part of our policy recommendation as well. But there's lots of work on the implementation side of our recommendations to be done, but my guess is that we shouldn't drill into too deep a detail on that today

because we're trying to look at this thing holistically to the extent possible.

I think there's no more questions, so Ricardo, thanks for the opportunity to make the pitch for the CCT recommendations that we believe are still relevant today and don't fall into the category of having lost relevance that Cheryl mentioned. So thanks for the opportunity to speak on them today. Back to you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Jonathan. Next, we have Alan Greenberg for the WHOIS recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG: The WHOIS is an interesting area. Of course, that's an obsolete term now, so we can't even talk about that. The RDS recommendations, in today's lingo, are an interesting one. The EPDP was put together to create a set of recommendations, the first of which was to make ICANN and its contracted parties legal.

The European community enacted legislation in 2016. It wasn't the first privacy legislation that they had enacted, but it was the first privacy legislation they had enacted with very severe penalties for not following the rules. Moreover, there were extraterritorial implications in the law which said that they apply to entities outside of the European community as well.

EN

So, suddenly, we were stuck in a position where our current WHOIS policies, which said you must display all sorts of information, were clearly going to be illegal for some classes of registrants—that is natural persons, people—and we had to do something quickly, and there wasn't much time, and certainly wasn't enough time for what would have been considered a standard policy development process.

At the time, we had a PDP going on the RDS system which had been going on for several years and was not making any headway at all. The board has the right, under our contracts, to enact the policy without the GNSO, but it can only do so for a period of one year. And that's what happened. The board enacted a new temporary rule for our contract, temporary specification, which said how the contracted parties could handle registrant data. The GNSO had the task of putting together a group that would replace that temporary policy with a new one, and that was the genesis of the EPDP.

The intent was that in the one year or so that the EPDP had, we would replace the temporary specification and given that we we're now going to be redacting huge amounts of information, come up with a process by which the information could be released to those with a need to know.

Well, in the first year or so, we got the first part done. We came up with a policy replacing the temporary specification. Not clear it was a really good policy, certainly from a consumer protection point of view, but it was a policy.

ICANN COMMUNITY DAYS 69

We then spent the next year and a half working on—let's stop there for a moment. So we now had a whole set of recommendations to implement. Despite the discussion that we were having in this kind of meeting, it is really no issue of whether we do these or not. e have to do this because the only way we can continue to do business and make sure that we're not violating the laws.

So the next part was how do we make information available to those with a need to know, given the fact that we were now redacting a vast amount of information? And in fact, under the policy we enacted, we are redacting far more information than is required by law. And therefore, there's even more information which people might have a need to know, that's not illegal, but our policy essentially redacts the information and hides it.

We have now finished that process and we came up with a set of recommendations—and I put that word in quotations—to create what is called a system for access and disclosure. The problem is, although each of the pieces of it made sense, when we looked at the whole package, it wasn't what we imagined.

We and a lot of other groups within the EPDP, specifically the GAC, the SSAC and a number of the business and intellectual property groups in GNSO agreed to things assuming other things would happen, and they didn't. So we're now in a curious position of we have recommendations that the GNSO has approved and sent to the board, and curiously, when you look at the content of this session, the ALAC is recommending, don't implement them, because although they are

recommendations, we do not believe that the world and the community and ICANN would be well served by implementing those recommendations.

So I guess we're fully complaint with the intent of prioritization. We're saying lower the priority of the recommendations that we helped put forward. That being said, we are stuck in a position of our policies are redacting huge amounts of information and we have no practical way of making that information available to those who need it, which includes a very large group of cybersecurity people who are trying to protect our users, intellectual property people who are trying to protect trademarks.

And although protecting trademarks sounds like a rather mercenary thing, in many cases, protecting trademarks really becomes stopping fraud because if you're protecting the trademark of a company, then someone who is masquerading as that company or pretending to be that company may well be attempting to defraud people who wander into that site by accident.

So we're stuck in a hard place right now. We don't have recommendations we feel will address a real problem, and we have recommendations that we don't feel will serve the needs, certainly, of our communities. So, a rather curious situation that I don't think has been paralleled anywhere else in the ICANN world. That's all I have. I see no hands.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Alan, for your presentation. Can we go ahead with Greg Shatan and the rights protection mechanism recommendations? Very briefly, Greg, please. The idea is to give us a picture of the recommendations that are really in the mind of an end user. Thank you very much.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Ricardo. As you can see, I'm here on the beach with Alan and it's good to be here. The rights protection mechanisms working group—or I should say the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs PDP Working Group—has been working on its recommendations for about five years now, and the second iteration of its report is ripe.

The working group reviewed policies relating to the URS, which is a rapid review system for trademark challenges to domain names, as well as the trademark claims and sunrise program, and the trademark clearinghouse which serves both of those programs. Five years, of course, is only phase one of the working group. Phase two will consider the granddaddy of the rights protection mechanisms, which is the UDRP, Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Mechanism. So now we know what we're doing for the next five years.

So I would say that the recommendations by and large are incremental in nature. There were, of course, many recommendations that were considered, or I should say potential recommendations that

were more revolutionary. But in the end, the proposals that are actually being made are quite evolutionary.

From the point of view of the end user, I think one that is of particular interest, or at least if you are potentially registering domain names, the trademark claims notice that comes up if you are applying for a trademark in one of the new gTLDs, at least during sunrise or during the early days, and in some cases, throughout the lifetime of that TLD, that trademark claims notice is written ten years ago, and is rather lawyerly and somewhat oppressive or scary and not as informative as it should be, so it is going to be rewritten so that it is both more informative and less intimidating.

There are also changes afoot in the scope of the trademark clearinghouse, which contains things other than trademarks right now, and that will be tightened up, I think, going forward. I think, again, from the end user perspective, as Alan mentioned, trademark protection has secondary gains, I think, for end users. In addition to the abuse issue, there is also, generally speaking, consumer safety, consumer trust as trademarks. The intention of them is to identify a particular resource or source of products or services and not to confuse it with others. So trying to avoid that end user confusion is critical in this whole process. At the same time, recognizing that there are competing rights and concerns that are involved.

So the group right now is very close to the end of its work in reviewing all of the comments and proposals and coming out with its next report, so we should watch this space. Or rather, I should say that the

process is working through. So I think we'll see several meetings devoted to this subject at the ICANN 69 we're all virtually attending. I'll see if there are any questions. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: No question, nor hand raised. Thank you very much, Greg, for recommendations. We can go ahead with Marita Moll and the multi-stakeholder model recommendations. Thank you, Marita.

MARITA MOLL: I'm going to speak only a few minutes on the multi-stakeholder model. It is coming up again next on the 19th, I think, the beginning of the AGM when we are going to be speaking to the board. What I'd like to say here, because we're talking about prioritization, let's remember that prioritization can sometimes lead us into not the best spot because it tends to make us look at the things that are the easiest to do. [inaudible] we can handle by managing time and resources, reaching for the easy button—although none of these things are easy.

We have to remember that the tough things, the big picture things also need to be prioritized. They need to stay on the agenda. We have that issue precisely in the multi-stakeholder model where we started out with 21 issues. We boiled down to six issues, and in the most recent version, we were asked to pick the ones we were going to prioritize, that are going to be the low hanging fruit, is how it was framed, and I like the way that is said. Which ones can we access more easily, which ones are more accessible?

But now that's turned a little bit on its head in the most recent request for comments in that we had three top issues out of those six that we prioritized and there were three very important issues on the bottom. Let me tell you what they are. Complexity, culture trust and silos, and roles and responsibilities. Huge issues. And they need to stay on that agenda.

So we have actually very strongly worded in our comment on this that we want to see all these things on the agenda and a timeline over the current ICANN five-year strategic plan to be dealing with all of these issues. And not just the prioritization of work, not just the precision and scoping. These things are all extremely important, and there are bits and pieces in ICANN that are working on bits and pieces of them, which is why they are maybe a little bit more accessible than something like culture, trust and silos.

But the big message is let's not drop these things or put them on the back burner somewhere, because that will not turn into an evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. It'll just be a more efficient model of what we currently have.

That's my major message here. I know we are running close on time, so maybe there's a question or two. I could say a whole lot more, but I'm happy to leave it there, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Marita. I don't see any hand raised. I think from your presentation that you make three—maybe we can [inaudible] the

culture and siloes—sorry, I missed the one—the culture and siloes for [some of the responsibilities.] I missed one of them. You mentioned three.

MARITA MOLL: Complexity, culture, trust and siloes, and roles and responsibilities are the bottom three issues that are still on that list from the original 21.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Marita. No hands raised. We still have one more of the rock band, it's Laurin Weissinger to talk about the SSR2 review. Please go ahead if you're still here. Sorry for taking that long.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Hello everyone. So yes, SSR2 I think is a bit of a special one because the final report is actually not out. This was planned for earlier this year, but thanks to the little pandemic we're dealing with, things have been delayed because our face-to-faces had to be canned and it had been difficult to kind of work on all of that. That means things are still somewhat moving when it comes to SSR2.

SSR2 has quite a few recommendations itself. We also, by the way, looked at the SSR1 recommendations and we're going in the direction of also seeing that we as a team—not to talk about my own point of view as much but more about the time view, kind of reporting this out, team is not particularly happy with a lot of those that were

implemented and if we're at a point where we can say, "Yes, this is fine" and move on.

So this is, I think, on its own a big problem and I think one that a lot of other review teams share. The next thing is the real two big parts I see personally is, one, on kind of ICANN internal security, there are a lot of recommendations on risk management, organizing things according to industry standards, things like ISO and so on. The other big part [is really focused on] DNS abuse. So things like we have actually discussed in the last hour or so about how can we deal with the kind of worst of the worst when it comes to allowing abuse in their portfolios and stuff like that.

The problem we see, or the problem that also appeared during the public comment, is that on the one hand, you are asked for specificity, on the other hand, you don't want to be too specific either. So the problem that emerges is that you end up with a lot of text, and we're still working on kind of cutting down the recommendations. And this is on a personal note, I'm also in favor of having fewer but more impactful.

However, a bit of a meta point as well—and this is from the SSR2 perspective—recommendations were not made in the draft report— and not in the final report that will be coming soon—just for fun. They were made because an issue was identified and that the team believed is an issue that needs to be dealt with. And I think that is shared by a lot of other review teams as well.

So I think prioritization will be difficult because there's just a lot of issues that are going around, a lot of issues that need to be addressed. So now, obviously, we're not sure how things will continue with SSR reviews because of the ATRT approach to how to continue with these kinds of reviews.

So keeping in mind that we are not fully done yet, I believe that quite a few things, particularly in areas of abuse and anti-abuse techniques, as well as kind of Contractual Compliance and the contracts, and all the things that essentially come with trying to solve this does create a lot of recommendations. That'll be important going forward. It's a key issue that has to be dealt with as ALAC itself kind of identified as well. And the internal ICANN security issues also need dealing with.

And last but not least—and this is [inaudible] CCT as we recognize in the report, there are a lot of questions about essentially transparency and what is being measured and how.

So I think these are all extremely relevant ones, and as I said, just dealing with those few alone will require dealing with a lot of problems and a lot of policy issues, and therefore, these three topics alone have a lot of recommendations attached.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, and thank you for coming to do this overview of the recommendations. We have a question from Holly Raiche. Please go ahead.

ICANN 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Ricardo. I'm a bit puzzled by all of these recommendations. Some of them look very much like ICANN security, and I would have thought that ICANN Org would be looking at these issues separate from the other kinds of issues that we're talking about, DNS abuse and so forth, which is more of an outreach, the rules of ICANN, if you will, in regards registries, registrars, and the sorts of impacts they have globally as opposed to internally. Have you thought of at least separating out some of these recommendations that really are ICANN Org and the other ones that impact on end users, or had you already done that? Thank you.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: So, Holly, what we're doing is we're going by topic area. Essentially, there is a section that is very much focused on the issues you've just described, like internal risk management, internal compliance to relevant standards, stuff like that, and there is another section that essentially deals with kind of the whole abuse area and whole lot of stuff that has to do with, for example, dealing or treating the few but very present bad actors in the space, which depending on how you see it, would involve changes to how Compliance works, changes to contracts, and a variety of other things.

So yeah, we're breaking it up as far as is possible. And when the final report comes out, you will see that division very clearly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Holly. Thank you, Laurin. I have Sébastien Bachollet next on the queue. Go ahead, Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Ricardo. I am not talking about any of those reviews, but I wanted to add one point, is that Cheryl gave a very good presentation of one of the recommendations made by ATRT3, but as you all listed all the items, we need to take into account there are four other recommendations in ATRT3. It's why I think it's important to have that in mind, because those recommendations are very … We just in ATRT3 worked to have few recommendations, but what we think is important, even if we rank them, and there are consequences of what ATRT3 is putting with the question of how to organize reviews in the future, how to organize the implementation, how to organize public consultation and so on and so for. Therefore, I think it's important to take that also into account.

And as a matter of fact, each one of the people who talked here were coming with [his] part of the cake with saying it's the best part of the cake, we have to take all. And the difficulty we will face within At-Large, but also within ICANN in general, is that every one of us will maybe wish to push their own part of the cake because they were participating in that. That's where it's difficult to organize this work. But I think it's very important to have that.

EN

Yes, I know, Cheryl. No problem. You were supposed to talk—but I think as all the others listed all their recommendations, or each and every topic, I think it was important to put in the table that ATRT3 put five recommendations in total. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Yes, that's our next exercise. Thank you for introducing it in a different way than was supposed to happen. The idea is to have a conversation now as to … We have 91 participants in this meeting. The idea is to look at the different recommendations of the ATRT3. We're going to begin with this. I think it's one of the newest working groups' recommendations.

So the idea is to go there and have some kind of interaction. if we don't have questions on the queue, the idea is to go ahead and with these, one, two, three as the prioritization for us as end users, the idea is to go there and try to feel what is the priority for us, for the end users. So we can start [a poll] with each one of these five recommendations of the ATRT3, and for all of us to give their view of what is—if it's a high priority, a medium priority, a low priority. We have right now on screen the At-Large [poll one,] and this is supposed to be for the assessment of periodic, nonspecific and organizational reviews.

We're sorry for not having all the text on the screen. The idea is, for ATRT3 that you have on the screen for recommendation 1, what do you feel is the priority for the end users? The high, the medium or the

YESIM NAZLAR: Ricardo, 34% of our participants have voted, and I'm just going to share the results with you right now.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Yesim. It seems it's a medium priority for us on the first one of the recommendations, the assessment of periodic, nonspecific and organizational reviews. Thank you for filling this in the screen. We can go with Jonathan. The idea here is to have a discussion, not just to have these five polls and that's all. And we can't do this for the 200 recommendations we already have. Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Ricardo. I guess I want to make one important point. We as the At-Large community are focused on trying to identify in advance the interest of individual Internet users. So that is the challenge for us and that is our remit. But I think that what might overcomplicate our lives a little bit if we're focused on evaluating each of these organizational recommendations in terms of their impact on individual end users. Instead, we have to think of them as what their impact is on our ability to advance the interests of individual end

EN

users. So it's a little bit of a subtle difference when it comes to organizational reform.

When it comes to policy, we're very often talking about the actual interests of end users to have law enforcement get easy access to registrant data for example. But in the case of institutional reform like this, we have to take a step back and look at the implications of this particular recommendation on our ability to advance those interests. In other words, our standing within the organization, our ability to participate within the operations of ICANN. That's got to be our criteria, not the usual indivudals end user formula.

So for this recommendation as an example, the reason for the recommendation has to do with the fact that there's been so many review teams that have been seated that have produced so many recommendations that then need to be commented on that have resulted in the problem that we now have, that we have new recommendations before the old recommendations have even been fully implemented, and our volunteers that are trying to evaluate all this are overwhelmed.

So that's a situation that's somewhat unique to us because we're purely a volunteer community in the At-Large. So this problem of volunteer burnout and the need for capacity building and things like that is somewhat unique to the At-Large. So this particular recommendation, I think, would be a high priority for us because it's about spacing out these reviews a little bit more so that they're better able to be managed and it decreases the demands on us as a

ICANN 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

community to be constantly addressing organizational reform when we need to be doing policy to help individual end users.

So it's just an example. not to change your vote or anything like that, but the way to think about some of these institutional reforms has more to do with us as an organization than it does with individual end users directly. I hope that's helpful.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Jonathan. We also have Sébastien in the question.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Totally agree with Jonathan, and also with the comment made by Marita. I don't think we have discussed this recommendation in detail and had a chance to make really considered vote.

Democracy is good, but democracy not informed is not good at all. I really feel that this is one of the most important items we have as At-Large to push, the four representatives within the ATRT3 worked very hard to have this recommendation set up in this way. If we are not supported by you, we are dead.

I really feel that the way we are doing must be more [with better light] on what we are talking about. Just a title not deserve the reality of the situation. Therefore, I really feel that we need to find another way to have this input. And if we don't have the discussion, we will not know what is inside.

I know there's five from ATRT, but I'm not sure that I know the other ones, and the title will not be enough. Thank you very much.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Sébastien. Alan, you're next. Please go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to comment something Jonathan said when he was commenting on why it's important for us to work on these institutional reviews and some of those issues. And it very much comes down to the concept of ICANN's credibility.

If ICANN can't essentially stand up and say it is a legitimate organization and is doing things properly, then we're dead in the water. The positions we take on behalf of ICANN don't have a lot of merit. And that's one of the reason we've participated actively in some of these things and I think need to continue to do that. It's not policy within ICANN, but it's ICANN's credibility which is at stake, and that's absolutely crucial to any of the other work that we're doing having an effect. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Alan. No more hands so far. The idea of the exercise is, as [inaudible] mentioned in the chat, is to have a chatter to try to find out where do we begin, where do we start the conversation. It's not here. Definitely not here. We only have four minutes more for this conversation and we can't go ahead and look at all these

recommendations. The idea was to start, to put the seed on the head of each of the participants here to have this conversation, to look at this enormous quantity of recommendations and to find out what's really important for us, what our priorities must be as end users of At-Large.

And of course, the idea is to end up with next steps for this. I understand there is no presentation for each of these recommendations so we can do a totally informed vote or a poll. The idea, as I mentioned, is to have some kind of interaction. We don't have better tools than the ones we are using. We might have another presenter with a [inaudible.] So the idea is to do these four polls and it'll help with the next steps. And the idea is to see you all on the OFB working group from now on and try to discuss why we have so many recommendations and what can we do and see all the things we can do on the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group.

Thank you very much, we can go ahead with the second poll, please. This is for the prioritization and rationalization of activities, policies and recommendations of the ATRT2.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Ricardo, I am sorry. [inaudible] the one who was presented, not the one we didn't discuss about. Just don't start with the one we didn't discuss. And even I introduced them just shortly at the end, but that's not fair enough. We need to have something—some part [where there's discussion that then talk about CCT RT and so forth.] Then

please, I really feel we are going in the wrong direction here with those elements which were not presented. Sorry.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Sorry, Sébastien. Yes, we don't have a presentation of each of them. We didn't make any presentation of the different recommendations. Cheryl just mentioned one of the ATRT3. CCT RT have 40-something recommendations. Jonathan just mentioned few of them for security and stability review. Laurin just mentioned something, but it's about a bunch of recommendations. And we don't go deeper with the Work Stream 2 which has more than 100 recommendations.

And yes, the idea is to have a temperature of the room and start this real conversation on the OFB working group from now on. Sorry for that. We have Cheryl in the queue, and Holly. If you don't mind, we ended with this poll and go ahead with these three hands. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Ricardo. And I think we've only got probably a few more minutes left on today's call, and I think it's important for us to recognize that this is just an exercise. It's a method—in fact, the only one we can do with the limitation of the Zoom tool we're using—well, sorry, only one of. There is another one. So perhaps, Ricardo, it could be useful for Alp to bring up the demonstration of using the Zoom whiteboard.

ICANN | 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

But what we really wanted to try and get everyone to think about is discussion obviously has to go on in groups, we have to find a way of doing the consensus building. There are a number of tools, the jam board which is on the ICANN Org's approved list is one of them, it's just not able to be demonstrated in today's session. Another one is [inaudible]. We could look at that intersessionally. They're basically the same sort of thing in a virtual format to getting sticky labels and putting them on a whiteboard, seeing where clusters are and seeing what trends there are.

So there's a bunch of ways we can do this, asynchronously and fully informed. This is just an exercise. So try not to take it too seriously, but do pay attention to it. Sorry, Ricardo. Back to you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Cheryl. I have Holly, and yes, this is the last poll we're going to do. We only have eight minutes left for this session. We'll have about five minutes from one of the members of the staff, Alperen Eken, that will show off, as Cheryl mentioned, the whiteboard.

[inaudible] unfortunately was not available to be uses for this presentation. But it can be used, also we understand, for working groups. So please go ahead, Holly, and then Yesim, quickly give us the results of the poll. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Ricardo. My suggestion would be that we look at this list offline, after the meeting, and we all have a chance to think through all these things and then just set aside a special meeting so we can set priorities. Because nobody can actually look at the list now. We can't even scroll down to see what's on the list. I just don't think we can do anything meaningful in about three minutes. But it's an important issue and I'd like to see this list and have time to consider it myself and come up with some priorities and then have a meeting to discuss that. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Holly. Yeah, that's the idea, to share this list of recommendations and to think about it. The idea of the exercise was, as I mentioned before, to put [inaudible] each of you and we have to do some prioritization of this because about 200 recommendations are too many to work. We need to focus, we need to see what's really important for us as end users, as I mentioned.

[In some working groups, we reached a consensus, all of us SOs and ACs,] but it's not necessarily our priorities. The priority we see in the room is the priority we see for ICANN, but it's not necessarily our priority as end user.

So I have no other hands. Thank you very much. Next we have Alp showing us very briefly how to use the whiteboard. The idea here is to show us a tool that can be used in the working groups as we go virtual, and not to have a full course of this tool. Thank you very much.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thank you, Ricardo.

YESIM NAZLAR: I'm sorry for interrupting, shall we just end the poll and share the results before we move on to your section?

ALPEREN EKEN: Yes, go ahead, please.

YESIM NAZLAR: Okay. I'm sorry. So this is the result for the current poll that we were displaying. Back over to you, Alperen.

ALPEREN EKEN: Thank you, Yesim. Now I am going to share my screen and PowerPoint. Hello everyone. This is the recommendation thresher session. As stated in the title, it is, where do we begin? It was a setting the scene exercise.

In ICANN, we have lots of—maybe not too many, but we have a couple of tools that are useful for collaboration and brainstorming. One of them is Zoom whiteboard. The Zoom whiteboard can be used collaboratively. I tried it myself a couple of times.

Here, we can share the screen and open the whiteboard. After opening the whiteboard for this exercise to discuss each item more precisely

and in-depth, we can enter the text. This one, for example, from ATRT3, and I entered the text here, and after that, any participants can comment, highlight or annotate in any way they want.

As you can see here, a participant can merge their comments if there are a lot. For future use, we can do this so that a collaboration would be possible between participants to discuss each item in this list of issues and recommendations. In addition to sharing their views with annotations, they can use stamps. For example, they can put likes anywhere on the whiteboard, they can put arrows, okays or crosses as you will see here so that we will see that people's ideas [inaudible].

And also, the Zoom whiteboard is easy to use on mobile an also desktop, which will help the future sessions to be accessible for everyone. That's all from my side. Thank you so much, everyone.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Alperen. As I mentioned, the idea is to have a very brief presentation of all o the tools that can be used with Zoom. It seems the jam board from Google can also be used in the working groups, not in this presentation. And yes, we need to make more interaction in our meetings from now on.

As a final step, because we only have one minute, next steps, someone already put on the chat and was the idea of this conversation, is to have the discussion on the OFB working group, the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group. And yes, it [can't] be done by all the group. Like the Consolidated Policy Working Group is doing with

the SubPro, it's small groups having the discussion and then having their results on the Consolidated Policy Working Group. The idea is to do more or less the same here, to go ahead with this prioritization, to have a conversation in the OFB working group, and start these subgroups and have the conversations of these recommendations and bring back to the Operations, Finance and Budget Working Group and then to the ALAC the priorities of us as end users.

I have no more of this conversation. I don't know if Maureen wants to end this first session of the morning. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Ricardo, and thank you, everyone who's actually been part of this really great discussion for us within At-Large. It's been very helpful. And we've finished on time. I think considering everything that's been discussed today, we've actually come a long way and it's going to be very helpful for us after ICANN 69 when we start getting back to our groups and working again.

So this is the end of this session, and we'll see you very shortly at our second session which will be coming up, and have about a half-hour break. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, everyone.

ICANN COMMUNITY DAYS 69

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]