
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – Joint Session: ALAC and GNSO Council
Wednesday, March 9, 2022 – 16:30 to 17:30 AST

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Hello and welcome to the joint session for the ALAC and GNSO Council. My name is Michelle DeSmyter and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted via chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I will note in the chat momentarily. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Please click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom Room. And once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and please take the floor. Before speaking. Ensure you have selected the language you will speak from in the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language that you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, please be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN multi stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from this session if you do not sign in using your full name. And with this, I'll hand the floor over to Justine Chew. please begin, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you. Actually the agenda says welcome's to be done by Maureen and Philippe. So I should hand the floor over to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, thank you so much, Justine. And I just thought I'd just take a few minutes, less than a minute, but I just want to say thank you. Thank you for organizing the session. Thank you to the GNSO team for participating. I know it's been a long time since we actually had a session together. But I also know that we've got some very committed and very genuine people interested in the work that they do on behalf of ICANN and especially with the GNSO. And we're very fortunate to have Justine and Cheryl, [inaudible] guns on our side. So I'm really looking forward to discussions. And I know I'm speaking very fast. And I promised I wasn't going to do that. Okay, but thank you so much, Justine. Over to Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Maureen. This is Philippe here. I can only second what you just said. It's been a while since we talked, even longer since we had a face-to-face meeting. We know within the GNSO the interest and involvement of the ALAC community in the policy development process

and the working groups, both past and present. And we thank you for that obviously, and we certainly need more such interactions in these times of virtual meetings. So we welcome this as an opportunity to provide some updates. And thanks, Justine, for coming up with this. I'm hesitant to call you the ALAC liaison. You're our liaison, Justine. So not only to those who are involved directly in the PDPs, the EPDPs and the small teams but also to the broader ALAC community. So thanks again. And over to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Maureen. And thank you, Philippe. My name is Justine Chew and I'm the At-Large Advisory Committee liaison to the Generic Names Supporting Organization Council. So the acronym for that is ALAC and GNSO Council. and I have the pleasure of being today's moderator, or the moderator for today's session.

Firstly, I'd like to point out as both Maureen and Philippe already said, this is actually meant to be a working session between the ALAC and the GNSO Council. And it is a recommencement of what I hope to be many conversations between the two groups. And we hopefully expect this to carry on into future bilateral sessions at future ICANN meetings and as well as intersessional work between ICANN meetings.

Now both groups have chosen to hold this call by a regular Zoom session rather than the more restrictive webinar mode. But because this is a 60-minute session, I have to be somewhat strict with time checks in order to give all our identified speakers and also the commentators enough time for the interventions. So it follows that I

will give priority to all the pre identified ALAC topic leads to react to the updates given by our GNSO colleagues, and the agenda items 4(a) to 4(c) as you see on your screen. So, you see the agenda is quite packed.

And then, if time permits, then we will try to take comments or questions from the floor towards the end of the session. And as Michelle has stated earlier, if you could just put your questions or comments in the format mentioned. And if you had a question that you wanted to direct to particular speaker, commentator, please, by all means, do that. And I would appreciate that very much.

Okay. So now swiftly moving on to conversation topics. 4(a) is the standardized system for access and disclosure operational design assessment, or the acronym for that in the wonderful world of ICANN, we have lots of acronyms, and the acronym for this is the SSAD ODA.

So just to just by way of a little bit of background, if I could just put this in very simple terms. Since the European Union's General Data Protection Regulations came into effect in May 2018, ICANN and the ICANN community have continued to grapple with obligations to redact certain domain name registration data, and at the same time trying to still facilitate access to those nonpublic data by legitimate requesters such as law enforcement personnel, IP, intellectual property lawyers, cybersecurity researchers and those sort of people.

And if I can just cut short, this brings us to this thing called the system for standardized access and disclosure, which is the SSAD. So the SSAD is a new system propose to centrally handle requests for the nonpublic domain name registration data, as envisioned in the recommendations

of the final report of the GNSO expedited policy development process on temporary specifications for gTLD registration data phase two.

Right now due to the resource investment and complexity that will be likely required to implement the SSAD related policy recommendations, the ICANN Board had requested an operational design phase or ODP, an assessment coming out of that particular ODP to inform the Board's deliberations, including whether the recommendations are in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. And this ODP is actually run by ICANN Org, ICANN Organization.

And on the 25th of January this year, ICANN Org actually released the SSAD ODA, the actual assessment. And the recommendations coming out of that became the preliminary basis for the GNSO Council's consultation with the ICANN Board, and there was a call on the 27th of January, first call between the ICANN Board and GNSO Council, and there was a follow up conversation between Council and Board. I believe it was yesterday. And I'm pleased to say that GNSO Council also met just a few hours ago. So we have the pleasure of listening to the latest updates.

So in this context, I'd like to invite Sebastien Ducos who leads the GNSO Council small team in reviewing the SSAD ODA to perhaps give his input in terms of the questions that ALAC wanted to pose, which is how does Council intend to proceed with its recommendations on the SSAD given the concerns raised by the Board, the ICANN Board and which concerns actually reflect those of the ALAC. The floor is yours, Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS:

Thank you, Justine. So my name is Sebastien Ducos and you basically gave a brief of the last five and a half, six years of work in five minutes, and I'm going to have to do the last three weeks in 10 seconds, I guess. So we have formed a small team within the Council. And given the complexity of the topic and the amount of work that has been done before, we've ensured that the small team was made of members that actually did the work, were part of the work, were part of this EPDP phase two, we went back to the different SG's and C's and asked them to appoint somebody, a point person that would be a subject matter expert, in order to not reinvent the wheel on this one.

So as you've mentioned, we've been tasked to answer to the Board's letter and their concern, but also, as the ODA just published when we started at reviewing the ODA and reviewing it for possible clarifying questions, for inconsistencies that we could see between the recommendation as we understood them, and as they had been interpreted in the ODA, and possibly possible missing items. And with all this review, to look at the Board's questions and answer them.

Now, this work is early days, we've actually physically met twice, and spent everybody in their own corner a bit of time to gather information, clarifying questions, the points that I mentioned before, which were just sent to staff, to the ODP team last week. So I don't want to get too much into the results of the small team because they're so far, early days again, so far, we haven't come to any results.

I think from the comments that we've seen, I think it's fair to say that everybody understands that this is not an easy question to answer, that the ODA probably doesn't offer all the answers, all the elements that one would hope for in order to be able to have a clear cut decision. As you would have seen it, it's a very expansive exercise. And so I think that they did need some thinking about it. And we will need to discuss within the small team how to handle that.

Justine mentioned the fact that we discussed this on our Board meeting a few hours ago. One of the topics that is coming around this is and was discussed on the 27th of January call between the GNSO and the Board already was this idea of a possible pilot, which at this stage hasn't been defined at all or still remains a big question mark. But on a pilot in order to test a few hypotheses around the ODA.

Now, depending on who you speak to and the different interest in the community, there's wide views as to what the pilot should be testing and what it should be exactly. So I don't want to get too much into the weeds here. And let us have some time within the small team to reflect on that. But this is one of the topics that has been discussed.

To the Board's concerns, or to your concerns, again, if these matter exactly, again, I think that that these are also the concerns from the small team, we have here a project that everybody knew was going to be a very big project but possibly not everybody had understood would be that big.

There are key questions with regards to the sustainability of the project that has been presented in the ODA, the financial sustainability, i.e., the

usage and all the things that are questions on the table that we'll need to resolve. We have set a target to try to do this work within the month of March in order to go back to GNSO Council in April and then eventually to the Board once GNSO Council approves are the fruit of our work. It's a tight schedule. We have already scheduled a number of meetings, two meetings a week to try to get as much done as possible. Let's see how we get there. And we'll be sure to update you guys.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Sebastien. I also wanted to note that the small team that you lead does have members outside of GNSO Council, including ALAC rep. And quite grateful for that. So I'm going to call on our ALAC rep, Alan Greenberg, and the alternate, Hadia, if they have any comments to add.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you so much, Justine. And for me, one of the alarming findings actually is the implementation timeline. So the development and implementation will take between five and six years. And to me, this actually raises a lot of questions, even more than the cost and all the other things. Because it makes you wonder, would we really need this system six years from now if we can actually live without it for six years? Could it be obsolete in six years? Is it adaptable enough in order to accommodate changes that could happen in those six years?

So to me actually, one of the really alarming findings is the implementation time. And usually, development of policies usually

takes or implementation takes two to three years. But if you're talking about a tool that is going to be used, this is different. Even three years would have been too much. But six, that makes it a doubtful tool. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

All right, thank you. I'm sure these things will be taken up within the small team. And I'm pretty sure that Sebastien is taking notes on these. Alan, do you want to just make a brief intervention?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Just very brief, I think Sebastien gave a pretty good summary of where we are right now. The interesting thing is one of the things that the group has been looking at and asking is, do people believe there's enough information in the ODA to actually make a decision? And there's a widespread belief that there isn't, and for different reasons on different sides. But clearly, there's some level of dissatisfaction with sufficient information. And my personal opinion is the ODA team did a huge amount of work and it's quite mind boggling. But at the same time, they seem to have had a number of very significant omissions and places where the ODA was not very specific. And whether that was a time constraint or something else, I don't know. But I think we're going to have a hard time at this point. If we choose to go ahead with it, then the actual implementation will probably be years longer than we think, because of the discrepancies and the lack of specificity in some cases. But as you know, ALAC's position is we shouldn't go ahead with it. So that may not be a problem at all from our perspective. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Alan. Well, you know, good luck to the small team. We hope to hear more development soon. Okay, all right. Let's move on to the next topic, which is subsequent procedures ODP. Alright, so just briefly, and the next speaker is actually the perfect person to talk about subsequent procedures, and I will let him introduce himself really. But I'd just like to mention that the subsequent procedures, actually, in short, we call it SubPro, actually refers to the ICANN consensus policies as intended to apply to the next round of applications for new generic top level domains. And after about a five-year period of policy development, the GNSO Council back in March 2021—so it's been a year—submitted its recommendations report to the ICANN Board, and the ICANN Board in the similar veins of the SSAD has requested for SubPro operational design phase—ODP—for an assessment of that to inform its deliberations on the SubPro recommendations. And again, this particular ODP is held by the ICANN Org.

I will now just jump to Jeff Neuman, he is the GNSO Council liaison to the SubPro ODP. So, Jeff, if you could provide us some inputs into the two questions that ALAC posed which is could Council—And of course I'm going to leave it to you to inform us whether you're actually speaking on Councils behalf or not. But could Council provide an update to the SubPro ODP process, including questions being discussed with the ICANN SubPro ODP team? And what is Council doing within that process itself to address known issues for the next round? Over to you, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, thanks, Justine. And yeah, thanks, everyone, for having this meeting. I think I'm glad to see we're having these meetings again. I think they're essential and a great way to understand what everyone is working on. And it feels weird to be saying this to you, Justine, because you've been so actively involved in all of this as well. But for everyone else's sake—and this is very timely to have this discussion. So I think with the introduction that you gave Justine, I think that was fantastic.

The other things I will add, as far as what has happened so far with the ODP is that we have had two sets of questions from the ICANN GDS team that's working on the ODP—I should just shorten that to the ICANN ODP team—that's led by Karen Lentz and Lars Hoffman, and a fantastic number of people that are working on it.

The first set of questions related to confirmation of a few different items that were part of the different recommendations in SubPro, fairly easy questions to confirm. They were all kind of ICANN made assumptions that seemed in line with what the SubPro working group was working on. So we submitted those answers.

And then a few weeks ago, we received questions set number two. And that question set was much more difficult, I will say, in the sense that they required and still do require additional conversations by the Council. Essentially, although the question was related to the topic of applicant support, it was really more about future process. And so the question essentially is that there are some recommendations within

the applicant support section that ICANN believes may be outside the scope of what we would normally think of as implementation.

And so they were asking us, the GNSO, a question of whether we really intended that work to be done by an IRT as opposed to some other mechanism. And this is because in their view, some of the items may be closer to policy development as opposed to implementation.

And so you may ask yourself, well, okay, what's the big deal? Why does it matter? Well, when an implementation review team is set up, the implementation review team is convened by ICANN staff, and ultimately, the responsibility of implementation falls to ICANN Org as opposed to community, meaning that the community is provided opportunities for input. But at the end of the day, it's ICANN Org that does all of the implementation.

So the question in between the question, if you will, is whether the GNSO Council was really comfortable leaving all of these things in applicant support up to an IRT and ICANN Org essentially. So the Council's discussed this a couple times, once in the February meeting, and then a couple hours ago during the Council meeting. I can't speak on behalf of the Council, I'm going to try to give you an update. And I really hope that Councilors jump in if I have misstated anything.

But essentially, what the Council discussed is regardless of whether this is classified by ICANN Org as policy or implementation, there is a recognition that work needs to be done on some of these issues. One of them is applicant support. And then there are others such as the registry, pre-evaluation program, appeals and challenges, the SPIRT

team, so the predictability mechanism to have a standing committee to consider changes as they arise.

Those things are new. And those things we all know as a community, work needs to be done. So the GNSO Council is currently exploring ways in which we can do some of that work now as opposed to just waiting until all the recommendations are approved by the Board. We haven't decided on the official mechanism, of course, to do that. The Council is still discussing, but there are some principles that I think the Council is in agreement with.

And by the way, I should mention, and I don't know if someone—I can't really see the chat at the moment, but hopefully someone can post a link to the question set two and the response as we're drafting it. So what you'll see once that's posted is language that frankly I came up with to hopefully summarize what's been going on. But this is by no means final language at all. And the Council can go in and should go in and revise the language as it sees fit.

But essentially, I believe, personally, that some of the kind of guidelines for this future discussion is that to ensure that the discussions have a very narrow focus based only on the final recommendations in the final report, final SubPro report that was accepted by the GNSO Council and that—I'm doing this because it's not up on the screen, I'm trying to do it from memory, that it involves the whole community. So it is not the intention of the GNSO to do this alone, we know that especially applicant support is very important to you all, the ALAC, as well as to the GAC and frankly, other members of the community. So whatever

mechanism we try to come up with will hopefully be inclusive in that manner.

And the goal is really to try to provide more guidance to the ODP team so that it can better assess the costs of the program. So I believe all of this work is going to be very useful. So I know I've gone on for a little bit long, but if anyone has anything they'd like to add, please do so. And I'm happy to take any questions.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks. We might try and take questions at the end if we have time. No worries, I'm just trying to make sure that we get through the agenda. But I do want to ask Jonathan as one of the SubPro topic leads if he had anything immediate to comment on.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I know you're trying to keep a tight agenda, Justine, so I don't feel like anything rises to the necessity of intervening at this time. ALAC is one of the parties that believe that there were some things that remained that were policy related issues. Hadia and I chaired an At-Large session a couple of meetings ago on applicant support in particular, and it's clear that policy decisions would in fact have a dramatic effect on the type of implementation that you'd want to put in place. And so I think there were some concrete questions there that needed to be answered by the policymakers have ICANN before putting them in the hands of the capable staff to cost them out and figure out how to go about accomplishing them.

And so I don't think it's a hairsplitting exercise, I think it's actually important for them to be able to do the job they do to understand the goals the community has for something like applicant support. So that's just an example, but glad that this conversation is taking place. Thanks, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Jonathan. And I'm just going to take my hat off as a moderator now and put on my hat as one of the co-leads of SubPro on the ALAC side. And I'm going to go out on a limb and ask if Council would consider involving the ALAC on the dialogue for closed generics. So I'm not going to insist on an answer now. I'm just going to put it up there for Council to consider.

Let's move on to the next topic, DNS abuse mitigation. Alright, so we all know that DNS abuse continues to be a high interest topic for many if not all of the parts of the ICANN community. And as far as I remember—I'm more or less considered new to ICANN actually, I remember distinctly back in November 2019 there was something called the framework to address abuse which was an initiative launched by a couple of registries in registrars ostensibly to—it was an attempt to encourage contracted parties to tackle what they considered as the most egregious abuses of the DNS domain name system.

But they did specify in the document that they consider DNS abuse to be of five types of abuse, which is malware, botnets, phishing, pharming and spam when spam is used as a delivery mechanism for the other forms of DNS abuse.

The document that I'm referring to, the link to it on the screen, so you can have a look at it if you're not familiar with that. And as far as I know, the last count, there were about 59 signatories to this framework. But since then, if I can comment, there has been questions around the efficacy of this particular framework whether it actually really works to reduce the type of abuse that has been defined in it. And also, the conversation around DNS abuse has evolved over time, and has been quite a few initiatives having been undertaken and continue to be undertaken by different parts and different parties within an outside of ICANN community. And I believe it's fair to say that these attempts have a common goal of trying to grapple with questions around what should constitute DNS abuse and how can such DNS abuse be effectively tackled.

And GNSO Council particular back in its October 2021 meeting established a small team of Councilors to consider what might be the next step that Council would like to take in terms of DNS abuse. So the next speakers that I'm going to put up would be Mark Datysgeld and Paul McGrady who are jointly leading that particular small thing that I mentioned, DNS abuse. And if I could pose the questions that ALAC have in mind for Mark and Paul, which are, has Council arrived at any steps regarding DNS abuse, how would Council take on Board input or efforts from other parts of the ICANN committee on such next steps, and would Council be able to share an indication of its plan and timelines for such next steps? So over to you, Mark or Paul, whoever wants to go first.

MARK DATYSGELD:

Thank you very much for the great introduction, Justine. Unfortunately, Paul will not be able to join us today. He has an overlapping commitment, but I hope that I can do the best to report in the name of the small team.

So I do not wish to repeat myself from what I said in other sessions today. So I will try to stick to the different questions. I will very briefly provide a summary. We have sent some outreach forms to different members of the community, to different constituencies, SOs and ACs and we are hoping to hear their impression on this subject, and this is still ongoing. By the end of March, we'll get back those results.

And now I'll try to step onto a different subject. So, the perspective that we are approaching this from is that we have not been able to make that much progress as a community in terms of the definitions and so on, there are these broad themes that seem to intersect with other questions of the of the ICANN policy process and affects directly several actors.

But there must be things that this community of very intelligent people who are very well positioned in different structures and in different places can actually do to help make this problem smaller, help make this problem less impactful.

So, what are the actual steps that we could take from the policy side to try to improve the situation? We are looking into very specific things, we do not want to create an entirely new PDP that will spend the next decade. That will not help the people who we are trying to help, which

is how do we make people get scammed less? How do we make people get into less problems on the Internet, common people, right?

So, what we are looking for specifically is that the community helps us try to arrive at questions that we can actually focus on and try to solve. So how do we actually make the commitments that are already in ICANN contracts for example, be enforced evenly? Or even one aspects of those commitments, even the smallest fraction, if we can deal with one particular aspect that would be a gain, we are not seeing that kind of gain across the Board at a policy level.

We see very well intentioned members of the country code member members, we see very well intentioned registries and registrars who try to enforce this within their own remits. But we still need a more concrete policy action to be sure that we are able to make some progress. So this is what we are asking the community to help us with.

Our first intention is to get back this result by the end of March, get into a meeting right after, try to analyze together with staff what we are hearing. And I believe that at that point, there's a fork in the road, right? If there is a general consensus from the community on certain specific topics, then great, we kind of have our way forward. If we are seeing too much of a spread, then maybe we need to start discussing again how to scope this. At the end of the day, what we want is to scope something attainable.

So I'm pretty sure you will be hearing a lot more about this on the ICANN meeting hopefully in person. But for now, we are encouraging everyone to provide feedback to—ALAC in specific has had its own consultation.

But if you want to message us with some impressions you have, some ideas on how to shape this, please do. We are really trying to approach this from an angle that's trying to solve the problems rather than creating more problems for us as a community. So thank you, we try not to take too much time, but very glad to be here and to be able to speak with you all.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you very much, Mark. Jonathan, any brief interventions?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

You still want me to be brief? I was brief once already. That's a lot to ask, Justine. Thanks a lot. Thanks a lot to Mark. The At-Large community started kind of rattling the cage on this issue in Montreal. And it was just a general frustration, I think in many ways, that we were expressing on this issue of DNS abuse.

And then we've had some specific sessions, including trying to understand where the contract falls short. And that appears to still be a controversial issue, one in which many believe that changes to the contract are necessary and many believe that no changes are necessary but a change in practices of contract compliance are necessary. Right.

And so with all of these different initiatives that you mentioned—and a lot of them are great—I think the task in front of us in the community and in the GNSO, in particular, is to kind of figure out who can be doing what, what are the next steps. There's the framework, there's the DNS Abuse Institute. There's actual policy through GNSO. There's

ICANN itself if they were to invest in predictive technology, for example, and make it available.

And so I think what we're hearing from the Board, and now from the GNSO as well, is tell us what we can do specifically. And so we need to do the homework and haven't really done it yet to at least theorize what steps fall into what hands. Right? And for one thing, I would love for the Contracted Parties House to sit down with contract compliance and resolve this issue about the contract.

This shouldn't be something that we continue to debate about, it should either be true or not true. We have examples of registrars and other contracted parties where DNS abuse is unusually high. And so we have these case studies that we could use to really look at the contract and see what needs to happen. And so I feel like it's about trying to figure out what the truth of that matter is, because then that will then dictate, do we push for changes or additions to the contract, for example?

So we'll do our best to make our own assessment, hopefully, in cooperation with you in terms of what makes most sense to happen within the confines of the GNSO policy development process, versus what are things directed directly to the Board, which are things that we—just to try to apply pressure on the contracted parties for in terms of trusted notifier programs and things like that that might fall outside of ICANN's remit.

It's possible that the GNSO has a role to play in developing of the voluntary framework on trusted notifiers as opposed to ICANN

managing it. But it might still be a good community exercise to figure out what a trusted notifier program looks like that goes beyond the kind of ad hoc system that's in place. So that's a lot of sort of brain dump. But I say that all to say that we've received your letter with your three very broadly worded questions, and we will do our best. We've gotten similar requests from the Board. And so we have some homework to do. But we're on it. Thanks, Mark.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Thank you, Justine, and thank you, the entire ALAC community for receiving us today. It's a pleasure.

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Mark. Thank you, Jonathan. Okay, I'm mindful of time, we've got less than 15 minutes left. So could we jump into the next item? Yes. GNSO priorities for 2022. Can I invite Philippe, Sebastien and Tomslin as GNSO Council leadership? Would you like to address us on GNSO priorities?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, thank you, Justine, for this opportunity to give me the floor. So we saws three topics for ALAC. I'm not going to go back to it. Those are priorities for GNSO as well. I know that we have little time left. We had a webinar at the beginning of the meeting and please go to those webinars. They're great and enable us to—since Sunday we are not able to work, we were able to sum up with those three work groups. Those

are our priorities for 2022 on IDNs—internationalized domain name—the curative rights as well and the workgroup for transfers.

We also have a scoping team for the data accuracy. So, this is what we are working on now at the GNSO with our Council. I would add that we have some activities for the implementation of phase one for the PDP and preparation for phase 2a as well for the EPDP.

In general terms, our priorities for 2022 is the work we do on the SSAD and the ODP and particularly the phase after the approval of the recommendations by the Council. This is something that will necessitate a lot of communication with the Board and between ourselves. We have small teams working at it, this is not an easy task. This is not part of a major topic, but this is something that is really needed, this ODP, this is really clear we have to work very hard at it. And we will do so.

In 2022 we will contribute working with the Board, working with staff, the GDS team we talked about earlier, we try to improve the implementation of those topics and to improve the PDP and we'll take a step back and we'll try to do better with PDP 3.0 and try to develop policies in a better fashion.

This is very quickly our priorities for 2022. I'm going to now give the floor to Sebastien and Tomslin. Thank you very much.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sebastien, Tomslin, do you have anything to add?

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Hello. Just to say that, Philippe, you did sum up everything very well.

JUSTINE CHEW: Tomslin, anything to add?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: No. Nothing else to add, Justine. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: All right. Thank you very much. And in the interest of time, I'm going to hand the floor over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr who chairs the recommendation prioritization subgroup of the At-Large Operational Finance and Budget Working Group to introduce to Council one of the last priorities for 2022, which is that of member engagement. Over to you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you, Justine. And I note Sebastien's first in queue for Q&A. So we will all be as very brief as we possibly can. Time is tight. Just to make sure everybody understands that ALAC and the regional leadership have, all the way back to the Mexico meeting, had metrics and performance criteria are in place and have measured the engagement and the expectations that we put at least on our leads.

But as a result of the second organizational review of the At-Large, there were very specific recommendations which we have been

implementing, and these reach out in terms of engagement and the effectiveness of ongoing engagement of right down to our rank and file membership in two parts: the At-Large Structures—Alan Greenberg will speak to you on that—and the individual members—in other words, unaffiliated with At-Large Structures as such—within the region. So two types of membership and two very extensive approaches have been taken. And this is being implemented. So, it's very much top of our minds and a current priority amongst others for ALAC in the At-Large community. And so I think, Alan, it's you and your slides first. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. And I think I have some slides. So if we go to the next one. Okay, thank you. When At-Large was created in 2002, the concept of an At-Large Structure was created. These are essentially on the ground organizations, typically preexisting organizations and there was a process by which these At-Large Structures could join—Rather these organizations on the ground could join as At-Large structures. And we currently have about 250 of them in a little over 100 different countries and territories.

Why were they created? Why was the concept invented in 2002? It's a little bit lost in history. But if you read the bylaws, it's pretty clear that the reason we have the concept of At-Large Structures is because these are organizations that exist within various parts around the world that have members. And clearly, most of these people have no idea what ICANN is, certainly not what At-Large is, and most of them, as we probably know, don't care. But these are all people who have an

interest in the Internet. And the hope was that at least some of these members of these organizations would take an interest in ICANN and start working with them. Next slide.

Until now, although we have had these At-Large Structures, and if you read the words in the bylaws, that's why they were there, most of our contact with ALSes has been with appointed representatives, each ALS has a formal representative to At-Large. And they have an obligation to pass on information to their members and to be a conduit between their members and ICANN At-Large. But the reality is in many cases that hasn't happened.

So what we're looking at is making sure that for each of these organizations, that we have a real conduit of ways to reach their members and perhaps get information back but at least acquaint them with ICANN. We're going to be using targeted communications that will hopefully be free of ICANN buzzwords and acronyms. We will be doing it in languages of that country, of the various countries. And the target we hope is to—from the thousands of members within the ALSes, we hope to essentially intrigue at least some number of them to start working with ICANN.

If you look at the number of people who are active within things like PDPs, the number is not very large. So if we can attract another 10 or 20 or 30 people who want to become active within ICANN, we are going to help address the recruiting of volunteers, the problem that every group within ICANN has, and hopefully get a larger committed volunteer base

to continue our work. And that's basically the whole study the whole study, the whole game. Back to you, Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Alan. Yeah, Roberto, can you take us out? Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you. So I would like to talk about the individual members, [inaudible] ALAC is based on ALSes. We have a huge potential for people who are not members of any At-Large Structure but are still interested in joining the ICANN policy development process. So this is the reason why we have individual members. And also, there was a recommendation at the At-Large review who recommended to have individual members.

A couple of regions, namely North America and Europe, had started already their activities with individual members predated the At-Large review. But now with the At-Large review, we have started trying to rationalize and have all the regions having at least some common ideas and processes about including individual members in their processes.

We have right now all through At-Large 155 individuals who are acting as volunteer in different working groups and structures and so on. So they are providing a huge contribution. And 22 observers, that is people who are participating but they don't—well, it's too complicated now to explain all the detailed rules.

The mobilization of individuals is in some way easier because individuals join because already they have an interest in participating in ICANN. So they don't need to be convinced. But we have a huge potential for extending our footprints. And so our effort is on one hand to try to get these individuals, for instance, in meetings, and then that are not necessarily linked—not necessarily ICANN meetings. Not only the IGFs but also IT professional meetings or things.

And so we need to do some advertisement, to have some material, we need to explain what ICANN is. And so that's one thing. On the other hand, we need to, in order to mobilize them better and to have a better return on investment, we need to build sort of a roster of abilities and skills so that we know if some opportunities are in a working group that need somebody who speak for the Internet users on certain topic, we know whom to contact and how to address people in order to increase the efficiency. That's basically it. I'm, of course, open to be contacted if anybody has more information.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thank you, Roberto. I want to apologize to some of the speakers for cutting short the time for intervention. It's a 60-minute session so we can't really go over. But I would like to thank you all for coming and for presenting and providing comments as well. And as I said, this is the start of a conversation, a long-drawn conversation. So we will hopefully have you back next time. Thank you very much. Have a good day.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you, Justine. Thank you, everyone, for your participation.
Meeting adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]