EN

MARRAKECH – At-Large: Welcome to ICANN 65 and Policy Priorities
Monday, June 24, 2019 – 08:45 to 10:15 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, I'd like the ALAC members, please.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much. Gisella speaking again. So I'm just going to go through the list and if we can just see that everyone is here and we do note the apologies that we've received so far. So we have Maureen Hilyard, John Laprise, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sebastien Bachollet, Richardo Holmquist, Marita Moll who is absent, Javier Rua-Jovet, Bartlett Morgan who is absent, Humberto Carrasco, Joanna Kulesza, Bastiaan Goslings who is absent, Holly Raiche, Kaili Kan, Seun Ojedeji who unfortunately is absent as well, Hadia Elminiawi. There's one missing. Sorry, just let me get the…

MAUREEN HILYARD: EPDP?

GISELLA GRUBER: No. Andrei's not a member anymore. Sorry? Yes. Yes. Is Hadia here in the room? No?

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.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No. [Inaudible]

GISELLA GRUBER: We have gone through the attendance of ALAC. So Hadia is not here. And we do have four apologies and we want to make sure to have the proxies for the four people not attending in person. Now, just quickly go through the housekeeping rules. I'd like to wish you all a very warm welcome to Marrakech. For those returning from 2016, I hope you have found the facilities easy to move around. For those for which it is the first time, I hope you have found your bearings between the Hotel du Golf in the Palace and the Conference Center. A reminder that there are three meeting rooms that are actually in the central part between here and the Palace Hotel, the Diamond Opal and [inaudible]. And if you have any questions, we are all here to help you navigate around this conference venue.

We have French and Spanish interpretation as per most of our sessions. So if I could kindly remind you to all state your names when speaking not only for transcription purposes but also to allow these lovely people, our interpreters who sit in the booth here all day, to identify you on the other language channel as they may not know who you are. I hope you also like the new set up of the ALAC room, so we have a little bit more space and

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

much more visibility on the audience. And there will be more housekeeping rules as we go through the week. But we are taking attendance. If for any reason the ALAC members, regional leaders, liaisons, if you're not able to attend a session, please do send staff an apology. Email is always the easier option as the Skype chat does become extremely busy during the meetings. And this will be noted. If we don't receive an apology, then we will just have to put it down as no apology received.

But as I said at the beginning of each session, we will be taking attendance. If you have any other questions, please don't hesitate to ask staff. And I'll hand it over to Maureen in wishing you a very successful meeting here in Marrakech. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Gisella, for that. Can I have… Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: My apologies. Very important point. We are now using Zoom as our interface. No more Adobe Connect. So I would ask you to be very patient with us. This is our first meeting. So if there are any glitches, we do apologize ahead of time. This is literally Yeshim's first meeting running remote participation via Zoom. And a friendly reminder that if you are in the room here, please do you

use your tent cards and raise them if you have a question. We will also be monitoring the Zoom room. Thank you very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Tijani speaking. I'd like to -- as you know, we have students from Morocco here. We'll have a session now at nine. So they are waiting for us, all the AFRALO leadership. So I would like to apologize that we will be today and tomorrow a little bit absent from our meetings. But we will come any time we can come when the students will be elsewhere. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much for that, Tijani. And good luck with your work with your students. I'm sure it'll be great. Okay. So what we're going to be just doing for the next few minutes is to go over the program that we've got for At-Large for this week. Just as a reminder to go on about what is actually on. But for those who are actually part of the presentations, it's a reminder for them to be prepared and to be there on time, et cetera. I must at this point make my apologies that during the week there will be times when I'll be ducking in and out of the room to meet with the heads of other ICANN sessions because of the times

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

that are available for them. So I apologize in advance if I'm missing a particular session. But I'm sure you guys will not even notice that I'm not there.

But I think that we've already complained far too much and I have already complained about there's not enough hours in the day to do everything that we have to do. So we just have to sort of grin and bear it. Okay, so going into the schedule for today, for example, as Tijani said at the same time as this is running, the AFRALO team have got their sessions with students. There's also the subsequent procedures PDP, which is going to go on all day. And I know that Justine is just running away already. Javier has got some activities on today for work track five. We're very much involved in a lot of the things that are happening within the meeting in other areas, which is good. But it's a little bit depleting of our -- and so therefore, I very much welcome the people who actually have come into our session today, and I hope we don't bore you too much. We hope you find it enthralling enough, I hope, to want to be part of our team. We'd love to have you.

Okay, so today the key item for this session is going to be my colleague here, Jonathan Zuck, who is going to be looking at policy priorities and the talking points. Now, I'm assuming that everyone's got a copy of the talking points. This is what Jonathan's going to be addressing. It's really important. As we

said before, we all want to be talking about the same thing, saying the same thing within our discussions that we have within the community this week. So after that, of course, then Olivier will be -- do you want to say something about your session that you're going to be running today?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Yes, the session immediately after this one will be at 10:30, will last for about 90 minutes, and it will be a joint NCUC At-Large outreach session where we'll be speaking about the commonalities and differences between our two communities. The NCUC being the Non-Commercial Users Constituency part of the generic name supporting organization. We'll have three topics of discussion on policy. I'm not going to tell you the three topics, so you can stay here to find out what they are. Thank you. I've learned about clickbait.

MAUREEN HILYARD: So I'm sure that everyone is sitting on the edge of their seat, waiting for the next session to start, Olivier. You're all very welcome to do so. Of course, this is actually part of an ongoing thing that we've been -- Olivier and NCUC has actually been organized. How long have you been going -- how many meetings have there been so far?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Five. Ten. Maybe not 20, but quite a number. Thank you. No, it's been something that's worked very well and we've had good attendance. And I understand that we'll also have a number of local students coming over that will be sent over by Tijani Ben Jamaa. So we really look forward to engaging the local community and trying to clarify a little bit what this whole ICANN jungle is all about. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. Okay. Following that session… Well, if you're looking at your schedules, you'll sees that there's and ALAC GAC capacity building focus meeting, which is actually a closed meeting. But it's one of the things that the At-Large community is actually working on. Just as Olivier is working with a section, the NCUC, which is part of the GNSO, we're also working with the GAC on common interests with regards to capacity building.

And one of the key players for that is Joanna Kulesza, who is the head of the capacity building program within At-Large. So we're going to be probably moving out -- with apologies -- out of the NCUC session so that we can actually meet with them. Then, of course, at lunch time, we're actually going to have a bit of a meeting to discuss again with Jonathan and Joanna the ALAC hot-policy topics. You'll notice that in our schedule, the ICANN

schedule, there are four high-interest topics that are going to be discussed across the community. So what we're actually doing is looking at our own topics. And they may coincide, of course. But that's putting the finishing touches to our… Do you want to say something about that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, sure. Thanks. Jonathan Zuck for the record. We have two sessions that will sort of appear to be overlapping. This first one, dealing with the talking points. And then at 10:30, this session talking about the hot topics. And there's some overlap. But the idea behind the hot topics is that there's sort of the overall general interest topics for the At-Large for the year that will percolate, et cetera. And we're trying to figure out what's in and out of ICANN's remit. That's the discussion that we're going to be trying to have there, whereas the talking points, to the extent possible, are tailored to what's going on at this meeting, right?

And so there's obviously overlap. But then the hot topics are conversations that are going to take place over the long term. So that's the important distinction, I think. And it's better because Joanna's involved. I think that's the other important difference.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Because this is a policy forum, of course, Jonathan's going to take the lead in quite a lot of the activities, and Joanna is a helping hand in her capacity building responsibility. Okay, so they're two key people that you'll see a lot of during this week. Following that session at 1:15, we have an introduction to the Empowered Community. That was Stephen Deerhake, who's from the ccNSO. And he has a role as our administrator secretariat. And really just to sort of introduce you to what the Empowered Community is all about. It's quite an important body, and you'll learn more about it. That session is going to be two parts, so we'll have Stephen for half the time and the second time continuing on with the community involvement, it will be the reports from key players in each of the cross community working groups that At-Large is involved in.

So it's looking at what sort of impacts we as At-Large have within some of those cross community areas. And already, as I mentioned, some people have left already to participate in some of those activities. So going onto the three o'clock session today, there's a bit of an update on the At-Large review and ATLAS III. And then the second part of that is going to be reports from regional chairs about what's happening in their regions. Then we will probably be pretty flexible, depending on what time is available for the chairman of the board. Shivran Shaleby,

Ura Malbi, the CEO, and Leon Sanchez, who's the At-Large representative on the board.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, not representative. Selected by.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Selected by At-Large. Following that, of course, is the outreach and engagement subcommittee meeting. Everyone's invited to that to get some updates on various activities that are happening and our involvement in them. And then, of course, the day ends with those two high-interest topic sessions. No, no, sorry. Apologies. The last thing, of course, is the ethos awards, which you would have heard about this morning when Marita was doing the introduction to the program. It's quite a busy day already.

I'm just being reminded that from 6:30 to 7:30, there is an AFRALO networking event community engagement, a time when everyone can get together again and have a chat. You're welcome to have a chat with anyone. Nice to see you. At the end of each day, if you haven't been to an ICANN meeting, there is always some kind of networking opportunity for you to catch up with any of us, any of our community, or other communities as well.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

Okay, so moving on to Tuesday on the schedule, you will see that I put in the names of people who are actually really involved in the program. And one of the things that we decided earlier on in the year was that we wanted to make our sessions a little bit more interactive. It's always better if people from the ALAC community or the At-Large community who want to be involved in sharing information, being part of planning. And so just to make it more meaningful and looking at -- as long as the focus is end-user based, we really feel that it gives just a little bit more interest to the community at large to have a little bit more than just sort of people coming into the meeting and telling us things about what's happening in their area, which is interesting. But it really does need to be more focused on us. What does it mean to us? So that's basically what we set work on for our schedule. And if you've got any recommendations or any suggestions to make, please let us know because we still like to make sure that our program actually does meet your needs as well.

Do remember if you've got a question or a query, even from the floor, just put your hand up we'll give you a microphone or something. Okay. Going on to Tuesday. We have Jonathan again starting the day with policy workshop on Geo Names. Do you want to talk about that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, folks. That session is actually about an internal discussion by us to see if there are points on which we can reach consensus with respect to Geo Names. Because right now we're sort of a divided group on that, which makes it more difficult to go outside this room and share an ALAC perspective, because at this point there isn't one.

And so we need to try and reach some consensus on at least some core points and core principles so that we can then go evangelize those principles, potentially partner with others such as the GAC, which is one of the discussions we've had. They need to do their homework, too, right? And then once they've done their homework and we've done our homework, we may find a couple of common points that we could partner with them on in terms of letters, et cetera. So that's sort of a homework session where we all get together and see if we can end the session with some core principles or points on which we have some consensus.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I think one of the interesting things is that the policy group is looking at some of the hard questions that we've got within ICANN and just ensuring that what, as Jonathan said, trying to get some census of opinion for At-Large to be singing from the same hymn book, so to speak. Following on from that, of

course, at the same time we've got again the subsequent procedures and the AFRALO student meetings happening. The AFRALO AfrICANN group have their own meeting as such at 10:30 on Tuesday. Then we have Joanna and Jonathan actually holding a capacity-building workshop, an introduction to policy development at ICANN. So, Joanna, would you like to give a few words on what's happening there?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes. Thank you, Maureen. This is Joanna Kulesza for the record. So on the capacity-building policy development session, we want to get people more involved into policy development. I'm happy to share the floor with Jonathan if he has anything to add. But we're trying to give the newcomers here who are interested in policy development the first steps, to toolkit, so to speak.

So we will start off with the very basic explanation with thanks to our wonderful staff off where to find information, what kind of information is available. And then we want to take it a step further and try and explain how we do it. I think it kind of links in with today's session with the answer you see, where the comparison is introduced. And then picking up on that, in tomorrow's session we will try to explain how to get involved into this community and how to help us develop those positions, for example, that Jonathan was just speaking about.

So that's very brief. I'm happy to hear back from Jonathan if I've missed anything. But that's the overall idea of the session. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Well done, Joanna. Okay. On the rest of Tuesday is, of course, the two topics, the GNSO review of all rights, protection mechanisms and gTLDs. And then there's the policy aspects of DNSO over -- I don't even understand what that is, but I'll go along and listen in and find out more. And, of course, probably one of the biggest things that's going to be discussed during this week is going to be evolving the effectiveness of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model. The board has actually got a consultant who's working with all the communities to get some consensus about how the whole multi-stakeholder model can be improved within ICANN.

Just quickly going through the other days, on Wednesday at 8:30 we've got a major session on universal acceptance. It's something that is very important to us as end users. So therefore, there's going to be a session that my colleague John is going to be -- do you have anything extra to add to that, John?

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record.   No, we'll be rolling out the messaging strategy for universal acceptance.   I encourage representation from all the RALOs because the responsibility for getting this messaging out and communicating with individual members and ALS's will rest on the RALO Secretariats and the social media leads in the respective RALOs. So please be there, and we'll introduce you to universal acceptance. We've had meetings here previously on this, and this is a follow through of those previous meetings. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.   Following that, we will have one of our traditional meetings that we hold each ICANN meeting. And that's a joint session with the GAC. So the ALAC and the GAC get together and we talk about common issues, and we're actually developing more common issues because we're working with them quite a bit in some areas. I know that they are very keen to hear about what we're doing in ePDP, the capacity building, and some other areas that we might be able to cooperate on.

So that's going to be a little half-hour session. And then we move back from their room, which I believe is in another building. And then come back to look at Internet governance issues.   And here we will have Nigel Hickson, who's the government engagement person who's going to be looking at

ICANN
POLICY FORUM
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019
65

how he sees At-Large being effective in some of the interactions that we've had at IGF activities. Then Tijani recently attended a Rights Con Conference. So he's going to give us a bit of feedback on that.

Following that, we have another capacity building session on cybersecurity. Joanna, do you want to give us a little bit of an update on what that one is going to be about?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes. Thank you, Maureen. This is Joanna Kulesza for the record. This session actually built on the series of webinars we've had for ATLAS III. We've organized five webinars in two time slots, so overall 10 sessions discussing the fundamentals of ICANN policy making, policy development, Internet governance. One of those sessions that seem to be popular among the participants, we've seen a lot of questions, was focused around exactly this topic, and Patrick and the colleague from ICANN staff were kind enough to give us the webinars. And we thought it was a good opportunity to actually have a face-to-face meeting.

So building upon what was said there, we want to have a face-to-face meeting that discusses what seems to be a point of contention among the community when it comes to, on one hand, making sure that the users are secure, and on the other hand, making sure that the right to privacy or other human

rights are protected. So I'm looking forward to that session. I'm hoping to have interest from the community, but also questions coming up hopefully that will facilitate policy development process we're discussing here in various aspects.

So it's not just privacy, and it's not just security. We're looking for the nexus, which I hope will facilitate debates. And it will help us understand better where the user stand and what they expect from us representing their interests. So that was the idea behind that session. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Joanna. Following that, we've got the At-Large regional leaders meeting, which is the RALO leaders meeting together being moderated by Mohammed, who is from the AFRALO region. Then we have a session which will include the ATRT3 team, who will come to explain the accountability and transparency review that they're actually engaged in. And I note that there is one of the co-chairs from that team here, and I just wondered if you could give a very brief introduction as to what is going to be involved there, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Maureen. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. It's my pleasure to respond to that question. In fact, what we want to

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

do in the hour we have with you and remember, you have appointed several of us. You have Vander, you have Sebastian, you have Daniel, and you have myself on the ATRT3. Pat Cain, co-chair, and myself have set forward -- hopefully you've already received them -- a group of questions that we'd like the interaction to be primed with. And then we'd like to have a free-flow conversation about some of ALAC and At-Large's views on some of the issues about accountability and transparency, in particular relating to policy development, the transparency of it, and the effectiveness of your voice in it, so that it will have a nice little nexus with the other work you've been doing. That's where we'd like to take our 60 minutes of thrill-packed and fun time with you. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. Okay, so then we move on to John, looking at consumer safeguards issues.

JOHN LAPRISE: This is John Laprise for the record. This is another ongoing topic. We spoke with the team from ICANN Org at ICANN64. This is a continuation of that conversation, though in a slightly different direction because not all of compliance's staff is present, but we will take up questions. And compliance is

always an issue that At-Large is concerned with. So I encourage you to be here and bring your questions. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, John. Of course, there's another networking cocktail on this. Actually, that evening, there's an At-Large dinner, which is just like for-- I think it's closed now -- but generally the At-Large community who had registered to attend that dinner. Now, Thursday is pretty much our wrap-up day. It's sort of like the leadership wrap-up. For example, it just has a series of activities including a session with the SSAC, Rod and Jolly coming from that.

And then we will have a session after the coffee break at 10:30, where John will be looking at what impact did At-Large make, at this meeting. And that's as a result of the sort of like the work that we're doing with regards to the talking points, with regards to the hot topics discussions that we've been having. It's saying, okay, so we've actually been through all this. You know, what do people think that they actually sort of like -- you know, what value did we add to the ICANN meeting?

And then there will be finishing off, with basically looking at a review of ICANN65, and then looking forward to ICAN66 Montreal, which is including ATLAS III. So we'll be looking at

how we're preparing for ATLAS III, and that will all happen. Probably the naming of the travelers -- we should have that concluded by then, and we can name who has been given a travel opportunity. But I can tell you now, that we have we are actually funding 60 travelers. That's as much as I can say. We just have to select, confirm the names. And we've got a few checks and checks to do before that. So that is this week. So it's going to be a busy week. We hope that you're all going to be able to participate.

I'm expecting of course, ALAC will be attending all the At-Large -- I mean, the At-Large plus leadership team will attend all At-Large activities, and participate where need be. And of course any other participants who are interested, are welcome as well. So that's me. And so now I'm really to pass over to -- I'm still assuming that there are no questions, because I don't see any cards up. No one's been waving their hand at me. So -- oh hang on. Sebastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you chair. Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I wanted to point out that as the document, the ICANN stuff, published a few days ago, regarding the preparation of the staff for a future round of applications, for new detailees. And I think this is an interesting document which we need to consider properly. We

need to think of how we intend to use it exactly. Because, I think the staff could motivate us to try and enter into future rounds. I think this document should be considered thoroughly. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much for raising that Sebastien. It was a last minute entry into our program, as a result of the fact that it really only just came to hand during the last week. So we actually have Cyrus Namazi, who is the senior vice president of Global Domains Division, who actually prepared that document. And so he's coming to speak to us in our wrap-up session at 8:30. So if you want to hear about -- to discuss assumptions that are being made about the last round, and how it's going to impact on any future rounds. So if you're interested in that, come along to that meeting. Are there any other questions? Okay. I'm now going to pass over to Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good morning. Jonathan Zuck, for the record. I thought of a joke like a half hour ago, and I feel like I need to say get it out of my system, even though it's probably not the first time that it's come up. But we have some people from the ALAC that aren't able to make it to the meeting they're sort of missing. And so if

this was like a crime drama on TV, we would say that the suspects are still "At-Large". I'm just saying -- So anyways we have a lot of -- I thought I'd get things off on a fresh note. There's a lot of discussion about the At-Large, within the ICANN community, the effectiveness of the end-user voice within the ICANN community, etc.

And there's a lot of directions that that conversation can go. A lot of vectors, right, from which to approach that challenge. And I think it's very easy for us to jump to what we have not been given. Right? We haven't been given enough seats on the board. We haven't been given enough votes in a PDP, we haven't been given enough money for outreach, we haven't been given enough travel funding to make it to meetings, et cetera. So it's very easy to focus on what we haven't been given as the core problem, because it's a more passive way to think about it. And I think what we need to always try to do is focus on what it is that we haven't taken. Right?

And I think that our effectiveness initially at its core comes from a few things. One is the fact that we're a large organization and so when we are able to achieve consensus, we're representing a very large perspective within the Internet community, right? And our ability to connect our consensus and our positioning to end-users is a critical part of how we communicate with the rest

EN

of the community. And so there's always a risk in every meeting that we're in, to just be smart individuals. Oh, what you're saying doesn't make sense because of x and y. And when I was on the committee for Z, we said such and such, right? And what you're doing in that context is deflating your influence and your power.

If you're able to say that it's the result of consensus at large, explain how it applies to end-users, and get to the point, you could have a lot of influence in a lot of areas inside of ICANN. And so I think it's really critical whenever possible to present things in that way. Which means that part of our homework is trying to reach consensus, but it's also a discipline when you're talking about these issues to try and hold back the attempt to just be smarter than the other person in the room. Because I know you all are, right? But it's just not as powerful as delivering a message that's a product of consensus, and that has a direct line to the interests of end-users. So everything is a little bit about framing, and if you want to personalize the point, that's perfect too.

Like, if there's an example from your region or your experience with end-users, et cetera, as long as it's part of delivering that end-user message, then personalize it, make an example, et cetera, that's terrific. But try to de-individualize it to the extent

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

possible, right? Make it about this community and about end-users and you'll see your effectiveness within the community go up.

So to that end, we have an ongoing experiment of trying to take our work in policy development in between meetings, as we do comments on, on in public calls for comments as we develop advice, etc., as we have discussions regarding policy -- this is the second meeting -- to take where we've landed in those issues and, and boil them down to some talking points. And what you'll find is that sometimes, they're not as pointed as they could be, because it's an area where we didn't reach consensus, right?

And so the more consensus we reach, the more specific these are able to be. But these are meant to be derived from our discussions. And sometimes you'll disagree individually with them. But again, I guarantee you that in the long term, your influence within this community will be more enhanced by delivering a consensus message than always trying to make sure that you are contrasting from that message out in the public forum. The best place to do that is here, right? Have those discussions here, change minds here, and then try, to the extent possible, to leave the room with a unified set of messages and

principles. I hope that makes sense. Do you have a question? Go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Satish, for the record. Recently be at an introductory session 2, ICANN65 back in India. And one of the questions that was posed that to me was it given the very extreme diversity you have at At-Large, do you force consensus on people who would otherwise be having a divergent opinion? So what's your take on this? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I would never suggest forcing consensus on anyone. And everyone here is free to participate in any conversation as an individual, and to express explicitly their individual viewpoints. The two things that we need to be careful of is confusing people outside this room as to whether it is At-Large consensus viewpoint, or your personal viewpoint. So you need to be clear about that. And then what I'm trying to say is that we should do our very best to reach consensus, and to get everybody on board to deliver that consensus. So you can even say, "This isn't my opinion, but we reached consensus," and that's what's important on this issue. And that we're trying to put forward.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

And that means that everyone is delivering a similar message across the coffee breaks, the subsequent procedures meeting, the meeting they're having in dinner parties, etc. -- and that's where the influence and power of the At-Large will come into bear. So that's all I'm saying. I don't want to change anyone's integrity. It's about how you talk about it. This is the position of the At-Large on behalf of end-users. That's the issue. And the more often we're able to say it that way, the more powerful it will be when we're delivering that message. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: This is John Laprise for the record. I'm running the queue at the moment. I'm actually first stop. So I just wanted to riff off of what Jonathan was saying. To your point citation. There have been occasions in the past where ALAC has had divergent opinions on an issue, and it's okay to say to the wider community that we don't have consensus, we're split on a particular issue. We try to come to consensus, but that's not always possible. So you know, I don't think it's a problem to say to the broader community that we're of two minds or three minds on a particular issue. All right. So, Alberto, Yrjö and then Fouad.

EN

ALBERTO SOTO: Good morning, everyone. I'm going to speak in Spanish. Alberto speaking. I would like Jonathan -- because he's mentioned something that is really very important. I think it's interesting to listen to Johnathan and what he's saying, because as far as I understood, Jonathan says when we talk to the rest of ICANN community, if we want to deliver a message, we have to deliver it as a consensus message. That from another perspective, and I'm talking from the perspective of the various RALOs, and ALAC as well, there are different opinions on how that message should be conveyed. When I may speak in LACRALO, many people think that consensus should be reached at ALAC level and not at RALO level. And I think that we should set some guiding principles because there is some confusion on how to reach that consensus in ALAC and the RALO's level. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. That's a very good point. This is Jonathan Zuck again for the record. And I think that's another area for development on our part, is how we reach consensus. And I guess I meant to make a point that I forgot, so thank you for reminding me, is that another thing that will lend to our credibility within the organization is some kind of transparent process for reaching consensus. That includes asking people somehow communicating with end-users. Right?

And I think that the extent to which we're able to incorporate that into our policy development process will dramatically increase our ability to speak on behalf of that constituency with credibility outside of these rooms. And in fact, John's session about universal acceptance is a first attempt at building a communication channel through the RALOs to the ALSes to their members and back again and seeing what that feedback loop can look like. And if we can develop that channel of communication, then we'll have something very powerful, not just for advocacy, but also for understanding the end-user perspective ourselves.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you. Yrjö Länsipuro for the record. This is an excellent endeavor and actually, we should have started that long ago. But anyway, it's good that we have started it now, especially from my vantage point as a liaison to the GAC. We had been talking about cooperation and we have made actually some joint statements with the GAC on pretty much like apple pie and motherhood issues. But now that GAC is interested in actually having intercessional policy discussions with us and that's possible only if we have some sort of even a minimum consensus within ourselves. And of course, that's what GAC is

trying to do now. That is to say, especially on the geographic names.

FOUAD BAJWA:	Thank you. Good morning. Fouad Bajwa for the record. A few perspectives. We will always rely on ALAC to do a lot of hard work for us, because ALAC will always be on top of the issues which emerge, and which are passed down to the RALOs. And that being said, the policy development process and the involvement of the RALOs and the ALSes, will always stay one of those, let's say the struggling processes where everyone tries to get as much feedback as possible. But it really, there's going to be a lot of more hard work required to get that significant amount of feedback that we tend to find from the RALOs. I believe that when the issues of finance come up, when we see that our requests are not being met in terms of our travel, our events and so forth.

One thing which works a bit to our advantage in our real-life activities or, never organizational activities, is that we have something called continuous working groups. Not, not like CWG as in Community Working Groups, but specialized subject matter groups, which are continuously looking at a certain issue during the whole lifetime. So if we have this continuous working group, which continuously keeps passing on the message, keeps

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

enforcing our needs and keeps advocating at all the necessary spaces within ICANN, which means essentially those meetings where these decisions are being taken, I think the assertion will be much more significant that these are things needed by the At-Large community and their respective worlds.

Second most important thing is, we cannot deny the significance of the work you're doing. That significance, I can only stress as much as possible that this needs to also be a continuous working group, a continuous activity. Because policy challenges are going to evolve as the Internet evolves, as the users who interact with it evolves, as the innovation on the end of the network evolves. And the significance and that role and, and the changing needs -- we have to respond to that. And another important aspect is how do we get the ALSes involved as much as possible. Some I've had in my own policy [inaudible], I've explored something called fluid democracy. I don't know if some of you have heard about it.

But you know, we go to the ALSes when we're designing our social media engagement strategy or we're surveying them - what is working in our engagement activities. Maybe if we have some kind of dashboard - this is just a suggestion - which have all the pressing issues and all of the messages coming out of ALAC listed on them, and everyone can interact with those

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

messages through the community dashboard we already have in confluence -- I think that would be a new and important step. It's a new development activity.

I know there's more technology involved over here, but that we may be, we can continuously keep in touch with our ALSes, have them continuously involved in the PDP and continuously get feedback. I cannot guarantee it, but I can assure you one thing that even though I wouldn't be physically over here, but I can assure you that I would at least give my 70 to 80% to that because I'll be only clicking and maybe giving one or two line comments -- that would be really significant to get the feedback to Satish from every RALO. That will be significant to get feedback to your RALO. Right?

And that collective feedback is going to be significant for ALAC. And if that continuous working group continuously shows those dashboards to someone, or those people at the top, I can assure you, not in one year, not in two years, but in three years, you're going to get your multiple vote seats, you are going to get your finances straightened out, improved. That's the right word. So it's how we are going to realign ourselves for changing times, is how we're going to get what we need. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. So in the queue we have Wale, Sebastien and Matogoro. We are on a two-minute timer at this point in time. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just take a second to unpack some of that. Some of this conversation about these long-term development of issues, is what's going to be happening at Joanna's session, about the At-Large hot topics, right? That's this idea of sort of ongoing development of our positions and policy and talking points that should last over a significant period of time. And that tool is designed specifically to be a kind of menu for the RALOs to use in developing their own regional hot topic documents, in hopes that they will customize their version to their region. But start from the list, so that there is this ongoing cooperation, that's happening. So I think that's an ever evolving thing. You're thinking about a dashboard. We're making some changes like that as a result of the implementation of the At-Large review.

And so for example, the comments that we file now have executive summaries, etc. associated with them, so that the amount of effort to sort of get one layer in is less than it used to be. And if we need to go another layer up, we can do that too. But let's just keep trying them and experimenting. And so do check out the policy page now, because it's different from the

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

last time you may have looked at it, because it's in a constant evolution. But thank you very much for your input on that.

WALE BAKARE: I am Wale Bakare for the record. I am actually -- all I wanted to say, as I'm cautioned by the last speaker anyway. When you trying to build consensus there are key elements that you need to integrate into consensus to reached completion actually. If you see you have a message, you have to make that message to be driven. Message driven is one key element to improve and to make consensus effectiveness. And two, you need to make sure that you have responsiveness -- when they are responsive, then every member, every stakeholder will understand what is going on. That also leaching into what we call transparency. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. I have to go quicker with talking in English. Sorry. I have few comments and I used the wrong channel to convince them to. Jonathan, sorry for that. I will not read all my comments, but I want to raise one single point of concern, the last one about the imaging, identifier technology. I don't think we can say that UH and DOT show great promise. From my point of view, each show great risk for end-users.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM
65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

Therefore I say we have time to have this discussion. Why I that that and why maybe other, and if you go to the page, I try to gather information about the topic. I share across the CPWG, the policy group. You will see that it's not just a great premise. It's maybe worse than everything before. Therefore, I say we discuss it and we find a consensus. Either we don't say that it's good or bad, we just say that it's a point, that we are concerned, and we will work on. Thank you.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Yeah. Thank you. Matogoro Jabhera. I represent ALAC to the ICANN SSR2 Review Team. I'm glad that I'm part of this discussion and I'm happy that we are discussing on how to reach the consensus, especially regarding various issues that are affecting the Internet end-users through the Iraq. During my representation to the team, we have been going through a number of issues and I think the discussion of the consensus is very important, so that we have their voice as we are speaking on behalf of more than 7.1 billion users. Around half of the population of the group are now using the Internet.

So we are the voice of a lot of people behind us, so having the strategy to reach the consensus and to give us more voice in any team or any group, we are representing these Internet end-users. If we have reached to the consensus point, then it'll give

us more voice to stand on what to we have agreed. So I support to put in place a strategy, or a way on how we can reach to the consensus, especially for people presenting ALAC to different groups and review team. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot for that point. One of the things that we've been doing is getting reports on the CPWG calls from Alan and Hadia, as they represent our interests on the EPDP group with respect to GDPR compliance, and the At-Large consensus about that. And the basic structure of their presentation is - here's what's going on, here's the main issues that are being discussed. This is what we think the At-Large position on this is. What do you think? And then we discuss it and refine it, and they're able to go back to the EPDP emboldened, right? With more consensus on those issues. So I would love to see that spread to other areas in which we're engaged in ICANN.

And SSR2 is a perfect example of coming in and saying what are the questions that are being raised, where other controversies, where do you see the end-user perspective coming up? And let's get a conversation going because I think that'll be a good trigger, because we're not necessarily paying attention to what's going on in that review team. And it would be great if you were making us pay attention to the things you thought were

specifically of interest to end-users, so we can incorporate them in the discussions. Thanks.

JOHN LAPRISE: So I have Daniel, Amrita and Sebastien in the queue.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel for the record. Just to have a few key points in respect to the dashboard of Ella, I think there is need to outline respective timelines of which these policies are taking place. So in case a respective discussion is taking a certain period of time, I think we have to be cautious, because this also affects the hot topics implementation.

In reference to AFRALO, when the hot topics were drafted, we came up with the implementation plan. But the implementation plan which was meant to take approximately one year of implementation took longer than before, which again brought in another twist into the whole general implementation plan. Is there probably a demarcation? Probably this could be coming up so early into the discussion of how do we outline timelines regarding to this key issues that are being discussed. Because by the time when the hot topic has come up, by the time when the discussion starts to take place, or it hasn't been

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

implemented, another one is springing up. So that's also one of the key things.

And then also lastly, regarding to consensus building, I think the fact that some recommendations coming from the community representing the end-users, I think also our respective ALSes have to play a key role in disseminating key discussion points that are appearing in respective meetings or during the respective reviews that are taking place of a respective policies that affect the end-users. I think we also have to clearly [inaudible] how can we -- like a feedback mechanism from the community whereby it's a give and take [inaudible]. I'm not seeing that happening. Probably that would be something for discussion. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I agree completely.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you. Amrita Choudhury for the records. It's a very good thing that the policy's being focused, and more people are actually being encouraged to come and see the policies even in the website. One challenge which I see from my engagement activities is that people do not come to the website. And I'm not seeing people who are involved, I'm seeing people who are not

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

involved, but are ALSes. So one idea perhaps needs to be seen how to bring them to the website, at least to see what is being discussed. Now everybody might not be able to contribute to everything, but at higher levels they can give their perspective, which also helps in consensus building. You know, when you get into in depth, not everyone might have the technical knowledge, but on a broader aerial view, they can. So if that can be brought in, the interests can come and perhaps people will understand more and help in the consensus building. So these were two points which I touched.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. I agree completely. And again, I want to really stress the importance of John's session with respect to your universal acceptance.   It's only partly about universal acceptance. The universal acceptance is an excuse for us to test out a mechanism for creating a feedback loop. That's just the first topic we're trying it on. But the real issue is trying to get that feedback loop established so that we can use it more fluidly through the RALOs to the ALSes to their members back again, as we develop policy and developing some efficiency around that. That's the real experiment. And so please, even if you're not thinking about universal acceptance, be a part of that effort

because it's actually a process effort as much as it is a substantive one.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Well, universal acceptance is good in terms of an outreach. We've been trying to do it in India for some time. As at this point of time, if you're looking from an Asian perspective, it is more at the developer's level, and the business to kind of implement it. The adoption is -- the challenge is there for us now, but yes, that's a good start.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Jonathan, I am a little bit concerned that everything will fall under the CPWG. Are you sure that you want to have the policy and the review teams, because there are currently three going on? One, it's SSR2, one it's LDS2, one it's ATRT3. And then if you add the CCWG on the auction proceed, and so on and so forth, maybe it's a good idea to have everything under this umbrella. But one day we can also disband the ALAC and the all the other groups, and just have this one. It's a joke what I'm saying here, but be careful not to take too much on the shoulder of this group, and really it was supposed to be policy. I am not sure that we can really say that review teams are policy.

At the end of the day, yes, we will have policy, but it's not the same thing that the PDP or a cross community working group, on specific topic. But it's a, it's a question mark, just to be questioned on that. And I think if it's on this group, we need to act systematically on this, on the agenda, the three reviews going on, and if there's something to say, great. If not, it will be a place holder. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Again, I don't know the answer to your question. What I'd like I'd like to see personally is that some place, the representatives to a review team or working group are saying, here's three issues that have come up that I believe effect end-user interests. Can we come up with, we the At-Large, whether it's the ALAC, CPWG, etc. is not my priority, but is there a way for that person to then go back to that review team and say we have consensus on these three points as opposed to that person just giving their personal opinions while they're sitting on it. That's all I'm trying to change. So if it's through the CPWG and that doesn't work, then you find another mechanism. But I don't need to hear about everything that's going on in the review team. Hopefully there's some editing that happens, that says here's some specific things, respect to end-users that we ought to discuss. Let's get a discussion going. That's all.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Excuse me. But we are not in the review team just for end-user. We are there for ICANN Internet and the world. Sorry to say that, then we need also to have the inputs of At-Large on topics that may not directly affect the end-user. I know that we are trying to shrink our focus on that and that's great for policy issue. I am not sure that it's the best way. We will enter into the review teams in general. At least we need to have this somewhere in the discussion one day. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: This is John Laprise for the record. We have Satish, Olivier, Maureen and Shreedeep in the queue. And then Daniel, I see. Daniel, and Holly, and Satish.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, John. Satish, for the record. I have a process issue to be flagged and this refers to the large number of the ALS members. So currently we are engaging with the ALSes and individual members, but each of these ALSes have a significant number of members who are not directly, for whatever reason, communicating in this, or participating in the policy process. I'm wondering if there's any way to kind of involve them as well? Going beyond this barrier, which is fairly artificial after the At-

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

Large review. And that review has pointed out that we have to involve the members of these ALSes beyond the ALS representatives. So is there some way that we can think of a process change, whereby we can consult them as well? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So, I welcomed very much the document which we have on our screen. The thing that I was looking for though -- I think maybe if I could suggest as next steps -- would be to have a Wiki page that basically has the links to all of the different RALO hot topics, that has a table that has got each one of the titles of the RALO hot topics, so we can also compare in between regions. I think that'd be really, really helpful. And then to be able to have one column of that table. So six columns; five - one for each one of the RALOs, and the sixth one being the ALAC hot topics. So then we can kind of link them together because I'm a little concerned to hear that --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, we're a blending a lot of issues. So I didn't really mean to open this can of worms right now, except to say that your voice will be more effective out there this week, if you're able to say

this is a consensus as you, this is how it affects end-users. So these are great discussions that we need to keep having them. The hot topics is a different session than this one. And I think - make your suggestion there because we'll need to figure out how to present them and make that useful. This is literally just some talking points for this week and to aid you in the conversations that may come up when somebody says, what do you think about x? Right? Or you're in a working group and you raise your hand and say, the At-Large believes such and such, right? That's this exercise this morning. So if you've got more questions about that process, then put your card back up. Otherwise we should probably continue on, because the issues of how we reached consensus is an ongoing discussion we aren't going to resolve before the coffee break.

JOHN LAPRISE: So, at present, we have Shreedeep, Daniel, Holly and Matogoro and Maureen in the queue. If you have substantive comments along the lines that Jonathan has requested --

JONATHAN ZUCK: We haven't even got over them yet.

JOHN LAPRISE: And at this point we're going to close the queue.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Yeah, I'd like to speak. This is Shreedeep. I strongly believe that the multi-stakeholder process and the multi-stakeholder engagement itself, both are different things. So a better communication strategy is needed to target the individual leaders, as well as the ALS. So that could help in building up the consensus because ultimately there is a confusion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Agreed.

DANIEL NANGHAKA: Daniel for the record. Sir, I don't, I wouldn't want to react to that issue of the communication strategy that has just come up, but my previous issue was the issue of the reviews. Just to what Sebastien mentioned, the reviews are very, very important. Updates from the reviews to the community are great. I think this is something that you should really take into consideration and the fact that we, the ATRT, we'll be having a session together with the ALAC to discuss some of the -- because during this meeting we are doing a lot of our scoping and gathering of data. I think we need to really review that.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

And then just to highlight, in less than 30 seconds about the issue of the communication strategy. Currently that is what that is in progress and they're just waiting for updates of the At-Large communication strategy. And then from there, we can be able to come up with other respective options, engagements and communication strategy. I think Maureen will be able to highlight that at a certain point in time. Thank you. But when it -- lastly policy. Let's see how we can get full community participation in the policy development process. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: A couple of practical things. One, was the problem with the website. Now if you're not familiar with it, that's very, very difficult. But one thing that RALOs could do in all of the RALO meetings, is to actually have people go to the website to see what the issues are, and focus on perhaps one issue so that everybody in each RALO can then go back to each ALS and equip people on how do you understand what the issue is and how to provide feedback. I just think there's a real mechanical issue about how easy it is to provide feedback or even to understand the problem. Thank you.

MATOGORO JABHERA: Thank you. this is Matogoro for the record again. I really appreciate the ongoing discussion and, since I joined the SSR2 Review Team in 2017, we have been going through a number of ups and downs, and ALAC and the community is aware, and we are dealing with a very critical issue, security, stability and resilience of the unique identifier. And internet users are the ones who are affected very much with these issues we are dealing with. [Inaudible] says that without having the communication channel in place, the way to give the voice of the Internet users related on the issue of security, stability and resilience of the unique identifiers, then we find that the voice is not that much represented.

However, we are a group of experts and we are dealing with very unique and difficult issues, so there is a need of ALAC having a structure in place to make sure that we are presenting the voice of a more than four points, one billion users on the initials of Internet security, stability and resilience. So often insisting that, initially on the previous, we used to have maybe monthly calls or quarter calls to represent or to give a progress of what we are doing. But since the pausing of the SSR2 Review Team, nothing has been happening and we have been doing, having a progress. You find you are making good progress, you'll find that you'll stop then. So without having ALAC behind us, so we rank as

orphans in the group of experts. So I need to ask to add the voice of Internet users to this. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Here we go. Let's see. The discussion has actually been quite comprehensive, and has gone probably a little bit beyond what our original intent was, but we will take note of the comments that had been made. I just wanted to sort of just make one comment about the CPWG. It is a unit that is -- a working group that looks at building consensus around particular topics that are sort of prioritized. So we don't -- there are activities that we're actually involved in, with regards to public comment [inaudible] take up a priority. So we don't -- like everything, all and sundry, isn't discussed together. They're usually led by a pen holder, someone who comes in with a perspective and that discussion takes place.

So we're also looking at -- we have weekly meetings, chaired by Jonathan and Olivier. And we have people who contribute to those weekly meetings, a growing group, and people just come out when they're available. But at the same time, we've got to make sure that we're actually building a sort of consensus of opinion from the discussions that we have here. So I just wanted to end on this, and to take aspect to the talking points, which is

at was our main purpose for the session, and the importance of these talking points for what we do this week. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I have to be careful of trigger terms that I use that launch us into other conversations. But what I want to do is just talk briefly about some of the talking points we have for this meeting, that we formed via our flawed process of consensus building that we will continuously be trying to improve. So, we go through the basic slide version of this just so that everybody gets a kind of overview. We'll try to talk about them quickly. Sebastien made a couple of points, as well that, we can try to make some adjustments to the document as you're talking about them, etc.

But let's just go over them briefly. So on subsequent procedures, I think our number one talking point is that there's no rush, right? There isn't a huge consumer demand for new, or end-user demand for a new TLDs, etc. And so I think we continue to deliver that message and I believe that's also a message, that we'll be able to, deliver in conjunction with the GAC actually as well. So, I think that's a powerful message even though it's so simple. We continue to believe that priority needs to be given to both community and, applications from underserved regions. Sebastien's point on that particular issue, is that, is that sometimes, people in well-served regions try to

put domains, top level domains in underserved regions and that's not quite the same thing. And so, we'll talk about that a little bit, but a prioritization and it should certainly be given to, applications that come from indigenous members of those underserved regions as well.

And then the third big message is - get it right this time. We have a great list of recommendations that we made at the last round and this is again, a good area for credibility because everybody likes to hear, I told you so. Where we made points, they weren't implemented and then they cause problems as the previous round took place. So I think we have a strong case to make that getting all of our ducks in a row, getting the process solid before proceeding, has got to be a priority. That means implement the CCT, RPM, and SSR2 recommendations before having a new round. It means to listen to the SSAC comments and considerations and taking those into consideration.

And don't leave everything to staff implementation. Right? That's the other thing is that that distinction between policy and implementation probably left too much to staff to figure out to the org to figure out, in the previous round. So those are some of our key topics around subsequent procedures. Wherever you are, you find yourself talking about that issue. Those are sort of

our consensus places and they reflect the comments that we've submitted thus far. Next slide please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you explain what those abbreviations are?   Because I'm pretty sure some people here they don't know what CCT, SSR2, RPM are.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. CCT is the -- Sorry. Holly's going to talk about our position on CCT. So I, again, I'm not trying to load you with so many things and make everyone an expert in depth about each of these things, but to give you the elevator version, so that we're saying the same things over and over again, message repetition is message delivered and retained. Right? So Holly, will be talking about our inputs of the CCT, but that's the Competition and Consumer Choice Review Team.   The RPM is Rights Protection Mechanisms. SSR2, as we've just been talking about, is the Security and Stability Review. And the SSAC is the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. So those are things that we think are important prerequisites to a new, to a new round. And if they ask you for which specific CCT recommendations you're trying to track, you may remember, you may not, just pretend that someone's calling you from across the room and leave the

ICANN 65
POLICY FORUM
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

conversation, but deliver the message that these recommendations are a prerequisite.

Okay. Next slide please. Geographic names. This is still a work in progress for us, right? But, one of our key principles is that we should minimize end-user confusion, right? So there shouldn't be a top level domain that makes a basic end believe that it's one thing when it's really something else, that it's a community thing when it's really a commercial thing, etc. There we should prioritize indigenous communities, for non-generic region specific uses. In other words, if there's a proposal to do something that's about the region and it's not just making use of the name as a generic, then we should prioritize those indigenous communities. And we're still working on consensus on the rest. And so this will evolve as the week goes on cause we're going to have that conversation.

All right, next slide. Auction proceeds. It should be consistent with the ICANN mission and remit, in other words, fall within the confines of ICANN. It shouldn't just be spent on helping people understand how to send email. And then another point that we've made is individuals in ALSes, should be able to participate in the process that evolves. And so these are just high level points that we've made in comments, on auction proceeds.

Next slide please. The GDPR implementation or EPDP phase two. The most important thing to us right now, the priority for At-Large is accessed by legitimate actors to the information that's now withheld. So that cybersecurity researchers, it's law enforcement, it's focused that are people that are focused on malware and phishing scams, etc. All those people and getting them a mechanism to request and receive that data is now the top priority for the EPDP. But if possible, we should revisit the issue of geographic distinction for disclosure, we should revisit the legal versus natural distinction for disclosure. So these are the things that are in fact made public. That's different than access. And this is a vocabulary discussion that's going on and on. So we're just going to agree inside this room that disclosure is this information that's out there all the time. That access is the ability to get to the hidden information.

And then, we need to look at the true costs of these distinctions if they were implemented and with an independent study. Because right now it's all been done through the eyes of the contract did parties. And so, Alan and Hadia have been pushing hard for an independent research to happen on what the costs of making these distinctions would really be because we're just hearing that they're expensive and we're supposed to take that on faith.

Next slide. And again, all of these have more text in here, right? Evolution to the multi stakeholder model. It's okay to say structural issues still exist that need to be addressed. And that's come up and it's been discussed, and I think there's rough consensus within the At-Large that there are still structural issues to be addressed. They won't be addressed this week though, but I think it's worth mentioning them. But specific to the process that's taking place right now, we are strengthening the security of the DNS and the DNS route service system, evolving the DNS to better serve the needs of end-users. Ensuring ICANN's long-term financial stability, is another thing that keeps coming up in the context of our At-Large meetings and encouraging participation by the broadest community of voices is another big issue for At-Large. It's how do we get more people aware of and engaged in these discussions, in a way that's manageable by them so they don't have to devote their life to it, the way that we have.

Next slide please. On the reviews of the big points that we suggest, the nom con process needs to be more transparent. That's a point that's come up consistently. And that we are supportive of the new standards for specific reviews, so that they have better scoping, they have a process back and forth with the board before the outsets, so there aren't surprises the way that there was with the CCT review. So these new standards

are something that we discuss quite a bit, and we think will be beneficial to the review process. Another thing that has come up, that might come up in our ATRT discussion, is whether the ATRT should be empowered to prioritize reviews, postpone some, bring others up, etc., so that we don't have this crunch of them as we're having now, where we have so many recommendations, that the organization can never get to them.

Next slide. If there is one. Emerging identifier technology. This is another point that Sebastien brought up, and, and did so just a few minutes ago, there has been a lot of discussion about this. It's by no way finished. People believe that there's great promise in terms of security associated with DNS over https in particular. But there's a lot of increasing concerns about the effect that it might have on competition, and a kind of a monoculture that might result from the fact that only a few resolvers might exist. So those are open discussions. And we both would definitely think there needs to be more research, before we do anything definitive.

JOHN LAPRISE: So this is John Laprise for the record. We have a brief queue of three. We will have one minute interventions, because we're running out of time in this session. Okay. So I see Judith, Ricardo and Abdulkarim in the queue and that will close the

queue and what we're turning to the session back to Jonathan. So Judith, you have one minute.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, it's Judith Hellerstein for the record. So a couple of things. One on the Auction Proceeds. We also discussed -- are we not also going to focus on the importance of transparency and the importance that, of making sure of there is no conflict of interest, because that was another key point in the Auction Proceeds comments. And on NomCom, the question is, are we going to -- I don't know if we discussed this on a 360 review. So that one is that when the NomCom pictures people that they conduct a 360 review prior to selection. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I don't remember the last one, but I think the other ones are easy to add because they're just logical, right? So in here when talking about Auction Proceeds, transparency and conflict of interest are definitely worth adding into the talking points as well. And then, I don't know about the 360 review and so I can't speak to that. So, if it's something you're really familiar with, then speak to it, but I don't remember it being consensus policy from us.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Ricardo Holmquist speaking. When you mentioned the EDPD phase two, you included in the slide that it was a top priority, so then legitimate actors may have access to the information. I think that at the Kobe meeting we discussed that ALAC was not 100% sure about the legitimate actors. So who are these legitimate actors or players? So it was printed in capital letters as the top priority. Certainly I don't want my government to have access to my data. So who are these legitimate actors, before writing them in capital letters as a top priority? I think we should discuss this. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. It's a very good point, and I'll just respond briefly cause we're running out on time a little bit. What I think we are advocating inside the group is defining a process, because that's what's going to take so long. A process is the top priority and that another discussion will be identifying who those legitimate actors are. So this doesn't presuppose that we know who they are yet, but that actually coming up with a mechanism for them once we've identified who the legitimate actors are and have that discussion, that they can begin to access the data.

Because we've already seen through the presentation that we had in that discussion a decrease in the ability of cyber security research to take place, etc. And so there's an urgency in finding

the things on which we do agree are legitimate access and will then also have to have a discussion about how those people get certified and all those other issues. But having a mechanism in place to get to that data is an important priority.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. This is Abdulkarim for the record. I just want to seek clarification regarding when you emphasized that it was consensus around the issue of having indigenous communities given priorities with geographical name. I want to probably seek some clarification for you to explain a little bit before the, especially coming from the issue of, especially with Amazon, which we're a bit familiar with. So I just want a clarification on your consensus on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you for your question. This is a subtle point and it's something that we continue to discuss. But the issue that I -- my understanding that continues to be discussed, is whether or not the intention of the domain is meant to be reasonably specific or whether the word is meant to be used generically. And if it's meant to serve the region somehow, then that kicks in the need to get letters of permission and things like that, if the domain is about the region as opposed to simply the use of the name.

And so in the context in which the purpose of the domain is meant to be region specific than we should be given priority to those indigenous, that's something on which we have consensus. So Amazon is a different issue and not one I that I know that we have consensus on, but certainly that when the intention is for that domain to be used for region specific purposes, that a prioritization should be given to the indigenous communities.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank very much everyone. I think we have to finish this. You've got 10 minute break before the next –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just one more second. I'm sorry. So part of what we lost time for unfortunately, is that I really want everyone to make a decision to go to a meeting outside this room this week to either listen in on a session so that you can bring some intelligence back to the meeting or, find an opportunity to bring up some of these points in that meeting. There's no public forum this time because it's a policy forum. And so finding an opportunity to raise an issue inside of one of these groups has got to be a priority for this group, to participate in the processes outside this room.

So, what we didn't get to discuss is who was going to go do what, which is what I was hoping to spend most of our time on in this session. but we had a great philosophical discussion that will be ongoing for the next five years. But what I really want you to do, is think hard about what sessions you're going to attend that are not in this room and what that opportunity might look like for participation. Either to learn something new that you can bring back. Because at the end of the week we're going to have a debrief session and ask all of you what sessions you attended, what points you made, how they were received, and if there's anything else we need to do or clarify etc., as a result of that interaction. So sometimes it's just there to listen, if it's a GAC session or something, find out where they are and some of these issues.

So what I will do is forward this spreadsheets or staff will forwarded around to everyone that's here. We'll take a look at it and if you see a session that you think is relevant for us that I didn't think of, then please add it to, but they'll forward it around, sign up for something. Say, I'm going to go to this session and I'm going to deliver this message. I'm going to go to this session, and I'm going to listen and take notes, whatever it may be. And then, at the session on a Thursday, let's talk about, how that went. Okay. But that was the real purpose of this session. So look in your inbox for this excel spreadsheet, looking

for opportunities to either learn more about a particular issue that matters to us or to raise a point, if you feel comfortable, that we have reached some consensus on.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I was just going there looking at this, I mean, you have actually got a bit of a schedule of people assigned to various things to him do for these kinds of topics. So, I mean if you're on that list have a look please. Yeah. We'll get this on the Wiki. Sebastien, we've only got five more minutes and they were starting a new session.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You told me that we will be discussing who will be the voice of our At-Large and the various high interest topics, who have you decided it will be? It's my question, sorry.

MAUREEN HILYARD: We're doing the high interest topics at another session. This is only the talking points. Okay. We're not doing that. Thank you very much for coming. We're really pressed for time and of course we haven't stuck to the clock as much as we should have. I hope you got some value out of that session. There is the NCUC session coming up in about five minutes and it gives you a bit of

EN

a five minute break before that starts. Have a good five minute break.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65 MARRAKECH 24–27 June 2019