PANAMA – Joint Meeting GAC and ALAC
Wednesday, June 27, 2018 – 11:30 to 12:30 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

MANAL ISMAIL: We already have a full agenda. Sincere apologies for the delayed start. We have the agenda already on the screen. Again, for the sake of new GAC representatives, if we can quickly start by introducing the ALAC and what you do.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. I will introduce [Indiscernible] to take the lead on this.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I have the slides up? Thank you.

So what is "at large"? Grateful for the opportunity to briefly explain what "at large" is and what is the difference between "at large" and "ALAC" or rather how ALAC is the part -- at large -- committee -- advisory committee is part of the "at large." Next slide, please.

So "at large" community. Within ICANN, the at-large community acts on the interests of internet users and works to ensure that the internet continues to serve the global public interests from a user perspective. Internet users -- the author, if you would --

next slide, please. So internet users -- there are 4 billion of them. We don't claim to represent them. That would be foolish. That would be crazy. But we do try to understand their needs and identify their interests. We call them "users" and you call them "citizens." They are the same people. This gives some ground for our corporation. Next slide, please.

So "at large" the lowest -- on the ground, we have what is called "at-large" structures, more than 200 of them, but independent members. About 00. The numbers are growing. ALAC committee is the apex of it. Next slide, please.

So here, we have 5 more abbreviations -- acronyms. The regional at-large organizations, or RALOs, they follow the how ICANN defines the word. There are -- I think 2,228 at-large structures more than 100 countries. And these 5 slides here just demonstrate that we really have feet on the ground. ALSEs, at-large structures, they are pre-existing structures, more or less devoted to the [Indiscernible] and since they are affiliated with us, it means they also have interest within the issues of the ICANN limit. You just can take the next slide and next and next all these five slides. So basically, this just demonstrates that the ALSEs are pretty much different from each other. But the common -- is that they are interested in the issues within ICANN [Indiscernible].

Next. The at-large committee, ALAC, represents one member from each region, plus the nominating committee. Next slide.

This is from the bylaws. This is the basis from our existence. The at-large committee is -- for individual internet users. The role of the ALAC should be to consider and provide advice on the activities of the ICANN as far as they relate to the interests of individual internet users. Next, please.

And this includes policies created by the ICANN SOs as well as many Other issues, coordinates outreach to other internet users. Next, please.

So to do this, we participate in various activities, PDPs, cross-community working groups, review teams and present the perspective of end users. Where we see a user impact -- we of course interact with other parts of ICANN like right now, and we involve this distributed community. 2,228 organizations as a sounding board from where we could get grassroots impact for the advice we give. Thank you. I think Alan has promised to answer questions if you have.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, I'll start off with a statement if not a question. You might imagine, how can we get these people around the world -- many of whom have never heard the word "ICANN" before to get

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

involved and to participate. You can imagine how hard it is for employees or individuals who are not paid to do this. We are hope to go get better at it. We are still learning.

MANAL ISMAIL: So thank you, Georgio and Alan. Georgio is the liaison to the GAC. He has been instrumental in putting our joint agenda for today and so Alan, maybe -- so you're in advisory committee like GAC, and we normally have a Communique out at the end of each meeting. How do your advisory process compares to the GAC? Do you do this at the end of each meeting? Do you provide advised intercession? How do you come up with your advice?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm afraid we're not nearly as organized as you are. We have, over the years -- we have taken the position that we are in a much stronger position to give advice if we ever do, if we are participating in a lot of the processes. So a very large part of our focus is actually participating in PDPs or other groups around ICANN with a CSNSO, who are taking our decisions and doing our best to influence them along the way.

Look carefully at public comments. If there's a user implication, we try to influence processes that way. It is -- you know, it would

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

seem that we're in a stronger position to give advice to the board which is counter to what supporting organization is saying. We have tried earlier on -- and I know that is something that GAC is doing actively as well right now. And as a result, we don't find we end up giving advice to the board all that often. There's a couple of times a year perhaps and we don't try to necessarily synchronize it with an ICANN meeting although the discussions at an ICANN meeting -- it would come out at the meeting or shortly after. In fact, if you looked at the record, we don't do an awful lot of advice and I hope we're being effective nevertheless. I take it personally, I am the outgoing chair. I will be the chair for the next few months. My position is, if we don't have to give advice, that means we are successful. The more advice we have to give implies that we were not able to move the organization at some earlier time. Unlike the GAC, the board is obliged to answer our advice but not necessarily to take it or not even to not to. We envy your position. To the board's credit, when we have given advice, they have given credit and said, "Let's talk about it."

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alan. I have Portugal and [Indiscernible].

PORTUGAL:	Thank you, Manal. It is difficult to discuss the several issues. I would like to propose to have different taskforces along with the different themes that we have on the table. But small taskforces because I think that in this way, it would be much easier to change our points of view because I think that we have some connections and it's very, very interesting to see it as a potential, and it would be a good way out. Because this plenary is -- we don't have really a dialogue, right? Thank you.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	My comment is that we have done it on a few rare occasions over the last decade and we would be delighted.
MANAL ISMAIL:	We now have India.
INDIA:	[Indiscernible] Hussein from India. The recent response from ALAC has [Indiscernible] control from the ICANN community. Leadership has understood -- they don't accept several of the recommendations. I would recommend some kind of elaboration on this from your end.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This review has been a strain. It now has been going on for 3.5 years and we are now at the stage where we're about to start implementing things. The board at their meeting just prior to the ICANN62 meeting adopted -- accepted the recommendation -- the proposals going forward and we are just about to start implementation. I won't go into a lot of the details although I would be delighted to share them with you privately. They would take far too long. The recommendations in the review in our minds were in many cases identified valid issues. We told them about many of them to begin with. We were not unaware of the problems that are involved but some of their recommendations were simply not practical. They were not implementable. One of the examples is we should use the auction proceeds funds to fund the ALAC. ICANN decided we are not going to use them for operational funds. We like else have a difficult time getting people into volunteer positions, having them deliver and work. One of their recommendations is we should have the number of people involved, divide it by 2, and everyone should take on two jobs instead of one. We thought some of them were -- to be blunt -- would probably kill at large instead of improve it. We took all of the issues to heart that we felt were applicable, and moving forward to address the issues that need to be addressed, but in a slightly different way that the reviewers recommended. So that is the summary. The good

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

news is we are past that point. We now have a plan and we will start implementing it. Thank you. Thank you for the question.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alan. Any further questions? Yeah, Iran, please. I'm very sorry. Go ahead.

IRAN: Thank you. I don't have any suggestion, but I would like to seriously -- very deliberately, congratulate ALAC because of your very very effective participation in all activities, CCWG, and others, you have a big task. You represent those who cannot be represented. You voiced those that have no voice, but they have no ways [Indiscernible] voice to be had. And you have done it very well. Continue that, we have the journey, in the CCWG, we have Leon, and John, above all of that, you have a very good positive constructive relation with you. Always be delighted that. You're listening to us. We are very delighted that you have a contact with us. We are happy that we work together and you have a recommendation to be continued and so on. You are more lucky than us in one area. You have a board member we don't have. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: On behalf of all of my colleagues, I appreciate it. I appreciate the cooperation we have with the GAC, I appreciate that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Iran and thanks, Alan. Any further requests for the floor before we move on to GDPR?

ALAN GREENBERG: An unimportant discussion. No one really cares about GDPR, right? [Chuckle] That is a joke.

I don't think we need to review where we are. Everyone is pretty well up on it. The focus this week is on the GNSO expedited PDP, how will it happen and how will we be involved in it? I know the GAC and the ALAC have shown strong interest in how we can participate. We don't have a lot of people who are willing to take the 30-40 hours a week that people are predicting in order to be able to participate fully. It is one of these things that is, "Careful what you ask for." If we get what some people would like us to get, there is no way we can actually meet the target. But nevertheless, we are committed to working with the EPDP, and we hope when the GNSO finishes their deliberations, we will have a place to play there. We are looking forward to making this work.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

How we're going to do this in the period of time we have including things like the accreditation model which is a real difficult thing, not in the model, but how do we get the credentials from all the various groups, it's going to be a real challenge. I don't think anyone pretends to have the answer. I hope we will move together and go forward. After that it is looking into a crystal ball and hoping we do it right.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alan. Yeah. As you rightly mentioned, GAC has strong interests in participating to the EPDP, given the workload you already mentioned, this is one of the reasons we are asking to have more seats than just one, because we don't think that one person will be able to carry the whole workload. We also have the unified access model to the GAC as well and where there is a proposed role for the GAC to play, so yeah. So a lot to do in one period. It is challenging. Iran, you want to weigh in?

IRAN: Do you think that these unified mandatory access model should be done outside the model? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, I'm not speaking on behalf of anyone else because we haven't discussed that as a group. My personal opinion is it

should be done within the EDPD, but within a prioritized matter. The critical part is to replace the temporary specification. The temporary specification says, "Think about access." But the part in the specification that must be replaced by May 25th, 2019 is not -- is not that detailed. So I believe it should be included in the EPDP. They should have two phases. Two reports. And if we relegate it to some other process, it's going to take forever and I wouldn't want to see another EPDP having to start. I think it should be a process. It is a personal process not having discussed it win else in our group. If anyone else in our group has a different opinion -- [Indiscernible]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Knowing that the unified access model will not be the end because we need accreditation models. Those will be based on unified access model so I think we need to have it together with the new EPDP.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are more than halfway through the session and we are only on item number 2. So maybe we should move on unless there's any strong other feelings. Okay.

The next item is -- the next item is a moderately quick one which is Work Track 5. The geographic names. It's easy to stay at our

position because we don't have one at this point. We have a number of positions within the group. Some of them really strong. Other positions within the group say we really don't care how it comes out, but there shouldn't be any big winners or losers. Somehow we have to find a balance. There are people in the group who strongly favor one answer or the other and something we have to do over the next couple months is debate it to see if we can come up with a single ALAC position.

MANAL ISMAIL: I think we are more or less in the same position here at the GAC. We have tried to compile individual GAC inputs to the process and we have submitted this to Work Track 5. So just to encourage GAC participation and as you can imagine, even within the GAC, we don't have a unified position yet. To provide as much information from the GAC side as we can. So any specific comments from GAC colleagues who are active in Work Track 5? I can see a request for the floor at the back. Please, go ahead. If you can identify yourself, please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: My name is [Indiscernible] I'm a participant of at-large. I just want to go to Alan's comments about ALAC's advice are not being specifically attended to by the ICANN board. Advisory board, GAC, bring about a balance in the multi-stakeholder

process. If ALAC is not strong enough -- when GAC remains strong, it gets reduced to the typical private/public scenario where, invariably, the private actors find a way to exceed the balance. So it doesn't interest the GAC or the multi-stakeholder process that GAC should address this imbalance and help ALAC become strong enough so that a balance prevails in the multi-stakeholder process. Thank you. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah. Thank you. Any further comments? Any comments or remarks on geographic names in specific? Yes, Switzerland.

SWITZERLAND: This is Jorge [Indiscernible]. Just a quick remark. I think it is a very useful cooperation, subsequent procedures, I feel there is a convergence in a lot of the ideas, in the ALAC representatives and GAC representatives share in the sense that, in the end, you are many times representing -- speaking for the interests of individual users and their communities, their local compliance, looking into what are the needs, not only of global players, but also for those local communities and in the end, I think that from our side -- at least personally, I would say that we tried to also strengthen that thought. Of course, also from the side of on the lining of value of public authorities -- local public authorities -- who in the end represent those local communities and are

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

accountable to them according to the rule of law and democratic procedures. So I just wanted to share that remark with you and thank you for the good cooperation. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Switzerland. I have Iran next.

IRAN: Thank you, madam. I wish to make another question. You probably -- and our strategic colleagues, Giani is here. [Indiscernible] received a message from the staff is in the process of applying -- finishing the touches -- or massaging to the final report of the CCWG, and send it to the charter organization with the view that ICANN 63, the charter organization will sign up their views. As you know there are 100 recommendations coming from 9 groups. I just want to request the ALAC, whether you discussed how you treat these recommendations. Do you treat them by chapter by chapter, or jurisdiction group? The diversity group or you go to some sensitive recommendations? That would be helpful also for us because we are facing the same situation and they will discuss in the course of our meeting that helps to do that. I don't think there will be time to go recommendation by recommendation. If you have thoughts -- even if it is not discussing the ALAC. I know

you are active and -- the reader could also give the views that he has as a member of the ALAC. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavous. Tijani -- if we can postpone the response to Agenda item 6 and wait to see if there are other comments or questions on geographic names and then we will proceed to agenda item and then take your question. Indonesia. Is this on geographic names?

INDONESIA: Yes. Geographic names. Input from international community -- because it may happen. Geographic names may be used by several countries. One name can be in several countries. Not only that, the sensitivity of those people using geographic names might be different from country to country. Similar geographic names different countries, it may be different. I just wonder how can you -- you know, accommodate all these differences. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The simple answer is: I don't know. The ALAC has discussed it -- we have not discussed it with our regional people. I won't pretend we can give an answer on behalf of all the groups. We are trying to provide a global resource, top-level domains, for all

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

existence in the world has been local. How we're going to do that, I don't know. It is a real challenge. You can add in commercial interests who have established rights and in specific jurisdictions, in specific topics for -- you know, intellectual property rights which we've never had to -- you know, they are very specifically local and now we are applying them to a global resource there. The same issues show up. And how do we find a balance between all of these? Hopefully Javier is one of our co-chairs. We are implementing the ideas of the co-chairs. I don't have them now. I won't pretend I do. The position we have taken -- we did discuss it in the ALAC last year -- is -- the answers are going to be difficult, but there is the potential for significantly hurting the multi-stakeholder model in ICANN if we can't find some level of compromise. That is a very serious consideration. That is why I said -- at the time we discussed it -- one of the prime answers was: We don't necessarily side with one side or the other or have the magic answer. But if we can't find some level of compromise that makes everyone moderately comfortable, then I think it's a potentially real dangerous sign for the multi-stakeholder model in ICANN. That doesn't answer your question, I'm afraid.

MANAL ISMAIL: Any further questions or comments on geographic names? So if not, with your permission, Alan, let's proceed to agenda item 6

first to answer Kavous's good question and then we can go back to agenda item 4.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will turn it over to Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: I will talk about the process. It is more of an update I will give than a position. ICANN 61, [Indiscernible] adopted the main subgroups recommendations and defined the report. It is a compilation of the recommendation of all the 8 subgroups. During this meeting, the board raised some concerns about four recommendations which are a recommendation about the advisory board of the ombudsman to increase or to -- yes, to increase the independence, and three other recommendations about [Indiscernible] concerning improving ICANN documentary information disclosing policy, the second one is documenting and reporting on ICANN's interaction with governments. And the last one is transparency of the board deliberations.

We met with the board chair and some members of the board. We discussed those concerns and we come up with a discussion that the recommendations that were adopted will not be changed, but the co-chairs, we work to provide -- to provide -- how do you say -- implementation guidance that addresses --

that address those concerns. This was done Sunday. The plenary approved these recommendation guidance that address the concern of the board.

We have the final report together with those guidance that we are working on to prepare them to send them to the chapter organizations for approval and we hope that this will not be done after -- this should be done before or by ICANN 63 in Barcelona. Once it is passed, we will take it to the board for consideration. This is the status. Thank you for the work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. I will try to answer Kavous's question. We tried to answer the questions as they were out for comment. We answered the package in the last public comment. And at this point, barring some radical change, we are not likely to review the details of all of the recommendations again. In our last public comment, we expressed general support for the whole set of recommendations, but noted that although each of the recommendations makes sense in its own right, the whole package is perhaps going to impose a very large burden on the ICANN Organization and the SOs in the cases and we have some concern that we may be a very transparent organization that never gets around to doing our real work because we are so busy being transparent. So we are likely to issue a comment to the board along with what I am suspecting will be approval until we actually vote on it. I won't forget that. I am concerned where, as

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

we implement, we try to keep things as simple as possible. There are expensive and time-consuming things that are in those recommendations. Some of them -- for staff -- have budgetary implications, it will add significantly to our administrative load -- we feel. I hope that answers it.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Alan. I see a couple nodding. So this answers the question. Any further questions or comments on Work Stream 2? Okay. If not, then ITI and our joint statement.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll turn it over to John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: In the interim, ICANN has urgent and important issues on its plate. It is busy at this time. We recognize that and other things are taking priority. Also, we do recognize that we will have to come back and address this more full any the future so we are content that ICANN will do this, but at present, we recognize that things like the EPDP are drawing its attention. Be quick and sweet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, John. I mean clearly what we ask for in our -- oops. What we asked for in our joint statement, we don't think -- we thought there were some short-term solutions that could be imposed much quicker than the ITI, and I think both of us need to get back to that and be a little bit more specific and clear to the board. We don't have the time right now. I don't know about you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, John, and thank you, Alan. I was just about to say the same. We didn't have time to follow up on this joint statement. Everyone was distracted by GDPR, and geographic names and other things. But yes, you're right. We had -- I mean, something more quick and more straight forward to implement in mind when we came up with this joint statement and not necessarily this huge initiative which may ultimately incorporate our concerns, but yeah, probably will take time. So any comments from GAC colleagues? I know we had the webinar from ITI on ICANN on ITI initiatives. So if you have attended and you would like to [Indiscernible] views as well.

So clearly we didn't have the time to follow up or to cross-check our requirements with the ITI initiative, but I know it's a big one and it is long term and it has so many other things than the straight forward requirements of our joint statement. But

hopefully we can try to find the time and be more specific in our requirements because we got the same answer you got in response to our Communique. You will find it in the board to the GAC. So we look forward to working together on following up.

ALAN GREENBERG: The next item on the agenda is the at-large review. We have talked about it, but I would like to turn it over to Maureen. One of the people who is heavily involved in the processes and will be involved with the implementation. Perhaps going over to a quick summary and answering any additional questions people may have.

MAUREEN: This is Maureen for the record. The proposal was accepted by the board just the other day and we were very pleased that we've finally gotten to the stage where we can now implement the recommendations that we actually made in that report and there were 16 recommendations and they're grouped around things like policy and outreach and organizational stuff. But I just wanted to refer back to the statement that we made together about -- you know, breaking down barriers, information to our -- the sort of thing we were talking about, how do we make -- how do we make sort of like the work of ICANN more meaningful to the people that we're actually

working with, and that is probably going to be one of the key things that we're actually going to be including within the implementation when we're working with how do we make our alias structures? Our -- the -- our membership more engaged, more participative, instead of they bring their voices to the discussion tables that we have.

And I think that it's going to be one of the strong things and I really do appreciate the offer of more collaboration with the GAC and as an advisory committee as we are to sort of like look at ways in which we can work together on some of these issues that actually make us more effective and you know, within the ICANN community, and I think that this is going to be one of the key things that is going to be part of the implementation.

ALAN GREENBERG: One of the things we know we have to do is package information about the ICANN and the ICANN issues are the ones on the table at the moment in ways that people who are not already indoctrinated can understand and that includes, of course, in their language, they speak. Because in the vast majority -- the people don't speak English. We are optimistic, if we can success in doing this, the material will be important to ICANN as well. For us, in your case, if it's representing governments within ICANN, you have people who ask you, "What is ICANN? What do

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

they do? What are you spending your time on?" These are difficult things to answer in simple terms. I could meet someone who will say "You are traveling all the time, what are you doing?" To describe that in a meaningful term is difficult. In getting this information to send out to our community, it will be useful to many colleagues within ICANN.

MANAL ISMAIL: It sure does. This is Manal speaking here. I'm sure it will be of benefit to the whole community as you rightly mentioned. Any quick questions on review? Good. We are right at the hour. We managed -- at the right time. It's half past. So thank you again, Alan, John, Maureen, Tijani, all of our colleagues. Thank you to my gastric colleagues as well and to everyone. We will be -- for GAC colleagues, we will be reconvening here at 1:30. We will start with half an hour meeting with registrees and registrars.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]