
MONTREAL – At-Large Leadership Session: Board/GAC Meeting Prep and Updates from the At-Large Review Implementation, SSAC Leadership and ICANN Strategic Plan for FY21-25
Sunday, November 3, 2019 – 08:30 to 10:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Good morning everyone, we're going to get started now, we've got some guests coming in soon, so I'd really like everyone to sort of get themselves organized, please. The first activity we've got is some preparation for the meetings that we're going to be having with the Board and the GAC, so just checking that everyone knows what they're going to be doing. Because you know how I like to share those responsibilities.

And then of course we've got the At-Large review updates and Alan's going to be doing that. And I know that Roberto wanted to raise something, and I'm just wondering if he's going to be coming. This has to do with individual members. And then, of course, we'll have SSAC giving us an update, and then we'll have Theresa Swinehart. Now Yesim is going to give us some housekeeping.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you very much, Maureen. This is Yesim Nazlar from At-Large Staff. Before we start, I would like to give some reminders. As you know, we have English, French and Spanish interpretation for today's sessions. Just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the interpretation, as well as the transcriptions, and also please don't forget to speak at a reasonable speed so we can have

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.

accurate interpretation. Also when you would like to stand in the queue, you can always use your tent cards, put them up like this, so we can follow who would like to speak. And I believe that's all for now. Thank you all, and welcome again.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, I'm just trying to find my link to the page that got the questions for the Board and the GAC. We have a question from the floor.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much, there is a question from the room. Could we please have tables so that everybody can sit at the table? It seems that we are missing spots, all the chairs are occupied at this point, or almost all of them. It's not really nice to be in the back, but I guess I will do that, thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, thank you, that's being sorted out. We're just looking at the question that we've got, for the Board and we're going to look at the DNS abuse topic that has been prepared for us anyway. Jonathan, I'm assuming that you're going to lead on this one. Sorry, I just wanted to know, I'm just wondering how the Board, have they said anything about how they want it done? Do they want us to deal with our question first, like they did last time? Has anyone heard?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm happy to take that on, I've only been focused on our question and not heirs, so I'll hid over here and focus a little bit on what they've asked and figure out how to...

MAUREEN HILYARD: You just deal with the DNS abuse one...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, because what I have done is ask for any volunteers who may wish to make comment on their question. I think that Marita, Holly, and Ricardo, I think what I'm going to say is that on the strategic plan, the financial operation and the work plan for the multistakeholder model, is that we just have people who would like to make a comment to the Board. And Marita, I believe you're interested in doing the multistakeholder model comment. Is there anything that you can share with us so that we know what you're going to say, that we're aligned with it, or something like that.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Maureen. Marita Moll speaking. If there are three of us, we should get together and align about what we're saying. Holly and Ricardo are also speaking on the same.

MAUREEN HILYARD: No, no, I think like you were doing the multistakeholder model, I know that Ricardo actually came just to make a comment about the financial side of things. Holly, what were you going to talk about? The Board.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, I could see it being useful to talk about perhaps the human resource aspect of the multistakeholder challenges, and the challenges for everyone, not just us, but everyone in the kind of time that it requires to work in this particular context. So I haven't actually put together the exact wording, but that's along the lines I was thinking, although I'm prepared to do it differently.

It could also be something around making sure that we that we support the idea that there has to be a holistic view that there has to be some kind of review of roles and reviews, that's another big one that we could bring forward to the Board to make sure that they get that message. So if anybody else wants to weigh in, please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Ricardo, can you just give us -- and also, these can just be comments, it doesn't have to be anything long, I think that we'd like to give the discussion about the DNS abuse because that's sort of our issue, what we're doing with these comments is just brief feedback. Basically, it's a summary of what we've actually already commented on in our statements. And they've asked for some feedback, so whatever is on top for us. But I do want to focus on our show and it's what Jonathan

will be preparing. Now, I understand, Sébastien, did you have your card up?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I wanted to be sure that we address the message to the right person. I don't think that today the Board is the right place to talk about holistic systemic review. It's a place, you will have, and we will have to discuss that with the ATRT3 team, that's the place where it must happen. Therefore, I think we will lose time in asking the Board for anything on that topic.

I think we need to really concentrate on what today the Board is doing and what we think we must ask the Board to evolve or to take care of, but that specific, we have to take into account that there is ATRT3 going on, there is a question about multistakeholder model going on, and we have to target each of those groups with a specific question and will ask the right question for both of them. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: It's a little bit late in the piece I guess, because the questions were invited, we put this out quite a while ago. And the response was, the DNS abuse which is the issue that we are going to raise. And I think that's in relation to the fact that it is an important topic at this meeting and we would like to address it from the end user perspective, which I think is quite appropriate.

But, with regards to the brief comments that we will make before we start on that particular issue, it is just in response to the fact that they have asked us for some comments and I only had three volunteers who said that they would add something and it can be a personal comment, I'm actually quite happy with that, but the main issue, we want to spend as much time as possible on the key issue so that the Board is aware of our perspective and to address what we think is an important issue for us. Abdulkarim?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: My name is Abdulkarim, I just want to find out, is it too late to volunteer now?

MAUREEN HILYARD: About what topic? You mean for the contribution to the Board? On what particular topic? Strategic plan? You two talk together. Okay, that's fine. Okay, great. Okay, we've got the GAC questions. Questions for the GAC. Who is organizing the GAC?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Thank you, Maureen, Yrjö Länsipuro speaking. We had an intercessional call with the GAC on the 30th of September and at that meeting we had Hadia talking about EPDP, we had Justine talking about Subsequent Procedures, and John talked about the cooperation on capacity building with the GAC. Unfortunately, the GAC was not really prepared to comment on the proposals from our

side due to the fact that on the GAC side that call had been understood as a leadership call and not really call with various GAC experts on these areas could be available.

So at the end of that call, we agreed with Manal that we run this sort of full ALAC GAC meeting here with the same agenda and I have asked Hadia Justine and John basically to make those same proposals and presentations at that meeting, where we now of course await some comments and reactions from the GAC.

There has been a suggestion for the AOB at that meeting, and that came actually from several people, I think Ricardo was the first one, and then there were others who pointed out two examples of that happening, namely cooperation and contacts between GAC rep and At-Large people on a national level. This is something that was, they were really mainly from our side who thought that this would be a great idea. Also for capacity building purposes on the GAC side. And so I have also told Manal that we would like to take this up as an AOB, and she agreed. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Any questions? Okay, Ricardo was going to explain what he was going to do.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Not just because one of the points is mine with the financial, I don't know if you want to discuss it here or I just sent you the text of what it

was to be, you make some comments, and that's okay. I am okay with what is in there. If you want me to share? Well, one of the points is the operating on financial plan and as of now, there is only the IANA and PTI plan in place. We make some comments there, not too much, it's a small budget, they have made some adjustments to the expenses they have there, that's increasing very small from past budgets.

The only thing there is there is a discussion on the root zone governance that may influence the IANA part and the PTI part of the budget, so we're asking them in the comments what is their expectation about this root zone governance that's going to be different, when we made some comments about three months ago. Then there is the operational plan and the budget plan for the fiscal year 2021, that's not in place as they told us yesterday.

The only comment I have in there is for fiscal year 2019, that the results are since this week available. You find out that 51% of the budget of ICANN is personnel, and then you have 25, 26% is professional services, that's quite a lot. And it's only 11% on travel and things related to the kind of things we are doing here, and I think it is important and we're spending a lot of money. I know that it is not an expense, but 51% in personnel seems like a lot. It's about 75 million in personnel, if you took the relationship is about 200K for each person that works for ICANN in the budget; that's quite a lot of money.

And the other comment I had is they just released the document, they issued the Fiscal Year 2019 results. There was a place they mentioned that prior to Barcelona meeting they met with five major universities

in Spain. But you probably didn't know that. And as a result of that, no one from Spain is asking to be an individual member or an ALS or whatever. So we didn't know that happened.

There was a big opportunity for EURALO to be present there and maybe to be one of the speakers there. We have people like Johanna that is related to universities. We have people like Olivier that is very well known with ICANN work. And they didn't invite us and that's the kind of things that multistakeholder looks very nice on paper, but once we want to do that in the field, it's not taking place. So, that's the other comment I have for this. Everybody is very quiet so I don't know, it's still in the morning.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay, I have three people, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

This microphone is moving further and further away from me. Olivier Crepin-Leblond for the transcript. Yes, thank you for this, and thank you Ricardo for the points that you've raised. I think that on the topic of stakeholder engagement and ICANN having an event taking place in Spain and without us being aware of, We should have probably raised this with Global Stakeholder Engagement yesterday. I don't think that the Board deals with those things directly.

On the topic of budget itself, I'm entirely with you when it comes down to the question regarding personnel. We had a presentation yesterday

from the finance department and so apparently there was a decrease in number of people, number of ICANN employees this year, but they're looking at catching up next year with another I think it's 36 hires, and I wasn't too convinced as to why 36 people were going to be hired.

ICANN is now about to reach the 500 people mark very soon if we continue in this direction and there is yet no launch for another round of new gTLDs so the answer we were given was, well, they will be hired as in when needed for different projects and I didn't quite know whether this was going to be full time contractors, part time contractors, or full time employees and maybe we need to try and find out about this a little bit more, especially when we are being told, well, we were told in past years that there was a freeze on hiring at some point, supposedly, but apparently that wasn't the case, and at the same time, we have to freeze our own budgets, so we have really sustained restrictions when it came down to several of our programs. So, there is a concern there, especially since, as you said, the largest cost is salaries and personnel. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE:

John Laprise for the record. So, respectfully, I must take issue with my colleagues regarding personnel costs in a nonprofit organization and for a moment here I'll step aside from my role here. My day job, I work for a nonprofit organization a membership organization that has 50.000 members globally and has an annual meeting later this month

in Chicago that has 50,000 attendees. We have a staff of 300. The staffing at ICANN Org is in line with the work they do from what I see.

So I respectfully submit that the staffing costs that we see in the budget are in line with my experience in working in nonprofit organizations, so that's my two cents. I see no problem with the current staffing levels and the budget changes. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Tijani speaking. First of all, thank you very much, Ricardo, for this presentation, for this introduction. I agree with most of what you said. But my remark is about other thing. We are preparing messages to be done to be given to the Board. I think that each one who is in charge of giving this message should write a few lines with the main message that we want to give and send it on email so that everyone is aware about, so that if there is any big concern, it can be erased.

Of course I know that Marita wrote the statement about the multistakeholder model. I know that she will be inside this, but the message, we will highlight message, the message that you want to give, it is good to circulate it to the ALAC members because it could be on behalf of ALAC. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Mohamed El Bashir, AFRALO. I think Ricardo you raised very important points and actually people skip and slip those numbers. I

think what's alarming is not the personnel, but it's the professional services part of the budget, it's really huge. If you look to the details it's very big numbers. And if you go to the level, I mean, I think there's legal fees that cost millions and millions and I think that's the alarming part I think need to be raised to the Board level. Definitely they have finance committee could look at that because we don't have clear justification why those costs are so expensive. I think it's having clear justification to that, that's reasonable.

In terms of staff, I don't think it's a major issue. I mean, we don't want ICANN to be enlarged to the level it could have unnecessary staff, but I think to the level of the mission and going back to the globalization of ICANN, and the freeze that we had in hiring, maybe it's time as well to expand, especially in Africa, for example, where you have 54 countries and you have actually two staff and an office that's not even operational.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mohamed. Sébastien and Holly? It's just that we're actually eating into Alan's time here.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet, I hope I'm not going to take too much time now for Alan to speak. And I think we have to be very careful who are we talking to. There is a comment period regarding finance. This is the time to ask those questions, you can tell to the Board everything when we meet them but budget finances. How many personnel employees.

I remember when I was a Board member, when we are over 100 it was already too much for me. Now it's over 400, so it was a big increase. And personnel is not to be a cost, it's very not nice to say that it's a cost. It's an investment. They're here to work, don't look at them as a cost and think about cutting personnel, they are an investment. But isn't it time to have one budget with the PTI and ICANN only one budget. We did separate and I don't think it's necessary anymore.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you for that. Just to remind you that Leon is actually due to be here with us. So we might be able to ask him later, as well, and may adjust what we raise. And it's good that we're actually raising it here so we can actually manage what it is that we say. Marita, just very, very briefly please, because we've got to get to Alan.

MARITA MOLL:

Marita Moll for the record. I'm going to support Tijani's suggestion, oi like it, and I'm fully and I'm fully prepared to do that. We need to be on the same page. I've been kind of waiting for the question to evolve, but it's essential that we get to the core of something they can actually say something about rather than just saying, well, Brian Cute is dealing with that.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you for the discussion, and I think that with this particular session, and I wanted to keep it to about 10 minutes anyway for us,

because I do want, as I mentioned, I do want to give the DNS abuse section of it a decent time for discussion. But as I said Leon's coming we can address some of those issues, perhaps before that meeting, and I'll let Alan do his thing now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Maureen. I just noticed that I was in fact allocated only 10 minutes and Roberto 5 minutes in a 45-minute session. So the rest of the time I'm just going to be quiet -- I'm told it was a typo. Alright, could we have the presentation or the document on the screen. This is a document I sent out late last week or sometime recently to the ALAC and the RALO lists. That's right. Thank you very much.

Those of you who are old enough and have been around long enough will remember something called the ALS Criterion Expectations Task Force, which was launched somewhere around the second year of my chairmanship. It's been known for a long time that we have a problem recruiting workers, getting people to actually make major contributions.

And we looked at a number of, you know, going back to the historic documents of why do we have ALSes, because we focus a lot of energy on ALSes, and it's interesting if you go back to the ICANN bylaws which go back to 2002, and you go look at the processes and procedures we put in place for certifying ALSes, which goes back to 2006 and 2007, we understood the process. We knew that ALSes are there because they have members and members are the ones we're looking at. It's fine to

say we have ALSes and RALOs, but ultimately work is done by people, individual people, regardless of whether they're affiliated with an ALS or unaffiliated, they're people who have knowledge and are willing to put time into it.

So the question is, how do we find those people? And one of the main rationales for ALSes was they have members, maybe some of those members might be interested in doing something. When we went through the At-Large Review, the report from the external reviewers essentially said ALSes are not contributing an awful lot to this process. To a large extent, get rid of them. They didn't quite say get rid of them, but they said minimize the focus on them and it was close enough to get rid, that's the way it was viewed by many people, and rightfully so.

We looked at it and said, the original reason we have ALSes is to get to their members who already have established that they have an interest in computing and communications, if nothing else, and maybe ICANN. And when we rejected the recommendations that were associated with ALSes and individuals in the At-Large Review, we went back to the work we had done in the Criteria and Expectations Task Force, which essentially says let's start doing what we said we're going to do in 2002. And that was accepted by the Board. Now, you might ask, if we did work four years ago in this task force, why are we still talking about it today?

Well, the short answer is we got involved in the IANA stewardship transition which literally sucked all of the time and effort out of most

of the workers in our group. That morphed into the ICANN accountability effort. And then the At-Large Review took all of our focus to try to kill some of the really dumb recommendations that were made by the reviewers, at least ones we thought were dumb. So here we are four years later, with a piece of work that still seems applicable. We have committed to the Board to do it, and perhaps it's time to actually do it. And that's where we're sitting here right now.

Now, if you look at the beginning, this document I sent out a few days ago, it's still a work in progress. It's going to be changing. You'll notice, towards the end, there are still some notes that have to be cleaned up. The first page quotes the sections from the Bylaws, and the sections from our rules which essentially say, "A major rationale for having ALSes is to get to their members. For the last 10 years or so, we have largely focused not on the members of the ALSes, but on the representatives, the formal person named to interact with us and history has proven that in the vast majority of cases, those people don't become active workers. Now they could be, but they don't. So, some of them do, most of them don't.

So we have to reach through into the ALS to actually communicate with people. The vast majority of their members are not going to be interested, but we don't need a lot. We have 200 and something ALSes. If we got one active worker per ALS, we wouldn't know what to do with them. If we got one from every 5 ALSes, we would have 50 workers and we probably would still have some trouble managing them. Our targets are not high, but it has to be more than zero. And what we're looking at here are some relatively small changes which

we hope will have major impact. Can you scroll down a little bit? I'm being asked, can I be interrupted, I'm always being interrupted, please go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I'm so sorry, Alan, it's just that Leon has come in and I know he's got a really busy schedule. So, people who have got their card up, that's fine, we've got it listed, but I just want to give Leon an opportunity to say something to us. We've actually just been discussing the questions that we're going to raise with the Board and just to get your feedback on it. But, we do want you to have your opportunity to speak to us, as well. Thank you. Thank you, Jonathan.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Good morning everyone, thank you for having me. Sorry, Alan, for interrupting you. Well, I guess that I would ask if you had any doubts on the questions that the Board is asking, and we have reviewed the questions that you are submitting to the Board. They seem to be pretty clear. But most of all, I hope that we can have a candid open discussion when we meet with the Board.

I think it's proven to be more fruitful when we have this open discussion and we actually interact with each other, rather than just having the scripted questions and answers, and you know what we're going to answer, we know what you're going to ask. So I think it's better if we just have these as an open candid conversation. So I really encourage you to stand up, interject, ask us questions, reply candidly,

and I'm going to encourage my Board colleagues to do the same with you. So, let's have this be a fruitful discussion and not a scripted one. That's what I would recommend and suggest.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Leon, we had looked at how we might present it, and the Board questions were related to feedback on the on the strategic plan, finance and operating plan, and the multistakeholder model evolution thing. And so we've got speakers who just want to make comments on that, so maybe get some brief reaction, but at the same time we've got a topic, DNS Abuse, which is probably going to be the one that we'd like to focus on because it's really topical within ICANN at the moment, anyway.

LEON SANCHEZ:

In that case, I would suggest that you say exactly this at the beginning of the meeting, so that we can concentrate most of the time on the DNS Abuse discussion, if that is what the At-Large community feels is the more pressing issue and the most important issue for that meeting, and maybe just saying, okay, let's maybe switch the order of the questions and the answers so that we can have either comments in a nutshell from you in regard to the strategic plan the operating and financial plan.

And then we can use the rest of the time, or most of the time to deepen the discussion in regard to DNS abuse. So if you could just have, as I said, in a nutshell, feedback for the Board in regards to the

first two questions and then expand in the discussion in regard to DNS abuse, I think that would be very useful.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Alan's got a question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Very quickly, I was very encouraged by what Leon said of making this a discussion. There's plenty of ways that when the Board makes a formal decision and has a formal Board position, it becomes public and it's announced and it's all formal. We're not looking for formal Board positions, we're looking for input from Board members which may or may not become formal positions at some point, but to make a discussion it has to be the people talking not the Board talking.

LEON SANCHEZ: I agree, I agree.

ALAN GREENBERG: I interpreted how you said it, and I'm just making it really clear.

LEON SANCHEZ: No, no, yes, and I will encourage my Board colleagues to do exactly as we are discussing right now.

MAUREEN HILYARD: And I just want to say while we're here altogether and it's your first opportunity to be with us since your appointment as Vice Chair of the Board, hearty congratulations from us, anyway.

LEON SANCHEZ: I want to thank you, Maureen, and all my colleagues in the At-Large community and the ALAC for your continued support. I want to ask you for supporting me going forward in this role and literally nothing of what I've achieved would have been possible without the help, the support, and the teachings from each and all of you.

I am in constant learning, you know I am a person who likes to listen to others, to learn from others, and I have been very lucky to cross roads with all of you who have been kind enough to teach me and to guide me and to support me through this journey. So I wholeheartedly thank you very much for your support and ask that you continue supporting me. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Leon, and thank you for your contribution to this part of our work. We've got some some important stuff to get through and having interrupted the former Chair of the ALAC...

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Maureen, thank you Alan, for letting us interrupt you. So, have a very fruitful discussion and meeting. I have to leave. I'm sorry but as the Terminator said, I'll be back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We can go back to the presentation and scroll a little bit into Page 2.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry, is there an opportunity to ask questions to Leon? Because we had Leon, we worked on Board questions, we could have asked him whether it was suitable to ask some questions to the Board, but we didn't make use of this time. It's great to see Leon with us, but we have to talk about important things, too.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah that's good, sorry.

LEON SANCHEZ: So, the question is whether you can ask questions to the Board?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you, Leon. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So, just before you arrived we were discussing a number of topics. And of course, there's the Board topics that have been brought forward, but there were also some questions that we had to the Board. And we weren't quite sure whether some questions were suitable to ask the Board or to go directly to the ICANN department in charge of this. One such question was to do with a recent occurrence that ICANN had an

event in Spain and the At-Large community was neither represented, nor even told about this event.

Now, is it something that we need to take up directly with Global Stakeholder Engagement? Or is it something that we need to take up with the Board directly under the multistakeholder model part of things, as in ICANN has a duty to inform the multistakeholder community, including At-Large, of what its activities are when it comes down, especially relating to outreach and things that are directly in the ALAC's remit.

I would encourage you to raise it directly to the Board. The Board is part of the community and whatever affects the community ultimately affects the Board. So if we are not aware of what's happening, we cannot help you do your job and your work in the right way. So please do raise these questions and these concerns directly when we meet with the Board because otherwise we lose visibility of these issues and it might not be us directly who will provide you with an answer, but I can assure you that we will be keeping an eye on this.

Just as in the same way that I have personally kept an eye on the visa issues to attend this meeting and I was informed that we have a successful turnout. However, we had some rejections which are of course I'm very sorry to hear that there were two people that couldn't attend ultimately, but I can assure you that I was personally following each and every case of rejections and reapplications.

So if I was not aware of that, I wouldn't have been able to do this followup. So, it's the same for this situation. If the Board is not aware of what is affecting the community then the Board is affected directly because we are not aware of that and we cannot help you and we cannot facilitate your job and we lose this continuity and this collaboration.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon, very helpful.

LEON SANCHEZ: So, I really need to rush now. So thank you guys for your time and I'll see you later.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Leon. Lovely that you were here. Now the two questions over here was that related to Alan? Alrighty. Do you want to take the questions or do you want to continue?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd like to continue at this point. We're now getting closer to the 10 minutes you gave me in the detailed stuff instead of 45. By the way, is Roberto here? Is that going to be on the schedule? Okay, not this moment, but I will try to allow a few minutes for Roberto. Okay, if we can scroll down to after the first paragraph of page 2. Just about where the cursor is. Thank you.

Alright, the premises for ALSes are ALSes have an interest in ICANN; we need working communications channels with them, we need to get information to them; and we have an effective communications channel with the members of the ALSes. Now the latter one to a large extent, with the exception of one or ALSes does not typically exist right now. Scroll down a little bit more. We have those who are very active, and we can probably count them on two hands and maybe one foot right now. We have those who are familiar with the issues, are not very active, but have an interest.

And three, the large pool of ALS members who probably are never going to be more than watchers. The challenge we have is to move some people from group 3 into group 2 and have people from group 2 periodically move into group 1, maybe not all the time, maybe only when their interest issue comes up, or when they're willing to have enough time because their workload is a little bit lower. So, we need people continually moving into group 1, and we need people moving into group 2, and that's the challenge of this program. Next page.

These are some of the things that the ALS Criterion Expectations Task Force came up with. And they're all bits and pieces to try to make sure that we have viable communications with our ALSes and with their members. Right now we bring on board an ALS, and we may have no more communication with them ever. Sometimes we have a representative that's active, sometimes we don't.

So the first bullet says we need to make sure that they're still alive. They still have people, they're still interested. We need to get

information out to them that is usable by someone who is not already familiar with ICANN. That means we have to avoid buzzwords, we have to avoid complexities that no one will understand. These are little samplings of things to try to get people intrigued to try to get them interested. If they ever get interested, then we can start feeding them the more complex stuff. But if you don't give them something really simple they're never even going to read past the first paragraph.

So that's a challenge we have, how to do it is going to be difficult. We have to make sure it's not perceived as spam, things that they just delete. We have to make sure that if this organization says, I want to be an ALS, they tell people about it. We've had examples of people joining us in North America, a person joining as an individual member because he didn't belong to an ALS.

This is a rule you can't be an individual member if you're a member of an ALS. Turns out he was on the Board of Directors of an ALS. And he didn't know that that group was, that ISOC chapter, as it turned out, was an ALS. That we have to avoid. The ALS has to be able to respond to when there's needs from At-Large, from RALOs. And one of the interesting things we have is if you go to our website we say here are all the ALSes in your region, join one.

How do you do that? None of them have contact information. We need contact information. We need to make sure that if an ALS says I'm representing users that users can actually join them, should they choose. This is all in parallel with individual unaffiliated members that

we're going to have a different initiative of, but this is just the ALS part of it.

Alright, I'm not going to go into a lot more detail, there's more stuff here and some of it just needs to be cleaned up, some of it we need to figure out what we want to do, and my hope is we can get this back to the ALAC, now I've sent out email asking for volunteers. Our hope is we can get this back to the ALAC within a small number of months. Get the ALAC to approve it, with of course input from the RALOs, and start doing this. It's a major part of the At-Large Review. It's the core part of the At-Large Review, and we have to stop talking about it and actually start doing things I'm not managing the queue. Please, whoever is...

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, we have Judith, Sergio, Jonathan, Tijani. And we're on the one minute timer, thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Hi, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. Thanks, Alan, for the document and the ideas. We had similar issues years ago when I was a first-timer secretary under Glenn's leadership. Many of our ALSes were inundated by all the emails. So what happened is you get on a NARALO list, but you're also an ALS Announce and other ones, and you get three emails instead of just one, and so they got turned off from it. Another point is that they also were not aware really what they really should attend or what they didn't, and we ended up having individual

conversation with the reps who then could educate the ALSes, and with that, we also got new ones to take on new jobs.

We also got increased attendance at the NARALO meeting so that would enhance their understanding of what was going on. It's a long process because it takes a lot of people to actually work and each one explain, see what they're interested, get them matched up to different positions and then get them to be active.

And then one last point I had is that when we do, if some ALSes are in leadership position, we can invite another one to come in a general assembly and they do some work and then they can't go to a meeting like other ALSes because the leader has taken a slot, even though they have leader position and it's funded for another thing, so they can't get their own little spot to come to a general assembly to get even more involved.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, two things, we don't have enough time here to solve problems and to talk about the specific solutions. There'll be plenty of time to talk about that. It is well understood, however, that the people who have chosen to become the representatives of the ALS are not necessarily the ones we're talking about here. Because, in general, they've proven not to be the ones interested in policy issues, with very few exceptions. So let's not focus on what has happened before. How do we make it work? Because we invest a huge amount in supporting

ALSes, we have to get a good return on this particular aspect. Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, Alan, this is Judith Hellerstein again, that's a great comment. One thing is that each of the RALOs needs these --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Judith, we have to move along.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: [CROSSTALK] and explain what to them what they need to do, so that the reps, the ALSes --

JONATHAN ZUCK: Judith, we have other people coming in later that we have an obligation to seat. We have to get through these questions. Who's next in the queue? Sergio just very, very quickly.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio speaking. I'm Sergio Salinas for the record. Thank you very much. Alan, my friend. I was looking at the criteria for the ALSes that you drafted and as it is a very extensive process I'm offering as a volunteer to work together with you so that we can be more inclusive in this organization. You already know what my position is about, about individual users, individual members. I'm a firm believer in

collective work. So I offer myself as a volunteer to work on this. If you all accept my offer, then you will see that there will be many more people from my region willing to work on this. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Just a reminder to everyone, we have 10 minutes before SSAC is arriving, and then we need five minutes for Roberto. So these are very quick comments.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Sorry, Sergio speaking. I need an answer for what I said, I need an answer from Alan, from what I said.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I didn't think you were asking a question. Your contributions are welcome. This is not a discussion about individual unaffiliated members. That's another part of the At-Large implementation. What we're looking at here is finding individual people because ultimately people do work, people attend meetings, people draft documents. So we're trying to find more people from the ALSes to become active contributors in this process. That is what we proposed to the Board in the At-Large review and what was accepted, and this is an attempt to try to make it reality. Not about individual members. It's about getting workers from ALSes. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Look, we have got far too many people here with comments. What I'm going to do is I'm going to ask Roberto because he's going to be talking about individual members and if you've got questions related to individual members, Roberto is going to propose something anyway. So, Roberto, how about we have you first.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Since we are in Quebec, I'm going to speak in French. Hello everyone. I would like to talk about individual members. As you know, in each RALO we do have individual members but the organization of those individual members in each region is quite different and I think the first problem we do have is to make sure that those individual members do discuss between them and talk between them, share their experiences, and the activities being done by individual members in those regions they are to tackle with suggestions and give examples to other regions.

So, we want to review ALAC, this is quite important those individual members. The review gave us a mandate to favor and promote the participation of individual members, but we do not talk about the connection between those individual members between different regions. So I would like to really emphasize what Alan did present regarding the three types of individual members. And if I may, I would like to add a fourth type of individual member. But how can we move from the third group to the second group to the first group?

I believe that in each region we need to talk and have a debate between individual members. They need to know the issues. The fourth group would be the individual users that don't know anything about ICANN and are somewhere else, they're doing things, but they're not in relationship with ICANN, but they're users, they're end users. And potentially they could work with us at ICANN. So, what we need to do is to go get people outside of the same circle, of the same ICANN bubble.

We have to try to find those people and bring them, bring new people to our process. Unless we do that in a few years, we will be the same people with the same ideas. So we need new people with different ideas. And do have a different internet experience. I'm talking about young people that do not know about buying a domain name but do everything on social media. We need this type of people in our community. I do believe that to become an individual member of ALAC is the best way of recruiting new people. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Alan has a quick comment and then just for the record, we have two minutes before SSAC is due in. I'm going to ask that everyone who has their cards up or who is in the queue, please put your comments on the list and start a conversation with Alan and Roberto on this, because we simply don't have time. We have SSAC coming in, in two minutes, and then following that we have ICANN Org presenting. So if you have comments, put them on the list because the queue is closed.

We're going to have one comment from Alan when we're going to be preparing for SSAC to come in.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Please, please, yes, I agree with you, but this is a very important subject that we have to program for the next meeting and have one hour discussion about it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We had 45 minutes which went down to about 20, so just a quick comment on nomenclature, on words, we are using the wrong words in many cases, and that's causing confusion and disagreement where it doesn't need to be. The bylaws say we are here, At-Large is here to look at the issues related to individual internet users. The people that we have in RALOs who are not affiliated with ALSes are unaffiliated members, everyone is an individual user, all 4.3 billion people are individual internet users, that's who we're here to serve. We have to be careful about using our words because it causes confusion and disagreement, where it doesn't need to be there. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, and I completely agree with you Tijani. With this particular session, the purpose of it was to allow Alan to introduce Issue 2. Also, because he has made a call for a working group to work on this particular issue, it was important that he be able to introduce the document. And we thought it was a good idea too, because it's sort of

like looking at membership to have the other perspective about individual members.

But I urge you all to join the group, make the comments, because this is a really, really important issue about the ALS criteria and as Alan said, it's something we have been working on, so we really do need to actually have your input on the call, have those discussions here. And I'd like to call the SSAC team up and we will be able to have Julie, Rod, Andre.

JOHN LAPRISE:

This is John Laprise for the record. I also note that on the last day of this mean there's a meeting of the ICANN67 Planning Committee and to Tijani's point and to Sébastien's point about more time for this discussion, that should be a priority for the planning group for going forward, for ICANN67. So, if you're on that group make a little note for this as an Action Item. Thank you.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV:

I see the schedule is really tough. So I see Rod is like running between rooms.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

A warm welcome to the SSAC team. And we're looking forward to the update, thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks, we only have 15 minutes this time, so I don't know what we did to make you mad. I literally was running here from another place. So, I had seen in my email that you wanted to talk a bit about the expansion of the TLDs and then DNS Abuse, right? In particular, if you have any other topics, we'll see if we have any time left after 14 minutes here. Oh, we have the slides up, excellent, could you skip down to the Subsequent Procedures response, which we had put out a correspondence series on this, way down, it's like slide 15 or something like that, I think. We put out a comment on the public comment period around the initial SubPro.

There you go, SSAC2019-07. Basically we reiterated SSAC100 which is the standard stuff we've had around name collisions and root scaling, all those kinds of things, they haven't changed since they put them 10 years ago, for the most part. The other thing that we did talk about though, which was a bit of a new bit of information was looking at the concentration of abuse in specific TLDs, that we anecdotally and in our data saw occurring, and that was something we believe our members were quite adamant about this internally, saying something on this, taking a look at this and understanding what were the root causes of those concentrations of abuse as part of starting up another round or expanding the namespace.

So kind of the standard stuff, the technical issues around root scaling and name collisions and all that good stuff that we really haven't changed our advice on in years, and then this wanting to understand abuse, which segues us naturally into the other topic, which is DNS abuse.

So just to give you a quick update there. This is obviously something that's become really to the fore in the last four or five months. There's been a huge amount of interest in dealing with this in one way or another. We have various people in the cybersecurity industry and elsewhere put out some studies offered up their opinions and recommendations. Some of the contracted parties just put up a framework that some of them have decided to ascribe to. And then we have the community session here on Wednesday, I believe it is, and then just in general, a lot of chatter around dealing with these issues.

We ourselves have had this on our radar for a while, as we've been telling you and we actually have formed a work party, it just happened, we're having our first meeting this week here, face to face. We're going to take a look at some potential areas to comment on because the SSAC itself has not been any formal work on abuse before and we have not provided a definition of it, what ICANN kind of defines as DNS abuse internally is something that came out of, I believe, GNSO or the GAC, you know, various places. That's never really been something that SSAC has opined on.

So, we may provide some thoughts on a framework for that, and also take a look at some potential studies, something like what happened with some of the new gTLDs, understanding those a little bit better, understanding those root causes. Can you scroll down just a little bit more so I can make sure I don't skip something?

Oh yeah, also, take a look at what some of the contracted parties are doing, because there are places if you take a look around the

landscape where there isn't a lot of abuse and there are reasons for that. But what are some of those best practices and other experiences that people are doing and using and can those be shared, can those be codified in some sort of fashion. We want to take a look and understand that, not just anecdotally, but take a look at it with some data as well. I think that's about it. Yeah, that's it.

Okay, so those are the four areas, you can scroll back up a little bit. I want to do a couple of things, and those are to help with the discussion around how to define and deal with abuse in general from a framework perspective and then look at specific areas where we can do better and bring in the people who are doing a good job to try and figure out ways that can be extended out so that we raise the level of the entire industry, right, so you know, raise the tide, it raises all boats, that's the idea. So that is the quick five minutes.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Yeah, good on you. And just to disabuse you of the fact that we don't like you anymore. I think we originally had about a 45 minute session, which is our usual, and all these people just wanted to come in and see if, but also we've been constrained a little bit too by the ATLAS program which has taken up quite a lot of time and just to say, too, we had to cut short a serious discussion we were having. We have Holly, Justine. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: This is actually a question from both Joanna and I. In light of a lot of the comments, talking about the fragmentation of the net and the idea that it can be done. Now, I don't believe it can I think China is a separate issue. But my understanding from security with the way the internet works is fragmentation just isn't possible.

ROD RASMUSSEN: It depends on how you define fragmentation, I think. This is an area we actually do have some concerns around the fragmentation of the namespace, so you have things like alternate routes that were something that was being discussed 20 years ago. Those are still obviously possible. You have some interesting conversations and ideas coming out of the few countries that want to run their own version of the root. We're going to be discussing those kinds of things at RSSAC and the like. So there's concerns there.

And then there's resolutions as well. This kind of ties into another work party we're doing around doh and dot, no really the protocols themselves as much as the deployment methodology. If you're actually taking the resolution out of the traditional DNS resolution path, you provide abilities for centralized players to change the way the resolution works for some people versus other people. So there are some areas that we have some, I'm not saying the sky is falling here, but we want to understand these issues.

HOLLY RAICHE: Are you saying it's possible, but a bad thing?

ROD RASMUSSEN: It's possible, I'm not going to opining on the goodness or badness, but we do ascribe I think in general to the one world one internet concept. There are operational and other considerations that some people may have for various applications or services they're running. If you think about mobile networks and things like that, that's not the traditional internet, that's the backbone for that, but then they tie into the traditional internet. So, when you start thinking about those technical backgrounds and things that's an area where, that's why I say it depends on how you define fragmentation it's really important to define that, what concern you have, but there are some concerns.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Justine and Staff, we are on a minute timer, thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: This is Justine, for the record. Thanks for coming and sharing this new endeavor. I'm actually very interested in this. And I just wanted to point out that I've been very appreciative of the fact that NCAP has a discussion group that's open to other people outside of SSAC and I've been on that and I've been following that. I was just wondering whether you're going to take the same approach with your party here. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, NCAP is a unique vehicle because we actually have a public discussion list, et cetera, and that's a new and different thing. We don't have plans on doing that for other work parties and this is because of the way NCAP was set up was a Board resolution and it was very high profile and as part of the resolution they said we need inclusiveness from the community. That said, for other work parties, we actually do bring in from time to time invited experts.

So, I chaired a public suffix list work party a few years ago and brought in the head of the Mozilla PSL and some of their folks to work on that, and we've done that with other work parties in the past, IDNs. For the abuse work party, we are actually looking to potentially bring in some outside parties, particularly those who have been dealing with creating best practices around abuse and would like to help contribute to that. We kind of reach out and invite expert in versus it's not an open for anybody just try and sign up type of thing.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Good to see you, Jonathan Zuck for the record. We are having our own little discussion session about DNS abuse this afternoon at 1:30 and if there was a particular representative from SSAC that has the most fluency on this issue and wanted to participate, it'd be great to have you there, and you would get more than the five minutes, so let us know. We have Drew Bagley coming from the CCTRT and Graham to come talk about that proposal you mentioned that was a subset of the contracted parties.

And ideally, I think the At-Large would love to come out of this meeting with some kind of statement or some recommendations to the Board about the path forward. So, we'd love to have your participation in that if somebody is available.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: I'll be there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You'll be there, okay.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Andrei will be there and then I'll put out the word to our mailing list that if somebody wants to also come by that has an interest or expertise in that area. We're tied up with our own other meetings we have on the leadership team, but I'll put the word out. I'm very happy to hear you guys are doing that session.

ANDREI KOLESNIKOV: Just a little reminder on Monday 3:15 to 4:15 there will be a SSAC public meeting, so if anybody is free, come join.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Aziz?

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you, in French, please. Just to add to the answer that Rod gave Holly, I would like to mention that fragmentation is still a possibility. The architecture of the internet as it stands, means that there is the head and then there's root servers and China, other countries tried, as Rod mentioned, to have their own internet. But because of the architecture of the internet as it is, a server cannot connect with another server without going through the root servers and those root servers are managed by ICANN. So, I just wanted to add that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to point out that the main topic we're raising with the Board is DNS abuse.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much Holly for asking that question. Thank you for the input from Aziz. But my understanding from what Rod had said is that the sky indeed is falling...

ROD RASMUSSEN: Definitely not falling.

JOANNA KULESZA:

But I heard you say that it is possible to distribute, at the conclusion of this question or intervention, and this is of deep concern, I'm happy to speak more about this, is for us as the ICANN community, the entire community, to follow you guys in creating a clear message to the outside world, not just the GAC, but the entire cybersecurity environment out there, and I'm happy to define it, on whether that is possible, and if it is not, to clearly explain why.

If you argue that the sky is not falling and the internet is not to be fragmented, that's something that I heard in Aziz's intervention and that has been my understanding for long time. So, if one cannot technically fragment the internet, I would suggest strongly for ICANN to get that message out there. Thank you. I'm happy to have that conversation offline. Thank you very much for phrasing that and putting that on the table. I think it's of significant concern. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Let me be clear. We don't see it happening today, but there are trends that are concerning that there could be fragmentation, depending on how you define fragmentation. And this is something that we're keenly aware of. Depending on what the thing is, is there something we can do, that is the next step to the question. So, yes, let's continue the conversation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Hadia Elminiawi for the record. Just a quick comment on what Joanna was saying. Technically speaking, fragmentation has always been possible, and will always be possible. So from a technical point of view, yes, it has always been possible, but it has not happened. And to Aziz's point, you could also have alternative root servers, and then technically it would be possible, as well. So it's not about whether it's technically possible or not, it's about the policy, the framework and everything else around that. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And might I add software libraries and a whole bunch of other things that depend on regular order, so to speak, some of these things are changing and that that's where the concerns start to come in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Bartlett?

BARTLETT MORGAN: Sorry to really to jump in. It's nice to say well, it's technically possible, it's not possible, or what have you, but I feel like we're at the point where the conversation needs to go just a little bit more in depth beyond that point for a wider audience. ALAC and the type of people we represent, based on where things are going now generally, we

need to have a slightly more nuanced understanding of one, where we are and what does it need to be technically possible for this to happen and why isn't it likely, stuff like that. I'm not saying we should have a conversation now at all, but I'm just saying I feel like the conversation needs to move a little bit.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Let me take this on board because this is why we have these meetings. We've had some internal discussions where this has been on our radar, but I hadn't heard this in a broader sense. So, this is actually exactly why we have this kind of meeting. We could spend a couple hours talking about this easily, more than a couple days. So let me take this on board as a topic and bring that back to the SSAC that there is, you guys are clearly showing some interest, if nothing else, to understand it.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

We happen to have a few more minutes if anyone's got any other questions, because we're waiting for Theresa. Oh no, not Theresa.

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE:

Good morning everyone, my name is Nathalie Vergnolle, I'm Director of Strategic Planning for Multistakeholder Strategy And Strategic Initiatives. I have to apologize for my boss, Theresa Swinehart, who was not able to attend. But I do want to thank you for the opportunity to talk about the strategic plan. So I'm going to try to be very brief in

my presentation to give you time for questions. I know we have just a few minutes, so I'll be very brief.

So, I've been supporting the Board and leading the efforts of the organization in developing the next iteration of the strategic plan for fiscal years 2021 through 2025 and the Board adopted this new plan at its last workshop in June. And that new plan will come into effect on the first of July of next year, so there's still time to familiarize yourself with this plan before it comes into effect. And I'm happy to be here to talk briefly about it and point you in the direction of where you can find it online to read the full document and then embrace that as you plan for the work ahead for your community.

So as you know the strategic plan is something that is mandated by the ICANN bylaws along with other planning documents. So, it's the first of three documents. There's the strategic plan which pretty much gives the direction of where ICANN is headed and then there's the operating plan that explains how we're going to get there, a five year operating plan and then an annual operating plan and budget which go more into further details of what are the projects that are going to be done and what are the costs associated with those projects. Can we go to the next slide, please.

So I want to talk briefly about the structure of this new plan, if you were familiar with the previous plan, it's very similar in terms of structure as the previous plan so it has three elements. The first element is a vision and that vision is really the direction where ICANN is headed in the next five years and it's a new vision. It's different from

the vision in the previous plan. I'll come to the description of that vision next. The second element of the plan is the mission and it's simply a restatement of the mission as it is defining the bylaws. And the third component of the plan are a set of strategic objectives and goals which really describe how we go from where we are to where we want to be, which is our vision. So it's the path forward. Next slide, please.

Okay, so let's talk about the new vision. There's a lot of words in the vision. It's hard to fit on the screen. As you can see, I even had to put it on, on two different slides, so I'm not going to read the whole thing. But each word in the vision was actually very carefully picked by our Board members and almost all of those words are important. So when I was preparing the slides I was trying to highlight some important words and I ended up just putting a lot of colors, because I wanted to highlight almost everything.

But just to emphasize a few things. ICANN wants to be a champion of the single open and globally interoperable internet. It demonstrates that important role that ICANN wants to play in the internet ecosystem as a whole. We want to be the independent trusted steward of the unique identifiers. So, those words are really important, and other words such as 'collaborative, diverse' are very important words that the Board wanted to be part of that vision.

So I'll let you read the whole the whole vision statement. But it does call out for many of the aspects of what ICANN aspires to do and it's a very good summary of the full content of the strategic objectives and

goals. So let's move on to the mission. You can skip through that. And go to the mission.

The mission was refined by the community as part of the work on the transition a couple of years ago. The transition of the oversight of the IANA function from the US government to the multistakeholder community. And ICANN is a technical organization with a fairly limited remit, which is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the internet unique identifier system. That's our mission. That's why we exist as an organization, and that mission is staying in our bylaws under Section 1.1, if you want to refer to that.

So let's take a look at the last part of the strategic plan. So there are five strategic objectives under the new plan which are directly correlated with a set of trends that were identified. We ran brainstorming exercises with various stakeholder groups about a year and a half ago to identify which were the main themes and those themes were actually very common among the different stakeholder groups and so it really helps surface those key components that really everyone seemed to rally around and that were the main things that ICANN should focus on. And so this is how the strategic plan was articulated around those five areas.

So the first area with no particular order of priority in there. The first area is around security and strengthening the security of the DNS and the DNS root server system. I heard a lot of talk in the session today about DNS abuse. So obviously, that is something that is at the heart of everyone around here. The second objective on adjunct

governance and improving the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance. Again, another issue at heart for everyone. Everyone is suffering from too much work, prioritizing issues, that kind of thing. So how can we evolve our model to work more efficiently and more effectively.

The third element of the strategic plan is on unique identifier systems, it is to evolve those unique identifiers As the technology progresses and as our user base evolves. So how do we keep these unique identifiers acute with the needs of our end users and the evolution of the technology? A fourth aspect on geopolitics and addressing the issues that impact our mission and ensure a single and globally interoperable internet. I heard again discussions in this session about questions on fragmentation. So, how do we mitigate fragmentation, how do we go about those things? How do we avoid the next GDPR? All those things are what's behind this objective.

And the last objective on financials and ensuring ICANN's long-term financial sustainability, which obviously is important as well. So each objective is further defined with specific goals and under each goal, there's a set of targeted outcomes which clarify what are the intended outcomes. So what is it that we should be aiming towards. I'm not going to go into all of these, but I do invite you to read the full document to get a better understanding of what's in there. So let's move on to the next slide.

Measuring progress. The plan once we have a plan it's only the beginning of the journey. And then we embark on the journey and we

have to see how it goes. So it's going to be important as we navigate through this journey to measure our progress and it's not only measuring against what we do, so what we do is checking the box of our operating plan. We've done this, we've done that, okay, but is this bringing us closer to our strategic objectives, yes or no.

So it's also measuring against those strategic objectives and seeing if the direction that we're headed is heading us in the right direction. I know I'm running out of time, but I'm almost done. So it will be important to do this assessment along the way. And, if necessary, to evolve our plan if we see that it's not taking us where we should be headed. Maybe we need to head in a different direction along the way.

So let's move on to the next slide. I just encourage you to read the strategic plan. It's available right now in six United Nation languages. I put all those links here in this presentation and more information on strategic planning is available on our website and you can navigate to it through the resources governance planning and strategic planning page. And I'm available for questions. You can email me, nathalie.vergnolle@icann.org or strategicplanning@icann.org.

JOHN LAPRISE:

We have a short queue, so we have a one minute timer from Staff, and I see Holly, Jonathan, and Joanna, and then I will close the queue. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to repeat a conversation we had with the last speaker. The idea of fragmentation of the internet which is now, we're concerned about that we asked SSAC about fragmentation, I'm wondering where that fits in your plan and where somewhere you're actually looking at a lot of discussions that are going on that may serve to have a fragmentation.

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE: So it does fit under the objective on geopolitics. Whenever we speak about ensuring a single and globally interoperable internet the fine lines prevent fragmentation. Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jonathan Zuck, for the record. The thing that jumped out at me a little bit in your presentation was a reference to geopolitics, because that is frightening from a mission creep standpoint, I think. Things that might affect our mission of having a single internet, et cetera, I'm curious how that gets discussed by the Board and elsewhere in terms of how to prevent that from being something that floats too far afield of the naming system.

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE: Well, that realization that ICANN does not operate in a vacuum. And so whatever we do impacts the world and what happens in the world impacts us. And so, things like GDPR is something that happened outside of ICANN and we've had to deal with it has had consequences

for ICANN, it's that acknowledgement that we cannot just operate without the context of the rest of the world.

JOHN LAPRISE: Joanna, and also, if people would please on the meeting today, there's a full overview of the slides, please do take a look at it, as well. Joanna, go ahead

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. So just for us as a takeaway to take to the world as the stakeholder community if you could elaborate on the justification, why it is a bad idea to split up the internet, it's technically possible, and there are significant geopolitical issues rising up in the real world, as you say. So what is the message for us to take out into the community out there, outside the ICANN bubble? Why is it a bad idea to split it up? Thank you.

NATHALIE VERGNOLLE: Well, I think it's more than vision, it's really ingrained in our mission, it's part of our mission to keep the internet single and interoperable. So I think it's at the core and at the heart of everything we do.

JOHN LAPRISE: Sébastien, sorry, I'm going to take Sébastien and Olivier and Mohamed, I see three, we are well in the time, so this is a one minute

timer, quick comments, please. And then we are closing queue and adjourning this session, because we have another session to get to.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Sébastien Bachollet speaking. To answer Joanna's question, it's the reason why ICANN is existing. If we are not struggling for one single internet, therefore, we can close ICANN. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. I don't think Joanna was looking for an answer there. I think what she was saying is in these documents, one needs to say why. ICANN could have a mission to go to the moon, it has to say why it wants to go to the moon and here it has to say why it wants to keep a single interoperable internet. It might be a religious reason, it might be whatever other reason, but it needs to be made there so that we know why that's the case, because that's the first question that one asks, why does ICANN want a single interoperable internet. Thank you.

JOHN LAPRISE: Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you, Mohamed El Bashir, AFRALO. I think for the first time I've seen the word geopolitics clearly, visibly in an ICANN document. I think it's important because for many years ICANN had been working with other stakeholders to lobby governments, to mitigate the effects of policies that will affect the one interoperable internet.

One case we had for those who have been here for a long time, the ITU International Telecommunication Regulation Conference in 2012, where there were proposals to fragment the internet, proposals like cross border traffic, countries could block such traffic, have the right to block such traffic. So, some countries put proposals like that on the table and actually most civil society organizations in ITU conference were behind the tables at the end of the hall, because we're not allowed to sit at the table they are not governance, but we were lobbying there. So I think it is important to be there and it's important to use us as a community as well to reach our governments when there is a need.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Thank you, Mohamed. And at this point the queue is closed. Thank you, Nathalie, for coming and speaking with us. I invite everyone to please look at the materials that have been presented by ICANN Org on the site. Thank you to the interpreters and technical support, and we are adjourning this session; we have six, count them, six minutes before the next session begins. There is coffee out in the hall. Next session begins at 10:30, At-Large policy session, expedited policy development process on gTLD registration, led by Hadia and Alan. So,

please be here in six, thank you. We actually have 10 minutes, because interpreters need 10 minutes.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]