
MONTREAL – Joint NCUC-At-Large ICANN66 Outreach: Policy chill-out at ICANN
Monday, November 4, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hello. All right, everybody. Okay. Can I ask people to take place around the table? Because it's very difficult to speak at 360 degrees here. Chill at the table, exactly. Take your coffees, teas, any drink of your choice. Look how much space there is over there. Take your space on the table. You'll have a table. You'll be a lot more comfortable than in the seat at the back.

So, this session is a joint NCUC and At-Large session. And we're going to be focusing today on policy, because I guess we often speak about everything else but policy is really important for us. We're going to be trying to focus on this. We'll start first with an introduction to NCUC and At-Large. This session is meant for newcomers and people that just enjoy being in these sessions as well, I guess, and being able to debate some of the issues. We don't often debate issues between NCUC and At-Large. Sometimes, we have various points of views, I guess. Sometimes, we're aligned. So, this is meant not to confuse you but rather to show you the difference in points of view that we might have.

I introduce with me today Bruna Santos. Actually, it says Bruna Martin.

BRUNA SANTOS: Both ways.

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.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Both ways. Bruna is the chair of the NCUC. So, over to you, Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS: Hi, everyone. Thanks for coming. This is yet another NCUC and At-Large outreach. So, welcome everyone. Thanks for being here.

Starting with NCUC, starting with you that already – I see some [inaudible] faces here, I also see some new faces here. I know you're kind of used to this. NCUC is one of the houses for civil society here at ICANN. We are the Non-Commercial Users Constituency, part of the non-commercial stakeholder group.

What that means. That means we are often the voice of non-profits. We're the voice of sort of part of academia. We are the voice of consumers and also end users inside the Generic Names Supporting Organization.

So, a little bit about its [inaudible] story. NCUC started back maybe almost 20 years ago when discussions were starting up at ICANN. We didn't have GNSO. We had DNSO (Domain Names Supporting Organization). Back then, when we were starting to form and improve ICANN's multi-stakeholder governance and structure, we were missing the place for civil society and a place for non-profits. Those parts of us who used to be owners of domain names as well. That was the need for assembling a space for all of us to speak and assembling a space for all of us to have our voices heard inside the GNSO policy making processes.

To wrap up, NCUC nowadays, we are divided into five leaders for each of the regions of the world. We have some of them here. We have Mili,

which is APAC. We have Franco from LAC. We also have Ben from the African region. We have Dev up there which is the outgoing for APAC. Now we're welcoming Mili back in. Whoever else? We also have Michael and Ines who are not here. And Louise who is our current EC for Europe.

So, just to keep it brief, and then I guess we can move on with the agenda. Thanks for this space.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Bruna. As far as At-Large is concerned, we have Maureen Hilyard, the chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee, who unfortunately has to run immediately afterwards, but please, Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks, Olivier. What I want to do is we're sharing this role here, John Laprise and I. John is going to introduce At-Large and then I'll just go over the governance side.

JOHN LAPRISE: Hi. I'm John Laprise. I'm outgoing vice chair of policy for ALAC, the At-Large Advisory Committee. At-Large includes everyone. It's about what you do when you are getting online. It doesn't matter what constituency you're from. It doesn't matter which advisory group. At some point, you get online to do something, whether it's set a restaurant reservation or order something online or just communicate with someone.

So, when you are acting, when anyone is acting in that capacity as an individual online, you are someone whose interest we are trying to represent. I'll hand it over to you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Okay. So, when we're actually looking at how we're actually organized within At-Large, of course our organogram, the top line there in yellow are the 15 members are three members from five RALOs, five Regional Organizations – Asia-Pacific, the African region, North American, European, and LACRALO.

So, there's 15 of us up there. What I've got on the right-hand side – one of them is hidden. I think that must be Jonathan or Joanna. Those four and myself make up what is called the ALAC leadership team. So, 15 members are the ALAC. That's a decision-making group.

When you come down to the next level, that's what we call the ALT-Plus. In the former years, we had the ALAC Leadership Team was the group that used to discuss issues before they made recommendations and took them to the ALAC to actually make the formal decisions.

But when I came on board, I included into this group the regional chairs because I really wanted to make sure that the membership base actually had some input into the discussions. So, that's why the middle sector has got the ALAC Leadership Team and the RALO leaders.

Also, this group on the far left, the odds and sods sort of group, but they're actually our advisors and they're liaisons to the GAC, GNSO,

SSAC, and the ccNSO, plus two former ALAC chairs. So, they're an advisory group. They join us regularly.

The thing is that At-Large is mandated to do outreach and policy. And our third section is organizational management which is what I do. Olivier and Jonathan do ... Actually, I didn't ask you if you still wanted to be in the policy section. He hasn't seen this yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I just like to see my picture on screen. I love it.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, exactly. Honestly, I'll tell you what. Last year, he was in three different sections, three different photographs. This year, he only has one.

But it's really just to show how we organize ourselves to carry out the three roles that we do within At-Large. That's it. Done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Maureen. I love the fact that you're still using a picture of mine from ten years ago. It's great. All right. I was going to ask, actually, how many newcomers do we have at the table? How many people it's their first ICANN meeting? Oh, there's quite a few. Okay, excellent. So, this session is for you. Feel free to ask questions at any moment at any time. There's no such thing as a silly question. There's one silly thing which is not to ask a question. So, this is really a thing where you can just ask. We'll try our best. We do have a number

of experts around the room from both our communities, so hopefully we'll be able to answer the questions. If we can't, then we'll just refer it and we'll put you in touch with the right person, so you can follow-up with them.

So, now we've looked at this. We can look at the differences and similarities between the two communities because I think that's one of the first questions that gets asked. I could start, since I've already started on the roll here.

The thing is At-Large and NCUC, as far as At-Large is concerned, I think Maureen Hilyard has already said it's all about Internet end users. So, it doesn't just mean just civil society but we do also have other organizations that are involved that have an end user mandate. We also have individuals that come in our community.

And At-Large is an advisory committee. So, it is able to comment on everything and anything that takes place at ICANN. That includes budgets. That includes any organizational matters in ICANN. It doesn't just deal with generic names. The NCUC is part of the Generic Names Supporting Organization and I'll let David take you through this.

But the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) makes policy. The advisory committee advises on policy once policy is made.

I hope it's not too confusing. But it's a little bit like your neighbor that is able to point out things that are not working out in your process and say, "No, no, no. You've got to change it this way," or, "Change it that way."

The ALAC is also, as being an advisory committee, is a bit like the Government Advisory Committee as well. The governments another able to come together and comment on ICANN policy and then that gets taken into account in the policy making process. But David, the NCUC is part of the GNSO.

DAVID CAKE:

Yeah. So, the NCUC is part of the GNSO and the GNSO, it's right there in the name. It's about generic top-level domains. It's a lot of what we do here at ICANN but it's not everything, so it's got a clear remit for what it does. Whereas, ALAC is much broader. ALAC can comment on a whole bunch of other activities that ICANN does.

Of course, you can comment if you want to but that's not really what ... The GNSO is there to make sure that policy is created. So, we're very focused on policy for top-level domains and we not just comment on the actual policy. As part of the GNSO, we also are involved in the processes that oversee and make sure that policy happens, make sure that if that processes gets a little ... Understand what their process is, make sure it happens right, make sure policy comes out at the end, make sure it's going okay. So, it's both the creation and the oversight of that policy.

Also, because of the way that GNSO is divvied up, it's very specific. We represent non-commercial users and all the different non-commercial organizations that want to be involved in policy for whatever reason. A lot of them have policy goals and processes that they're trying to achieve as well as just representing their own interest.

We are sort of in counterpoint with the commercial stakeholders and the other half of the GNSO which is the contracted parties, the people who actually run generic domains and the registries and registrars.

The other big difference, we specifically are non-commercial. ALAC is broader. It represents people who use the Internet for whatever purpose, whereas we're focused on non-commercial uses, specifically, though we comment on all policy.

What else is there? This bit we're trying to tell you how we're different, but there's of course a lot in common.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: In fact, what can NCUC and At-Large do together? Greg, I think you're a newcomer. Can we just have you afterwards ... Because I think Stephanie has to go pretty quickly, so let's just get Stephanie Perrin in and then we can ...

BRUNA SANTOS: Yeah, Stephanie, if you can help us continue explaining how we've been working together and how we both represent similar interests from time to time around this community. The floor is yours.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. Stephanie Perrin from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. People do ask us, especially newcomers, what's the difference? What's ALAC doing? What's NCSG doing? And basically we are putting most of our input through the GNSO, through the PDPs. And we focus only on

individuals or NGOs that are dedicated to the public interest that are non-commercial, as the name says. And that kind of rolls of your tongue when you say non-commercial stakeholders.

But we really do check in our membership to make sure that people are either operating in their own right as individuals with a domain name, having their little piece of the Internet and we worry about what their rights are more than the system itself.

And organizations that represent the public interest. So, NGOs, human rights organizations, and academia that studies some of these issues. In particular, free expression and privacy and human rights.

So, that's kind of our main focus. So, we can have the opportunity to work collaboratively with ALAC whose membership is in the At-Large I guess you would say. I'm always saying the wrong word when I'm describing ALAC. It could be all over the map. They could be small business. They could be bigger business. They could be intellectual property lawyers. They could be organizations. Hey could be ISOC chapters with the representatives of those ISOC chapters. So, those are all legitimate end users but they're different from us. That's how we kind of work collaboratively.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Marita Moll, what can we do together?

MARITA MOLL:

Thank you. What do we do together? Well, I'm going to be more specific about what I think we do together. I think that our chairs meet and talk to each other about what's going on and how we might be able to help each other. We are not, hopefully – and we shouldn't be – working against each other or anything like that. We have different and legitimate interests to represent but we can still do a lot of things that will help further the mission of ICANN and end users and anybody who is working on the Internet. So, we're always very, very scarce of resources. Any volunteer base group is scarce of resources. And it is in our interest to work together.

So, we have built some bridges with NPOC and they're building on a lot of communications tools that maybe we can share. We just want to build an understanding. We can work together by building an understanding between us, sharing the load. For one thing, NCUC/NCSG, I also – I'm always using the wrong word – has constructed a policy writing webinar which is fabulous, which anybody can use but this is something that we can share because we also need to do that. We also write policy. Not in the same way. It doesn't follow the same stream. But it's just as important. So, we can also do that sort of thing, build these things together. I just want to say we don't actually need ... We don't compete if that's the ... Well, we do sometimes compete. But we don't want people to get the impression that this is a huge competitive environment in which one group is working against the other. So, we don't want to do that.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you very much, Marita. And thanks for mentioning the course. It's a new resource. We have John and we also had Greg in the—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: John and Greg, yeah. John is getting very excited. I don't know.

JOHN LAPRISE: I just want to make a small intervention. If we're talking about differences and similarities, one difference is that when you're in At-Large, you may not even work in anything related to the Internet industry or any related sphere. I work for the Radiological Society of North America. That's my day job. I'm a market research manager. But when I come here and I take my vacation days to come here and work as an ALAC member, I put on my hat and I do Internet policy. I try to advocate for end users.

For us, this is another facet of At-Large, especially when we're meeting in groups is that we don't have any necessarily binding tie between us. Our only binding tie is that we use the Internet. I just wanted to add that in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, John. In fact, I think that many people who are members of both NCUC and At-Large. That's two. I think Raphael as well. You are an individual Internet user somewhere in Europe or North America. I can't remember where. Excellent.

So, now, Greg. Yes. Greg Shatan, the newcomer.

GREG SHATAN: Not really. I just wanted to clarify and maybe overlap a little bit with John on the organization of At-Large as opposed to the organization of ALAC. At-Large is composed of At-Large Structures (ALSes) which in some cases are purpose-built organizations just to be an ALS. In many cases, they are also ISOC chapters. In other cases, they are other types of organizations. For instance, I'm here as a representative of the New York Chapter of the Internet Society of which I am the President. So, that's my role here. ISOC New York is also a member of NCUC but I do not represent ISOC New York in NCUC, although hmm...

In any case, really our focus is on the individual end user and I think that whenever anybody is here in these groups there are lots of different kinds of people in the groups but when they're here representing their groups to At-Large, they're here with the interests of the individual end user at heart, whatever their business card – assuming they have a business card – says. Thanks.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you very much, Greg. This is a space now for questions. Is everything kind of getting of getting clearer to you guys? Do we have questions? Topics?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Have we confused you enough already?

BRUNA SANTOS: Yeah. Any acronym that got lost in the middle of the way, please raise your hand. This is the space. Go ahead.

FIDYA SHABRINA: I may or may not be confused. I am Fidya from Indonesia. I am ICANN Fellow 66. My question is what are the measurement tools used by ICANN to consider whether an issue will or will not be eliminated in the consensus building? Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS: I don't think we totally got your question, so if you can repeat it.

FIDYA SHABRINA: My question is what are the measurement tools, if any, available that is used by ICANN to consider whether an issue will or will not be eliminated in the consensus building?

BRUNA SANTOS: You mean measurements for either starting or ending a PDP or a certain policy.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's a really interesting question, actually, because it's not ICANN decides but it's the communities that decide because it's bottom up. In the At-Large community, I don't know if John wants to answer, how does At-Large decide to comment or not comment on an issue? Then, perhaps, somebody from NCUC can also say this.

JOHN LAPRISE:

Well, whether or not we're going to comment on a policy – and this is, in part, part of the things that Maureen has been doing since she's taken over as chair is that we have a consolidated policy working group, so we have regular meetings. We look at the issues that are coming up because we're not part of the GNSO. We're an advisory committee. So we're just debating whether or not we want to get involved in a particular issue from an end user perspective, and if we do, people volunteered to go participate in that and then periodically they come back at our regular meetings and relay what they found out, talk about what positions they're taking.

So, for instance, the EPDP. We have two representatives there. And every single consolidated policy working group call, they're coming back and they're giving us a report on what's going on. We discuss it and then they go back off and do work after they've heard from us.

So, it's sort of a continuous conversation for us. And if you come to many of our meetings, that's exactly what our formal business meetings look like as well is continuous directed conversations on topics. And generally ... I've been an ALAC member for two years now. Generally speaking, when we come to a point where we're actually taking a formal vote of the ALAC, most of the time it's by acclamation. There's very few issues that are sharply divided. The last one I remember was back a few years ago with the KSK rollover. There were two different views and we basically welded both views together in our advice.

HOLLY RAICHE: A more recent one which I'll mention later is geo-names but there are some things where, in fact, there are quite significant different honestly held views. So, the ALAC view is there are quite significantly different honesty held views.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: How does the NCUC decide on whether to get involved with a policy development?

AYDEN FERDELINE: I was going to actually respond to the original question but I'll also respond to what you just asked there, Olivier. And it's a good question. So, how do we measure consensus? What does consensus mean? How is it assessed? I wondered that as well when I first came to this community.

As you sort of established, the policy development process that the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) uses is supposed to work by consensus.

So, that means that community participants can agree to compromise with one another to reach a particular outcome or to reach a stage where everyone is either happy or equally unhappy, whatever that looks like.

The GNSO does have in its operating procedures some measurements or some tools for assessing consensus and there are also some voting

thresholds as well for matters that are taken to the GNSO Council to consider adopting or not. So, that is how we sort of assess consensus. It's not always scientific it's a bit speculative at times but it seems to work and it's one of those things that you just know when you see it that's helpful or not. Essentially, if everyone still has their hand up wanting to speak if there is still a lot of traffic on an email list about that, then there probably isn't consensus just yet to move on.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Then Ayden, the other question, the one where how does the NCUC decide on picking up a topics.

BRUNA SANTOS: How are consensus—

AYDEN FERDELINE: So, sometimes we don't reach consensus and there are issues internally we just don't have a position on because civil society does not have uniform views on every issue that there is. Even if we wanted to sort of a history lesson and go back 20 years ago to when ICANN was founded, there were many civil society organizations like the Electronic Frontiers Foundation that did not support the creation of ICANN. There were some that supported the creation of ICANN but didn't support civil society participation because there was a view that this organization

would have a purely technical mandate and therefore, if there was not a policy function, it would not need to be involved.

So, it's not really a clear answer, I know, but it's just issues are brought up, people that particularly care generally make an effort to make sure that others hear their view. Sometimes, consensus is reached, sometimes there isn't and then we just don't ... It's not a great answer.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you very much.

AYDEN FERDELINE: It's not a great answer.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you. No, it is confusing and it is complex. We're going to develop thoughts as well. We have Holly and Marita online and also a question up there. Who else?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll be really brief. I think you were asking kind of a global question. How does ICANN ... And the first answer to your question is actually it genuinely is bottom up. There's nothing to stop any of the SOs and ACs actually going to the Board and saying this is a very important issue for us. And it can be taken up that way or it can be taken up participating in the policy process of GNSO. There have been times when, in fact ALAC

has written the Board and said, “This is a policy we’re concerned about.” There’s times when GAC has gone to the Board.

So, in fact, there are a number of bottom-up processes but very rarely would the Board say, “This is a process. Somebody has to deal with it.” The exception might be EPDP because basically that had to be solved. But that was a process from bottom-up and it’s still being solved, or not bottom-up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. The key word is “bottom-up” I think. ICANN itself, ICANN Org, does not decide on these things. It’s the community. Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Yeah. I just wanted to add a very specific example which might be helpful. I was a member of something called work track 5 which was a PDP, a policy development process, which was about geo-names. That work track just finished after two years of discussion and came to a conclusion which everyone was unhappy with, just like what was already said.

But that’s not totally the end of the matter because it goes on. There’s a request for comment. There’s a report written. There’s a request for comment to that report. Groups can put in comments. “Okay, we also have something further to say on this.” All this stuff ends up going to the Board. We also have something further to say on this.

There are also different weights that are applied to how groups are responding. It's a very complex process. It takes quite a long time working in this area to fully understand. And it's also under revision at the moment because ICANN is trying to organize its processes and looking to finding better and more efficient ways of reaching these kinds of decisions.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you very much. We can follow up with the questions. We have three questions here.

TRACY COOLEY:

This is pretty basic. My name is Tracey Cooley. I'm with the Campaign for Personal Prescription Importation. I'm just wondering how big is NCUC and about what percentage of people are really engaged. And then the last question is are we geographically disbursed? Is it a really global group?

BRUNA SANTOS:

Quickly answering your question – and if anyone wants to chime in as well. Nowadays, we have maybe more than 800 members NCUC right now. Around that, yeah. Almost 1000 members. And we are rather spread around.

In terms of participation, in the end, it's obviously not the 900 members but it goes slightly smaller. I guess the number of members of NCUC nowadays works as a result of some outreach that we've been doing in

the past years, but at the end of the day, the number of members who get to be comfortable enough working with ICANN and giving their opinions on the list, it's part of our job as well and this is why we came up with the policy writing course and capacity building initiative, just so we can help those members be active and help those members have a proper onboarding into the constituency.

But I know Ayden wanted to chime in. Do you still do?

AYDEN FERDELINE:

You've really said it very well, Bruna, but I think that's right. Over 800 members fairly well geographically disbursed. We have everyone from the Heritage Foundation on the right to the Electronic Frontiers Foundation on the left. So, a little ideological diversity as well, which I think is important.

And we gain our strength and our legitimacy by having a number of active participation from large non-profits, really. Non-profits, thinktanks, educational institutions. So, there's always sort of this question of legitimacy and who can claim to speak for whom.

And for us, at least, that is one way in which we try to maintain our legitimacy is by ensuring that we have representatives who are active representing us in different processes who are speaking on behalf of organizations [like] themselves have some kind of mandate.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you. I think we had another question. Yeah. Go ahead, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. Hello. [inaudible] from Ghana, ICANN 66 fellow. I would like to get some clarification. Is it right to say that when it comes to the differences between the two entities - I mean, [inaudible] - is it that you both focus on the end users and then is it fair to say that a different [inaudible] in whether these end users are commercial and non-profit?

Then, another question is one-sided. What is the difference between ATLAS, ALAC, and At-Large? That is one-sided.

BRUNA SANTOS: Good questions [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, your first question nobody volunteered to answer. The second one, the whole row is going, "I can answer that!"

BRUNA SANTO: We have David right by you as well.

DAVID CAKE: Happy to answer the first one. The NCUC represents the views of non-commercial users but many of its members maybe organizations that have a policy interest that does not only apply to ... I mean, we have many members who are advocacy or organizations and things like that. And as such, their views may ... They may have views on how people who, other than non-commercial users, are dealt with.

A good example is the various electronic frontier organizations that are in NCUC. They are non-profits but they are non-profits who exist to be a part of the policy debate about the use of the Internet and they may include opinions about that apply to non-commercial and other users. So, we don't represent so much non-commercial users as the views of non-commercial users which can be a little bit broader.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Do NCSG have to own a domain name or not?

DAVID CAKE: Yes. They do have to own a domain name, I think. Oh no, we don't anymore. I think that got removed from the charter.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It used to be.

BRUNA SANTOS: Yeah, at the very beginning, yeah.

DAVID CAKE: It used to be the rule, yeah.

BRUNA SANTOS: At the very beginning back 20 years ago. When the whole ICANN structure was being developed, the idea was to have a space for non-commercial domain name owners but it has evolved into including

more civil society individual members and also civil liberties groups as well. So, this is a rather broad group whose definition and focus has evolved across the years.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. As I said earlier, a lot of people are members of both organizations. ATLAS, ALAC, At-Large explained, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, At-Large refers to the whole community. All end users, all individual end users and at an individual level and what they do. Billions of them. So, At-Large is organized in a way that is globally into five RALOs (Regional At-Large Organizations) as Maureen said earlier. Those five RALOs each have three representatives to the ALAC (the At-Large Advisory Committee). That's the top-level group.

In each RALO, two of those members are elected on a rotating basis. So, I was elected in North America two years ago. And one of them is appointed by the NomCom. So, each region has three members, two of which are elected, one of which is selected by the NomCom process. And then those 15 members comprise the ALAC which is the body that actually votes on binding advice to the Board or works with the different SOs and ACs in the community.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. ATLAS is ... I'm going to get this wrong what the acronym is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The At-Large Summit.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, the At-Large Summit. So, every five years?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Depends, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, more or less. Every five years, At-Large brings a group of At-Large individuals to an ICANN meeting to do development. This year's ATLAS III, the focus is on developing leadership skills. So, there was an application process. People had to take some classes to bring themselves up to a certain level of knowledge. They applied and those accepted are now going through basically a leadership bootcamp of sorts to provide workshops and skills and case studies to at least begin developing some of those skills and provide them with the skills to go forward to lead and shape the conversation in At-Large going forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think we've said enough about this one. Let's just move on.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just one thing, though. There's a thing called the At-Large community. We use that term to say that all the At-Large members whether it's RALOs or At-Large or ALAC members is just a way of saying it's everybody. Including individual members.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let's go to the next question. You've been very, very patient. Bruna just told me, "Oh no! Look how long it's been." Go on.

ARIANE NAKPOKOU: Hi, everyone. My name is Ariane Nakpokou. I'm a NextGen member and I'm from Benin in West Africa. My question is what are your relations with NPOC? Do you have any work relation with NPOC?

BRUNA SANTOS: NPOC is our sister constituency inside the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group. So, we're both part of the non-commercial group and then we have some differences. I can also get Joan to do a little explanation on if you want to, just say how different we are in terms of membership, how it's diverse.

JOAN KERR: The answer is to be a member of NPOC, you have to be a legal entity in your country. You have to have operational concerns. You have to have a website and you have to be a legal entity.

DAVID CAKE: To get picky, a legal person rather than natural person. I can't be an individual person but as an individual person, you are able to join NCUC and NCSG.

JOAN KERR: I was doing the quick answer.

BRUNA SANTOS: You can join both NCUC and NCSG as an individual member but then it goes a little bit different for the NPOC. John, do you still want to ...? Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Confused, still? Trust me, I was confused. I was like, "Okay ..." It's not easy. Go ahead.

YAZID AKANHO: Yazid Akanho, fellow ICANN 66. I'm also NCUC and NCSG member. My question is to understand why sometimes I understood that I can be an NCUC member without being NCSG member. Why this?

DAVID CAKE: You can't.

YAZID AKANHO: Sorry. Maybe it is the opposite. NCSG member without being NCUC member. Sorry, I apologize for that.

RAPHAEL BEAUREGARD-LACROIX: So, yes. You can be NCSG member without being a member of any of the constituencies, either non-for-profit operational concerns or non-commercial users. We do have some members who choose not to do that. It usually depends how you see your own role and position in this whole thing. Most people, when they join, they will usually elect to join one of the constituencies. You know that, too.

One thing that you cannot do if you're not part of any of the constituencies, I suppose, would be to either get the leadership position in the constituency or vote in the elections for that constituency, specifically.

And you can be, if you want to, a member – as John said, you can be a member of both the non-for-profit operational and the non-commercial users as well, if you want.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Shall we talk policy? Yes. I hear the whole row going, “Yes! Let’s do it.” Okay. Let’s move on, if you guys are all okay. We can talk about this Expedited Policy Development Process. How many of you have gone to the session that took place earlier about the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP)? No one. Okay.

So, I don’t blame you. Here’s someone who has been following this very closely. So, we’ve got two speakers on this one for NCUC and one for At-Large. I think, Ayden, you follow this Expedited Policy Development Process very closely. This is all about the General Data Protection

Regulations. Exciting stuff. Please take us through a quick rundown of what this is about.

AYDEN FERDELINE:

Sure. Actually, before I do that, I hope you don't mind if I just quickly touch upon something that I don't think we've covered yet. Why would you actually want to join the NCUC? Just before we dive into the policy work because we've sort of covered now what is the NCUC, what is At-Large, what are our differences and similarities, but why would you want to get involved in this?

And just so that you know what might motivate someone to do that, it would give you the opportunity to see the multi-stakeholder model in action rather than just reading about it. It can give you the opportunity to learn the language of policy as well as the process of policy and to see how it is developed in a genuinely multi-stakeholder bottom-up manner. You can also form a sense of collegiality with colleagues, and while no one comes here for the social networks, of course you can also make some friends along the way.

So, I wanted to just emphasize that there are reasons to get involved and to stay involved and while the learning curve at times can seem a little difficult and it's not always clear what the pathway is to getting involved, particularly when some of these working groups that we're about to discuss now have been going on for extended periods of time, it can be worth your investment.

So, the Expedited Policy Development Process (the EPDP). This has been going on because just over 20 years now ICANN has refused to comply with data protection law. And it's never really had much of a need to comply.

The Article 29 Working Party wrote to ICANN consistently from around 2002 onwards but never took any enforcement action. So, ICANN the organization, the legal entity, based in California never felt much of a motivation to comply with this law. ICANN does not have a good track record of listening to the concerns of civil society, unfortunately, on many issues unless there is the financial muscle, the economic muscle rather, or the state muscle to compel ICANN Org to behave in a certain way. It's difficult for civil society to be able to bring about any change.

But something that civil society has flagged for over 20 years is that there was something wrong with what is called WHOIS. And WHOIS is a de-centralized database that contains personal information about everyone that registers a domain name. So, their name, their home address, other attributes.

For a long time, this was all publicly accessible. It just sounds ridiculous to describe it. So, the primary purpose of WHOIS ... I'm being a little flippant here but it's also true – was to enable identity fraud, to allow spam to proliferate, and to allow domain names to be easily hijacked and stolen. So, it never really served a legitimate purpose.

So, what has happened since the GDPR came about and ICANN was a little late to the table was that there was a need to start redacting this information. So, the information is not being deleted. It is still available.

It just needs to be gated in some way. So, this is what the EPDP is working on.

In terms of what our positions are, it's easier to distinguish on this particular issue between the NCUC and At-Large based upon where our positions differ.

So, the NCUC has historically advocated for privacy rights for natural persons whereas At-Large is consistently taken positions opposed to privacy for natural persons.

The NCUC speaks up for privacy rights. The At-Large speaks against privacy rights. The NCUC is opposed to having personal information disclosed for any reason whatsoever, whereas the At-Large supports having open-ended reasons for disclosing one's personal information to any entity that wants it.

The NCUC supports a redaction of all public fields, whereas the At-Large supports some fields remaining public even if they can lead to the identifiability of a natural person. For instance, the city field or the organization field. That could allow, say, a women's shelter or a political dissident or whatever to be identified rather easily.

There are others. The At-Large supports a fragmented WHOIS policy where we are going to be forcing the contracted parties – the registrars and the registries – to be distinguishing between, based upon geographic location – what privacy rights are offered to some individuals and what are not offered to others, whereas the NCUC believes that all registrants, regardless of where they live, regardless of

whether they're in a jurisdiction that has an enforceable privacy law in place deserve privacy protections.

So, in a nutshell, that is where we differ in that the NCUC is consistently advocated for privacy rights for natural persons, which is perhaps not surprising given that our membership is non-profit organizations. Whereas the At-Large, one could say advocates against privacy rights and kind of has been captured. And if you look at their EPDP representatives, one of which is a representative of an authoritarian government, and the other of which I can lead you to draw your own conclusions as to whom they represent, I think you'd be able to see very clearly we had some differences on this issue. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Ayden. That's an interesting one because At-Large and NCUC have not been agreeing with each other on this topic. So, you've got one view. And then now you're going to have another view with Holly Raiche because Holly is on the list. So, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm going to give a little bit of factual background here just so you understand where we're both coming from. WHOIS started off probably the early days of the Internet where the information that was shared was between mates and it basically was, "This is how I can get to your computer," and probably connected 20 people, then 200, and everybody was quite happy to exchange the information.

It grew like [inaudible] and grew in many ways out of control. ICANN adopted, when ICANN was formed, the WHOIS policy which is enshrined in the contracts that ICANN has with registries and registrars. And if you look at the RAA, which is the Registration Accreditation Agreement, you'll actually see the list of information that is required by ICANN to be publicly available. So, you can just check these out.

Now, for some time – and I wouldn't say it's simply NCUC – there have been concerns about the privacy. In fact, there was a WHOIS report that was done by ICANN and pointed out to some of the implications. Certainly privacy was one of them. And the development of what was called the privacy-proxy server, so that if you really were concerned, you hoped that you could use a privacy-proxy server to protect your private information. And that has been available. Sometimes, it costs and it wasn't always available.

The thing that rather crystallized the difficulty with the requirements under the RAA was not the European data protection laws as they first were and as they've grown up in many jurisdictions other than the EU was the fact that the GDPR, which is the General Data Protection Regulation, were very stringent in terms of both the requires for informed consent and the penalties that are attached and it suddenly became very clear that WHOIS was in direct contradiction, and in fact there were going to be lots of penalties.

So, the GDPR was passed in 2016 in May but didn't take effect until 2018. It gave everybody two years. ICANN was not the only people really caught off their feet by having to finalize some kind of at least

temporary specification. A lot of work was put in by everybody to at least have the registries and registrars be able to comply with, or not be contrary to, the requirements of the GDPR. That was the first phase.

The second phase was then what was called – and it's called EPDP (Expedited Policy Process) to start to have the outline such that the policy of WHOIS could be replaced by a policy that would be consistent with or at least not in contravention of the European data protection laws.

There have been a number of questions that have had to be solved by what's been essentially – I was going to say [inaudible]. It's been a number of different parties, all of whom have quite legitimate views on what information should be available and under what circumstances.

If you look at – and I'm not going to go into the details of the General Data Protection Regulation – but there has to be a reason for the data to be collected. It has to be known by the person who is giving the information, what that reason is. It has to be consistent with the act.

In terms of how you work through the many – and I haven't even touched the policy issues – it has been a hard [inaudible].

Let's just say where we're up to now is what's called EPDP 2 which is to deal with many of the issues that have not necessarily been resolved. One of or a couple of the main issues that we've had some disagreements on, we have actually argued that the actual data protection regulations do distinguish between what's called a legal person versus a natural person.

A legal person is a corporate entity that in some way under the relevant national law has been incorporated. It is a legal person for legal reasons but distinguished from natural people. And we have actually said there should be some difference in the way that the data of a legal person should be treated as to a natural person. Just one of the many issues that we've talked about.

Another is – and this keeps coming up. I was sitting in one of the sessions today and discussions about whether we comply totally and model our model completely on EPDP or if we actually leave room for other privacy regulations which are, I would say, spread through. There are 140 pieces of privacy legislation. Not all of it is consistent with EPDP. It is to be acknowledged that the EPDP is very high level. There are other levels. And there was discussion in the room. I'm just putting out there that this was discussion in the room that was today.

Where we're up to, which I thought I knew until I walked into the room and thought, "Oh, my goodness. That was yesterday." I chuckled because we've got up in the display screen we've now got a hamburger and there are two sides and in the middle are all the complex issues that are spilling out. That's one version of where we're up to.

What ICANN Org has also done is draw up it's own what is now called Strawberries. It's beginning to be a vegetable shop. A Strawberry version of it would like advice from the data protection authorities on in terms of all of the issues that have to be resolved.

So, without going – I could probably spend the next three hours. None of you are going to be here in three hours. But we're talking really about

what data has to be [inaudible] and it starts with what data should be collected in the first place, which has been a difficult one. Who has access? And that's not easy. There are words in the GDPR that would suggest some of its law enforcement agencies, how you define that is difficult. Do you include other agencies such as your consumer protection? How do you do that? How do you name that? So, that's another issue that's difficult.

Access. Do you have to have a process of accrediting every one of the bodies that's going to get access to data, to make sure that they fit in a category that has been accepted? Then, how do you provide access? If you provide access, do you mean that you have to make a judgment, some individual human being has to make a judgment every single time that it's appropriate for that individual in those circumstances – and the circumstances would be limited – to have access for that occasion?

So, you can see that it's actually quite complex. It's got many issues involved. We have agreed in some cases but not all. I think the legal/natural person is one.

How you deal with access is going to be a big issue because there is an issue about simply the volume of people seeking access. Do you insist that every access request is reviewed by an individual? And is that possible? Is it realistic? And if so, how do you manage it? That was another item for discussion.

There are other issues for discussion but we'll get there but it has not been an easy one. It's come down to really a balance between the legitimate interests of many parties to access ... There's a difference

between what information is made available. Do you only make a name available? Do you make any other contact information available? Then, based on a range of information, at what stage do the various kinds of applicants for access have access to that information? How do you make that judgment and how do you agree on it?

So, there's a difficult balance that has to be reached. Where that balance is, I would say, is difficult even amongst people in the same group. We will get there but it's probably there's always going to be ... And just as in many other issues, there are going to be compromises that people are not comfortable with.

But I'm not sure that I agree with everything that you have characterized. I think you've made us out to be fairly uncharitable and fairly uncaring and I would dispute both.

DAVID CAKE: However – and I am sorry but you didn't actually dispute anything of what I just said. I was taking [notes].

HOLLY RAICHE: I put it in much milder terms and I acknowledged there is some legitimacy in what you say and I would appreciate you acknowledging there is some legitimacy in what I say.

BRUNA SANTOS: I think we can move on with the agenda a little bit.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, you see the differences in views with regards to privacy, with regards to the ... Yeah. I think when one speaks of end users, a majority of end users actually do not own domain names. So, the At-Large community certainly looks at those people that don't own domain names, some of whom have a legitimacy to have the knowledge of who owns a domain name and so on. You have a question? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just have a question about the proxy server mentioned. The proxy server you mentioned, is that in regards to WHOIS whereby there is an email listed and that goes for a proxy to—

HOLLY RAICHE: Actually, there's a really excellent report that in about 2013 called the WHOIS Privacy-Proxy Report. It is a service provided not universally and not necessarily free by some providers that allow ... In fact, they distinguish between when you are, as a proxy server, you are in the place of somebody. So, you as the registrar, provide the information about yourself. And then there are very limited circumstances in which you would even provide the tiniest detail about who you represent.

There are other circumstances which are corporate, where in fact you are simply an agent for somebody else. Now, that's distinguished in the 2013 report. And read it. But it is essentially a service where there are different reasons. Corporations simply may not want to give away what products or services they're about to provide so they want an agent to

deal with that. That's not about privacy-proxy. It's about protection of corporate interest.

There are other quite legitimate and privacy interests which are protected by a similar service. If you're really interested, I would read the Final WHOIS Report. I think it was 2013. It explains the two different kinds of services provided.

As I say, it's not universally provide by all registrars or resellers. It's not necessarily provided free by all resellers. But the information is all there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Another question?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I had a question for you regarding the whole privacy sector and the transparency differentiation. I just wanted to know what if a government organization or a security service organization like the FBI or CIA can request information on an individual who, if they're suspecting something, does that play a role in transparency?

HOLLY RAICHE: As Ayden will agree, this is a subject of a great deal of, I would say, controversy. On the first hand, there's a question about which agency under what circumstances should be providing the information. You can't even list the kind of well like, like, like because each one will have possibly a legitimate role or not a legitimate role depending on that.

Then, as between countries, there are going to be some countries where you're going to be really scared if an [inaudible] person comes up and says ...

So, these are really difficult issues because you have to distinguish between who, what's the nature of the agency, and then you have to ask under what circumstances should they actually have to provide the information or not.

That's argued about in Australia. I can tell you it's a [bun] fight in Australia alone. It's true in every country. It's a really hard issue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic] work that out or ...?

HOLLY RAICHE: ICANN does not make ... We make the decisions, not ICANN Org. So, we're talking about the committee here and we're talking about the discussions as to how you work through how you define the circumstances in which a legitimate law enforcement agency would have access to what enumerated data. It really is that desegregated. I can't give you a simple answer because there isn't one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And as we said, this topic has been going on for so many 20 years or something and it needs to be resolved pretty quickly so that's why they're really working so hard on it. I'm really concerned we're going to spend the whole thing on the Expedited PDP. Greg, not this time, sorry.

GREG SHATAN: Then I'm going to go because I'm not going to sit here and—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right. Have your minute, please.

GREG SHATAN: What is the point of me sitting here if you're just not going to allow me to speak?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: Two points. First, law enforcement also has other ways of getting at information WHOIS other than going through the system that the EPDP is working on. That's a very significant point.

Secondly, one of the most amusing parts of these meetings is when one group describes the other one and it should usually be taken as comedy and not as fact. So, I'll leave it at that.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Let's go to human rights because I think that's a bit less controversial in this organization.

GREG SHATAN: No. We advocate human rights, apparently.

BRUNA SANTOS: I'm happy to introduce Akriti which is one of the co-chairs of the CCWP Human Rights. You have the floor. Akriti is also an NCUC member. So, go ahead.

AKRITI BOPANNA: Thank you. I think over the past two years I've found it's equally controversial with all the different definitions of which human rights are more important. Is it privacy? Is it diversity? Which one exactly?

Hi, everyone. I'm Akriti, as Bruna said. I'm one of the co-chairs of the Cross-Community Working Party on Human Rights. My other co-chair, actually, recently resigned. She was Collin from Article 19. She was the chair for over two years and I've been engaged in the space for two years.

So, all this time what we've been trying to do is focus on different aspects of ICANN's policies that impact human rights. Not so much privacy recently because of GDPR conversation. There's enough emphasis and focus on privacy.

When I started out about a year or so ago, something that was important to me and my institution was how diverse ICANN was. So, we did a diversity analysis of ICANN. Over the past ... This year, what we've been doing is conducting a human rights impact assessment. One of the PDPs, the one on subsequent procedures, one of the work tracks, the one we chose was work track 5 and we conducted an [HRIE] on it, looking at how the policies within the work track would affect human rights.

The instruments that we used were different international law human rights instruments such as the Universal Declaration on HR. So, that's something that took quite a few times because it's also the first time which is something like this we were trying to do given that ICANN is a multi-stakeholder environment. It's a lot harder to galvanize different things. Everyone is working in different places, has different priorities. It's voluntary. A lot of the work that people do is on their own time.

The actual presentation is on Wednesday, so you can come for that to hear more about the human rights work that we've been doing. But that's sort of the main project that we were focusing over this year.

It's exciting that [inaudible] to see what else we're going to focus on over the coming months. If any of you want to contribute or talk to me about anything that you might think is potentially an exciting idea, then I'm very open to that conversation.

The CCWP generally is a forum for where we have these sort of discussions. We don't have a session at this ICANN since I'm presenting the report at the GAC on Wednesday but usually we have a human rights

session and people just come and talk about different things. Some people present papers that they have done before or just comment, have an informal conversation about how they can participate, the kinds of rights that are affected by different ICANN policies. It's very one-ended. It's not very formally structured.

At the next, at Mexico, there will be a session there. So, I hope to see you there.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you very much, Akriti. I'm taking that Joanna was—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Joanna, actually, I think takes part in the CCWP. So, Joanna, you can say a few words. Joanna Kulesza?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. First of all, let me note I fully agree with Olivier that human rights are totally non-controversial. In that vein, I will just briefly refer – I believe we are running short of time. Isn't that correct? Right.

So, in that vein, I will just briefly refer to the document that was just briefly mentioned. On behalf of At-Large, let me just note that we welcome the document. We think it's a worthy effort. We appreciate the opportunity to have been a part of that working group, to look into it, and to better understand what the approach is.

Thank you for the leadership in that working party. Thank you for all the work that has been done. I very much look forward to the GAC session. That will be our opportunity to exchange views on how to best implement the possibility of a human rights impact assessment. We very much look forward to working with you on this for making that a feasible tool to enhance the community. We welcome the reference to human rights that is there in the bylaws and we will do our best to support a way of implementing that reference and how best to do it is yet to be explored. I look forward to the GAC session and I look forward to us working on that in good conditions in a friendly manner throughout the following meetings.

I'm going to stop here, Olivier, and I'm happy to speak about capacity building as originally planned. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you, Joanna.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's even off the page at the moment because we spent so much time on other topics. It is good because we went with the flow. I hope many of you will join the work party on human rights because it's excellent work. I'm on that. I'm one of the silent people that just reads the stuff and goes, "Great stuff."

BRUNA SANTOS: We really need new volunteers to this discussion. You're all welcome.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Then we just have a little thing on geo-names, subsequent procedures. So, there's another round of generic top-level domains that is likely to come up in the future. It's another huge task that has taken many years. There was a previous one in 2012. We're in 2019. It might be I don't know how many more years. Holly, do you want to say just a few words about this? Because that's one of the main topics that is also being discussed at this meeting.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. Really, just a few words. Our first position on subsequent procedures is that all of the issues that have been raised – and they were raised by a thing called the Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice report. I think that report was in – what year was it? It doesn't matter. It was many years ago.

But there were many recommendations in that report and our review is all of those issues should be addressed before there is another round. That's our first point.

The second, on geo-names. This is about who gets the right to what name and is it a city? Amazon was the really difficult one. The issue has finally been resolved by everybody being unhappy. However, they were all divided with the process. So, that's fine.

As I said before, we in ALAC, there was quite significant differences that we all held quite sincerely so we didn't have a position except that we participated.

The one thing that we have been very strong about is coming out of the report, the Consumer Trust Report, there were a number of issues raised about what should be done to address DNS abuse. A lot of those things have not happened and it's our view that those issues should be addressed before there is another round. End of story.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Holly. It's interesting because there was a question earlier on how do we get consensus and sometimes you just have to say, well, there is no consensus even within the same community. And trust me, you've seen some of the heated exchanges here. You should have seen some of the heated exchanges in At-Large within our community because some people hold very strong views in one way and others in other ways. But that's the whole point of being able to debate freely and openly in the space that we have here. Good debate, actually, sometimes brings consensus. Sometimes it's like, okay, we can agree to disagree. There we go.

Shall we scroll up? I'm not quite sure how the scrolling goes. Oh, look at that. Magic.

BRUNA SANTOS: Now how to get engaged with us and how to be here in [inaudible] this community. So, we'll talk a little bit about PDPs, working groups, and how does all this policy discussion actually become reality around this.

So, I think Ben is going to help me with this part. Benjamin, NCUC Africa. And Joanna as well. Ben, if you want to start.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Hello. Good evening. What an interesting conversation we've had. My name is Benjamin. So, for those of you really interested in participating in policy development processes in NCUC, first NCUC gets involved in PDP by selecting people to go to the GNSO Council through the NCSG. There are some elected seats and there are some appointed individuals.

However, all of this starts from response to public comment, which comes up on our mailing list. You show interest in it and you participate actively. You are nominated to either draft a comment. Public comments might attract your interest. So, you start writing and create an opinion about the particular topic of conversation. And this is just by joining the group and being on our mailing list and actively contributing to those conversations.

One of those times you might be called upon to join a working group that is particularly working on a particular issue. From that point, you can contribute to shaping a particular policy.

All of this is things you learn as you get involved. It doesn't start or finish one day and you can see how complicated or how complex some of these issues are. They are moving parts.

So, the most important thing is to get involved. And if you show some level of consistency, you get elected or appointed to the GNSO Council or, at some point, to represent NCUC in a particular working group.

NCUC has members in the EPDP Working Group and all of the working groups that are relevant to shape policies.

One of the things you must really get to learn is how to write comments, which NCUC provides capacity building through our different webinars, because there's a particular way you need to draft and communicate your ideas. So, these are ways to get involved.

There are charts. We have seen some of those charts in our different newcomer sessions and you can go back to them now. These members sitting across the tables are members of some of these working groups and councils. So, councils, you can join them or ask them to show you what they do, so you can see they are blood and flesh here and they are [inaudible] as well. So, feel free to talk to them and find out what they do and how they do it. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you, Ben. Just to add it is important to mention as well that NCUC does [inaudible] at the stakeholder group level. So, we do policy with and as NCSG and with the NCUC Policy Committee. So, by those interactions, we tend to build the efforts for our policy preservation such as the policy writing course that Marita mentioned before which is on the ICANNLearn platform and you all can take the course and give us feedback on it. So, I'm going to give the floor to Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Yes. It's Joanna Kulesza for the record. I always forget saying that, so here I am saying it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Joanna, by the way, unfortunately Jonathan Zuck isn't around, so you can actually cover both two topics.

JOANNA KULESZA: I was just going to say that. The one thing you guys don't know about me probably, I'm a clock watcher. I know we are running short of time. For the sake of time I'm going to combine the two and I'll try to be succinct. But as always I'm happy to answer questions or talk to you in the corridors if that might be needed.

ALAC is an advisory committee but experience has shown that in order to provide informed advice it is wise for us to follow along with the policy development process. In order to do that, we do our best to have informed members, informed participants.

With that, let me start with a brief overview of the capacity development tools that have been introduced within At-Large, but since we are an ICANN community, all of those tools are available to the entire community.

Now, the go-to option, the default option, is ICANNLearn. Just as NCUC, please let me applaud and welcome the policy development course that NCUC has introduced recently. At-Large also has individual ICANNLearn courses accessible and available to everyone.

Our latest endeavor was to introduce a series of updated courses that dealt with five issues that our ATLAS III participants, whom I attended

to during this session – I apologize for arriving late. So, they had to follow through those five fundamental courses. Some of them have been updated on ICANNLearn for the purposes of the ATLAS III capacity building exercise. They were accompanied by a series of five webinars. So, those were five issues that were addressed in the webinars. However, there was a total of ten webinars we attended to the global community that is spread out across time zones. We tried to make it as painless for the entire community as possible. Those webinars are available online and they're added value is that since we are a global community, those webinars were provided also in Spanish and French and in those language versions they're available online.

We covered issues ranging from introduction to ICANN through cybersecurity through how the DNS operates, etc. You are more than welcome to look into those.

As already said, this year or year-and-a-half efforts have been targeting ATLAS II. The participants are in separate rooms right now working in the breakout sessions trying to make best informed decisions on how to attend to current ICANN challenges and issues and problems.

ATLAS III is, in itself, a capacity building exercise. So, we have people on the ground. We want to train them the best we can for them to be able to support the community, the entire ICANN community, to the best of their abilities. You can wave at me and I'm going to stop whenever.

All right. So, other than that, we're working on different tools to facilitate capacity building. Just talk to me. I believe in conversations, just like [inaudible] said. I'm happy to talk to you and provide you with

more specific information about capacity building and policy development. Thank you very much. I'm going to stop here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. We have to be mindful. We have interpreters that have been speaking the whole time. So, this is why we can't really go over.

How to become next leadership? Volunteer. Volunteer to join the community. Join the mailing lists. You don't have to pay for emails that you receive. You're not going to get so much that ... So, just volunteer. Get on the email and get things into there. John?

JOHN LAPRISE: Yeah. And I will say, for At-Large, it's simply a matter of showing up and doing some work. That's all it takes.

BRUNA SANTOS: Can you tell us how to join NCUC or NCSG?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How to join. Yes. So, how to join NCUC or NCSG, we have a website which you can go. It's a Google form. You fill it and then your membership is reviewed hopefully extremely fast by our Executive Committee. If you don't receive any answer from us within a time which you deem reasonable, feel free to email someone.

Then, we review applications, and after this, you are accepted. And you will know that you have become a member when your inbox is flooded

with emails which will be a time where you will also learn how to have filters if you use Gmail.

BRUNA SANTOS: Just go to NCUC.org and become a member.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's what I was going to say, NCUC.org. For At-Large, it's atlarge.icann.org. Again, same thing. Online forms and things.

Okay. What else do we have? Wrap-up. Okay. I don't know if you have any last questions, pressing questions. If you do, perhaps ... Okay. So, one more and then we need to close.

AUSTIN BOLLINGER: Hi, my name is Austin Bollinger. I am from Grand Rapid, Michigan. I was just wondering, within ICANN, who exactly has the most power to change WHOIS, the WHOIS policies? For example, really quickly, I know that it's required to put in your name, address, all that stuff and basic security principle is to verify information. I know that's rarely done.

If an attacker, for example, gets any of that information, they can utilize that to social engineer and lead to domain hijacking.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Wendy Seltzer, who has the power?

WENDY SELTZER: This is the subject of numerous policy development processes through the EPDP Phase 1, 2, Hamburger, Strawberry. The answer is ICANN needs community support to make those changes and that's what these long processes are trying to do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any changes to policies relating to generic names. And I think we might have not mentioned that. Any policy has to go through the Generic Names Supporting Organization through a policy development process. So, the Generic Names Supporting Organization has the power to make those changes. It then has to go through the Board but the Board usually has to follow what the community says. So, we have the power, effectively, as a group of people. And this is one big difference from ICANN and other organizations.

DAVID CAKE: The short answer there are no short answers, only ones that take at least 20 years.

BRUNA SANTOS: So, thank you, all, very much for being here. If you're interested in any of our communities or both of them, we don't bite. Get in touch with us and reach out to us. We'll be around until Thursday. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And thanks to our interpreters for the extra minutes. You guys are stars. Thanks to the tech people for such a good deal today. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]