
KOBE – At-Large Leadership Prep for ICANN64
Saturday, March 09, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, everyone. If we could can actually make a start, I'll just turn off the ... I think you're right. Welcome everyone. Thank you very much for being on time. And we will watch everyone else who comes in late, take note. And as soon as Johanna finishes talking – we should've known to put you two together. Okay. Before we start I'd just like to pass over to Yesim so she can get the housekeeping issues done.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Maureen. My name is Yesim as you all know. So welcome to Kobe. Just a kind reminder before we start. Please don't forget to state your names before you speak, as usual. We have English, French and Spanish interpretation. And also please don't forget to speak at a reasonable speed. And when you would like to ask a question, please don't forget to use your tent cards. If you'd just place them here, we'd be keeping them in cue. So I think that's it. Thank you very much, Maureen.

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.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Thank you, Yesim. Okay, Maureen, for the record. I'm usually the one that forgets. Just to say welcome everyone, especially after we've been here two days already, most of us. It seems strange that at the end of the second day we're saying welcome to you all, but it's great to have the team together again and we've already been engaging in some really interesting activities already. I did really appreciate the contributions and discussions that occurred during our leadership session. There's some good feedback that's still to come back from David on that. And I understand, some of you maybe still got some of those ... Did you find those? We've got some notes that were still around in the room. If anybody needs a hardcopy of those notes, they're available somewhere.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Somewhere.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Somewhere, yeah. See Sebastian. He'll be able to tell you where they are, where that somewhere is.

Also just to let you know that yesterday John and I attended the SO/AC chairs meeting and it was really great to hear from all the different constituencies about what was on top for them for this week.

One of the things that I have to mention to you is that we – that At-Large – really did get kudos, congratulations for the work that has been done by the CPWG in the public comments that have been made and the statements that have come through already. It was really nice to get those, a really sort of congratulatory comment being made by Goran to pass on to At-Large and to the ALAC, especially. So I do congratulate you, and I think that it was a real feel good moment for us. And it all can be attributed back to the work that goes on with Jonathon and Olivier at the helm, but with everybody’s contributions that they make to those sessions. Well done.

Okay. So today we’ve got some visitors, and of course, our first visitor has arrived already, which is really nice. Nice to see you, again, Leon, after several ships passing in the night already during today. So after Leon, of course, we’ll have the finance team coming in. We’re not quite sure whether Xavier is actually available, but we’ll just see when they come through the door.

Is Joseph going to be coming as well to talk about the travel issues? Okay. Well, that’s a new one, but I think it’s an important one to look at travel support.

And then there will a bit of ... After Leon’s session, and of course, after the finance session there will be a little time for some Q&A. And then, of course, we will end with a review and discussion of

those talking points that we've been talking about, which Jonathon is going to lead us in at the end of the session.

Is there anything else that anyone else would like to raise in this session? No? Okay. Well, welcome, Leon. And the floor is yours.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Maureen. Hello everyone. Hola, todas! Hello everyone, it's a pleasure to be here once again at home as usual. I'm going to speak in Spanish, so I would kindly ask you to wear your headphones. If you don't speak Spanish, please wear your headphones so that you can hear the Spanish interpretation.

So, welcome to Kobe. Welcome to the ICANN 64 meeting. I would like to speak about the board and the activities of the board. There are some activities that we have been carried out during this year, I'm talking we're concentrating on 2019. We had two workshops; one was held in Los Angeles, and the other in Kobe. This is not over. We are still working on that workshop. And we also had a public meeting on two special meetings. Within these meetings we had some important resolutions. One of them is the approval of the detailed plan for the At-Large review implementation. So this was approved as you know some time ago.

I also informed you about these through the mailing list and also through Maureen. And I would like to congratulate you and I would like to congratulate the team. I would like to congratulate the team who has been working on this because I know this has been a great effort for you. You have been working very hard and this makes my work on the board easier. And definitely this is the support that I always am thankful for.

There is another resolution being approved, and this has to do with the approval of the CCTRT Review Team.

The report issued by this working group was recently approved and the board took action on every commendations that were included in the CCTRT report.

So this report has already been sent to the review team with an attachment where details can be seen regarding the actions that the board is taking regarding each of the recommendations regarding the recommendations issued by this review team.

The temporary specification was also reaffirmed. This has to do, as you know, with the gTLD registration data. This is the last time the board will be able to perform this activity. As you already know, this specification was issued in May last year and it will expire in May this year. So we are getting ready and we are about to see the expiration of this specification. According to bylaws, this temporary specification has to have a validity of

only one year. That is the effective period. So the board has taken an action, and this was to reaffirm this temporary specification every three months pursuant to the ICANN bylaws. And we are getting to the end of these, of the validity period for this temporary specification.

The EPDP working group has done a great job despite the fact that many people didn't think that they were going to make it on time, but our community showed great value and a great commitment in order to move forward these activities. They were able to review the temporary specification and they were able to embrace the necessary elements, the elements that they consider to be valid for the future of these specification, and they were also able to add new elements to this specification to turn it into a consensus based policy, for this policy to be aligned with the GDPR that we know has modified the landscape and the scenario regarding the registration data within our system, the well-known system, which is the WHOIS system, that we have seen that some changes has been performed at the level of consumer, and at the level of the end user, and also it has certain implications regarding intellectual property issues because access to WHOIS data is no longer as it used to be in the past.

Those of you that have read this EPDP reports are going to be able to see that there are some recommendations being issued

and there is a new working phase being proposed. This new phase is proposing that EPDP charter this second phase with work on the issue of access on the non-public data access. So, the EPDP team is now starting this phase. They are going to reaffirm the group charter and they are going to redesign the plan for the second phase, which as I said before, is going to focus on the signs of this new processes for uniform access for those who are compliant with the policy may be able to access to the non-public access data for domain names.

There is another important resolution, and I am very happy to inform you about this. Of course you will be able to see this. And this is the establishment of the creation of the anti-harassment working group.

We had some strong statements and claims from members from the community, especially women, who have suffered a certain type of aggression or harassment and they have requested the board to take some action on this issue.

Of course the board has a priority, and this is to guarantee that ICANN meetings are a forum where we are all able to participate safely, and where we contribute in a respectful and constructive manner the policy development process.

So we made a decision to create this working group which is mainly composed by women, but of course, we have men as

members of this working group because we did understand that one of the main barriers to report these types of activities or behavior has to do with this issue of gender. That’s why we are focusing on establishing, or creating, this working group and the objective of this working group is going to establish all the guidelines and the steps so as to report cases related to harassment.

I believe that the most important activity of the board – and perhaps we can go to the next slide. This is designed five-year strategic plan which has been published for public comment and we are going to have public sessions during this meeting so as to be able to continue with the discussions with the community in order to be able to fine-tune this strategic planning.

And in this strategic plan there is a new mission. I mean, I’m not going to talk about the ICANN mission, which is established in the bylaws will remain as it is, but there is a new philosophical mission, so this is new. And the idea, or the main objective, is to have a unique, open interoperable Internet and the ICANN community, and ICANN Org, should be the stewards of this system – the unique identifier system – which are the ones making the Internet work.

So within this strategic plan there are five strategic objectives. These are not ... The ones that are you see are the five objectives, but they don't have different priorities. This means that these objectives have the same level of priority for the board. And one of these strategic objectives is to strengthen the security of the domain name system and the DNS root service system.

There is another strategic objective, and this is to improve or to increase the effectiveness of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. So, this is a multi-stakeholder model of governance, so we are analyzing the comments of the community. We have received comments from the community from different sectors and they express that we can work in a different manner.

So, we recognize the challenges that we have ahead. We are trying to find consensus to create agreements, and of course, we have realized that due to the transition and due to the other efforts, such as the EPDP, probably we have worked in a different way and this has helped us to achieve common goals.

This was not easy, but the most important thing to take into account is that the decision making time and the resolution times have been reduced significantly. So thanks to establishing or thanks to having a deadline to meet for decision making. We have to achieve something which is very important and this is

that, despite the community having been very busy, we have been able to reach the goals set and the agreements proposed.

The third objective is to keep the pace of the evolution of unique identifier systems and the idea is for this system to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet users.

We are aware of the fact that there is an evolution in the technologies that we are using to identify Internet resources and the strategic objective that we have proposed is to be updated and to be relevant within this ecosystem.

And the fourth objective is to take the necessary measures so as to be able to phase and address the geo-political challenges that we see are coming up regarding issues that go beyond Internet governance and the impact of the ICANN mission.

So the idea is to guaranty that these unique and [inaudible] Internet at the global level remains the same. So the most recent example that we have of an event that changed somehow the way in which our ecosystem works is the GDPR. And what we want to avoid in this situation, or what we want to avoid with these strategic objectives, is to have another situation in which we're not able to prevent certain actions.

So the idea is to set the guidelines for us to be able to address in a timely manner these challenges that are arising due to situations that are geo-political issues.

So the fifth objective is to ensure ICANN’s long-term financial sustainability. So we’re well aware of the fact that funding, the funding sources, that are the source of ICANN budgets and which are the source for the community being stabilized. And the objective is to ensure, or to guarantee, this financial sustainability, paying close attention to the community programs.

So, based on this, the idea is to create strategic – to create financial operation plans that are fully funded so that we can strike a balance between the operational costs and the needs of the community.

And this is, in general terms, some of the activities that we have been addressing in the board. As you already know, we are going to have some public sessions in this meeting. We are working towards having more public sessions. We want to have many members of the board – many members of the board are willing to push for having more open sessions and we want the community to be aware of our procedures for decision making. We want the community to learn about the way in which we’ll discuss topics, because perhaps from the outside world

sometimes people believe that the board is just a validator of certain points of view or the approval of certain documents that are being issued by the organization, but let me tell you that this is not the truth. This is a concept which is not true for us. We have a different point of view in the board. We have diverse opinions which at the end of the day help us to make decisions, and we want to make this process visible for you. Why? Because, of course, we want to have a transparent board.

So, Maureen, thank you very much. I am at your disposal for any question or for any clarification that you might require. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Thank you, Leon. And I think that what Leon has actually said endorses what Cherine and Goran were saying yesterday, how important the strategic plan is. And I think that one of the things that actually came to get from us, and I think we are going to be discussing that later on in the week before we actually meet up with the board and what they want to know, is how can they impress on the community how important the vision is, and the strategic objectives, and how do people ... Like how can we get people to remember, to memorize what the vision is so that we're all talking the same ... That the vision is what we are all maintaining and the talking points that we're

actually wanting to maintain for ourselves for this week, for the board, that the vision is important.

I know that Holly’s card was up, basically as soon as you started talking, Leon. And I’ve got Jonathon in the cue as well.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Leon, I was particularly interested in the fact that the board has decided to implement the report from the Consumer Trust and so forth. When is that going to be public? Because one of our talking points is instead of looking at, in subsequent procedures, what is going to be implemented first? And, of course, that’s going to impact on the timeline. So, is that document public now? Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Holly. I am not sure if it’s public already, but I’m sure that it’s been sent to the co-chairs of the CCTRT. Has it been sent? Well, then it should be arriving any time now because we’ve approved it for it to be sent. So, yes. I’m saying maybe this week it will be published.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Jonathon?

JONATHON ZUCK: Thank you. I guess there's some irony associated with the strategic plan that's just occurred to me now because we've commented on it a little bit. One of the things is to try and take the positive lessons of the CCWG and the EPDP because the deadlines allowed for work to be accomplished in a more efficient manner. And then there's another objective, is to avoid being surprised by outside forces that affect us.

And yet both of those examples were outside forces. And the efficiency was associated with the fact that we were surprised by those items. And so I wonder to the extent of which there's an inherent contradiction in those two objectives.

LEON SANCHEZ: So you're saying we should have been prepared to the unknown?

JONATHON ZUCK: Well, because some people would argue we had five years to deal with GDPR and the transition was something that was a surprise, right? It came out of the Edward Snowden revelations that, you know, ultimately And so that the first timeframe, in both instances, was something that came from outside as well, and that had we anticipated it earlier we would've had a longer timeframe.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Yeah, I mean, this has to do with two of the objectives, as you rightly point out. One of them being how to address geo-political challenges and issues that we are facing. And that has to do with the preventive part of your argument.

And the second one, which is how external factors that have imposed timelines, or deadlines, in our community have actually made us be more effective. And that has to do with how we evolve the multi-stakeholder governance model within ICANN.

And while they might not be seen as linked to each other, I think there is a link, as you rightly say. So what we need to think is, okay ... And I'm just providing my opinion, of course. Given experience that imposing deadlines, either from external factors or internal, has proven to make us be more efficient, and we've already done so, why don't we think of a way in which we can evolve our multi-stakeholder model of doing things by thinking how we can incorporate this kind of deadlines and timelines so that we are more efficiently working in this environment?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. I've got four people in the queue, and if you wouldn't mind keeping your questions really short, and Leon's going to

keep his answers really short, so that we don't have our next guest waiting too long. Okay? Sebastian?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Leon, for your presentation. It was very interesting. I remember when I was in the ICANN Board, we couldn't do this, and when I say we couldn't, we weren't authorized to do this. And I think then that this is a very interesting evolution.

People tell me you are not here on behalf of ALAC. You are a member of the board, and you should not discuss this with the people on the Board. So that's why I think this is a very good thing.

I have a question. You did not talk about work stream two, and I think that this is an important issue that is close to your heart, I believe. And the other question I have is in connection with the mission. Are we going to discuss this? Because I think we have changed the [inaudible] with respect to the mission that we have right now with respect to what is presented in your speech today.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Sebastian. The time we have to talk about work stream two was not sufficient. However, within the board we are requesting the organization to proceed and implement

work stream two and we're asking then to have a plan that allows us to fund the impact that this will have in ICANN's finances. So that's why we have not published the resolution yet or would not have the resolution to approve the work stream two program. But we still are working on this kind of funding so that we can implement it as soon as possible.

Now, with respect to the mission, I suppose in the sessions we are going to have with the community to discuss this strategic plan and the mission, it will be very useful to receive your comments in this regard. So, thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Leon. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I would like to speak French as the others speak Spanish, but I will not do. There is the problem of time.

Leon, the strategic objectives, they are very good. I understand that things are evolving and it's normal that the strategic objective evolves too. But there was a strategic objective that was present there since very long now, which is the cooperation and the interaction with the Internet ecosystem, which is not there anymore.

I understand that this is the result of the discussion we had in the CCWG accountability, where people said that we have to stick to our mission and we don't have to go to those fora that are not interesting. But I think this is a big problem because you saw what happened in Dubai and you saw how it is evolving from a meeting, from an ITU meeting to another.

So, if we are not present, if we don't defend our position, if we don't defend our model, it will be lost. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Tijani. I agree with you. This is addressed in the objective that deals with geo-politic issues, with geo-political issues. If you go to the detailed strategic plan you will see that objective 5.1.2, if I'm not mistaken, addresses exactly that point. So we are aware that we need to be there. That is why we are supporting the organization to apply for ITU membership. That is why we, in the Board Internet Governance Working Group are continuing to advance these issues and continue to try to find ways in which the organization, the board, and the community together we can address these challenges, and we continue to be in a leading role within the Internet governance arena.

So in the Internet Governance Working Group we are trying to find ways in which we can continue to collaborate, as I said, with

the community and with the organization to continue with these efforts. I see your point, and I share it, and it might not be reflected fully in the high-level objectives, but I can assure you that it is in the strategic plan.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Ricardo?

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I'm going to speak in Spanish. Thank you, Leon, because even when you speak in Spanish you bring forth a diversity that needs to exist within ICANN.

Secondly, when you mentioned the strategic objectives – and I think they have not really been defined, they're not ready yet. But you said that they're all there with the same level, that the order is not really significant. And I think this is something we do need to define. I think those objectives should have some kind of priority, because when we discuss the financial part, and we have a budget that is almost insufficient now, having clear objectives was also a priority for those objectives should be one of the things we should bear in mind.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Ricardo. Even though the main goals in the strategy has the same priority, when it comes to translating those goals into the finance and operating plan, there will be – or we will establish priorities to address each of the actions that will help us to contribute reaching those goals.

In other words, the strategic plan is the what and the operating plan is the how. So understanding that in the what the five goals have the same priority, and the how in which the operating plan will have to establish priorities.

JOHN LAPRISE: I just want to bring this back around to Jonathon’s point about policy and that is one of the things that we discussed at the meeting yesterday was what responsibility does the empowered community owe to ICANN Org and the board? Because in large part, after the IANA transition it was all about how the empowered community could keep tabs on the organization and, perhaps, this is a case where we owe a responsibility to the organization to act in a timely fashion when the organization flags us that there’s a policy issue that needs to be resolved.

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, I think that’s a very good question. When we were going through the transition I remember that many in the CCWG said,

“Okay, so who watches the watchers?” Right? And I think this is the exact point. And as part of work stream two, if I’m not mistaken, we visited how the community – the empowered community, and each part of it – should be accountable to their own constituents. I remember that we spoke at some point about being accountable to other SOs and ACs as well. So I think it’s an important topic that we need to continue to flush out and we need to continue to discuss, so that we can actually find ways in which, as you rightly say, we hold ourselves accountable to the other parts of the organization.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Leon. We really appreciated your input today and also the responses that you have given to our questions. So we will see you during the week again, several times, I believe. But thank you very much, and we actually have to ask you to vacate the seat because we need it.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, again, Maureen. Thank you everyone. It’s so great to be back home.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for your patience. I’m sorry, we’re running a little bit late, but we’re looking forward to hearing your side of the story. Okay? Thank you very much.

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Maureen. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Becky Nash from the ICANN Org finance department. I’m here with my colleague, [Shawnee Coodway]. We are here to give an update on the finance activities and cover a few different topics, including Q&A. So if we could go to slide number three, please, that would be helpful. Thank you.

So the agenda that we suggested was a quick overview of our year to date FY 19 financial overview, then to cover the FY 20 draft budget highlights and overview. And then we have a section related to an overview of the public comments, themes, and to engage on the public comments.

Just due to the timing we wanted to make sure that we address Q&A and a couple of other topics including travel, guidelines, and travel per diems. So I was going to suggest that we have these slides distributed to everyone, and that we would go first to the public comment theme just because that is very timely, that the public comment submissions were submitted and we are in the process of engaging here at ICANN 64. So if I could ask the team to go forward to slide number 15. Thank you.

So today our objective is to provide an overview of all of the themes that were submitted as public comments for the draft FY 20 operating plan and budget.

We then would like to ask for any clarifying comments, or any additional information from the community members on the comments that were received. It's a great opportunity for us in finance to have an exchange on what we may be displaying as a theme and/or to get a little bit more background information. And the reason is that this type of engagement does help us to prepare responses that are more in line with what the intent of the actual comment was. So we use it as a process for clarification.

So with that, I'm going to pass the next slide, number 16, to [Shawnee], who is going to take us through some of the statistics.

[SHAWNEE]:

Thank you, Becky. Here on this slide you can see the total comments that we received for the FY 20 budget. The total number was 143. Relatively in line with what we had seen in the prior years, but slightly lower than last year. Last year we saw about 40 more comments, and you'll see on the next slide which group submitted those. And the reason we declined was

primarily due to individuals. The SOs and ACs continued to comment about the same level as the prior year.

The public comment window closed on the eighth of February and our plan is to publish the staff report on the week of March 19th. If you could go to the next slide.

So, here you can see the groups that have submitted comments. And what we do is we get the letters, or the documents, that are submitted to us, and then we parse out all of the questions within those. So 24 different groups have submitted documents or comments, and then within those documents we broke it down into 143 different questions. And then on the next slide we'll go into the themes.

As I mentioned, you can see the biggest change in the FY 20 budget versus the FY 19 was that the number of individuals has significantly dropped and that's primarily due to the fact that in the FY 19 budget there was some reductions made to the fellowship program as well as ICANN Wiki and CROP and some community programs that generated a lot of comments.

If you could move to the next slide, here you can see the breakdown of the themes that we saw within the comments. And some of the biggest ones were financial management, the budget development process and document structure, community support and funding. The three of those groups

make up about 60% of the comments. We also have a large amount with community outreach engagement programs, funding with 6%, ICANN Org headcount is another 6%, policy development at 4%. The reserve fund in GDPR also at 3%.

If you could move to the next slide. Here, what you'll see, is on the left side of the column these are all of the themes and the number of comments that we received. And on the right are the ten comments that we pulled from your submission. And the biggest being community outreach; there were four comments. Policy development, there was two. And then you can see there was one in a few different buckets: language services, the information transparency initiative project, and along with the budget development process.

So I think at this point what we really wanted to do – and I can hand it back to Becky – was to just try to get a little more information regarding the comments that you guys had sent in and see if there was any clarification.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you, [Shawnee]. So just based on this slide we know that the community outreach and engagement programs is something that we received the highest number of comments from ALAC. We acknowledge that these are very important programs. One of the areas that we wanted to go through in this

presentation is also the additional budget request process and the timeline for that process because we know that that's also a very important aspect of needs that are requested.

So if we could jump first to slide number 24 – and thank you, I know we're jumping around a lot. This packet has a lot of information that we do encourage all of the members to review in addition to our year-to-date financials.

Before the FY 20 SO and AC additional budget requests we just wanted to highlight that the timeline for FY20 is very similar to the timeline that we had in the FY19 process where we are, at this point after the submissions were sent in to ICANN Org at the end of January, we are in the preliminary review of the requests that have been received. We are here presenting at ICANN 64 with hopes to engage on this process.

And then after the meeting is when the final assessments and the recommendations by ICANN Org takes place through the end of March. The actual recommendations are then submitted to the Board Finance Committee with a recommendation for the Board Finance Committee to recommend the approval of the additional budget requests as part of the submission for request for approval for the FY20 operating plan and budget.

So that key date is that we anticipate the Board Finance Committee recommending to the ICANN Board the adoption of

the FY20 operating plan and budget on 4/19, around that time, and that we anticipate the ICANN Board to consider adopting the FY20 operating plan and budget on May 3rd.

One key step that we do is we do re-publish the FY20 operating plan and budget documents approximately two weeks before or right after the board finance committee and it's at that time that we have some information on the total amounts indicated for the additional budget requests. But the final report is issued right after board adoption, which will follow around May 3rd. So that will probably be no later than around May 5th.

So are there any questions, or comments, regarding the public comments, or any of the additional budget requests that were submitted? Thank you, Maureen. Yes, Olivier. Please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I just have a question regarding the input that was received from the ALAC. Do you have any feedback on any responses to the points that the ALAC has made in its statements? Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much. We are in the process of preparing the staff report for public comment. We did acknowledge that there were several comments as it relates to community outreach,

and as it relates to funding for travelers. As you know, we do have the guidelines as it relates to funded traveler programs. And for those requests that meet those guidelines we do evaluate the funding and I believe there were a couple of items that appeared to be submitted that also looked as if they might be additional budget requests type items. And so that is a little bit of feedback that we had regarding those submissions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you, Maureen. So is there a response for those additional budget requests or is this not decided yet?

BECKY NASH: The additional budget requests actually go through a thorough assessment, and as noted on this slide here, there isn't a response yet, meaning that that hasn't been fully assessed and a report written as to whether the request was accepted, or whether or not it didn't meet the guidelines, and/or whether or not we didn't have enough funding for the requests. So I hope that answers your question.

Are there any other questions or points that anyone wanted to address to the ICANN Org and the finance representatives? Yes, please, go ahead, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. This is not in relation to the presentation you just made. I just wanted to confirm. I thought there was something about changing the financial year to two years. I thought it read it somewhere. Yeah. Is there a status on that? Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much for your question. There was a document that was posted for public comment and the public comment was extended until approximately March 5th or maybe a couple more days and we have received several comments. And in this two-year planning process, it really was phase one that was submitted for public comment just to gain initial feedback from the community as it related to the consultations for a strategy for two-year planning. There is going to be a phase two as it relates to a second public comment, but that will follow the ICANN Org staff report is issued, which is now estimated to be approximately the 22nd of March.

But we welcome feedback, and we do acknowledge that there were several groups that did submit comments. We do have some initial data that will be presented at a finance public session here at ICANN 64 where we do provide overview charts of the number of submitters, the general themes that came out of that consultation. And I do hope that you don't have any conflicts to come to this session which is on Wednesday, March

13th, at 9:00 AM. And we do realize that community members are very busy with other sessions. In the event that your membership could make it, it would be very welcome, and we do have some overview slides that we'll be presenting at that session.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you. Following the question asked by the previous one I would like to know why you wanted to change from one year to two years. What was the weakness for two years, for a one year plan to two years? Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much for your comment. In the past there have been comments received from the ICANN community that the level of effort to engage on an annual operating plan and budget is quite extensive. We do realize that community members participate to many, many decision-making processes in ICANN, and that the financial budget and operating plan does take a lot of effort to review in detail. It is also part of the new community accountability with the empowered community process.

So there have been comments in the past about having a two-year planning cycle and that would mean that the ICANN bylaws

would change to adopt having two years for an operating plan and budget.

The consultation that was submitted, or the two-year planning process discussion that has been raised, again is in two phases just to identify from the community whether or not it's two years for an operating plan and budget cycle or is it more engagement from the community that would be more helpful? That would mean taking two years to plan for one year, which is the current bylaws, where the ICANN Board adopts an annual operating plan and budget.

So these were several of the items that were laid out in this consultation just to identify how can we ensure that there's more engagement in prioritizing and the activities of ICANN and having enough time to engage? At this point in time there is, you know, a lot of pressure for the public comments. We do acknowledge that from ICANN Org's standpoint we've been having the process take place earlier and earlier each year in order to permit the full timeline of having an adopted operating plan and budget at least 30 days before the beginning of the next fiscal year.

So the process has been accelerated and we do realize that this last year we posted for public comment the draft right before the year end where in some countries that's a holiday, or with

the New Year it's a holiday, and that's why we take more time on the public comments which was posted for 53 days, which is compared to the normal standard public comment period of 40 days.

So I hope that that provides a little bit of information about the two-year planning process and I do think that as we see the comments and the themes, the next consultation on this process will be very important.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Sebastian, is it a short question? Because we're actually running a bit out of time. Thank you. We've got one more topic anyway.

BECKY NASH:

Yes, thank you. And if we could just move to the last slide, I just want to make sure that we have that as the recap. So the last topic that I wanted to raise here today was just in regards to the funded traveler program, and the per diems. So ICANN Org did announce at the last ICANN meeting, at ICANN 63 in Barcelona, that the per diem process would no longer include any cash on hand at an ICANN meeting.

We do feel that that process is not very sustainable. It's not very standardized and has, obviously, a lot of risk as it relates to anything as it relates to cash. I am the finance person talking.

And the commitment that ICANN Finance and ICANN Org has to the community is that for any funded traveler we have the ability to make arrangements that are safe, secure and that are timely so that we will be processing these per diems in advance to ensure that anyone that has been granted this funding does receive the funds well before the ICANN meeting so that they are able to use it to cover any expenses.

But we just wanted to follow up on that communication just so that we discuss it at this point in time because that is effective for the next ICANN meeting.

So if there are any questions, I'll take those, and if you could just list your name.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Good afternoon. There are some countries – in my case, I'm coming from Argentina, but there is people from Venezuela here by my side. And we have issues to receive the money in our hands, or in our bank accounts. Usually, when the money is deposited it is lost on the way. I don't really know what the issue is among the banks, but it is lost and we just can't get it. So it is possible that ICANN may be able to reimburse that money, but we would never have that per diem in our hands.

So what we request is that in the special cases of Argentina and Venezuela, this be contemplated. I don't know if there is the same issue in other countries, but in our case it does happen. So we won't receive, in the cases of the countries that I am mentioning, we need to receive the per diem in cash at the meeting. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you for your question. This is Becky Nash again from ICANN Org. I just want to reiterate that the question received was just related to the fact that advance payments via wire do not seem to arrive at the destination. And I can just acknowledge that that is of great concern in the respect that any transfer of money that is sent there should be a trace on it and we should be able to ensure that it is received.

What I would like to do is evaluate if there are other payment mechanisms of any sort that might work. That is something that we're evaluating. However, from a standpoint from ICANN Org we would like to be able to send the money in advance just so the participant has the safety and security of the funds available, and that we won't be able to have cash on hand to do any kind of reimbursement at an ICANN meeting. It's just not a very safe and secure process. And we would like to evaluate if there are other ways in order to receive the funds. We don't know all the

details about wire transfers in every single territory or country. However, we would expect that should an account holder have an account that they should be able to receive the funds.

I have not personally heard of funds being lost and never received. That's of great concern just to hear that, so I hope that we can find a way to make sure that the funds can be sent safely. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

I'm sorry, Suen. I had actually closed the queue, if I could just have Tijani and that would be the last one. Okay, sorry. I thought you put it down. Okay, you as well then, but quickly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yes, I'm sorry, I'm going to reiterate what Sergio says, but I will say it in English because it seems that you do not understand part of the conversation in the translation. I'm sorry for that. [inaudible] translation, or something like that.

I happen to be one of those that missed the funds transfer in my first fellowship. It takes me about six months to get the money for a fellowship.

And the second thing is Venezuela. Venezuela has exchange control. You can't put an account that is Venezuelan, so you

need to have an account outside Venezuela to have the funds. And not all Venezuelans have that.

We are five Venezuelans here in the meeting and we usually are between four and eight Venezuelans at all the meetings. So you'll have for all Venezuelans the same problem. But we are not the only country in the world that has the same problem. So I understand completely the problem to have cash in your hand. And yes, it might be we use it anonymously if everybody gives an account, but not all the people that came to a meeting can do that. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much for your comment. I understand that it is a difficult change for several people, and I have heard exactly what you've said about the fact that there seems to be an issue being able to send money, so I do appreciate your comment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

So, thank you. A positive comment, Becky. I recognize that it is the first time I received the per diem before I leave to the meeting and it is one week before I leave, so it was very good. Thank you very much.

BECKY NASH: Thank you for your comment there, Tijani, and, again, we are committed to ensuring that the funds are sent in advance so that they are well received prior to any travel that takes place. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Now it's asking that there will be some follow up to what Ricardo and Sergio had said, that would be great, thank you very much, Becky. And [Shawnee].

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Alright. Sorry. I apologize that I've let it go a little bit longer, but I think there have been some important issues that have been raised and addressed, and there's still some follow up to be done. Now we have Jonathon, and I hope you've all got you talking points documents so we could get straight into it.

JONATHON ZUCK: Thank you. One of the things that we're trying to do and have set as an objective is to have everyone that's here with ALAC on their badge, or At-Large on their badge, saying similar things in

the hallways, in the workgroups that they're participating, in the public forums when they're answering questions, etc.

And so there's going to be a lot of experimentation to make that a reality. But the idea is to think of the At-Large as less of a collection of individuals and more of a consensus-oriented group that speaks with a single voice so that there will be more influence and conviction across the ICANN processes. So that's the objective.

So, one of the things that we did in the ICANN 64 planning committee was to look at the idea of some talking points for all the members of At-Large that are here at the meeting, and boil some things down to some very basic points so that they're easy to absorb and easy to repeat when these conversations come up.

So in each case there's a small sort of background conversation about what's going on, what the issues are, and then sort of the three main points that At-Large have been making in the comments that they've been submitting and the discussions that they've been having within these working groups.

So I'd welcome feedback on the format and the text, etc., but this is our first shot at doing something like this. And it's also an attempt to identify what we think most of the conversations are

going to be at this particular meeting. So that will change from meeting to meeting.

And so the three things that we anticipated being big topics of discussion at this particular meeting are GDPR, obviously and what's next in that discussion now that phase one of the EPDP has been completed, and the temporary specification has been replaced. We now know what data is going to be collected by registrars when you registrar a new domain name and we also know what data is going to be made public. And what data is going to be redacted or kept confidential. And that was sort of the results one phase of the EPDP.

The next part of this discussion is going to be about access to that information. In other words, what does the system look like both technically and politically for interested parties to gain access to that registrant data?

So there's discussion of having a unified access model so that there's a single API that everyone will use. There's discussions about ICANN taking on some of the liability that would otherwise burden the registrars so that there's less fear associated with disclosing data. And there's discussions about the use of data and how long it can be used, etc. Those are some of the conversations that are going to be happening in phase two of the EPDP.

And so these talking points are based on that looking forward. And not trying to refight the battle that Alan and Hadia have been engaged in for the past year, but to think in terms of looking forward what's most important to the At-Large.

So the first point is that we want to try and preserve, and facilitate, access to the non-public data by legitimate third parties. Right? Whether that's law enforcement or it's cybersecurity researchers, child protection, consumer protection, organizations and even intellectual property holders since there's a high correlation between intellectual property violation sites and malware, for example.

So legitimate third parties, we want to make sure that there's access. So therefore we're interested in a unified access model, something that would be easy to implement and standardize for gaining access to that data, and on a technical level there's something called RDAP which would be sort of the API that would be created to gain access to that data.

So the data would remain distributed across the registrars, but to the person requesting data it would look as though it was centralized in terms of the way they requested it. So that's the RDAP.

And then, finally, continue to work on drawing a distinction between natural and legal persons. Legal persons means

companies, basically, right? And shouldn't their data continue to be made public? And some of those conversations are still ongoing.

And then also Hadia, in her email, reminded us that some of the discussions about geographic differentiation are still ongoing as well. And so those are some things to think about.

So those are some talking points about what our go-forward approach will be as we enter into phase of the EPDP. And I'd like to open it up for any questions that people have, or clarifications. But ideally you see these as things that we've talked about before. None of this should be a surprise. These are things we've talked about, formed consensus on, and have put down on paper. But the idea here was to try and boil them down to something very easy to digest and easy to then discuss with others that you meet in the hallway or in various meetings. Any questions about this first section? Yeah, Hadia first. Sure.

HAIDIA ELMINIAWI:

So just for clarification, the email that I sent today did have some objectives. One of them was actually the geographic distinction. So we actually put it as one of our objectives, but for the purpose of transparency and clarity right now it's not on the table. We are trying to push it on the table, but as a matter of fact right now it's not. Thank you.

JOHNATHON ZUCK: Thank you for the clarification. Again, these are our objectives and what motivates us as much as anything else. And so what are these things that we want to constantly have as a refrain so that people start to hear it. Right? Other questions? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Sebastian, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't see your card.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Go ahead, go ahead, oh, Sergio. Sergio, excuse me, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sebastian, go ahead. Sebastian, go ahead. Sorry, I just didn't see you. I apologize.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I, you can't do two things. You can't present and see who puts the card. And it must be two different people. Sorry for that. I want to thank you for doing that. It's very useful and interesting. For the global point, I would say – and it's not too much for the first point, but we need to translate it in English. Sorry, that word

I can't understand. Therefore, if I need to go to my dictionary to understand what I want to say as At-Large, it's difficult. Therefore, you need my help, or the help of somebody who is not English first language to have a good English understandable document. But, once again, thank you for doing that.

My point on this one, it's I would like very much that you put in bold the number three and you put it at the number one because it has consequences on what is number one is and number two. And I think when you put something in bold it's more important. And, for me, the third bullet point, it's more important. Thank you very much.

JONATHON ZUCK:

Sorry, that was – they were all meant to be bold and that's a mistake, a typo, on my part that it's not bold. But thank you for your feedback on that. And on the language, I'm sorry if my language got too flowery or something like that. But I do want feedback on this as well. And it was just confined to the ICANN 64 planning committee this time, but we'll try to make it broader for feedback in the future. Now, who's next?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Jonathon, I just want to say a whole lot of cards went up at the same time. So I think if we'd just go around. Wale? Yeah.

WALE BAKARE: Yeah, you mentioned about the EPDP process versus ... Do we have a kind of ... The phase, is it in a test environment or in the production environment that these EPDP process that have been put in place? That is one.

Two, but do we have a kind of the requirements that you've put in place, one, political requirement; two, business requirement; three the technical requirement that you develop in a way to guide this EPDP process development? Do we have that available at the moment? Thank you.

JONATHON ZUCK: Thank you. I confess I'm not sure I understand the question exactly. The EPDP process was put in place by the board, and for the past year it's been a group that has included all of the SOs and ACs working together to try and answer the fundamental questions of what data should we ... Why should we be collecting data was the first question. What data should be collected? And what data should be made public? Those were the three big questions, really, for the first phase of the EPDP.

And Hadia and Alan Greenberg were our representatives from the At-Large on the EPDP, the Expedited Policy Development Group. So there's now entering into a second phase which will then talk about of the data that's been withheld and maintained confidentially, what will the process be like for legitimate organizations, or people, to get access to the data that has been kept confidential?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you. That's fine. So you want to design something, I mean, for people to access data, you understand? So you need to have I mean, a built-in requirement, [inaudible] about the political requirements in regard to, I mean, the legal assessor, or whatever that is, the second part has to do with the technical requirement. Then we talk about the business requirement governing all this, and the registries and registrars. So this is really what I'm talking about.

JONATHON ZUCK:

Okay, I see, I'm sorry. Yeah, so those things are being discussed in real time. It's not finished. So ICANN.org has been making some proposals for discussion about what a unified access model might look like. They've also discussed about what their implementation of the RDAP protocol might look like from a technical level. And then there is a discussion of a kind of an

accreditation process that would determine who should be able to get the information and that accreditation will probably not be ICANN. It will probably be organizations around the world that have the wherewithal to grant some kind of accreditation. But that's not yet defined yet. Those are the discussion that are going to be part of phase two.

So all we're expressing, at a high level, is that we're supportive of the idea of there being a unified access model, and that we use some version, some implementation of the RDAP protocol as the technical foundation of that unified access model. Does that make sense? Okay. Who's next? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much for this work. I appreciate it very much and I appreciate particularly the position on the subsequent procedure. It is exactly what we discussed. It is very clear, very really to the point. There's something missing in it, which is the geo names. Perhaps because it is now in a track, in track number five, we don't include it but it is inside. And I think if you were in the session this morning you understand that the issue is really controversial and the consensus is not for tomorrow.

So perhaps we need to have our position to voice it so that when we come to the meeting we have something coming. Thank you.

JONATHON ZUCK:

Thank you very much. That's a very good observation. We haven't gone over those talking points yet. I'm not positive as the co-chair of the CPWG that we've reached consensus on geo names inside of At-Large. And so I think that's something that we should aspire to do, for sure, to understand what our position on that is.

The first policy session tomorrow is about what we want from subsequent procedures and how we can get the kinds of applications that we want to happen. And so that would probably be a good time for us to try to discuss that and move toward a consensus.

I didn't want to put anything in this that I didn't feel we had already agreed on, right? Because I didn't ... The idea was not for this to be a controversial document that's meant to be something that just puts on paper things that we've discussed already. But I think it's very smart to bring up, and tomorrow, that first session at 8:30 is when we'll be talking about subsequent procedures. Who's next?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. So first I'll start with a very short anecdote. My company sells routers and firewalls, across the

global basically. We do a lot of secondhand equipment that we export to developing countries.

We often receive cold calls, if you want – you know, emails for inquiries, etc., etc. And what we usually do is to find out if the inquiry is genuine or if it's a SPAM that is sent to pretty much everyone. One of the things we do is to check the WHOIS records. Of course, recently the WHOIS records just say redacted for GDPR. No matter where it is, it doesn't even say what country, but what amazing personal information that is, what country the bloody thing comes from.

As a result we've pretty much stopped answering such inquiries. And that's really detrimental. And I think it's detrimental for end users and for companies.

The second quick question – actually that was a statement. The question I had was to do with the point you made about ICANN considering taking shared liability for ... I mean, what kind of an idea is this? This is probably completely against the ICANN bylaws and the mission statement which says that ICANN has to deal with the stability of the DNS.

Here ICANN is putting itself in a position where it might bring more instability because it brings liability to itself. I've never heard of an organization do something like this.

JONATHON ZUCK:

Thanks, Olivier. This is something that at is very early stages of discussion and it's fairly detailed, and it's part of our discussion with the board as well. So that will be something to make sure you're a part of. But there's different ... Under the GDPR there's different kinds of characters, if you will, in that play, in that theater and data processors, for example. So, the question is ICANN be a coprocessor of data because of the contracts? The availability of this data is a function of the contracts that ICANN has with the registrars and so can ICANN set policy for how that data is made available and then share some of the liability associated with following those rules?

Right now one of the roadblocks of the consensus building with the contracted parties is the liability they face just from the uncertainty of compliance with GDPR. And so if ICANN is able through their contract to specify how the data will be used, is there a way to take on, in some way – and again, this is still very ill-defined and open for discussion, some of that liability in order to take it off of the contracted parties given the fact that they are acting under ICANN's direction when they share that data?

So that's just an ongoing conversation. It's in very early stages, and it is one of our questions for the board.

MAUREEN HILYAD: Thank you. We've got the interpreters have given us ten extra minutes, and so if you've got a question related to that, or any of the other topics, you have to be really, really quick, because we need to go.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a couple of quick points. Number one, I understand your point about intellectual property, but my goodness, there are plenty of people who can argue that very strongly. So can we put that one sort of on the backburner? It's sort of there, but my goodness, other things are more important. I've just seen how strong that lobby is and they don't need our help.

Gated access. The last time I looked at RDAP it was originally designed to allow gated access, but when ICANN technical people mandate its adoption they did not mandate gated access. I don't know if that's changed, but it's really critical that if we are in favor of RDAP, we're in favor of RDAP with possibility, sorry, that we mandated gated access to actually accommodate some of the things that will come out of phase two. Thank you.

JONATHON ZUCK: Thanks, Holly. I'll take your second question because we're short for time. The RDAP proposal that was released by ICANN was meant to be vague enough to allow the Phase II of the EPDP to

specify the specifics and the politics as we discussed earlier is going to come out of this. And so I think the implementation of RDAP will depend quite a bit on whether or not there's agreement to have the unified access model, for example.

And so it's more just a question of a placeholder that ICANN is saying that RDAP is the way we would think of implementing such a thing, but they didn't go into detail because they wanted the community to specify those details.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yeah, just a very briefly. Apologies for taking up the time. This is a call for clarification. I apologize for arriving to the party late, but there is reference to legitimate third parties. And in one breath we reference law enforcement, researchers and IP holders. And this question is just to double check whether that is actually the position that At-Large is taking representative for all end users.

GDPR offers different extents and different purposes for each of those three categories. Being very blunt, my understanding is that it is the IP holders who have proven to be most controversial in the ongoing debates. My understanding is also

that At-Large encompasses a very broad category of end users, some of which have a direct interest, and having that group included here, and I just wanted to ask for clarification whether this position that's represented here has strong support from among the community, represents all end users, including those, for example, that deal with fair use and trade markets. Thank you.

JONATHON ZUCK:

So it has been At-Large's position in these discussions that the intellectual property holders are among those with legitimate interests for access. But, again, the details of this are going to be sorted out in phase two of the EPDP. So I think we're just trying to say that there are legitimate interests and the rest was just a list of examples, not necessarily like, "Oh, we're fighting hard for intellectual property holders." But they have been included in previous discussions going forward in terms of being included in the legitimate interests that are out there.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Just making sure that these are discussion points. You expect us to support that this is an exemplary list, correct?

JONATHON ZUCK:

It is an exemplary list. Right.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Marita?

MARITA MOLL: Thank you. I think this is a great start at this kind of a document, and I think we really need to have this sort of thing. But clearly we need to do a lot more work on the wording and exactly what's involved in it. In this kind of a thing, every single word has to be weighed, because every single word can and will be attacked. So I think we have to be careful – very careful – about exactly how we phrase these things.

My second point was I know Jonathon has a love for the letter three. I like the letter five. I think that we could ... These are very complex issues. We could have five points rather than three in order to give us some more areas on which we can discuss these things.

And the last point I wanted to make is under the strategic plan. I'm missing the importance of the ICANN strengthening and supporting the multi-stakeholder system. I think that's really

one of the big, big messages that we need to and that we can deliver. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Can I just get these questions? Yrjo?

YRJO LANSIPUO: I think this is a great initiative and it doesn't need to be, actually, very detailed since its talking points for talking [inaudible]. And keeping it on a general sort of high level we also evolve these problems, mistakes and so on and so forth, but a great initiative. And soon we will be wondering how we survived without a tool like this.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So I have a few comments on some of the issues raised. So with regard to the implementation of the access model, there is a technical study group that actually has been working on a technical model for access to non-public registration data and the draft technical model for access to non-public registration data was published on March 6th. And as Jonathon distributed,

actually it provides the technical requirements that would make the policy possible.

So we are looking for a distributed model which allows access to authorized and non-authorized accredited and non-accredited users. And the draft is available online.

With regard to the RDAP, the RDAP is actually the protocol that is going to replace WHOIS and it has all the technical requirements to implement the policy which yours does not have now. For example it allows for tier access which WHOIS does not allow for.

And then finally with regard to Joanna’s comment to the IP holders, we actually strictly say that we protect the rights of the protect and serve the interests of the end users, and part of that is actually protecting the consumer rights. So maybe that’s why you have the IP holders here. We are not concerned with the IP holders, but we are really concerned with the consumer’s rights. And part of that is the work of the IP holders. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Hadia. I’m going to leave it up to Jonathon to sum it up and look at the next steps.

JONATHON ZUCK:

Sure. I mean the next steps is just go through this, think about it, try to absorb these things. This is kind of why we only try to do three points, because there's going to be nine points to try and remember, and that's already three times too many in some ways. But in the future we'll continue to work on these, and maybe it'll mean that they get reprioritized and that Marita's fourth point becomes the third one, or something, because what we really want is something that's easy to digest and to remember.

I'm happy to take other questions as you're going around that you take. I didn't want to delve too much into the details because there's not this expectation that you're all experts at all the details of each of these discussions, but I want you to be conscious of, aware and dedicated to the consensus positions that the At-Large has taken, so that, again, as we go out there you're not just trying to wing it from memory, but try to remember what are the things that we discussed and the decisions we made when we discussed them. So I hope it's helpful and will continue to evolve. But thanks a lot for your time.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Jonathon. Thank you, everyone. Definitely, thank you to the interpreters for staying that extra length of time for

us. And, of course, the tech support for hanging on in there. We could've been sort of just been talking very, very quietly and nobody would've heard us. But thank you and we'll see you at the fellowship event. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Everyone, the fellowship social is on now. You go back to the main lobby of the hotel and you go one floor down and the room is Kairaku.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]