MICHELLE DESMYTER: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, and welcome to the ICANN69 Planning Committee call on Tuesday the 18th of August, 2020. On today’s call, on the English channel, we do have Adrian Schmidt, Alfredo Calderon, Amrita Choudhury, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Dave Kissoondoyal, Holly Raiche, Joanna Kulesza, Jonathan Zuck, Judith Hellerstein, Karen Mulberry, Matthias Hudobnik, Maureen Hilyard, Sébastien Bachollet, Yrjö Lansipuro, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and Abdulkarim Oloyede.

One the French channel, we do have Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong. We have received apologies from Gisella Gruber. From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Michelle DeSmyter, on call management. Our interpreters today are Claire and Isabelle. As a friendly reminder to please state your name before speaking and to please speak slowly and clearly for our interpreters. With this, I’ll turn the meeting over to Maureen Hilyard. Please begin, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Thank you so much, Michelle. Welcome, everyone, to another exciting session on ICANN69. We have got quite a few bits and pieces to get through today. Just trying to decide what people are planning to do. We have been talking about that and slotting things into some kind of order, but we need to get some confirmation on various things. So, bear with us. It will probably be a bit of a mish-mash, but we’ll try and go through this, through the agenda, as well as we can.

So, first of all, is there anything else that anyone wants to add to the agenda? We’ve got the EURALO, apart from the ICANN69. We’ve got our own At-Large schedule. We’ve got EURALO. Olivier is going to be doing a bit of a spiel on his session. Is there anything else that anyone would like to add? No hands up? Okay. Something may come up later, anyway.

Okay. So, first things first, action items. A few things, there. Just looking at the 29th of July, I think we did ask about the interpretation tool. And of course, we have been told that they’re going to be using the one they had last time. So, that has been raised.

And the break-out rooms, I guess, as in 10th of August, was raised again. I think that, if break-out rooms are going to be used, we do need to know well in advance. So, that’s something that we’ll be mindful of if you’re planning your sessions.

And there is going to be a webinar on presentation tips. So, I’m assuming that that’s in preparation, and Joanna, Hadia, and Jonathan are organizing that. Can I just get some confirmation on that, Joanna? Do you have anything? Jonathan? Are we connected yet?

JOANNA KULESZA: Hi, Maureen. Just a brief update from myself. I believe that the action items for myself and Hadia are to try and find a good spot for Jonathan to present before the actual meeting, so that’s where I stand on that action item. I’m happy to hear from Hadia and Jonathan. I believe that that’s where stand right now. So, the webinar is going to happen. We’re looking forward to Jonathan presenting. It’s just a question of figuring out the date, which I’m hoping might happen on Thursday, and I’m happy to hear back from Hadia and Jonathan. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Well, I think that’s one of the things that we’ll be doing today, anyway, that we can, as we go through the items on our list, try and pin-point some slots in the calendar between now and ICANN66 – as if it’s 66! I’m still in Montréal. ICANN69, so that we organize ourselves a little bit better.

So, I think that those things are still open until we make some decisions, which we could do in this meeting. So, could we go back to the agenda then, please? Okay. Right.

The first thing that we’re going to do is to have a look at this new block schedule. So, can we have that up, please? Right. Oh, this isn’t the actual schedule that I was looking at. I was looking at the one that Gisella sent this morning. Is that not the same one? Clicking onto this block schedule that’s in the agenda.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: One moment. That was the one that was hyper-linked on the Wiki, but I will look. One moment.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. It details … Oh, sorry. The one that I picked up this morning details what’s happening each day. Sorry about this.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: One moment, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Anyway, while that’s coming up we can look at the sessions, for example. We want to get an idea of any ideas coming forward from people about the sessions that we may want to include into either week one or week two.

I’m actually assuming that … One of the things that we’re talking about this morning with Heidi and the team was that, although the program for ICANN69 is spread over three weeks, the prep week, which is all the ICANN Org preparation that is being proposed, and then week one, which is the time when SO/ACs will probably do most of their work, and then week two, which is the conference itself, what we have to decide is what we specifically want to do, if anything at all, in prep week, what sessions we would actually do in the second week of the three weeks, but it’s actually called week one, and then, of course, the plenary week.

In the schedule that I was looking at, there are sessions that have been set in week two for GAC meetings, and things like that, and board meetings, and other things. But we need to, first of all, get some idea from you as the team to look at prep week. Joanna, Jonathan, and others: is there anything that we would be considering for prep week?

For me personally, I would actually like people to be able to take advantage of what ICANN is offering for prep week, unless it’s something that we really feel we need to include in that week.

But it’s just that it’s over three weeks, and I really don’t want to impose on people over three weeks. It’s going to be a pretty hectic two weeks with our program in that week one and ICANN’s plenary week, the second week. It’s quite a big imposition. So, I think we have to think really carefully about where we put things and how we use our time. Cheryl, hand up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I’d like to join the queue, too.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Thanks, Maureen. Okay.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I’ll go to Jonathan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You’re up next, Jonathan. Look, I think there is so much on in prep week that, if we can get our people, the At-Large, to attend as many of the prep week sessions that are very much preparatory for, probably, a few things in week one but a lot of week two, then that’s what we should be focusing on.

I don’t have anything front-of-mind that desperately needs to go out to the wider community from us in prep week, but I might be wrong. I just think we have already got commitments, as you said, over two solid weeks. Should we be asking even more of our people than attending as many as they practically can of the prep week activities? It is getting busier, and busier, and busier, and it’s getting more and more ridiculous. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Cheryl. That was, yeah, sort of what I was thinking, too. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Thanks, Maureen. The only thing that I can think of is the session that we do to prepare, where we try to get people to sign up proactively for the things that they’re going to attend, and go over talking points, and things like that. That particular sessions feels worth having in prep week because there are, in fact, things that we’d want people to attend during prep week.

So, that’s the only thing that occurs to me as something that might possibly be worth having either during prep week or on our own time before that. But having that conversation with our broader community about coverage, and talking points, and things like that feels like it’s worth having early on. Just a thought.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, thank you. That’s something else we did talk about. I think that, for us, the conference actually starts in week one, and that’s when we’re basically going to have our sessions. One of the things that we … Our traditional welcome session—my welcome session—is just that basic introduction that will happen, basically, at the beginning of week one.

What I proposed was that it would be a welcome, and then that very first session would be that introduction to the policy sessions to, first of all, the talking points and that kind of stuff, and then leading into an introduction to the policy sessions as we did last year. Last year! Last meeting.

So, we’re actually looking at having a similar sort of session as we did in the last meeting, but making it at the beginning of week one. I just think that I’d really like us to be able to concentrate on this week, week one, as being our At-Large … Well, the sessions that we produce are during that week one, and we have got prep. We’ll leave that for ICANN Org.

We have got the plenary, which is the week after, which we will … If there is anything that’s burning that we would like to include into the whole cross-community ICANN involvement sort of thing. I’m thinking that, at the moment, things like the ALAC and the board, and the ALAC and the GAC, and those sorts of interactions will be there, plus we’d have a wrap-up session, which is the end of our year for At-Large, as well as for ICANN, in the changeover. So, that sort of thing would be in week two.

But I know that you’re actually asking for people to come in to be introduced to the sessions that we’re running probably a little bit earlier, but I think that, if we have it at the beginning of the week and we say, “This is what’s going to be happening this week for At-Large, “ and we plan it that way … But I’m willing to hear from others. Any other views? No hands up? Okay, okay.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, I was a little slow. Maureen, I was a little slow.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, okay, Judith. Okay. Go for it, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I would like if we could do it … Because of the time zone issues, it would be great if we could do it in the afternoon times on prep week. I mean, unless … Is prep week going to be on Hamburg time, or is it other times? If it’s other times, then we could do … [relating Jonathan’s session] will be good because there is only a very small amount of time period that people in North America and Latin America are really going to participate in because of the time difference. And so, if we could do some stuff in prep week toward the … Yeah, that would be great. So, if it’s Hamburg time, then toward the afternoon. If it’s UTC regular time, then a normal time. Thanks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yep. No, I can see your point there, Judith. It’s just that, yeah, we could coordinate … Oh, prep week is not in Hamburg time, Gisella says. So, that is a time that we could actually be a bit more flexible. So, we could actually provide an introduction during prep week for that, I guess, making it more user-friendly. But I think that we still need to do an introduction at the beginning of week one, anyway, because that is part of the general/the main program for us.

But definitely put that down, someone, for consideration. It just means that we’ll probably do it twice: once in a … Well, what is a user-friendly time other than, probably, the 12-hours difference that will be from Hamburg time? They can do it in my time, which would be in the middle of the night.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Or I think, maybe, 14:00 UTC would be good for even people on the West Coast, because it’s not too early. And so, that way, it might be good. Oh yeah, I know it’s not great for the APAC region. Okay, so, what? 13:00?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, that’ll be midnight for Aussie and 4 AM for me.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So 13:00, then, is … Well, yeah, the CPWG, where we have one of the schedules for the Consolidated Policy Working Group, we have a 13:00. It’s not great for West Coast people, but I think it’s better, and it’s not horrible for APAC.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Well, we can … Yeah. You’re getting some really interesting comments from APAC, I’m afraid. But I think we would have to consider … I like the idea, Judith, and I think that, for in prep week, okay, I’ll concede that. But we definitely need to … Especially for those people who are going to be doing the presentations, I think that that is important, that it’s a good time for them.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right. But it’s also—

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, we will put that down as a consideration.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Maureen, [inaudible]. Can I give one last thought? One thought is that, if we entice people with some sessions that will be good, maybe they’ll get up, making a schedule, and get up early for these sessions. But if we have no enticement, we may not have many people getting up really early.

MAUREEN HILYARD: True. True, true. I’m definitely aligned with your thinking, there. But yes, we’ll work on a time, an alternative time, in prep week, then, and we’ll let people know. 13:00 is 3 AM for me, Holly, and I hate that time. Okay. So, that’s the first thing. One thing out of the way.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: But we do need … Yes, Heidi. Sorry.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, I’m sorry. Just to confirm, do you have a title or a topic for that session, yet?

MAUREEN HILYARD: This is, I think—

HEIDI ULLRICH: For that [inaudible] session?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, what Judith has asked for is that it’s the introduction to the policy sessions, which is what Jonathan asked for, too, to have it, actually, during the [inaudible] time. I think that—

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan. I just need to clarify, I don’t think it’s just policy because this isn’t the policy forum. So, this wouldn’t be just me talking but would include Marita, maybe, talking about what our talking points are on—

MAUREEN HILYARD: Ah, yeah. No, no. Yeah. No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The multi-stakeholder model, things like that. That’s all.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: A broader range [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. I think it’s sort of like that welcome session we were actually looking at, the sorts of interesting things that are coming up in the At-Large and in the ICANN thing. It’s that general introduction to ICANN69.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That’s right.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Which we did last time, which I think it really helped to encourage people to come to the sessions. And so, it is a good one. So, that would be a prep one, and then we will do a similar one as part of the welcome in our normal thing – the welcome and introduction to the sessions in the week one. You have to remember, prep week is different, week one, and then week two. That’s what we have got to be thinking. Okay. So, we have got that one organized. Are you okay with that now, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, that’s good. Yes. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. Thank you. Okay. So, then we’re actually looking at other sessions. So, first of all, can I have some idea, please, of the policy sessions? Because that’s what we have to organize and start thinking about, the session that we are planning to do. Now, if you could just put your hand up, there are the two sessions that I know that Joanna has actually recommended, like those. Jonathan has some.

And so, we just need to get a better idea of what others … Because I haven’t had any other suggestions sent to me, and I’m not sure whether Gisella and Heidi have been sent any. But if you could just confirm with us, just now, if you are planning on a policy session? Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Maureen. I have indeed provided … Overall, those were three suggestions, but I understand you’re referring to the two most recent ones I proposed as plenary. I understand if they are not as community-broad as they were [planned] to be, but I welcome your consent to present those as ALAC sessions.

So, with my focus and interest in Internet governance and the geopolitics, there are two issues that have been raised on mailing lists that have been put forward because the ICANN Org team. Since we are meeting in Europe, the media content directive has raised some interest on mailing lists and was also covered by Elena in one of the policy briefs.

So, the suggestion/the proposal was for us to discuss this specific document, invite Elena, and try to discuss whether the media content directive, as proposed by the European Union/European Commission, would become the new GDPR, and whether we need to be ready, since this would indeed have some impact on the way that ICANN does its business.

So, there does seem to be a direct link, and since it is originating from Europe, we might want to use this for what originally was planned as a Europe-based meeting. I know this is closely linked to the sessions that Olivier and Holly have been talking about/proposing/suggesting, so I’m happy to adjust my proposal to meet the needs of the community.

Then, the second session I proposed was based on another report that recently [inaudible], and that was produced by Veni, who is the ICANN rep for UN. He has produced the report on what seems to be a new cybercrime treaty, this time proposed by the UN, as opposed to the Council of Europe.

I see Holly’s hand is up, but I’ll just be brief and I’ll give the floor back to Maureen. I’m looking forward to feedback. So, that would be the second session, and I view these as general interest. I think they should be of interest to the entire community as they focus on potential legal regulations that will impact all community members, regardless of where they are.

And then, my original proposal that I shared with the ICANN68 Planning Committee Team, I also touched upon what is referred to as “vulnerability disclosure.” This seems to be an interesting area that links current political discussions and the work that has already been done by OCTO within ICANN. So, I did share that with the staff – I believe yourself, Maureen. If this would be of interest I am, again, happy to share it with the group that we have here on the call.

So those would be, overall, three proposals: one on media content directive that [inaudible], the second one on a UN cybercrime treaty focusing on Veni’s report, and a third one potentially on vulnerability [inaudible] process that I think is closely related to what ICANN does and whether that is something that we could use, since that’s something that the government are closely working on. I’m going to stop here. I see Holly’s hand is up. I’m going to give the floor back to Maureen. Thank you for letting me present. The floor is yours, Maureen. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Talking to myself. Thank you, Joanna, and thank you for coming today during your holiday break to support our preparation. Holly, did I hear Jonathan murmuring in the background earlier? Does he have his hand up? I’ll check with him later.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I have my hand up. Whenever you’re ready for me.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I do have Holly first, thank you. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a note. The session that I was proposing to Olivier was really for the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance because it’s a discussion on the Australian digital platforms report. What that report said, what has come out of that report in terms of other activations of where this is particularly interesting for Internet governance … I don’t know if people are interested in that as an ICANN session. I’m happy to do two sessions on it but I’m not clear in my mind that it would actually be something that ALAC would be interested in. So, I’ll leave it at that.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. I guess if you … I do see that you’re in Olivier’s Internet governance session. If you think that there is something that you would like to propose, you can still do that. I’m going to call Jonathan now because I know he has been waiting. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I’m happy to wait forever, whatever you need, Maureen. But the—

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. All right. Well, okay. Let’s get through Shiva and Amrita. Shiva first.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes. Holly’s proposal is a good start. If it can be expanded as a discussion on similar developments around the world, including a development in U.S. and other parts of the world, then that could become a very good Internet governance topic of relevance to ICANN. That’s just a thought. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Shiva. I might call on Olivier a little bit earlier. We’ll have Amrita first to discuss that, anyway. Amrita?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Maureen. I think the suggestions from Joanna are great, as in I personally like them because these are topics which are being discussed globally. However, the concern is whether they fit into ICANN’s mandate or it expands ICANN’s mandate, which many may not want. Weaving it into the end-user perspective is something which needs more consideration.

And also, there is a particular school of thought which is going that ICANN is overstepping its mandate, whereas ICANN does say there are not into political issues, but there are various papers which have actually been published which are political in nature. So, that also goes into a bit of a gray area. So, I’m not sure … As in, that’s the concern area.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. I see Joanna has got her hand up.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Maureen. Just to briefly respond to Amrita. I’m happy to elaborate. I believe there are very close links to ICANN’s mandate for all three of those sessions. I will try to share links in the chat as we progress, not to take up too much time. I also see Olivier noting his willingness to share his opinion in the chat.

But just to answer your question, Amrita, I believe that there is a justified reason for us to discuss these during an ICANN meeting I will use the papers produced by ICANN Org as a point of departure, and I believe they provide a comprehensive argument for looking into those specific processes as closely related to ICANN’s mission.

So, it wouldn’t just be me, but it would be the report that would be the point of departure for our discussions, and that goes, also, for the vulnerability disclosure processes. There are at least two recent papers coming from OCTO—I will put the links in the chat—that I believe we could use to discuss these processes that are closely linked to ICANN’s mandate in the context of most recent events happening elsewhere.

So, I’m happy to build that argument but, as always, I’m a team player, so I’m happy to welcome your opinions and suggestions. If you guys feel this goes way beyond our scope of interest, I’m happy to hold back in making that proposal. Thank you for sharing your thoughts, Amrita. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We can’t hear you if you are talking, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, that’s right, because I’m muted. Yes, Sébastien. Thank you, Joanna.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: You have your hand up.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Yes, yes. Thank you. Just a short … I am not sure that it’s At-Large who need to shrink what we can do. At-Large is the only place in the [inaudible] of Internet governance where we have a place for end-users to talk about Internet governance. Yes, we concentrate first on ICANN issues, but I don’t think it is us who need to make any decision, or it is inside or outside. If it’s inside end-user perspective, we may be able to discuss it together and with the others, if they wish. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Sébastien. Joanna, is that your hand up again?

JOANNA KULESZA: No, sorry. That is indeed an old hand. Thank you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay, thank you. Okay, Shiva. Shiva?

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Sorry. I was on mute. I don’t understand the reason why there are so many objections related to mandates. As Joanna pointed out, there may be a process within the mandate that allows this person [for this kind]. But whether or not the so-called “mandate” allows these topics, these are topics that must be discussed, and only by discussing these topics the mission of the ICANN is completely carried out. That’s my point, and it does discuss some objections raised. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. No, that’s okay, Shiva. Yrjö.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Yeah, thank you. It’s an interesting discussion, actually, this, whether we can even mention things that are outside ICANN’s mission. I think that we all know what ICANN’s mission is, but I don’t think that anybody is asking or trying to get ICANN to act outside its mission.

I think the other thing is that we have these meetings where we discuss things that potentially have relevance, have connecting points to ICANN’s mission, and that we should not put on blinkers at our meetings, but let’s really open up and see what kind of world we are dealing with. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Yrjö, for that. Okay. So, I’ll now go back to Jonathan, who has waited very patiently, for his input.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Thanks. I guess, just very briefly, I think we tread in somewhat dangerous waters when we disregard the mandate of ICANN, because the mandate of ICANN is the At-Large mandate. There are many, many fora in which things can be discussed. It doesn’t need to be an ICANN meeting.

And so, I think that we should, to the extent possible … And this is not a judgment on this session but I do know that there was quite a bit of pushback in Joanna’s session at the last ICANN meeting about making sure that dark enough lines were drawn between the sessions and ICANN policy development.

So, we just need to … I don’t think we should be in total disregard of what constitutes ICANN’s mission because that is ALAC’s entire mission, within ICANN’s mission. We don’t have a mandate beyond that. So, I’ll just say that generally.

The point that I was going to make when I raised my hand initially about sessions, in particular, is, if I might channel Monsieur Bachollet a moment here, I think that we’ve had a lot of panel discussions in the past couple of ICANN meetings, and they might have been appropriate for the policy forum and things like that, but I think we ought to try to really make sure that we have broader discussions, broader participation in the sessions.

And so, one session that we had talked about possibly was we made a commitment to do a kind of educational outreach about DNS abuse during ICANN67. And so, having some brainstorming and discussions about what could happen in the region, and then using that as an opportunity to do breakouts and whiteboarding in small groups, I think could be a really powerful use of Zoom.

We can’t keep putting things off to a face-to-face because that just seems to get further and further. So, having a genuine face-to-face-style meeting, where we’re trying to actually build consensus on something/brainstorm on something, I think, could be a powerful thing to do and a good example to set for the rest of the community.

So, I think that we should do some. One or two of our sessions don’t need to be on policy, per se, but rather on building our own consensus around different issues, one of which might be how we’re going to go about doing that education campaign. The other might be that we will now, by then, have reports from both Alan’s group and Roberto’s group on ALS mobilization.

And so, that would be a broader discussion, for example, that should be more community-wide. I think that those could be exciting topics to have during an ICANN meeting to get everybody engaged and try to, through smaller meetings, get more people talking and then reporting back. So, that was one of the things I was going to recommend.

As far as policy discussions, I made a proposal for a plenary which was about consumer protection post-GDPR. In other words, what has that world been like, and that kind of a conversation. So, even if it’s just an At-Large meeting, it will probably be community-wide and we’d probably try to get people from outside the community to share their stories about how things are going, both from a contracted-party side and a consumer-protection side. And so, that’s one of the things that are up there as a proposal for a plenary.

I think that the contracted parties, after spending the last meeting entirely on trolling, are now proposing a plenary which is doing what I think I am going to now term “CP-splaining” to us what their business model is and why we should stop impeding on it because it’s how ICANN pays its bills. I don’t feel like that’s a plenary discussion at all. I think, at best, it’s a webinar or an ICANN Learn course about what the business model of the contracted parties is. But that’s a topic for another time.

But I think at the very least we should be trying to have a cross-community discussion about how things are going and hear from everybody on that. But was sort of my policy discussion.

And then, finally, I think we still need to revisit the voluntary registry commitments, the registry voluntary commitments, formally known as “PICs.” I think there is a lot more conversation to be had and consensus to be built inside of the At-Large on that issue in terms of recommendations we might make about registry voluntary commitments going forward. So, those were my thoughts. I hope it wasn’t too many things to keep track of.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I’m sure Heidi has been jotting those down and we will follow them up. What I really liked was your educational outreach and using the [slide] break-out rooms.

I really think that, sometimes, someone has got to actually demonstrate how we can use Zoom rooms more innovatively. If we can set something up that introduces an ICANN topic in a way that is a little bit more inclusive and encourages more participation, I think that we should try something.

And so, if we can get a team working on that, that would be really great. I do like your other suggestions, as well. So, I think what we have got to do is try and see what the suggestions are out there for things that we can actually put into our week, and then we’ll have to decide what we might have to shift and see if we can put into week two. Yes, I see Amrita has got her hand up. Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Maureen. I just had a suggestion about from the policy sessions and other discussion points, and also Jonathan’s sharing of the theme of having whiteboards and discussing activity, which is much needed.

I would also suggest, if possible, to have an open session for all the RALOs. For example, have people from each RALO share their experience, one ALS or something who has not been so vocal in the meetings but is active in their community, to come and share what they have been doing, share experiences, so that there is some kind of discussion on how we can engage more people to share their thoughts or why they are not being able to do … Some kind of an open place where there is more discussion and we can hear more from the ALSes coming from different RALOs. This is just a part – because I think it’s very top-down at times, we need to hear from the bottom, also.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Amrita. That is very much what we have been attempting to include into our sessions – something that comes from the RALOs and demonstrates to other communities exactly what our regional groups are doing.

So, if you’d like to take something like that one and coordinate something, that would be really good from across the RALOs, including all the groups. Because I know that EURALO will actually have their GA during this week, as well, which will be coming up. There will be a little slot of that later on in the agenda.

So, look, we’re getting a whole lot of ideas, and I think that that’s really great. We can cobble something together. The other sessions that we are planning to include, as well as the welcome and the wrap-up sessions: of course, the wrap-up session will probably include a bit of a debrief and planning for 70, but also it is the changeover. It’s the AGM and it will be the changeover, so there will be people leaving and people entering ALAC and the At-Large leadership team.

So, there will be that. So, there will be that. There is a traditional AFRALO meeting, traditional regional leadership meeting, outreach and engagement, as I mentioned, and there will be … The ALAC and board meeting and the ALAC and GAC meetings, I think, are actually proposed at the moment for the main conference time.

One of the things that, just going back to the agenda, which I seem to forget sometimes, 4(d) on the agenda is a Zoom webinar or meeting room format. We specifically made contact with Tanzanica this morning to ask about if … We said, well, one of the interests of our request that we made to the communications team was that our preference was to use the meeting room. We felt that that was more convenient for us and allowed us to be a little bit more interactive with each other.

They have said that we have a choice. We can actually have a meeting room or a webinar room. So, as our preference is for a meeting room, please indicate to us when you present your session to us your proposal, whether you want to actually have a webinar room or the meeting room is, basically, going to be our default, I think. So, that is one thing that has come out of it.

Okay. We have talked about prep week and that we looked at week one/week two. I’m just looking at the time. And so, the recommendations that are being made, could you please put your proposals in, even if just in some sort of brief format so we get some sort of idea. Timing: a 60- or 90-minute session? Give us that kind of information so it makes it easier for us to slot things in. Now, I’m actually moving straight to five, which is a little brief update on the EURALO GA, and that’s with Sébastien and his team. Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Maureen. I don’t know what you want me to tell you. We will have a general assembly. I asked for two slots. [It seems] that I have got one. I had my proposal at the last meeting. I didn’t have any feedback on my proposal. Therefore, we will do what we can do. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Well, if you need a second slot, we will try and see what we can do. Heidi will put that on the list, so we’ll have a look. If you can give us just an idea of what is going to happen in those two sessions, that would be really handy. Thank you. Olivier—

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have done it last week, Maureen, already.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, really? Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have done it last week. I made a proposal. I had no answer. Nobody wanted to discuss that with me. That’s okay. But I put the two proposals for a second slot and I can do it again, but I think it’s [inaudible].

MAUREEN HILYARD: No. Well, I’ll have a look for it. I’ll have a look for it and Heidi will direct me. Okay. Thank you for that. We’ll definitely look at that one. Olivier, do you want to give us a little run-down on your session, which is now part of our program?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much for this, Maureen. Can you hear me?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sure can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello? You can? Okay. All right. Cool. Excellent. No, sometimes I start talking and then nobody can hear. It’s terrible because, then, I can’t remember what I’ve said. Yeah.

The previous Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, now known as the Engagement Group on Internet Governance is usually, during two meetings, during each one of the ICANN meetings, and here we have managed to shrink it down to one, where what we’re proposed is to have a discussion, like we always do for the public meeting, on a specific topic, and then submitting a governance update.

Sorry, and then a discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, because the board does have a working group on Internet governance, as well. We don’t often hear from them, so that is the ability for them to be able to share with the community what they’re doing.

And then, finally, some Internet governance updates, if we haven’t covered them already in the two previous sessions, or the two previous agenda items.

Usually, we do that in two sessions. So, we’ve got the board’s discussion on one side in one room, and then we’ve got the public session with more time to discuss the topic. But here, we have had to shrink it all into one, which gives us only about 45 minutes for a topic, which is proposed as being digital platforms and regulation.

It’s Holly that brought this forward to the group, speaking about the Australian competition regulator and the movement that has happened there. That has certainly created some ripples in the region as other governments have been looking at this thinking, “Hey, maybe this is something that we might be interested in implementing ourselves.”

They, since then, have also proposed that we speak about the European equivalent. I can’t really see that. It’s not really the equivalent. But the European topic of the Digital Services Act, which has been mentioned a bit earlier since, yes, government engagement department has written a paper about it.

So, that certainly touches on ICANN, and it’s to do with what’s going on in the European Union, what is going to be replacing—or what is likely to be replacing—the current legislation in place, and it sounds as though it’s a lot more constraining than what we have at the moment.

And then, of course, looking at the other regions, potentially—and this is just the discussion stage at the moment—looking at what’s happening in the United States, where we appear to be now seeing some acts relating to specific companies, like TikTok. Again, a digital platform.

The U.S., funnily enough, doesn’t seem to have acts that cover absolutely everything, or at least not at the moment. But now, the President is pushing for things to happen for specific companies. So a very different approach, but also something that might affect, certainly is very likely to affect, ICANN.

Because if governments start getting used to regulating digital services in a much more strong-headed way and pushing for national services, etc., this is something that we used to hear from Russia and from China. We’re not seeing this in other places.

That, of course, brings Internet fragmentation, and that’s exactly the thing that we’re extremely concerned about. Not only Internet fragmentation, but we could have DNS fragmentation and the DNS market fragmentation. So, that’s how it links with the rest of ICANN’s work.

Now, the question is whether there is room for this session plus, also, an At-Large session. I say that, because this session only has 45 minutes to be able to discuss things and we always run out of time, there is room for two sessions: one as an At-Large session and one as an engagement group session that is more what the other … Well, that has to be very inclusive of the other parts of ICANN.

One of the things is, of course, we always try, because it’s an engagement group that is multistakeholder in scope/previous Cross-Community Working Group, to get panelists that are mostly from across all of ICANN. So, Holly is from the At-Large community, but we are filling the other slots with participants from the other SOs/ACs. That’s it. Any questions? I’m happy to share. I have no idea, now, Maureen, on whether you managed to push this as an ICANN session or whether this is going to be an At-Large-sponsored session. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Are you muted, Maureen? Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I’m sorry. I’m sorry. Yes, sorry. I’m talking to myself. Yes. I’m trying to get that into the week two. But at the same time, I mean, you said 45 minutes. We could make that 90-minute session. I mean, I can’t see the … To give it a decent slot.

So, I think that it’s really important that, as you said, it’s something that has been off the table for quite a while, and yet we need to ensure that … Especially if you can get the cross-community side of things and the board, I saw that you had mentioned. So, getting the board involved into it, as well, makes it really important.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just in response, Maureen. You mentioned 45 minutes. Yeah, that’s just a section that is on digital platforms and regulation. There is 20 minutes foreseen for Internet governance updates and 20 minutes foreseen given to [Trixie] and her group to explain what they’re doing and to exchange with the community. So, that’s 45, plus 20, plus 20.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Right. But if you needed extra, could you manage with 90? Could you manage with 90?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I could—

MAUREEN HILYARD: I thought you would.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: —Manage with 120, 360. I could manage with three days. It’s fine, no problem.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah Okay, 90 it is. 90 it is. Okay. I see Holly has got her hand up. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. Thank you. If it were going to be a much larger session, what I would like to hear is what other countries are doing, as well. Focusing for Australia, the two aspects that might be completely relevant would be the anti-competitive effect of the digital platforms – also the privacy, which is, obviously, a topic that concerns us all. Looking at those two aspects, and then looking at what other countries are doing.

So, I wouldn’t make the Australia report and outcomes as a complete session. I would like to hear from Europe, I would like to hear … The UK has also got its own reports, and so forth. So, I would hope that there would be … If there a session on digital platforms. So, that would be, really, almost what Judith was talking about, or Shiva: what are other countries doing about both the privacy aspect and, possibly, the anti-competitive effect of their digital platforms? Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Okay. Amrita? We’ve got one minute, Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thanks. I agree with Holly. There should be discussions of what developments are happening everywhere. For example, the countries listed in the chat. India is having their own thing. There has been a ban on various … India banned TikTok earlier to what the U.S.A … Then there is a lot of discussion, of course – not like U.S.

But similarly, there is a lot of geopolitics which is going on and many countries are coming up with their own privacy rules or talking about how to deal with open data. For example, India is talking about how to deal with non-personal data, which no country is currently doing. They have done it in different ways.

So those are discussions, perhaps, which could [show] on the developments which are happening in different countries, not just restricting to two or three. And the conversations would continue in developing countries.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Cool. Okay. Olivier, final word?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks, Maureen. I heard the mention of, “Yeah, let’s do it for more than country,” and yes, that was the point. The whole point was more than one country. It’s still in development but there is so much going on.

Of course we can’t cover all of the countries, but I think that we should focus on the ones that are likely to affect significant parts of the world. The Australian one being one of the first ones is likely to inspire a number of countries into following suit.

The European one is, of course, a group of countries, a huge market, and that is likely to be a real heavy-weight. And the U.S., of course, being a huge market as well, we might start seeing fragmentation, starting from the last place that we could have thought it would come from. But there you go.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. Okay. I can see lots of people are pushing for 120. We’ll definitely look. We’ll definitely look at spaces. Well, we’ve run out of time but we have got quite a lot of ideas, and I know that we have … Oh. I will actually get Sébastien to have the last word because he had his hand up before and had to go down. Sébastien, just your last comment before I finish.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It was not so much on that topic, except to say that, the two last IGF in France, we discussed this topic. But it was to come back to the previous thought because I discovered that the timing on the agenda is wrong. The timing put here must be in UTC if it’s 12:00 to 13:30. It’s in UTC. If it’s in European time, it’s 14:00 to 15:30. Just to be sure, my request was to have the block five also on this day of the 13th of October. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, sorry. My last word is that we used to have a coordination of RALOs. It used to be done by the RALO where we received it, the group. Therefore, we have this and it must be done within this framework, or we change the rules. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, there is a regional meeting, and that is coordinated by you. So, I’m not quite sure if you’re referring to the RALO meeting that Marita was talking about but, yes, we’ll definitely work on that one. Holly, is your hand up for a reason? No? Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So, we have come to the end of … I think we covered most of the items that we were supposed to cover. I think that, between this meeting … Over the next week, before our next meeting, we’re going to try and see if we can slot in all the sessions that have actually been mentioned.

If you have got a proposal for a policy session or some activity that you either want … Be specific about whether you are hoping to get it into week two. It will be week one or it could be … If it’s the prep session we have been talking about before, as well …

But week two will be hard-pressed to try and find slots, but we’re focusing mainly on that week one time for us, and that is still Hamburg time, unfortunately for some. So, we will try and get that, and then we’ll something a little bit more concrete, hopefully, next week, to be enhancing our work on it.

So, no other burning questions, burning suggestions? No? Great. Okay. Well, thank you very much for your … Your contributions today have been very helpful and it just gives us a lot of work to do over the next week. Thank you very much, and have a great day.

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Thank you, Maureen. Thank you, everyone. Meeting adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**