YESIM SAGLAM:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALAC monthly teleconference, taking place on Wednesday, the 20th of April, 2022, at 18:00 UTC.

On our call today, we have Dave Kissoondoyal, Raymond Mamattah, Sarah Kiden, Holly Raiche, Maureen Hilyard, Navid Bin-Rais, Joanna Kulesza, Pari Esfandiari, Carlos Aguirre, Laura Margolis, Jonathan Zuck, Lianna Galstyan, and Justine Chew.

And from our participants, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Remmy Nweke, Jose Lebron, Barrack Otieno, Denise Hochbaum, Priyatosh Jana, John McCormac, Eduardo Diaz, Glenn McKnight, Ricardo Holmquist, Claire Craig, Hadia Elminiawi, and Sebastien Bachollet.

I see that new people are joining, so I just would like to inform you that the participants list will be updated after the call.

And on the French channel, we currently have Anne-Marie Joly-Bachollet.

We have received apologies from Satish Babu, Daniel Nanghaka, Tijana Ben Jemaa, Marita Moll, and Matthias Hudobnik.

Our guest speakers today will be Alan Greenberg, Jonathan Zuck, Justine Chew, and Yrjo Lansipuro.

From staff side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Gisella Gruber, Claudia Ruiz, Michelle DeSmyter, Siranush Vardanyan, Melissa Peters Allgood, and

---

myself, Yesmin Saglam. And I'll be doing call management for today's call.

We do have Herb Waye observing today's call.

And just to mention the interpretation, we have Spanish and French interpretation provided on today's call. And we have David and Marina on the Spanish channel, and Aurelie and Claire on the French channel.

And before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your name, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes.

And one final reminder is for the real-time service provided on today's call. Please do check the service. I'm going to share the link with you here on Zoom chat right now.

And with this, I now would like to leave the floor back over to you, Maureen. Thanks so much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Yesim. And welcome, everyone. It's really great to see a still-rowing crowd of people at today's meeting. You're all very welcome.

Just going through our agenda, just as we normally do, today is actually quite a special meeting because we're doing something a little bit different in that our guest speakers are actually in-house from the CPWG. We've put out a submission from At-Large to the GNSO, which I think everyone know more about. And as well as that, we've been

involved in of course the EPDP IGO, and I've just put out a final report [inaudible]. We have of course or regular special guest, Leon Sanchez, who will give us an update on what's happening with the Board. And then we'll have some updates and highlights from our liaisons and our other core working groups: the Operation and Finance Budget Group, as well as the Outreach and Engagement. And I note that Daniel is not here today, but I can give a brief update on that. And of course we'll finish off with an update on ICANN74 from Gisella and a couple of general notices just to finish up.

So that's the agenda at the moment. Is there anything that anyone would like to add? [inaudible]

No? No hands? Okay. So let's get started. I will introduce Olivier Crepin-Leblond, who is the moderator of the CPWG to start off our, basically, panel discussion. And people are invited to ask questions at the end of it. And I'll pass it over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. And I'm, yes, again, on Adigo on one side, but I also turned my camera on the other side so you can see me. Welcome, everyone. This is going to be quite a different ALAC call because, indeed, what Maureen said was, rather than having just one invitee, one speaker, coming into speak to us, we have the quadruple group of Alan Greenberg, Jonathan Zuck, Yrjo Lansipuro, and Justine Chew—four experts in At-Large policy—plus the fact that we cancelled today's Consolidated Policy Working Group call. So I hope that we'll be able to quench your thirst for policy discussion.

And the two topics that we're going to be touching on today are, first, the ALAC responses to the questions from the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) small group on DNS abuse, a long process where the ALAC sent a huge amount of advice to the GNSO. And then there were questions on these responses and then responses to these questions. So Alan Greenberg and Jonathan Zuck are going to take us through that.

And immediately afterwards we'll have the IGO, otherwise as IGO, otherwise known as Intergovernmental Organization—yes, I am not happy to [say] acronyms here, but there you—final report on curative rights work track, something that has taken years and years and years of work. But finally this group that Yrjo Lansipuro and Justine Chew took part in has found consensus, and Yrjo and Justine will be speaking to us on the final report and their findings.

Now, without any further ado, let's introduce those people that don't need an introduction, Alan Greenberg and Jonathan Zuck. Over to you, gentlemen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. This is Jonathan Zuck for the record, Vice-Chair of the ALAC for policy and Co-Chair of the CPWG (Consolidated Policy Working Group), where we've had a number of discussions on DNS abuse. Early on, now going on a couple of years ago, it became our objective just to kind of raise the alarm about DNS abuse and try to raise the profile of it as an issue across the ICANN community. And we've held a number of different kinds of sessions—public sessions, closed sessions, etc.—all to

try and advance the cause of individual users with respect to DNS abuse and try to figure out what the ICANN community can do to mitigate it.

What's happening now in this space is that a lot of different initiatives and efforts have begun to develop, including a DNS Abuse Working Group within the Contracted Party House. That's the registries and registrars. A former employee of Tucows was hired by the Public Interest Registry to head up a new initiative called the DNS Abuse Institute, which is going to be an outside-ICANN organization to address the DNS abuse issue.

And so there's a number of initiatives that have been taking place.

And one of the questions that comes up is, given different types of DNS abuse, different types of efforts to mitigate that abuse, and questions about who should be responsible for what and where, different aspects of the DNS abuse problems that should be discussed have come to the forefront. So now the conversation is becoming more nuanced.

And as evident of that, the GNSO small team on DNS abuse put out a brief questionnaire to members of the ICANN community for input into what aspects of this DNS abuse conversation should be handled as policy discussions within the GNSO as opposed to being handled elsewhere.

And so the person that took the lead on that response to these questions is Alan Greenberg. And so with that introduction, I guess we didn't coordinate on this, Alan, but I will hand it over to you and help out as needed and provide some color on some of these issues. But,

EN

Alan, if you'd like to give us an overview of what we suggested to be the role of the GNSO in this DNS abuse overall topic, that would be great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I must admit, if I was invited to do this, I didn't notice it. So I'm not quite prepared with a neat presentation, but we'll wing it.

The GNSO asks several questions of us, and they also ask the same questions to the SSAC and the GAC, and a similar set of questions to the Domain Abuse Institute. The first question was, can you provide details on what specific problems policy development in particular would be expected to address and why you believe policy development is the right mechanism to solve these? The second one is, what do you believe are the expected outcomes if policy development would be undertaken, taking into account the remit of ICANN and so on and so forth? And lastly, does the ALAC have any expectations regarding possible next steps for the GNSO Council that the GNSO Council could or should undertake in response to looking at doing policy development?

The document that is attached to the agenda is a slightly older version. It's not the final version. I'm not quite sure why, but in any case, I'll send the final version to staff again if you don't actually have access to it. I'm not sure why that would be the case. But I don't believe the version on the agenda is very different from it.

In any case, what we looked at in terms of the question … Can we bring up the copy that is on the agenda anyway, even if it's not quite final? The next one—the ALAC response. Okay, thank you. Essentially, we

EN

looked at a number of examples and we made it quite clear that these are examples. They're not the definitive list. And the final version actually leads off with a sentence making that very clear that these are examples.

The first one is there's strong evidence—and I don't think anyone disputes it—that there are domain names that are registered often in very large quantities, either all at the same time or over a period of time, that are explicitly designed to be used for malicious activities: botnet, command & control, and spam, which is often used for distribution of malware or other malicious activities. And they're used for very short periods of time, typically taken down/not used but discarded after that. So the process of discovering that a name is being used for this kind of activity and then taking it down doesn't really do anything because, by then, it's not being used anyway or certainly shortly would have not been used again.

In the older world, where WHOIS was available, typically for convenience, these domain names were all registered to the same registrant with the same or similar contact information. So because there were services available which could allow you to find other domains registered by the same registrant, it was possible to go and find those domains because they were being used. Now, that's still possible, but it's possible with the explicit support of the registry and/or registrars, which is not always something you can guarantee on a short term.

Now, there are currently no tools to do this kind of thing for domains, given the GDPR world we're looking at. One area for potential

development is to attempt to identify both registrations. And exactly how you define it is not clear. And we're not trying to address the problem here—that would be the problem for policy development—but are trying to identify registrations that are going to be used maliciously based on the volume that are being done.

Now, there are registrations, and large a number of registrations, done for very valid reasons. You will very often find them being done associated with trademark, with the launch of new product. There's a whole host of reasons why you might want to do a large number of registrations at the same time.

So the problem is, how do you differentiate? And one of the solutions that's very heavily used, particularly in the financial area, where you're trying to prohibit money laundering and things like that … So you don't want to, for instance, allow someone to go into a bank and give you a million dollars in very small bills because those may well have been obtained in some illegal way. On the other hand, there are valid businesses that accumulate very large amounts of money in small bills. So the solution is what is generically called "know your customer"—that is, if somebody randomly walks in and says, "I want to do this," you're going to have to vet them first. You have to make sure that they're not doing something where you have a high degree of confidence that they're not doing something for malicious purposes.

And the same could be true for domain names. If you are clearly a lawyer doing intellectual property and registry domain names on behalf of clients, or you're a registrar that deals exclusively with large businesses and you know who you are dealing with, then bulk

registrations may be fine. If you're someone who just comes out of the blue, then that's not going to be nearly as fine.

So there are ways to do this. And, yes, it may slow down registrations in some cases, but you may be able to eliminate the bulk registrations that are associated with abusive activities.

Now, I'll note that, no matter what you do, someone will find a way around it. That's simply the nature of the business we're in. What we're trying to do is reduce, not eliminate.

I'm not watching hands. If there are any hands that have come up, please let me know. I'll try to address them as they come.

The same, by the way, can be done for registrations that are not bulk, that are not all done at the same time, but done over a period of time.

The other thing that we can do—and there are both research and live examples of it—is try to look at the domain name, look at what you know about the client, and recognize a name before it's registered, even if it's not done in large quantities.

Now, that's going to be a changing market. The world will evolve quickly, and it's not something you can write some predictive code on and just stop and never do it again. But there are a number of examples of algorithms to identify potentially malicious domains before you allow them to be registered. Some of them have very good track records. The critical thing is they can generate very, very small false positives. So you will very rarely identify a domain that you think will be used for abusive

purposes and will not be. You may miss some. You may have false negatives. But, again, it's a balance that we have to target.

So those are techniques that could be used. How applicable they are in the gTLD world—these have been largely used as both research and in the ccTLD world—remains to be seen.

Let's see. Do I have … Yeah. A third way that is worthy of consideration—whether it's applicable or not is not clear—is to look at the type of abuse that we have [where] there are conditions within the RAA and the registry agreement to, in theory, address but they're not being addressed. These are areas where Compliance does not feel they have the ability to take a registry or a registrar to task over them. Perhaps they're not specific. Registries and registrars have said multiple times that they believe Contractual Compliance does have the tools for some of these. So it really is matter of getting together. And if indeed they are not addressable with the current rules, let's find some rules that are.

Now, I'll add as a note here that we're proposing these as possible policy development areas. You can change a contract in one of two different ways. You can change it by simply negotiating between the two parties. And if everyone agrees, the contract can be changed. Policy development can be used on a specific set of contractual conditions, not all. They have to be within what is called the picket fence. They have to be specifically identified within the contract as being eligible for policy development for that policy development to be binding.

But there are other ways. If indeed if everyone has a good will and intention of doing something, then one could simply negotiate these terms into it, just as, for instance, the current accuracy spec ends up in the contract. That was not the result of a policy development, even though it's an area that is very eligible to policy development. But it was done through negotiations. So that's an option going forward, but certainly in the absence of everyone stepping up and saying "Let's come to a deal quickly," policy development is a good option for many of these.

The next one is, what do you believe are the expected outcomes? Well, we believe the expected outcomes could be a significant reduction of the number of domains registered with malicious intent. Simple as that.

And does the ALAC have any expectations with regard to possible next steps that the GNSO Council could take? We are making a statement here and saying we have a strong interest in this area. We clearly have talked a lot about and we have instigated a lot of activities, but we're not necessarily the experts on domain name abuse. There are people whose daily jobs are associated with ferreting it out or identifying how domain names are used improperly. And we're suggesting that a convening of a group, including stakeholders from within the ICANN world but a significant inclusion of those parties who really are living the domain abuse issue in their regular work lives … And we believe that there are in the better position to identify good target areas and to scope out the area in a better way than we can in an off-the-cuff comment, such as this. And we are suggesting just a small group be put together as a prelude to generating an issue report on the [issue].

And that's the summary of what we have said. I'll comment very briefly, and I have a presentation I can send to the … Well, I'll have it posted onto the agenda. You can reach it there. It's a presentation I did a week ago on the CPWG meeting on what the responses were from the other groups. [inaudible] up quickly. So I summarized what the ALAC said.

The GAC said, number one, anything we do on domain name abuse we should do before the next gTLD launch. And that gives us a few years at this point under current expectations. They do say we should consider the recent EU-sponsored report on domain name abuse, although I will note that other parties have criticized that report due to not being rigorous enough and a number of other issues. They think that a PDP may be premature and maybe we should wait to see what the current efforts do, adding of course that the GAC would be happy to participate in a PDP or pre-launching scoping effort, which is the kind of thing we were talking about, if this should come up.

The SSAC pointed to SAC115, a report they did on domain name abuse, which identifies a number of critical issues. Most of the work that they identify would not be subject to policy development because they're simply not things within the same scope. But putting some of these things into production may require policy development. That is, you may do some work, but forcing registrars and [registries] to use it may require policy development if it can't be done with mutually-agreed contractual terms.

The Domain Name Abuse Institute said policy development can help. There's a lot we [inaudible] from anecdotal evidence, but we real little concrete knowledge of the specifics of domain name abuse, and

understanding it is key. And that certainly is something I agree with. They note that there's no agreed definition of DNS abuse, and they add, "And it's not clear you need a definition." There's enough things that we do agree on that we can focus on and not spend all of our time coming up with a formal definition, probably which would change anyway. They do suggest that we look at common issues and not edge cases and do a number of very small PDPs instead of a large one. That's something I also would support. They do give a list of types of examples of micro-PDPs, and I don't agree with their particular examples because I think they are diving the overall domain name abuse malicious registrations in the wrong way. But you can look at that one. I send in my [inaudible] to this document.

And that's about all I have to say.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot, Alan. There's been some conversation in the chat, but that was a great overview of the discussions that we've had. Some of these discussions are not new, but we're trying to refine the conversations in such a way that they might be taken up in a productive way by the GNSO. And we too recommended that it not all be done as some sort of uber PDP that tries to handle every issue related to DNS abuse but instead has focused-scope PDPs that have some likelihood of finding resolution on the fairly near term.

Are there are other questions that folks have about this, about the topics? There are some things that have come up in the chat that I tried to answer as they've come up.

One of the ongoing issues, as Alan mentioned, is the definition of DNS abuse. And on the one end of the spectrum is the definition on which everyone can agree that's sort of like a least common denominator definition that is definitely favored by the contracted parties and by the DNS Abuse Institute, which is a fairly narrow definition of DNS abuse.

And all the way to the other extreme is probably the definition of DNS abuse is advanced by this European paper. And the real final answer might be somewhere in the middle. But as Alan mentioned, as the SSAC noticed, we really only need a working definition. It can be fairly conservative to identify areas for reform. And once those reforms take hold, we can make incremental adjustments based on broadening the definition after further conversation. So we don't need to frontload discussions of reform on discussions of definition.

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think, on the definition, I'd go farther than what you just did. I don't think we need a definition at all. I don't think we need a working one. There are certain classes of things that everyone agrees is domain name views. Registering 1,000 domain names with the explicit purpose of using them for botnet command & control is domain name abuse. There's no question. There's no one who will disagree with that. So there are things that we might be able to do to address these clear-cut, blatant cases without spending a year or two years on the definition.

If you look at discussions within ICANN over the last several decades of what is the global public interest/what is public interest, we have very

often chosen to not address the public interest because we don't have a definition. Now we're looking at a framework instead of a definition because I don't believe a definition was ever practical. All your definitions do typically is address the things you've seen the past, not in the future. And the same may well be true for domain name abuse. And there is enough work to be done to keep us busy for a while without actually having to define it. It may not cover all of the cases, but it certainly would be a start and is far ahead of where we are right now. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Alan. I think we are in violent agreement on that and just saying it in different ways.

Greg Shatan? And then we'll close the queue because we've got some other speakers.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. Just briefly, I'm one who believes that the working definition that has been used in many cases, including by the contracted parties, of domain abuse is too narrow and that there are other things that should be included.

However, I think, for moving forward in this current situation, we could lose years if we fight about broadening that. As a matter of fact, we've already discussed for years how it could be broadened and it's still unsettled. So I think that any PDPs that starts out with an attempt to broaden the definition from that, other than the one that gets strong

consensus already, would essentially be held hostage to the definition discussion, potentially forever.

So I think it is much better in this case to go forward with the definition that's agreed, more or less, without necessarily having to hammer it down—the "we know it when we see it" definition of domain name abuse that nobody seriously disagrees with—and work on those issues. That might provide a fair pass in the future for how to deal with the more contentious things that some would say are domain name abuse and are others. And there would at least be a model for how to deal with domain name abuse as a policy matter and an implementation matter. So frankly I think we get to the broader issues better by not getting to them first. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Greg.

Steve, I'm going to ask you to put your question in the chat because we've overrun our time on this topic a little bit. So if you ask your question, I'll try to answer it.

And with that, though, I'm going to pass the stalking stick back to Olivier to introduce the next speakers.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Indeed, thank you for the introduction and the discussion on this topic.

Now, the next topic is one that's equally as interesting, and that's the Inter-Governmental Organizational final report—now, EPDP, STRP, IGO final report—and that's quite a mouthful of information. It's the final report of the Expedited Policy Development Process on specific curative rights protections for international governmental organizations—the rights being, of course, the intellectual property rights to specific domain names, specific strings. And this is a discussion that's gone on for a very, very long time.

And Justine Chew and Yrjo Lansipuro were part of the working group that managed to unlock this and get some kind of a consensus doc. Let's hear from Yrjo and Justine.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Olivier. The EPDP was about the narrow but thorny issue. It had defied solution for years. It was about the acronyms of intergovernmental organization—that is to say, strings like UN or WHO or ITU and so on and so forth.

Why is this important for end users? Because these acronyms have become authoritative signals for people. An obvious example is, of course, WHO during the pandemic. Fraudulent use would be confusing but also dangerous.

So, for years, there was no agreed mechanism for how to deal with this. There was doubt whether an IGO (Inter-Governmental Organization) could use UDRP or URS because these abbreviations are not trademarks. Submission to a mutual jurisdiction would have been a problem for the IGOs because their immunities and privileges. A losing

registrant has the right to go court, but then the IGO can claim its immunity. So it was basically a sort of quadrature of a circle that we were faced with to reconcile things that were diametrically opposite.

Now, what the EPDP achieved over these 45 meetings was that, first of all, an IGO was properly defined. And its access to the dispute resolution process is based on the fact that it uses the acronym in conducting public activities in accordance with its mission, which in turn is based on an international treaty.

Second, it was agreed that, as a condition for entering a UDRP or URS, an IGO does not need to submit to a mutual jurisdiction. The registrant is informed that he or she can still go to a court if he or she loses but also warned that the IGO may in that case claim immunity, and the court may not hear the merits of the case. So it's up to the registrant what they will do. But the registrant has the option to agree to a binding arbitration at any time, even after it has tried its luck in a court.

So perhaps Justine will say something more. I was sort of cutting corners when it comes to the substance. But I just want to say that, as a whole, this EPDP was a pleasant experience because, even though the main protagonists obviously had different interests, there was a willingness to compromise. And I must say that Chris Disspain was an excellent chair.

Now, for Justine and myself, as ALAC representatives, what we were interested in was that there be a compromise, that there would be result—never mind the small details. And I think that, with our presence there, even though we were of course less active than the main protagonists, we were able to exert pressure that was conducive to

their arriving at a compromise and consensus. And perhaps that is a factor to take into account when we, At-Large, in the future assess whether it is worthwhile to participate in this or that PDP.

So I'll stop here, but I hope that Justine will continue. Thank you.

JUSTINE CHEW: [Not] much add to what Yrjo has said, actually. I was being asked if we are going to go ahead because he has [inaudible] to get to, so I'm just going to defer to the Chair.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Justine. If I can just intrude, [inaudible] it can carry on after Leon has actually participated. It's just that I know that he has a meeting to go to, and I do want him to be able to give an update on the Board. So if you would just excuse us for a bit, I'll let Leon carry on. Leon, please?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you so much, Maureen. And my apologies for skipping the line. I will be brief.

The Board has approved some relevant resolutions that you may have seen, two or three of which I would like to highlight. One of them is the deferral of the third review of security, stability, and resiliency of the domain name system (SSR3). And this resolution was passed on March 10th. And basically, it goes along what the ATRT3 recommended—to

defer this SSR3—and that was the resolution that was passed in this meeting.

We also adopted other recommendations of the EPDP Phase 2A.

And we also reviewed the IRP panel decision for dot-web. And we resolved that the BAMC should have a closer look and analyze the resolution from this IRP panel and of course flesh out many details that need to be worked out before the Board is able to take action on that panel resolution.

Then another one that you might have already seen is the allocation of emergency financial support for continued access to the Internet. To this end, the ICANN Board passed a resolution to support continued access to the Internet, especially in the conflict area in Ukraine. And for that, the Board allocated an initial sum of one million dollars. And of course, this is meant to be a permanent program for supporting these kind of initiatives, so the initial sum of one million dollars will be of course something that will be reviewed as [it] depletes.

And we also had our Board workshop prior to the ICANN meeting. And as you can imagine, we had a lot of food in our dish, and we ate it all. And we started on Thursday, March the 3rd, with some strategic outlook trend identification. And as you know, we of course have a strategic plan in place, and we [inaudible] document. And what we do in these workshops is that we review the different trends and the different opportunities, threats, weaknesses, etc., that we may have in the ecosystem. And we analyze them and see how they could impact ICANN's mission, and we plan accordingly.

We also discussed, of course, SSR2. We discussed the proposal to defer SSR3, which we later resolved, as I already mentioned. And we of course talked about DNS abuse. We also spoke about the SSAD and how the different phases are coming into place. And we discussed also the operational design phase on new gTLDs. And of course, we made progress on that as well.

And, well, we also continued work on our [inaudible]-held priorities. We had a public session last week on this topic, and we reported the progress that we have made on each of the operational priorities. And just as a reminder, these are tasks that the Board takes into its many, many things they have to work so as to build effectiveness and try to improve the way that the Board delivers its work to the community and to the organization.

And, well, now we are headed to Los Angeles next week. We will have our workshop in L.A. It will be the first face-to-face workshop that we will be holding since the pandemic began. And in the case of Maarten and myself, we will also be meeting the SO/AC leadership. We will have a meeting with them. And I really look forward to seeing you all in The Hague.

So thank you very much, Maureen. Thank you, everyone, for having me. I will remain for five more minutes in case anyone has any comments or any questions for me. And I am happy to try to answer them or follow up offline. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Leon. And, yes, I know that Jonathan, Joanna, and I are looking forward to meeting up with you and Maarten next week. So it's great to be able to have that opportunity to be able to get together again. Really looking forward to it. And thank you for obliging us by being here and amongst your [inaudible] as well.

But also thank you to the CPWG team, whose session I actually interrupted. My apologies. But this time is actually given over to the policy. Another ten minutes has been given over to the policy team anyway. So if you would like to continue, except I see Sebastien has got his hand up. Sebastien, short, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have a question. Thank you, Maureen, and thank you, Leon, for your nice and interesting summary. I just would like to know who are the leaders of the community you will meet in Los Angeles, please. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Sebastien. These are the SO/AC leadership. This is compromised of the chairs of the different SOs and ACs. And in the case of the GAC and the ALAC, it has been a custom to also include the vice-chairs. So of course, we cannot include the full vice-chairs of the GAC because they are many, but in the case of the ALAC, we were lucky to allocate two travel spots for them. So that is the leadership that we are meeting with.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Leon. And from the GNSO, just the chair?

LEON SANCHEZ: As far as I understand, yes, but I would have to double-check on that.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks.

Okay. Continuing on then, Olivier, back to you. Ten minutes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. And I guess we had reached the point of questions on either of the topics that we tweeted today: the ALAC responses and the questions on the GNSO small group on DNS abuse. I think there was some discussion that went on in that with some Q&A, but we haven't had any question on the IGO final report for Yrjo and for Justine. And so I just thought we'd open the floor for any questions or comments on this process.

I'm not seeing any hands up.

Yrjo and Justine, is there anything else you wanted to add? I see Justine has put her hand up. Justine Chew?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to add a couple things. One is that the ability for registrants to take a dispute to arbitration is still subject to … There has to be a failure at the court level simply because of the IGO being the complainant exerting their immunity and [inaudible]. So what happens, simply put, the merits of the case haven't been considered. So that would the only situation where the losing registrant would be allowed to take [inaudible] going through the court process.

And the second thing I wanted to add is that this final report has been subjected to the GNSO Council. And the GNSO Council has considered, in the first instance, that [inaudible] last week and will only be voting on it at the next GNSO Council meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this precision, Justine. That's very helpful.

And I think that, with just a few minutes on this topic, the only thing that remains to be done is to just thank both you and Yrjo for having lasted all these meetings. Was it 43? 47? Well, over 40, which is a huge achievement. And this is really one of the things that sometimes you launch into a process, you volunteer for an expedited—I like the expedited—policy development process, and it ends up being quite a mission but certainly something that is needed. And as Yrjo mentioned at the beginning, starting with diametrically opposed positions and being able to find consensus is quite commendable and really remarkable. So well done to you, to both you, and to the chair of the group. And I know that you've been very involved with helping with finding the consensus.

I see Alan Greenberg, another serious, serious, hardworking participant in those processes. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just two quick comments. Number one, on "expedited," "expedited" means there are some steps omitted from the process, not that it's going to be quick. It implicitly would be quicker than if it wouldn't be expedited, just because there's some extra steps and public comments associated with it, but it's not necessarily a quick process, although one could always hope.

And the other comment is just a brief comment on Yrjo's thoughts on the ALAC participating in a PDP, even though we are not really involved as one of the parties that will benefit greatly from it. Our lack of interest sometimes can help. And that's very true. I think we have to be very careful that we don't decide to participate in everything just because we can be wise people who can arbitrate between the people who have differences. That could be a sink on resources. But it is something to consider going into these kind of things. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for these words, Alan.

And I think that pretty much closes our quadruple grouping of policy right now. But for those people who are still interested in policy, the next agenda item is going to be introduced by Maureen Hilyard. And I have a feeling it's policy as well. Maureen, thank you so much. Back to you.

EN

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. The next item is of course your normal policy updates, and that's basically what I was going to pass back to you. And you have probably a little less than ten minutes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I've spoken to much, so let's pass the baton on to Jonthan Zuck. Over to you, Jonathan. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, thanks, Olivier. We right now don't have a huge pipeline of specific public comment periods that often drive the work of the CPWG, but at the same time, there are enormous overarching issues, such as DNS abuse. And the other one that looms even larger is the so-called subsequent procedures discussions that are taking place inside ICANN right now, which is what the next round of new gTLDs will look like, what that program will look like, and what the objectives of that program will be.

And there are particular areas of interest for the At-Large, including a better success for internationalized domain names, a better success for applicant support, in the hopes that some new gTLDs might be applied for by those in disadvantaged regions or communities. And so we are hard at work in a number of different fora to advance the interests of communities and individual end users in these discussions about this new round. And that is going to dominate a lot of efforts and conversations.

We are soon going to be fielding a poll of individual end users to discuss the value and usefulness of internationalized domain names. We are going to be holding a policy session at ICANN74 to develop a more nuanced position on so-called closed generics, which are generic top-level domains that are managed by only one company, and what the implications of that are.

So we're doing a lot of policy work. And I guess I would say the good thing is that it's not all being driven at the tail-end of policy development processes, which is the public comment periods, but at the front end. So there's lots going on. The transfer policy is another thing that we're discussing quite a bit. So there's a lot going on in policy where people are participating, but we aren't yet producing papers or comments. So lots going on. Please do attend the CPWG calls whenever you're able because then you'll really have a sense of the conversations that are going on inside the ICANN community.

With that, I think we can give the microphone back to Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Awesome. Thank you so much. And I think that's been a really great intro into the ALAC meetings, just having those great presentations about what's actually coming out of At-Large and how we're contributing to the work within ICANN. And it's good for those of us who don't get to the CPWG meetings as often as we could/should and to get the feedback. I think that's really great.

Olivier, did you want to have the last word?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please, Maureen. I was just going to, in the interest of time, point out that you're able—or everyone is able when they look at the agenda—to actually take on the tabs of all these different policy development processes that are taking place with the fact that we're getting regular advice every week or regular feedback from those people that are representatives on each one of these groups. And we're able to feed them with answers. Sometimes there are polls. Sometimes there are Q&As. There's all sorts of interaction for our wider community to be able to feed into these processes that are absolutely needed these days with this new policy development process 3.0, when we have these representatives in these groups.

I just wanted to recognize those people because it's heroic work. It's a lot of work, as you've heard, from Yjro and Justine. And it's stuff that needs to be done for the end user input to be there. And that's of course in addition to the ALAC statements that you've seen have been ratified during the period. That's all. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thanks so much. The tabs are really, really important because, as Olivier said, they do represent the many different groups who are within this consolidated policy group. And that is a very important area.

Okay. So we do have quite a bit more to get through. And moving down, we'll have, first of all, our quick two-minute refresher on how our membership is going from Claudia. Thank you, Claudia.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hi, everyone. Thank you, Maureen. If you click on the tabs, there are a few for the ALS snapshot. We currently do not have anything new for the ALS application status update. We currently have two that are in the process to go for vote for decertification—one for EURALO and one for NARALO. We have a few that are waiting for due diligence and are on hold.

For the individual applications, we have received one from AFRALO, one from EURALO, and two from NARALO. And we also have two individual applications from NARALO that are just waiting for one or two bits of information and should be added by the next meeting. And I will update the totals on those.

And I believe that's everything. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Awesome. Thank you very much. And I love that graph that shows the growth within At-Large. Very pleasing to see.

Okay. So moving on to our next agenda item, it's the reports from our liaisons and our other working groups. So anyone who would like to give a presentation—oh. Olivier, is that a new hand? Just noticed.

Okay, thank you. If anyone would like to give a presentation on anything there from any of those. Any updates? Any highlights that happened over the period?

Okay, we'll have Lianna first.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you, Maureen. I don't have much update on the ccNSO world, but I just wanted to highlight the page on reporting. And some of you mentioned this tabulated version of pages, so I consolidated here some information about the ccNSO Council, which is the on the meetings, information about their decisions, the committees that are formed within the ccNSO, and the newsletter that they have regularly every month. So all the information that I will gather I will have from ccNSO I will update here regularly. And once we have any updates, I will make you know.

Just to say why I don't have any updates, the council meeting [inaudible] will be tomorrow. So after my taking of the position as liaison, we did not have anything. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Lianna. And, yes, once your role starts and you're attending those council meetings, there'll be a lot more news, I'm sure. And I do love the use of tabs. It makes it so much neater and it shows where everyone can get their information from.

Justine?

JUSTINE CHEW: Thanks, Maureen. Just briefly, I also have a [inaudible] report from the GNSO Council side. [inaudible]. It looks very complicated, but I think [inaudible] having to [inaudible] topics that are under consideration and also [inaudible]—

YESIM SAGLAM: Justine, I'm sorry for interrupting, but I think you're moving your mic. We do have some noise. Not sure if you would be able to keep it stable. If you could please, kindly try. Our interpreters are having a hard time. Thanks so much.

JUSTINE CHEW: Okay. So just to mention that what you see on the screen now is actually my wiki space as the ALAC liaison to the GNSO Council. And you see that I've marked the page according to different sections. One is highlighting developments on topics and their consideration. The second is actually a listing of all the GNSO Council meetings I've attended and also basically what happened in certain [inaudible].

So I do want to draw folks' attention to the most recent April meeting. And I have in fact submitted a summary report to the ALAC[+] list. That actually appears in the … Well, there's a link to it under the topic of DNS abuse. So, Yesim, you might want to go back to that particular link on the agenda wiki.

But I just wanted to highlight a couple things. One is, in terms of DNS abuse, the small team called GNSO Council DNS Abuse is still at the early stages of its work. I posted something in the chat on this. We are still waiting on responses to the same questionnaire that ALAC responded to. We're still waiting for responses from other SG and Cs of the GNSO. We've only received four from the earlier ones, which is ALAC, GAC, SSAC, and the DNS Abuse Institute. From memory, we have also received something from the BC and NCSG, but as I said, we're waiting

on responses from the other SGs and Cs. So the discussions on the responses are still ongoing and very nascent still. So perhaps I'll come back and report on it in a subsequent meeting of the CPWG.

I do want to raise the issue of closed generics. Yesim, do you have the link? If you go back up …

YESIM SAGLAM: Sorry, Justine. It seems like the link is not working—

JUSTINE CHEW: No, no, no. It's 3A.3. Roman 3.

YESIM SAGLAM: Oh, sorry. My apologies.

JUSTINE CHEW: Right. So in terms of closed generics, there's also a small team amongst GNSO councilors. The small team was constituted by whichever councilors volunteered to be on it. And we've only had one meeting, but I wanted to point out that this particular small team earlier on had a narrow remit of basically recommending to GNSO Council whether to accept the invitation by the Board to GAC and GNSO Council to have a dialogue on how to move closed generics forward. I won't get into the specifics of why the Board invited only GNSO and GAC to do this [inaudible]. Perhaps we can pick it up at another time.

But in terms of the small team at the GNSO Council, we didn't get very far because there was an objection raised by NCSG. And the rationale for the objection is posted on the screen, as you see. But it's safe to say that the whole matter was brought back to council to decide on. And I believe council has indicated to the small team that we should be looking at expanding the membership.

So I think one of the criticisms that NCSG raised was the fact that the small team wasn't representative. The thing is it was going to be based on whoever volunteered. So if you don't volunteer, then there's nothing much you can do. So, anyway, GNSO Council has stipulated that this small team should be a bit more representative and it should still proceed with its work in terms of finding a recommendation to bring back to GNSO Council on how we want to move forward with the GAC. So the impetus is that the GNSO Council is [preparing] to have a dialogue with GAC.

But also one of the things that the small team has been charged to look into is to see whether we should be expanding the dialogue to include ALAC. And that's something that I myself and Jonathan have raised in a number of fora, to basically say that this closed generics issue isn't just a GNSO/GAC issue. It affects the whole community, so we should have a seat at the table to speak.

And terms of the ICANN central planning, I believe that, at this stage, we wouldn't have a formal full council and ALAC meeting like we had in ICANN73. We probably would be looking at leadership-to-leadership meeting, so to speak. And it's simply because of the fact that the policy forum is very short compared to the community forum. And there is

sufficient rooms and resources to possibly support the full council and ALAC bilaterally.

I'll end and take questions at the end on- and offline. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you so much, Justine. Really great to see the advocacy that's going on to ensure that our voice is also heard in these groups.

Okay. Are there any other contributions?

I can actually give a brief update on outreach. I think that I noted that Daniel was an apology. But to just to mention, just to remind people, the Outreach and Engagement Team of course went into a bit of a hiatus during the pandemic. And then Daniel was unwell. So we're actually reestablishing the regular meetings, and we've got a joint leadership thing here, with Danel refocusing on the administrative side of the outreach activities. And Natalia, when she gets back on track, knowing and understanding what's happening in her area, will be focusing on inputs in regard to the regional liaisons and getting more engagement and focus on the RALO outreach and engagement strategies for FY23, and hopefully working within a more engaging environment as we move towards hybrid and then hopefully back to face-to-face. But I'd really like to encourage everybody, if involved heavily in other groups, to join the Outreach and Engagement. And we'll try and get a little bit more action happening leading up to the AGM.

Okay. Holly?

EN

HOLLY RAICHE: Do you want to hear about the CSC now or later?

MAUREEN HILYARD: You got two minutes.

HOLLY RAICHE: Two minutes. And the OSB Working Group?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah. Pease.

HOLLY RAICHE: Really? Seriously?

MAUREEN HILYARD: [inaudible] Three minutes. Go.

HOLLY RAICHE: The CSC (Customer Standing Committee). For people don't know, this is the group that oversees the PTI. We have meetings every month. We look at the SLAs. They're usually 100% compliant. So not much to report there. And those reports are generally on the side in the ICANN website.

                           This past meeting was just last night, so it's less than twelve hours away. We had two other items. One was an overview of the PTI customer survey. They actually talked to their customers, their users, the root servers, the ccTLD, the GNSO (Generic Names).

I was a little concerned with the survey. There was a very response rate. Of a root server community of 722 questionnaires that went out, there were no responses. And that was quite general. So some of the discussion was how to get a better understanding. They do use other tools, but the survey actually doesn't have a very good take-up. So I'm not terribly concerned about it.

The issues, when asked for general issues for that community, were interesting—things like blockchain, DNSSEC, the alternative DNS, resolution technologies, abuse mitigation, and security. So those are sorts of issues that are familiar to us that are also front-of-mind for that particular community.

The other was an actual look at the effectiveness of the CSC itself. That survey is underway. It's just a review. One of the items that came out was we should be relooking at what is being surveyed so that, when we get results, they actually are of industries that we should be looking at. And the hope is that we review all of those SLAs and see what is still useful that is being surveyed and what we've missed. We will have more results in a month.

So that's the CSC and where we're up to there.

For the OSB (Operation, Finance, and Budget), as most of you are aware, we spent probably half of the year looking at the budgets and making comments on the budget. That's the IANA budget and the ICANN budget. We get briefings from ICANN Planning and respond to the budget. And hopefully some of you participate in that.

The other half—we look at the operating initiatives, and we look at it from a view of what our priorities are. What was very useful—very useful—was the very recent strategic outlook trends—that section that was run with ICANN Planning. And luckily lots of ALAC and the At-Large community participated. So in two weeks' time, we will be having another meeting to look at the outcome of the broader community and what the priorities were. And then, when it comes time to start commenting on budgets, we will be able to have a better handle on reflecting the ALAC and At-Large community priorities when we start responding to budgets.

Now, a subgroup of the standing committee is the Prioritization Working Group. I don't want to comment on that. Cheryl is on the call, and she can give a very, very brief—or Sebastien can also give a very, very brief—view of the Prioritization Work Group.

So back over to you, Maureen. And do you want to hear about this subgroup of prioritization as well? Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you. Unfortunately, we're really hard on time. And Joanna has got her hand up for a GAC report. Thanks, Holly, though.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

EN

JOANNE KULESZA: Thank you, Maureen. Yes, indeed. Just very briefly to update the At-Large community on our cooperation with the GAC, following up on the bilateral meeting during ICANN73, we have agreed and recently confirmed that it would indeed be useful to hold intercessional dedicated thematic meetings on topics that were selected in the runup to ICANN73. And the bilateral included DNS abuse, obviously. And I welcome all the remarks have been done throughout this meeting here today. I am certain there is room for alignment between the advisory committees and the GNSO. I'm very much looking forward to engaging further with Justine and the small working group that deals with DNS abuse within the GNSO.

However, regardless of that, we would like to follow up on the work that has been previously between the advisory committees on DNS abuse. The European Commission report and the feedback that was received thus far will likely be the focus of an intercessional meeting, which we are hoping to plan. The GAC/ALAC leads and, on behalf of the GAC … Shi Young is consulting with the group tomorrow. The GAC is holding a meeting where these proposals will be tabled.

We have also agreed in the runup to ICANN73 that it might be useful to leave SubPro and, optionally, any related topics for intercessional meetings. Should this be approved by the GAC, we'll proceed with [inaudible] that will help align the vision of the advisory committees on SubPro and anything that might be related there, too, and a follow-up as we have heard during the meeting today.

During ICANN73, one of the topics that raised significant interest was on aligning on-the-ground presence of the ALSes and respective

governmental representatives, with Yrjo kindly agreeing to work with Shi Young on that dedicated proposal. We are looking into either collaborating in that area online or, again, holding an intercessional meeting, which will allow us to summarize this effort and hopefully progress made during ICANN74.

And this is where we stand in terms of aligning the policies. I would view this as deepening the collaboration that has already been in place with optionally a more dedicated approach, allowing us to confront the positions of the two advisory committees between the meetings and then culminating this work within the face-to-face meeting in The Hague. The 60 minutes we have for the bilaterals are usually not sufficient, so we're kind of hoping to be able to prepare for that meeting in the runup.

This is the latest news with regards to aligning the positions of the two advisory committees. I'm always happy to answer questions. And thank you for giving me the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much for that, Joanna. We're just getting a little bit pressed for time now, and I really do need to get at least an update for everybody on ICANN74 and exactly what's happening. And I'm sure Gisella can do that in five minutes.

GISELLA GRUBER:	Thank you, Maureen. And I accept the challenge. Thank you, Maureen. I'm going to run through the highlights of ICANN74 that we have up on the screen, just as I said, highlighting our sessions at ICANN74.

Just before we start on this, just as a reminder, ICANN74 is our first hybrid meeting, and it's going to be a policy forum held over four days, from the 13th to the 16th of June in The Hague in The Netherlands. So this is a shorter meeting than the community forum and the annual general meeting.

And from the At-Large perspective, we have our planning committee working on the schedule. We meet weekly on a Monday and already have a draft schedule for At-Large, which I will be running through momentarily. And a reminder that ICANN74 is again, as mentioned, our first hybrid meeting. So it's novelty to both staff and the community, and we are working diligently to make it as successful as we possibly can with all the information and the restrictions that we have to date. So please note that, as soon as we have more information and, as the information comes in, we will be sharing it with everyone. And also, with many restrictions, it has been quite challenging scheduling our sessions.

So, as a reminder, we have a one-stop-shop wiki page, which is something that we create for all the ICANN public meetings. And I have put the link in the chat. So please do bookmark this page on the wiki, as this is where you will find all the essential information to make it a successful meeting for all.

To run through the sessions we have, I'm going to start with the main sessions, which there are three of during the week. We will start with the session on subsequent procedures, working together on progress. So for some groups, this will unconflicted. And for the At-Large, it will most definitely be an unconflicted session—the first block on Monday. We have a plenary session on Tuesday, which will be on the topic of the five-year follow-up to who sets ICANN priorities. And on Thursday, we will have the geopolitical forum to actually end ICANN74.

For the At-Large policy sessions, we currently have two sessions proposed. The first is on Monday on "Evolving the DNS Abuse Conversation and End Users' Perspective: The Role of At-Large". This takes on from ICANN73, and this session was suggested and moderated by Hadia Elminiawi. And on Tuesday, we have the "Closed Generics: Finding a Balance," suggested and moderated by Jonathan Zuck.

Note we are still in the planning stages, so we haven't until the end of the week to have forms submitted. And there may possibly be another policy or another general At-Large session. But again, all the information will be posted on our wiki page.

For our bilateral meetings, we have two confirmed, which is the joint ALAC and SSAC meeting on Tuesday, and the joint ALAC and GAC meeting on Wednesday, which Joanna has already kindly touched upon.

We are planning on intercessional meetings with the GNSO post-ICANN74 as their schedule is already fully booked and we're not able to find a suitable slot. And with the ccNSO, we have the same issue, so we'll plan a face-to-face at ICANN75 in Kuala Lumpur.

Briefly, the other At-Large meetings will be the At-Large leadership welcome on Monday, followed by he regional leaders meeting. On Tuesday, we have the RALO policy session: "Laws and Regulations in the European Union." That will be moderated by Pari Esfandiari and Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Sebastien Bachollet will also be on that. And on Wednesday, we have the joint AFRALO-AfrICANN meeting and, to end the week, the At-Large leadership wrap-up session.

So as I mentioned, we will have more information on the logistics of the sessions, including when and how to register over the next coming weeks. And please do keep that page bookmarked. And any information that does come through will be shared on that wiki page and also by the mailing list so that everyone both attending in person and remotely can be fully briefed on what to expect for ICANN74, which we are very much looking forward to. So please stay tuned.

And with this, I'll hand the floor back to Maureen. Thank you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Gisella. And, yes, it's just showing that we're, as always, very well planned for our involvement in ICANN. And thank you so much to those people who turn up for those planning sessions. It's really helpful to have their own thoughts.

Okay. So what we'll do now is we'll go straight on to … We've got some other Other Business here. And I hope the interpreters don't mind giving us another five minutes.

But some quick updates; first of all—and there's an additional one from Alan, I understand—from Heidi, about the election.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you, Maureen. Hi, everyone. This is Heidi. I wanted to just let you know that the launch for the 2022 ALAC members and RALO members and NomCom liaisons have started. The RALO launch was on the 21st of March, and everyone else was on the 18th of April. So they are all open currently. And you'll see that schedule continues, the nomination period continues, until the 29th of April. And then those that have been nominated will have until the 6th of May to accept their nominations, unless of course that is a [false] nomination. Then they'll be called with candidates if [inaudible] by the RALOs between the 9th of May and the 12th of May. And then, if elections are required, then those elections will take place between the 13th of May and the 20th of May.

And you'll see that we already do have some nominations coming in, definitely from NARALO and also coming in from APRALO already. So please, all others, continue sending in those nominations.

Thank you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much.

I see Holly's hand still up, but I think that's an old one. And, Sebastien, very, very quicky. We've got to get to [inaudible].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, very quickly. Did we receive the mail about the nomination? And did all the number of the RALOs get them, please? Thank you. I didn't see anyone. That's why I'm asking. We cannot vote on something without sending something. It's [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, Sebastien. We did. Staff did send those all on the 18th, so please do check your inbox. I will double check that it actually went through. But, yes, all of them were sent. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: I can attest to that, too, because they come to me as well. So, yes, they did go out.

Okay. The next AOB from Joanna—a very quick one. Joanna?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Maureen. Yes, indeed. This is just a follow-up to update the community on the conversation or the exchange of letters—a very formal exchange of letters—we have had with Maarten and the Board, following up on our bilateral meeting during ICANN73. I'm going to paste the communication to the Board in the chat. It has been posted on the official correspondence page.

The idea behind that correspondence was to respond to Board's request for more details on how to recognize volunteer participation in the policy development processes. And this meeting serves as specific proof

of how challenging and, at the same time, how effective the policy development process has been for the At-Large community.

Following up on the conversation with the Board, we felt it was appropriate to provide more details since the meeting, again, would not allow us to elaborate further. Marita, during the meeting, indicated that the Board has, among its strategic objectives, advancing the multi-stakeholder model. And this might be done with an attempt to measure the impact that volunteers actually do have on the work that's done within ICANN.

And looking into the feedback that we have received with regard to outreach and engagement, trying to do outreach in the challenging times of the pandemic, I was looking for suggestions or advice from the Board on incentives to get people more involved, to get more people involved, or to simply appreciate those who have been devoting their skills, expertise, and time to the policy development process.

Now, you will see the details of that communication under the link. We have received a response which is somewhat ambiguous, but at the same time, I do feel it does hold potential and is optimistic. The remarks that have been shared will be included into the process that was launched in 2019 on advancing the multi-stakeholder model. So all the suggestions that were made will be duly considered by the Board and hopefully looked into as the Board advances on meeting the strategic objective of advancing the multi-stakeholder.

Now, we are hopeful that this might serve as a step to recognize the contributions from the At-Large community. We have been indicated as

one of the few communities that actually does include volunteer input without any contracted parties' links. We had this conversation around the definition of a volunteer and their input. So that is the conversation to keep going.

But just to give you an update, as Maureen requested—a very brief one—the response from the Board is optimistic, and these suggestions will be incorporated into the process of advancing the multi-stakeholder model.

Now, Maureen, I know you have a more detailed perspective and context for that response, so I hand the floor over to you. And that would be the brief summary from me. Thank you very much.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Joanna. And as you say, this is going to be an ongoing thing, especially until I vacate the chair, anyway. So this is something that came up right at the very beginning of my term, and it's been an issue ever since. So we will continue with this discussion and we'll keep it at the forefront for the Board.

Now, I have one more AOB, and that's from Alan, I understand. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just very briefly, as a result of the last Board selection process, there was a recommendation for a small update to the ALAC rules of procedure. I'll be suggesting some wording for that shortly. If anyone else has anything else that urgently needs updating in the rules of procedure, this is a really good time to let us know. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Great. Thank you for that reminder.

And thank you so much to the interpreters for staying with us for an extra few minutes. It's been a really, really busy meeting but a very productive one. I'm so pleased with the contributions that everyone has made.

And thank you so much, everyone, for being here. And we'll see you again on Tuesday, the 24th of May, at 16:00, where our guest speaker will be Graeme Bunton from the DNS Abuse Institute. So see you then. Thank you. Have a great morning, afternoon, or evening, wherever you are. And enjoy your day. Take care. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]