
MARIO ALEMAN: Hello, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the NARALO conference call on Monday, January 8, 2018 at 20:00 UTC.

On the call we have today on the English channel Glenn McKnight, Gordon Chillcott, Eduardo Diaz, Susannah Gray, Ron da Silva, Allan Skuce, Matthew Rantanen, Leah Symekher, Mark Buell, Jonathan Zuck, Dana Perry, Bill Jouris, William Michael Cunningham, Tom Lowenhaupt. The other people are joining actually right now: Dustin Phillips. Those are all the participants on the English channel.

On the French channel we have no one.

We have apologies from Alan Greenberg and [inaudible].

On the staff side we have [inaudible], Heidi Ullrich, Sylvia Vivanco; and myself, Mario Aleman doing the vocal.

From our interpreters, we have on the French channel [Arelle] and Camilla.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking not only for transcription purposes, but also for our interpreters.

With this, I will turn it back over to you, Eduardo. You can begin.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you so much, Mario. I am trying to connect to the AC, but in any case, I have [inaudible] me. Mario, Alfredo Calderon also made an apology, sent me an apology, so just to make sure you record him sending one.

Anyhow, everyone, glad to see you in the ether one more time in a new year. Greetings to everyone and a Happy New Year. I think it's going to be a great year for all of us and it's going to be an interesting one.

Anyhow, I want to jump to – the attendance has been doing. I'm jumping to the quorum part, which is going to be hard to do. We were talking about this at the beginning. I will ask, if you remember next time when you log into the AC room, after your name you put a dash and put your organization, so staff can make sure that they get the right ALS because we're counting ALSes attending and affiliate representatives are attending, so for quorum purposes since the new Rules of Procedure require that we keep track of that for consensus calls and for votes, if any of that has to be done.

In any case, I hope you have seen the agenda. Some of the things I'm doing with the agenda is that I'm asking people that are leading different discussion items to add an offline report because we're not going to get to all of them in an hour. Some of them can be done offline, but the agenda can be used as an offline report, so everybody can read about this discussion item about what has happened. I encourage everyone to go to the agenda and read it before coming into the meeting, so you know some of those items what is going on with them.

Item four now, [inaudible] discussions. These are discussions that you see [in color here] are discussions that are going to be sent to [inaudible]. We finished with the discussions and I want to just – you know that these are once ... We recommended the meeting before to take out. And before I'm going to take them out, then [inaudible].

We have created the groups. Item 11, the CROP program. We had a little bit of discussion about the CROP program. This item was put on dormant state until ALAC decides what's going to do with this program.

The NARALO newsletter is being done now by Glenn McKnight and Shelly Robinson. The rest of folks are helping, adding content to it.

I've been [inaudible] the [AASC] – Judith was the only one interested in this working group. The [ABSC] participants will be William, Glenn, Alfredo, Judith, and myself.

So, those items are going to be closed. If anybody has an objection to take them out, let me know. If not, then we can continue to take them out.

The meeting discussion order. Tijani Ben Jemaa asked to talk to us as a group to give us an inside of the coming At-Large webinar. I don't know if Tijani is online already to talk. I don't see Tijani Ben Jemaa.

MARIO ALEMAN:

No, we don't have Tijani, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. We can skip.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Eduardo, this is Heidi, if I may.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Sure.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thank you very much, Eduardo. This is Heidi, everyone. Welcome. Happy 2018. On this item, what he is asking is that all of the ALS representative individuals send information or send suggestions for topics for the 2018 At-Large capacity building webinars to him or to staff before I believe it was the 10th of February so that we can have additional topics to choose from that are of particular interest to the ALSes.

In the analysis that we did of the 2017 capacity building webinars, we've seen that those that were of much more interest than the others, even though all of them were of interest, the ones that spiked in terms of interest were those particularly that were focused on ALS and ALS policy, ALS engagement, etc. So, that's why he's going to be asking all of the RALOs to send their suggestions – or ALSes to send the suggestions – to him or to staff in the next several weeks.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay, thank you for the clarification because I got a message from Silvia on the Skype and I was under the impression that he wanted to talk about the At-Large webinars that were already set. Thank you for the clarification. Any questions from anyone? Okay, thank you.

Now, I believe I'm connected to the Adobe, so it will be easy for me to manage the call this way.

In any case, some items are being recommended to be closed. These discussion items have been there. They can be closed like the SOI updates. I believe that call was sent out to ask everyone to update their SOIs.

2018 and 2019 timetable, that's something that Glenn is putting together. I just want to make sure that we don't miss any deadline for any of the projects or things that have to do, like the additional budget requests. None of you know, but it's Friday is the deadline to submit additional budget requests. That timetable is being put together and I think that's something we can take out and do offline.

All the [inaudible] reports were done or submitted. The ICANN 61 Showcase and NARALO 10 anniversary, I will do that. I will put that on a dormant state and I will work with Glenn and whoever wants to volunteer in helping in doing that. Then we will come back here and tell everyone what's going to happen in the showcase.

ALS decertifications were sent to ALAC for the certification and they will tell us the result of that discussion over there, so I'm putting that on a dormant state until we get that result.

The ICANN 61, the two slots that were open by Javier and myself, there was an open call for anyone interested. No interest was received, so those open slots were sent to ALAC for their disposition into the At-Large community.

I recommend that those discussion items are dormant or closed as defined, so if I don't hear any objection to that – oops, I'm sorry, Glenn. You have your hand up. Please, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, Eduardo. I just want to clarify those two spots, that was just for travel if I recall. Is that correct, Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: That is correct, only travel. No hotel or diem.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great, thank you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, that's correct. [inaudible]. If I don't hear any objections to this, then I will close those items.

This [inaudible], this monthly meeting, this is the first time [inaudible] seen the snippet webinar. I call it snippet, like I said, because there should be no more than 15 minutes about something that is a policy concern or a discussion that has been around.

So, I asked Alfredo Calderon to coordinate this and we have [Mark Buell] from ISOC who is very knowledgeable about the net neutrality things that have happened.

And I have seen floating around discussions in this list, on all the lists, about if net neutrality has a direct effect in ICANN or not. Some people say yes. Some people say no. I asked Alfredo to put something together from the educational group to hear about net neutrality and have some discussion. We don't have to reach any conclusion at this point, but at least we can discuss it and see everybody's opinion about if it affects ICANN or not. Then we take it from there. If it doesn't or – I don't know what the conclusion will be, but I think it would be a nice discussion to have.

So, with that in mind, Alfredo is not in today but I wanted to just – Mark is unit director of North America for Internet Society. Correct me, Mark, if I'm wrong. Then I will have you, Mark, to go ahead and do your presentation. Hopefully this will take about 15 minutes and then we have just a minute to discuss this. If we take longer, then we take longer.

I didn't see John Laprise on the call, so that might be perhaps skip the thing about the NARALO hot topics. Mark, the floor is yours.

MARK BUELL:

Thank you. I had some slides. I don't know if we can pick those up or not. We'll just wait a second. There we go. I'll try and be as brief as I can because I think, as you said, what's most important is really the discussion.

The other thing to note is that this is a very contentious and polarizing issue. I'll do my best to be as unbiased as I can.

I'll start off by saying and probably starting some discussion already or starting some pushback already. What is net neutrality? What are we really talking about.

The Internet Society, how we define it is that all Internet traffic should be treated neutrally or equal by service providers without blocking, throttling, or discrimination. Pretty simple. It's a concept that goes back to 2003. Tim Wu is the guy who coined the phrase. It's an incredibly complex policy issue in the US.

I'll do a brief overview of the history. This slide starts with the 1970s. Really, what we're talking about goes back to the 1934 Communications Act which established the FCC. Throughout the history of the Internet in the US, however, it's really been characterized by a push-pull on the FCC and others to regulate net neutrality.

For the FCC, it does go back to that 1934 Communications Act and boils down to whether or not broadband should be considered Title 1 under the act, which would be an information service, or Title 2 under the act which would be a common carrier or more like a utility, like a telephone service.

I like your comment in the chat. It's not a complex policy issue. It's a complex political issue. I think you've really nailed it on the head with that one.

I'll skip over 70s, 80s, and early 2000. 2004, when the FCC adopted what [inaudible] the four Internet freedoms. They were the freedom to access content, the freedom to use applications, the freedom to attach personal devices, and the freedom to obtain service plan information. Net neutrality or the principles of net neutrality aren't necessarily mentioned explicitly in there, even though it had been coined years before.

In 2010, however, the FCC adopted three other rules which were more related to net neutrality. That being that ISPs must be transparent about how they handle network traffic and congestion, that they can't block traffic on wired networks and that was primarily to address [OTT] services like Skype, and it outlawed unreasonable discrimination on those networks. At the time, the FCC assumed that it could enforce these rules using the Title 1 classification of broadband.

If we fast forward to 2014, there was a court case. Comcast versus the FCC where the court said that the FCC could not use Title 1, but had suggested that they use Title 2 to enforce these rules.

Previous to that, protections had been always considered as covered until Title 1, but the court had said by 2014 that, no, that wasn't the case.

So, we get into 2015, the Obama administration. Can we go to the next slide? The FCC under the Obama administration passes the open Internet order, which applied to both wired and wireless Internet connections and were grounded in Title 2 authorities. To me, this is critically important to note that Title 2 isn't net neutrality. It's the legal

vehicle the FCC used to regulate, to give itself the authority to regulate net neutrality but they're not the same. You'll see in a lot of discussions online and other places that the two often get conflated, but they're not necessarily the same thing.

Also important to note that for the previous two decades, before the open Internet order, under both Democrat and Republican administration, it operated under Title 1 and that was actually a period of tremendous growth in the Internet. However, that growth means that we are in a very different environment in the Internet policy world than we were, say, in the mid- to late- 1990s.

It's also important to note – and this doesn't necessarily mesh with the way I define net neutrality up front, but this open Internet order did not address edge providers. Edge providers can and do engage in activities that can impede Internet openness [inaudible] something like curated search results might not be getting all search results that you're expecting because your search engine may be using algorithms or may be engaging in practices where they're not providing you with all results.

We look to the next slide. Last year, it changed. The fact is a lot of people on the inside had expected it to change. There was report cases that were making ... There were cases that were making their way through courts. We always knew that there was very little support on the Republican side for the open Internet order, so that if the administration change to the Republicans, it looks like that it would be reversed and it was. When Trump appointed Ajit Pie earlier in 2017, he had expressed his interest in overturning it. He did not support the open

Internet order when he was a commissioner with the FCC. In November, he announced that he would repeal the 2015 order, and by December, that's exactly what happened.

There was a vote split along party lines – Democrat, Republican – and the open Internet order was repealed. What that essentially did was threw back authority over net neutrality over to the FCC. While there are transparency provisions in the new order, the way it is now, whether or not those are sufficient, we don't know. And there are certainly some considerations with the FCC having the authority over net neutrality. The FCC is more of a consumer protection organization. It's not proactive, but it's complaint based and it's very time-consuming and tremendously expensive to go through the FCC to show that an organization has been acting in an anti-competitive manner.

Could we scroll ahead a bit to the next slide?

So, where are we? We are at the point where, as I said, the FCC now has or will have authority over net neutrality. What that means is we've turned to the pre-2015 days, pre open Internet order days. ISPs are free to practice throttling, blocking, and prioritization. They no longer have to [inaudible] law or anything like that.

However, I don't necessarily think that the net neutrality debate is even close to being over. I'm trying to follow the discussion at the same time in case anyone is asking questions.

Legal action from advocacy groups and others could be taken. I certainly expect that to happen, as do many, many people. But, action from Congress is almost certainly to happen. Congress has 60 days under the

Congressional Review Act. They have 60 days to review and overrule the repeal via simple majority vote.

As of today, a bill put forward by Senator Markey from Massachusetts has received 30 cosponsors. That means that the senate will have to vote on repealing – on reversing the order. While it's a Democratic bill, it's not likely to pass. In my opinion, that's pretty politically shrewd given the fact that net neutrality is actually very popular in the United States. In an election year, it could be very interesting the Democrats making the Republicans take a stand on net neutrality. We'll see.

Yeah, Glenn, that's a very good point. I will address how it impacts Canada, and really in that regard how it impacts other countries around the world.

Now, the question that was put to me is, how would this affect ICANN? ICANN's [inaudible] is really related to naming and numbering. When you think about that, it's not really traffic related, so really ICANN naming and numbering in general shouldn't be greatly impacted by the decision. Goran Marby had publicly recently [inaudible].

However, ICANN and NARALO members are members of the Internet policy and governance community, and as such, we all bare responsibility to use our voices as people who understand the issues and know what's happening, to use our voices to ensure that people are informed about the debate and whether or not – where you stand on the issue isn't really relevant, but what we can do as the informed Internet governance community is ensure that others are informed as

well. There's a lot of misinformation out there. There's a lot of very strong information out there. I think it does behoove us to take that on.

I'm going to move on to addressing some of the comments in here. Javier, I think we just all remember that net neutrality, that [pipe] should be [inaudible] always been an Internet [inaudible]. Exactly. That's very true. And it is true that the open Internet order, what they use to make a policy legally binding in the US.

Title 2 reclassification of broadband, though, I would say was only one vehicle that could be used. We could see Congress legislate net neutrality and perhaps extend it to cover things like [ed] providers remains to be seen.

When you had asked about what it means for Canada, it could mean a couple of things for Canadians. One is the fact that a good deal of Canadian traffic is exchanged in the US, so it could fall victim to traffic slowing, throttling, traffic management by whomever is carrying it in the US. We'll see how that plays out, but that's certainly a possibility.

The other possibility is if you look at content providers, big ones like someone like Netflix, if their transit fees – if they have to pay more to be in priority over other traffic in the US to ensure that their service is delivered optimally, that cost could carry on and passed down to users outside of the US, including in Canada.

Glenn, “[inaudible] through the US and under the NSA rules.” Yeah. I've seen varying studies on how much traffic actually goes through the US. Some have it very high, but all of it looks over 50%. There's a significant

amount of Canadian traffic that transits the US and could therefore be affected by it.

Matthew, I don't know about your question. Does it impact ICANN possibly? Is it its jurisdiction? I don't know if it's ICANN's jurisdiction. I think that would be up to you guys to decide.

Are there any questions anyone wants to raise or we could just get into some discussion? Glenn, the [IX Maps] is an excellent tool.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Mark, Jonathan has his hand up.

MARK BUELL: Okay, I'm not used to ...

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. I think somebody has to mute their line. Thanks. This is Jonathan Zuck from The Innovator's Network and an individual member of NARALO.

Looking at some of the comments, I agree that this is a difficult forum to have this conversation and definitely one that we should have. I think there's a couple of different issues. One is about the nature of net neutrality itself and what it represents. I'm not sure that that's a

foregone conclusion. There's different types of data that you might want to have higher priority. There's already edge caching services like Akamai that allow Netflix to spend money to get its content to you faster anyway, so there's already a kind of money-based discrimination that happens on the Internet today.

The other issue is whether or not the FCC is the right place to do this and whether Title 2 is the right way to handle it within the FCC. I think there's a lot of people who are concerned about this Title 2 designation because it comes with it an enormous amount of capabilities to actually censor what goes over the wires, and while there's this promise to forebear on that during the Obama administration, that's just a promise. So, accepting Title 2 authorities is the same as saying that the FCC has the right to regulate content on the Internet. I think we need to be cautious about that and the slippery slope that entails, given how political the FCC can be.

I think that talking about really boiling down some scenarios or use cases, as us geeks like to say, and getting that through something in Congress feels not only like a more stable solution, but hopefully a more limited and targeted solution, the issue of net neutrality. I think we can all agree it needs to be dealt with in some form, but the Title 2 I think has a lot of problems associated with it.

MARK BUELL:

Yeah, Jonathan, that's exactly it. The extension of that is that Title 2 really reclassifies [inaudible] as a common carrier type service equating it with something like telephone numbers. Enabling the US government

to consider something like Internet service as a telephone number I think in some ways is a slippery slope on the global Internet governance stage because it really does open the door for other countries that have had their ongoing push to move Internet resources under the purview of an organization like the ITU. It could fuel some of that push, which isn't really helpful for an organization like ICANN or like ISOC for sure.

You're right. Our fear when the open Internet order came down in 2016 was that we were looking at this ping-ponging back and forth between administration in the White House when the FCC is under a Democratic administration. You'll see the open Internet order, when it falls under Republican administration, you'll see it bounce back to the way it was before.

What the Internet really needs is stability if we want it to be successful, and I don't necessarily believe that Title 2 was the right vehicle to bring that stability to the Internet in the United States.

Are there any other questions?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Even though you mentioned Title 2 will not allow blocking or [inaudible] or discrimination and now that's gone, I read somewhere that in the law any edge provider that is going to start doing this they're required to say it, to put it somewhere for people to read it. If that happens and if people does it, then at least you will know if somebody is doing it.

The problem with that, I think, is if you have only one provider in your region, then you're screwed. If you have competition, then you might

be able to move from one provider to another, but in the end it it's going to happen but it might. I don't know if you care to comment.

MARK BUELL:

Yeah. The transparency, that's something Ajit Pie had trumpeted with his promotion of the repeal of the open Internet order is that in that document there is a requirement for providers to be transparent in how they manage traffic.

I'm not in a position to say whether or not I feel that's sufficient. I don't necessarily believe it is personally, but it is very similar to what we have in Canada. There's a requirement for providers to be transparent about how they manage traffic.

Anyone have their hand up? I can't tell because I'm not on Adobe Connect anymore. Do we have any other questions?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

It's Glenn. William has a question. Go ahead, William.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM:

Can you hear me? I always have to unmute my mic. Am I coming through here?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yeah, you're fine, William.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: Alright, very good. The question is ... We've had this discussion online. I wasn't satisfied with the discussion we had online because I think it limited the ability of the organization to have an impact on the proposed policy because it appeared the organization – I'm talking ICANN – and the At-Large group was fearful of this set of policy [makers].

But my question is this. What should ICANN or the At-Large group or NARALO, however you want to break it out, half of the issue with this organization is you've got all of these committees and groups, so it's kind of hard to break through that, but what should the position of NARALO/ICANN be on this issue? Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can I say something, please? Nobody has their hand up. I will say, William, that if we look at this whole thing, if you look at ICANN's mission, it's only about domain names. If you look at it, really is to manage the domain name system. I'm also saying the net neutrality issue is a big issue, period, for the Internet. I agree with that. But, from the ICANN remit, which is the domain system, it doesn't affect it directly. Indirectly, it affects ICANN, it affects everyone. I don't know if that is the answer that you're looking for or is it what is NARALO going to do about it? Are we going to put a statement about it as NARALO from ICANN? Maybe that's the question you're asking.

If that would indicate, I [inaudible] haven't seen anything. Anybody care to say anything else? I hear silence.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I can hear you.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, so no comments then.

MARK BUELL: I'm just curious. Has ICANN or other At-Large organizations weighed in on the net neutrality debate elsewhere in the world?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Not to my knowledge, but again there's so much information out there. Again, this is a big issue in this part of the world, but you mentioned, Mark, it affects countries like Canada – it might affect countries like Canada because a lot of traffic goes through here.

MARK BUELL: In Canada, we've had pretty strong net neutrality policy in place, especially since 2014. Since the open Internet order was repealed, all of Canada's major political parties have expressed their support for net neutrality as it is. We may be affected by US net neutrality because of how much traffic transits through the US, but in terms of the Canadian policy, given how strongly our industry administer and the leader of the opposition came out in support of – how strongly they came out in support of net neutrality, I don't think it puts Canada necessarily at risk.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

This is what I think is going to happen. This thing is going to get into a legal battle. It's going to last four years, and in four years, you will see another administration and the same will happen again. It will be revoked, be put back in. That's what I think is going to happen. It's going to be a ping-pong type issue. In the end, I don't see people doing this [blocking] thing. I always said when people do [blocking] and discrimination, how do you detect that? They do it [inaudible] doing it or not. Sometimes a page comes in very fast, sometimes it goes very slow. It could be because of traffic, because of being blocked.

MARK BUELL:

I'm not necessarily [abetting them], but I would put money on whether or not Congress will introduce legislation this year. I have a feeling that it just may happen. I spent a fair bit of time talking to people on the hill in DC and some of the thinktanks and there's certainly an appetite on both sides of the aisle to do something about net neutrality. It doesn't hurt that we are in a midterm election year and that this is something maybe not widely understood, but widely supported in terms of people supporting the principles of net neutrality when they understand what it is.

So, we may be lucky that it is an election year. We may very well keep [inaudible].

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Okay, does anyone have any other questions or comments to make about this? I don't hear anyone, so Mark, I want to thank you for taking

the time of putting together and participating – oh, William, you have your hand up.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: Yeah. Can you hear me?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, we can hear you.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: So, what's the next step on this? And if there isn't one, if you don't have one in mind, I'm assuming that this is just for discussion purposes, to bring the topic up to this group. But, I'm interested to what your next steps are after this discussion. If you don't have a suggestion, then I would like to make one in terms of requesting a formal statement in a formal review of this issue on the part of NARALO, possibly ICANN. I know the CEO makes some statements about this issue, but I propose a formal statement.

EDUARDO DIAZ: What do other people think about that? Glenn said we can take a poll. I don't know. Everybody is in the group, they want to put a tick mark about making a formal statement ... What kind of statement are you looking for, William?

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: Alright. A little background. I basically ... The kind of statement that I would be looking for would be one that would opine on from the standpoint on the organization that's responsible for managing names and numbers on whether or not this net neutrality policy as written by the FCC would have an impact on the long-term viability ...

And this is the other thing. I understand where you guys are coming from when you say that this policy does not affect ICANN today. I get that, and I would agree with that. But, I'd like to see a statement that would opine from a technical perspective, on the short-term, intermediate, and long-term impact of this FCC policy on the technical operation of the Internet.

If you want to limit it from the standpoint of this discussion – and I think this is a false limitation, by the way. Since you want to limit it to names and numbers only, even though you have a portfolio of other efforts that are designed to increase social return and factor in social attributes, but if you want to limit it only to the technical aspects of names and numbers, that's fine. But a statement that speaks to that.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, William, look. It doesn't affect ICANN. For example, my main organization is Internet Society and they do are interested in net neutrality and the effects that it has, and that's where I put my statement because it's part of the organization I belong to.

The ICANN remit doesn't affect ICANN. I don't see what the relation there is. I can see it with ISOC because ISOC has a different mission. It's [inaudible] and it has to do with open Internet and things like that, but

ICANN's mission is just domain names. So, I don't see us putting a statement out there short, medium, or long term.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: Number one, I appreciate your opinion, but I'm not sure that that's actually the case [inaudible]. Open to other opinions about that. One, it gives them some real assistance in determining whether or not the statement you just made is true. I don't think it's true, but I hear you. I understand.

And even if it is true, then I'd like to see a statement from ICANN that outlines what you just said, so that everybody can see, so that other people I'm sure that when the rest of the world takes a look at the statement that says that the group that's in charge of names and numbers does not think that a policy that's going to impact a subset of names and numbers – one that's a technical tool – doesn't think it's their mission. That's fine.

So, pro or against, for or against net neutrality, what I'd like to see this organization put forward is a statement that says either here's why it's a bad thing or here's why it's a good thing or here's why it doesn't matter, it doesn't impact us at all.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, like Mark put in the presentation, the CEO says it doesn't affect ICANN. What else do you want to see more than that? I don't think we're going to put a statement out there from the ICANN perspective saying this affects domain names and things like that. Like I said, it

affects everyone indirectly, but it doesn't affect ICANN. So I don't see what the issue is in putting a statement there of something that doesn't concern ICANN and its mission.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: Once again, you could be wrong. That's your opinion about whether or not it affects ICANN [inaudible].

EDUARDO DIAZ: So, we agree to disagree.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM: Hold on. If I can finish really quickly. Number two, I'm not asking for a pro or anti statement. All I'm asking for is some statement. And number three, the reason to put that out there is here's what I think is going to happen. I think this is actually going to really negatively affect the Internet. That's just my opinion.

So, ten years from now, when people are looking back and saying, "Boy, that net neutrality thing really wrecked the system. Wasn't there anybody that said this is going to have an impact? Well, there was this group called ICANN. They were supposed to looking at their mission. They were supposed to be looking at this kind of stuff. What was their opinion on it?" I want historians to be able to look back and see the statement from you that says that this has no impact, or it does have some impact or we don't know – but something.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Let's close this discussion because we have to move forward. Let's just [inaudible] take a little poll. Whoever is in the group in this call, put a little green or X if they agree to put a statement or not and we'll take it from there. I stated my opinion and it's my own opinion and I don't think we're going to put a statement out there, but please. There's some people out there that haven't said anything. [inaudible]. You are not there. You don't want to participate or you don't care.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I'm sorry to interrupt you, but those are on Adigo. You'll have to just interrupt us because we can't see you waving your hand. We're [inaudible] with Xs and checkmarks, so just a couple more people. Give me another minute. Back to you, Eduardo.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: People who are on mobile may not be able to see where to put the checkmark or X mark. So, if you can't see that, write in the chat what you think, yes or no. Ron wants a clarification on the question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is [inaudible] for the record. With respect to clarification, I guess what I would suggest is the question is should NARALO, ICANN, the At-Large group make a statement concerning the FCC recently enacted policy concerning net neutrality, or Internet freedom as they call it, or [inaudible], and should that statement – should there be a formal statement? And this is, again, a formal statement that I'm asking for, for the record, from this body concerning the impact, or lack thereof, of this

Internet freedom policy from the FCC. Call it what you will, the mission of ICANN, the Internet in general – that’s a little broad, so I would say the mission of ICANN. Is that helpful?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I lost my Adobe Connect, so Glenn, could you add, subtract, tell me what the result is?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: So far, I think most of the people have voted, so we have one, two, three, four agreements, checkmarks. And in terms of disagree, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven crosses. I’m not sure. I don’t see anyone else, so the majority do not agree with a statement.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. So, [inaudible] and move to the next item in the agenda. Thank you all for the discussion and for participating and let’s move to the next item on the agenda. We have five minutes for you outreach and working group, Glenn. You have something to say.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you, Eduardo. We’ve been working hard on creating a working group for NARALO, but it ties in to the larger group, which is the At-Large working group on outreach and engagement. The outreach and engagement group has not had a formal call right now to have a meeting, but I’m hoping we’ll have a meeting in January.

But, just to give you a quick update, we recently did the IGF Geneva, which myself, Judith, and Thomas [Trutt] who is one of our unaffiliated members, and Matthew all were volunteers at the booth that we did. We got five solid leads from the event out of the 109 total, so it was a very successful event. There's a full report on the page as well.

So, just to give you an outline in terms of forthcoming outreach and engagement activities, [Marita Mull] has requested some of the discretionary funds – I believe there's \$250 left in the kitty of the \$2000 – to do a pre-ICANN 61 event at CIRA coming up in February. We're working with the CIRA staff with [inaudible] to work up a logistics. It's going to be a community event that will be livestreaming as well. That's one event in February.

In March, it's our big event at the ICANN 61. Lots of things that are happening including the very good North American School of Internet Governance, which will be reaching out to each of the delegates at that event to inform them about NARALO.

The second outreach effort, we'll have a booth. We're working with staff on each of the – ICANN is gracious enough to provide us a table and a banner in the village. We'll have that at the event as well. We're looking for volunteers who will attend the ICANN meeting to put their time slots. It's going to be the morning before everything gets started, morning break, lunchtime, and the afternoon break. It's not an entire day's event, but we'll have literature at the event.

The last thing we'll be doing at the ICANN 61 is going to be our showcase. We're working on that. So, if anyone wants to volunteer for

the booth time, please let me know. I've already posted very early on the link to the outreach and engagement page. Happy to have more people in our working group.

That's basically right now a report from me. Back to you, Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I'm sorry, I was muted. Thank you so much. With this last report, I want to close this meeting today. Please send me your comments, suggestions, for the next monthly meeting. I wish you a very happy new year and I hope to see most of you when you come down to Puerto Rico, so we can greet all of you here when you go and visit this beautiful island. Thank you so much.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Great, thank you. Bye-bye.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eduardo, are you still there?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, I'm here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's Jonathan. I sent you an e-mail about trying to do some volunteer work there and stuff. Let's try and coordinate on that.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Oh, okay. What kind of volunteer work do you want to do? I have several people that want to go to schools and do some painting or some kind of work.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was going to try to really get something big going, getting people to show up early and get something organized. It sounded like you were already organizing something, so I wanted to coordinate with you. We don't have to stay on this call because the ICANN staff probably want to close the Adobe, but I shot you an e-mail. Let's keep the conversation going if we can.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Well, one second. What's your telephone number? I can call you now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. It's 202-256-1457.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, I'll call you in a moment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, thanks. I'll get out of here.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Sorry, Eduardo, just a quick thing. I put a link to the NomCom website [inaudible] enough time to share updates. So people can get to that link and get updated [inaudible].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, Leah. Thank you so much.

LEAH SYMEKHER: Thanks, everyone.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you. This call has been adjourned. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]