

---

ICANN86 Seville | PF – At-Large Welcome Session ICANN86  
Monday, June 08, 2026 – 10:00 to 11:15 CEST

NATHALIE PEREGRINE

Hello, and welcome all to the At-Large session. My name is Nathalie Peregrin and I'll be the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Please do remember all to sign in to the Zoom room as questions will be taken by the Zoom room only and hands raised will be noted there too. During this session, questions and comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use the physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak, if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck, ALAC Chair. Jonathan, over to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you. And welcome everyone to ICANN86 and to Seville. I think we're going to really appreciate the air conditioning in our windowless conference room this time around, given the weather

---

**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.**

that we have outside. People will be taking five-minute journeys I think out there on breaks and are scurrying back.

This is an important meeting. There's a lot going on at ICANN86. We're in a period of significant transition because of the new round, the next round, I guess, as it's now being called. We're starting to move closer and closer to a finalized version of the review of reviews, recommendations. We're monitoring how the applicant support applicants are doing. We're working in Latin diacritics. And then there's also a fairly significant PDP taking place on one of our key issues, DNS abuse and associated domain checks. And so there's a lot going on.

There's a lot that's important to us that's going on. And so I encourage all of you to look through the schedule and see what sessions you might want to attend and then look for action items, opportunities to collaborate, etc., that you then report to us on the closing session. So thanks to you all for being here. And with that, I think I'll pass the microphone over to Leon Sanchez, our representative, I guess, waning representative to the ICANN Board. Leon, welcome.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you very much, Jonathan. I will take advantage of the interpretation services. I will speak in Spanish, so please get your headset up. I'll wait for you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK

No, I normally to make everyone do that.

LEON SANCHEZ

No, no problem. Well, first of all, I'd like to thank you for having this opportunity to be with you again. This is my second-to-the-last meeting as a member of the Board.

And I'd like to start by saying during this meeting, with a sad comment, a very sad comment, both for the Board and for our community, which is, unfortunately, the passing of Alan Barret, who was a pioneer of the Internet in Africa. Let's say he was one of the columns or pillars with regards to the Internet in the African continent. And obviously, he did a lot for the users, for the Internet users, by introducing the Internet in his region. Likewise, I'd like to also have a moment of silence in remembrance of Alan.

Very well. We will have a ceremony in remembrance of him. And for those of us who had the opportunity of collaborating with him and having friendships with him, maybe we could dedicate some words on his behalf and on behalf of his family during this week.

As you know, as we always do before the public meetings for ICANN, the Board has a meeting, or a work meeting, a workshop, so to speak, a three-day workshop, and this was not the exception. We had that. We started on Friday with different activities, and we practically had closed sessions where we were able to reflect on different topics that are currently in discussion by the Board. Some also were by CINFRA, and we also had a conversation with our CEO

and updated us with different topics and some progress that they've had in their work plan. We also reviewed the different recommendations or the pending recommendations that we still need to implement. For example, the Board approval of these.

And we also had some meetings to be able to review the resolutions that were approved yesterday. One of them has to do with the policy for transferring the domains, which we think is very important for the Internet users. We also had a discussion with regards to artificial intelligence within the ICANN context and how this can impact AI with the unique identifiers of the Internet. We also had a session to reflect on the cost and the economic impact that these new recommendations and these new policies can have when they're implemented in the future.

The discussion had to do with trying to achieve within the discussions that we have as a community include a cost exercise. That way that gives us an idea of what will be the implementation cost of these policies. And obviously this could probably be covered per organization or maybe we can find other financing alternatives. Nothing has been decided yet or put on the table. It was just an initial discussion to just present the topic. And maybe obviously we can start discussing it as a community.

We also had an information session with GAC. The chairs and some of their vice chairs were present and it was a meeting like any other meeting that we've had with CSOs, NICs in which they talk about how GAC works and how we develop their advice, the

communicate, how they're drafted, etc. So that's what we discussed with them as well. And they presented to us what they needed.

And yesterday we had our Board meeting and like I said we passed several resolutions. One of them, which I think is the most relevant, is the transferring policy or domain transferring policy. Obviously we're going to be participating in different sessions during the week and you'll see me with all of you participating with you in the sessions. And we also have an important topic that we'll discuss which is the working group of the Reviews of Reviews. Arias is one of the co-chairs of the group and we're going to have some public sessions. And I think it's very important that you join us with this because we are already at a certain stage where we already have a first preliminary report, and obviously it's very important that all of us as a community we can contribute to this so that we can shape this new review system that we want to implement in the future.

So having said that, Jonathan, I give you back the mic, and I'm obviously available for any questions you might have. I don't promise to have all the answers but yes, I would like to listen to all your questions and I will remain here for a few moments more and thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Leon. Gracias. Does anyone have a question for our Board member here? Things that went over. What do you think the

---

biggest challenges are that that we're facing getting going with the next round?

LEON SANCHEZ

Well, I think there's several challenges. I think at least at first the challenge that has to do with regards to communities that we have not been able to tend to that's pending that was considered in the last round and in this round I don't think that is going to be any different unfortunately. I don't know why in some regions where there hasn't been this type of penetration to be able to establish domain name registers or registrations we haven't been able to do that.

In Latin America, the engagement team has done work in trying to spread this new round of domain names and to try to make the community aware of this both for the users and for businesses so that that way they can have an interest in this new round. And likewise then they can enter their applications for these new domain names, but currently we don't know how the response will be.

Another challenge that we have that I think is important is to increase the support that we give to the applicants. For example, those that are of low funds, support this applicant support program. I think that currently generally we're on a good path but obviously we always want to offer more support.

---

Sometimes the support is not necessarily in a way that's requested. There's a lot of support that has to do more not necessarily in money, but in type and it all has to do also with the economic value. We have to look for new forms to be able to support these new applicants and also to try to do it in a way in which they ask for it. Not necessarily a support that we currently can give, but in what they need.

Those are the challenges, Jonathan, that we that I see that we have initially cover those underserved areas and also give greater support to the applicants that have a need for this type of support. Obviously there's other topics that have been put on the table like for example DNS abuse, also the understanding the different consumers, the different end users, also challenges that we have with regards to the problems with WHOIS, etc. They're not minor problems but they're still on the table to be discussed.

LAURA MARGOLIS

Good morning and thank you very much. I'm going to speak in Spanish this time. What's interesting in this ICANN meeting is that we don't see a staff team member that's dedicated to the support of the new round but only with email. This is just a comment that I'd like to give. It just caught my attention since we are in a new round. I'm surprised that we don't see these people here.

LEON SANCHEZ

Thank you, Laura.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you very much. I wanted to talk about the loss of Alan Barrett because Leon told us our friends from the NomCom are not here, but we also have to share the death of Arinola Akinyemi. I do think that we also need to remember them. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you, Sébastien. All right, I see no more hands in Zoom or at the table, so thank you, Léon, and you're free to stay or go as you need to.

Okay, so the next item on the agenda is talking a little bit about the sessions that we have coming up that we are, in fact, managing ourselves. The first one is about universal acceptance, and that's coming up, I don't know when it is, sorry, the timing of it, but it's today, right? At 14:45. And Hadia is moderating a discussion amongst a number of different players on the issues basically surrounding the politics of universal acceptance.

In other words, we've come a long way in terms of technological advancements, the updating of libraries and things like that to facilitate updating websites to accommodate both long domain names and internationalized domain names, but there's still a lot involved in terms of the politics. And so there's a discussion about whether ICANN's doing all it can do and what else needs to be done potentially by governments to facilitate a transition to a more

---

universally accepting Internet. So that's the purpose of that session.

Another session we're doing is on the topic of the next round and on objections and community involvement. And so I thought if I could put you on the spot, Hannah, maybe you tell us a little bit, rather than me summarizing it, why don't you tell us a little bit about your intentions there and why people should pay attention. There's a slide. You have a slide? Maybe just start riffing and then the slide will come up.

HANNAH FRANK

Thank you so much. Hannah Frank, for the record. As you say, Jonathan, Wednesday we have the session. Hadia will moderate the session too, or is she? And I would like to invite you all to join our session, the new gTLD 2026 round At-Large, comments and objection procedure. As you know, this new round of gTLD moves forward, and At-Large has an important role here to play in reviewing applications, identify concerns, and determine when comments or objections may be appropriate.

During this session, we will explain the procedures that have been developed by the ALAC and the At-Large community for comments, objections, and appeals. We will also hear updates here in this session from ICANN and the GAC, discuss community and limited public interest objections, and explore how the different RALOs can contribute to the review process.

In addition, we will introduce the At-Large gTLD application review group, the GAC. As you know, we have been deep-dying to the different RALOs during the last few months. This will help coordinate application review across our community, and we will launch a call for volunteers' interest in the participation in this work. This session is intended not only for those already involved in the next round, but also for anyone who is interested in understanding how At-Large can contribute to this important process and how they can get involved. So thank you so much. Hope to see you on Wednesday.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Hannah. Any questions for Hannah? So yeah, that's going to be a very important session, and I think we need to be rigorous in our evaluation of different applications. So that's going to be an important process coming up.

The third session, again being moderated by Hadia, is a session on the AFRALO work that's being done that has changed recently. It used to be that every meeting a letter was generated, correspondence was generated to the Board about African-specific issues and some recommendations for ICANN. And in this particular case, they went back over all the letters that have been sent, and 18 of them had to do with accountability and transparency. And so the NextGen participants have been engaged basically in going over those 18 letters to analyze them, see what

became of them, the responses from the Board, etc., and what still needs to be done.

So I think that could be an interesting session to see how this work has taken place over several years, what it's amounted to, and what the next steps would be from it. So that's, I think, well worth attending session as well. Finally, there's a EURALO session as well. Frédéric, do you want to talk a little bit about what's planned there?

FREDERIC TAES

Yes, Frédéric speaking. Thank you, Jonathan. So we have indeed a session with NextGen, and that's really important because it's a new generation. We need to onboard them to make really things concrete for them. And so it will be something interactive. We'll ask them their feedback about priorities, what the EURALO are doing, even in general, broader than only EURALO, and together with some people from the EURALO Board. We have Simone, Mohamed Atif, and Natalia Filina. So it's really a teamwork to onboard all NextGen.

And by the way, I will leave this meeting just a quarter before to meet the NextGen and to really welcome them, because we have so many sessions here at ICANN, and sometimes it's conflicting. You have the NextGen in one room, in one place, and we are talking about them in other places, other rooms. I know it's difficult because many things in parallel, but it's really to bridge the gap

---

between the communities, and that's really the key purpose.  
Thank you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Frédéric. So I think that's it for the At-Large sessions. I know you have a General Assembly as well, I guess, but that's closed.

FREDERIC TAES

Yes, Tuesday we have also General Assembly. We will also present a report on some survey we made with different ALSs about what's their interest in ICANN topics, what they would suggest as actions to do and things to improve, on top of also all usual stuff for General Assembly, like activity report, etc. This is this Tuesday. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Frédéric. Let me get back into Zoom to make sure there's nobody with their hand up there. Okay. And next we discuss the talking points, and for that I hand the microphone to Avri Doria.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Avri speaking. Can we have the --there's a slide deck that goes with this. And one of the things that I hope we can do as we're going through this is while I may give a very slight introduction to the issue itself, for each of those issues there are several of you that are focusing on them, that are working on them, that have the concerns up to date, prime in your minds, on the tips

of your tongues, and so I'm hoping that you all will speak far more than I will.

So, please, can we start. Go to the next slide. Okay. So, the topics on which we have At-Large message points. And first thing I'll say on this one, I don't think anything is missing, but I think there's probably the possibility that for some of you something might be missing. I don't know what it is, but at the end of it, if we didn't talk about it, say something.

Okay. So, the first thing is IDN and universal acceptance. That's already been mentioned, but we'll go back, come back to it. DNS abuse mitigation PDP1, a very current topic. New gTLD program, new round in applicant support. I mean, that's important, that's now. I think one of the things that's already important is start thinking about the next one. This one's on. This one, nothing's going to change. This one, you might be able to help along in your local, but by and large, the next one is where the work will actually be at the policy level. And that was just a personal aside.

Latin diacritics PDP, that's been interesting to watch. System for standardized access disclosure, supplemental recommendations. There's work going on there, and there are some people that are very knowledgeable on that one. Review of reviews, that one will probably end up with me or Jonathan doing a lot of the talking, but I'd also like to hear from those of you that have been paying attention to it and think the right thing is going on, the wrong thing is going on, have been paying attention to it, and can't make out

---

what's going on and are confused. Continuous improvement program community coordination group. That's an important activity. It's mentioned in review of reviews, but not being reviewed there. I hear me echoing.

And then there's the fiscal year 27 strategic priorities and operational planning. So, there are a lot of topics. Okay, UA, no, no, no, let's stick on the previous slide. It moved a little quicker than I was ready for, but this is what I'm ready for. So, we've been talking in ALAC, in our meetings, in letters, we've been talking about it. And as Jonathan said, it's sort of entering a different stage now. It's not a new topic. It's not something that people don't know of. More and more people know of it. UA days are held, the work. Somebody's got me playing in a microphone. It's very distracting to have to listen to myself. And we're even going to have an ALAC plenary on it.

We have many, many leaders of UA here. Would one of you like to sort of take this topic and give us a little bit more on why we should still care or why it's not a lost cause? We've been lurking on it forever. And have we really achieved it? And are we doing the right things to achieve it? Does anybody have a view on it? Yes, please, Satish. Thank you.

SATISH BABU

Thanks very much, Avri. Satish, for the record. Yeah. So, two points about the UA activities of ICANN. So far, ICANN had treated UA as a community project. They would fund it, but it was not an ICANN

---

program. But today, that has changed after the first decade, first 10 years of UA. Of course, progress is made, but ICANN wanted to steer it in a slightly different direction. So, after the first 10 years, 2015 to 2026, 2025, actually.

Late 2025, they put together a new group called the UA Expert Working Group. That group is now in charge of charting out the plan for the next five years until 2030. And the group has actually produced a draft guidelines, which was put out for public comments, and ALAC did respond to the public comments. The review is taking place now, and we expect that the revised guidelines will be available sometime later this year.

The second point I would like to mention is that the UA Day is this year, that concluded on 30th of May last month, was the fourth annual UA Day. And it has been the largest so far in terms of geographic spread, but more importantly, on account of institutional involvement by international agencies like UNESCO, which has actually given it a slightly different trajectory for the future. It is no longer a technical accomplishment to achieve UA compliance, but it's actually a step towards a multilingual internet, which is a much more broader topic, at least At-Large for us. So, that has been another change in the trajectory. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Any further comment, questions for Satish? Any other viewpoints on it? No? Okay. So, in which case, if there's nothing else to be said. So, we think it's still important to us. I see lots of

---

heads nodding. Yeah, Satish, I would expect your head to nod, but thank you. But for the rest of us, too, those of us that are, you know, the overwhelming silent majority on most of these things, it's good every once in a while to sort of look around and see that heads nod and such.

So, let's move to the next slide and the next topic, if no one has any, oh, I have to check hands here. No, no, no hands. Comments? No, no comments. Oh, Kathleen. Oh, Kathleen, I couldn't, excuse me, please.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

On DNSV.

AVRI DORIA

Oh, you're already. No, it was my fault. I started to move and then I came back a little. So, my apologies. Okay, moving on to DNS mitigation. And it is one of the topics of this meeting. It's got plenaries, it's got PDPs, it's DNS abuse mitigation is everywhere. And even a few people are worried about needing a mitigation for DNS abuse mitigation because we worry about what happens to people when DNS is being well mitigated. So, with that, and having snuck in my main concern about DNS mitigation, personally, I'm afraid of it. But Kathleen, please, you had your hand up. So, let me go to you.

---

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah, so, I can start, but we have lots of members of the PDP team in the room. So, please jump in after me. So, as Jonathan mentioned, we are in the full swing of things of PDP one. We have developed the straw person language to the first six substantive charter questions on associated domain checks. Some of the major issues that we have been speaking about and pushing for are coming up with language on what should trigger an ADC and using previous negotiations in the RAA as a framing mechanism to be able to come to a resolution on what a trigger and what an investigation for an associated domain check should look like.

We have also been pushing that in the course of that investigation, we're not creating new points of unnecessary data, but still pushing for using all of the relevant data that we can get to have the highest potential of mitigation for individual end users. So, we have presented a document to the At-Large community with the straw person language and the elements that we can live with and may want to change, but also things that we cannot live with.

As we go into these next few days, we will have four sessions on the PDP. And so, we've asked for input from the At-Large community that if there's something that the team in the room should be pushing for and that you really think is very important as it relates to associated domain checks, please let us know. We can use more feedback. We have our own thoughts about it, but we are there to represent the constituency and we would take all of the feedback on that. Oh, sorry. So, we will update you as those discussions happen here. Once we've come to resolution about those six

---

substantive questions, we will then move to questions of implementation. So, that's also coming down the pipeline soon, but let us know your thoughts and we will update you once those sessions have happened at the end. Thanks.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And this gives me a good opportunity to mention there's going to be so many meetings on DNS abuse mitigation. There are going to be many of you attending those. This goes back to something Jonathan said at the beginning of the meeting is reporting back what you've heard, reporting back issues that we may care about that perhaps you didn't hear mentioned. Does anybody else want to add anything to what Kathleen said or ask any questions or indicate any concerns? Yes, please.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Thank you. Claire Craig, for the record. Yeah, we do have a document that is being circulated right now, but importantly about that is that we really want to know whether this document captures anything that may impact end user interests. As you would expect when you're talking DNS abuse and the whole PDP, there are quite a number of persons who have other interests besides end user interests.

And so, it is important for us as the ALAC to have a voice, but we want to be able to not have our own personal opinions on this, but to hear from the At-Large community about what you would want

---

us to ensure that is included in that document. So, please take the opportunity to review it. We do have a deadline of today for this particular document, but the work is ongoing, so we would like you to continue to be engaged. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And we also, at our weekly Consolidated Policy Working Group meeting, touch on this topic probably each week, so there's always more opportunities to get involved in it. Anyone else have another question, another comment, something to add?

So, as I say, please be sure on this topic and others to come back, write a sentence, speak a sentence if you've picked up something that you haven't seen anybody else pick up yet. You know, you don't need to repeat what other people have said, but if you've picked up something or if you've come up with a thought that you haven't heard. Yes, Jonathan, raising a hand, not even a flag.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Since I was next to you, I didn't mean to cut you off, though.

AVRI DORIA

That's quite all right.

JONATHAN ZUCK

My question is for the members of the team, and have you identified areas in which there's friction? In other words, is everybody on the same page on the team? Because very often on

---

this type of a PDP, there's some friction between us and, say, the people that are going to have to implement the policies that are put in place. I know, for example, that some registrars say they already do this.

So is there going to be some kind of a litmus test or something like that for the folks in how this is enforced, etc.? Is there anything that requires more oomph, more discussion in terms of getting people over the hump of just coming from, you know, where you stand is reflective of where you sit, right? I'm curious if there's been friction.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

I can start with an answer, and anyone else can jump in. There's been lots of discussion about how varying business models of registrars will implement this policy differently. So whether that be different levels of access to information and what that looks like for an appropriate and reasonable investigation, as well as their obligations vis-a-vis third parties or resellers and how to maintain accountability for registrars given that they interact differently with third parties.

So I think those have been definitely areas where we're just trying to work through to make sure that the obligations remain consistent regardless of all of these differences. I also will say we are moving towards a further discussion on implementation of this policy. We've done 1 through 6. Now charter questions 7 through 9 speak to that. So there's more discussion to come on that.

---

Last thing I will say is there's also a few points in the document that we shared on areas that we like to see further policy work out of the GNSO. One of those that I think is of particular interest to the At-Large is a lack of standard dispute or recourse mechanism for registrants for mitigation actions taken in response to DNS abuse. This was identified as an issue both in this PDP but more broadly towards non-ADC identified instances of DNS abuse. So also trying to push for that. And that's definitely an area where there was some friction on whether that fell into scope of this PDP. But I know Steinar has his hand up, so I'll let him speak more.

AVRI DORIA

Steinar, please. This is Avri speaking. I've been reminded that we all have to self-introduce when we speak.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD

Yes, my name is Steinar. I'm also at this working group together with my colleagues Kathleen, Claire and Eunice. First of all, there is definitely true that there are different business models among the registrars and this is challenging in a way that how these registrars are doing DNS abuse amendment as of today. And there's also a fact that those registrars that are in this working group are among the good registrars, if you can say that kind of categorization.

The way I see it is that we're also trying to make a policy that forced the bad registrars to do something because there are bad registrars out in the space too. So we have to develop some mechanism that

gives the opportunity and the possibility for ICANN compliance to actually act on the bad registrars. This is one of the objectives, at least the way I see. We have a challenge also because not only business models among the registrars, but the different toolbox that the registrars are working with to do their DNS abuse mitigation and investigation.

And there are per today not something, there is not defined some sort of toolbox for the registrars by ICANN, by regulation. So if we had something that was kind of a fixed level, it will be more easy to build on that fixed level. But we don't have that today. I don't think we will ever have that today because it's a different way of approaching DNS abuse. There's different ways of investigating and also mitigation of DNS abuse.

Having all this said, I think the working group is productive. It is good. I think the At-Large members of this working group is also doing a nice job. You can treat us in the coffee break. That's our price of it. And we have a very, very tight timeline for this. What I'm curious to see when we put this and it goes into DNSO, how long will DNSO take for the implementation time of that?

So this is not something that is going to affect this year or next year, most likely, even though the wording may be clear. But at least it's a good start. And as Kathleen said, there are more to come on this one. And I think there is, we have to look at the right for the registrant and how to deal with when there is, when you have been

---

an offer for something that was maybe identified as false positive or something like that. But thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. And thank you for mentioning implementation. I think it's a word we'll hear very often on many, many subjects because all of a sudden, whether it's this PDP, another PDP, non-PDP work, implementation always seems to come up as one of the longer tails of any process we build.

Let's move on to the next one. I don't see any other hands up. And this is a topic we could talk about for the rest of the week. There's the second slide, which I probably should have slide, DNS abuse in two. I don't know. I think we've probably covered it. Or do we need to cover anything more on this one? No, I see head shaking. So thank you. Let's move on to the next one.

New gTLD 2026 round At-Large comments and objection procedures. And I think the process that's being put together now for comments and objection procedures is really important. We heard a little bit about it at the earlier. Hannah gave us an introductory view into it.

I wonder if there are any questions now. Hannah, is there anything more you wanted to say on it in terms of any of these issues? Important one there is the call for volunteers down at the bottom. So I think it's something that all of you that have an inkling of caring

would probably want to care about. And I see that Hannah moved her microphone. So maybe she wanted to say something.

HANNAH FRANK

Thank you so much, Avri Hannah Frank for the record. Yeah, I want to just add that we are going to have a form in order to apply for this group. And there will be if you want to submit. And the most important thing is that you come on Wednesday that we have people who is interest in this topic. I guess, as I said, again, I repeat, it's a unique opportunity for our community for the At-Large community to join.

I know there is a conflict of interest, of course. But if something we can see, if you are familiar with the applicant guidebook, with the At-Large procedure of the new round of gTLD, I invite you to all to join. If I can send you my email or Deb. Well, Deb is the co-chair of this group of the small team of ALAC objections. And if you are interested, you can come and talk to me. And I am open to answer questions or doubts or whatever. Thank you so much.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Generous offer. So please talk to Hannah. Anyone else have a comment or question at this point before I move on? It is important. We should talk about it often to make sure that many of you do go, many of us even.

Okay, next slide, please, then. Latin Diacritics PDP. This one took a long time to get going. Now is going. It unfortunately almost

---

always is at the same time as some of our other meetings where we would talk about it. But the members that have been representing us in that have been very good about making sure at least one of them was around to keep filling us in and to send in notes. And I see even before I ask, Satish is ready. So please, Satish.

SATISH BABU

Thanks very much, Avri. Satish, for the record. So we've been missing the CPWG calls, alternate because it clashes with the PDP. Now what's happening in the PDP right now? It had published its preliminary report of public comment, and we also had submitted a response to the public comment while evaluating the public comments from all the public comments received. The PDP got into a kind of loop on a very basic question as to what is actually a Latin diacritic. I mean, what's the definition of a Latin diacritic?

Now, while starting off the work year back, the PDP had made certain assumptions on what it is based on the kind of use cases that we got, including At-Large, of course, our Louise here. And we had used the Quebec example as one of the canonical cases which defined the diacritic. And the working group started from there and completed its work with 54 recommendations plus implementation guidelines.

But then what happened was that some of the more technically oriented members of the group came up and said, look, you have made some assumptions on what constitutes a diacritic. But

---

unfortunately, that expansion is actually much broader, in fact, if you look at it in a technical way.

So therefore, if you are making recommendations on a very narrow self-assumed definition, you may not be covering all the examples that may come up in the future. It is true that as of now, only we have this use case, which has come up. But in the future, others may come up with parallel use cases, which will be excluded if you go in this trajectory.

So it took us a long time to converge on. We were, of course, covering other responses also. But right now, we are very, very close to agreement on this. It is not yet fully closed. But hopefully, in this week's session, that is tomorrow, we'll be able to close this and then move on to the rest of it, which means basically closing all the public comments and moving on to the implementation stage. So that's where we are now. It took us a little longer than we thought, but I think we are over the hump now. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Avri, speaking yet again. Thank you, Satish. I'm glad to hear you're over the hump. Anybody wish to ask anything or make any other comment? And as I say, I do appreciate the effort you all make to bring us status to the CPWG, even though we happen to be scheduled in conflict. So very much appreciate that persistent effort that you all make. And with that, I'll move on to the next one.

---

Seeing no hands. It's SSAD supplemental recommendations.  
Excuse me? Claire? Sure.

CLAIRE CRAIG

So whatever is on the slide. Sorry, this is Claire Craig, for the record. I'm bringing apologies for Alan Greenberg, who's at the NomCom, so he can't be here, as well as Marie McCurchee, who is the alternate, because both Marie and Justin are currently at a meeting discussing this SSAD supplemental recommendations. So it's happening as we speak. So just wanted you to be aware of that. And please feel free to read what's on the slides. This is what is happening at the moment. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Does anybody else have any comments or questions that they'd like to pass on to those who aren't here because they're busy working on it already? And it'll be interesting to see what can be done, having lost or had the previous recommendations sort of turned down. What can they do with these? And I think I'll keep the rest of my views to myself. Does anybody have anything to say? No. So let's move on to the next one.

Review of reviews. This one I can't keep to myself. And very pleased to be one of the two liaisons nominees, what have you, from At-Large ALAC. And I'm going to probably rely on Jonathan to have comment more than me. But I just want to give the quick

status of where we're at on this. So at this meeting, we're basically discussing our draft report.

Now, you'll find that that draft report, while it fleshes out many of the main mechanisms, the reviews, the changes we're making, you know, there's an immense number of issues that I could get into on this one. My brain is way full of review of review issues. There are also some smaller points that we're still working out and we're working out.

Where we are in this process is we've now got a review draft that gives basically where we're going, that talks about the future reviews. They've passed through several of the several periods of questioning, several periods of comments, and are getting to the point where we think they're starting to stabilize. So if you see something stabilizing that you think is absolutely horrid, this is really the time to say something.

Because, you know, now there are lots of things where some of the details are still being discussed. For example, is the interval between two structural reviews 15 years, like we originally suggested, or seven years? And will we spend a year and a half on such or three years on something? And there's a lot of issues like that that are still pending, that are the issues that we're starting to close up now, that we will be talking about over the next period, etc.

So those are also, make sure that those questions get put in there. You know, I personally think, I see holistic review up there. Some

of these comments are sort of the very old comments from At-Large, ALAC, that I was fully behind and very much, but now we've accepted that we are doing a review of review. I can say that I believe that many of the essential points that were in holistic review, and were in ATRT3, are indeed reflected in some sense in what's coming out.

But if you who were, you know, very strongly behind ATRT3, and very much behind holistic, see something that's missing, see something that's not there, this is a good time to bring it up. Because we're getting to that point now, remembering at the end of the process, the reviews will come to the SOs and ACs, as well as to the Board for approval.

So one of the things that I always thought was the biggest deficiency we had in our reviews, and I actually thought if we had fixed that one thing, we may have been in a lot better shape and spent less time, is we never came back to the SOs and ACs and said, do you agree with what we've done? We just basically went from the committee straight to the Board. And we assumed that because the people that did it came from the SOs and ACs, everything would be fine. But they get into a groupthink, and they become something different. So that's in there now. I think that's important.

Jonathan, you've been sort of, as opposed to trying to make this happen, you've been certainly pushing a certain issue, the

---

implementation one, which I think is starting to get a little bit of currency. But I don't know if there's anything else you want to say.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah. It's been interesting participating in this review of reviews, certainly, because we had some feedback sessions in Dublin and where individual issues were brought up. Like one person brought up the idea of let's base this on our articles of incorporation or on the strategic plan. And so we now have a situation where we're basing it on documents, the accountability and transparency, what we're now calling the accountability review, but it's broader than that.

One person brought up this idea of scope. And so scope has become a very big part. Somebody else brought up a question of the makeup of the team. And so now the makeup of the team is an integral part of what we're doing. But I'm concerned that no real causal relationship has been made between any of those things and a deficiency of the reviews in question. In other words, these were like pre-forum assertions at a public assembly, and they're now incorporated in.

So we've solved a lot of problems that feel largely hypothetical. And the one that I keep raising is about implementation. And it's a powder keg, right? Because it involves org. It's not just the community. And how org prioritizes its work and some implementation of some reviews, how do they get prioritized by org? How does some new initiative by the new CEO get prioritized

over the recommendations of a review team, for example? What are those issues that lead to things being left undone? Because one thing that's been universally true, or nearly universally true, is that every review team has begun with a review of the implementation of the previous review team, and in almost every case has found that it has come up wanting.

And I can say, as having served as part of the CCT review many, many years ago, that there are, in fact, recommendations that we made that were accepted by the Board that now are not yet implemented without explanation. So in my mind, that's a failure of accountability, a factual one, a non-hypothetical, and yet there's nothing that we've done, at least to date. There's some recent work, and so there might be some overlap here, but so much of our focus has been on whether or not the review teams themselves have done their job properly without really demonstrating any example of them not having done their job properly.

And so we have examples of where org has not done their job properly and have, at this point at least, not yet addressed that, which I think might be the most fundamental of the accountability issues that we're dealing with. We've increased the influence of both the Board and org in the process. We've engaged them earlier on in the process so that not only do they have a filtering effect on what gets approved by the Board because of implementability costs, etc., and having the ear of the Board, but up front as part of the determination of the scope. So if we're not completely careful,

---

things that the Board or org don't want to see reviewed could be delayed or even neglected altogether if we're not careful.

So I guess those continue to be my concerns as we move forward through the process.

AVRI DORIA

Thanks. And while we have done some work, this is Avri speaking yet again, we have done some work to try and talk about implementation, we certainly haven't gotten to the point where we're specifically naming particular parts of the process that are responsible for that. Fortunately, now we don't have to worry so much about the Board having approved something because they've got mechanisms to unapprove things.

So we've got some improvement that the Board has actually approved something. No longer has the meaning that it used to. No longer has that power. But anyway, you said I have some people with hands up. Yes, I've got Olivier and Sébastien. So Olivier, please. And we're probably starting to crunch on time. Nobody's yelled at me yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK

It's a soft yelling.

---

AVRI DORIA

I can hear it in the back of my brain. So Olivier, please. You'll have to unmute yourself if we're going to hear you. But I have my thing in.

JONATHAN ZUCK

It's on our end. There we go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND

Yep. Okay, excellent. Now I can hear myself. This is even better. All right, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. Thank you for this, Avri, and I absolutely agree with Jonathan. But Avri, your level of sarcasm has reached new levels in regards to the Board unapproving things.

I have very similar concerns to Jonathan's concerns. I just wanted to add that the idea of having implementation review team and IRT seems like an interesting way for the community to keep the implementation in check and keep pushing it forward before we were just lobbing things over. And one of the problems was all of the review teams always ended up spending a considerable amount of time in reviewing the previous work because it still wasn't done. And sometimes it was not even the previous one. It was the previous to the previous one. So it was just unbelievable how far back we had to go and how much re-churning the same things we had to re-churn. So thank you for that.

---

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. Sébastien, please.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you very much. Thank you for all the work you have been doing. Thank you for the work that the group, the working group has done. I've spent the last three days reading very carefully the report that has been drafted.

First, I would like to say it's a pity that we have all of the meetings of our community today and that we only have time to discuss this internally at the end of this ICANN meeting. I think it's not very well organized. I would have preferred for us to have a discussion all together about what we're going to say. I'm going to say what I want to say, but anyway.

I think that the proposal that has been done is too complex, too complicated, too difficult to implement. There's too many points on which we are almost certain we won't agree on. And so some reviews will never be done because having the agreement of five SO/ACs, it will not work, and we know it. We see it in ALAC's proposal. There's no SO or AC that agrees with us. So two is difficult, five is impossible.

So I've started working on a counter-proposal, which is simpler, easier to implement, and easier to explain, but I'm not going to explain it right now because we don't have the time to do it. But I've sent it to our representatives, and now I don't know what to do

---

with it, but I believe you will advise me on what to do with this proposal.

And again, I would like to thank you for all the work you've been doing. I think we all need to think on it all together to decide what direction we want to take for the future because once again, and I insist on this, the proposal that has been submitted to us is way too complicated to implement and to follow for a group such as ours. Thank you very much.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Sébastien. So I guess you're saying we've at least failed at our requirement of keep it simple. So thank you for that. And apologies for not responding to an alternate suggestion that I don't quite know how to deal with, but thank you. And do I see no other hands on this? I am getting time pressure and there'll be a lot of chance to talk about review or reviews again.

Next. I have how many more slides do we have on this? We've got CIP. Oh, no, I'm not allowed to call it that. We've got the Continuous Improvement Program. Who wants to speak on that? I haven't the faintest idea what. Bukola. Oh, sorry. I see the hand up. Bukola, please.

BUKOLA ORONTI

Thank you very much. I hope you can hear me loud and clear.

---

AVRI DORIA

Yes, can hear you.

BUKOLA ORONTI

Thank you. This is Bukola Oronti. So just a quick backstory to this. A couple of weeks ago, the ALAC members were engaged in the CIP timeline between 2025 to 2030. That was during the OFBWG call, that is the Operation Finance and Budget Working Group call. And there the ALAC members were asked to from the previously identified activities that were identified by ALAC members as important and urgent and which were in tandem with the ALAC strategic priorities. So the members were requested to identify some of these activities that they will be interested in shepherding. And some of the activities were identified and a couple of ALAC members also volunteered to shepherd these activities.

So during the OFBWG session on Thursday morning, these shepherds will give an update on the scope of the activities, how it will go, the details and of course the timeline that they thought would be best with this task. So this progress will be after Thursday meeting during OFBWG calls. They'll be giving updates on the progress and the work done so far. And of course, the final presentation will be made to the ALAC on the way forward on this identified activity. So this is just a summary of what will be happening on Thursday and what is to be expected in the coming weeks. So thank you very much. I give it back to you.

---

AVRI DORIA

Thank you, Bukola. Thank you, Claire. Any quick comments on it? We are running out of time, but no, in which case I will, with very little time left, pass the floor off to Claire because the next topic, the FY27 strategic priorities is hers. And I'm sure she could use all the time I just wasted on all the other topics.

CLAIRE CRAIG

Hi, everyone. I am Claire Craig, for the record. Just to make a quick comment on what Bukola just said, at the OFB meeting, we will continue our call for volunteers to work with the Shepherds because we have not gotten sufficient people on some of these activities. So please remember to volunteer to assist in these activities.

Working on the FY27 strategic priorities, we would have gone through these priorities. And what we need to determine is whether we, sorry, we would have gone through the FY26 priorities. And what we need to determine is whether we need to revisit them and revise them as we move into FY27, which begins on July 1st and runs until June 30th.

So at the OFB meeting on Thursday morning, we will be revisiting those FY26 strategic priorities, as well as reviewing the outcomes and some of the work that would have taken place over the last year. And we would be inviting your input to adjust if there are any adjustments that are needed. But I am going to ask of you a simple exercise. I'm going to give you some homework.

---

That presentation is already available on the agenda. And I would like to ask you if you could please review that presentation prior to Thursday's meeting. We're going to be asking you to do a poll, and so that most of the time can be spent on discussing how we move forward, rather than people still looking back at what we would have done. So we would have the opportunity to look at what we would have done, but we really want to spend some more time moving forward on Thursday, if that's okay with everyone here.

So thank you very much for that. OFB would be the three last topics that we spoke about, which would be the review of reviews, the continuous improvement activities, as well as the FY27 strategic priorities. And we're looking forward to seeing you all at that meeting on Thursday morning. Thank you so much.

AVRI DORIA

And with that, I think we have finished this, and I pass it on to you. Apologies for spending too much time on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK

It's very important stuff, so no apology necessary. I mean, we do need to reserve more time to talk about these things. But we do luckily talk about a lot of these talking points on the CPWG and OFB working group calls. So hopefully not too much of this was totally new or extraordinary for you.

Two things that were left for me to talk about. One was our petition to reject the new bylaw amendment that we filed on the 1st. The

rest of the community had seven days to support us and has not done so. We've received an informal notice from both the GNSO and the ccNSO about their unwillingness to support us. There's definitely been discussion that's been inspired by this. So it could be argued that that was what we had the most to hope for, was that people are at least talking about some of the issues that we were raising and the timeline slipping, etc. So those conversations certainly happened, but it wasn't enough.

And another conversation that will come out of this that came up in the SO/AC chairs meeting is changing some of the timelines associated with this. Giving the respondents only seven days, especially somebody like the GNSO, to get together and come up with a response to this is just ridiculous, unfortunately. And so changing some of the timelines that were established during the transition is one of the things that will come out of this. Did you have something on this topic?

AVRI DORIA

Yes, just a quick comment and sort of say that I kind of understand their unwillingness because it really does fit into our whole character as we're moving forward of changing our minds, of making it easier to delay things. So within a philosophy of changing previous decisions and how do we make it easier to delay this motion basically puts in a formal manner by which we can delay things. So I think it's very much in keeping with the direction that

---

ICANN is taking. So I understand why it is difficult for the GNSO and ccNSO to go against that particular direction. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Okay. Thank you, Avri. And so that's the state of that. The other thing I wanted to mention briefly because we're finally coming up, but because the pandemic was delayed, is Atlas. So we're going to have an Atlas. And so as we need to begin the formation of some planning committees, etc., we're going to have 50 travel slots on top of the normal 29 travel slots that we have in an ICANN meeting. So we're going to need to come up with some objective criteria for who to invite. So we have a great deal of work ahead of us.

We've started a document in the At-Large leadership team about a possible structure for some of the things we might want to cover, which is really about the At-Large loop and the relationship between all the members of the community, the ALAC and the RALOs, and working together and with focus on universal acceptance and on DNS abuse as substantive issues for conversation. So that's going on. There will be a call for participation in various planning committees.

So I encourage you to sign up for one or two of them. Somebody's already signed up for three of them. That's probably too many. Maybe one or two is enough, but get engaged, and we'll start building toward an Atlas coming up in Lisbon. I will no longer be the chair at that point, but I'll definitely make every effort to make the meeting. So let's get on top of the planning. And I don't have

too much more to say about that. More to come in your inbox, so keep an eye open for it.

Okay. I think we are at 11:14. We are given no extra time. So I want to thank you all for getting us started here at ICANN86. Please check out sessions of interest. Look for action items, discussion items to bring back that we should discuss or have special sessions on or intersessionals. And with that -- oh, does Gisela have things she wants to cover? Oh, sorry. Let me give the microphone to Gisela for housekeeping. Gisela, go ahead.

GISELLA GRUBER

Thank you very much, Jonathan, and I hope you can all hear me loud and clear. Welcome to the ICANN86 Policy Forum here in Seville, and I'm very sorry not to be with you in Seville for those attending in person. And also a warm welcome to those attending remotely.

Just a minute, please. All our At-Large sessions will be held in this room where you are. We have interpretation in English, French and Spanish. So please, at the start of each time you take the floor, please state your names so that the interpreters can identify you. Even though they see you, they don't know who you are. And also speak at a reasonable pace for accurate interpretation.

For the At-Large schedule, I send out daily reminders to the ALAC announce list with the details of not only our sessions, but also the main sessions. Zoom rooms are only posted 24 hours prior to the

sessions. So please keep an eye on the main schedule. Also, very important, attendance is taken at the start of the session. So if you're not able to make a session, please send staff an email with your apology. This will be noted accordingly. And also very important for those in the meeting room there, please log in to Zoom. Even if you're not actively using it, it does help us to know that you are logged into the Zoom room.

And tent cards, these have been handed out. And if you do not have them, they will be available on the black back table. However, as you can see, we are short staffed on site. So please keep your tent cards with you throughout the week. Staff are not responsible for keeping them. Put them in your bag and please bring them back with you.

Now, on a more practical note, you hear on in FIBES 2, level 3, next to the GNSO and the ccNSO. The GAC and the main community room, Babylon 3A, are in FIBES 1. So please allow enough time from going from one section to the next. And be mindful that we do start sessions on time. So please be on time. And I know I'm a minute over time. Just one more minute, please. Coffee breaks are on level 2, one floor down. Again, this always makes it tricky to be back on time. But please do be respectful for the times. Medical Centre is on level 2. For lunch, food can be bought on level 1 in the catering hall. Hotel shuttles, all aware that it's posted on the main website and they leave from level 2.

And a reminder that every evening there is a networking reception from 6 to 7 p.m. And these will be on level 1 in the catering hall. Today is the opening network reception. And then tomorrow we will be recognizing the working group chairs. With that, wishing you a successful ICANN86. Enjoy the coffee break and the meeting is adjourned. Thank you to our interpreters, to our staff in the room, to Natalie for helping out. And have a great ICANN86. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**