
ICANN86 Seville | PF – At-Large Leadership Wrap Up
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 CEST

GISELLA GRUBER

Hello, and wishing everyone a warm welcome to the At-Large Leadership Wrap-Up session. My name is Gisella Gruber, and I am 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 ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session includes 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 a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak in if speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to you, Jonathan Zuck, At-Large Chair. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Gisella, and thanks to all of you for coming to the At-Large Leadership Wrap-Up session. I'd like to start, as we often do, by making sure that everyone has unwrapped their headphones,

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.

plugged it into the remote, chosen the language that they wish to speak, so that when somebody wants to speak a language other than English, there's not a delay associated with that. I'll also mention that, at least to date, AI tools are not allowed into Zoom, and they will be booted out. The good news is there's already a transcript being generated of the session, and you can easily feed that transcript into a summary tool or a note-taking tool or something like that and get the same results you'll get from an integrated tool. So, all is not lost.

So, what we're going to try and do here is get people's reactions to the meetings in which they attended, action items that have cropped up, things that we should look into, things we should discuss, things that we should address, people we should correspond with, work with, et cetera, as we go through. And so, this is a meeting that always runs out of time. It's not a time to get involved in deep debates about things. The answer may be we need to have a deep debate about something, and we'll schedule that, right? And so let's keep it at that level and say that this is something we need to have more of a discussion about, and then make sure that we do that. So, with that in mind, I'll go to the liaisons. Again, just looking for things that happened in the group that you're monitoring that you think that we need to take note of or take some action on. So with that, I will start with Greg on the GNSO. He's our GNSO liaison elect.

GREG SHATAN

Thank you. It's Greg Shatan, for the record, and I was honored to be introduced yesterday at the GNSO Council meeting, which took place yesterday afternoon. It was a rather short agenda. I hear somebody's sound is on over there. Over there. Okay. And the council had three motions in front of it. Two were to honor the memories of Alan Barrett and Arinola Akinyemi. Sorry. Arinola Akinnemi and Alan Barrett were honored due to their recent passing. In addition, the council considered a motion to refer an issue to the SPIRT regarding the referral of an RSP issue, a registry service provider issue, a rather technical issue having a disconnect between different standards for Extensible Provisioning Protocol extensions. The SPIRT, as it's set up, cannot take up issues on its own accord. It needs to have a reference to it. So, the registries were required to go to the council to seek a reference to SPIRT for the SPIRT to resolve the issue. And that was supported and passed without objection.

The remainder of the council meeting was spent discussing a non-voting matter, which was the preparation of a prioritization and work management tool, particularly one that would allow the council to better identify the different priorities of different issues before the council and as part of the GNSO PDP process. No decisions were made, but they are moving toward either a test or a pilot of a system that would allow council members to provide input in a way that can be recorded and then analyzed through metrics, Jonathan's favorite thing. So that was the sum total of the meeting of the GNSO Council.

JONATHAN ZUCK Any action items from it?

GREG SHATAN There are no action items for us at this time. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK Thanks, Greg. Laura? Oh, she's in the ccNSO wrap-up, right? So what other liaisons do we have present? Is SSAC having their wrap-up as well? This could be a thin part of the... Let's see, who else? What other liaisons do we have? They're not listed. Not as long as I'm on the list.

UNKNOWN Joanna.

JONATHAN ZUCK Joanna, yeah. She's probably with the GAC still.

UNKNOWN No, the GAC ended, but I think she left early.

JONATHAN ZUCK Oh, I see. All right. Have to talk to her about that. All right. Let's get to the working group reports then. So on to the CPWG with Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Avri Doria.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND

Thank you very much. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I don't know, Avri, did you want to go first, or how do we do this? We haven't actually coordinated in any way. We obviously had our session earlier this week that went through each one of the working groups of the CPWG and had some updates. But I think I can probably hand the floor over to Avri with regards to the statement that is currently being put together, and I saw that there was some feedback in regards to some parts that needed to be added by Satish Babu on the statement that's going to land on your desk, I guess, on the ALAC's desk today, I think is the day.

AVRI DORIA

Hi. Avri speaking. I think this was a handoff to me. Yes, that statement was worked on quite diligently by the folks that had said they'd work on it, and they've got a completed statement, so that statement will be coming to you. It's on the additional reference label generation rules, et cetera. So, the whole discussion we had, is it just a statement? Is it something we want to... So the outstanding action, and kind of becomes yours, is if you want to make this advice, then you as ALAC need to do whatever ALAC magic makes it advice. But the CPWG part is pretty much done.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, that's excellent. I guess if we want Olivier to later be able to refer to it as advice, we should make it advice in the first place.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND Absolutely, with a capital A.

AVRI DORIA At the moment, it's not advice, it's just a comment.

JONATHAN ZUCK That's right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND Look at the big A that I've got here.

JONATHAN ZUCK Yep. Anything else from CPWG?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND Yeah. Thanks, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Just to add, and you can see it on the agenda here, there was, of course, the DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP1 that was taking place. We had a very good explanation from Steinar Grøtterød and Kathleen Scoggin on this. I don't know whether there's anything that has happened since that session, and I can see Kathleen has put her hand up. There probably is an update on that. So over to you, Kathleen Scoggin.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Hi. Kathleen Scoggin. The only thing of note from session 404 of the PDP was a proposal by the IPC and a slight conflict, if you will, between the IPC and the registrars that fell in the "can't live with" category, around the use of reasonably available data and where that sits, whether that should sit in the official policy language or whether that should sit in implementation guidance. So that's being sorted out now. For the moment, At-Large doesn't have a super strong opinion on where this lies because ultimately, the standard still remains on a reasonable and proportionate associated domain check. And so where this definition lives, don't have a strong opinion about it now, but if others do, we would appreciate any sort of feedback there. I will also reiterate our call for feedback on the scoped human rights impact assessment that has been circulated to the CPWG mailing list following that session. Was that just yesterday? Maybe yesterday. But recently, and we would really enjoy feedback on that as well. I think it's moving in a very positive direction, and I think we've got a lot of what we want. We also got a lot of clarity in the session on the differences between policy language and implementation guidance. So that was helpful to continue to advance some of the things we care about. So yeah, request for feedback on those two things would be great. Our next meeting is not this coming Monday, but the Monday after, and that's when we're going to be talking about the human rights impact assessment. So we said that in the email. There's a deadline. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND Thank you very much for this, Kathleen. Very helpful. It's Olivier speaking. So that was one...

JONATHAN ZUCK Can I ask Kathleen a question? Olivier, do you mind if I ask Kathleen?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND Yes, sure. Yeah. Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK Yeah, I just wanted to ask Kathleen a quick question, which is, during our open house, we received a presentation from Interisle about higher than expected percentages of malicious registrations in the 2025 year, and then there was also some conjecture about how this might help with the associated domain name check work that you're doing, and I'm wondering if any of this came up in your meetings, if it's helpful, if there's anything else that we should be doing to follow up on that. I almost feel like we need more time with that study to understand it better. But I didn't know if it had come up in the context of the PDP.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Yeah. The specific study has not come up, and I'm not super familiar with it. But if there are more things out of that conversation and takeaways from that that you think are applicable, happy to bring them up, especially as we work through the more specific implementation guidance and rationale. That doesn't necessarily go towards the implementation of the policy but is important to understand the current context and maybe why that's shaping the decisions that we're making in the PDP. But yeah, I'm not super familiar. It didn't come up specifically. If there's more I should do in bringing it up, let me know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND

Thanks very much for this, Kathleen. Thanks for the question, Jonathan. The other one was the SSAD SRT. I know that Alan was around earlier. I'm not seeing him on there, but Murray McKercher is here in case Alan isn't in the room.

AVRI DORIA

This is Avri. If I can add, that was pretty much a report on what's going on at the beginning of a thing. I'm not sure that there's anything in it that ALAC needed to deal with at this point in time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND

Okay. Thanks for this, Avri. So Olivier is speaking. All right. It's just in case there are some, of course, things that have happened since we last met. But fine. That's it, I think, for this page. We need to go

to the next page in the agenda, please. And I think that these would then mean it's, here we go, the OFBWG. I was going to give the floor to Avri, if there's anything else on the implementation recommendation teams and in policy as well, in the policy pipeline that needs to be added.

AVRI DORIA

Thank you so much, Olivier. No, nothing to add.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right, great. Thanks you two, and thanks for all your work in co-chairing the CPWG. It's a big task, and a lot of discussions funnel through that group. Similarly, the OFB Working Group, Claire and Bukola, who wants to go first, if there's anything from that session that we want to report out to the ALAC, to the leadership?

BUKOLA ORONTI

Okay. This is Bukola Oronti. Am I audible?

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yes, you are.

BUKOLA ORONTI

Okay. Thank you. So, during the OFB session, we had updates from the ALAC CIP shepherds, which were working on different activities as identified from the ALAC. And so, they gave the different updates, and we expect more in the coming weeks during the

OFBWG calls. And also, we had an update on the ALAC strategic priorities for FY26. And then, we went through the different activities, and what came out from that was actually the fact that we need to measure the activities, if they achieve the desired outcome and the impact on the At-Large community. And of course, we'll look into that, and during the coming weeks, during OFB calls, there will be updates on that. And also, we got an update from the RoR team, and I think that's all with regards to the OFB call for this ICANN86 meeting. But also, myself and Claire want to say thank you to everyone for attending our different calls, the OFB calls, and also for volunteering in all the different groups and activities that were necessary in the OFB call. Want to say thank you to everyone, and on to the next meeting. That's all from my end. I don't know if Claire has one or two things to add.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Well, thank you, Bukola, and thank you and Claire for your work, for your ongoing work on the OFB Working Group. We appreciate it. RALO highlights. We're going to let Frederic talk even though he's not brought more chocolate for us.

FREDERIC TAES

No, no more chocolates. I had two boxes, and those are empty, sorry. Ah, okay, we have Avri there. That's really community spirit. Thank you, Avri. Okay. So Frederic speaking. Yeah, it was really a short week but highly intense, with many things going together. Just to highlight some points not highlighted already. So we had

notably also the new gTLD and the new round application support program and how to organize the applicants review group, so the GAC, with filing comments and objections. There was much more focus also on internationalized domain names, and we had good discussions about that, and really also to segregate the content sides from the infrastructure. But we need to have universal acceptance everywhere to be able to have really multilingual content on the Internet. So thank you afterwards for me, if they are left.

So, yeah, universal acceptance also with support of UNESCO notably, who highlighted a presentation, but also the NextGen. And really a main focus, and we are lucky for Europe, we had 15 here on NextGen, sometimes coming from different continents but being in Europe to study and having made presentations. I really encourage you to watch their presentations. They were really top ones about artificial intelligence, privacy, DNS abuse, many different topics. Really interesting to onboard those new NextGen. And this something to follow up during not only Seville, but afterwards. So we are planning to organize different webinars and round tables afterwards. For Latin America, it was much more difficult because they didn't have events in NextGen for more than three years now. So that was a point also raised from there, to have new generations coming.

What to say next? Yeah, also to apply, we have also the phishing campaigns with ACES, different things really. We are working on the rollout with different teams for different regions to really make the

rollout of this phishing awareness. So many different projects. We have also addressed some more stricter problems and changes. Some of them, we have ALSes we are not in good relationship with. They are not active enough, or we don't know. Sometimes they are dying. And it's really how to keep an active community. And that's really something important. And to have the good balance between the individual members and ALSes, that we are all together representing the entire community. For this in Europe, we made a survey, which results also were shared with the different RALOs, and there are interests in some really topics here addressed during this Policy Forum and some others less policy development and more, how to say that, implementation. And so there was a question raised by Lance. Lance broke his arm here during the event and was, however, heavily involved, really great for him. He had to leave today. But he came with a good point: how to move the technical community to be involved in policy development. And one of the keys is really to onboard the new generation. You can be an actor when you join At-Large, and we have ALAC for policy development. You can become really an actor on the development and not just a consumer of standards existing. And yeah. And we have really good signs from the next generation on that. I see that's the next topic also, fellowship and NextGen highlights. And then I propose, yeah, there are other topics and review of reviews, et cetera. You name them. And maybe some people in the room I know. No, Greg, nothing to add? No. Okay. Do

we have something to add from Africa, from another continent, from Latin America? No, nothing to add?

Okay. So those were some highlights. Also another one, and it was good to have the support from Claire also outside. This was the support in terms of tools. We have Confluence as tools, and we have mailing lists, and currently it's not enough support to really manage projects with people, with teams, to have good collaboration tools. We don't have this. We miss this. That was a key message from the RALO. We miss also having good contact management tools with all our ALSes, candidates and leads to join the community. And I have understood that for the workflow, it's even broader than At-Large, the issues raised. It was raised already in the past by other constituencies. And we have a follow-up action point also with ICANN to find global solutions for that. So yeah, that was it. And for the rest, it's alignment with the strategic plan and everything, just, how to say, the day-to-day, I would say. Nothing special to add.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you very much, Frederic. Any questions, Frederic? All right. Fellowship, NextGen highlights. Raymond. Raymond here?

RAYMOND MAMATTAH

Raymond's here.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, there he is. Go ahead.

RAYMOND MAMATTAH

Hi, Raymond here. For the fellowship report, to start with, we had only six out of the eight assigned fellows who could participate, mainly because of the visa issues. And personally, I also nearly missed it because I got my visa on Friday and traveled on Saturday. With our engagement, unlike the previous mentoring processes where we met every week, this one we met every other week because the fellows are returning fellows who are already more experienced in the ecosystem. So the mentoring process was a more relaxed one compared to the previous ones. And our engagements prior to arrival were mainly on the topics that they were compulsory to take, and also discussions around the logistics. The logistics were really a problem, which put a lot of the engagement off because, for instance, Songo had to spend several number of days before getting his visa, so that took a lot of attention from the main engagement that was needed.

And whilst preparing for this report, I always engaged with them to find out what is their concern that I should bring whilst presenting my report here. And two things stood out. One is more visa assistance should be provided, especially to the African participants, since we are the ones that have issues when it comes to getting visas. And the second concern is how they will engage in the ecosystem. Though some of them are returning fellows, they still don't know the various ways that they can engage. So I would

suggest once more for us to have a section on various ways that people can engage when it comes to the At-Large ecosystem through the various RALOs and any other working groups that are available. So that would be my suggestion for further activities after this program. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Raymond. Presumably, we'll follow up with a call with them in the not-too-distant future as well, right? Excellent. Alfredo.

ALFREDO CALDERON

Okay. My report basically highlights that this is the shortest meeting of the four, so the onboarding process when there's a Policy Forum is a little bit different. And it's different because they actually have to have some webinars or seminars or whatever you want to call them, previous to the ICANN meeting. It makes it a little bit difficult for them because most of the NextGeners are working on their master's or PhD degrees, and the sessions were carried out during a timeframe that was difficult for them to participate in the live session. So what they actually did was watch the recordings. In my particular case, as a NextGen mentor, the process we followed was to meet every Saturday for at least one hour and discuss different topics. I was also invited as a guest speaker for one of the groups of the fellowship program so that they could understand the pathway to get more engaged in ICANN.

The other thing that I want to mention from the NextGen point of view is that we need more presence of the At-Large community in their presentation session for each day. I would like to see more people there. I know it conflicts with other sessions that are important for you guys. But the interesting thing of the presentations is that they bring research topics that we need to look into because they impact the emerging technologies like AI, quantum computing, and even John Crain made an approach to one of the NextGeners because they approached one of the issues that we have. The title of the topic was DNS resiliency, and I invite you all to watch that session because it has a lot of important information and an approach that John Crain is very interested in doing internal research with his staff. The other thing is that we decided since, I think it was Prague, to have a session with the Board, a lunch with the Board, and it's been very productive because now the NextGeners have the opportunity in a more relaxed scenario to speak with them, and the Board members that participate also have the opportunity to ask each one of them questions regarding why they are involved in the Internet ecosystem. Interesting enough, some of them knew about ICANN. Others found out about ICANN doing a Google search and their interest in participating in some kind of Internet governance organization where they could have the opportunity to travel.

The other point, and final point I want to make, to engage this group or all the groups in the NextGen program, we have a huge issue. They're finishing their studies, and their priority is getting a

job, not participating in ICANN the way we are doing. The fact that we have the follow-up with them is very good from the CIP activities that have been included in the strategic plan. And we also started with the help of Glenn. Glenn, you're right there, right? We started an initiative where we are inviting people from the community like Steve Crocker to have sort of an additional session with the fellows, and we're going to do it also with the NextGeners so that they can try and keep more involved with what's happening in ICANN. That's basically my report. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

It makes me think we should put together a list of jobs that coexist with ICANN and publish that for them. Go for these jobs because these you've learned a little bit about Internet governance. There's government jobs, there's university jobs, there's all kinds of jobs that have application to the work that we do that would allow them to come back potentially. And if maybe we helped identify those jobs. Nothing beyond listing them, but I don't know, it just occurred to me as you were talking.

ALFREDO CALDERON

Sure. If I may add, we actually had a session where we invited Ulrich, and John was also available to talk about opportunities to find jobs within the Internet governance ecosystem. And that was very well received by the fellows and the NextGeners as well, which was the main idea of the session. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right, excellent. We'll definitely follow up. The next part is session reports. We don't do formal session reports anymore, but this is where I want to open it up to everyone in terms of the sessions that you've attended and anything that was a curiosity that you think we should know about, an action that we should take, something we should learn more about. I'll start by saying we had a productive meeting with the SSAC, but they are very interested in us doing more intersessionally, and we've talked about it, but haven't really pulled the trigger on it. I think we need to do that to really understand what work they've done that we might help evangelize, what work they've done that might translate into policy that we should try to advocate for inside of ICANN, and what kinds of things might help as information for end users. So, one action item is to reconnect with them intersessionally and sooner rather than later to begin to compile a list of things they're working on that have application to end users or to ICANN processes that we may want to influence. So that was something certainly that I took from that meeting. I'm curious to have everyone who witnessed something else or something came up that they think that we should be aware of to raise their hand, and I would like to hear from you. I see some hands going up on the Zoom, so I'll start with Judith Hellerstein.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN

Yes. This is Judith Hellerstein for the record. So I attended the GAC meeting with the Board, and what was an interesting talk about the application support when several of the GAC members had asked, that was a question one of them, they opposed it because they had the GAC advice about increasing the amount of support that was given. And then Tripti hemmed and hawed and said, "Oh, well, in the comments that we got from the public comments," and named ALAC, Michael Palage, and the RySG, indicating that we were against giving the extra money, when it was really only the registrars who were against it, but that we mentioned a process issue. And so she lumped everything into one, and I know it got a lot of the GAC members upset, and also Michael Palage, because none of us had voted. It seemed to indicate, by her comments, that our comments in the public comments said that we're not for the increase in the application support when it didn't say that. So I think that's something that we may want to respond to. But thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Judith. We did receive a letter very recently from her to that same effect, and basically the issue we brought up is whether or not we should be continuing to go after using the auction proceeds as the source of funds and pillaging that resource when funds come up. And that's what we showed opposition to. So we'll probably have some correspondence back with her about that to clarify that, because we certainly were in favor of making sure that all of the applicants were able to get the 85% discount. There was no question among our group on that. All right, so that's another

action item, is a response to Tripti to clarify our position on that. And Kathleen.

KATHLEEN SCOGGIN

Hi. I have both an ask and a suggestion more broadly. So I guess my first ask is we had very low participation on the straw person language of the recommendations for the PDP, and this is something that we've been pushing for, for a long time, saying that we have lots of alignment with many other constituencies, and it's something that strongly impacts end users, et cetera. And so my ask is really that this is a very important process and will also determine, and how we contribute to this process will determine some of which will happen in the next PDPs as well. This is the first of several on DNS abuse, and we really need community input. Otherwise, it's the team deciding what our position is and whether we agree or don't agree with the proposals that are being put forward. So my ask, I guess, is for more input there, and my suggestion is that we make sure that before we start up a bunch of new things that are also important, there's so many important issues, but specifically around DNS abuse or related areas, that we make sure that we have the bandwidth to do so and to do it properly. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, so we'll take as an action item to-- I don't think individuals are going to respond to your suggestion. So I think we'll take it as an action item to schedule discussion about it and make sure that

we get the feedback in an organized way, I think. I've got-- I think you were next.

SETONDJI

Yeah, maybe.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, okay. Yeah, I can't tell from the cards because I'm supposed to be using Zoom, but go ahead.

SETONDJI

Okay. Setondji speaking. I'm AFRALO secretary. Thank you. Now, of course, I took part in several sessions, but I just wanted to draw your attention to two sessions I've attended. The first one was the AFRALO African session that we organized, and first and foremost, I would like to thank everybody within AFRALO who took part in this session. Thank you, and thank you in advance also for your support. You've understood that for years now, AFRALO has been drafting statements at each ICANN session meeting with several Board members, and right now we are currently rejigging this way of doing things. And the first thing that we did is that we created a think tank, a working group, and we said that we would pick a topic and give Africa's opinion on that topic. Over the years, we made 18 statements on the same topic, and we realized that sometimes we did not have any response or any reaction, or there was no impact on Africa. So, thank you for the work done and for the people who have done this work, and we will keep doing this. The next session

was the Africa Space session, which aimed at informing the community of what is done for Africa. Of course, a lot is being done, and I would like to thank ICANN for this, because ICANN does not do everything, but they do a lot for Africa. So thank you very much. And that's it for me.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks a lot. And I think the new think tank process is a good one. And I guess the question is, what happens to that document that got created? It's about a 30-page document that I read that was some recommendations drawn from 18 correspondences, about accountability and transparency, and that's certainly very timely. So we should probably take that up on the OFB and see if something comes out of that in terms of recommendations we want to make formally as the At-Large or through the ALAC. So I guess I would take that as an action item as well, is to take up looking formally at the recommendation portion of what came out of the AFRALO think tank. Thank you. Frederic.

FREDERIC TAES

Thank you, Jonathan. Yeah, one of the meetings was the ALAC open house. It's, I think, very interesting. We had a presentation from RIPE NCC about the open trust architecture, and this was really interesting. And from our survey, the trust on Internet is really the hot topic, the first one coming as a request from our ALSes. This is more a note. We had two other ones, from Humberto Carrasco's presentation on assistance on domain name holders, also

individuals in the UDRP process. And if you are just an individual user or just an individual having a domain name, even the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy is really complex and trust me to come with clinic. And he comes really in support for all RALOs, even if it's in Latin America, to have the engagement also of the RALO in this process. And in the margin of this, I have discussed also with Justine Chew, who initiated a joint webinar we made recently between APRALO and EURALO about trusted notifiers. And also we can have really the ALSes and individual members that can join this initiative of the trusted notifier network to say, "Okay, this domain name here, for example, is bad for this and this reason." But we need to also engage the community ALSes and individual members from ICANN to be part of this process as trusted notifiers, or at least joining this process much faster. That was, I think, good idea also to follow up. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Perhaps turn it into a succinct action item that we should take note of.

FREDERIC TAES

Yeah. So the action item, I think, is with the people organizing this in the webinar, so with Steinar, with all the team, with the Trusted Notifier Network, to see what would be the criteria for the ALSes and for the individuals, and if we match this criteria, to open it and to allow the community to have, how to say that, more influence in

blocking some bad domain names. So I think those are the two phases and next step.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Okay. Thank you, Frederic. Sebastian. Oh, okay. Eunice?

EUNICE PÉREZ COELLO

Thank you. Want to speak in Spanish? Well, I'd like to make the comment that I had the opportunity to assist or participate in several sessions that had to do with DNS abuse. And something that I'd like to suggest is that this is one of the first PDPs that's related to DNS abuse. And with regards to that, if we can include in our meetings other working groups. For example, today, in that session, we had the registry working group with SSAC, where they expressed their points of view and how they operate, and I think this is important not only with this group, like, for example, NCSG and others. I think this aspect is important because that way we can identify or find out why they're giving weight to something, or why they're discussing something when we're talking about this policy development and the statements that give the rationale as to why, and for us to be able to defend our point of view as final or end users. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

So let me now ask you, if you have to boil that down to an action item, what are you suggesting that we do?

EUNICE PÉREZ COELLO

For us to be able to have, within our meetings, sessions with other working groups. Like, for example, the Registry Stakeholder Group. I don't remember what the abbreviations are, NCSG, I just don't remember which are the abbreviations, but we already have SSAC that is already with us. But aside from that, there are other groups that also can participate and talk about what they're doing specifically with the DNS abuse topic.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I'm just trying to not have a conversation about it. Okay. I think the action item is to invite others in addition to the SSAC to come to talk to the CPWG to find out what it is they're doing about DNS abuse. Okay. See, this is...

EUNICE PÉREZ COELLO

I will not be understood in Spanish either. But it's not just about policies. If there could be sessions within the meetings along with other groups. For example, just like ALAC and SSAC have these joint meetings, we could have ALAC with also the Registry Stakeholder Group. I mean, not just related to just policies, but related also with DNS abuse.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Okay, so explore opportunities for face-to-face meetings at ICANN meetings with these. Yes, we've done many of these, so we should continue to explore them because our schedule gets very full, and

we end up trimming back. So for example, the NCSG didn't make it this time, but we've had a couple of meetings with them in the past. So that's part of the problem, is just that our schedule gets very tight, and we want people to go out and participate in other meetings and not just be in this room the whole time. But I think it's a good recommendation, and maybe we need to come up with a rotation or something like that, rather than trying to bring in five new groups that we meet with every meeting or something.

EUNICE PÉREZ COELLO

Good idea.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Okay. Now, Sebastian.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Thank you very much, Jonathan. I went to different meetings, sessions, but the one I was more interested in was the review of reviews. I will not tell you what happened in those meetings. Hari was chairing, and she knows better than me. But I just wanted to say that it's time for us in At-Large to discuss the pre-report and make our comments and to be ready also for the final report to be sent for comment period. But I think we need to work as soon as possible. In addition, we heard different points of view of different groups during the week. It could be interesting to know about that. And finally, I committed a document with another proposal after three days of work on reading very carefully the report. I try to put

on the table something a little bit different, less complex from my point of view, and that I hope could be the basis of some discussion and maybe a base of a decision of the point of view of At-Large and ALAC on that specific topic. I am at your disposition to discuss that issue when you want. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Sebastien. Emmanuel.

EMMANUEL ORUK

Thank you so much, Jonathan. Emmanuel Oruk, for the record.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, you are here.

EMMANUEL ORUK

My submission is not very far from Sebastien. I was with Sebastien in the review of reviews meeting, and so many discussions came up, especially issues of timeline. So I am also interested in ALAC's position on defining timelines when it comes to review of reviews. I'm wondering what that position could look like for ALAC, but it's a very interesting discussion, like my colleague already mentioned earlier on. So we need to look into that, and we see how best we can deliver on this and make sure that our point as ALAC is very clear on timelines. Thank you so much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Emmanuel. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND

Yeah, thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And this morning, I attended the ICANN Empowered Community Forum, and was, I would say, quite disappointed because it focused solely on the fundamental bylaw amendments regarding the Customer Standing Committee and IANA naming function review bylaw amendments, which are dating from last month and are non-controversial. So the 75-minute meeting ended up closing after 30 minutes, there being no other discussion on the table. I was quite surprised that the ALAC position was not discussed in regards to the bylaw amendments that the Board has made in regards to reviews. Very disappointing and unfortunate, and it's not us, but that ICANN didn't make use of this time to discuss the ALAC position. I also wanted to ask you, what was the latest response from the other SOs and ACs? As you know, we need to have at least one other SO or AC actually supporting our position actively for our position to succeed. So I don't know where we are there. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Olivier. There's no requirement for anybody to actually respond, but we've gotten both informal and formal responses at this point from both the GNSO and the ccNSO on that topic, and both of them have declined to support our rejection petition. The rest have simply run out of time, so I've received notice from JJ that

this petition has been terminated. I think it led to some interesting conversation within the GNSO, which is a pretty eclectic group. And it raised the issue of whether or not there's enough time in the timeline for groups to respond because the GNSO having to respond to something in seven days is ridiculous on its face, given how heterogeneous they are. And so, that conversation, I think, was probably a valuable one. There were some supportive comments made about our petition within that group, and the registries' public comment submission on the review of reviews is supportive in many ways of our position on implementation and brings back the conversation about whether we need a COO, for example. So there is some support out there, but it didn't rise to the level of support at the SO or AC level. We got some pushback for waiting till the last minute. Maybe that's on me, that we should've sort of given people a hint that it might be coming. But I don't know that the outcome would've been different. But certainly, some people were caught off guard by our petition. So that's it. This particular effort is now over. But we did stir up some conversation, both substantively and procedurally, as a result of having done it, so that's never a bad thing. And you want to talk on this topic? Okay. Then I'll... On this topic also? Okay. Then I'll let you guys jump the queue and make Hannah wait. Okay? Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA

Thanks. Avri speaking. Just a quick note, I spoke to a couple Board members after that session this morning, and while they did not give me an opinion on the ALAC letter one way or another, they did

speak about being very happy that we were indeed using the mechanism as it was meant to be used and submitting petitions, and even if we didn't succeed, that was beside the point. So they were very happy. So just so we're not getting shy about, oh, no, we're submitting things and nobody agrees, that's okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK

I agree. Thanks. Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN

Thanks. Greg Shatan, for the record. I think this is now the second time that we've tried to empower the Empowered Community with a petition, and the second time it didn't move forward, and I think the lesson learned from both of these together is that we can't wait until we have made our decision before we start letting other structures know that we have this under consideration. I think we need to let them know that as soon as we are beginning to discuss it, that it's under discussion, so that they can start considering it, too. We may actually get some feedback that might either get people on board, or we might get feedback that might change our petition somewhat so that it will get support. But I think that given the lack of time and the lack of notice, it's a design flaw, but the way to deal with it until the design maybe gets revised is to make other structures aware that we are considering this and let them engage during that time, as opposed to only after we pop our petition. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK I agree with what you just said. It's a responsibility. Thank you for re-emphasizing it and putting your boot on my neck.

GREG SHATAN Yeah, not so much the responsibility, but I think it needs to be part of our process.

JONATHAN ZUCK It does.

GREG SHATAN It's not up to the chair. Frankly, whoever begins the petition discussion needs to also begin the socialization process. It's not your concern, but it needs to be all our concerns.

JONATHAN ZUCK Okay. I'm just teasing. Did you want to speak on this topic, Pari?
Okay, briefly. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI Thank you. I want to also echo what Greg said and emphasize what you already have said. But I think in addition, the fact that the outcomes have been negative shouldn't be discouraging. Sometimes making a point is as important as the outcome, and I

think that I encourage continuing this kind of exercise regardless.
Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

All right. Agreed. So Hannah had her hand up on just general feedback from the meeting. We're back on our topic.

HANNAH FRANK

Thank you so much, Jonathan. Hannah Frank, for the record. I just want to highlight the cross-community session we had with the SSAC. It was so dynamic and interactive that it's so great to have these sort of sessions that touch the hot topics we have within Internet governance and in that kind of method. Also, I want to highlight the session we had yesterday about the ALAC objections. We had the pleasure to have input from the GAC, from the vice chair, and also from ICANN org, Elisa Busetto. Yet today, earlier, they had a session, the SubPro had a session, and the main topic they discussed was about the independent objector, something that we're following closely, and we will follow closely. It's important for our community, for the At-Large. And also, the membership form for the At-Large gTLD Application Group has been launched yesterday. People can apply until the end of June. Staff will closely send the call for members, call for volunteers, into the RALO membership list. And the ALAC objection team, the small team, that is not the small team anymore, fortunately, is planning to gather next to this ICANN meeting closely, very closely, because we need to continue work moving forward. We encourage all the

interested community members to join the group or apply or ask questions to me, to Deb, to the staff, or join the membership list because the small team is still working. It's the base for the future gTLD Application Group. And of course, if you want to speak to me, I am here, or send an email. Okay. Thank you so much. That's what I wanted to say.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Hannah. Yeah, that was a great session. And I think we need to figure out how to formalize our comment process, as it appears like we'll be doing more commenting than objecting. All right. I think that's all the hands and cards I see up there. Next on the agenda is next steps toward ICANN87 AGM, which is now going to be in Bali. That's a big meeting, the AGM, so we have both the incoming and outgoing leadership, so we have a lot more of us at the meeting than normal. And so if anybody's interested in voting me off the island, I'd be happy to be left on an island in Indonesia. I think that would be a good place to retire. So, I'm looking forward to that meeting. I may just wander off at the end of the meeting, never to be heard from again in Indonesia.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET

Be careful, there are sharks there.

JONATHAN ZUCK

And the other thing is, we've taken on a bunch of action items here, and this is often a very slow period for the ICANN community

generally and for the At-Large in particular, and we're going to have to try to fight that instinct to take all of August and be gone and things like that, because we've just now, in the course of the past hour, taken on a number of interesting topics and things that we need to be on top of. So, when you get home, take a few days, take a few breaths. You don't have to answer anything right away, but we need to get back on it, have some of these intersessional meetings, because if anything we've discovered we need to do more in between the meetings in terms of cross-community work than just meeting with people at ICANN meetings. That's not enough. So let's get that going, and I know with ACES, we have a lot of work to get going there as well. So, this year at least, I won't be shooting a movie this summer. It's already out. And so the next steps is to stay the course during the coming months. What's next on the next slide? The next might be the reports from... Oh, it's not on the slide? Yeah. Okay. Sorry. Okay. I can introduce. Yeah, I guess we're a little bit early, right? Yes, but I don't know. I guess this is time for any other business. Something that's not on the agenda that you want to raise with the group? Amrita, go ahead please.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

No, it's not any other business. Amrita, for the record, I just wanted to share a positive feedback I got from a few people, including Board members, that this time the At-Large sessions were pretty interesting discussions. So quite a few of them said that the

sessions were good, informative, which is important. So, I guess congratulations everyone, whoever organized it.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Amrita. Yeah, I think we've put quite a bit of rigor into the sessions that we had, and I think that pays off. And so we're very active participants in the work groups in which we're engaged, and I think that we've come a long way in recent years in increasing our visibility and respect within the ICANN community generally. So that's due to all of you. So let me say thank you for all of that. So thank you. Traditionally, at the end of the meeting, we thank our technical staff and our interpreters. We would like to hear from the head of the interpreters briefly, if you will allow her to speak up.

GISELLA GRUBER

Please.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Come to a microphone.

GISELLA GRUBER

Yes, come to the microphone.

GREG SHATAN

What language will you be speaking in?

GISSELLA GRUBER

Sabrina.

SABRINA MOSQUERA

Hello, everyone. This is Sabrina Mosquera for the record. Thank you for having me here. Thank you for this opportunity to address you all in person. Most of you know me because I'm always on your calls assigning language interpretation and managing that service. Today I am here to say goodbye and thank you. My tenure will conclude on June 30th. This is because I am going forward, moving into a new path in my career, which is very exciting. But I wanted to take a moment to say goodbye and thank you to this community because my journey with ICANN began in the ALAC. That was the very first session I interpreted, so I am very grateful that everything goes full circle, and my very last session at ICANN is with all of you. I leave you in expert hands. My colleague, Veronica Penelas, will take over once my tenure is completed, so you will be in excellent hands. And that's all I wanted to say. Thank you so much, thank you for having me, and thank you for all these wonderful years.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thank you for 15 years of service.

SABRINA MOSQUERA

Thank you very much.

GISSELLA GRUBER

Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

You're getting lots of hearts and applause online as well.

SABRINA MOSQUERA

Oh, wow. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Silent applause. All right. Thank you all. Appreciate all that you do and all the work that you do. Thanks to staff. We were very understaffed this particular meeting, and so our folks had to work twice as hard. So join me in thanking Gisella for working remotely, and Silvia for all her work here, and Susie, who came in and joined in to try and match all the logistics for the At-Large as well. So thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER

And I want to mention...

GREG SHATAN

And Michelle.

GISELLA GRUBER

Michelle as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, and Michelle, sorry.

SILVIA VIVANCO

Yes. Thank you so much. And I just also want to acknowledge our team supporting us remotely. My voice came back, thank God. Gisella, Michelle, Jessica, remotely. Here in the house, Susie, Christian, Osan, and the technical team, of course, and our great interpreters. Thank you for supporting me in this meeting, and thank you all for your participation and your engagement. Always excellent and very much welcome. I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK

With that, ICANN86, as far as At-Large is concerned, is adjourned. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND

Hey, hey, hey, hey.

JONATHAN ZUCK

What? Oh. What do you hey, hey...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND

Jonathan, my hand was up.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Oh, okay. All right. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND I just wanted to thank you, Jonathan. Well done. You've been filming a film with sharks and so on, and having to deal with ICANN, which arguably for some people has got a lot of sharks in there as well. So, well done, and once again, congratulations. And in fact, to all of you, seeing it, I'm far away, but I was with you in spirit, and it's great to see so many people dedicated to the cause and spending time free of charge. So well done, guys. Well done. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK Yes, go see "Chum" at your local theater and online.

GISELLA GRUBER Yay.

JONATHAN ZUCK We are adjourned.

SABRINA MOSQUERA Recording stopped.

GISELLA GRUBER This meeting is adjourned, and so is ICANN86. Safe travels, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]