ICANN75 | AGM – Joint Session: ALAC and GAC
Wednesday, September 21, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 KUL

GULTEN TEPE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the ICANN75 GAC meeting with the ALAC session being held on Wednesday 21st of September at 100 UTC. Recognizing that it is a public sessions and other members of the ICANN community may be in attendance.

GAC leadership and support staff encourage all of you who are GAC members to type your name and affiliation in the participation chat pot. This is to keep accurate attendance records. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment, please type it in the chat by starting and ending your sentence with a question or comment as indicated in the chat. The feature is located at the bottom of your Zoom window.

Interpretation for GAC sessions include all six UN language and Portuguese. Participants can select their language they wish to speak or listened to by clicking on the interpretation icon on the Zoom toolbar. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Once the session facilitator calls upon you, please unmute yourself and take the floor.

Finally, this session like all other ICANN activities is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. In case of disruption

during the session, our technical support team will mute all participants. This session is being recorded and all the materials will be made available on the ICANN75 meetings page. With that, I would like to leave the floor to GAC Chair, Manal Ismael. Manal, over to you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Gulten, and good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Welcome to the ALAC/GAC bilateral scheduled for an hour. And I would like to start by welcoming Maureen and all GAC. I'm Sorry. Maureen and all ALAC members who have joined us in the GAC room or on Zoom.

And I would also like to sincerely and Joanna and Xiong for their significant intercessional coordination efforts to prepare for our bilateral year and to compile an agenda that is of common interest to both governments and end users. And special thanks also to ALAC for always supporting the GAC in capacity building activities. Before we get started with our agenda, allow me to pass the floor to you first, Maureen, for any opening remarks.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you so much, Manal. It's lovely for the At-Large community to be able to meet with the GAC members as per what is becoming

a tradition anyway, and we do appreciate it. We have Joanna Kulesza who is our liaison, is a remote participant and she will be engaging, coordinating the session for us today.

And I do note that one of our speakers, Alan Greenberg, is actually sitting in the audience, and I would like him to come up because he is going to be one of our speakers today. But we do have, well, Joanna will introduce the speakers as they are going to be presenting. But yes, thank you Manal for the invitation we enjoy becoming anywhere.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Alan needs a musical intro, I think, to come up. So that's the --

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you, Maureen, and thank you, Manal. Thank you to the GAC for hosting us and for indeed keeping this much welcome tradition going. And I will start briefly with the introductions and with a brief review of our agenda, the topics that were selected.

These are the topics that on one hand are well known to be community, and they will be and have been discussed previously and will be discussed during this meeting. On the other hand, however, these are the topics that are of most relevant to both

the GAC and the ALAC, and we welcome this opportunity to exchange ideas bilaterally.

Without further ado, I would like to introduce the topics and our speakers starting with a theme that was also selected for a plenary. We will be discussing Internet fragmentation as we progress with this meeting. But for today, we have kindly asked Xiong and myself, Nigel and Pari, to provide the position of both communities when it comes to this interesting and hot geopolitical topic and what policy implications it might hold.

Then we are very much looking forward to hearing from representatives of both constituencies on the subsequent procedures round and closed generics. Once again, the ALAC appreciates the support that the GAC has shown in our involvement and participation in the GNSO process. And with that, I'm very much looking forward to our speakers presenting the viewpoints of both constituencies, but at the same time, using this opportunity to further align our positions.

And then last but by no means least, we will look into the Local Cross Community Corporation. And with that, please let me note. Thanks to the two speakers who took the floor on Saturday during the GAC capacity building session.

Cheryl and Ian exemplifying a good practice example from the APAC region and sharing their experiences on the Australian

cooperation between the ALAC, the At-Large structures on the ground and the governmental advisory committee representatives throughout the years across different areas of cooperation. We have reserved a few minutes or a brief Q&A.

Hopefully, there will be other topic that are raised from the floor. And once again, we welcome this opportunity to exchange ideas bilaterally. Not to take up any more of the precious time, I would like to hand the floor over to Pari and Nigel. Before we hear from Manal. Manal, as you hand this up, I will do my best to moderate remotely. Please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Joanna. Just a quick suggestion for any other business I was just talking with Maureen before the session, if we can have under any other business, a quick introduction of new leadership on both sides, if you don't mind. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Wonderful. That sounds great. I'm happy to hand the floor to Maureen to take us through that one. Thank you very much. If there are no other issues that I might have missed in our agenda, I would be inclined to hand the floor over to Nigel and Pari. I've see Nigel's talking points are on the screen, Nigel, welcome, the floor is yours.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening to you. Can you hear me okay?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes.

NIGEL HICKSON: Good. Good. But, it's always a pleasure to talk to the ALAC and to discuss ideas with you, especially this time of the morning, as they say, in London. But it's a good opportunity. And I feel rather as an amateur here because Pari, who I've had the pleasure to meet recently, is the true expert on this issue and is taking a leading role in our session later today. And that's why I've put this as the first bullet, so to speak, to come to come later to the ICANN plenary session on the internet fragmentation.   And I hope everyone does. It promises to be a very lively, a very interesting, I'm sure. And hopefully, a thought-provoking session.

Because this is one of those issues where we, a number of us feel deeply passionate that we need to know more about it and we need to understand more about it. We need to understand the ramifications of internet fragmentation and where it fits into the ICANN structure and where it is of deep interest and potential

concern to ALAC, sorry, to ICANN and to all the community. So the yes. So please do come along to the plenary session later.

Now we obviously have our own interpretations of Internet fragmentation. But I think one of the things that many of us do share is a concern for the open internet, a concern that the Internet should remain open interoperable global in nature. And fragmentation is a concept of course, where the opposite can happen. And that's deeply troubling to many of us. But of course, Internet fragmentation takes many different forms. And this morning in the plenary session, we'll go over some of those different elements of Internet fragmentation and where it occurs in the different levels of the Internet.

I think one of the issues that we're very acutely aware of course is the potential for Internet fragmentation to be introduced inadvertently or to be introduced in a way that governments or legislators or policymakers have not envisaged. And this is one of the thing, obviously, that will be discussed. Pari and I will touch on this later in the session. But Internet fragmentation is not just, of course, a policy and legislative issue. It can occur in many other ways.

Many of us or some of us are old enough to remember the walled gardens of the internet in the early years when the internet grew up. And if you likely the lack of the ability for people to perhaps

access types of content that they wanted to because they were on a particular access or they had subscribed to a particular access provider, so content. So fragmentation can occur at different levels.

I'm going to leave it there, but I think I'll just finish by saying that we do consider this to be an important topic within the Government Advisory Committee. It is something that has been discussed before. It's something that obviously will be discussed in earnest in our plenary session, and will be reflected on as we go forward in this debate. So thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA: Wonderful. Thank you very much, Nigel. Indeed, there is an entire session devoted to the topic and the policy implications. I understand that this is always a concern. How are all of these events related to ICANN policy? You have highlighted the ways and means in which this might indeed be connected to the on the ground protocol work that we do. But I also welcome the intervention from Pari. I understand you are in the room, if you would like to take the floor please be so kind to do so. Thank you.

PARI ESFANDIARI: Hello, everyone, and thank you very much, Joanna, and Nigel, and everyone for joining us. I am delighted to be here and thank

you for the opportunity. When it comes to fragmentation, the interest and concerns of ALAC, GAC and ICANN are aligned. I represent ALAC, which strives to safeguard the interests of end users, and fragmentation has a strong end user component to it.

The plenary session taking place later today is an attempt to contribute to the emergence of a shared understanding of Internet fragmentation and to provide a space for an inclusive dialogue and reflection and the challenges it represents to the ICANN community and identify shared priorities and responses.

The fragmentation debate is not new, as Nigel explained. But over the last decade, geopolitical tensions have impacted the internet ecosystem and threaten its open and universal nature. While it's unlikely that in the near future, any country will cut itself off completely from the universal open Internet due to the economic and political disadvantages of doing so, yet it's a grave mistake not to take the current trends towards fragmentation seriously, particularly concerning our trends towards multiple and incompatible root zone files and associated naming and numbering systems. The DNS route is at the center of contention because it is a centralized point of control under logic layer.

Other concerns are over changes in the routing architecture and the spread of incompatible technical standards. Two scenarios are predicted. One, verification of the Internet as a result of a

strategy competition between the U.S. and China, resulting in technology cold war. Two, a federated Internet, motivated by a desire for more autonomy with a network of nation state linked by Internet protocol, but for most parts separated. These trends may fragment to open and universal internet and internet experience based on the location of end user in sovereign territories. This will limit their access to information and expose their data to national governments scrutiny.

Another concern is that fragmentation shift the Internet governance from the global multistakeholder model to a government control model. In doing so, the voices of Internet end users will be weakened, if not diminished. There are also serious concern over the stability and predictability of the Internet system. Finally, there are concerns over innovations mainly in blockchain that are aimed to decentralize the DNS system. These are often initiated by non-governmental actors for commercial interests and or libertarian sentiments. While unlikely to gain permanent, but still concerning.

The internet is an extraordinary human achievement and defining technology of our time. Its fragmentation could be determined not just for the technology, but also for our democratic values and lifestyle. So far, the open and universal Internet has shown remarkable resilience, but how long and how far can it endure the ideological pressures? And how would it

impact the ICANN community and its multistakeholder model? Should ICANN community be reactive or proactive? Stay tuned as we deep dive into these issues in the upcoming plenary session starting at 10:30 today. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Pari. That's a wonderful summary and a great leeway into the plenary. More hopefully, we will get a chance to deep dive into all of these topics. Speaking about dedicated topics that are being discussed in PDPs, please let me take us to the next agenda item on subsequent rounds of new gTLDs and closed generics. My understanding is that we will be starting with the ALAC speakers.

We have three speakers assigned to this topic. I'm going to start with Alan, assuming that he's in the room and has made it to the speaker's table, and I see Greg is joining us remotely as well. And if you would be willing and able to take the floor, please start us all, and then I will briefly hand the floor to Greg for his comments as well. Alan the floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG: Greg is the lead into this. So if he could speak first, that would be good. Assuming he's on.

JOANNA KULESZA: Right. Thank you. Greg please go ahead.

GRAG SHATAN: Thank you, Alan. Can you hear me well?

JOANNA KULESZA: We can hear you well indeed. Please go ahead, Greg.

GRAG SHATAN: Great. Thank you. So as you can see, we certainly welcome this opportunity, and we're glad to be brought in to what was initially a bilateral discussion.   And obviously, I feel it's important to represent the end user perspective in this. As you'll also see from our slide, I wouldn't say that we have highly developed talking points at this point. It's something that we are working on in our consolidated policy working group and with the ALAC and throughout the At-Large community.

I would say that there's probably a certain amount of weariness about closed generics and a desire to have a controlled outcome. I think that is pretty much the marching orders of our small group as well, which is to not choose either extreme as the end result. And hopefully, we can choose an end result, which was a failure or at least an outcome that was what we had as I participated along with a number of others here in the discussions during

subsequent procedures about closed generics, which we ended up revisiting at the very end realizing that there was no way around the need to discuss it, but yet we could not find an end result.

So I'm hopeful that we can find analytically a methodology in order to deal with the question of closed generics in a way that is appropriate and keeps in mind the interests of end users and the interests of essentially establishing a taxonomy of the Internet in a way that that makes sense. It'll be interesting to see what people bring to the party, and who comes from GNSO. I understand they're working party is filled out or almost filled out.

So I'm looking forward to developing our thoughts here and also beyond the initial questions of whether closed generic should be allowed and how. We explore some of the next level questions such as review panels and criteria and perhaps special contractual specs, like spec 9 and spec 11, both for closed generics. And that we consider how we can go from a question that has been around for nearly 10 years without being answered to one for which we finally have an answer. Thanks.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Craig. I'm curious if Alan or Jonathan wish to add anything at this point on behalf of the At-Large?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you very much. It's Alan Greenberg speaking. Greg said we really don't want either extreme. I suspect the ALAC could easily live with maintaining the effective ban that was there in the 2012 round. The whole issue is fraught with problems when you try to use the expression public interest, which we've never been able to define, and yet maintain the level of predictability that we seem determined to have in the gTLD rounds.

So I guess the ALAC position at this point or at least has been, let's make sure we do no harm. If we can't be sure what we're doing is really going to be safe and not endanger the overall ecosystem with antitrust and various other potential dangers, then let's do something safe. And until we can make sure that we're what we're doing is not going to end up harming the ecosystem and implicitly the users. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Alan. Jonathan, please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Jonathan Zuck for the record. I'm really excited to be here in the joint session, maybe for the purposes of discussion about this. Because I feel like it's an issue that's going to have a lot of difficulty scaling, that any kind of mechanisms we try to put

in place, etc., once we introduce more non English domain names, IDNs, variants, etc., that it's going to be difficult to scale. And a part me would like to express a personal opinion here that is not, I repeat not the consensus position of the At-Large community at this point, and it's decidedly not.

But to go off of what Alan said, but take it a little bit different direction, I wonder if there's a path forward whereby we identify the risks associated with closed generics and what our greatest fears are of that outcome being and then look at ways to mitigate those risks so that we're focused on protecting the public interest as opposed to trying to find some esoteric way of promoting the public interest.

And as somebody that was on the CCT review, I have my own concerns about safeguards and things of that sort. But to me, it feels like that the compromised solution is going to come from demanding concessions on the part of those who apply for these generic strings that are meant to mitigate the risks that we associate with them, and I haven't thought of all the risks.

But from an end user standpoint, it could be confusion. Right? There's dot books out there, and people might think, well, this is, all books are here, not just books from Amazon, for example. And how do we get past that? Is that through a branding exercise or something like that?

So I don't have the answers, but a part of me suspects the answer will spring from endeavoring to protect the public interest rather than trying to promote it. And I feel like that's the only actually scalable solution that doesn't take one of the other the two extremes. So that's me expressing an unpopular opinion in this room, I suppose, but I think one that we need to consider as we go in with an open mind to these compromised discussions.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan speaking. One further thought. This whole discussion is based on a GAC communique of nine years ago. I don't know if there's anyone in the room here who was in that room and participated in creating that line, that critical line in a document in Beijing. But I think very quickly into this process, the onus is going to fall on the GAC to number one, reiterate that they still believe this is relevant as Martin's best said in the GAC Board meeting yesterday.

Periodically, we have to make sure that what we said 10 years ago still makes sense. And if it does make sense, again, I think the onus is going to follow in the GAC to try to elaborate and flesh out a little bit what public interest means. We know we're not going to be able to define it in some really clear way, but since we're working towards addressing a GAC concern, I think the GAC is

going to have to put some effort into making sure that everyone understands what the concern is. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, gentlemen. I also note the questions coming up in the chat. There seems to be a bit of a parallel conversation which always good. Pavel, your questions are noted for the Q&A round, time permitting. And for us to make sure we do well on time, I will swiftly hand the floor to the GAC speakers on the same topic. That's Jorge and Nigel. Gentlemen, I will let you decide who should take the floor first. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO: Thank you. Thank you, Joanna. I hope you hear me okay. And this is Jorge Cancio from GAC Switzerland. So I'm joining you remotely.

JOANNA KULESZA: We can hear you well.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. Thank you so much. I'm joining you remotely this time. Happy to have you here in this bilateral and also very happy to have you in this facilitated dialogue. So the interventions from

Greg, Alan, and Jonathan have shown that there's plenty of wisdom, of thoughts on your side, on the matter of closed generics. I think this is a common undertaking. So this is a facilitated dialogue.

And of course, the GAC has developed the Beijing advice. But we know, all of us know that the issue of closed generics didn't pop up out of the sky because of the GAC advice. But was a question discussed in the community as it has been discussed during the subsequent working group for many years without finding a solution.

So we are in early days, early stages still of this facilitated dialogue, which we welcome as an initiative to bridge the differences between different parts of the community, not only between the GAC and GNSO. But within the GNSO, there are also different sensitivities within the GAC and probably as we have seen within ALAC. So it's really a good opportunity to finding good solutions, common solutions amongst all of us in this process.

On the GAC side, as you may have seen from our dialogue on Monday and also our exchanges with the GNSO, we are still starting to consider the preparatory documentation prepared by ICANN org. It provides good information. It's a good paper for a start of the discussions. And it very usefully includes the GAC

positions we have been providing the GNSO with during the last years also on closed generics.

So it's not just one line we have from Beijing nine years ago, this is still our baseline, of course. But the GAC has been providing the GNSO process with a lot of aspects and considerations. Also engaging with different ideas, which came up during the subsequent procedures working group. There were three approaches developed by individual members of that working group. And the GAC offered its opinions on those approaches. So what I would really suggests that everybody has also looked at that annex with the GAC positions which will inform and guide the GAC during this facilitated process.

And well, the last point you have on the slides, I think was really answered by Alan, Greg, and Jonathan. But of course, if you have any further preliminary reactions or comments regarding both the process as a whole as on the preparatory documentation prepared by org, we would very much welcome those on our side, the discussions that we had internally within the GAC on this matter and on subsequent procedures in general will be reflected in the GAC community as usual. The GAC community sessions are open. So you can already have a look at where we stand on this issue. So I'll leave it by that and thank you very much, Joanna.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Jorge. Thank you also again for the interesting conversation that is happening in the chat. So I'm hoping we can pick up on this one in the Q&A section of this bilateral. And with that, I'm going to hand the floor to our third speaker, Yrjö, to give us an insight or his references to the on the ground cooperation. The third topic is on advancing the multistakeholder approach, and we would like to look at it through the lens of local cross-community cooperation.

Yrjö as the former GAC liaison who has built up this process, who has built up this opportunity for us to meet and discuss dedicated issues bilaterally is the best person to share his experience and ideas about how we might be able to advance the advisory committees operating on the ground as since you can see that also on the slides, the multistakeholder approach does indeed start at home. Yrjö you thank you very much for agreeing to speak during this session. Please kindly take the floor.

YRJÖ LANSIPURO: Thank you very much, Joanna. Yrjö Lansipuro, for transcript record. Good morning, Selamat pagi, as they say in this country. It's great that the idea of the cooperation between our two advisory committees, both of which have feet on the ground around the world. That this cooperation is now extended to the ground level, to national context. It's been on the agenda for our

meetings for some time and the best thing is, of course, that there are examples from the ground.

Now what are the possibilities? Can this cooperation between local ALSes and governments take place? The most obvious thing are national and regional IGFs. There are now 85 national IGFs and 17 regional IGFs, Internet Governance Forums. Of course, they are all the offspring of the original Internet Governance Forum, which was set up by the World Summit on Information Society. And it's been there since 2006.

These forum are intended for discussion of Internet related issues between all stakeholders in a country. As they are now, perhaps not all stakeholders are participating, but that is the idea, that is the ideal. And as I said, that's one of the most obvious places where the ALSes and governments could cooperate.

Preparation for meetings, as you know, there's, for instance, now there's ITU Plenipot coming up. And taking an example close to me from Finland, we have a committee preparing for that meeting, including all stakeholders, including the local ALS, which is the ISOC Finland. And I feel that we have been able to contribute to that process because ISOC, the Internet society, has made quite good research on the Internet related solutions proposals over that meeting.

So again, there are opportunities for mutual benefit if we talk to each other. Also saying for rulemaking, that is to say preparation for regulation and legislation, so on and so forth. Now countries obviously are different. They have different systems and different structures. But in many countries, when legislation or regulations are prepared, there is a request for comments from relevant organizations.

And here, first of all, the ALSes or the organizations that are also At-Large structures, they should make sure that they are on the list of the organizations that are consulted on matters relating to our sort of issues, and they should be ready to participate, and of course, to make their input.

And finally, capacity building, there are already good examples of joint capacity building efforts involving ALSes. And in all honesty, I could say that ALS members are, in many times, they have been around for years, maybe decades. And they are, some of them are really walking repository of all knowledge that relates to ICANN. So I think that it would be good idea to utilize that knowledge and experience. So yes, multistakeholder approach starts at home. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you very much, Yrjö. Thank you for this insightful comments. I apologize as the moderator, I only have the early

time here locally as my excuse. I had skipped Nigel's comments on closed generics. Nigel with my deepest apologies. If you would you be willing and able to take the floor and you could scroll the slides up by one, that would be most appreciated. We did have two commentators from the GAC side, Jorge and Nigel, with regards to closed generic. So if you would be willing and able to take the floor, with my deepest apologies, please share your thoughts on the closed generics topic. Thank you very much.

NIGEL HICKSON: Joanna, no problem at all. And I have got very little to say because Jorge, of course, as usual, has covered the different elements. I just really wanted to add that as many of you will know on closed generics that there is going to be a work group. Work group has been setup that involves the GNSO, and GAC, and ALAC. And it will be really good working with colleagues from ALAC and of course to GNSO on this issue. I think the paper that Joanna put in the thread is really worth a read on this. And for those that think what is this closed generic all about and why is it relevant? I think that paper points out that the potential and the competitive nature of closed generics, the potential confusion for internet users, which of course is a concern to us. And I think it points out those issues.

And indeed to find a way forward is going to be challenging. I'm sure there are instances where a generic term being used by a particular entity can be in the public interest for particular reasons, where an institution or a company has a particular locus to that term. But clearly, there are other occasions where the ordinary man in the street when he sees a dip, I would hope that it's open in nature. This paper refers to simple example like Amazon and books and things like that.

You wouldn't expect a generic term book to be controlled by perhaps just one conveyor of books. So the working group going forward is going to have its challenges. But we have to be in a constructive mode and try and find a way forward with the experts. And it's going to be an absolute pleasure working. A few of us that are working on this will be a pleasure working alongside Greg Shatan on this and other colleagues. So thank you. Thank you very much.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Nigel, with my deepest apologies once again. This takes us, as already noted, to the last agenda item. Thank you again, Yrjö, for highlighting the need for on the ground direct cooperation. My understanding is that Xiong had he'd been able to join us would likely present the GAC

position on that specific agenda item. We did, however, hear from Ian during the capacity building session on Saturday.

So this is just for me to check with Manal, if you would be so kind to confirm if there's anything direct on the GAC with regards to the on the ground cooperation. And I do note a hand from Marita, who's the lead for a multistakeholder cooperation on the At-Large side. Marita, thank you very much. I believe Ian's hand is up as well, so it might be useful for us to hear from the GAC side, and then I'm happy to give you the floor. Thank you very much. If that's okay with Manal, Ian, please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON: Thank you, Joanna. Ian Sheldon, Australian GAC for the record. So I'm happy to jump in here very briefly on short notice and speak reasonably off the cuff. I guess reflecting some of the comments I made over the capacity building weekend. So I guess in this instance, I would be speaking from mine, the Australian perspective and not really on behalf of the broader GAC, but I thought important to share my views regardless. I think I very much agree with a lot of your comment.

JOANNA KULESZA: I'm sorry to interfere. Joanna. Can you please speak closer to the mic? Thank you.

IAN SHELDON: My apologies. So in Australia, we have if you call the capacity building session that earlier over the weekend, we have a regional IGF called NetThing that's coming up in November. And my team has been slightly involved in its coordination and planning. And in fact, my minister will have a small slot there to provide the views of the Australian government. And in fact, I will also have a small speaking role to provide a range of government updates and standard dialogue and some of the broader challenge that internet governance is facing more broadly and more globally. So I fully intend to share some of my perspectives from this week.

And then I'll be attending the ITU Plenipotentiary in Bucharest. And I also think it's critical that I bring those perspectives back and share them with the local Internet community, particularly with the At-Large community. I think it's important that we continue to share our perspectives and in turn hear the responses from the other parts of the community.

So I think both after these important meetings as well as in some of the preparation for this as well, in the lead up to both this week's meetings and this wasn't laid up to the Plenipotentiary. My departments held a range of consultation sessions where we've been able to hear from At-Large groups like ICANN in Australia.

ICANN had an opportunity to drop into one of our preparatory sessions for Plenipotentiary and we're fortunate enough develop that relationship and we'll be looking to coordinate with them over the course of the week. I think it's a credibly critical and invaluable to continue to have those dialogues both at the strategic level as well as at the tactical level as we work through issues on the ground and be able to tap into that rich source of deep expertise and understanding that the At-Large community can offer.

And so I think I'd probably leave it there. I'm very much in support of deeper, richer collaboration between the GAC and the ALAC. And at least from the Australian perspective, we would very much welcome further conversations like these or over coffee or beers in the hallway to unpack these issues further.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Ian. That is indeed much appreciated. As Yrjö has indicated, it does come down to the on the ground cooperation that actually happens rather than us thinking about this in the abstract. And I'm just going to give the floor briefly to Marita raising her hand as the At-Large multistakeholder model lead. And then we, I believe, already have a Q&A. I have taken note of all the questions that have

popped up in the chat, and I will go through them in the allocated time slot. Marita, just very briefly, please go ahead.

Marita Moll: Thank you, Joanna. Thank you for giving me a floor here. I am an outgoing ALAC member for North America, but I hope I'm not an outgoing member as the lead for the multistakeholder model development work that goes on within ALAC. Speaking to your audios, a statement at the bottom here, the multistakeholder approach starts at home. I attended the GAC Board meeting and was very pleased with one of the suggestions that was made by the GAC at the time.

And I'll just remind you of what that was. Asking if the ICANN staff could consider conducting a community call at key checkpoints throughout the year between SOA SSAC leadership, the whole board, and org executives to reflect on whether recent public meeting discussions have influence thinking on any of the community's strategic priorities. That's word for word out of one of your slides.

And as much of our work in the last budget and operating procedures, comments that we made, we were speaking to the need for evaluation of the priorities, strategic priorities, what was an evaluation with regard to how the multistakeholder model is evolving. And we were asking as an At-Large community that we

be careful about the need to collect contextual and qualitative data on progress other than relying on simple numbers. And I'm suggesting here that this suggestion from the GAC would be an interesting way for us to cooperate on furthering that particular agenda. Thank you for giving me the floor.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Marita. That's a very tangible proposal that is most welcome. I'm curious if there might be any direct reactions from the participants in the room to that last agenda item. Thank you very much, Ian, for intervening. Manal. Please go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you very much, Joanna. And Marita, thank you for bringing this up and thank you for your interest in the idea. I frankly can't recall the GAC member who proposed. Maybe UK. I was just trying to give the credit to the member who has proposed the idea. But, yeah, indeed, then it took some discussion during the prep session as well because we were very mindful not to burden the process with yet another layer of bureaucracy, but still we would like to see some checkpoints at some point in time to make sure we are working towards the strategic priorities. So I'm glad you see it a sensible idea and then looking forward to how we can put this in place. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:	Thank you very much, Manal. I am mindful of time. So what I would like to do is just note the questions. Some of them have been replied to in the chat, we received two direct question. Questions one from Pavel. What is the SplinterNet? It's a very good question Pavel.
	For everyone who's not quite familiar with the term, we did receive quite a few responses in the chats. This is just for me to make sure if any of our speakers wish to intervene and add anything on to the question that Pavel has posed. And there's a similar question coming from Ashwin Sasanko. What is the ALAC opinion or our speaker's opinion on the development of large scale intranet that may cover most part of the country, but connected with ICANN Internet through gateway for higher security?
	Perhaps other ALAC members may give their opinion on the question that was posed. And I also see I hand up from Ananda. I'm going to give you the floor Ananda, and then I'm going to come back after these three questions to our speakers to see if they have any direct comments for the further two minutes. Ananda, please, a question from you. The floor is yours.

ANANDA GAUTAM: Thank you for the floor. Greeting everyone. I'm from Nepal, and my name is Ananda Gautam. I represent a high level government body, and I'm also the coordinator Youth IGF Nepal. I do say that it was a very wonderful session on the fragmentation of Internet. And I can see that people who are representing GAC from Nepal are no more part of the government structure anymore. And is it legitimate to have in such positions when you are not in the government structure that is one of my questions? And in this scenario when there are no government representative on the countries, and how do we connect the GAC to the local government issues. That is my question, and I can give back. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Ananda. That is indeed a very interesting question. I'm not sure it's an easy one for us to be able to answer in one to two minutes, but that is duly noted both in the transcript and in the hearts and minds of the participants. I'm just going to turn the floor to our speakers to see if there are any direct comments or replies to the questions we have received during this session. Please kindly raise your hand or simply take the floor if you are in the room. I am not seeing an entirely reactions. Yes, please go ahead.

PARI ESFANDIARI: If I may on the question of SplinterNet, I think fragmentation happen in various levels, let's say in application and content level.   But when we talk about the splinterNet, it's the fragmentation that happened in logic and infrastructure level. So basically, it's when the networks are completely divided and that's ultimate fragmentation often referred to as SplinterNet.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Pari. And I see Nigel's hand us up. Please Nigel go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, yes, just very briefly and good questions on the SplinterNet, and good questions from our colleague from Nepal. And thank you so much for making that point. Just to say from, I think from our perspective. I mean, it's legitimate for anyone to have a view on Internet fragmentation. And the more of us that understand it in our communities, the more that can talk about it and express concerns on how it can happen.

And I really do come back to the point that I made earlier that sometimes policymakers and legislators have the best intentions in mind and introduce policies or legislation to try and correct a harm as they as they see it. And that has the alternative effect. And the same could be true on security. If we suddenly said, well,

we can't go to our website unless it's accredited to XYZ or whatever, then some people might argue, well, that's good because that enhances security. On the other hand, it creates a fracture in the Internet. So we all have to be mindful of this. Thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you. Thank you very much, Nigel. And I also believe that that is a very good introduction under the plenary that is happening later today. Being mindful of the time --

MANAL ISMAIL: Johanna, we have a hand up here in the room from the US.

JOANNA KULESZA: Of course, the US, please go ahead. Thank you, Manal.

U.S: Thanks, Manal, and thank you, Joanna. I think this is a very interesting discussion. And I just wanted to contribute just another thought on the fragmentation piece. I think it's also useful to consider fragmentation from the perspective of the end user. So if the end user is unable to reach the same site or location on the Internet that any other end user is unable to reach it that

could be considered fragmentation. But just another thought to contribute there. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Thank you very much. Indeed, I believe that that is a great introduction to the plenary. I recall there being certain concerns about how directly these topics might be related to the ICANN mission, and there we are. There seem to be very directly related. With that, I would like to come back to any other business that was proposed in the beginning. Maureen, I believe that the proposal came from you, if you would like to guide us through the introductions of new leadership for both constituencies. That would be much appreciated.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you very much, Joanna, and thank you to the GAC members for allowing us to use this time to introduce the change, of course, in leadership within the ALAC. This is the end of my four years as the Chair of the ALAC. And I would just like to introduce you to the incoming chair, and I'd like to give Jonathan at least two minutes to introduce himself to anyone who doesn't know him already.

Just to highlight some of the -- he's been integral, of course, to our consolidated policy working group. And so a lot of the

positions that we have presented to you have come about through his role as a coordinator within that working group. And Jonathan, two minutes max.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi, everyone. My name is Jonathan Zuck, and I've been acting as a vice chair of the ALAC for the past couple of years, focused on policy. And I've been spending the last week learning that there's a lot more to the At-Large than just policy. But I'm sure that that will still be my bias. And the focus of my personal participation whenever possible.

I went to school for international relations. In fact, I went to school with Chris Mondini for those of you that know him from the ICANN staff. And then instead of doing anything useful with my life, I went on and became a software developer for about a dozen years, and then I became a lobbyist for software developers.

So I've had kind of a surreal path back to international relations and now I find myself in broiled in the very thing that I studied so many decades ago. But it's been a pleasure working with you At-Large and it's been a real pleasure serving under Maureen as one of the vice chairs that the At-Large has had and I only hope to continue the progress that she's made in making the At-Large community and ALAC in particular respected and influential voice within the ICANN community.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

GULTEN TEPE:	Thank you very much, Maureen, and thank you, Jonathan. So in the sake of time, Joanna, I'll just introduce quickly our also new incoming GAC leadership team. So we have a Nicholas GAC representative of Paraguay as the incoming GAC chair. Yeah, we will be having Xiong, Ola. Xiong from Korea, Ola from Sweden, and Francis from Burundi serving on a second term. And we're having as new incoming Nigel from UK and Zeina from Lebanon serving their first terms. And the terms will start by the end of ICANN76.
	So with that, I would like Maureen to thank you very much. It's been a pleasure working with you and looking forward to continuing collaboration with ALAC with Jonathan as well. So please if we can round of applause to Maureen. Thank you. So to GAC colleagues, please be back in the room at 13:15 local time, 5:15 UTC to continue our communiqué drafting. Before that, there is the panel on fragmentation taking place in a different room. So see you after lunch. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]