
BUENOS AIRES – ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session

Sunday, November 17, 2013 – 09:00 to 18:30

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

UNIDENTIFIED: No you don't. You have a minute to, what's the word in Australian? To leave. Oh...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, let's get going. Could you please take your seats ladies and gentlemen? Just little housekeeping notes. I hear that some of the tin cards are not printed yet. There is only one printer in the building, so it will be coming if you don't have your tin card. We will be able to have them soon.

Let's start the recording. Thank you. Well, good morning everyone. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody listening to us remotely, or watching us remotely actually. We are all back to have a long week of work.

This is the At Large, well it was the Metrics Committee earlier, we've finished that, haven't we? It's the ALAC and Regional meeting working session number one, and this is the first meeting of the week for us, the ALAC. I welcome everyone around the table.

Usually we go for a quick introduction. First I'm going to give you some housekeeping notes. When you speak please introduce yourself. In fact, I should do so myself. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And that's of course for the interpreters, because if you are on another channel

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.

and many people speak, one after the other, it sounds very strange if you don't introduce yourself.

That's the first one. The second one, the second housekeeping note is that we need to be quite short in our interventions because we have a very packed schedule today. Sandra Hoferichter, whom I can't see at the moment, oh there she is. Sandra volunteered to be our time keeper, so if you see Sandra waving at you, it's not that she's trying to say hi, it's that you need to get on with things.

Yeah, the T thing, perfect. So that's one thing. And then the other thing is just to, let's go for a quick, around the table list of the people that are here. And oh yes, speak slowly. Well, we need to, because we need to have for the record who is around the table. So just your name and affiliation please. And we'll start in an anti-clockwise manner, so we'll start with Rafid Fatani.

RAFID FATANI: Rafid Fatani. I am the Nom Com incoming selectee for APRALO.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Eduardo Diaz from NACRALO.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, chair of NARALO.

PHILIP JOHNSON: Good morning. I'm Philip Johnson, incoming secretariat of AFRALO.

AZIZ HILALI: Aziz Hilali, secretary of AFRALO and next AFRALO chair.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Siranush Vardanyan from Armenia. This is my first meeting as APRALO vice chair.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Fatimata Seye Sylla from Senegal. Outgoing AFRALO chair.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Carlton Samuels. This is my final meeting as ALAC from the Caribbean Nom Com.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Good morning everyone. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, ALAC member from LACRALO.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sandra Hoferichter, European representative for the ALAC.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Nom Com appointee from the Asia Pacific region, also my last ICANN meeting.

MARUEEN HILYARD: Marueen Hilyard, incoming ALAC member for ALAC RALO.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche here, APRALO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And ALAC member.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg, ALAC member from North America, liaison to the GNSO, and ALAC representative on the ATRT 2.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Evan Leibovitch, vice chair, ALAC member from North America, and still here one more year.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond, ALAC chair.

WOLF LUDWIG: Wolf Ludwig, EURALO chair.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr, outgoing ccNSO liaison, and incoming chair of the nominating committee for 2014. I just want to recognize that Maureen

who is not only a new APRALO rep, into the ALAC is also taking up the mantle of the ccNSO liaison.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco, ICANN staff.

MATT ASHTIANI: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC member and outgoing vice chair of AFRALO.

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Julia Charvolen, ICANN staff.

HADJA OUATTARA: Hadja Ouattara, AFRALO, ALAC new member.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Glenn McKnight, incoming NARALO secretariat and outgoing Nom Com.

EDMOND CHUNG: Edmond Chung, ALAC IDM liaison and ISOC Nom Com.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Carlos Aguirre, former ALAC member, LACRALO.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Sergio Salinas Porto, member of LACRALO, former member of ALAC for LACRALO.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Sylvia Herlein Leite, from Brazil. I am secretary of LACRALO.

NATALIA ENCISO: Natalia Enciso...

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Salenieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. I'm outgoing APRALO representative to the ALAC.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez. Incoming LACRALO Nom Com selectee for the ALAC.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima Cambronero, incoming ALAC member by LACRALO.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. This is Olivier speaking. We've got a small desk for some reason. We've got quite a few our members behind, so let's just go through the back row quickly.

YULIYA MORENETS: Thank you. Yuliya Mornets. My first ICANN meeting as EURALO secretariat.

JOSE ARCE: Jose Arce...

JUAN IGUACIO: Juan Iguacio. This is my first meeting.

DIEGO ABIELA: Diego Abiela. And I'm first time to meeting.

SAVENACA VOCEA: Savenaca Vocea. ICANN staff serving the Oceania region.

GERALD: Gerald [?], EURALO Board and ccNSO Nom Com [?].

RICO: Rico [?], Caribbean representative, [?] be first ICANN meeting.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Roberto Gaetano, individual ALAC member.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But also individual in EURALO as well. Okay. We'll thanks for this quick round the table list. We're already a bit late, however there is one thing that we do need to start with, and that's the very sad passing way of one of our former colleagues and members, ALAC members, and that's for Gareth Shearman. Gareth passed away a few months ago.

We thought it would be appropriate for us to have an one minute silence for Gareth standing up, thank you.

Thank you. And Garth, you have the floor.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Garth Bruen, chair of EURALO. I've emailed some of the groups about this, that I'll be collecting anecdotes from anybody about Gareth Shearman who worked with him. I'm going to be creating a collaborative circle ID piece to memorialize him within the community. So email me or come and speak to me any time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Garth, much appreciated by the community. So, joining us now at the table is Fadi Chehade, who is the CEO of ICANN. And I think we can just do a quick introduction. Over to you Fadi. That's how quick it can be. You have the floor.

FADI CHEHADE:

Well, first of all, welcome to all of the incoming members. I think, I'm still feeling like I'm incoming. It takes time to really acclimate and be part of this very, frankly very beautiful community, very rich community. So welcome onboard.

And to those of you who are outgoing, I was delighted to hear that everyone exited from the door and entered from the window into something else. This is good. By the way, this is a very good sign that the community has enough places for everybody to continue contributing and giving.

And your group in particular has been, as he always complained, you know we all pinch people from your group because you're a very fertile ground of good ideas, of open approaches to things, and you enrich us, not just here but across the ICANN community. So thank you. Thank you for all of you who served. A special thank you to those of you who served and are continuing to serve in some other capacity, and we welcome to the new people.

And especially to those who are here for the very, very first time, a very good welcome to you. This is the beginning of my second year at ICANN. It feels longer than a year because it has been busy. But it actually has been just a year. I met most of you casually in Prague, but I really started working in Toronto, which is a year ago.

And it's been a remarkable year. When I met three, four of the original leaders of ICANN when I started, they invited me to dinner, Evan Surf and Steve Crocker, our chairman, Brian Cote from PIR, and John Currant

took me out to dinner to just, you know, give me some energy for the job.

And I asked them, at that dinner a year ago, if we could have the dinner every year, and they graciously agreed. So I will be having another dinner with them in the next few days. And then I asked them, “When I meet you in a year,” which is about now, “what would be a catastrophic failure of mine? What would be terrible? If you met me in a year and I said, ‘Oh my God, that’s a catastrophic,’ what would it be?”

And they all agreed on one thing a year ago. They said, “If this new gTLD program, whether we agree with it or not, does not take off, it would be catastrophic for ICANN.” For many reasons, it will signal that we are not operationally capable of birthing a major program. It will signal a failure at a core activity that is extremely visible, because actually we have many core activities that some may argue that are more important than the gTLD program.

But there are not as visible. The trouble with the gTLD program is, you know, when I get a call from *The New York Times*, or from *The Financial Times*, or from most of the media, I struggle to talk to them about what we do at ICANN, but they want to talk about the new gTLD program.

So if failure would be so visible that we would have trouble making the rest of our agenda strong. So I’m happy to have that dinner with these four guys again because I think we have crossed that chasm. The new gTLD program is up and running. As of tomorrow morning, we will have more new gTLDs in the root than all the gTLDs to date in history.

We have signed over 100 contracts, and we have hundreds of contracts already out for signature, the program is on its wheels. That's a good thing. That's a good thing. It really is, and we should be very comforted by that. Again, with no particular emotion about the gTLD program, I have to remain very, this is not busy if it fails or if it succeeds, that's the busy of the people who ask for these things and we trust them, we check that they're at least good enough to carry on their job.

But it's about ICANN itself appearing to be a functional organization. So we should celebrate this moment. We should celebrate our community. We should celebrate that we got a very complex program that took eight years off the ground. And that's good. We face a difficulty here ahead of us for new reasons.

In the next two years, the subject of Internet governance will be central to the debate. Very central. Why? And why is it important for ICANN? First why, why is it important? Well, because the Internet, unlike 15 years ago when ICANN started, is now the life blood of economies, the life blood of social of lives, the life blood of communities, and I venture to say the life blood of political systems.

When I was in Korea earlier this month, the Vice Minister of Science and Technology told me that when the Internet was shut down in Korea, due to a huge cyber-attack, 43% of the GDP of Korea was frozen. That's... He looks at me and says, "That's real work." I mean, this is serious.

So the Internet is no longer just for my kids to get on Facebook and for us to talk, which is also important, you know, to communicate, but it's now also a life-blood of many things and therefore its importance has risen. I think the surveillance revelations of the last few months have not helped that, in the sense that if it was important now it's also visibly important to heads of state. When the president of Brazil spoke, I might say eloquently at day one, she spoke about the fear that she, as a head of state, does not know how to explain to her own subjects, how could this happen to them and to her.

That fear, from a head of state, is something we should be worried about. Because heads of state, when they're worried, they do something. Now we want them to do something, but we want them to do something in the right framework. We want them to do it in a multi-stakeholder framework. Because if heads of state leaving New York after Dilma's speech, all went back to their capitals – and I know of at least six who did, I'm sure others did that I don't know about – and they went to their cabinets and they said, excuse my language, that's literally what one of them told me.

The president walks into the cabinet and says, "Who the hell runs the Internet in our country?" And he got a well, you know, the foreign office. Well, we kind of don't know who runs the Internet in our country. This is serious business, right? I mean, this is no longer... We meddling here in ICANN with our business, this is now stuff that is coming at us.

As Wolfgang, our new Board member told us yesterday at the Board meeting, he said, “Yes, we at ICANN have an eco-system and we’re managing our job, and we should stick to our knitting.” And yes, I agree with him. But we live in an environment. Our house is not on a planet on its own. We live in an environment. We have to be aware of the environment. And the environment right now is changing. We have many governments awake to, hey, hey, who runs the Internet?

The president of Mexico went to his cabinet and says, “Who runs the Internet in Mexico?” And they said, “Well, Texas.” And he said, “No, no. I need to know who runs the Internet here.” That’s a good question. So we are rushing right now to participate in that dialogue. All of us, we should rush. Some people now are upset at me because I took initiative, or I rushed fast. I’m done with the initiative.

You know, we went and what we did was we energized the process. We didn’t invent anything. You all, all of us have been talking about this for years. All we’ve done is energized it. We put a little energy into it, and now it’s up to us. Each one of you has to participate in that dialogue in a thoughtful calm way.

Build on what has been done, not restart something new. There is nothing new to start. I bet you if you got Roberto, or any of you guys who have been at this years, to just articulate what needs to be discussed and where we need to head, it’s clear. We just need to be together, and to do it calmly, and smartly, and wisely, because if we don’t, now here’s why ICANN and why we should worry.

If we don't, two things will happen. Let me start with the big, global picture then what will happen to ICANN. What will happen in the big global picture, think of the [wicket]. All of you followed the [wicket]. What happened at the [wicket]? At the [wicket] we got polarized. I was there. Many of you were there. What happened is you had Russia on one side, with a lot of people coalescing around that, and you had the United States on one side, with a lot of people coalescing around that.

All the governments in the middle were kind of, where do we go? And some ended up through pressures going one way or the other, and what we ended up with is frankly a very confused global community. Now maybe that's a good thing. Some of us would like the [wicket] not to produce something, say that's a good thing. But I'm not going to get political, I'm going to be practical.

The reality is, the nations of the world were divided and that division, going into next year, is more dangerous. Why? Because the side that believes the multi-stakeholder is the solution is right now rattled by the Snowden revelations. And there moral high ground for an open, free Internet is a little bit compromised, and therefore they're weaker, if I can be blunt. So it's very important for us to forge a middle ground.

And that's what ICANN, and the ISTARs, and the community in Bali are trying to do right now. We're trying to forge a middle ground, to find a middle ground, and we started with Brazil. Why Brazil? After her speech at the UN, I had a chance to talk to Kofi Annan. I called him to take his opinion about what he heard at the UN.

And Mr. Annan told me, he said, “Fadi, the momentum right now is in Latin America. It’s not in Africa. It just happens to be Latin America, because the Latin American countries are, right now, rising to figure out how to govern the Internet in a unique way. And I think Africa is coming right behind it, but right now,” he said.

And so this is Mr. Annan himself he told me, “Go to Latin America. Go there.” And I did. And I didn’t know I’d meet President Rouseff. How am I going to meet President Rouseff? I just went to meet with our community, CGI. What do you think? What do we do? And one thing led to the other. In two, three days I’m in Brazil, they said, “You need to meet the president.” And the president agreed to meet me.

This was a miracle. I tell you, this was a bit of a miracle because I was with President Mujica’s people in Uruguay, and they wrote her a letter to meet me, but she didn’t. She refused to meet. She said, “Who is this guy? Why do I need to meet him?” But something happened in Brazil that was a bit miraculous. I actually admit that, I don’t know how you’ll take it but if you haven’t been to Brasilia, Brasilia is of course a beautiful city, and in the middle of Brasilia, as you know, Brasilia was built by a very famous architect.

And in the middle of the city, he built a beautiful church. Have you seen that church he built? I took a picture with my iPhone but that’s how it looks like. It’s a gorgeous church. And so I went to the church that morning, and I – yeah, I asked for some help because I did not feel good about where things were heading, because the day before I saw

President Rousseff, she said publically, she said, “The solution is at the UN.”

Not only at the UN, she said it the day before, you can go see her blog. So, I was in front of President Rousseff. And I sat with her just like this, like Cheryl is sitting, she sat next me, and I looked her in the eye and I said, “President Rousseff, you spoke the truth at the UN. I thank you for that. But now, how do we get beyond this and get into a solution? You want a solution, don’t you?”

She said yes. I want... She’s very pragmatic. She said, “I want a solution.” I said, “So you think you’re going to get the solution at the UN?” And she tilted her head, she said, “Well, where else do you want me to go? Where do you want me to go?” I said, “There is something called the multi-stakeholder community. You are a leader in that community.”

And she says, “Yes, I know, the CGI.” And she says, “Where is the CGI people?” Because in the meeting, the CGI people were not let in the meeting. This is a long story. So I told her they were outside. She told her chief of staff, “Go call them. Have them come in.” These are the Brazilian multi-stakeholder leaders. So she brought them into the meeting. It was really remarkable because at that point, all the parts of her government, who have been maybe sometimes sparring over multi-lateral or multi-stakeholder, multi-lateral being inter-governmental.

They were sitting at the table with us, and the president chose multi-stakeholder. And tomorrow morning, this is news I’m sharing with you,

tomorrow morning the government of Brazil will have a press conference at 9 AM our time, and we'll announce that President Rousseff is calling for, and I quote now, "the first global multi-stakeholder meeting on the future of Internet governance."

Okay? It will be in April, next year. So this is transformation. Why is it important for ICANN and then I stop. Some people are telling me, this is not why we elected you Fadi. You should be, you know, paying attention to SSEC and RSEC and gTLDs, and I do. I am. Believe me, this is why we're not sleeping a lot these days. I'm not, not paying attention. We have a superb team, and tomorrow morning when I speak to all of you, I'll show you how much we've accomplished.

There is a lot that has been accomplished. And we continue to work very hard at ICANN on our core business, but we also have to pay attention to the environment. If we don't pay attention to the environment, we will feel pressures. Two kinds of pressures. One pressure that I am already feeling, is people coming to me, serious people, government people as well, saying, "Hey, ICANN runs so well, why don't you take on all these new subjects?"

Why don't you take on more subjects? We want to announce that ICANN should do privacy stuff." Oh, no. I am into names and numbers. That's all I want to do, and we don't want to make ICANN grow further. We don't want ICANN to become a big organization because we'll become like any big organization, quite the opposite. We need to keep focused on our knitting and do it well. So we don't want ICANN to continue feeling pressure to expand its job.

We should stick to our job, and do it well. The second pressure we'll get is if the world starts moving to Internet governance in the multi-lateral, which equals inter-governmental model, without all stakeholders participating in the consensus, this is your making, we will feel that pressure too because the next thing people say, "Well, why are we doing privacy this way? I think this human agency or this inter-governmental group should also take on names and numbers."

So we will feel that pressure. So it's important that we are part of an ecosystem promoting the multi-stakeholder model to preserve ICANN's role and our multi-stakeholder nature. And I need you for that. I'm done. I decalcified a few things. I reenergize a few things. But I can't continue alone.

ICANN will fail without each one of you stepping up and continuing to do, I'm not asking you to do anything new. I know all of you have been engaged in these debates, but now we need to energize them. We need to find a common way to do it. And so, the creation of one net was in Bali so that ICANN, all the ISTARs, the business community, the ccTLD community, the civil society, the academics, all of us have a voice together because we all have...

And that doesn't mean that it eliminates our private voices, individually, or as At Large, or ALAC, we all have our voices, we continue them. But then, when the world wants to hear us, one, united. The one net initiated was created by more than 300 people that met in a crowded room in Bali and said, "Let's do it together. Let's get our voice out together."

And one that will need us, each one of us. So I encourage you to engage in the dialogue, to participate, to make your voices your heard, to make our voice heard, everywhere in your communities, we need each other. This is the moment. This is the moment. And if we miss it, we will be marginalized by global debate that is very powerful. Is this helpful? Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. I see a number of nodding heads. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Thank you very much Fadi for this introduction to our day. I guess you're the first guest coming in, and it certainly is something – what a starter, exactly. Do you have time for a few questions by any chance?

FADI CHEHADE: Maybe one or two because I'm late already to a meeting, but please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: One or two. We have Tijani Ben Jemaa who is quick on the trigger, and Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro, and Evan Leibovitch. That's three.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I will speak English since you are in [?]. Fadi, I am so happy that you are saying what I said five years ago. Five years ago, I was fighting for that. People don't know that in the CSTD, discussing the enhanced cooperation, there is a wall. Don't know here....

In ICANN, people, they don't care. They are happy with their multi-stakeholder model, but this model will not survive if we don't go to the [?]. I will not be long, I am very happy that you say today what I said five years ago.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Next is Salanieta.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. Just like to echo what my colleague Tijani said to himself, congratulating you on your leadership, particularly in these interesting times. We are doing what we can in our respective communities in terms of the preservation and the safeguarding of an opening for Internet.

And clearly, and I really like the tone that you set into these meeting, with privilege, that we kick start at ICANN for the [?] with you addressing the ALAC, particularly on the notes that you mentioned. And we're very aggressively doing that in our region, and from the Pacific. And I know [?] who is ICANN staff, has also been aggressively doing that.

In terms of aggressive enhanced cooperation, I think one of the things I noted in Bali, particularly was, there was a still significant –and Maureen Hillard, Holly and many others. One of the things that has been lacking is the understanding by many people in different constituencies that enhanced aggressive cooperation already exists. But people don't know that.

In fact, it's been happening for 10 years, not just within ICANN. And I think what really needs to happen, and I hope you can take this into consideration, is if you can get people to come out of their silos, and maybe talk about the success stories of these cooperation a bit more. And that's all I would like to say. Oh, and just one last thing.

Just very quickly, just to wrap it up. Just because you are sitting and I won't get this chance again. I think the crux of the debate between multi-stakeholder and multi-lateral actually go backs to an old UN General Assembly document. So if you want to remove the politicization, you've actually got to reverse the actual document, just a thought. And it could be done. Happy to talk offline.

FADI CHEHADE:

Please, if you have a link to that document, could you email it to me? Yeah and please send it to me. You see, I just want to commend you on what you said and the strength in your spirit, which I felt. This is important, and we and our kids will remember what we did now, where we could do something.

Tijani's frustration is well-placed. We've been screaming in the desert, but now we have a place, we are energizing ourselves, let's make sure we're heard. We have some much to celebrate and to tell. Nothing new here, as Tijani said, just energizing the great things that exist today. Let's put them all in this one net canvas.

One net is now blank. Next week, we'll start giving people pens so that they can write everywhere on one net. It's a canvas. Let's put our

stories there. Let's tell the world what we've done. So thank you for your spirit. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Fadi. The world, sorry the UN six languages are here, we've got one last – we actually have one last person. Evan Leibovitch, please make it short.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks a lot Fadi. As I hoped you recalled, the At Large community was probably one of the first to get up on its feet and applaud what you did with Montevideo. We tried to make sure that before the Bali IGFs started that you had in hand a letter of support from us, to indicate that despite what sniping you may have had from elsewhere in the community, you had our support.

I would also say, and I guess this is speaking personally, but that support comes at a bit of a price. And that price is to hold you to the commitment that you made when you first came here to us. And use the term multi-equal-stakeholder. I haven't been hearing that much lately. And what I want to make sure is that as you move forward with the Rio conference, as you move forward with these initiatives, that you realize that there is an understanding, there is significant imperfections in the current ICANN model of multi-stakeholder, in that it does not go from simply what people believe to be industry capture within ICANN to government web capture within the IT model.

We've always been promoting a kind of middle ground, and I hope that's what you try to get at Rio. Please make sure that there is public interest participation in that isn't only expressed by governments. Please do what you can to ensure that there is that kind of equal participation.

As long as that kind of balance is there, as long as that kind of equilibrium is there, I think you'll continue to have our support, but please understand that that is the qualification, I think.

FADI CHEHADE:

Yeah. I want to thank you and Evan for this important comment. The statement you provided me in Bali was the first and strongest statement of support. In fact, some people are saying to me, "You haven't gotten that level of statement from your own Board of Directors." So I thank you for that. This was very helpful to me.

And it gave me wind, it gave me wind in the sails. And today the Board will publish also an important resolution, because very people know, but I'll share with you now, because it will be published later today, that I did not sail on this journey alone. The Board was with me, it's just that the resolution they gave me, and the mandate that they gave me to go do this was kept confidential. Today it will be revealed.

They will publicize what they told me two months ago to go do, because this was exactly started on the 15th of September, when the resolution was given to me. They will publish that resolution, and I think they will publish today a second resolution to give us wind for the next few

months. So you will hear that publically, so no one is questioning that Fadi is on his own, kind of doing things.

I wasn't. I took exact instructions. But thank you for your support. I value it. It's very important. You keep this more equal stakeholder than anybody. You do. And I thank you for that. As to what I plan to do, I will take to heart what you suggested, and I want you to know that the Brazilian organizers, I'm not organizing, it's Brazil that is organizing, but they will announce that they want to build a steering committee to organize the meeting, to decide the agenda, etcetera.

And they're going to have the steering committee equal on government and non-government, so it's not all government. And the non-government piece will all come from one net. So they're asking the one net initiative to start organizing itself, and to field people for the steering committee that will then decide, you know, how we may bounce. But in terms of my discussion with the president, when I met her, as to who should attend, yes the idea is very much that the attendance is not government driven, is not government invited, but rather is again open and they're asking one net to help them figure out how to keep it open and to bring more people.

In fact, I will leave you with this thought, just to tell you how impressed I was with President Rousseff. She said that in her view, the meeting should not start, despite everybody calling this a summit, should not start by heads of states speaking, as most meetings do, but rather by screens around the room, bringing people from around the world who wish to address the attendees.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: President and CEO, Fadi Chehade, thank you. Okay. Without any further ado, I now invite Sally Costerton to join us at the table. Sally is senior advisor to the president on global stakeholder engagement. And we also have the regional vice presidents who are here. They're all here. We have a small table. Heidi believes it's a great photo, okay.

So welcome Sally. And I guess, I should just say the floor is yours.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you Olivier, and so nice to be back with you all again. And most of you I think I've seen before, we've met before. This is always one of my favorite parts of the ICANN meeting, I must say that. And, I've got my gang here, this is very exciting. So very good room layout.

That's actually a very good starting point. So we have a little time together this morning, I will be very brief in terms of just giving you an update on what's been going on since we saw each other last in Durban. And I have my team here who I'm going to, they haven't got the mic, so I'm going to introduce them. I think you know who they all are.

To start, this is like the beauty pageant. So starting on the left, we have [?] who looks after the Middle East, [?] who is Oceania/Pacific, Chris [?] who is North America and business engagement, Pierre who is Africa, Rodrigo who is in his home gig here so Latin America and the Caribbean, and not last but very much not least, is [?] – oh...

[?] promotes himself, that's very typical. Can I just make this point? No. This is [?] who looks after Asia for us. Hang on. And [?] who looks after Russia and CIS. So thank you very much for all being here. This is great, actually. And that's a very good point to start on. When I first came to ICANN, which my first meeting was the Toronto meeting, and it's really not that long ago.

It's 12 months in an ICANN cycle, but I have filled – it's a lot longer than that, in elapsed time, or lack of sleep, or I don't know what it is. But when I came to that meeting, I did wonder if I accidentally joined a cult, and I couldn't find the way out. Now I know that that was true, and I've given up fighting. It's a wonderful environment.

And my key goal when I came to ICANN was to help ICANN build, as Fadi asked me, he said, "I want you to help us build a world class engagement capability." That was my primary job. I also helped build some capacity in our communications team, who you are going to talk to in a minute. So this session is on engagement. We had some great people on the team already, slightly differently organized.

We now have a complete set, so we're done, and that's really the big change that's come since we saw you in Africa. Particularly Adam [Quack?]. We had gone sometime without an Asian/Pacific lead, now [Quack] has two roles, which is the other thing that's been expanding since we last saw each other, which is our hop strategy. So I wanted to spend just two seconds, hopefully clarifying the difference between our engagement operation and our hops support, because it can be a little confusing, and we've rolled them out pretty much at the same time.

So these guys are all very senior guys, they are all have been brought in because they understand the issues, and they understand the Internet community in their region. And their job is to be the front door for our community in their particular region. All stakeholder groups, [?] balanced. Somebody said, Evan said, equality, this is in their goals, this is in their performance goals, that they're waiting in their time, even in their resources which sometimes people, sometimes is money, across all four of our broad stakeholder groups.

And obviously that drives programs in a different way, because depending on the maturity and the evolution of our community in different parts of the world, sometimes we need more in some areas, less in others, and it varies a lot. So they join up well together globally, to share best practice, and tools, and learnings, but the implementation of engagement is always local, it's always regional, it's not done in some darkened room. Without really touching and engaging with the guys in our community.

And all of them are at various stages, as I know we've discussed this in this group before, of rolling out regional engagement strategies, which are community, groups, volunteers, and staff together working on very focused engagement priorities, and they vary quite a lot from region to region.

So there is a lot of difference between them. Now, we have added what we call engagement centers. Now what that really means is again, it varies depending on the need. So we have an engagement center in

Beijing, and we've added a China engagement head, [?] who is here at the meeting and I hope you meet him.

He works for quite a key space in Beijing. We're running support lines in fact, phone lines, out of the Beijing office. Not just for applicants, although that was one of the early demands, but for anybody in the ICANN community who wants to speak to ICANN in their own language, in their own time zone, and that is a triaging process, almost a call center if you will, to make sure that enormous country is being better served directly by ICANN.

Now the engagement hubs are not just in Beijing, we obviously have offices where all of these guys are based, so they're point people. But we, there is more offices, sometimes there is a person working from home, it's a nominee if you will. Sometimes, in Brussels for example, we have a build in, in DC we have an office in the conventional sense. Now the other side of this we've been involving is the hub's strategy.

This is about splitting our headquarter operation into three, to serve time zones. There is obviously some cross-over – clearly if we want [?] who is based in Cairo, works very closely with David Olive who is the general manager, if that's the right world, it's not quite, but we understand that concept, I think, of our operation in [?] Europe, Middle East, and Africa hub which is Istanbul, which is very conveniently geographically, pretty much bang in the middle of that time zone region.

So [?] and David will do engagement activities together. [?] has Turkey, it's been a part of his engagement region, so they are connected. But [?] isn't based in Istanbul, and he doesn't need to be. We may add people working in [?] who are based in Istanbul, over time. And I hope very much that as community members, you will start to feel you can utilize these hub offices because they do have meeting room space, they vary in size, they're not huge, but they are community facilities.

[Quack] is doing two jobs. So he is looking after the Asia/Pacific hub, which is in Singapore, which is been open about two months, down in the financial district for those of you who know Singapore. It's very centrally located. And he is looking after people in compliance, and legal, and registry and registrar support, as well as having a small engagement team there as well, which will grow.

And he will start to expand putting feet on the ground not just in Beijing, which he has already done, but in other parts of the region. But I don't anticipate we will open more kind of physical offices, so I hope that's helpful because there is a lot of – sometimes a lot of confusion about this in the community, and we'll get settled with it.

So that main priority for these last two months has been about completing that – get the talent if you will, the people that make this possible, and really trying to accelerate the working groups in the regions, the cross-community working groups. I know that's not quite the right term because that means something else. But our independent groups that are looking at engagement.

The final thing I would say is, and I'm happy to take questions obviously, is that we are having a session on Thursday, so this is the overall engagement team. And many of you in this room have been great partners in our community outreach group, where we will bring the community up to date on some of these final sort of tools and programs we've been building together over the last six to nine months.

We will share an engagement plan, an integrated engagement plan for the whole of ICANN, showing how all these different pieces and parts fit together. And I hope we will be able to have a good discussion about that on Thursday morning, and once everybody is comfortable with that, that will be a document we'll make available on the website for all of you, and we'll translate it, we'll make it longer or shorter, PowerPoint or PDF, whatever anybody wants.

And hopefully it will become much easier if everybody to feel, this is how we all participate, and how we partner together. So I have lots more to say, but it's a short session, and I want you to be able to ask my colleagues questions as well. So I'm done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sally. It's Olivier speaking. The floor is open for question. First we have Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Garth Bruen, chair of NARALO. Do you have initiatives to reach out to the blind, deaf, and disabled community?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Sorry. Sally for the record. Chris, this is... I have Chris Gift here on my right. Chris could you...? Thank you very much. To be blunt to answer to that, one is Chris on access issues online, which is an important part. We spent quite a lot of time discussing this. It's not always as straightforward as it should be.

And the second thing I would like to ask all of my team here behind me is, if anybody would like to make a contribution to that? They're very welcome to. I would like us to setup a separate dialogue about this Garth, and it would be useful to me and my team to understand how we might best do that, because I don't think we have spent as much time as we should.

We haven't spent no time, but we haven't spent enough time. Chris.

CHRIS GIFT:

Yes this is Chris Gift with ICANN staff. Accessibility is a big, is a paramount issue and concern for us. On the new digital tools, and certainly new website that we are working on and that I'll discuss in just a few minutes, and I'll show that. So yes, we are getting some special training for the developers.

There are nonetheless conversant in some of this, but they're getting special training so that we can keep working on the accessibility for those tools.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Chris. Follow up from Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: It's wonderful that the technical aspects are being addressed. I was in a doctor's office recently, and there was a blind woman in a wheelchair, waiting, and the nurse came out and said, "Ma'am can you come with me?" And she said, "No. I can't come with you. Someone has to take me." Now the hospital has elevators, and wheelchair ramps, and braille, but there are people that need to be taken the rest of the way, and you have to go right to these communities to find them.

SALLY COSTERTON: Garth, in the interest of time, but recognizing the criticality of this issue, I think we need to give it a separate voice, a separate platform, whatever word we want to use, a separate dialogue. I'm going to ask Chris [?] who – just because he is in your region, to liaise with you, and I would ask you to share with us, with this group, how you think we might do that.

There is lots of different ways we could, but you have my commitment that as a group, we need to spend some time on this, on this particular aspect of engagement. I completely agree with what you're saying. I really do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sally.

UNIDENTIFIED: [?] from the Oceania region. In my region, there is a woman called [?] who is a very good advocate for the disability people. And I do bounce off a lot of discussions with her, and that fits into our internal stuff, what we are to do as well. Next month I will be in Fiji, and there is a disability group for the whole Pacific region.

And that's something I'm going to be talking to them as well to try and invite them in, for the first time, into ICANN.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you [?]. It's [?]. I think that you have been in touch with her, have you? We can fix that. Okay. I just note that more regional vice presidents have joined us, behind us. We have just one more.

NIGEL HICKS: Good morning. Nigel Hicks. I do apologize I'm late. I know many of you and it's always good to be here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. We have a queue in operation. We have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Yuliya Morenets, and Salanieta Tamanikawaiwaimaro. So let's start first with Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. I am known by being someone who is always complaining. This time, I will surprise you, I will not complain, I will thank very much Sally and her team. Sally did in Bali something that it wasn't possible in ICANN before, at all. Because we were in a situation that we didn't have a tool to show our ICANN labs and our online platform, etcetera.

And the discussion between me and her, the day forever after, she put everything in place [?]. And this is for me something extraordinary. Thank you very much, you and your team. But [laughter]. I would like to emphasize on something very important, the preparation of our participation in the international fora. This is something very important because if we don't prepare that in a good manner, we will fail. And we don't want to fail. So I propose that you constitute a working group, taskforce, anything, constituted by the community, staff, and Board members to prepare, starting from now, all the upcoming international fora.

And there is a lot. I can give you the list. And see what kind of participation you need to do, and what are the tools we need to do this participation. Fadi just spoke about, how to say, obligation to be present, not to look at our ICANN only, we have to look at the environment, and this is the best way to make people in this environment respect us. And it is by the participation, the substantive participation. Not by the nice speech or the nice brochures.

No. We have to participate. We have to make people respect us, respect us a community, as staff, and as Board. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. So I'm closing the queue, and so we still have Yuliya Morenets, Salanieta Tamanikawaimaro, and Fatimata Seye Sylla in the queue. So we'll start with Yuliya and please keep your interventions short, because we have time pressures.

YUILYA MORENETS: Thank you Olivier. Yuiya Morenets from EURALO secretariat. I actually want to follow up what was said concerning how to address people with disabilities, and say maybe we have also to address vulnerable or marginalized people. We know that this discussion is very important and ongoing with different initiatives around the world. We had recently, the discussion in Bali, where we had Fadi Chehade who addressed us concerning the issues, and we had the chance to have Nigel with us as well.

So I would just like to call to address not only people with disabilities, which is very important group to be addressed, but also vulnerable or marginalized communities. Thank you. And I would be happy for sure, or we would be happy to share what we've done and to join.

SALLY COSTERTON: Could I just respond very quickly to that? As I go into my second year of ICANN, we're moving into a different stage with our engagement, on the staff side. We've been doing a lot of building, a lot of capacity

building frankly. And now, we need to drill into some of these really key issues, particularly of outreach, reach and access.

And there are many different groups that come into – they’re marginalized for different reasons, some are global, some are national and regional, and there are many organizations in the wider Internet community who are already focusing on some of these issues, with who we need to reach out and partner. So, I think this is an important strand of our engagement as we go in, to also frankly, this wider Internet governance debate.

This is not just about the DNS, you know this is about why one net needs to exist to some extent, to protect people’s rights and to make sure that they are being properly enabled, however much – whatever the reason is why they may not be being enabled. That we are allowing them to bring that to the table, we’re not doing it on our own because there are many other people that we can work with.

And this, I think, is a very important theme for our next 12 months. Thank you for that input, very helpful.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sally. We actually had also remote participation question in there, which will start on. Matt Ashtiani please.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hi this is Matt Ashtiani for the record. This question comes from Oksana Prykhodko. Oksana asks, “What is the balance between regional

preferences and ICANN’s preferences regarding engagement centers?
I’m asking particularly about Eastern Europe and the CIS.”

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Vinnie.

VINNIE: For the record, Vinnie [?]. This is a question which we have been dealing about in my region, which is Russia, Eastern Europe, CIS, because some people there were feeling that ICANN was somehow not actively engaging there. But the reality is that we have done a lot in the region without the necessity to share an office. We believe also... It’s shared among the dot management. It’s not necessary to have an office everywhere, what is necessary is to engage the community and what we are trying to do is exactly that.

I’m happy to say that actually it’s a very good example of At Large, that through the ICANN Fellowship. Without them, I’m going to show off a little bit about Bulgaria, but through the Fellowship with all the Bulgarian lady here a year ago, and then she on her own, from an university, asked for the university to join the At Large.

It’s [?]. Not only that, this year she came with a proposal and we are going to support it by sending people to teach there. They have a course on Internet governance and cyber-security. They did it on their own. We just said, “We can support you in any way we can.” But that’s

example of how we could actually do a job without having physical office in the region.

And I think it's better to use the resources that are limited after all, to help the people from the community. And Oksana actually asking the question is one of the examples because she was a very active part of ICANN community, and I hope that she will continue to help in the future. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Vinnie. Next is Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you. Sala for the transcripts. Hi Sally and everyone in your team. First of all, I would just like to commend you on very excellent work you all are doing in terms of engaging our communities around the world. I just wanted to ask if there is already work done, of if there hasn't been if something could be done, in terms of having some sort of central repository where we could, you could build new engagements in the different foras like the IETF.

And we have the planet pots, or anywhere really where there is policy going on where ICANN can itself actually engage in. And I know there is already information, but just making those links and having it in a central place so that people like me can go in and look for stuff. Thank you Sally.

SALLY COSTERTON:

I hope we might cover this in the next session. I'm probably [?] colleagues will thump me heavily after this. We're definitely talking more about this this week, so please let us take this offline. We'll definitely cover it in the open session on Thursday. We've done a lot, we'll do more, there is always more.

This is very key for access issues, if we don't know we are, if we're not joined up, if we can't partner, Tijani's point, that we can't plan, our engagement will be diminished. So this is – you raise a great point in terms of giving us the right tools ahead of time, and we're working on it and love your responses to it as you take a look at it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Sally. Finally, Fatimata Seye Sylla.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA:

Thank you Olivier. Fatimata Seye Sylla, AFRALO chair. Thank you to all of you. Thank you Sally. I would just like to add my voice to Garth's, regarding the disabled, the disabled people. And I completely agree with the suggestion Sally is making that in working with all the people. I would just like to see if there is a group or a committee to be put in place to work on this.

I think all the regions should be represented. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Now I'm going to show that I've only been in ICANN for a year with my lack of process qualification. I personally think this is something that I would be very happy, very happy, for us to participate in a cross-community group or taskforce maybe rather than a working group, that looks at the issues, who is involved at the moment, how we partner, how we engage globally and regionally.

I think that should be not just from the ALAC of course, but from other parts of the community, and I'm very happy to partner with any of you who would like to kick that process off. And we look at how we do it. I think there will probably be quite a lot of other people around our community who would certainly want to participate in that kind of dialogue as we go through the next few months.

I'm completely up for that and I'm sure my team are as well. I'm not looking at them so they've got their hands up behind me like bunny ears, haven't they?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Sally. And I realize that you are pushed for time, you probably have a very full agenda. So we're very thankful and happy that you've been able to join us here with your full team. I do want to put it to the record that, I think it's the first time that we have that many regional vice presidents that have all come here.

A few years ago, it was difficult to even get one. So well done. Nigel doesn't know any other room than this one, but for the others, yes, well done, thanks. Thanks very much for joining us. And I think we'll

continue then with our morning’s program as a few people run out, run in, etcetera, since they are a couple of other meetings that are about to take place as well outside this room.

So some of us will be needing to go. But I invite to the table Duncan Burns, vice president for global communications and Chris Gift, vice president for the online community. And I note that there are a few other people also, a few ICANN staff that are in the room so we might also ask for Duncan and for Chris to introduce them.

MATT ASHTIANI:

Hi. This is Matt Ashtiani for the record. One quick housekeeping note, please remember to state your name before speaking and to speak at a reasonable pace for our interpreters, please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay everyone, let’s continue. We’re losing minutes and I see Sandra currently with her timepiece. Come on everybody, please take your seats. And I’m not quite sure who is supposed to corral the regional vice presidents, that’s a new one. We do need someone to herd them.

Okay. I’m not quite sure who wishes to start, Duncan or Chris? It’s very democratic here, it’s up to you. Okay. Duncan Burns, please.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Good morning everyone. Duncan Burns, I’m the VP of global communications for ICANN. I met some of you in Durban which was my

first meeting, so this is my second meeting. I thought I might just give a short update on communications, what we've been working on in the last trimester, and then onto any questions that you might have.

One of my real goals and focused areas for the last three months have been around internationalizing our media, internationalizing our communications, content, making it more accessible, making it more relevant, trying to look at and explore different channels of delivery.

Which sounds very dry but I think, and I'll talk about some of the examples, where we can create some content centrally, content and collaborate with community, and then let it exist, saying let it go in the wild to have people use it. So some of the different areas we've been focused on, some of this is based on feedback from this group. We've been looking at audio in particular, so we have an audio boon site, audio boon dot FM slash ICANN, which is an easy to use, I hope it's easy to use, low-bandwidth way of accessing a lot of our content.

Some of it is the audio stripped of videos we've done, because we recognize not everyone can download videos, that it's not always accessible for people. So we're exploring it. We welcome your feedback. We've been going just for a couple of months on that.

We've also looked at getting the podcast page going again on ICANN dot org, again trying to find a cost effective and efficient way of doing that using – so that when we're creating content centrally, whether that's videos, whatever it is, that we can repurpose them. So you'll see, I think there are a half a dozen up at the moment, including some applicant

videos because we wanted to bring to life a little bit for people what it is that the whole new gTLD process is, because otherwise it can be extremely dry.

Two other areas which are not audio, but there is a lot of content and presentations. We all go to count presentations, so one of the things we've launched, and again, this is some feedback from the community, and we talked a bit about it in terms of sharing content and central databases a few moments ago with Sally, is a slide share page, an ICANN slide share page.

Where we have put up, and I'm forgetting the numbers now, maybe a dozen presentations that people can download, use, take off wherever they need to. We also put out a call for the best slides that people have seen, their own slides they've used. Now we're not going to go put up everyone's, but we want to try and capture some of the best around the ICANN community that we'll put up.

We have to put up obviously, this isn't an ICANN slide, it's, you know, individual X. And we can agree whether Creative Commons, dot, dot, dot. Within a week of launching, I think our most popular slide download was, "What is ICANN?" in Russian, by an order of magnitude more than we didn't anticipate.

And I think what's been quite useful is seeing feedback of who is interested in what content, what people are downloading. We don't want it to be English only. I mean, I encourage you all here, if you have

interesting slides, things you think would be useful, send them through to us.

You'll also see, we haven't released any in the last month or so because we had some other focus areas, but a greater use of infographics as a way of trying to tell a story and help people understand what we're doing. One particular area that I've been focused on is how we talk about rights protection mechanisms within the new GE framework.

People don't always understand, well is it Trademark Clearinghouse? What else? How does it work all together? So I have a 99.9% final draft which I hope will come out in the next couple of weeks. We can probably start to show it this week. I'll show you a soft copy if you want, if anyone is interested, tap me on the shoulder.

So you have ideas for infographics, things that you think your communities are really want to see and understand more clearly, let me know. And finally, because I do want to leave time for questions, [?] internationalization is how we use in scale, using social media more broadly. So that is making our twist of handles, for example, a little more engaging than just broadcast.

You know, that's a new muscle, that's not the easiest thing to do for any organization, but it's something we're really trying to work on. So one of my teams that's here this week, Nathalie you see around, she is going to be sort of [?] trying to go to a lot of sessions and help make some more how social media handles, a little more lively and relevant.

So you know, it's an experiment but we may not be great at it but be patient, and do engage with her. She wasn't able to come because she was actually in the newcomer session at the moment doing that very thing. And then Facebook, Google Plus because that helps people find our content. There are not a ton of people on Google Plus, it does help with the search algorithms.

And then finally, internationalization and how we're taking the content in terms of filling out my team. We've hired a superb woman, Alex [?], who is based in [?] in Uruguay, Montevideo, who is our Latin American and Caribbean coms manager. We're very close to hiring someone in Singapore, which will really help us achieve scale in terms of communication in APAC.

And then the next step is to try and hire someone in Istanbul to help us in Europe, Middle East, and Africa. In the absence of those individuals, we're really trying to make sure we are communicating, we're not missing the regions, but it becomes much easier when you have an in region expert to really help drive relevance and activity. And with that, very happy to take any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Duncan. So the floor is open for questions. Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, chair of NARALO. There seem to be a lot of outgoing communications. Are there in-going, incoming communications?

DUNCAN BURNS: In terms from the community? I think that's an area where we can always do more. I think that's where – whether it's the slide chair, we've had quite a lot of feedback. I think a lot of the feedback, actually Chris is going to touch on in a second, we're really trying to focus around the ICANN labs, what we've been able to do there. If you have ideas, I would welcome that.

GARTH BRUEN: This is Garth again. I think that a priority, something you should look at, is just streamlining all of ICANN's inputs that exist now in terms of complaint process, etcetera, and making them into apps and easily usable and accessible to the Internet community.

DUNCAN BURNS: That sounds like a great idea. I'm definitely going to let the head of online services talk about that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. We have Rinalia Abdul Rahim and then Sandra Hoferichter. Rinalia.

RIANLIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you chair. Rianlia Abdul Rahim for the transcript. Thank you for the presentation. This was a question that I didn't get to ask in the regional stakeholder engagement session, but it's connected to what you're trying to do. I actually envision all the regional engagement to actually have events in the region that will be the focus for consultation for the regional community that will actually build towards the global ICANN meetings.

And I think that in trying to consult in specific issues, you can actually look at demand for specific issue explanation and translation, and the communication aspect of difficult technical issues to be at that level. So I think there is a connection that needs to happen between what you're trying to do, it seems to be pushed out, but also demand that could arise from the regions.

And another thing is that, separate to that, I'm drafting the ALAC statement as a response to the ATRT 2 draft recommendations on improving the policy development process. And we're trying to look at how to enhance participation from the grassroots, bottom up. And essentially, whenever there is a public comment, you invite people to provide comment itself, but the thing is you need a webinar to go out to prep people because different people are at different levels of capacity to engage.

And at the same time, something that Chris was doing in terms of a multi-stakeholder round table views could compliment that, because first you push out information, these are the facts of what the issues are, and then people start thinking about, okay, what are the different

positions that could come out depending on where you sit? That could inform our community in terms of how they could position themselves.

I think it needs to be packaged as a stream, and you need to work together somehow. But there is a connection there. Thank you.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Thank you Rinalia. Duncan Burns for the record. I think you make some great points. One of the, well I shouldn't totally speak for the engagement team, one of the things that we've been talking about is engagement that they are working on with people who aren't able to come to ICANN meetings in the regions.

That's really important that it shouldn't just be that filter and trying to help them understand and answer questions to your point. Explain, digest. One of the things that is going to be the focus of this coming year is really help make the regional strategies, the regional vice presidents that have partnered with the community, bring those to life and work out how communications can work out best within that. And I think, I hope that answers some of your question.

And then on the lines of action, I'm going to let Chris answer that because I think he would be better placed when it comes to that. You mention webinars, we obviously rely a lot on webinars. They're not necessarily the best tool every time, and I think one of the things we're trying to work out, which is why we're looking at these different channels is, how can we create content that if you aren't up at three in the morning, if you're in Australia – or two, or five.

You know, how we can make that accessible to people. Does it always have to be a webinar? Is it something that can exist separately that is a regular check in? And then at the same time, encouraging everyone across the engagement spectrum, so a lot of my colleagues in the GSE team, to provide those updates, the relevant blogs, to their region. I think will help make it more accessible. I hope.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Duncan. For the sake of time, I'm closing the queue after Fatimata Seye Sylla. First we have Sandra Hoferichter and then Fatimata. Sandra you have the floor.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. It's Sandra Hoferichter speaking. I would encourage you to work with local partners in each region, and I would encourage you to maybe extend that effort, inviting people from the community to join your team, helping you to get the right communication in their regions for two reasons.

One reason is the way the community might communicate and the way US [?] might communicate, might be different and ICANN should speak with one voice. The second reason is we just had that experience with [?] and pilot leadership training program we had recently here, where we were facilitated by Inside Learning which was a great company to give us, or to facilitate us.

But it was very much American centralized. And those tiny little things, somebody mentions, okay, you can read a book within a couple of hours. No. A French person, a German person cannot read that book within a couple of hours.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The book actually had 240 pages, so that's very fast reading, even for English speaking people.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. So these are the tiny little things which are [bearing] for global communication, and which might keep some people, out of defense, because they feel, okay, I cannot read that book in a couple of hours. There are just very small little details, but I think they are building a sort of barrier in certain areas because people feel, okay, I cannot contribute to this community because I have not – capability, but I think exactly the opposite is what ICANN wants.

And for these two reasons, speaking one voice with the community, and being real, making it a real global effort, I would really recommend not just having an open session where you can gather feedback from the community, but really identify persons who are taking up the volunteer effort, and joining your team, and which you can consult when you're doing an effort.

And side note, I might help you with an European Association to work out an European structure because I have some – I don't want to

promote or sell anyone, but I can maybe give you an entry into this effort. Thank you.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Duncan Burns for the record. You make two great points. I've written here before I sat down, I said, "Different voices." I think one of the things we need to do better is provide a platform for community members to tell the stories, to explain what's going on. It's much more authentic that way than just being staff, or leadership, or – and so, absolutely, and I welcome that sort of progress.

We're making some progress within the Speaker Bureau, for example, trying to get community members to be represented in the community. In terms of the accessibility piece, I totally agree. I think that's a real challenge for us because little of the base content, quite complex and so one of the things my team is looking at is, you know, we call it the simple English guide but it's basically simple so that whatever language it is in, people can really digest it.

And without putting everything on Chris's section, this is something we've really been focused on because we work quite closely together, folks on terms of the web strategy and how we make that happen. But look forward to talking about your offer as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Duncan. Next is Fatimata Seye Sylla. And I'm aware that there is also one remote participate question that will come immediately afterwards. Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yeah, Fatimata Seye Sylla, chair of AFRALO. I just wanted to point out how difficult it is for non-English speaking community members to participate. Even if you had webinars in all of the languages, even if we had [?] translated, sometimes when there is a public comment posted, people the community will discuss about the topics, it's in English, a high level English.

And all the other members, who are not fluent in English, cannot participate at the same level. And this is a way of understanding the issues and being able to, you know, to provide your input and make proposals. And that's something really I don't know how to deal with it, but it's been something really preventing the wider community to participate, you know, the way they would like to do so. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Fatimata. Is that directly related to the thing? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The ATRT 2 commissioned a study on the GNSO PDP, which a particular part of our work. And did some statistics on where participants come from. And the results are startling, not surprising to

those of us who participate, but the active participants are almost exclusively North America and Europe.

Language, time zones, and cultural issues all are aspects of it. The part of it is that the overall community is somewhat restricted, but there is a far better participation in ICANN than in policy from other parts of the world. It's not clear how to fix it, the costs are going to be enormous, and the effort is going to be enormous, but we can't pretend that we represent the whole world when we have such radical discrepancies in some of our processes.

So not going to be easy things to solve, but we can't pretend they don't exist.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Duncan Burns for the record. I think you make some great points, both of you. I think it's one of the real challenges for us is how do we remember, how do we keep trying to create content, create mechanisms, foster that discussion. It is a lot of work and it can be expensive, but there are improvements we can make.

We're not going to suddenly leap to the answer, but I think every little improvement we can make as a team, and something Sammy has had, is all very focused on how we can better use the website to address even some of these. And I think again, you're going to hear a lot from Chris about this because we've really been focused on how best to crack at least bits of that as we go forward.

But we are trying to address it. Any ideas you have, suggestions, please let us know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Duncan. Just a quick...

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan Greenberg. I have to do a follow up, and what I didn't add is web connectivity in those parts of the world, so websites and teleconferences don't always address that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. We finally have a question from a remote participant, and then we'll move on to Chris Gift. Matt? Julia, okay.

JULIA: Thank you. Julia for the record. We have a question from Peter Knight. He says that, "I wonder if Sally and her team are working on short e-learning courses for people wanting to learn more about ICANN? We spoke of that in Toronto, but I'm not aware of any action on this.

Perhaps I'm mistaken but I think on demand online is a realistically small chunks in multiple languages would be useful."

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I think this will actually go over to Chris Gift.

CHRIS GIFT: Thank you. This is Chris Gift for the record. We have been working with members of the community on a new online learning platform, and that is actually getting launched – it has been beta tested over the past month or so, and I think that is being formally announced and launched at this meeting. I think there will be more about that tomorrow and afterwards.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Chris. And I think that actually provides a good bridge over to move over to Chris's, I guess you have a presentation regarding ICANN Labs, because I'm mindful of the time as well. So the floor is yours, Chris Gift.

CHRIS GIFT: Thank you very much. This is Chris Gift. Okay, I have 10, 15 minutes. I will make this rapid. I'm going to give you a quick reminder of where we – about ICANN Labs and what we launched last spring in Durban, what has happened with that. And what that is turning into, which I think is a more interesting part I'd like to spend most of the time.

So I will – my apologies, I will move through this rapidly. This is the topic I was going to discuss. The whole slide is not appearing. Okay. If we get rid of some of those tabs. Anyway, so we started talking about this at Beijing, Toronto and Beijing are a lot of these request, some of these same things we're hearing echoing today around diversity, and

outreach, and accessibility, and people being understand the content on ICANN.

So there was a number of requests to try new tools, and new online services for people to be able to better understand what it is that we do. Out of this came... This was the purpose of ICANN Labs. We wanted to have a place where we could get community feedback around these ideas, because we didn't necessarily – well, we understood the problem.

We didn't necessarily understand the solution, and we wanted to work on a solution with the community. So we created ICANN Labs as a place to have a number of experiments. We moved through those. There was a great deal of participation, and I'll get to that in a second. We created four tracks.

After talking with a number of people, a number of interviews, we ended up created four tracks, which ICANN learn was also, which is the online learning platform, was also part of one of these. We had a peer advisory network. And I know many of you in this room participated in this process.

So again, thank you very much for that. It was very, very helpful, and your feedback and ideas were very appreciated. We did a number of outreach around ICANN Labs, trying to again understand the solution, not only understand the problem of what we've all been talking about today, but what possible solutions we could bring to bear to solve some of these.

And so a lot of you again participated, people signed up on ICANN Labs. We had quite a few people who volunteered to support individual projects, and we had some fair number of outreach around this initiative. So, but again, since I only have a few minutes, so where does that leave us? Well, ICANN Labs was always a means to an end.

ICANN Labs will continue as a place where we can continue to experiment on new ideas, or new problems as they are brought to bear, such as new tools for accessibility. How do we ensure that they work for everyone? So that will continue, but those ideas that were tested and the drive and the initiative that was asked from us back – almost a year ago, I should say, has come to fruition in a new ICANN dot org.

Now, before I show you this, I want to reiterate a few things. One is, what I'm about to show you is the bare bones of something, right? And it is very much in beta mode. I'll go through the roadmap in some length, right after – well, not in some length, in a few seconds, right after I show you this.

But bear in mind, we're going to continue to develop this site just as we've developed ICANN Labs. It will be with the community. What I'm showing you is just the bare bones. All of us together will continue to develop this, all right? It is not me and a small group of people doing this, all right?

I just want that to be very clear. And also what I'm showing you is very much beta. We will be opening the Komodo in the next day or two depending on how we can get things settled. So bear with me, and now

I'm going to very rapidly share my screen. Okay. Matt, I may need your help for a second. I know...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The wonders of using Adobe and a fruit based computer. Why don't you use pen and paper like everyone else?

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Olivier, it's Salanieta speaking. Maybe we can use this time for interventions already? Maybe we using this time for interventions already? Maybe not questions, but interventions?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We can certainly do so. I was just hoping that they would fix the technical quickly, but yeah, the floor is open for questions for the time being. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I come... Can I speak English? Yeah, right. So, given that my intervention is not very substantial, this is a very good point to make it. Chris Gift has done a lot for ICANN. He developed the online platform. He didn't have any subjects so he created ICANN 101. I tired and accessed it to see what was on it and I made comments, many which were included, some I was told were not included, but I hope they will be in the future.

And ICANN Labs was an extraordinary idea. I very much liked it, and I think we should all engage in this effort. And what I like about Chris is that when you tell him something, he doesn't wait an entire month to react. He reacts immediately. So I told Fadhi and Sally that Chris was the best gift that Sally and Fadhi ever gave ICANN.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Are there any other comments? Then I'm going to look at Matt who should learn French. Is the technology working? Okay, any more questions? In fact, you still have Duncan Burns here as well, so if you have any questions towards Duncan or comments as well to make.

Without putting any pressure on anyone, we are now eating into our coffee break. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Olivier. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. Duncan, you mentioned earlier, and I think this community would very much appreciate having some wisdom, guidance, and assistance on social networking, particularly coming up to our At Large summit which will be in London.

So we've got a lot of very important ideas that Olivier's leadership team is putting together. I think the backbone to that will be clever and effective outreach beyond our normal borders and it seems what she's

doing is probably useful. So perhaps you and Heidi should make the magic happen.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Thank you Cheryl. Duncan Burns for the record. Well actually, I think one of the things we're trying to get staff better at is social media, what they can do, how to best use it. But I think it's something that in partnership with the community there are some great tips.

And I think building the platforms for ATLAS for London, as a Londoner that sounds wonderful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It's a good test.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Duncan. And just to remind Matt that his computers can be seen throughout the world at the moment. I'm not quite sure, it's going from page to page. Are we ready Chris?

CHRIS GIFT:

We're ready.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Monsieur Gift.

CHRIS GIFT: First, thank you very much Tijani. I truly appreciate the words. I was actually blushing over here. Now I have to... So, again, what I'm showing... I'm aware I'm eating into coffee time, so this is... We took a lot of the learnings and what people had talked about, especially if you would recall we were very focused on newcomers.

So what I'm going to show you is trying to solve that problem. How do we engage better with newcomers and allow them to give them the means to better understand the content? What ICANN is? What it does? And to better digest what's there, and so it can better communicate to everyone.

So what I'm going to show you touches on that as well as solves some other issues, I think, that are issues for the ICANN veterans as well. So you'll notice that, a few things on this landing page. And again, I'm showing you something bare bones. We need to work with the community to build this and to – this is just the very, very beginning of this.

That there is a couple of things. One is that there is the ability to get started. So we're asking people to participate and to learn more. And when you create an account on ICANN dot org, you will be able to better – you'll be able to personalize your experience.

So you'll be able to say, "Hey this is the kind of content I'm interested in. This is who I am. This is the group I belong to." And we'll be able to push content to you. So somewhat as My ICANN does, but actually a little bit more sophisticated, and a little improved from that experience.

So, but again, from the very beginning we are focused about exploring resources, meeting the community, and we're just asking people to join and we're just trying to bring some clarity to the information that is there. When people do, one of the things that we do is very rapidly is we bring them to a get started page, where we tell people about ICANN, welcome to the global community.

You know, back to the online class. People asked about online learning. Were we able to integrate with the online learning platform? And very rapidly also personalize the experience in terms of showing who the people are. Please don't get hung up on who these particular people are, who is showing up.

This is test images for now, and people who actually volunteered to this, so maybe I should than them if you are one of them. But that was one of the learnings we had from newcomers, is that they wanted to see the people were behind ICANN. One thing to always read these policy documents and see this content, but they really wanted to understand who the people were.

So we're trying as much as possible to humanize who we are as an organization, so people can feel more welcome and be able to join the

conversation. So there is quite of here on this. Now, understand that we test this so we show this to newcomers.

We show these pages to them and say, “Hey, you know, does this page work for you? Does it provide you content?” We are doing that now. Another thing, on the news page, there are no results. Am I on the...? Yes. I’ll come back to that in a second.

When it comes to resources, one of the problems we keep hearing about in terms of veterans as well as newcomers is being able to view PDFs. So if you click on a PDF, going forward, you will be able to access it inline and be able to page through this. I am aware that we need to address that we’re using tools that are accessible.

So this is, again, one of those tools that is accessible, and people can use it with screen readers and things like that. And then obviously we’re working just many other areas, we’re looking at many of the areas, for instance, you know, public comment as well. Nothing really new there. We’re just, in terms of, we’re not affecting it, but we’re just making sure that, excuse me, what is there is just conforms to what we’ve already done in the past, but it’s just in a more digestible view perspective.

So that people can easily navigate the content that is there, and then, you know, in a future as we test this out to be able to sign in and have a public comment right there and then, instead of navigating away to another website to view a public comment. So the comment would be in line with the policy, or the proposed policy.

There is a great deal more, I'm out of time, but there is a great deal more here. Again, this is – I want to be very, very clear about a few things. One is this is just the bare bones, the framework. We're are going to work with all of you, there is going to be a means for people to comment on this website, on the tools, on anything on this, within the tool itself.

So you'll see right down below, below here, there is this little tool. It will allow you to suggest ideas. So you'll be able to comment, you'll be able to adjust ideas for the website right here, and we'll be able to see them and react to them, as Tijani says, as rapidly as we can.

We fully expect this process, because we're working with you, we fully expect this process to take about four months. We're not rushing it, we're going to take our time, and when we're all content and we're all satisfied that this meets our needs, then we'll switch sites and we'll make this the main site. I'll stop there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Chris. And we have a couple of minutes for questions. So Carlos Aguirre? And we'll have... Philip Johnson. Okay. First Carlos.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you Olivier. Great job, excellent work. Incredible things in the page. But a question. This development is only in English?

CHRIS GIFT:

That is an excellent question. It is not only in English. So, thank you. So we are actually... I don't have a good solution yet for the other languages. We still don't. You know, we've talked about this. We are still thinking of several ideas.

What I don't like, I think, well, none of us like is the experience that we currently have on ICANN dot org, which is the content is in one language but the navigation is not changing. So it's very difficult for somebody to navigate and experience it. So we don't like that at all, and we don't – that will not be repeated here.

I can say that. The issue that we're struggling with though is we don't have enough translation resources to translate everything. So, you know, what do we translate and how does that still make an experience that makes sense? Because we translate some things and not others, and it's always show as that.

The experience won't necessarily make sense. They won't connect the dots between everything. I apologize. I just don't have an answer. We are working on that. It will be part of a rollout though that it is a meaningful experience for all languages.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

I see quite a few people who want to comment. Oh goodness. Okay. Tijani, very, very short comment please. And then we'll have Sergio and then we'll have Jose, and then we'll come to you Philip. Sorry.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's even worse, Chris. When you click on the other language, sometimes it's switch to the other language but it is not the same content because the translation is not a good translation. I don't think, for example, for the learning module, we never have to translate something because you would not get what you want.

You have to produce material in the other language. And this is a bigger form that you have to do. You are not listening to me. No problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Tijani, if I could make a quick intervention. Some of the regional strategies are also looking at local solutions, and I don't think we should lose sight to that. And, you know, with 56 languages in Asia-Pacific, we kind of know what we're talking about.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sergio Salinas Porto.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very... I will speak Spanish. Please use your headphones. Is that right? My question has to do with something more technical in nature. We're speaking in PHP for the development of these tools. And the second question is, if we are working in PHP are we using some CMS? Some content manager? Or is this our own development because if we have CMS, there are many CMS like – are known to anyone, to everyone that allows us to have this translation tool.

This translation tool is manual. We need to manually translate everything but we guarantee that there is no automatic translation and that every content and all the manual is translated at least in the six languages of ICANN. Being that is the case, we should gear to the road to that end. Thank you.

CHRIS GIFT:

Thank you. This is Chris Gift for the record. Thank you very much for that question. So we do use a standard CMS, an open source CMS and that is Droople, which I think is familiar to some of you in the room, and certainly globally. Yes, I do agree that the navigation should be completely translated.

To us, that's not necessarily the issue, it's the how do we support the amount of content that we create? We create so much content on a daily basis. But I agree with you, yes. It should be and it will be translated, the navigation. As to how we, you know...

Some of that, I think, touches on machine translation and tools about outsourcing translation, and how do we do that, involve the community in that. I can provide some of those tools, but to be honest, Nora [?] is the person who is running languages for us, and I think she's coming to address the group?

She is not coming to address the group. Then perhaps I can, she just arrived. Okay. But she is the best person to ask that question of, if you don't mind.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jose Arce.

JOSE ARCE: Good morning everyone. I will speak Spanish. Basically the question is general regarding communication strategy. I would like to know, ICANN strategy, how many pages do you want to have uploaded on the Internet? Because I have ICANN page, My ICANN, the Wiki, ICANN Labs, and I can go on counting.

The more pages with information we have uploaded, and that I can have a search, or I write down ICANN, and that will be confusing because there will be many pages. Is the idea to merge the pages? Because I don't know what the strategy is.

For example, when you have beginner, you have to tell them, "You have to go that page and get information." Or a person that see something about ICANN, clicks on Google, and there are six or seven pages different. So the question is, is there some idea to unify and merge every content?

CHRIS GIFT: This is Chris Gift. Yes, a very good question and yes, we are absolutely merging the content and the proliferation of tools into exactly one tool. And that will be ICANN dot org. We could not do that in the past because the platform would not be able to support the applications we wanted.

And due to the speed at which we were moving, we created these additional things. However, we absolutely, 100% agree that they need to roll into one tool. And that is the plan. I apologize that the text is very small, but the plan is for in phase three...

So the plan is... We're at the end of phase one right now where we're are showing this and making this open to everybody. You know, a lot of people have already participated in this, but to open it up to everybody. And phase two is to production the system, what we have. So gather even more and more community input, and then launch it. And then phase three is to migrate all of those individual tools into this new platform.

We're not going to remove any of that functionality. That functionality is very useful to many people. We are just going to migrate it into the new ICANN dot org.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Chris. And last question from Philip Johnson.

PHILIP JOHNSON: Well, I'm Philip Johnson, incoming AFRALO leadership, member of the leadership. But my question has... Let me first congratulate the two team, the outreach of Sally and the communication team. They have done quite well in the outreach program. But what concern me is, how do... What kind of strategy have they put into place to make them look

at, for example, on the ground or in the community, promoting this digital outreach?

Like in... I come from a different [?] country, let me say that, that they found difficulty understanding the digital outreach that have been developed. They are very brilliant, but you would need, for example, a look at ALS on the ground. Who in turn promote these digital outreach tool to the civil society, the government, or the stakeholders for example the university?

Recently [?] the manager for the group outreach in Africa wrote me said, “Philip, I’m going to your region on a mission. What role can you play? Now this are these things, you should have some strategy. What role can the – look at ALS on the ground, played in helping the global outreach team and communication team reaching ICANN to the entire community. Thank you.

CHRIS GIFT:

Thank you very much. Another great question. And I think it also ties into some comments made earlier about localization of content, making sure that the experience and the information is relevant to people within a particular region. I can answer part of that question.

Certainly we are working on... And I think this is where we’re going to need a lot of help. We’re only in the very beginnings of these ideas, and we need to engage with everyone on this. Is how do we create regional experiences of this? Right. We don’t have those. How do we create a regional microsite, if you will, if you want to call it that.

Because it doesn't necessarily make sense. One of the... Let me take a step back. When we talked about translating this with many members in different regions, and created a localized experience at ICANN dot org, people didn't necessarily like that. They thought that they wanted to see one unified global experience on ICANN dot org.

They felt that, for one reason or another, that if they were getting an experience that was tailored to them, they were missing out on a global conversation. It didn't... So we thought hard about that and we said, "Okay." So ICANN dot org itself must stay global, but then we should look at regional sites that have some of the same information, but again content that is relevant to that region.

It's not answering completely your question. So how we create those microsites, how we create templates for them and make it easy for people to put them up and then populate them, is something we've just started to look at. So I think this answers some of the real, hopefully will answer some of the regional questions, regional websites.

I suspect it will take us a few months working together to create a strategy for that, and then to launch it based on some tools that we have. As for then promoting those digital tools, once they're up, that really is a question for the regional vice presidents, you know? Unless Duncan...

DUNCAN BURNS:

Duncan Burns. One of the things we're working very closely on, and I missed of Sammy's session, you know, the global engagement plan and

then the plans in each region, is very focused on that issue. What's our strategy? What's our approach to achieve in what we collectively want to achieve?

So we're not just asking [?] for community involvement. There is a real approach that you have a sense of what the opportunities are, things you might be interested to engage in. You know, that it's not the same demand or the same person every time. And I think that's it is a work in progress.

It's something with Pierre and Yaoi, for example, we're very focused on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you Duncan. I'm seeing Rinalia make a face of being very unhappy. Go ahead Rinalia, you have the floor. She will kill me.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you chair. I'm not unhappy, I'm very happy with Chris. I was asked to be nice to him, and I don't think that's a problem. He's a nice person. He's doing great work. I wanted to make a suggestion. Many years ago, the World Bank started something called the Global Development Gateway. And that was a global initiative, and then they also looked at the issue of how to make that more localized, and having national gateways, and can't remember where there was regional gateways as well.

So we have a new member of the Board, [?] he used to work at the World Bank. I suggest we sit down and talk to him and find out what

not to do. Very important, yes? Okay then you know how to go forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. And this pretty much closes this session. However, just one more thing. There is the At Large Summit taking place in London next year. It also coincides with ICANN's 50th meeting. So Sally Costerton is assembling a team in London to be able to work on those matters, and I'm part of that team, and of course relaying all of the work that we are doing in this community.

There is an At Large Summit to sub working group in At Large, the ATLAS 2 working group, dealing specifically with public relations, and I think that members of this group will be working directly with you, or with Sally, and everyone in your team, to be able to build the best At Large Summit, but also the best meeting and the best ICANN meeting ever.

So if there is anyone in the room who is not part of that working group, this is just – they can go and speak to staff and to get added on it as well. Anyone remotely as well. It's a vital component of the work that we are going to do. And with this, knowing that we are more than 15 minutes behind schedule, we'll take a 10 minute break. There is coffee still served outside. But I thank you very much Duncan and Chris for joining us. So 10 minutes exactly.

UNIDENTIFIED: Just to let you know, the coffee is through the glass doors as you come out to your right, and there are absolutely delicious pastries over there as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Take your positions please. Okay, we're all set. Let's have the recording on please. Thank you and welcome back everyone after this short break. We now have the next parts of our morning's program during the ALAC and Regional Leadership meeting on today, Sunday. The next part is, looking through, a hot topic.

And the hot topic discussion today is to do with the At Large selection process of the Board Director. So just a quick intro. As you know, the current Board director that was selected by At Large is Sebastien Bachollet. His term comes up at the end of 2014, but we do have to go through a process to select a new Director way before that.

And what we're going to do here, we have, I think, one hour – well, less than one hour. We're running late, but we have some time to be able to explain what the process is, what we are going, what the different deadlines are, and any of the intricacies of the process. With us, we have Roberto Gaetano who has joined me at the head table.

Roberto Gaetano is the – well, I think we'll make introductions afterwards. He's chair a chair of the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee. We unfortunately do not have Tijani Ben Jemaa who is the chair of Board process, he's not here, BMSPC. I always forget. So he's at another meeting, yes that's right. I've just seen him walk out.

So let's get going first, I guess, with the process itself. How is it all coming together? We also have Cheryl Langdon-Orr who is here, who was shepherding the first process that took place, and so we'll go through it quick. I guess introduction on what we are about to launch, or what has just been launched. Who wishes to start? Alan or... Okay. So we have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. I had the pleasure or something of writing most of the documents that led up to this whole process. For one reason or another, we built a very complex process, with a lot of checks and balances in it, so this is not something that can be described completely in two minutes.

Overall, the process is that we will be soliciting candidates who are interested in taking on the position of seat 15. The BCEC, the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee will be doing evaluations of those and proposing an initial slate of candidates. After that is published the RALOs have an opportunity to identify candidates that were not identified by the BCEC, but who do put in an initial application.

Essentially the RALOs can petition that additional candidates can be put onto the slate, it requires three RALOs to support any given candidate to put them onto the slate. Following the creation of the final slate, and with an opportunity to interrogate the candidates, to ask questions, to have them make statements, there will be a voting process.

The voting process will consist of multiple votes potentially, depending on how many candidates there are. The process is the first vote will narrow the number of candidates down to three, and then there will be one or two successive rounds until somebody receives the majority of the votes. The electors are the 15 sitting ALAC members, and the five RALO chairs.

The RALO chairs may, depending on their own RALO's rules, either cast a vote based on their own conscious or could be directed by their RALO. Any direction by the RALO that is the decision to direct and the actual value of the direction must be done through formal votes of the ALSs of the RALOs. So, one of the things that we will have to be doing in leading up to this process is make sure we know who the RALOs are, who the ALSs are, because clearly since it is a formal vote, if you have ALSs that are essentially defunct, if we don't do something to clean that process up then you end up having essentially no votes and you may not end up with majority votes, based on whatever the quorum rules are of the RALO to carry out that kind of vote.

So there is a lot of cleanup work that's going to have to be done. The preparation for the summit will be doing some of that cleanup, but of course the summit comes after the election, so there is not quite enough time. That's the quick summary. As you've seen, or some of you have seen an email and we'll be talking about there are... When we rewrote the rules last year, there was one thing – or one or two things we seem to forget that have become important, and I don't know,

Olivier, if you want me to talk about that now or go through the overall introduction and then raise it. Okay. So I think I'm done in that case.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I was going to say, go through the overall introduction and then we'll raise it. Go through the introduction first, then we'll raise it. So to understand the process and be able to get to the concern. You're finished?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can raise it now, it will make sense based on what I said. So I can finish with this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Please proceed.

ALAN GREENBERG: We have a number of rules. I've said who the basic voters are, but there are some caveats. For instance, someone who is running for the position cannot vote. That's a by-law issue. So we have ways of substituting those so that the RALO is not disadvantaged in losing a vote because of that. One of the things we didn't cover was a situation that happens to be the case today, where we have a RALO chair who is also an ALAC member.

That would give one person two votes. And the general feeling is that the optics of that are not very good. So I am going to be... I have

proposed that there be a way to replace the chair's vote with somebody else. The other thing we neglected to address was, what happens if one of the electors, because of illness, physically being away, or whatever during the election, will not be able to cast their votes?

And, you know, there are times when we know this ahead of time, and we're suggesting that we add a provision to replace those also. All of this going down to try and make sure that no RALO is disadvantaged because of a quirk of fate and getting less say in the selection than otherwise they would have.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. So next, I guess, we can then move on over to... Are we going to take Roberto? And then, or Tijani perhaps first. So Tijani has stepped back into the room, and so he is the shepherd for the process of the selection process itself. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Alan had very good summary of the new rules, how we do, etcetera, so I don't think it would be good to repeat what he said. But I can tell you that our committee just started working, and we have very tight agenda, very tight time, to do what we have on our agenda. Today in the lunch break we will meet because we need to publish the timelines, and we will do it today, after the meeting. Our committee will be overseeing the process.

Roberto's committee will be selecting the candidates to be on the slate. So we have two separate missions, and they are complimentary but they are separate. I think I don't have to say more because the process is clear, and perhaps Roberto wants to say some words about his work.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Then I'll hand the floor over to Roberto Gaetano.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Roberto Gaetano for the record. I'm the chair of the BCEC. Yes, I wanted to add just a couple of quick comments to what Tijani has said. Most of the people who are hearing us and who are attending this meeting know what I'm going to say, but there are newcomers and also for the record. I think we need to explain why the procedure is so complex.

And other SOs or other advisor committees have much simpler procedures for appointing a member to the Board. The point is that we want to have this as the largest possible participation. So we have to include people from the civil society, possibility of having them as candidates, and not taking people just from a small circle of insiders.

In order to do this, we need to set up a series of checks and balances and make sure that we have a separation of power so that the process is transparent and fair. So since the fact that we can allow any individual interested in the process, in the position, to present their candidature for the Board, we need to have in place a sort of

nominating committee so the equivalent of what the nominating committee does generally for the Board and that's the BCEC.

Why do we have another committee? That is Tijani's committee is because we want to set the rules in a way that is transparent and we want to have separation between who has the power to set the rules and who has the power to appoint, to prepare the slate of candidates that has to apply the rules. So it is two different sets of people and that is an additional check and balance.

Then what we do as BCEC, we do not select the Board member. We do prepare a slot of candidates so we verify the qualification of the people, and we do it first ranking so that we can prepare instead of having the RALOs to discuss 55 candidatures, they will discuss about five candidatures. And then the real vote is taking place according to the procedures in the RALO.

So that is the overall concept. In terms of my committee, the committee that I have the honor of chairing, it's composed by two people from each RALO, and we will adopt rules that are strongly similar to the procedures to the rules that the Nom Com uses, that includes serious check on the conflict of interest, serious commitment about confidentiality so that personal data of the candidates are not becoming public record.

And the whole thing is ruled by, I would say, an ethic behavior of the highest level. That means that we are already at work to set in place all these papers that we ourselves have to sign, conflict of interest and

engagement to confidentiality and all of this kind of things. Where we are now, we are now working in collaboration with Tijani and with high supervision and advice from who has done this work before, Cheryl and Alan and of course Olivier. So in this space we are working together so that we are rolling phase.

From now on, we are going to be completely separated to ensure that there is no confusion of roles, and there is duplication of effort. That is basically it unless you want me to say something about the different subject.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Olivier, just two words. Why there is two committees, it is because the BMSPC is not like the Nom Com. Nom Com appoints people, choose people, select people. The BMSPC don't select people, BMSPC select the short list if you want, more or less. So this is different.

So this is a step further to be done, and it is done by the BMSPC. Plus the fact that the BMSPC is overseeing the whole process.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Tijani. Next we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Olivier. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. I wanted to say a couple of things. First of all, I think you've both as leaders of these two committees explained very clearly why there is this

necessity for separation, but I wanted to pick up on what I would consider, and in my experience was one of the most significant parts of the work on your committee, which is now known as the BMSPC under our new rules of procedure.

For those of you who want to fit it into the corporate memory of what happened in our first experience, we called it way back then, the At Large Board Member Design Team. And so there is a committee that disappeared, has grown up, and has now become this BMSPC. But one of the very important things, and this is why it needs to be continually seen as oversight, and design is that you do a check and audit at the end of the process.

Not only to see that things have gone as the rules indicate that they should, but also to take from the experiences of Roberto's team, what they believe may have been better ways or different ways of doing things. And indeed you can choose and I suspect between this second run and the third, I would encourage you to choose, not just can choose, but to choose, to go back to the wider community, the At Large and get some feedback, be it a survey or whatever.

It will allow you to build the next best model three years down the track. And that's a very, very important part of what the BMSPC does. I just wanted to recognize something which Tijani, you started to explain, but I would like it on the record because it is a tad confusing. In most real world situations, something we call a nominating committee or equivalent, does a search, discovery, and then set of suggestions.

For reasons known only to the bizarreness of ICANN, they called something a Nom Com, which I'm having the honor of chairing and many of you have had the honor of serving on, and some of you are now about to serve on with me, they call the ICANN Nom Com the wrong name. It is, in fact, a selection committee.

The ICANN Nom Com selects and appoints, which is not a Nom Com in any other world, it's just here in our bubble. So we could not, when we were looking at how we do seat 15, call what is now a BCEC, what it should be called which is a Nom Com. So we came up with this somewhat convoluted term, which of course is the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee. So forgive us for having to put more alphabet into your minds.

It's all because of the historic precedence of ICANN having a Nom Com which is a selection committee and us having a selection committee which really is somehow now called something else. I just wanted to take a moment, if I could Olivier, to point out how lucky we are to have not just the team leaders but the quality and talent that the regions have sent to populate both of your committees.

You've got some amazingly good people to work with, and I'm really very impressed, and I think it is a measure of our maturity that this much energy and effort is going into it. But I also wanted to particularly note where Tijani, you're known, known because you're with us now. Roberto, I'm going to ask you to do a bit of self-promotion here. You've had touch points on all that is ALAC, and indeed all that is ALAC review

and the matter of seat 15, in a number of places and in a number of times over the last 15 years.

Some of us know who you are and where you've come from, but I think we should put to the record why you are the absolutely perfect person for the job. So I could do an intro but I would like to hear it from your perspective. Thanks very much. A little self-introduction for the record.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you Cheryl. I don't know if I'm the perfect person for the post. I hope I can prove to be good enough for the position when this process is going to be over. Yes, maybe some of the new people, the people who have joined in the last months, or in the short time, kind of wondering who is this guy who is been parachuted from God only knows where, into this process to get such a responsibility position?

Well, just a little bit of history. I have been participating in the committees that were in '97, '98, creating ICANN. And so if there is somebody to blame for this mess, I'm here to be blamed. Then once, not happy about the mess that I have contributed to create with ICANN, I thought that the mess was not going to be complete if we did not have a presentation of the users at the table.

I had in the beginning unsuccessfully tried to create a constituency for the individual users that never saw the light, as the famous constituency that was never approved. So the second try was with ALAC and that was, I think, 2001, 2002. And so I was one of the first Nom Com

appointed members of ALAC. In this capacity, then I was the first liaison to the ALAC to the Board.

And then after, when things were almost complete and you guys were only waiting for me to clear the scene, in order to get it really up and running, then I was appointed to the Board. And I served a total of more than six years on the Board, either as an ICANN liaison or as a director. So I'm saying this because I think that I have a good idea of what are – what is the profile that is needed on the Board, what is the best profile of director.

But there is another thing to me is also important, it's not just director in abstract. I have seen the dynamics of the Board and I have seen how you can be an effective or an ineffective Board director. You can be fully qualified for being the Board director, but you can be also ineffective.

And since I am committed to the At Large community, and therefore to the At Large advisory committee, I would like to have – to propose a slate of candidates that would be not only good directors, but would be also able to bring the instances of the At Large user community to the Board in an effective way, because I think it is of paramount importance that we – that the At Large community has a voice on the Board that is effective.

I would just use another couple of minutes, I beg your pardon, but I think that this is important. When I was on the Board as liaison in the beginning, the At Large was seen as just a little more than window

dressings. It was important, it was useful, but, you know, what are those guys – not really. And we were seen, you know, we were not on a peer level.

And I think it is only after years of action on the Board supported by the good work of the At Large advisory committee, but it is also necessary that this is very good to the Board in a good way, that we could acquire importance. And at one point in time, I think it was 2008, 2009, when I was chairing – I was on the Board and I was chairing the Board governance committee, that we made the proposal for having, for changing the liaison, the non-voting liaison to the Board to a full voting member.

So that means the same full power as any other director. And I can assure you it has been a big fight, but really a big fight, and I think that if there is something that we have to be proud, the action of the At Large community, and the collaboration with whoever was on the Board at that time, that we have achieved this result. I think that it is essential to continue this.

Also, Sebastien has done an excellent work, but we need to have somebody on the Board that has the confidence of the fellow director. And so that needs to be somehow embedded in the profile of the person that is going to be selected.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

For the record, Roberto is a non-voting chair of the BCEC. So he is leading BCEC, but he doesn't vote.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you Tijani. And thank you Roberto for this extended intro. I think it's very important for people to understand the knowledge that you have in the – as you mentioned, the profile, the type of profile required for a Board director. And I hope that you will be able to transmit this knowledge to all of the members of your committee, so as for them to make the right choice in this selection of the slate that they're going to be making.

And we know that's going to be pretty hard work, knowing that there are quite a few very, very good people in our community that will be able to assume that post. Alan Greenberg, you're next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I just wanted to point out, for those of you who like self-punishment or history, the rules and procedure have a number of adjunct documents. One of the, document three, is essentially the history of the rules and the more detailed history of this specific first selection. But it includes pointers to the first white paper that was done, which – I mean, if you question why do we – why is the final process the way it is?

And Roberto gave a good reason of the rationale for the logic of why it is, but if you want to understand what were the six different things we looked at, and then ended up with this one in each of the stages, the white paper in fact looked at options, because there were many people in the community who suggested things that were quite different from

what we ended up , and tried to analyze the various options, and come up with a rationale for why the selections were done.

So there is a lot of history and detail there if you're curious. Now, whether we would make the exact same decisions today, who knows? But there is a lot of well documented history there, if you want to look into the process in any further detail.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. I open the floor for questions or comments on the process at this stage, whilst I ask staff whether they could just put their schedule up. And I was going to ask Alan to just take us through, just the major dates, the major deadlines. Not every single this and that and when the committee needs to make its decision, etcetera, but just to find out when do we need to have a Board member selected?

And working backwards from this, why are we concerned if we're saying it's going to be needed for April 2014? That gives us so many months to get there, so why in the world do we need so much time?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I can try, and Tijani who owns the process right now, may also have some insight. The last time, if I remember correctly, it took us about four months to go through the process. And some of the periods were very compressed. For instance, we had multiple rounds of voting, but

we didn't have an opportunity to formally consult with the ALSs between the rounds.

We had a process by which the RALOs could appoint someone, could not – could try to add someone to the slate, but that was a little bit compressed. This time we vowed that we would not do things late. Nevertheless, before we got all of the pieces in place, we were left with only five months instead of even more. So we're still tight.

The by-laws require that we identify who the incoming Board member is six months before they are seated. In this coming year, the Board member will be seated at the end of the meeting on October 16th and therefore April 16th is six months ahead. The reason for the large gap is to allow the Nom Com in its selections... The Nom Com is obliged to enforce certain balance rules, that is there must be one director from each region, there must not more than three or four, I don't remember which, five, directors from any region.

But of course they try to balance gender, and skills, and a lot of other things. So knowing who all of the NC and SO directors are, early in their process, gives them more ability to pick the right directors in the Nom Com process. The overall schedule, basically the landmarks that we were looking for, is sometime relatively soon, the BCEC will have settled on what questions they're going to ask the perspective candidates and solicit, put out a call for, expressions, interests, and they'll be a deadline for submitting those.

The next major step is the BCEC must evaluate the applications, the expressions of interest, look at the references, they may choose to do interviews. I don't know what else they're going to be doing. And come up with a slate, there will then be a several week period by which RALOs can...

And by the way, everyone who applies, it is a public process, unlike the Nom Com we will be posting the names and the parts of the application for every person who applies. If someone has applied and not been selected, there is an opportunity for at least three RALOs to say, "We want them on the slate anyway."

I'm presuming that there will be some process by which the RALOs can interact and, I don't know, Roberto may even want to interact with them privately so they understand why they weren't put on the thing. There may be... Pardon me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, it's Cheryl Langdon-Orr here. I believe that there will currently be a single purpose, multi-regional, and At Large community call on the 4th of February.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Correct. I forgot about that. So essentially there is a several week period under which RALOs can petition to add someone else on the list, and that's followed by, as I mentioned earlier, one or more

voting processes by which the candidates are narrowed down to one. There is a...

Particularly because we have an even number of voters, but anyway, when we have more than two candidates, there is an opportunity for ties. The rules call for the – to allow the BMSPC, in the case of a tie, to rerun the election. That presumes there is an opportunity for people to talk to each other, maybe change their votes.

If there is insufficient time to rerun the election, in the view of the BMSPC, and it's their sole choice, or if the second one results in a tie as well, there will be a random selection process, which will replace voting because we have an ultimate time. Pardon me? The documents do suggest one. One of the problems with the random process is auditability, and you have really two choices.

You can either say, "I trust this person to do it properly," or you can use a process which could be repeated independently by someone else. And my personal preference is that one, because then no one can say, "They picked someone we don't trust." And hopefully, by the end of that period, we have a new director.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG: This is Wolf Ludwig for the record. I would just like to recall that some regions, there may be different procedures for this candidate selection

process. For the last one, we had a consultation at EURALO because EURALO chairs have a guided vote from their communities, as we said before, and I think it's still mentioned in the procedures.

And I will stick on this democratic based process. I would never cast any vote of my personal preference, I will only cast a vote which is passed by the majority of my community. And last time, we had two consultation rounds before we finally came up with a regional recommendation. And this two consultation rounds is time-taking.

It took us minimum three weeks, and this I would suggest, should be considered in the planning process. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Wolf. I know that Tijani wanted to speak and then back to you Alan. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Wolf, you always have the possibility to have a directed vote, and it is in the rule of procedure. The other thing I wanted to say is that, Olivier you asked when we need to have the director selected. We need him to be selected in April. Why April?

Because the by-laws says that we need to send the name of the date after selected, six months prior to the AGM. So since the AGM would be in October, we need to make the selection before 16th of April.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to follow onto what Wolf was saying, the rules currently say, the rules that are in place for this selection, say that at the RALO's choice, the chairs vote may be directed. In the last vote, there was also an option for ALAC members, certainly the RALO appointed ALAC members, to be directed by the RALO. And indeed, some RALOs choose that.

This time there is an explicit rule saying that is not allowed. Now, there is nothing to stop a RALO member from deciding to follow advice, but they cannot be mandated to follow advice that they – they are put on the ALAC with some level of trust, and the rules allow them to exercise that trust. So that is a change from the last time.

And as Wolf pointed out, EURALO did do some consultations in the second round of the voting, which was done on very, very short notice after the first round, I believe immediately, that second round of consultation did not, was not very easy. And I believe the, we were told that some of the voters actually cast their vote prior to the consultation being finished.

So hopefully the schedule this time won't allow that to happen.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alan. Back to Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Just a quick remark. Democratic procedures are not easy, as a rule, can be very complicated and time taking, but I think it's worth everything.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. So just before we finish off this session, I wanted to have one more thing. As you know, we currently have a Board director who is going to join us very shortly, but one of the elements that Steve Crocker has introduced on the Board is the notion of a 360 review.

The 360 review is an Anglo-Saxon term for few people who are on the Board with you, so on the same committee that will basically be assessing your performance for the end. Well, the exact way that it was done, I know that it could be actually be even more than just two people, that it could be other people as well.

But you're basically are being assessed for what you've been doing, and on several aspects of your performance. There are varying thoughts as to whether the 360 review has been performed for the current Board member or not, but in any case, I'm currently in discussion with Steve Crocker for that 360 review to be available now.

To me, to the Ex Com, to the ALAC, we're not quite sure yet. So to the ALT, to the ALAC, we're not quite sure yet the Board governance committee has been sent a question as to what should be the spread of

this information, and so we will soon find out, hopefully be getting an answer pretty soon.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so thank very much everyone regarding this. Thank you Roberto and good luck for this hard work and thank you. I would like to actually specifically thank the people have volunteered to be on those two committees, because it's actually quite hard work.

And so, you know, it's always great to see new people that are coming in. As you know, the committee, specifically, the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee needed to be made up of people who were totally un-conflicted. If you were on the committee, you could not vote. So that meant no ALAC members, no RALO leadership chairs, and so on.

So that was thankfully done, we had some very good response as to all of the regions being represented on there, so good luck for all of your work.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Olivier, there is a problem. The electorate can be on the committee. It's only the candidate that cannot be on the committees, but the electorate can be on the committee.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

They cannot vote if they are on the committee. If anyone who is on the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee does not have a vote. Correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Only BCEC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Correct. That's what I just said. Tijani, I think you might wish to speak to our good friend, Sergio Salinas Porto, who has an unlimited supply of [?], and I think that's probably... We all have to get a little bit later on. We're all jealously watching you thinking we need some of that. So and with this, we're joined by Sebastien Bachollet, who is the current Board member.

We're not sure about the candidate. We're not quite sure whether he wants to continue another three years on the Board, but he is joining us here to be able to respond to our questions and to engage in a dialogue with us, and let us know a little bit what's happening at the top whilst we're completely at the bottom.

So there is quite a distance between up there and down here. So, Sebastien, I guess you have the floor. Do you wish to take specific questions?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you Olivier, and thank you everyone. I am ready to try to answer questions. I wanted to do a few introductory remarks. First of all, I hope it's just a joke between you, At Large, and me that you are the bottom and I am at the top. I feel that sometimes, on the Board, I am at the bottom and some other ones are at the top.

And I try to be, as much as possible, with you and that's for me, the more important to have your inputs, and to be able to act with inputs from your side. This meeting, as usual, it's with a lot of things going on than it would be difficult to make choice where to concentrate.

But I wanted to tell you that, for example, the meeting I just, we just finished about technical liaison group, this meeting was supposed to be for the organization with technical remit like SSAC, LSAC, and the TLGs, the ITF [?] ...and then, excuse me with the acronyms, that's all the organization we take care of standards in way or the other. And on my request, it was open to all about [?] to the organization. To the SO and ACs, all the SO and then the ALAC.

And just to show that it's one thing I try to take care of, for example, when we was in IGF, we have the Board meeting, the Board briefing with staff each morning, and I suggest that we open to the [?]. Fortunately or unfortunately, the only one who showed up was Olivier.

But for me that was enough. No, it's never enough. But the other SO and AC didn't come to the breakfast, but [?] was going to come and that is what's great because we need to be more closer from the community. The main topic, not really inside the meeting but will be discussed because I heard that the first full day I was here, is about the Internet governance issues.

And I guess you already talked with Fadi about that, and I will not – he is more eloquent in the more information than me. But it's an important point where you need to be involved one way or another. It would be

your choice, the choice of your organization, of your ALS, but it's really important to participate. And I will stop here, Olivier, and will try to answer any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sebastien. And so I already see a few hands up. First we start with Eduardo? Okay. Eduardo Diaz, go ahead.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo Diaz for the record. I have a couple of questions. Can you give some advice to the new candidates that are coming to this new process about the work? If you're going to be part of the Board, that's one question. And the other question, and this I'm curious, the three years that you have been there, what has been the most challenging thing that happened to you being on the Board?

If you can share that with us, thank you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. Time commitments, it should take each Board member, it's very different. From participating in the meeting, and preparing a little to participate to committee, to working groups, and to do some international works or travel. My time commitment is something around 75% of my time.

When I make this calculation last year, I even didn't count the time I was in the plane for ICANN. But, it's mostly – I would not say it's something

more than some, a lot of you, it's time consuming, but I know that some of you are doing even more than me. And then that's the first answer.

The second answer, it's strange anymore and it's [?] anymore. It's bold. You need time to understand how it's working and to be excited by the other. I was the first elected with a voice to vote, and I think it changed the way of behavior of the other Board members. Liaison, I was not there when the liaison was on the Board.

But I see the liaison with the group, the relationship, it's a little bit more easier, we'll say, because at the end, they don't participate to the vote. I really think that the Board have still improvement, it's a way of working, even after three years. Just to take one example, I am still struggling to have the voice allowed within how do we connect, because it's very complicated to think about.

But generous, you At Large [?] better support... I will not talk about [?] persons, and I will not talk about staff, but you have a very good team. And you are very engaged. Also, to user tools, and that's something other parts of ICANN could learn and specifically the Board.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sebastien. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm going to ask you a question in French so that you won't understand, muchas gracias. Sebastien, we are very good friends. Now if I had to choose, I'm forced to ask some questions. We

have chosen a member of the Board for him to get to the Board our point of view, and our concerns, and so that he would push within the Board for what we want to get done, so that it gets done.

So can you tell me, since you were appointed Board member, what have you managed to do? What are your achievements for At Large and for ALAC specifically?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

I have a short reply, and that is nothing. And I think that there is one thing that should be understood because what you're telling me is that I am your voice before the Board, and that is not the case actually. I am not only liaison. That is the difficulty of the situation that is trouble with, the others, the other SOs, the other ACs, bring policy resolutions.

The SOs, so get policy resolutions, and you are the only advisory committee or committee at all presenting recommendations to the Board who no longer has a liaison. And Board members are not supposed to be the go-between, meaning that when the time comes, I don't explain what ALAC does or that I do not push for certain things to be done, but it is complicated actually.

Because when you get to the Board, the first thing you're told, or the first person that you meet, is the devil's attorney, ICANN's attorney. And you're given the list of what you cannot do, and then you have a list of what you can do, and you can do one thing actually and that is to vote taking into account the entire organization.

As they say in California law, by taking into account the corporation. So it is of this difficulty that is associated to the position that I hold today, with the added complication that among those chosen in general for each organization, SOs choose two members, At Large only has one which makes it even more uneven.

I'm going to give you some examples which seem useful. Certainly you have worked very much on these examples that I'm going to give now because they come in handy, and I'm only a small part of that but I think if ATLAS 2 in London, takes place next year, I think I gave my small piece of help. And the opening of the numbered meetings which are quite closed to others and particularly to your chair, that is to me an important element.

And I also helped for the ICANN Academy to advance. But conversely, there are things that I do not manage to get them to understand such as the fact that the Board decided to shut down three committees. One thing, the committee that dealt with IANA, so that was a committee that advised on delegations, re-delegations, and so on.

Then secondly, the committee that dealt with – that is the BGRC so that is the Board global relations committee. So they dealt with global relations, and that is strange for it to be shut at the same time as they are launching and participating at the one net initiative. And then they also shut down the PCEC, which only changed names actually because it didn't even change the charter.

So there used to be a public participate committee which was the PPC, and then it became the stakeholder's engagement committee. And they also decided to shut it down, so that was the PCEC secondly. I mean, they do a good job, but I think it is very unpleasant to be a member of the Board which considers only internal affairs, which is only looking at its own problems.

I think there is very positive things. There are things which have progress. There are others which I find we have evolved actually, but we can evolve throughout this week. So that's all, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: ...and keep looking forward rather than looking backwards as to what we have done in the past, but more as to what we have to do this week, and what we have to do in the future. We've got a queue with Glenn McKnight, Jose Arce, and Fatimata Cambroner. So first I will have Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Glenn McKnight for the record. Olivier, you must be reading my mind because it's great to hear what you've done, and it's great that you understand Board governance and a lot of us don't really understand confidentiality and the whole issue of responsibility as a Board member. Moving forward though, what do you hope to achieve in terms of as a representative on the Board?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, if I could just stop this because we're not actually in the election, selection, and so on discussion. We're looking at what is needed this week from this community. What are the subjects which are going to be focusing on? Not on what Sebastien is going to do as a person, as a Board member.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Sorry, Glenn McKnight again. I didn't intend that. I hope you didn't read that into it. All I'm saying is, now that you are on the ground running, you're familiar with the job, you're getting used to the job, there is certain things moving forward this next year that you feel that maybe I need to put more energy in. Is that okay sir? Okay, thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: [?] to answer your question because it puts more energy, yeah. Really, as a point, it's to have always the voice of the users through me, because I am the – I was the only one. It's not any more true because I think that [?] could be also a very good advocate for the voice of the user. I was the only voice, and then I was trying by any means possible to advance that, and I want to continue, and I hope that I will get the [?] for that.

Now, to take the question of Olivier. Frankly, what is important, it's for the people that were here for the two day of training, I guess we get the more important issue, ATRT 2, consumer trust, the strategy planning, you have – and if you need my help, I will give you as much as possible

for the ATLAS 2. So that's for me next year, the most important event for ICANN, within an ICANN meeting.

And there is already ideas on the top figure to invite, and that's good but at the same time, you invite the bottom of our organization and that's the most important organization. That's the 165 or 70 people who will be gathered to be really treated as barely possible, and help to be efficient during the summit and during the ICANN meeting.

And of course, during this week, we will talk about Internet governance in general, and that will be a very important that you engage, you participate, not just during the meeting but after the meeting in the one net initiative.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sebastien. Next is Sergio Salinas Porto. Did I get the right person? No I did not. Sorry. Jose Arce, I apologize. I just have this mate thing in my head at the moment, I'm sorry. Sorry, Joe, I'm looking at you all the time. Over to you Jose.

JOSE ARCE: This is Jose Arce. Two very brief questions. The first one has to do with this, how important is for a Board member to perceive or to have salary? So how important is that salary for a Board member? And secondly, can you comment on the effectiveness of the ALAC work on the Board when you make decisions? What is the impact that this has? How do the Board members see this work?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: The salary is \$48,000 annually per each Board member. And the At Large and ALAC work is well welcome for the Board. But the chair of the Board is working on how we can take your advice, I don't know, how to say this word in Spanish, advice, how to take your advice and start a discussion without just reading a paper and asking or wondering what they are going to do with that.

So that is what we are doing right now. This is the task we are undergoing right now. And we, I hope, we will have some changes in the organization by-laws because the recommendations are also important as the GAC recommendations. So this is something that we need to take into account. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Fatimata Cambronero.

FATIMATA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatimata, I will speak in Spanish. I apologize beforehand this issue has already been dealt with and discussed before. I couldn't participate in the selection process of the Board member, and on this occasion, I will participate as an ALAC member, and I would like to have very clear on my mind certain issues.

Before you said Sebastien, that you are not a liaison within the ICANN Board. So what is the nature of this representation? Once the ALAC member is within the Board, is he going to work on his personal

capacity? Is he going to represent the interest of the At Large community or not? Because somehow, the way in which this role is performed, well this will have to do with the answers or replies that the At Large community will request.

So we are now having a first representative before the Board, so what are we accounting for? What is the ALAC community asking for? In this case, to you or to any other member.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sebastien Bachollet speaking. To answer your question is really complicated because we are – we have been elected by a group, this is the At Large group, and when we are elected we do not understand, or we do not have any connection or any link with the electors. But after three or four years, that is in my case, we have to return or go back to our electors.

So it is difficult. But let's see what happens, these past days, with the electors. So I will try to see what we can do and what we cannot do, but as I said before, it's a very good question because we are – we don't have still any representative on the Board.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

...still have Leon Sanchez and then we'll have Sergio Salins Porto. And the queue is closed because we do need to move on after that. So Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Olivier. I will speak in Spanish as well. In a previous meeting, we discussed about a second seat within the Board for ALAC. Is there any plan to carry this in a period or in a timeframe, once this project is concluded? And I think it would be a good opportunity to start thinking in case this is done, how the election will be carried out.

I imagine, we will follow the same procedures, but in that case, let's say it would be scaled.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sebastien Bachollet speaking. Well, to tell you the truth, that is your responsibility. I cannot do much. I can say that the status of the ALAC functioning as two members to the Board, and we only have one member, but in fact, is you the ones who should work. I can help you, but that is all.

But I think it is very important also, and if we take that into account together with ATLAS 2, well I think we can have success. We can be successful because we had already, in ATLAS 1, because we have proved that we can work together in each of the regions, but behind the regions, also at a global level.

So, we can make a better work in London. We can show the community that we are ready to have a second member to the Board. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

And finally we have Sergio Salinas Porto.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I will speak in Spanish. This is Sergio Salinas Porto speaking. I would like thank you Sebastien, not only for your task on the Board, but also for your activities within the Latin American region because you always make the effort to speak in Spanish, and we are very thankful for that.

And this is very important for the diversity within ICANN. On the other hand, I will keep on insisting on what Leon said. I remember during the first summit in Mexico in 2009 talking about this in meeting with the Board and in public meeting, and I think that Sherry had pushed me to speak about this in one of the public debates. The topic of equal co-governance. I mention this because the multi-stakeholder model should be based on the fact that all the stakeholders should have the same amount of participants or representatives.

And sometimes I feel that no matter how much effort ALAC makes or At Large makes within ICANN to have this space of representation, this is not taken into account by the other spaces. So the weakest part in terms of economics, structure of economic power, well we also in disadvantage whenever we have to debate these issues. For us, it should be of vital importance to have an equal representation level, equal to other sectors in the ecosystem.

So I would like... I wanted to emphasize this because I don't know if you had had the opportunity to ask or debate this, but the question is, is

there any possibility that the Board member debate this? Or this is not being taken into account by the Board?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Sebastien Bachollet speaking. My reply is this. I do it as many times as I can. The structuring [?] committee of the Board, when we discuss these issues, for example, yesterday I had a debate. It was not an official meeting, but it was a debate. The GAC recommendations should be taken into account, and I said, “But we also have recommendations by ALAC.”

And some members of the Board said, “Well, but that is not important.” And many others said, “Yes, they should be at the same level.” So we must keep on working because we have a long way to go, but we will do it together. So thank you very much. I was not ready so much Spanish because yeah, you know, I need to practice my Spanish. So thank you very much, and now we can continue discussing all together.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Sebastien. I guess that’s very good practice for the rest of the week. Since we are in Argentina, I’m sure you’ll be solicited on quite a few occasions to speak Spanish. So take it as good practice. We are going to continue now because time is ticking and I know that we haven’t got much time at lunchtime. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: We have an informal meeting in this room at 12, at 1:30, excuse me at one, at one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. Yeah, that's why I'm saying, time is ticking. Tijani mate. Mate. We're on the next part of our meeting and we have Susanna Bennett, who is joining us at this table. Welcome. And Susanna is the new chief operating officer. Well, new as in maybe that new, recent, more recent.

And I think that one of the things is, you've got quite a few new people around the table, and so it would be a good thing for you to introduce yourself, and introduce some of your background, and then ready sort of, well, what are the news with regards to operations? And what's happening in your part of the ICANN world. So over to you Susanna.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Thank you Olivier. Hello everyone. Thank you for inviting me. Yes, I'm not that new actually, with ICANN. I started on July 1st, so it has been several months. It has been very exciting, working with the team on several things. So a quick background on myself. I don't usually like to talk about myself so I figure in this environment, I should introduce a little bit with my background.

I started in Finance first, but very quickly early in my career, I took on several other areas in operations side. For example, HR and IT and administration, many of these operation areas. There is a lot of

advantage of having the finance background to expand into those areas, and be involved with many aspects of mergers and acquisitions, IPOs, and what not.

So as a result, I learned a lot from many of these events, and from my responsibilities and the people that I worked with. I'm very fortunate like that. So, over the years I really built up a passion for operations excellence, and had an opportunity working with Fadi in a startup in 1999, and six years later we sold it to IBM. And I really respect Fadi as a leader and so when he contracted me earlier this year, and I was very excited having the opportunity again to working with him.

So since I joined, the focus has been definitely on operations excellence, and that's one of the four objectives of fiscal year 14. In addition to that, we also focused on globalization. As you know, we setup the hub in Singapore and the hub in Istanbul, and it's a very, very happy to announce the team worked very hard on getting the hubs ready, and now they're both ready and we both about five staff at each of the sites.

I'm very excited about that. We're looking at about 15 staff at each of these sites, which was the end of this fiscal year. And the other areas of focus was on operational excellence and many projects had started. We applied the EFQM model, and quite a few long hanging fruits, I should say. We were able to make changes and implement very quickly. Then we have a plan to roll out several things in trimesters two and three, to really get us to another level of excellence.

So with that, I'd like to hear some questions that I can help address in the meantime. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Susanna. So the floor is open for questions from our community. Operations, on programs, etcetera, etcetera. I guess some of you might remember, [?] was your predecessor and of course, he's moved over to a new division that's now dealing specifically with the new gTLD.

SUSANNA BENNET: Right, [?] had definitely a lot more responsibilities. He had what I'm overseeing right now and many other things, including GDD and new gTLD division. So what he did is that he moved the finance, HR, and administrative responsibility to me and he kept the very critical areas of GDD and [?] thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. So the floor is open for questions. Tijani Ben Jemaa, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to open the discussion. I thank you Susanna for coming. You are in charge of, for example, the travel support. It's your remit. So perhaps we can speak a little bit about that. We have to, perhaps, think about

those small problems that make people, volunteers, come into those meetings sometimes very awful.

So if we can, together, think about those points and try to find, how to say, a structure or, yeah something that can be sustainable, and that will prevent for each meeting those questions arose, arise. Excuse me.

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Tijani, you're talking about the travel area, correct? Yes. Absolutely. I think it's very important for very good representation from all over the world at this floor here. And it's very important to the world, to ICANN, so you're absolutely right. We need to work together to address many issues, especially relating to visa, that many countries have problems of issuing visas for various other country's attendees.

And thank you for highlighting that to us, and we will work together whatever it takes, the best we can, to mitigate that. I thank you for pointing that out.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Tijani. We already have a queue. We've got Alan, [?], and then Evan. So Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'll follow up on Tijani, because the travel ones are one of those things that no matter how well you do it right, you're not going to get an awful lot of praise, but when you do it wrong, it's easier to

criticize, and we understand that. And the issues like visas are difficult and we're always likely to have problems.

If you do work ahead of time, they're easier. The parts that really bother me, and I know bother a lot of other members of our community – and our community is a little bit unique in that, although you provide travel funding for a lot of parts of ICANN, we're about the only part, that if you stopped, we wouldn't show up.

Whereas in the GNSO, most of them wouldn't have an issue coming in anyway. The money you give them is nice, but they have other companies and organizations that will pay for them. That's not the case for us. And in particular, I'll identify one or two sore points.

There are people here who depend on the per diem to be able to spend the expenses that they have to. ICANN, which doesn't have a lot of cash flow problems at the moment, there is no reason that the per diem show up in our bank the day before we leave, or sometimes the day after we leave.

Getting them to us a week ahead of time for those of us who really need the cash, and I'm not one of them, but those – it would be a real boon. And it used to happen that way, and they've moved in – or closer and closer in. And I know there is a danger that if you send it in a week earlier, maybe someone would have to cancel their trip and you'll have to retrieve it.

Give me a break. It's not an issue. Similar issues are repayment of travel expenses. You will not repay them until after the meeting. Now

if you buy a ticket three months ahead of time, you spent money. If I buy the ticket, I have to carry the float. And again, if I don't show up, there is an issue that doesn't happen very often.

You've told us this time you're going to pay the reciprocity fee for those who have to pay it, but you only pay it afterwards. And there is all sorts of annoyances like that, and there is certainly a bunch of things we're not going to go into right now on scheduling the travel.

That I'm allowed to arrive on a certain day, if I arrive five minutes past midnight, if I arrive five minutes before midnight, that's the previous day and it doesn't count. You know, there is all sorts of annoyances and sometime we have to spend some time looking at it.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Thank you very much for those points. [Spanish]

ALAN GREENBERG: ... over the last five or six years, but we'd be glad to do it again.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't know that you did that already. And, okay, excellent, yeah. Yeah, definitely I'll review that with the finance team. [?] is actually here, in the building, I'm not sure why he's not – he's invited to this meeting, I'm sure he got tied up somewhere.

So I will work with him and the finance team to review and also the travel team, Joseph and Diane. You know Diane, right? And she's

amazing. She knows a lot of history so she can definitely help all of us understand what are the challenges and how we can work on each one of them. And I'll get back to you. If those things can be easily fixed, we'll fix them. If those things we have issues with, we'll get back and chat with you. Okay? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next we have Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you Ms. Bennett. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcript. Just because of the challenges in time zones, and for people who will be reviewing the transcripts later who may not necessarily be here, in this particular meeting, whilst you were talking, you briefly mentioned some sort of model. FQW. I couldn't hear properly. But just for the sake of the transcripts, could you perhaps describe that acronym.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Yeah. QM model, that is the European model for operational excellence. And I think the team before had presented this model that we have been applying for a couple of years now. IANA being through, completed the first version of the model actually had it and passed the audit very well.

So the reason that we choose the model is because it's not just US based, it's international. And QM is a non-profit organization, so it's a really good model that we chose to follow. Yes. Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you Susanna. Next we have Evan Leibovitch, Glenn McKnight, and I'd like to get then Xavier Calvez who has joined us to then take the floor. So first Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I want to extend this whole thing, rather than just talking about the travel itself into talking a little bit, overall, about meeting strategy. There is a sense that now that business interests have got their way and the gTLD program has been approved, that there is less for ICANN to do so we need to shorten the meetings.

And so, we had a situation where Board meetings that used to take place Friday now take place Thursday, as a result that cuts one day off so that's saving somebody some money. But At Large still has a very big load. We still have meetings going on Friday, and yet we still have people who are at meetings on Friday who are told to pack up and leave on Friday, but basically – they have to check out of the hotel, go to the meetings, and then immediately go from the meetings to the airport.

There is a sense of humanity in this, I think, that's missing. And I mean, in general, the meetings are being compressed to a point where our load isn't getting any shorter, and yet the meetings are becoming more

compressed. Now there is more conversations about doing different things on Monday that used to be done elsewhere in the week.

And with the intention of efficiencies as opposed to actually accomplishing what we have been. And I'm really concerned about this. I mean, we find our workload sometimes getting bigger, not less because the issues that we've had aren't just with the gTLD program, and so we continue to be working with ICANN on many things.

Can you make a comment on the meeting strategies, whether or not there is any fear at all of things being contracted even further? Which is a real concern, seeing where the trends are going, and that we're able to do the work that ALAC has been mandated to do when we're here. Because that's starting, to me, to be a big concern. Thank you.

SUSANNA BENNETT:

Okay. Thank you for the question. So there is a couple of things that I address. So one is on the meeting strategy has been committees been working on this exact thing about the future of the meetings, and starting to get involved in the planning for this meeting in Buenos Aires, and knowing a lot, amazing how many meetings need to happen in Buenos Aires.

And Fadi and the steering committee talked about how creative we can change and be more effective in running ICANN meetings. And one of the thoughts that ICANN meetings, the most important things are for the different groups – different community groups to interact. If we can

focus ICANN meetings just on that, then we can cut down a lot of the conflicts.

However, if that's the case, that will not facilitate many of the groups, the community groups to meet, the opportunity to meet together. So they're various areas that the committee is looking at. And Sebastien actually is the chair of the committee, and it's still ongoing, and I believe the team will get together again in January to get to a good draft to propose.

So that's on the strategy part. And in the meantime, we have hundreds of sessions, just like this one in Buenos Aires. I believe we have two or 300 hundred sessions to cram in four days. It is very, very challenging. I totally agree. I have never seen any conferences so amazingly run, and it's certainly very tiring at the end of the week for everyone.

So having said that, we got in the first part of your comment. Actually Heidi and Olivier already brought that up to us, along with Tijani, so we try to figure out different ways how to address in the meantime, and not go out of the policies for the entire community, and [?] can get into more the policy side.

So what we talked about, how we can mitigate this one, admittedly is that we can have the Friday meetings start a bit early, and then make sure there is breakfast served in the meeting room, and the meeting can be finished around 11 or noon. This way, it will be at the time, checkout before the time of checkout. So, the meeting members can have time to get things ready and checkout and still plan time to go to the airport.

So that's an inter mitigation [?] that will work out well, or better, for most of the meeting members in the meantime until we have another look at the policy for the entire community.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Susanna. Next is Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Glenn McKnight for the record. I applaud the committee for supporting the pilot project, CROP. I think it's a great opportunity for At Large to reach out to new ALSs. One thing we brought up last year, which is something that is probably a burning issue more to me than a lot of people, but I think we all share the same thing, is that the fellowship program is great, and I'm not against it, but it neglects the First Nations or Native Americans and Canadians, which are disadvantaged just like a lot of least developed countries.

And I'd like to appeal to your office to reconsider the idea of supporting fellowship programs to First Nations. Some people call it indigenous, Americans call them Indian, in Canada we call them First Nations.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But I suspect you would like to have it global not just regional.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Absolutely. I'm not restricting it to Canada, the United States. Yes, thank you.

SUSANNA BENNETT: I need to get educated on this one more than I am right now. And Xavier, do you have more background on this you can comment? No, no. Okay. So please, forgive me, I need to learn a lot more about this and before I can speak to this. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, may I? I can give very brief clarity. Right now, the policy for this is that it is restricted to lesser developed economies. We have also poor communities within rich nations that right now are excluded. So that's the very quick way to describe this. That's what I'm talking about.

You have situations where within countries where you think, "Well, North America, they can afford it. They're rich economies." But within them you have communities that them themselves are very poor, and I think qualifying, perhaps, of the same kind of benefits that are allowed elsewhere. Thanks.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Understand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. We still have Yuliya Morenets and then Garth Bruen. Yuliya.

YLIYA MORENETS: Thank you Olivier. Yliya Morenets, EURALO secretariat. I wanted to just support was said concerning indigenous communities, and go maybe say, maybe vulnerable or marginalized groups, but we believe it should go together with outreach, further, which was discussed earlier this morning.

So to try these people to ICANN activities, and afterwards to maybe have some specific fellowship program. Thank you.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Right. Very good point. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, chair of NARALO. In the United States, some of our indigenous communities don't have the benefit of government sponsorship. There is a certain amount of autonomy. Politically there are almost separate from the United States. I know this is something that is difficult for people from the rest of the world to understand, and that's why they need a little bit more sponsorship.

SUSANNA BENNETT: Thank you. Good point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. And we now have Xavier Calvez, who has grabbed the flying mic, so Xavier, the floor is yours now.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Otherwise I can't very well. It's the shoes so. Good morning or good afternoon. Sorry to be a bit late. I'll speak quickly on the FY 15 budget, operating plan and budget process. A couple of comments and then I'll take your questions on that or anything else that you would like, so I will try to be very brief.

And as a result, I won't do it in French. Two main subjects on the FY 15 planning process this year. As you know, there is an ongoing process that started a few months ago to re-document, rather than redefine, the strategy, the five year strategy of ICANN. And that process has started, will continue through approximately April or May of 2014.

So this process will be happening effectively in parallel of the development of the FY 15 budget. As a result, we will not have, as we normally would need, the input from the strategy at the beginning of the budget planning process. So this is going to be another interim year where – while the five year strategy is being developed, we will conduct the FY 15 budget process.

As a result, we will have a phase of the FY 15, thank you Tijani. We'll have a phase of the FY 15 budget process that will enable us to formulate objectives at the end of FY 15. So between basically January 2014 and June 2015, what do we want to get accomplished? What do we want to achieve there as an organization?

By function, I wouldn't say at a very granular level, but by each of the function of the organization, level of service, specific projects, and along the lines and documented with the dashboard that Susanna may have mentioned, that we're going to put in place, with a relatively specific system of measurement, of metrics, and progress.

So this is going to be the intermit approach, because we're not going to have the five year objectives, but we're going to formulate the one year and a half objectives. And while doing that, we will therefore have a dimension of the resources to achieve those 18 month objectives, until the end of FY 15.

And when the strategy will be finalized towards April or May, we will of course, ensure that there is sufficient consistency within the FY 15 plan, and that will have been developed with the imminent output of the strategy so that we can take that output from the strategy into account, and possibly, of course, accommodate some of it immediately in the FY 15 plan.

We do intend to introduce as much flexibility in the FY 15 plan, to be able to take into account actions that will come out of the strategy, the five year strategy, and that will be applicable right away, I would say, during FY 15. How do we intend to introduce that flexibility?

We are thinking right now on trying to have within the limit of the revenues, which is the standard approach for us to budget for expenses. We budget for expenses no more than we expected to have revenues. So within the limit of revenues to increase probably the proportion of

the contingency, which is the amount included in the budget that's unallocated to any specific expenses.

To increase that amount, so as to allow to absorb potential costs that would not have been defined as part of the FY 15 budget, but that would result from output from the five year strategy. The second item that will change a little bit on the FY 15 process is the SO and AC additional budget request process.

Two main things that will change there. We are intending in the next few weeks to share the list of criteria that are being used to evaluate the requests on the one hand, so that everyone has those up front. In the other changes, if you remember last year, we introduced two steps in the process. In terms of timing, we had to first step in – of approval of requests in Beijing.

For those requests that need earlier approval because they are relative to actions that are coming earlier in the year, in the fiscal year. And we had a second phase, usual timing I would say, June approval, with the rest of the budget. This year, to try to leverage the advantage of last year and to eliminate the issues of last year, we are thinking to basically bring everything forward.

Having one process only, one step, but scheduling earlier meaning that in Singapore, and by Singapore, we would receive the requests, review all requests, and evaluate all of them, and submit to the Board for approval a list of requests in Singapore. And all requests would be then approved or denied by them.

It's obviously an accelerated process, and the purpose of that is to make sure that there is for everyone sufficient time to be able to plan then for the actions. So, your feedback on that would be helpful. I think last year in recognizing that the meeting last year, the spring meeting last year, happened a month later than it will happen next year, right?

Because Beijing was in April, Singapore is in March. Sorry. Right. So the... And we're going to start, of course, the process earlier this year as well because last year we started towards the end of December. So, Cheryl you want to start? So the... Tijani and I will work a little bit more precisely on the timing, but that's the intent in order to allow for a simplicity – more simplicity on the process.

Last year splitting it into two, had the advantage of bringing that earlier decision process, but also created a bit more complexity in the process for all of the organizations and for us, in terms of processing. In order to simplify it, providing one process, one deadline, is expected to make things a little bit more simple.

If only I recognize that it therefore provides less time to formulate those requests. And so, hopefully you can react on timing, and time required to formulate requests. Tijani, I don't know if there is, you can help here providing comments or the sense of the process that is being used to formulate requests. Is it something that you think you can be accommodated within this timing or not?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Xavier. Tijani, please go ahead. Okay. Thank you Xavier. I was going to say the floor is open for questions. We're kind of running out of time because we're a little bit late, but then Tijani is running the next session as well, so it really is up to him when he wants to end this one.

But with regards to having the earlier supporting organization and advisory committee, as OAC requests, that's something which [?] is going to benefit some of our regions, especially the ones that have events that are traditionally taking place during July and August. That's one thing.

That said, of course, it means that we do need to launch our own process of SO and AC requests and get our regional At Large organizations to file these much earlier. And so, I mean do you have an exact date by which we need to have those requests ready?

XAVIER CALVEZ: No. The end of February.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: End of February we need to have SO AC requests ready, sent, vetted, etcetera.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Submitted, yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Submitted. Okay. So we could work them in January. We don't... I mean, we're not looking at having a December 15th date, where we need to have started the process a while ago. We have time for that. Okay. Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Mister Chairman. Xavier, the Asia-Pacific region has a problem with the timeline in the sense that, well, December is a gone month for everyone, and January is a gone month for the Asia-Pacific region in general because of diversity, and the festivals, and the Chinese New Year, etcetera.

So it's very difficult and extremely compressed for us. So we need another solution.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay. We'll think about it. I'll try to think about it, but you should suggest other options as well, because I can't introduce more months in the year.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I have a solution to this, to abolish time zones, and months, and whatever, and to have just one month and one time zone for everyone. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, for [?] question. I think that, let him go with his deadlines, and we will negotiate the Pacific case, particularly, so I think it will not be a problem because they will have time to treat the other requests, and when your requests come, they will finish it. I think it is feasible.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Do you think that, of course, you don't know until you've done the process. But do you think that the type of requests that would come out of the process of inquiring and formulating those requests, would be significantly different in nature or in types of activities than the ones of the previous years.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because CROP is active, and we're very supportive of this, you can take most of those type of requests out of the equation, but I will note most of the Asia-Pacific activities that we would have want to have had, something like CROP. And this is Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record.

Something like CROP support for, falls outside of the FY 14 timing. So any of our activities are already excluded, say inadvertently disadvantaged Asia-Pacific in CROP, but we're supportive of getting the pilot working and making it work. So you will take all of those away. We won't put in CROP like activities because it should be dealt with CROP, but none of our activities fit in the limited space that CROP gives us as well.

So you won't be getting a whole lot of stuff from Asia-Pacific other than angst.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Anyone else? Back to Tijani and then Salanieta.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I think that in the future, additional request will be very, very slim. Because the CROP will replace any outreach request, and I think that, I will work with Xavier and Susanna on this, we need to include the participation of the community, in the international events inside the core activities of ICANN, so that it will not be additional request, it will be budgeted with the activities of ICANN.

So at the end we will have only the small things that Alan has foreseen that we have asked for.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcripts. First I would just like to quickly comment on the fixed variables, which is we have no control over the end of the financial year for ICANN, and the sequences that follow. But what we can certainly do to bring some sort of viable solution to address this is perhaps both finance operations can work

together with the regional communities to perhaps have more strategic development plans [?] for a longer period of time.

Having said that, understanding that the budget processes and request and applications happens annually, and so there is some difficulty. And I think a distinction can be made between what certainly can be forecasted, and I see that from where you are coming from Xavier.

But at the same time, being flexible enough to counter for the unforeseen potential activities that could surface. And I thought I would just add that to the mix Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Sala. Helpful. Any other comments or questions? I see no one else. Okay. Well, thank you very much for joining us Xavier, and know that we will be following up with you and if there is any follow up, of course, we do have the finance and budget subcommittee of the At Large advisory committee.

And I think I can also add that we might, with some of the changing leadership here, need to, in fact we do need to send out a call for new members of the finance and budget subcommittee. As you know, without members of the FBSC, then we cannot make those requests.

If we don't make those requests, we're not funded, if we're not funded, then we can't do things. So there is a whole process here where you need to obtain the funds in order to be able to get our communities to

be able to do things. And I know that the process has improved over the years. Just a few words...

Okay. Great. Well thanks for joining us Xavier, and thank you to Susanna Bennett for joining us. And so we now have a housekeeping note, which is going to be the length of the break that we have for lunch today. And it appears that on the paper it says, 13:00 to 14:30, which is indeed the case. However, there is a joint working group meeting of the BMSPC and the BCEC.

Not quite sure how Tijani wants to play this, or Roberto wants to play this. I'm turning to the two chairs, gathering people to the table, I guess, and for everyone else, then you're free to go and enjoy your little break. Coming back here at 2:30 is when you're regularly scheduled programs restart.

Please be here on time. We did start a little late this morning. This is what brought us a little late now. So if we can stick to the time, it would be great. Thank you.

[End Audio 1]

[Begin Audio 2]

UNIDENTIFIED: Regional Leadership working session, in the Golden Horn.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. We'll be starting in one minute please. Recording on please. Okay. Good afternoon everybody. Welcome to the second part of our Sunday session, the At Large and Regional Leadership meeting working session. And we now have Maguy Serad who is with us, the vice president of contractual compliance.

And she has come here with a few people from her team. I'll ask her to introduce them please.

MAGUY SERAD: Good afternoon everyone. This is Maguy Serad from contractual compliance. Thank you for being here with me today. With me from the team, I have Greg [?], I have Carlos Alvarez, and Victor [?]. We've already lost 10 minutes of the meeting, but we promise, if it's all right with you, to be very brief on our update, to still allow room for Q&A.

The first update I want to provide you is that the team has grown, and now we have a global presence in the Istanbul office. Three new ICANN staff members joined us in October. They have also just spent what we call an intense onboarding program.

And the first two areas that we put them to focus on and to learn intensely are very near and dear to this audience, WHOIS inaccuracy and transfer. They relate directly to public interests, and want to make sure that every staff member knows, and understands, and processes it. With the [?] team now, we can directly work with our ICANN community in all different global areas.

We cover 12 languages, 12 languages spoken by people from the regions, with an appreciation to the culture and the nuances. There would be a few slides, I'm not going to them, but I put them there for your reference. The second update is on the outreach activities, as you know guys, there are lots of things happening in the ICANN world, not only a new contract for the registrars, but also the new registry agreement.

So compliance team has been very active preparing, and communicating, and collaborating with the contracted parties to make sure that everybody understands the process, how we're going to get there, and responding in the timely fashion per process to address any non-compliance issue in a timely fashion.

So slide three will address those outreach activities for you. Now, on slide four, and I ask Matt not to go to those slides because I want to make sure we stay focused, is that the other program, year two has launched. If you read the audit program from year one, a third of the ICANN active registrars were selected in year one, and we had 317 registrars selected.

I am really want to share with this audience because I know it's a big area of concern for you about how many registrars are really delivering what they signed up to deliver. Based on the year one audit program, we had 99% compliance with the agreement on the 2001 and 2009.

So of the 317 registrars, we had a good success story. The audit program is available on the compliance website, and the audit reports

are available. There is a lot of good information there. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Greg please to provide an update on WHOIS inaccuracy.

GREG:

Hi, my name is Greg [?] with the ICANN compliance team. The first thing we wanted to discuss, or I wanted to discuss, is that the bulk WHOIS inaccuracy complaints, the mission, is now in production. This means that users who agree to the terms of use can submit multiple WHOIS inaccuracy complaints in a single file upload.

The system is based on a pilot program that we launched earlier this year, in which users that accepted the terms of use, were able to submit up to 100 WHOIS inaccuracy complaints per week, with each complaint being processed individually per compliances one, two, three process. Next slide please.

The results of the pilot, we had a total of 340 WHOIS inaccuracy complaints submitted, and out of those, all of them were resolved within the first notice turnaround time. Next slide please. This year, we suspended two reporters from submitting WHOIS inaccuracy reports temporarily.

In the first situation, we had a reporter that submitted 191 invalid WHOIS inaccuracy complaints within a timespan of eight weeks. Each of these complaints alleged that every detail of the WHOIS data was wrong, when most of the domains that were being reported were well-known WHOIS privacy proxy services, or well-known websites.

We conducted outreach and sent specific notices regarding what was wrong with this, but the reporter continued submitting invalid complaints. In our next example, we had a reporter who sent 37 emails to contractual compliance with offensive and threatening language to ICANN staff. In situations like this, after conducting outreach with the reporters, ICANN may temporarily suspend these reporters from submitting WHOIS inaccuracy complaints.

CARLOS ALVAREZ: Let's go to the next slide please.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Introduce yourself please.

CARLOS ALVAREZ: Yeah. The slides here. I am Carlos Alvarez. I'm a senior manager with ICANN contractual compliance. Being brief, we have the system updated and the complaint form live one week before the [?] came into effect, that is one week before August 31st. Since that date, we've received a bit over 40 plus complaints, regarding compliance, or outage non-compliance issues with the policy.

Among the most common issues that we've been seeing, some registers are being a little slow in updating their terms of service, their registration agreements. We're addressing that of course. Some registers are not renewal notifications as they should, that of course as well being addressed. And in a couple of instances, registrars did not

interrupt the resolution payout as they should have, thinking that it was not their obligation because the domains had expired before August 31st.

So we're addressing those issues. Obviously, our intention is to, based on the policy, protect the registrants and that's what we're doing with the most interest of course. Let's go to the next slide please.

Thank you. Regarding 2013 RAA, the team – all of the team is putting great effort in having the systems ready and the complaint forms ready for January 1st. We're going to have 11 new complaint types, four existing complaint types are being updated. We are already doing intensive work in making sure that the registrars comply with the WHOIS format as they should.

That's been intense for a couple of our colleagues on the team. And everything is running very well in having the systems up to date, and the team being able to receive those complaints. That, of course, along with all of the team becoming more knowledgeable in the 2013 RAA. That's the update from my side. Thank you.

VICTOR:

I'm Victor [?], senior manager at contractual compliance as well. I'd like to call your attention to [?] side, the [?]. Since we met in Durban, compliance has been focused primarily on getting ready for the faces that you see identified on the right half of the slide. From the contracting phase with compliant checks, as Maguy mentioned, doing outreach with delegated TLDs, and then as developing and establishing

the web forms for complaints in our website, ICANN dot org for sunrise and dispute resolutions and other new registry complaints that will be implemented.

And if you look at the bottom of the slide, there is a link, that's the link that will take you to the web forms that are already posted in our website.

MAGUY SERAD:

So Olivier, with this, we conclude the presentations. We have addressed the topics that you brought to our attention in your visit to LA that is of interest to the ALAC committee. So if you want to facilitate the questions or bring to our attention any other issues or concerns that the ALAC community has.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Maguy. It's Olivier speaking. So we already have a queue in operation, and we already have quite a few people in the queue. It starts with Alan, Garth, Evan. I've just seen Sala as well. We'll start with Alan. And Alan has just come actually, when you just started your presentation he came to me and said, "I want to be in your queue." So well done Alan, you're number one.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I have two questions. The first is on WHOIS inaccuracy. It's well understood that there are many domains registered which have a very short lifetime, they don't need to exist very long and those are

often the ones that have inaccurate WHOIS information. Similarly, for those that may not already be deleted by the time you look at the complaint, a very simple solution after the first notice is for the registrar to delete the name.

In both cases, the problem is cured and it goes off your radar. My recollection is you have no tools to handle repeat performers and a registrar who you continually get reports about, but who cure it miraculously, or the domain isn't there anymore. If that recollection is correct, what do you propose to do about this? Because otherwise you're simply racking up, we fixed the problem, or someone fixed the problem, but the problem is outstanding.

I have one more question but you can answer that one first if you like and then I'll go on to the second.

CARLOS ALVAREZ:

This is Carlos Alvarez again. The answer to your question, Alan, has two parts. First, the system has an automatic filter complaints regarding the same domain that are received within 45 days. Our... Complaints regarding domain names that are received within 45 days are closed by the system.

The complainant receives a notification because the assumption is the complaint was received. It's either being addressed still or it was fixed. That is the first side. The second side is, the metrics that compliance is able to produce can go to the level of detail that allowed the team to identify those instances that you mentioned, that can be of concern.

And we've identified them, and we have been working on them. So...

ALAN GREENBERG:

But do you in fact... The fact is, do you in fact have any tools to take action against a registrar for whom you continually get reports which are then fixed? Or the domain doesn't exist anymore?

CARLOS ALVAREZ:

We conduct our [?]. When domain is raised with inaccuracies [?] the registrar fixes it. The compliance issue is such, it disappears, but we see that it's a trend so we don't address it as a complaint from a compliance perspective, but rather from an outreach in which we try to explain to the registrar what's going on, and what the solution... We will not obviously come up with a solution, but we explain to them what their obligation is so that it's clear to them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But you don't actually have any enforcement tools?

MAGUY SERAD:

May I interject here? Yes. The enforcement tool for repeat offenders would be an escalated notice, which is pretty intense and shortened timeframe, but it's based on what Carlos is saying. When we have all the facts and we see the repeat, the team takes effort within that, and when we don't escalate a notice, it can lead to enforcement activity.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The second question is a subject, as some of you might know, dear to my heart, and that's ERRP, of which I have several pounds of skin, bone, and sweat in personally. How are you resolving those complaints? I mean, that's not particularly surprising that some registrars have not fixed all of their systems, and are not sending out all of their notices on a timely matter. What kind of actions are you taking? Other than just to tell them, "You better fix it."

MAGUY SERAD: So this is an area that is managed, overseen by Carlos. The simple answer, just to allow more questions asked, we manage it like we manage all of the complaints we received. We review the complaint, we obtain additional information if needed from the complainant, then we follow up with the registrar per process, giving it a clear turnaround time, requesting specific data, specific information to support the request to validate.

That they are in compliance with the ERRP. If they are not, Carlos and his team, they are immediately turning it around to follow to the next step, which will eventually lead to an enforcement if it does not happen.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: After Alan is Garth. Sorry, I was doing things. So Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Mister Chair. Garth Bruen, chair of NARALO. I have two questions, hopefully I'll keep them brief. I received a notice from a

member of my region, a domain registrant whose domain was stolen through an unauthorized transfer. And he filed a complaint with compliance.

He received a letter from your office, which stated in part that ICANN doesn't handle these issues and turned him away. So I'm wondering why someone would be turned away from filing this kind of complaint. Second question refers to another notice I received from somebody not in my region, from Asia, who does not speak English, whose domains were stolen.

And they were stolen because the people in his community do not understand enough about WHOIS and ICANN policy in English to be able to understand what happened, or even where to begin filing a complaint. I know you've expanded your language capacities, but the documentation itself is missing. What are we doing to address that? Thank you.

MAGUY SERAD:

Thank you for your question, Garth. What I would like to address is two points that I heard from you. You are correct. We have received complaints about stolen domain names. We investigate and request data from both sides. And a decision is always done based on the facts available to us.

So I would leave that at this point to ensure the audience that we do take the time and effort to make that. We don't turn away people. As to the Asia-Pacific challenge of the language or the knowledge, we have

several team members, correct, that do speak and read and are of the Asia-Pacific region.

So when we are dialoguing with Asia-Pacific, it is in that language. And we have completed a few sessions and many, many outreach sessions at a registrar level, or at a regional level, for the regions to make sure that they are informed and have a better understanding of their obligations as it relates to compliance.

So if those, again, this is not the forum to take it at a ticket level, but I wanted to make sure that I share with you that we do conduct outreach levels. We do send notices, and notes in two languages, English is always there and sometimes we add Mandarin to make sure there is no misunderstanding of what is being asked.

GARTH BRUEN:

Just to clarify. The complainant is insisting that there was no investigation. That it was not a case of his complaint being dismissed, it was a case of his complaint not being considered.

MAGUY SERAD:

Again, I would like to ensure the audience that we do all due diligence to gather the facts, even offer our services for extensive conference calls with complainants, with registrars, or with whoever is reporting an issue. So again, without taking it into details, we have a lot of information and data to support what we do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next we have is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. Hi Maguy. I've got three questions and they're all related to consume confidence, specifically in issues of transparency and reporting. Well two are, the third one is sort of looking forward. One of them goes a little bit back on the issue of repeat offenders. And from a point of view of public confidence, I'm going under the assumption that an awful lot of the really bad offenders are concentrated in a fairly small number that are the source of a lot of the complaints.

And if that's untrue, I'd also like to know that as well. But is there a way that consumers can get statistics that say, "Okay, this registrar, or these contracted parties have had a number of successful complaints about them."? I know you have to deal with each of them on an individual basis.

But for the point of view of consumer, or somebody trying to do reasonable statistics on doing their own consumer shopping, or make their own competitive assessments, is it easy at this point for somebody to come to ICANN and say, "Okay. These guys have no complaints. These guys have had a whole bunch of complaints, while these have been dismissed, or these have gone through."?

So into the repeat offender thing. The other thing I had to do was, is there a way to get a little bit more detail when complaints are rejected? So right now there is, okay, we've had a whole lot of complaints, and these were just rejected. For issues of transparency, could you provide

maybe a little more detail on why so there is not quite the sense of them going into a black hole?

And the third one is a little bit looking forward, and that is getting onto the dirty issue of picks because some of this is going to end up on the shoulders of compliance. And to paraphrase a member of our community who is not in the room right now, without good compliance, picks aren't worth a bucket of warm spit.

And you've all heard it before, you know. And so, I'd like you to spend a few minutes talking about the preparations that you're making to work with the picks, and to make sure that just having them isn't just a PR exercise, that there can actually be some teeth behind them, how the public is going to be able to try and initiate complaints about picks if they're not financially impacted, how you all are dealing with this internally. Thanks.

MAGUY SERAD:

Thank God I brought my Post-It, Evan. So let me address the first question you asked. If I summarize it wrong, please correct me, regarding statistics on repeat offenders. The only available statistics on repeat offenders is when it reaches enforcement and that is available on My ICANN.

If you are signed into My ICANN, there is a tab for compliance, and you will get that statistics there. Prior to an enforcement, it is not published. And then this is back to what Carlos stated earlier, if and when that behavior is consistent, believe me, we will enforce.

On the second item, if there is a way to get details about rejected complaints, we call them invalid complaints, what kind of details are you asking for? Because when we respond to the complainant, that a complaint is an invalid, we do attach what is invalid, what is the reason, why it is considered invalid.

And on the picks, if I may summarize, as you all know, the public comment period, I think it's closed, or it's going to be closed in a day or so. Based on the update that Victor provided at the Durban meeting, is that where we were last? Durban.

At the Durban meeting, the [?], if that's what you call it, I don't know what was the other example the spitting, but enforcement is there. However, what I would like to do, if it's alright with you, we want to wait and see what are the public concerns from the public comment period, and then come back to you at the next forum addressing some of those in more details.

But the process for the pick is consistent with the objectives and the enforcement of it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Just a small comment. You don't have to wait until the next meeting, we're all fairly easy to reach in the interim.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, just for the record, the warm bucket of spit, which was alluded to, was not allowed in the ALAC statement because it would be cold by the time it would be dealt with, specifically Sella.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Hi Maguy. First of all, I would like to congratulate the compliance team on the excellent work and progress. In the past two years, I've seen you advance.

MAGUY SERAD: Can you hear me? Olivier, I'm getting a compliment, please don't talk to me. Sala, please, repeat.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: No seriously. For the past two years that I have served on the ALAC, and this is my final meeting, I've seen ICANN compliance advance, and it's not easy and the tangible progress. I'm very, very impressed with the presentation that was made. Having said that, there are two things that I would like to put to you, the compliance team, to consider.

And perhaps if you wish to address it you may, if not we can have a corridor discussion on the issues. Firstly, in terms of traditional compliance mechanisms, very impressed with your process charts and all of that. What wasn't clear to me, whether there was – please correct me if I'm wrong, because I'm really ignorant in the area.

Is there a mechanism whereby certain complaints may come whether, and any formal complaints registered? But there is a mechanism for complaints to be monitoring. For example, a host exploit together with a group IBM CCSI, we sort of published this world host report. I can send you the links if you don't have it, but I'm sure you probably have it already.

But they keep a track record of bad host indexes. So the question I have is this, whilst traditionally compliance is sort of post activity, sort of monitoring, what I wanted to ask is whether there were certain mechanisms whereby you will also have a proactive approach?

And what I would be also interested in is the area of intersection, between what you are working with and also the RIRs, particularly in relation WHOIS inaccuracies. And whether issues such as WHOIS [?] and also feeding back into the policy processes. Sorry, I used RIR, I should have said, ESO.

You know, whether there are certain things that you are identifying that could potentially effect the evolution of certain policies. So from a compliance point of view, not so much just what's happening, but also like corrective approach. Thank you Maguy and Olivier.

MAGUY SERAD:

Thank you Sala. If I may address Sala's two questions. Yes please do send me that link, I just want to make sure I'm – I don't want to say I know or don't know until I really look at it. Again, I'm too boring as fact

based. But if I may address more general topic on that point, Sala, about compliance being proactive.

You are correct. When I first came onboard, it was reactive. We continue to be reactive, until about January of 2012 or around that timeframe, when the process was standardized, became more proactive as of March 2012. And the reason for that, again guys, it's all about access to information that allows you to be proactive.

Once we consolidated everything under one roof, everything, from all complaint types, all activities, all information is under one compliance system, that has allowed the team to look at it proactively. What that means is we don't just wait on the complaints, we proactively – we generate what we call compliance dashboards.

You saw on this chart that's actually still in front of you, one of the things that compliance does proactively by collaborating with the registry DNS engagement team, whether it's the registrars or the registry side, is we proactively provide compliance reports to them, to give them updates before a contract is renewed.

We share with them about compliance challenges or issues, and we also share about repeat offenders or behaviors like Evan was talking to earlier. So yes, we do proactively look, we do proactively do the outreach activities at every ICANN meeting but even outside of ICANN meetings.

On the second point about the area of WHOIS, we do participate with the WHOIS group. We have been engaged through the EWG, too many

abbreviations. I've also been engaged in working intensely with another ATRT effort that Margie is leading on WHOIS improvements.

If you are interested, there is a public session on WHOIS improvements on Thursday, where we are going to share and present some of that data and how it has evolved since. So yes to answer the question to that one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I've still noted that Garth still has his hand up in the Adobe room? Oh, okay. Rinalia, if you're asking a question then you are actually eating into your own time.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: That's your fault. Thank you Chair. Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcript. Maguy thank you very much for the presentation. I agree with Sala, I do see some improvement, but I think that we need more data to address all of the past issues and I will be most grateful if you can provide that.

My question is, Fadi has gone around saying that there will be a button, or that there is already a button, on the ICANN website for complaints regarding public interest commitments. And I wanted to know where this is also your understanding, and would it appear, for example, under here? Or would it be more prominent somewhere else? Could you just clarify that? Thank you.

MAGUY SERAD:

So at this point, I think you also heard through the ICANN Labs that we have so many initiatives going on. There is going to be a facelift of ICANN at work. At this point, all the compliance related complaints are under ICANN dot org, under the compliance webpage. Victor spoke to that link on the bottom of the page.

If the best way, just go to ICANN dot org, click on resources... There is a more direct way to get there, but I'm just tracking it for the team. And click on registries. So yes, every item that you've seen up here has FAQs built in there and a form to receive a complaint on.

Now, I've had somebody in the hallway tell me, "How can you put the form up when the public comments have not been finalized?" We can always come back and update, but we want to be able to have everything ready so that we can address, from an ethical perspective, in receiving complaints and issues.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Maguy, and thank you for coming to see us. Just one question. There is a compliant session taking place. Could you please give us the details and so on? Because I think that's really important for our members to go and contribute.

MAGUY SERAD:

Yes Olivier, thank you very much. First of all, thank you for your input. Please, again, I think as Evan said, I don't say I'm waiting from meeting

to meeting, if there are issues and concerns that are on your mind, which are to be proactive and think... Because we are public too guys.

We're part of the users. We are a part of the public. Please send me an email. But I always say to everybody, send me facts. I cannot work... Every story has two sides. You send me facts, I can respond, research and respond back to you, but most importantly, address.

So to get to my last point, yes, the Wednesday morning session, it's what we call the high interest topic, Fadi and – it's always on the calendar. 8:30 and it's in this room, which is familiar to you guys. Please join us. It's a great forum because I've had, in the past, several team members from this forum attend.

It's attended by everybody at ICANN meeting. I've had Holly stand up and answer questions in the past. It's not all questions about compliance, it's questions about the ICANN community. So it brings a really good perspective, your participation. Thank you Olivier, and [?] until the next meeting where you crack the whip on us again.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Maguy. You'll be happy if it's on your whip that we crack on you. No, thanks very much for coming down with your team, and I hope that we will have several of our members, they will be coming down over to the compliance session because I think the session we have here is a little bit short, but of course, we have such a packed schedule it was difficult to make it longer than this.

Now, I invite Rinalia to take over I guess, for the next part of this session, which is the discussion of the ALAC and At Large participation in PDPs, which I believe is either Policy Development Process or using the PDP term, as in GNSO PDP, with Alan Greenberg and Roberto Gaetano. So without further ado, Rinalia you have the floor.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcripts. I actually requested this session because I thought it would be useful for the ALAC and the At Large to have a discussion about our engagement in the policy development process, especially in the GNSO working groups or cross-community working groups.

And we are truly grateful to have both Roberto Gaetano and Alan Greenberg with us because they have chaired PDP working groups before. And so coming into this session, I have posed three questions to them, which they will address, and then we'll open the session up for questions from you in terms of what you might be interested in with regard to the issue.

So the first question is, why is it important for the At Large to engage in policy development processes, specifically in the GNSO and working groups? What are the barriers that are usually encountered by At Large representatives in PDP working groups? And please distinguish barriers for newcomers versus veterans. And what advice would you give At Large representatives for PDP engagement?

So I'll hand the floor first to Roberto Gaetano, please take about five minutes to address that and then we'll go to Alan Greenberg. Thank you.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you Rinalia. Yeah, I'll try to be brief. I think it's very important to participate in the PDP because that's one of the best ways to be really part of the development of the policy decisions. I think that this is something that probably has not been even appreciated to the extent that it need to be appreciated, but this is something that changed at the moment of the GNSO review five years back.

When we built this concept of having the open groups where the work was done, and where the policy statements were made, taking the responsibility away from the GNSO counsel, that up to now was the one that was responsible for making the statement, where the – and the GNSO counsel was having the role of supervisor of the process.

But the real work was done in the working group. And my personal opinion having participated in the working groups, is that there are not enough people coming from the At Large and from the community that participate in the working groups. And I think that we cannot then complain that the policy decisions are tilted towards registries and registrars who are contracted parties and so on.

When we, non-contracted parties and especially the ALAC that also has a general view, a global view of the problems more than a stakeholder group in the GNSO, are not participating in the process. So, this is why

it is important. The question is then on the [?]. And I think that the main barrier is from the fact that people who participate from other parts of the organization, are normally professionals of that type of – I mean, somebody who works for the registrar or for the registry, just to make an example.

They know how the domain name market works, they know a lot. And not only that, but they are also paid – it's part of their day job to participate in this kind of activities. Whereas, we... First of all, we only see the effect of this whole thing on the users, on us as users. And secondly, we have day jobs that are completely different from the management of the domain name system.

So there is a difficulty. Also, it has to be said, something that is obvious, I'm not going to spend a lot of time, we are much more geographically and culturally diverse than other constituencies. And so therefore, we have additional difficulties as an aggregate in participating to the process because the methodology, the way people deal with in the working groups, the way, for instance, somebody has to just jump on stage and give his or her opinion on something, might be something that is a cultural barrier for some of us.

And so that is the third point, the advice. The advice is... This process is done in good faith by most, if not all, participants. And if you jump in and you say something, nobody is going to kill you for what you have said. And you might have to face some substantial criticism, but I think the only single encouragement that I'm going to give to all of the

participants is you have an opinion and you have exactly the same rights to express this opinion as any other participant in that meeting.

Even if they are professionals with 25 years of experience in the domain name system, they might have the same chance of saying a correct thing or a stupid thing as you have. Don't feel shy, just go. And in my personal experience, because I have been going through this, I mean in the early ICANN meetings I was jumping into the public forum and I was feeling, you know, like 25 or 21 pairs of eyes looking at me that's the Board that is there.

You see the Board in the beginning, it was up on the stage, and you feel the poor guy who makes the silly comment, but then, at the end, you go on and say, it's like a drop that at the end manages to make a hole in the stone. And we have to be like this, we have to be drops with our opinions, we have to continue in our process and slowly, slowly, take it easy, it's going to happen.

Slowly, slowly we have achieved things, and we can achieve more.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Roberto. Rinalia again. Over to our probably longest serving GNSO liaison, and Alan, in addition to the question, do numbers matter in terms of representation?

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. The first question was why participate. I'm at the disadvantage of answering after Roberto, who gave a number of the

answers I might have given. I'll answer a different question instead, why not participate? The reason not to participate is, it's a lot more – it's a lot easier, perhaps satisfying, and comforting to simply criticize what other people have done because you in your wisdom, you know what's right.

The converse is what Roberto said. If you want to alter what happens, criticizing maybe a cathartic thing to do afterwards, but a more effective way is to participate in the process and make sure it's done right or at least to the extent that you can. We are among the very few people within ICANN who care about the user experience.

Now, sure, registrars care about registrant experience, they want repeat customers and all sorts of things like that, but there are not many people who are representing the real interests of users, or even the interest of registrants, which is also one of our domains. And someone needs to speak up on behalf of them, and it's us.

And if we don't, then the voices who want to see other things happen will predominate. Yes, numbers count. We talked about it in the previous session, the expired whatever, ERRP, whatever it stands, that's the policy that came out of the [?] thing. We went in with great expectations, we didn't come out with great expectations because we were overwhelmed by registrars who had money in the game.

There was a couple of us and a couple of business people who are fighting the good fight and got something out of it, but not very much. Numbers count. We didn't have the numbers. So yes. But the whole

reason to participate is, do we care about users? If users are going to be impacted by something someone needs to be speak up on their behalf, and there aren't a lot of other people around to do that.

You know, same argument why we would want Board members who would not listen to what we were saying and repeat it, but who cared about users. The barriers, the barriers are huge. They're often talking about things which are very specific, very detailed. Not technical in the sense of programming and computers, but have a whole large set of rules, and terms, and things often that aren't even written anywhere that you need to understand.

So it's difficult. If you don't go in there like a bull in a china shop and be belligerent, people are willing to help you. There is always someone who is ready to mentor you if you go in with the right attitude, and there is people within our community who will do the same thing.

So the barriers are large. I've been known to participate in a working group. I've participated in the one about locking domains during a UDRP. Well, I'm not an UDRP provider, I'm not a registrar, and I'm not likely to be a registrant who has their domain locked in the UDRP. I went into it because it was an opportunity to learn something, and I think I substantively altered the outcome of it because of my interventions, and I think it was a better product because of it, even though there was no hard rationale for why I needed to be there.

And most PDPs have some aspect like that, that there may not be a direct connection, there may be a direct connection to users, but

someone needs to be there listening and thinking about users. The barriers are high. It's going to require some dedication, it requires homework. You shouldn't be afraid to speak, but on the other hand, you should be smart enough not to speak until you have some clue as to what is going on.

After that, the advice, I think, I've just given the advice. Jump in, some of it is going to be boring, you may pick one you don't like. Other ones you may learn a lot, and it may not get you another job, but it maybe something interesting anyway. It depends on your own style and your own interests.

And on occasion, a single individual At Large representative, makes a substantive change in the outcomes of some of these PDPs and some of these non-PDP working groups. It does happen. It's nice if you can get the respect of the people. It works.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Alan. I'd like you to hold a question in your mind and respond afterwards, because I'm going to open it up for questions. What does it take to get respect from the people who are working in the working group? Yes Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

First of all, I'd like to talk about a particular barrier that we in the Asia-Pacific face and that is, just about all of the calls are timed so that I take the calls at one or two or three in the morning, and they're [?]. And I've

got to tell you, that when you're not feeling well that is just – it makes really, really, really hard.

And I just wish somebody in the GNSO say, "Can we please recognize the geographic spread of the globe?" And make calls at a better time for just occasionally not one in the morning. Personal play. I know that Cheryl doesn't sleep so it doesn't bother her. That's alright.

Next thing, I would like to suggest that there would be... I actually participated in the, and I'm going to have to leave this one, the policy and implementation working group. Being the chair of the working group drafting team was really interesting because that's where the debate started.

That's where you actually have the terms of reference defined. That's where you actually have the questions asked. Now, it can go completely skew after that, but at that early stage, as chair, you've got to be reasonably – well, you're very, very neutral, but you can manage to actually make sure the right questions are there to be asked.

So very early stage is important. Another thing that would be really help, is the webinars or something so that when people walk into a group, you can – you have a grounding as to what the real issues are, you can raise questions, it will actually help people participate from a knowledge base, and that will make it a lot easier.

One of the Bing webinars, and they haven't been at 1:00 in the morning, it has been really helpful to participate and to learn that way. So there are lots of things that you can do to participate, and I actually find it

broadens your own view of how things work. It is possible to make a difference being only one, but there are just some things that would make life a lot easier.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks Holly. Just hold on that Alan. Sala, your question.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you Rinalia. I just wanted to briefly comment on some of the barriers I face in terms of participating that maybe can be a bit helpful in terms of considering strategies of engagement and increasing engagement. I think one of the critical things that we come short circuit, or we come a short cut, particularly in relation to the PDP processes and contributing to it, as Alan had mentioned, is understanding the issues.

And sometimes it's not only what is being discussed, but more importantly, the evolution of the discussions because more often than not, you have diverse stakeholders who may have canvassed some of the issues that have already been discussed. So from two years, looking back retrospectively, what I would suggest is something that could be considered by the ALAC and At Large community is within the current spaces that already exist.

Is to think about a potential incubators, not necessarily happening in real time at meetings, but potential incubators where you have this sort of process happening, where you developing enough critical mass for

engagement. From a perspective of an ALAC member from my region, one of three, I would say that even in terms of trying to engage to solicit comments from the Pacific, I find more often than not, I am preparing the submissions myself.

Or if not, sometimes there are two or three people who may want to volunteer to add. That to me signals that we do not have enough critical mass. Yes, we can be at the table. Yes, we can be at the meeting. But at the end of the day, where rubble hits the road is the PDP and the actual policy. So my suggestion is, I suppose, we need to build critical mass in terms of substantive engagement on the policy themselves. Thank you Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Sala. Good comment. I have a queue, Carlton, Olivier, and Evan; but let's go with the response from Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I was going to comment on what Holly said. Holly isn't here, but I'll comment anyway. There are two solutions to the time problem. One is someone needs to invent a reasonably priced time travel machine, and that will fix the problem. But the second one comes back to numbers.

As long as there is one person from Asia Pacific who participates sometimes, everyone else is not going to be inconvenienced to participate at weird times. If we can start getting more numbers up, it's

a lot easier to make the case, and at least to rotate. Short of that, it's not going to happen, I don't think.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Alan. Numbers matter. Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Rinalia. Carlton Samuels for the record. I wanted to, Alan just said the first one, because I think that needs to be understood, that the numbers matter. It's the same for interpretation. If the numbers don't warrant it, you're not going to get the support for it.

And that's what is plaguing us. If you look at the report that was done by staff about PDPs and global participation, there is a spread that is very obvious, but you see the structural problems are sometimes determined by the numbers. And more often it's about the numbers. That's the first thing.

The second thing is, let us assume that you start by having knowledge of the issues, and it takes a lot. It takes elbow grease to get knowledge of the issues. You have to read the issues report. Usually there is an issues report, and you have to delve into the issues report and to figure you way out as to what it is, the interests that you have, and how the interests that you have are reflected in the issues from the issues report.

So that takes some analysis. And it's alone, Sala, that agree that have to do that because if you want to contribute, I don't believe I can do the

issues report and do the analysis and pass it on to somebody else to participate. You have to do it on your own. You have to do it yourself.

And this is where I have the greatest respect for people who spend all of this time, like Alan, who spend a lot of time... I remember when I came into the ALAC, I would ask Alan all of the time, you know, “Tell me what it is that I should be looking for.” And he would tell me, “Yes, you need to read the issues report.” And so on.

So there is no way around doing that work. Now, here is where the rubber hits the road. Volunteerism requires time and commitment, and they are usually in short supply. So we’re all willing to put in something, it’s just that the way these issues come about, it takes usually more of the little something that we have to put in to become really ingrained and to become productive in it.

What you see here from the others who are involved like Alan, is a lot of time and effort. You’re not going to get around making that investment to make any contribution. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Carlton. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. It’s Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just with regards to the webinars, the potential webinars that might be required for people to be able to understand a specific policy or a specific issue a lot more. When we actually have any of our policy

development process that requires input from the community, it is possible to request for a webinar to be staged on short notice.

And sometimes, due to the constraints that Alan was talking about earlier, we can actually stage two webinars. One in the morning, one in the afternoon. This is something that is entirely possible. What we do need, though, is if we do request webinars is for people to actually attend the webinars.

And one of the concerns I've had is when requesting webinars on behalf of the community is that we end up with very few people on the call. I'm not sure whether it's because people are busy, or it's the wrong timing maybe.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's not about timing, it's about interest.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, this is it. I mean, if there is interest in something, please, you know, write to me, write to staff, and we will conduct a webinar on that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. It's Evan, Cheryl, and then Garth. Please keep it to the point.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I'll try and keep it to the point, but there have been so many points here. I guess, I come from the opposite side of things. On one hand, it's easy to say, "Well, where are the numbers? Where are the numbers? Where are the numbers?" Look at this meaning, there are 20 of us funded to be here. There are a number of other people that come because of the LACRALO general assembly.

But outside of that, here we are amongst thousands of people, and we have this many that are expected to fly the flight on behalf of end users world round. Not only is there a time issue, there is a language issue, and there is a cultural issue.

There is a certain personality that is demanded of the kind of work that is done in PDPs. You are around a lot of people that are trying to make forceful arguments, that make very assertive arguments, and sometimes very aggressive arguments. And I've actually heard from people that have tried to participate in this process that either because of their personality or because of the culture that they operate in, this is just not the way that you conduct.

And it works itself well in American and European and elsewhere, but there are other places where this kind of aggressive, confrontational structure just does not wash. And I personally believe that in its current way, the PDP process is fundamentally structured in a way that makes an impenetrable barrier for At Large to truly participate.

And through a number of examples of my own participation, I have found that the best time that At Large has been able to contribute to

PDP and policy development, have been times when it is broken out of the GNSO structure and had to go on its own. We have the jazz, which started off as cross-community, eventually the GNSO decided they weren't going to charter the second phase of the work, ALAC had to go it alone.

We had the consumer trust metric. We had a situation where at the last minute, somebody pulled rank and a consensus statement was withdrawn because somebody didn't like some At Large things. What happened? We had to add our own things additionally as an ALAC process, not within the conventional one. I also sat in on a meeting and you were talking about before, well, you may not be...

Literally, there was Bo and myself in a room of 20 people and it was like a firing squared. We dared mentioned the idea of a set of registrant rights, and it was relentless. It was basically, for the rest of the meeting, was essentially just assailing the two of us, practically to the point of personally.

Now, Bo is not a shy person, I am not a shy person, and we can take that. But there is an awful lot of people that are dissuaded by that mode of operation. When you have people that come into meetings and they are relentless. Alan and I have been sitting through this thing with the Red Cross and the IOC.

The Red Cross and the IOC have been absolutely relentless. Every time a meeting happens, they will submit a written statement on what happened, on the tiniest minuet. It's hard to keep up. And it's also hard

to keep up when you think that no matter how much input we can give, on the big issues, that we probably won't even get hurt.

The biggest thing that we had for instance is that we had the IOC and the Red Cross should be treated differently. That was never even brought into the conversation. It was treated like a done deal before we even had input. So we get sucked into the minuet and figuring that every word of a 100 page report is going to be just right, but on the big picture things it becomes, we should have an ability to participate from people that have a vision, that have a big picture idea of things, but don't have the time to work on the minuet of the reporting.

If the will existed, it wouldn't have to be that much of a time suck. But the way things are designed right now, that's exactly what it is, and that's why I believe that there is an actual structural impediment to global At Large participation. That isn't going to change until the actual rules of the PDP change. Thanks.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thanks Evan. I have a queue and I'm going to close it with Fatima, because we have to stop to prepare for the SSAC, no you're not, you're done. Cheryl. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

No, I don't want to jump the queue, I'm further down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

All right. Okay. I've done a few of things, maybe one or two a week, three or four a day in some cases. And what I wanted to suggest to you is that I'm not disagreeing with anything I've heard, but it isn't just about number. It's not just quantity, it's quality and effectiveness of voice that needs to be brought, and I know that has been presented and Carlton spoke to some extent of that.

There are ways of engaging our communities, and let's face it, we are not going to get 50 people in the room, let alone 150 million in the room having their voices heard. You do have to look at a representational model, but that does not mean that you cannot have the webinars and then have those people who are at the table, who are able to perform, who are able to give voice, and who are able to be awake at whatever time it happens to be on it.

That they can say, based on the following input from, insert the number of ALSs and the number of people who are in an ALS, the view of the At Large community is, dot, dot, dot. There is other ways around it. That you can affect the table without actually sitting at the table. And the other thing I wanted to say is, I've certainly participated, and I'm restricting myself absolutely to the GNSO process because it's all you're looking at here, and the ccNSO process is indeed a different beast.

But in the GNSO process, I have participated where highly effective and influential outcomes have been wrought by someone who gave, in advance, their permanent apology to the weekly teleconferences. Those times were such, or the commitment was such, that they were not going to be able to make a single one of them.

But they used the list, they used the Wiki, and they were in some ways, more contributory than some of those people who turned up and did nothing other than have their names marked off the roll.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I just wanted to respond to something that Olivier and Carlton said earlier. In terms of getting interest in webinars, sometimes the webinar titles are opaque and redundant, and I think it gets lost on people, especially when they have to go to lots and lots of meetings. People will make time for things that are important for them, whether or not they're busy, but you have to make them interesting too. And I know that's tough.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Garth. Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you Rinalia. Fatimata Seye Sylla for the record. Well this will look like reputation. After following Olivier's offer about webinars, because again, language is a barrier. And the webinars I've been following are in English. I mean, English is the major language. Hell no? Okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Some were interpreted, and I do believe that there was at least one or two that were actually conducted in French.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yeah, in one they were speaking in French, and the presentation was in English.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But I take your point, that yeah, the language of working in ICANN is English, the main language, of course, the majority of webinars would be in English and then would be interpreted in Spanish or in French if there was this three people that were at least interested.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Okay. I will take about my region. In AFRALO, even though we have English speaking members, the active members are mainly French speaking members, and we don't have the critical mass of members participating because of the language barrier. This is not only about webinars.

You know, when I first made my voice heard about this, it's about discussions being held within the mailing list and all of that. We can't just follow at the same pace because... Tijani is a special one. I mean, he can follow maybe thousands of threads at the same time, but others can't do that at the same time.

They can't commit that amount of time, even though they might be very interested in the things going on. It's just difficult. Whereas, if you had like one or two people following this thread, the others following all the threads, that would make it much easier for us to participate in a very coordinated way. That's what I wanted to add to the basket.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Fatimata. Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you Rinalia. I will speak in Spanish. I am happy to have Cheryl speaking before me because she expressed some of my concerns. My question is, when it comes to the participation challenges, all the At Large should participate in the PDP for the GNSO is that correct? Or is it that some people are more trained or skilled to participate in this part of these process.

And there are some other people who can work on other issues. That is a part of my question. And on the other hand, I would like to agree with Carlton, as I usually do. We are volunteers and we dedicate time and effort, and this is not magical, but I think it is important to have the mentoring of all the people that are already involved for some time by now, and who can help us – or who can help the newcomers and guide us in this way.

And this might be very useful for our RALOs. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Fatima.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I was trying to, sorry, answer the question. I didn't, well, I didn't quite get it. Unfortunately because I was trying to, okay. I was trying to understand the question through the interpreters and I just couldn't quite make sense.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I will rephrase. What she asked was, is it a requirement that all members of the ALAC or At Large participating in the PDP? Or is it for a specific group that could restrain or already prepared for it?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's not a requirement. It's Olivier speaking. It's not a requirement per se, because I'm also well aware, and many are aware, that not everyone is involved in this community to participate in policy development. Some people would like to deal with the development of At Large, or the development of the organization itself.

People are involved in capacity building, etcetera. And I think that it would be unfair to ask that everyone deals with policy. But for those that are interested in the policy development side of things, then of course, they should be very welcome to do so and not only welcome, I think they should be helped.

And certainly I've heard of many people mention mentoring, and that's something I think we should actually look into maybe in a more formal way so that any newcomers will have a mentor that could make sure that they understand the terms they don't understand. And I would even go as far as saying mentoring into any of the GNSO working groups.

I'll give you an idea. The first time I ever went into a GNSO working group, I was not received particularly well. Strangely enough, I didn't announce my arrival or anything like that. I said, "Oh, let me just dial in." Apparently anybody is able to dial in, they're open working groups, let's be on it.

And I dialed in and the first thing, about a minute I think, after I got on the group, someone raised a point of order and said, "Who the f was I?" Now, fortunately, fortunately, Cheryl was also on the call, and she is not the one to use the f word, and I guess that at the time she managed to be my protector on that specific thing. Said, "Oh, don't worry. He's harmless. He's just here to listen.

Mostly harmless. He's one of the At Large people." I was in ALAC at the time. "He's one of the At Large people and would like to learn." But it's, yes, I do take the point from Evan, that Evan made earlier that GNSO working groups are sometimes hostile. There is a lot of money that goes around into this, and sometimes there is some real struggles between two points of views.

And when one arrives uninformed, you run the risk of falling into some kind of trap that was not destined for you but for someone else. You do end up in the middle of a battlefield. However, that has to be known that things are getting better. As far as At Large working groups, I'd like to think that we have a good, very sort of positive people here.

And the other thing, and that's maybe my closing statement on this, we have working groups. You don't need to join all of the working groups, so only join the ones that you are interested in. At least to start with, and that's how you divide the load. So I'm not expecting everyone to join every single working group out there.

And for policy development, as we see with the open statements, I'm hoping that we can get people from every region to comment on this. You don't need to all depend but just comment on it. We need the input. That's all.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you Olivier. I'm sorry Holly, I've closed the queue. And I would like to close the session, but before I do that, a few comments. Heidi, I think this topic of At Large engagement in PDP deserves further discussion. And I think you need to create space for it because there is a lot more comments.

And I think that people in the room, members of the ALAC would like, especially the new ones, would like to know how they can go in, who will be willing to mentor. In the terms of styles, perhaps our Northern

American colleagues can train us to be more aggressive, if we are from certain cultures that are less, I don't know.

But one thing to note, in the meeting with the ATRT 2, their draft recommendations contain specific clauses where they want to encourage participation from developing countries, disadvantaged groups, people who don't speak English, and cultures that are not Western. Those are really good recommendations and we should speak up to support that.

Okay, with that, I thank you and thank you so much for your participation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

So there is a break now that we were supposed to have for 30 minutes, but please let's make it 10 minutes. We still have time to get coffee. There should be coffee outside somewhere. They do close up quick apparently, so that's not particularly good.

Okay. Welcome back everybody. Thank you for taking your seats please. I gather the recording is on. Okay. Thank you very much. So welcome back to the ALAC and Regional Leadership working day, I guess we can call it now. We now have with us Patrik Falstrom and Jim Galvin from the SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

And there are a few other SSAC members also around the room as well, so welcome to you all. And I will immediately turn the floor over to

Patrik Falstrom who will be able to take us through a short presentation, and let's get on. So Patrik, you have the floor.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Thank you very much. So I'm happy to be here again. We have five possible different agenda topics for these 25 minutes, or the 30 that we have together. When we met with the GNSO counsel this morning, we started immediately with agenda bullet number two, and then we ran out of time.

So the question is to you, Olivier, whether we should go to one of the more interesting topics here. And in that case, the question is which one is the most interesting one? In ALAC, normally, I'm very careful about explaining what SSAC is, where we do an overview and activities, but the GNSO counsel, we skipped even that.

But this is up to you. So please, I ask for some advice.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Patrik. So I think the name collision is something, but I don't think we should spend all of the half hour on this one. We are on record, we as in the ALAC are on the record, to have altered the Board and also gone to speak to the GAC about the name collision risks based on previous SSAC advice.

And so the matter is well known in this community, but certainly an update and a run through SSAC 062 would be welcome to start with.

But let's just do say five, ten minutes on it and see where we go from there.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Good. Thank you very much. So let's go to the slide. Skip forward until you see SSAC 62. You do have the whole slide actually, you can see all the content yourself. Move forward please. Oh, maybe it's just slow in updating. There.

So what we have... SSAC has during a number of years, been talking about name collision risks. And we specifically issued a report in the fall of 2010 on the risk of name collision. Next slide please.

In this context, when we talk about top level domains, with name collision we refer to a situation where a domain name that is properly defined in the global DNS is also used for something else. So that applications, and people, and whatever, don't really know when giving a name, what the name is actually representing.

Got a question.

UNIDENTIFIED:

I do. In what context would it be used in other circumstances?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

In other circumstances, it might be the case that you have any kind of overlap between any kind of strings that you are using in crossword puzzles or whatever, so what we are really talking here is that we're

talking about that while collision consists of two strings which have different meanings, in this context one of the two is a top level domain.

So that's a subset. So there is specifically required, one of the two strings to be properly defined in the DNS. You might have a conflict, for example, if you are using various technologies like peer to peer network with none of the two are properly defined in the DNS and you have a collision.

Very question, though, it's the first time I get that. Bonus. I give you a tick in the box, you get a sticker afterwards. Okay. So, what we have been looking at is also when we producing this report, we're looking at this issue, this name collision issue, given the context that the acronym I always forget, NGPC? Yeah.

New gTLD program committee, NGPC. Okay. That they have come up with their recommendation and their decision. So that is the context where this is made available. We are looking at four different areas and we will go through them. High risk strings, trial delegation, root monitoring capability, and [?] rollback capability. Next please.

Okay. I move my own there. So, high risk strings. So with high risk strings we mean, strings with documented evidence of broad and significant private usage, and there are two things there. We say that just like everyone else has said, we should be very careful when using that if we are going to use them at all, but what we're all pointing out is that obviously there is a need in the world to actually do have strings that are for private use.

That doesn't really exist today. Very similar to private IP address allocation, that is like ROC 19 18 strings, the ITF do have two ROC 67, 61 and 67, 62, which documents some strings for private use, but in those documents, specifically 67, 62, some of the strings are listed in a non-normative appendix G of that ROC. And it's a little but unclear what status those strings actually have.

Next please. Regarding trial delegation, we are saying that if it is the case that one is doing trial delegation, and that is something that is talked about in this decision by the new gTLD program committee, it's important... We point out that there are actually two different kinds of trial delegation.

One which has to do with the DNS only, and one which has to do with also setting applications and services that responds to requests for those specific domain names. You got in the first one, for infrastructure testing, we have two subtypes. One which has to do with just logging the DNS queries, and the second one is actually to do with delegations, and you will have different data depending on which one they are.

So we actually do have type one A, type one B, and type two. And what is really important to know is what kind of benefits and risks you have with each one of these different kinds of trial delegation. Next please.

The next part of the report is about roots or monitoring capability, because what we have identified a couple of times, and we are to some degree repeating ourselves in SSAC, we are supporting the decision for ICANN to work with the [?] develop a long-term plan to maintain a

match server root data. We have recommended this before that this should happen.

Now ICANN is saying, in the NAPC, that this kind of monitoring exists, and we are supporting that. Next please. The next thing has to do with the [?] rollback capability because we identify that regardless of how low the risk is that something – that something go wrong.

If it is the case that something go wrong, there must be mitigation message to take care of whatever problem exists. The worst scenario, absolutely worst scenario, mitigation method is to undelegated the domain, to remove it from DNS or stop serving domain names.

And the question then is, of course, how do you do that? IANA already has a procedure for removing strings from the DNS, but no one really knows how to make that decision in an emergency. And that is something we identified. Next slide please.

So the recommendations. Four recommendations. The first one is that we recommend ICANN to work with the wider Internet community, including at least the Internet [?] board and ITF, to identify what strings are appropriate, to reserve a product name space use, and what kind of private name space use is appropriate for these various strings. Next please.

Sorry, and that has to do with whether the strings should be at the TLD level only, or if we talk about strings that should be private use on the second level, or other levels. Next please. Second recommendation is that when we talk about the trial delegation or in the situation of a trial

delegation, the various risks and benefits with trial delegations has to do with at least these four different kinds of issues and circumstances that needs to be discussed.

The purpose of the trial, it's good to know why we're doing it, what is the goal. The operation of the trial, how is the trial run? And we, as I pointed out earlier, we have at least three different kind of types of trial delegations. How to do [?] rollback because it might be the case that we decide to do a trial, for example, until a certain point in time, or until you have a certain number of queries, or certain size of load files, or whatever.

But you have some kind of pre-determined end of the trial, but it might be the case that you need to end the trial prematurely. What are the circumstances? How is that decision made? And then at the actual point of termination of the trial, what do you do with the results? How do you evaluate the result?

How do you know what is a success or failure is? And then we are talking about something that, we're talking about the un-delegation of TLDs. If it is the case, under what circumstances on delegation is there proper mitigation for security stability issue? And then the, what I mentioned earlier, the root zone management partners and how to accommodate the need for rapid reversal of the delegation of this TLD.

Because as we all know, removing things from DNS means that we still have the things cached and whatever. So what we mean by rapid, because it might be the case, for example, regardless of how fast we do

things, it will take a long time, so the litigation matter is not so effective as we thought, for example.

And then I think that was all of the slides. So we go to the next one. Yeah. So that's all. Done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Patrik. Don, take the box but maybe we might have questions. So let's see if anybody around the table has questions on this. This is of course an issue which has been going on for a while and I think which quite a few people have followed quite closely. I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Let me, in the meantime, let me ask you who run the slides, can you please go to slide number two again? And then I would like to, people that are SSAC members to stand up in the room, or to please... One, two, three, four. Okay.

The reason why I point this out is that if you don't come up with questions now, ask any SSAC member you meet, including these, to get more information, just in case that you feel that you really need to know this and what's going on.

So now, yes, question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Salanieta.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Sala for the transcripts. But before I ask my question, I would just like to clarify with the Chair, should it be restricted to this agenda? Our questions, or can...?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, Olivier speaking. It should be restricted to SSAC matters. So if you're going to ask Patrik about other matters, I'm not quite sure whether any of his colleagues would be answering.

PATRIK FALSTROM: If there are other matters, we can take that offline.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's take them offline then.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Whether in Sweden or I can talk about that as well. But let's start with this agenda, I think that's the most important.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Holly. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd be very interested in number four.

PATRIK FALSTROM: So number four, if that is because of that, no other... In that case, I pass over the microphone to Jim Galvin, and I ask you go forward to the slide which is SSAC 61.

JIM GALVIN: So, I should probably start by saying, just in case it's not obvious, this is SSAC comments on the initial report, not the report that was issued this past Tuesday. Just want to make that clarification in case there was any confusion there.

And we actually made four observations about that report, when the initial report came out. Next slide please. This just speaks specifically to what the EWG is, and why we provided our comments, and what it is. I'm going to assume that folks are familiar with that and go to the next slide.

So there were four areas that we choose to comment on, and the initial report that the EWG had produced. We reacted again to the question of the purpose of registration data, the availability risks. This speaks directly to the ARDS, the Aggregated Registration Data Service that the WG had proposed. We had some things to say about the authentication and access control that they were proposing for the ARDS, and the model that they had for that.

And then some additional comments about data accuracy. Next slide. On the issue of purpose, SSAC had spoken before in SAC 55 when it did

its review of the WHOIS review team recommendations that had completed a year prior to all of this, and we had inserted in front of our acknowledgment of the WHOIS review team recommendations the request that the purpose of WHOIS data actually be clearly stated and that be developed.

And so our first recommendation in this document was to remind the Board in particular, the EWG, of course specifically about the need to state why we have registration data and what its purpose is. Our observation about that is that it would guide what you have to collect, which of course then would drive who needs to get access to it.

Next slide. So the second recommendation was to ensure that the Board undertakes a formal risk assessment of whatever registration data policy comes out of the EWG work. There are a number of related policies that they're proposing that would help to manage the system that they're going to suggest.

So in this total replacement, revision if you will, of the directory services system, and the collection of data. We also just wanted to remind the community at large that it would be important to do this right rather doing security as an afterthought. Let's make sure that we take a careful assessment of that right up front, and do that risk assessment.

The third recommendation, one of the concerns that SSAC had was that the EWG did not provide enough context to explain why it made some of the choices that it made, and in addition, some of the choices that it

didn't make. What were the things that it reviewed that it choose to set aside and not include in its report.

From our point of view, this would help us to evaluate whether or not we agree with the choice that they made. And I'll observe, actually, in this report that they just published this past Tuesday, that they really did include a lot more information, so they did respond, in fact, to this particular recommendation. And I think that's very good, so that was, you know, very nice on their part.

And we appreciate the fact that they provided a more complete statement of what their thinking is. The fourth comment that we made at that time was to ask the EWG to look at our recommendations in SAC 58. The particular thing that we did in SAC 58 was to create a taxonomy for validation.

We created a three part taxonomy, syntactic validation, operational validation, and identity validation. And I'm also pleased to report that the EWG this time around, in their status report, very much adopted exactly that terminology, and used it throughout their status report that they give, and integrated it, you know, the terminology and all of the actions that we had suggested.

So that was a very welcome part of the report that they produced for us this time around. And I believe that's it. Next slide. So thank you. Any questions on that?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

No. I would be interested to read the second report. What was your first issue? I think it was finding out... Oh. It was the gathering, the purpose of gathering the data. Now, from memory, there are loads of purposes for gathering the data.

If I remember the EWG chart, it was the data is gathered for these reasons, and then they listed all of the people who might want the registration data. And there were a range of different purposes, so you actually might have, say, your business community, your intellectual property purpose, your law enforcement agency.

There were a whole range of actual reasons why you would collect the data, which probably gave – would have to give an honest answer.

JIM GALVIN:

So, what the EWG is doing, my interpretation in our view of what they had, is they're thinking about the data in terms of who accesses it, and the purpose that they have for it. The SSAC comment to them, the consensus, was to suggest that they should look at it from the other side, which is in support for the domain name registration system.

So the EWG is continuing down the other path, and I pass no judgment at this point on the fact that they've done that, except to observe that they have actually provided a great deal more explanation and information about why they did that, and until we've had a chance to look at that and consider that, I don't want to comment on their choice there.

So at least they have responded to the second request, which was to expand a great deal on their rationale, and they've done that. So we'll have to look at that and see where we are.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you Chair. Carlton Samuels for the record. I'm not speaking for the EWG here, I'm only a member of the EWG. But what I will tell you is that we've been taking note of the community feedback, and you will see in this report that we have made some adjustments and clarified our thinking with respect to some of the issues raised.

With respect to that one about the data and protection. We actually started with the registration data as is collected today. And we looked at the use cases for that registration data. And one of the things we're trying to do is to find a harmonization point around the issues that are now in the space, about that data and use.

And we're trying to chart a path forward that says, look, here is the registration data. Here is what is connected by the registration as required by the RAA 2013 today. That's where we start. Here are the uses that are made of that data. Some of these uses impinge on some deleterious impacts in the environment, privacy, consumer protection, and so on, and so on.

And we look at those and see how we might build a system that mitigates some of those issues. That's what it is. But we're having a full workshop on Wednesday, and it will be – if you come to that workshop, my colleagues would be very happy to engage in further conversations. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: So thank you for that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question. It was actually on the first slide before you listed the four, and I think you – was in essence asking why you are doing EWG when you haven't all of the WHOIS recommendations, haven't come close to being fulfilled? I mean, we slipped past that slide and I didn't even get it. Can we go back to the...?

JIM GALVIN: Yeah, can we go back to the first slide?

HOLLY RAICHE: I was just trying to figure out... Yeah. Okay. I think I understand that. Okay. Yeah, the current service is not able to meet the community need. Okay. I'm okay with it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. Next is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. I wanted to know if you had any activity about some of the stuff that has been submitted to the ITF on pseudo domain names some people want to use for peer to peer? There has been a proposal to do sort of, I think, dot onion, dot [?], dot gnu, and propose a couple of these.

It's actually, they appear as top level domains but they sort of reserved for use as peer to peer fronts. Are you aware of this? And is it being looked at?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Patrik Falstrom, chair of SSAC. Yes, we are very well aware of this, and we are forming what is happening there. What we see at the moment is that the ITF is reacting, which is what we recommend that ICANN is working together with the ITF and that they are going to do due diligence according to the process that they have.

And if needed also improve the process that they have. On top of that, many members of SSAC, including myself as an individual, do have, to various degrees, specials also in the ITF. For example, I am personally a member of the DNS directorate in the RTF. I can say that in that group, we are taking it very seriously, and we're looking at it.

So from a SSAC perspective, we are following what's happening and we think that – but on the other hand, this is also one of the topics that we will discuss on Tuesday. But from our perspective, it's something that ITF should take care of.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Patrik. Next is Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Chair. Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcript. Patrik, it's a question about the name collision report, and it's an unconventional question because it's not about the substance of the report but the governance of it. You were chair of the work party, you had members of the work party, you had two objections and one withdraw.

And I believe the objections were conflict of interests from officers of the corporation. And I was wondering whether there was not sufficient technical redundancy in the SSAC to be able to complete the report without recusing specific individuals.

PATRIK FALSTROM: No. Okay. I'm now going to... The first time where I feel the need to explain a little bit how we, in the SSAC, in general terms, decide what document to produce and what recommendations to give. And then I can explain the name collision document.

SSAC releases documents after considerations internally, and we only reach – we publish our recommendations when we have reached consensus. That consensus is something that the leader of the work party and ultimately myself as the chair, declare but it's also the case, of course, that the people can...

So anyway, we discuss things until we have consensus. We have no voting, anything like that. To be able to reach consensus, we give individuals, individual members of SSAC two different tools they can use, in which of course there is also a tool that ICANN uses a chair to talk with various individuals in the SSAC individual members.

The first tool is to recuse, which is something that individuals choose themselves, and in this case, one person decided to recuse from supporting the document. The other tool that exists, is that people can object. And this is also something that individuals choose themselves.

It is not something that other party is decided for them. It is not something I as chair decide, they decide themselves, and this is really, really important to know. When you object as a SSAC member, you must, yourself, submit a text, which is a verbatim added to the document itself.

So for this specific document, it's absolutely correct that we had one recusal and two objections. But just because the text in the objection is something added by the ones objected, I'm not going to paraphrase what they said, it's very short and I encourage that are interested to read that text, because it's coming from the one that objected.

And from our perspective, for us to be able to declare this consensus, it is really, really important that the text is coming from the one objecting to the one, for example you, that read the document, and so we don't have any whisper game here specifically around these topics.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Patrik. Jim Galvin has to leave us right now, so thank you for coming Jim. I also note that Julie Hammer, our SSAC liaison is online, so she is following this and she can hear us. I'm not quite sure what time it is in Australia, must be nighttime. It always is nighttime in Australia, when we have our meetings and so on.

So probably is, isn't it? Anyway, more questions then. So, we've got some more SSAC notices at the moment. There were some inquiries about SAC zero six zero. The user experience in IDN variant TLDs.

Should we move to that? You have some word for this?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah, I think that is the last document. If we can go to SAC zero six zero. So this is a document that we released very, very close to just after Durban. And no I'm not [?] but [?] could not be here, so I'm going to try to explain this as well as I can.

Of course, as many people in the know, in the room know, I had to work with IDM and such issues. I must actually confess that is probably I who came up with the IDM idea from the beginning of the ITF, yeah so it's actually correct to blame me for part of this.

It's my fault, yes. But I'm doing that to protect the other ones that are trying to resolve, like Rinalia that are trying to serve all the problems that I created. Next slide please. But I'm saying that also to explain that you can really talk with me about IDN issues because I absolutely know why certain designed decisions were done.

So what we did was that we saw that ICANN IDN variant TLD report was produced, that examined the user experience implication of active variant TLDs. What we found though was that, the user experience report was looking at the variant architecture given the way it was designed, when in reality we in SSAC did have – we had concerns over the design itself, of how variants or the variant processes are setup.

So we could not really have any comments on the user experience because the comments would directly be comments on the underlying system, which means that the user experience would actually have to do with the underlying system. So some of the comments...

So even though the comments on the user experience report, the comments might not be on the user experience report itself, but the underlying system that the report is looking at. So the reason why this is real important for SSAC is that we, of course, we are not user interface people, we are sort of technical people that probably designs software really badly, specifically that users are supposed to use.

But the reason that it matters that the root zone itself, compared to TLDs, is shared by everyone on the Internet. And because of that, what

kind of matching rules we are using for TLDs is so extremely much more important than anything else we have. So that's why SSAC is concerned.

To some degree, we don't care what is happening at the domain. If a registry TLD sort of, if they use that term, if they want to create a failure for themselves in their TLD, yes it's a big problem, but the root zone is so many magnitudes more important than anything else. So what is needed from SSAC perspective is that it's shared and it needs one...

It needs a set of label generation rules for variance that ensures minimal risk of conflict between strings, and minimum risks for all the users independent of what language or script they're using, independent of gTLD or ccTLD, and it must be a minimal potential for incompatible changes.

And we all know that for the Unicode script, they are adding characters all of the time. And whatever we come up with must ensure that the root zone is stable. Next slide please.

So, what we are... Just some highlights from... There are a quite large number of recommendations. We recommend the ICANN to exercise the principle of conservatism with respect to what are the allowable code points and the number of active variance. Because you can have a variant SEC and not all of them are active.

Because when you have added something to the root zone, we have to work with the assumption that whatever is added, regardless of whether it's a new character, or whether it's an activation of the variant, that will never, ever be removed. And this includes adding

something that will never, ever in the future be in conflict when you do variant calculations.

Even if we add new languages, new characters, and whatever we've added to the root zone, we must never, ever get conflicts when we do our calculations. So the second recommendation because of this, or in this highlight, is that it's very important that ICANN ensures that there is this secure, stable, and objective process, to handle situations in which the community, for example, whoever won't have a specific variant SEC, disagree with ICANN variant calculation.

And that is something we have not really seen. How do you handle that conflict? Because there might be built in interest to have a large number of code points, characters, or a large number of variants activated when in reality, the conservative principle that we encourage might be in conflict with, if I would call it, business interests or the interests from the local community.

And for the... And to follow up all of this is that to have a stability of the root zone, if it is the case that we need to update the label generation rules for certain languages, certain script combination, it is absolutely necessary that the future algorithms are quite compatible, to avoid incompatible results with existing historical locations.

And what we mean by this is that even if we add whatever script, whatever characters to the Unicode character set, it will be pretty bad if two TLDs, which were distinct today, one day in the future ends up

being declared being equivalent because they – the two strings are in the same variant SEC.

So one example of this, so everyone can say, “Okay. What does this have to do with...?” Can that really happen because we probably have all code points we need or characters we need in the Unicode? One thing that Unicode consortium is kind of working with, that I’m looking at very carefully, is that for the [?] T script, historically Unicode had only one case and now they’re adding uppercase characters, so [?] T.

And the question is, what kind of implications does that get? As one example. Next slide please. The next thing we are saying is that, it is really, really important to focus on the root zone, but then encourage adoption of registry at other levels. We see risks from SSAC perspective that it’s so easy to say that we have this LGR in the root zone, and then we require the contracted parties, and maybe even the subset of the contracted parties which are the new gTLDs, to also implement exactly the same kind of rules.

But from our perspective, it would be as an important to use the same label case generation rules for certain scripting language combination in all TLDs. So don’t forget that there are other TLDs than the contracted parties for new gTLDs. And then a very big thing that I’m still personally very concerned about has to do with the Trademark Clearing House, that really – how the Trademark Clearing House matching rules, and variant and set calculation fits together is something that people have not been really looking at.

To be honest, there is not much done if anything. Next please. But I think that is all, those are all the highlights. Yeah. So done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much. We have Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you very much Patrik. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcripts. Just a very quick question based on just what you presented. When you were talking about potential challenges to a variant calculations, and you mentioned that it's still very ambiguous at the moment. Do you foresee that there has to be, and I apologize if I'm using the wrong terminology, do you foresee that there has to be some sort of protocol, or some sort of policy, or some sort of procedures to govern the process of how people who are actually challenging the variant calculations should go through?

And also ensuring that there is a good governance mechanisms to ensure that there is a level of independence where it can be tested, it's publically available, and that sort of thing? Or whether that would be limited to particularly the objection process? Or whether it's limited to those who are actually being – who actually having that information disclosed to them in terms of the calculations, noting that much of the discussions and that sort of thing remain confidential?

That's the first one.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Let me first answer this. SSAC does believe, as you can see in the report, that the current setup of the labor generation used in the integration panel, that that is well done. So we think that works. We do though point out is that the specific integration panel, and everyone we have been talking to from SSAC do understand that the integration panel is key.

Regarding processes used when the community do not agree with the outcome of those [?] calculations, to some degree, I think, the one solution could be that it's explicitly said that whatever the integration panel finally comes up with, that is – there is no appeal process for that.

If the decision is done, the decision is done, but it's really important that everyone is aware of that. On the other hand, just because we recommend that the conservative principle is to be used, the default answer in that case for someone that would like to have something added would be no.

And that is also one way that, for example, appeals could be handled more easily because if the default is no, then an appeal can only result in maybe you add something which means that you are like saying yes to it later on. So that is also another way, of sort of, you can restart the work on labor calculation rules after no, but then you have to restart from the beginning again.

That's another way of handling it. We do not believe... I don't think that when [?], when in SSAC are saying, you just have to take in account

what to do when someone disagree without [?] and the integration panel, that doesn't – just like in many other cases, for example, with the name space collision issues, that we say from SSAC that it needs to be part of the documentation, doesn't mean that we have calculated there is a large risk or a small risk that would happen.

The way you're speaking personally, the LGRs and the integration panel is setup, I personally do believe that the risk for that kind of conflict is minimal because the work of the LGR and before that is a very open process. If someone disagrees or would like to give input, there is space to give input to that process.

But at the end of the day, specifically the root zone, there must be very conservative decision on what is added, just because we cannot risk adding a TLD that later will be invalid. Because I have no idea how to tell all the registrants that have domain names there, that printed business cards, that have all of their services running for domain name, and you tell them that their TLD is taking away, because of a new version of Unicode. We cannot accept or respect.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Patrik. And as we have, maybe pretty much 30 seconds left in this meeting without being late, I still am very much intrigued by the SSAC zero six three advisory on DNS SEC key rollover in the root zone. Could you give us a Twitter length explanation of what the issue is?

PATRIK FALSTROM: The issue, which is important – I think people that are interested should actually read the document. The issue is that we decided for proper reasons to sign the root zone. You sign the root zone by creating an asymmetric key pair, where the private key is in mountain bunkers, and that is the key that you use to sign the zone.

But then the public key is something that you give to everyone on the planet. Every name server in the world should include the public key, but now when we are going to change the private key, and sign with another one, then we have to tell everyone that runs DNS on the planet to no longer use the old key, but still instead use the new one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Why would you change the one that you have locked in the mountain?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Well, there are certain reasons why you want to change the key, for example it might be the case that the hardware you're using in the mountain breaks. It might be the case that the mountain itself gets filled with water. You might have some kind of disaster. Okay?

And that the document also talks about this. And then you have people in the community that think, even though the risk for being forced to change the key is extremely small, now while we are in the deployment phase of DNS SEC, why not do these key roll over now before we really have to, so we can do it under controlled circumstances to learn and get an experience?

Other people say, just like you, just sort of hinted, it's in the mountain. What can happen with it? Let's never change the key. Okay. If we look at cryptography, we do know that every 20 years, every 25 years, the encryption algorithms ends up such, and the computers ends up being faster, so you really need to have longer keys or change algorithm that we're using.

So we now that, at least we need for mathematical reasons, and the evolution of computers, we probably need to change key at least in 30 years or something, or I don't know whether we talk about it in the document even. So we will probably be forced to change the key, and then it is already, by the way, in the contract between ICANN and the US government, the keys should be rolled.

So it's not so much the question of why it should be done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Most of us will be retired by then, so I'm not quite sure if you need to.

PATRIK FALSTROM: That's why I think we, who are a little bit older, that will be retired by then, we should take the responsibility of rolling the key while we are around.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Very good point, Patrick, and I think that actually made absolute sense. I encourage everyone to read this report because it makes a lot more

sense than the title that it had originally. One last thing, you did mention that the SSAC works on issues that both SSAC members but also members of the community sometimes point the SSAC to.

So, effectively, do you want to sort of make an appeal here?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

You remember what we talked about Friday, right? Well done Olivier, yes. So, what we did in SSEC is that we have, because of staff support and the number of people that we have volunteers, and how much time we have, just like you have in ALAC, we have a certain number of issues that we can work on at the same time.

We just finished two documents which means, and Olivier was really good at doing that calculation Friday, when I said SSEC is working on three items in Palo. And Olivier said, “Oh, but you published two this week, that means we can host you two issues to work on.” So well done.

So we are this week, we’re looking at new work items that we are going to deal with. Of course, we have a list of, what we think, are the most important issues. But if it is the case that people have input, don’t have it coming back to us.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Here’s when one idea. Start looking at URIs and the stability and security of the Internet based on the use of various different types of URIs.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thanks for the input.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's all, okay. Thanks very much Patrik. Thanks all of the members of the SSAC here. Okay. Let's keep on moving. Now I hear that Steve Crocker is not going to be able to make it until half an hour from now, so what the suggestion is to move the – let's see, the second hot topic, the At Large summit, number two...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No one cares about that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So joining me here is Eduardo Diaz, who is the co-chair of the ATLAS 2 working group. If we could please have the right page on the screen, that would be good. And I guess that the first thing we really need to do, I guess everyone knows what the At Large summit is, but we just need to have a quick update as to where we are now effectively.

I note that Wolf Ludwig is also here with us, so that's great. As you know, there were several working groups that were created, and I still don't see anything on the screen at the moment. Okay, I'll let the screen try and work itself out. In the meantime, perhaps Eduardo, will you be able to provide us with a quick update on where we are as far as the schedule is concerned?

As you know, just to let everyone know, there are several working groups which have been created. There is only one so far that has been doing much work because its results will then influence all the other working groups. Over to you Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you. This is Eduardo for the record. If we can have the timeline, where, there. Okay. You're trying, but I can talk about timeline in the meantime. I understand that the survey came back on schedule, a little bit later, and Tijani can probably update us on that status.

That there were 90% of the ALSs have responded. We have to do a little of sending emails, but we got – I think we got a very good turnout, I think better than ATLAS 1. So Tijani if you want to bring us up to date? And that's the timeline. Basically with the timeline, once we had the survey and the information ready and analyzed, the next step will be to create the actual program.

The idea here is by the end of the year, we have it set. Okay? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Eduardo. Tijani speaking for the record. The survey, Wolf can speak about it better than me, since he is the one that is responsible for the survey. Have been accomplished, and all parts have been analyzed by several of the working group members, and now we have all of this.

It was done just before we came here, so we didn't have a look on it yet, now. The next step, as Eduardo said, is to use this survey for two things. For three things in fact. The first is to define the subjects or the themes that will be discussed during the summit, according to the reading of the ALSs as expressed in the survey.

Of course, it will not be only one element, but it will be one measure element to define those themes. Second thing, it will help us to kick off the establishment of the program, according to those things that will be defined. And the third thing, very important, it will help us to define the area where the ALSs need capacity building, to be prepared for the summit.

And those three things, we have to work on them, as I said, before the end of the year, which is a very tight deadline, but we need to have them because if we want the summit to be successful, if you want us to prepare the summit very well we have to do that before the end of the year. Is it okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Should we then move directly on to the survey? Quick rundown with regards to the survey, Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Wolf Ludwig for the record. Well, if you wish to do so, let's start with the base line. I think we agreed at the very beginning of the process,

that it would be as it was for the first summit, spring 2009 in Mexico when we conducted a survey as well.

It would be a good idea to do this for ATLAS 2. As we consider any summit planning, not being a top down but rather more a bottom up approach, we decided at this early stage to conduct the survey first to include and ask our community, our members, for their ideas, concern, and advice for any further program and summit planning.

We started, I think it was right after Durban, with the first draft of a questionnaire as part of the work of the survey sub-group, and then we send the first draft to consultation. And there was a second version, then we had some consultation with capacity building working group. They had some survey ideas and draft as well.

And finally, to be brief, we decided to merge the two surveys, and after the final testing, and approval, and translations, made we send it to the community. And for the time being, I think one of the groups news at this stage was set in all RALOs. You got an extremely high quorum of responses from the community.

I think the response rate, in some RALOs, 85% in some even beyond 90%, what is excellent. And what, as a consequence, means that most of the ALS At Large structures, by completing the survey, qualified for participation in ATLAS 2 in London in summer next year. So after most of the ALS structures completed, send their ideas and advice.

The next challenge was analyzing the survey results. What turned out to be quite a rather difficult exercise. The big parts voting tool, in this

case, compared to previous cases, I can remember where we had better tables and clearer outcomes, etcetera, this time it's, in my opinion, it was a bit of a mess because we had to subdivide the different parts of the surveys to different members of the survey sub working group.

And to do the analysis by hand, more or less. What was an additional effort, what took place until, I think, Saturday a week ago, but then all of the survey subgroup members returned their analysis sheets with – so the respective parts of the survey, and I think in the meantime, all results are together.

Some of these results have been questions with quantifying some preferences, etcetera, from one to five. What was easier afterwards to come up with the result or with the preference, once we agreed with one stance for most preferred, and five or less preferred, otherwise further, etcetera.

And some of the questions were just open questions, where people could fill in any idea, any recommendation, any Christmas wish whatsoever, and we tried list these answers, more or less, in a patterned way. Whether this was a suggestion for the summit planning, or whether it was a suggestion for the programming process, or it was a suggestion for the post-summit, like ICANN should allocate more resources and money for the RALOs, etcetera.

This is a very general recommendation, etcetera. One idea was it's not enough to have one representative per ALS sent to London, sent to the summit. Okay, I must admit, it's a nice idea, but I don't see what we

could do or change about such splendid and nice idea at the moment. For the moment, one ALS per – representative per ALS for the summit and we have to accept it and we have to live with it.

I think the results that we have so far, then I will hand over to Tijani again. I think now it offers a good phases of ideas, of feedback from the community. It gives us a picture where we can discuss and build on for any further programming. I think if I probably recall some of the basic, or the key ideas, members want to be included in this summit project planning.

So we have to continue, we are on the right track, keeping this as a bottom up approach, as an open endeavor, as an open work in progress, and being a little bit flexible, but I think the key work will rest, as usual, on the shoulders of a few people of working group members, etcetera. And I'll stop here as I realize Steve came in, and Steve always has the priority.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Wolf, and yes, we will be continuing this discussion in a moment, a little bit later. But, as you just mentioned, Steve Crocker, the chair of the Board has stepped into the building. And I know that Steve's schedule is extremely very, very packed. So I guess we can hold our breath for questions and so on, and we'll come back to this afterwards. Steve, welcome.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you Olivier. A pleasure to be here, as always, and thank you very much for the accommodation. I don't actually like it when there is a big fuss, but it's the way it is sometimes. I'm supposed make a bunch of positive remarks, which is actually... Which actually is okay in this case because there is a lot of positive things to say.

So my notes here que me here we've adopted 19 policy statements, I'll come back to that in a minute. That the At Large summit for London is progressing, and we now have a Board tracking document, which is related very much to the policy advice statements in a way.

I have said, multiple times, that I've been extremely impressed with the growth and maturation of the ALAC over the years. Sort of the hidden, unspoken text of that is that I would not have thought that it would develop as positively as it has. It's a great tribute to Cheryl, to Olivier, to everybody, the progress from the early 2002, three, four, period when I first got involved.

So I'm a very big fan. When I was chair of SSAC I spent a fair amount of time watching ALAC in adopting some of the lessons about that in the way that we improved some of the process in SSAC. The question was raised a while ago about paying attention to advice from ALAC.

I took that seriously in two different ways. One was a suggestion back to ALAC that if the advice came in the form that we could sort of keep track of it, and again drawing from my history from RFCs, and some with SSAC, put a number on it, put a label, and so forth, and send it to us, and then we have to pay attention to it, we can keep track of it.

And what you guys did, and then the next step in that process was an advice tracking process which turns out to be good medicine for a lot of things, which we got comparable inputs, or I should say, we got inputs from SSAC that resulted in a comparable response in that we are trying to raise the level that...

So we have now a draft, or a first cut, of an advice register, and we populated it with some of the advice that we think we've gotten from you. And I don't know that we've gotten feedback yet, which is fine. I mean, it's all very recent. But it really is a work in progress, and it's intended to be effective and useful.

And it's a two way tool, it's a tool for three way tool, for the board, for the staff, and for ALAC, to track what's happened to the advice. So the very first thing is, when you give the advice and then it shows up in the register, is it accurately represented? And so that's the first thing you should make a point of checking that that communication actually worked.

And then that's the first step, of course. The next step, have we processed it in some fashion? Have we evaluated it? And then finally, if we said we were going to accept the advice, do we actually implement it and track it all of the way through? So, do hold us to account on all of this, and also be forceful in the response about the, whether the tool works the way it should or does the job, because we're still in the formative stage.

Even though the people put a lot of work into it, it is still necessarily a kind of first draft, and there is time and opportunity to refine all of that. I can't think of any other kinds of things to say. No suggestions for how to be doing better than you're doing because it's – you really do a spectacular job.

But I'd be happy to interact, or answer questions, or cover other subject. Ah, Rinalia.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Steve. Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Chair. Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcript. Steve, the ALAC leadership team previous noticed the Ex Com had the opportunity to preview the tracking device, tracking mechanism on the advice, when you first sent it out to Olivier and Patrik.

I have some comments, if you don't mind.

STEVE CROCKER: Good. We're happy to have a verbal interaction here, but it will also be necessary to, you know, but fire away.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I think in general, the leadership team found it to be an useful tool. It's very structured, very clear, and we like it very much. We know that not

all of our statements are listed. We also noted that the way the statements are labeled, deferred from the way that the ALAC statements are labeled, and the SSAC one.

And the plan is to open it up to the other SOs, then I think there needs to be some consistency in terms of how you list it, otherwise people will lose their placement in terms of which statement belongs to whom. And then there is the issue of, if we sent advice to the Board, and then you've responded, and then we don't like the response, and there is a follow up, it shouldn't be listed as another advice.

There should be some kind of continuation of that. Okay, and then also, I think you mentioned earlier, that if you made a decision and there is follow up action, and it's going to go to staff, how would that be referenced so that we know that staff has received that instruction?

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. So, those are all very apt, very relevant and helpful thoughts. One of the main goals is that when we receive something or we put it in there, it should accurately and completely reflect what you've given us. And if it doesn't, then we need to not only change the process, or do it, but each time do check to see that it's there.

It should be a relatively quick thing, and we should get good at if there is some bias or there is some persistent error in the way that we translate, there will be an adjustment, either we'll get better at it or you'll get better at speaking in terms that we can understand, or whatever it is, but I'm sure that will converge.

And then, making the system a little more thorough in terms of having a way of putting continuations in, or the next steps, all of which is the kind of thing that we want to improve. So thank you. It's... Don't depend upon me remembering and translating, but I appreciate the thoughtfulness about that. Good.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Steven. Actually we have the table on our screens at the moment, so you can have a look at it. And also in the Adobe Connect chat, there is a link to that table. Although I do have to note that it says, "Please, if you have any suggestions and so on, please email staff dash BRD support at ICANN dot org." And that email address appears to be going to some moderated list or something, because you'll receive a response and say, "You're not a member of this..."

STEVE CROCKER: Oh, is that right? I asked about that in fact, and I was told that it was open. Because I was concerned about that very thing. Let me tell you who that goes to, that goes to the Board support team that is headed by Kareem [?], Megan Bishop, Michelle Bright, and Theresa [?] are the other members of the team. And they operate very well together.

So that's a surprise, because I was actually was concerned about that very question. And I will go look into that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi. Steve, do you have any feedback for us regarding the nature and the quality of what you get? Is it too long? Is it too short? Is it usually complete enough? I mean, in terms of the style in which it is sent to you, is there things that we can be doing better?

STEVE CROCKER:

So, I think that's the right question. I don't have, at this moment, at this juncture, an answer for you, but I do expect that in the process of working through all of this, that the substantive responses will include at least the germ of answers like that. They may be exploited as, "This is too fuzzy to understand and it's not clear," which is a strong signal that hone in and say what it is you're really trying to say.

Or it could be that we'll say, "This is out of scope and we don't know why you're off on a tangent here." I'm being slightly tongue in cheek, but... And there will be other things for which we'll say, "Yes, that's a very good idea. We'll go do that." I think we need a little bit of experience, and then the question that you're asking probably deserves maybe some focus after we've had some time to try it. So we'll try it for a while, and then we should probably step back or step up and take a look at how well that's been working.

And there will be probably perceptions on both sides that will be worth discussing. So hold that question and ask it again. We did a big push to get this in there, and frankly I haven't had time, and people on the Board haven't had time, to study what the results are and look at that.

But I do anticipate that that question will get first class attention as we get time to do it.

I wanted very much to have this work committed in Durban, that we would have this up and running by now, and so we made it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Steve. Alan Greenberg is next in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: On your left. A question actually related to Evan's. I'm a strong advocate of terse, short statements, right to the point.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: At least one response we got back recently, and it may apply to more than one, terse and short is interpreted as we haven't really done our homework and don't understand what has happened before, and therefore we get a bit of education, sometimes a lot of education, on the history instead of an answer to reply to what we were saying.

And I'm not quite sure how to react to that without putting At Large histories and what we were aware of...

STEVE CROCKER: You're referring to responses from staff to what you said earlier?

ALAN GREENBERG: This particular one was a response from the new gTLD process committee.

STEVE CROCKER: I see.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: New gTLD program committee.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. I don't know what to say about that, but the point is taken.

ALAN GREENBERG: I plan to follow up on that one personally, but it's difficult to be terse and short and still give evidence that you've done all of your homework and understand what's gone on before.

STEVE CROCKER: One of the things about our ever growing community is that not everyone is aware of exactly what the history of the person that they're talking to. The idea of explaining to you the history, I understand would be unnecessary. But some of the people who are new, who have only been here five or 10 years, probably don't understand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Steve. Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Chair. Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the transcript. Steve, earlier in our interaction with Sebastien Bachollet, he mentioned that three Board committees have been shut down, and one of them was the global relations committee. And the question was raised, is that the right thing to do when ICANN is moving towards internationalization? Could you comment on that?

STEVE CROCKER: Sure. The broad topic is sort of, what is the correct functioning of the Board? And how do we implement that correct functioning? The Board Global Relations committee, and two other committees, IANA committee and Public Participation committee that then became the PSEC, Public Stakeholder Engagement, yeah.

Were born out of, in an era where staff organization was significantly smaller and worse yet, significantly weaker. And there is quite a bit of concern at the Board level as to whether or not the functions that were involved, they were getting the right level of attention. Over time, we have come to understand that that really is duplicating or participating in stuff that is properly done best by staff.

And we've been in the very fortunate position, particularly over the last year, where the staff has become a great deal more robust, more

muscular in a way that we have really excellent executives, really excellent teams doing that work. And the Board's role is retracting back to being much more of a proper oversight.

There is not, I should acknowledge, 100% comfort and uniformity across our entire Board. We have Board members and Sebastien, who I admire and embrace dearly, tends more toward, and he's not alone, tends more toward wanting to be actively involved and engaged. That's understandable and helpful, but it's not the fitting with the discipline that we need at the Board level.

So, we did in fact, in a kind of deliberate way, reviewed the set of committees at the Board, what their role was and what the necessity was, and we've cut back on the number of committees of the Board. Those are areas... It does not at all mean that we deprecated what the importance of those functions, it was instead an acknowledgement that those functions are now being handled better, in fact, than we can handle them at the Board level, and properly being handled by...

We have a public stakeholder engagement, excuse me, global stakeholder engagement team that Sally Costerton heads up. And so forth on that, so that's...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Steve. Just a follow up on this. Does this reduce, then, the number of responsibilities and the breadth of activities that Board members need to pursue?

STEVE CROCKER:

In principle, it should somewhat. There is some second order of questions about whether we can expand the work to keep all of the Board members busy, but that is sort of tongue in cheek, you know. If you look at the amount of work that Board members put in on our Board compared to Boards of any other non-profit, it's extraordinary. It's totally disproportionate.

Now, we're an unique organization, and we have a lot of volunteer energy, but it raises the question whether that's the right way to use that energy. And so this is kind of a slowly evolving question that we've been pursuing incrementally over, you know, year by year.

We don't have, thank you very much. We don't have a specific coordinated plan, but it is a background question that we look at on a regular basis.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you Steve. So that effectively shows the direction in which the Board is going to go, more of a corporate Board less of a hands on Board, that way.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. Let me, just to make the point quite clear. We're running fairly large budgets, depending upon which numbers you choose. I'll choose a baseline number of \$70 million a year, or more, that's a substantial

enterprise, and there are governance questions and oversight questions that are demanding.

We've been watching over the finances, watching over the strategic planning, watching over the assessment of risks, making sure that the performance of the CEO and the ombudsman are all proper. These are non-trivial things. The audit function is probably least visible, least widely understood, but one of the very key functions that is very important.

Even in a super clean operation that we run, which we do, has a surprising amount of content involved in it. So there is stuff that is just related to the breadth and size of the operation we have that are quite demanding. And there is... I could go on and on. But moving the Board out of the things that can and should be done by staff and by the community, I think is inescapable.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank...

STEVE CROCKER: May need to build other mechanisms for replacing these over time, other policy, or advisory mechanisms, or whatever.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Another question from Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi. I want to expand on what you're saying now, is that there is... Now that the TLD program is sort of underway and it's sort of more of an operational thing at this point, and you've got a change of vision to some of the, you know, Montevideo, and some of the very big picture future of governance kind of things. How do you see the Board as its constituted shifting?

I mean, if there has been some working groups that have been eliminated that maybe more operations, do you see that there is other things that need to be added now? That Fadi is engaging with the other ISTARs and the other groups, and now you've got, in some ways, a broader view that you've got to work together to preserve multi-stakeholder, the risk of future creep, and the whole thing of...

How is the Board itself shifting from this? What seem to be operational post-TLD policy into now this new mode of having to deal with ITU and all of this.

STEVE CROCKER:

There is a couple of things intertwined in your question that I want to tease apart. One of them is, how is the Board evolving? What are our needs? And what's happening with ICANN's mission? Let me deal with the mission part first. As you've heard, we've put...

Fadi has put a lot of energy in the staff, and the Board has been heavily involved in worrying about, thinking about, the Internet governance set of issues, writ large, and we authorized and gave Fadi a mandate a couple of months ago to attempt to build a coalition, so that the big set

of Internet governance issues – not just the things related to IANA or whatever, but the full broad set – have a way of being addressed that was broader than the binary choices of the US is in charge of everything versus move everything to the UN, which was kind of a simplistic set of goals.

And the results have been spectacular. The results have been absolutely phenomenal. And an hour or so ago, we finished passing another resolution, and it will be published today I think, a pair of resolutions, the one that we passed quietly in September, and the one that we passed this afternoon, providing a clear message that what Fadi has been doing, what his staff has been doing, has been with full knowledge, support, and encouragement, if not outright direction, from the Board.

That said, we are not, and I'll say it again, we are not getting into the business of trying to expand our mandate to cover Internet governance for the full set of things. We want to live in an environment which there are other mechanisms and other forums for these kinds of things. So this is...

What's taken place in the past couple of months has been a very contained, relatively short term, effort, and there will be a bit more to go but really to ignite and to foster a movement in which there are many parties involved. And we want ICANN to live within that environment as opposed to be that environment.

So, on the mission, we're very, very sensitive about mission creep and we have a big enough mission as it is, and we will stick to that mission. That's where we are. On the question of the evolution of the Board, I alluded to the size of the operation and so forth, and we look around at the skillset experience based and so forth for the Board, we have an extraordinary set of people with extraordinary experience, but I don't think that we have a Board with the same kind of corporate experience, business experience, political experience, for that matter, that we really need over time.

I have not said it before, but I've certainly thought it, that we need a Board for which I would not be a competent person to be on it. We need a really sophisticated experienced Board, so I think we need... There are a lot of important things that, skills and experience that we should be bringing into the Board. I think we've got a shot at being there.

And so I would expect the Board to evolve over time. I don't know if that totally answers your question, but it attempts to.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Steve. Next is Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you Olivier. Sala for the transcripts. First of all, I would just like to say, Mr. Crocker, that, and this is my personal opinion, for the record I would just like to state before I make this comment that I

wear two hats. ALAC when I attend ICANN meetings, at the same time in another capacity, I'm one of two coordinators of the civil society Internet governance caucus, which happens to be involved in other discussions and that sort of thing.

And the view I'm about to express is on my own personal views. I'm very, very impressed with how the Board, over the past 12 months, has really truly navigated the murky waters and the reefs and that sort of thing, very impressed. You've done it with class, with extraordinary diplomacy. I know you would have witnessed extraordinary backlash from various constituents, and ICANN is a dynamic beast in terms of having diverse voices and that sort of thing.

But the manner in which the Board has shown leadership, and I know I'm probably going to get attacked for my comments, but I thought I would make those comments anyway. But it's been very impressive. I really liked the way a subtle shift in terms of engagement at the IGF in Bali. It even came through the US government from ICANN, where we've shifted marginally from the antagonistic, hostile approach to us versus you or us versus them, to one of a strategy of engagement.

And I think it's actually changed the dynamics of the playing field, and it's very, very healthy. And if it's one thing that I witnessed in Bali... I was very impressed also with the success stories that has been shared by the community, different diversity stakeholders whether it was civil society, the technical constituencies, the governments, inter-governmental organization where they were sharing tangible examples, 10 years' worth of enhanced cooperation, success stories.

And that really came through. And I think we need to share more of that, the success stories. And instead of being hostile, but to continue to engage those who may not necessarily perceive the things we perceive or share our ideas. So thank you Mr. Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: That's, of course, heartwarming to hear. Thank you very much. Our coms team will be around to life you up on stage and give you an open mic, your own video channel, streaming and so forth. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next we have... Sergio, did you say you wanted to have the floor as well? No? Okay. You were just pointing to Sala, great. Well, she'll have the cameras and the action. Any other questions or comments? I don't see anyone put their hand up. I guess you've absolutely thrilled everybody and convinced them...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, at the risk of one more, this is Evan.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I want to follow up on what Sala said, and also in the commentary that we had with Fadi. I don't know if you are aware, but ALAC was one of

the first constituencies in ICANN to support Fadi publically in what he was doing before IGF. And so, you're supporting him, we're supporting him, we're very supportive of these efforts. And so part of this is also another request of the Board of, is there a way we can help show this going forward?

As you may have challenges elsewhere within the ICANN universe, of trying to do this path forward. Just be aware you've got some friends here, and if, you know, you may be called upon to use this as a resource. I think you'll find a lot of help here if you should ever ask for it.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. I mention that the Board just finished passing a resolution, which we published as fast as we can get it out. We had some extended discussion about some very small choices of words, and it was a question of, how many superlatives to put in there?

And the nature of the discussion was, well if we put too many in, it would look like we're going over the top and it will underlie the message, and if we don't put any there, it would look like it's a bit begrudging. Going back and forth on all of this.

I know it's out there, thinking there is no way to get this exactly right. So, you know, my first thought was, "Well, proclaim loudly the support." And on the other hand, too much of a good thing can take away... The thing that has to be true about ICANN is that it has to be solid. It has to

be stable. And when it gets its job done, that should not be news, that should be expected.

It's not a perfect analogy, but particularly with the IANA function, I often draw a similarity to the county recorder's office, which – I don't know if that translates across the world, but in the US, typically in each county across the country, is where the land deeds are recorded.

So if you want to know who owns what house, so if you want to know who owns a parcel of land, there is a place where that is a public record. And when there is a transfer made, that those records are changed. That's a public service job, government job, and it's typically done, without exception, across the entire nation.

And if it's ever in the news, it's usually very bad. I mean, the only reason for that operation to get any kind of attention is when something gets completely screwed up. And the person who holds the job of county recorder, is typically not treated like a rock star, and given a lot of attention, and is not wined and dined, and his children don't go to school and proclaim, "My dad is the county recorder," and have everybody say ooh and ah.

My sense is that, at a certain level, ICANN really ought to be as uninteresting and as sort of gray as that. So, it's great that we're doing things that are appreciated. It's great to have the support for Fadi, and I'm ambivalent, a little bit, I have very mixed feelings as to whether or not we should trumpet that, or whether we should say, "Yup. That's the way it is."

And go on about our business. And I don't have any... I'm not going to close with do it this way, you have to feel your way through it, but at a certain point, we should be used to doing the right thing, doing it well, and having people completely trust that that's the case.

And then turning their attention to more interesting and more difficult kinds of things.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Steve. I actually have a couple of questions, or maybe one question or observation. One was with regards to cross-community work, and the question was effectively, whether... I know that there is a lot of support across the ICANN community for cross-community work, and yet the Board very seldom asks for cross-community working groups to be created on issues of cross-community working groups, for example.

STEVE CROCKER: I actually can't think of anything to say about that. I think there are people on the Board who do worry about the whole idea of having working groups as opposed to, which are open and issue oriented, as opposed to constituency oriented or structure oriented. But it has not been a subject that we've thought about or talked about per se, except that some time ago we did like the idea of being more issue oriented and less silo, if you will, about these things.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to follow up on that. We had a discussion earlier talking about some of the difficulties of ALAC participating in a GNSO working group, including things like our volunteer time, lack of expertise. For those of us who live in the Asia Pacific region, the very odd times in which the meetings are held, language difficulties.

The sort of things that makes it that little more difficult to participate in issue based working groups. So even though it's a lovely idea to have a cross-constituency working group, there are some barriers in ALAC that may not exist elsewhere.

STEVE CROCKER: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And one last thing, which is to do with the leadership training which was made up of two parts. The first one being the facility – facilitation training and the second one being the orientation course. That has taken place, and this community has been, I guess, well is to be quite thankful to you, because you have been one of the firm supporters of this initiative from the early days I would say.

But it has gone on very well. In fact, it's gone so well that it started out with only one Board member attending, and it finished with two Board members. That's how quickly people became leaders of that.

STEVE CROCKER:

100% per hour. That's great. I was reflecting on why I didn't say something on the onset because it wasn't put in my notes and my head wasn't there. This is a spectacular success. You guys have been pushing for ICANN Academy, for leadership training, for all this sort of thing.

And the results, I didn't get a chance to attend but I did listen attentively to multiple reports, and they were just stars, just aces all around. So, let me congratulate you on being persistent because I know it was a long haul to get there, and on a spectacular success.

And double success in the sense that, it's a success as an ALAC initiative and it's a success because it's not limited to ALAC. You actually made it available to everybody, and I'm aware of all that and the Board is as well. And this is to be... I do actually have in my notes about things to say tomorrow morning and so on, so I do plan to say a word or two about it.

The allocation of time and space is very tight, but I get to squeeze in a thing or two. So this is good, and I thank you for reminding me and I apologize that I didn't lead off with it, because it's something that I should said right from the beginning.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Dr. Crocker, thank you very much. Okay. Then we'll return to the At Large summit for another 15 minutes, I think, that we have. Is it five? So 10 minutes just evaporate, that's great. That's how quickly things go. Let's go quickly back then to the... So we had the survey, which was sent out, we had the analysis of the survey.

Of course, there is a working group that is going to meet here in order to be able to work from there. Is it a two hour... Maybe two and a half hours I think. Since we have that little time, one hour, but I think that there is more than that afterwards.

Heidi, oh Heidi has gone. Will somebody be able to help me know if we have... Ah, here we go. So we do have... So we have one hour on one day and we have two hours on the other. So that's three hours, yeah, it's just into two pieces.

Now, this is an appeal for everyone here. The At Large summit is going to be, I think, well if not one of the largest if not the largest topic we're going to have to work on in 2014. Unfortunately, at the moment, there is only a small team that is organizing it. And of course, this is going to grow, I hope this will grow, with time.

As we know, things have to ramp up. But now that the survey, the first step forward has been taken, we do have to populate and continue populating some of the other working groups of the At Large summit. It has been divided with the survey group, as we've known. Then we've got the events group that is going to look specifically at the events that are going to be set up, and that includes the agenda, etcetera.

And I think Tijani is heading this. And I think it will require a lot of work because of course, now with the new discussions and the Montevideo statement, etcetera, there might be a lot more topics that are going to land on the table. And then, we've got the sponsors group.

Now, work has already started on this. I just wanted to give you a quick update. I have had meetings with Google, with Afiliias, with Microsoft, with a couple of other organizations asking for some funding for sponsoring for our events, lunches, cocktails, dinners, etcetera; so as to be able to take care of the whole community whilst we're in London.

So this is ongoing. But certainly, one of the first tasks of the sponsor's group, and I think this needs to be done pretty fast, is for – because that's what I've been asked, is for, not a booklet but I guess a brochure, a couple of pages, what really are the aims of the ATLAS 2? What does a sponsor get for sponsoring us? Etcetera, etcetera.

Sponsorship kit, that's what I was looking for, but this time, drinking too much of this red colored drink, and the drink not being wine, I just cannot find the right words. Then we've got a logistics group and that's going to also be maybe a group that is going to have to work on later on, specifically I think on visa issues, and working also with consistency travel, etcetera, to make sure we don't end up with the same sort of problems as we do end up with sometimes in some parts of the world.

A public relations group will be working closely with Sally Costeron and her team. As you know, this is going to be ICANN's 50th meeting. Some people have actually, I think the record is 48 or 49 meetings attended, I

don't know how that person is still alive, but not by the length of time but the amount of stress you manage to attain in 49 meetings, it's pretty incredible.

But the public relations group will work very closely with Sally and her team. I mentioned very quickly earlier today, that Sally Costerton is also assembling a group of people, in London, based locally, from all across ICANN, including local ICANN staff as well, and also some of her connections that she has in London. We have to remember that she has come from the marketing and advertising field in London.

So a media field in London. So there is a big push on this. So that we can make this a very large media fest. And that, by the way, will include a very large segment of our community. So please when you go in June 2014, please before you go there, go and get your hair cut and... You have to look good. It's just a joke, fair enough. Come as you are.

And then return on investment group... Yeah, well, if we get the sponsors, then we can get the sponsors to pay for the budget to make us look good. That was the whole point. And actually one of the ideas is not to go on to the standard sponsors, so I'm actually open to everyone. We don't need to go only to the usual sponsors, you've heard – I mention Microsoft.

Microsoft is not a regular sponsor of ICANN events or work that we do in our community, but we really are now looking into the wider Internet governance sphere, and the fact that the many, many large organizations out there are benefitting from the current model that the

Internet is built on, yet are not doing enough to pull their weight and help the community do the work that they do to keep the Internet working how it is working.

So I think that's maybe something they should think about. And then the return on investment, and that's the one that – is it Cheryl that seems to be running this, or you will be. Well, that's another one. That's very important as well because if we want to have regular summits in the future, we need to be able to show how much our community has been enabled.

And in fact, we all know the first summit was an absolute success, and I'm absolutely sure that the next one, the one that's coming up, will be an absolute success. But, we need to make it an absolute success, it's in our hands to do it. Eduardo, what next?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Oh, okay. What's next, like I said before, we need to get the schedule of what we're going to do during the summit, and we have to do that this year. So we can get involved with the public relations, logistics, and the rest. That's what we're going to do next year.

Just concentrating on getting the thing going. I would say like March, April timeframe, we should have it ready basically. You know, one thing here or there, we should have it ready by April, we should know what we're going to do and how we're going to do it. That's basically it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Eduardo. So the meetings that are coming up this week, just trying to frame what we want to have achieved by the end of the week basically. We've got the joint ATLAS 2 capacity building working group, and the regional secretariat's meeting.

The reason for this, to be a joint meeting between the regional secretariats, etcetera, is because not only do we have the At Large summit working group, but we would like the secretariat's themselves to be absolutely in being able to go and speak to the ATLS and get them involved and so on.

So it has to be a concerted effort between everyone. Yeah, it's going to have to involve a lot of people and a lot of help, and certainly we want the community to build its own agenda, so that's important. Oh, Tijani, please, sorry I didn't see you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you Olivier. The money of the sponsorship wouldn't be spent on anything but bringing more people to the summit. I made this suggestion before, because I don't think that you would need any money for anything other than having the maximum of people attending this summit.

I think that the members of ALAC and the regional leadership, are always deciding on behalf of the At Large community. We are always

sending statesmen on behalf of the At Large community. The summit is the unique occasion that the At Large community decides itself.

Physically present. And so, I prefer that those people who are deciding on behalf of the community, will have someone else from their ALSs come and participate in their decision. So I think that 25 people are not too much and that with the sponsorship we will manage to do that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you Tijani. Yeah, hopefully we can. One of the things that plays no favor is that the sponsorship budgets are usually done by January. So we will be able to get an answer rather early, rather than having to wait until May to be told, “Sorry, we can’t do it.” Or, “Here is your \$100, sorry 100 pound check.” And it fits in the financial year, yeah.

So the meeting on Wednesday, will start, of course, with sort of the way forward and the update on the ATLAS 2 survey. Then we’ll have the role of the RALOs in engaging ALSs. We’ve already seen the role of the RALOs in engaging their ALSs to respond to their survey, and that’s been quite a Herculean task, should we say?

And then we’ll have Sally Costerton and Duncan Burns coming to speak to us with regards to the public relations activities, PR and what we’re going to be able to do with regards to the media fest. So that’s really great.

Capacity building tools with Tijani, and then of course next steps. So that's really the gist of what the ATLAS 2 is all going to be about. As I said earlier, please have a look at the webpages that we have, have a look at the survey analysis as well. It will be good to have more than just the people on the working group itself to be able to bring more input, maybe, at that time itself.

With this, yeah, absolutely Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I just want to say that all those people that volunteered to help with the ATLAS 2 to come to these meetings, this is really where you can make a difference. So, if you know anybody out there that had volunteered for this, please have them come. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. I don't know. A neuron just interfered with another one and I thought... I'm just wondering, we've discovered through the wonderful work through the Academy training, that the online learning program is an useful tool but one that does need some finesse and some modification and testing.

I wonder, with the capacity building and some of the activities which we will need to be pre-activities for the ALSs, whether or not we might

suggest that we can pilot the next stage of the online learning program to meet the needs of the ALSs. It just, as I say, rush of blood to the head.

It just seems like we're going to have to be creating content, we might as well use the tool.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you Cheryl. Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yeah, just Sandra speaking. Just to respond to Cheryl. The online learning platform will be launched officially this week, I think it's Wednesday. I guess that Nora [?] and her team will invite the community to set up their own courses, which means that every ALS, sorry not every ALS, but every region is actually able to setup their own programs which they think it's needed for their work.

And so to say also, the modules which will be developed in the capacity building working group, over in the ICANN Academy working group, they are also able to setup their own programs the way they think it should be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sandra, I appreciate that, but I also know that there is also going to be – two things. A lag time while our regional leaders around the fact of what it is and what they can do with it. And it seems to me that an At

Large wider activity owned by those of us that are managing the ATLAS 2, could be a good example, a good engagement.

I, for example, have already put in my application for a LLP unit to be developed for Nom Com mechanisms, but through also outreach as well as activities within. So, some people are going to be early adopters, but we've got a few months and we've got a tool that's there, but it would take leaders, from around this table, to make it happen. That's all. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you very much. So we've just learned that Theresa Swinehart is going to be a little bit late, and what I suggest is to swap the last two agenda items over, so we can look at the last agenda item. We'll wrap before, yes. That's quite an ICANN thing isn't it?

Let's finish before we start. Let's launch before we're ready. It's that time of the day. So, if I can find this screen again. There are a couple of things which we need to look at as the wrap-up for the day. The first one is, the schedule for the week. You would have all been given this sheet of paper, but of course things do change with time.

And so the online schedule is the one that you should really be checking over. Meetings which are particularly important, of course, the meeting with the Board. We don't have a meeting with the GAC this year, but we will have a meeting with the ccNSO. We have – what are the meetings that we have that are particularly important?

The meeting with the ATRT 2, yes. That's one very good, thank you Holly, very important. The ATRT 2 report is out for public comment. There are quite a few points in there which relate to the public interest, and which would resonate with this community.

There are a couple of things which might be missing. I know Rinalia has been working on a first draft of a possible statement. And I'm not quite sure whether it's up for comment already on the Wiki. It could be. There are things missing in there, yes.

CAPS analysis. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would suggest you just post it. You will have comments from me later on tonight, but not until later on tonight.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

This is worth noting is the very last time for us to be able for us to comment on the ATRT 2 report, accountability and transparency review team. So if we then read it after the final report and find out it's absolutely vacuous, part of it is our own fault. I guess, Alan, Avry, and I personally, but part of it would also be your fault, because you didn't add to it.

So let's all hope that we can check it up. Now, on top of that, we've also... So there is a link on your screen which basically provides you with the, the ATLAS 2 working group charter. That's not the right link.

We need to have the link in the chat to the Buenos Aires pages. So there is ICANN, Buenos Aires, or At Large Buenos Aires pages.

It has got links to each and every day. It's got a link to the venue map, which I guess you can find elsewhere as well. It has got the list of questions that we are going to ask the Board. The list of questions that we've asked at the SO leadership meeting. The global stakeholder engagement questions as well. Communications department, I guess all of this was dealt with this morning actually already, I think.

And then of course, the topics for the public forum which is going to be happening later on in the week. But there, at the bottom of this page, a meetings report workspace. And the meetings report workspace is one which at the moment, if you go to is completely empty. The aim is to fill this. And it would be interesting actually.

You know, what we could do, Matt, is to actually add a couple of bogus meeting reports to give an idea of the size, length, of what is expected by people. It effectively is the ability to have a summary of most of the meetings that are taking place here. We're very much aware that many of you will be going on to other meetings.

If you sit in a meeting, that is a non At Large meeting, and if you could just write a few notes about what was discussed, was there a result that came out of it? It's always good to be able to have a good summary of all the meetings that you've missed at the end of an ICANN week.

And being able to see this, it's very helpful. We're quite a large community. We can cover the majority of meetings out here. In fact, in

the past, we have, but some people are better at doing this than others, some have provided full details including video, and pictures, etcetera, and they know who they are.

I'm looking at Glenn here, who has done the work of a journalist. But even just a few lines saying, "I was in that meeting. This was what was talked about. There was a conflict about this. A big discussion about that." Five lines is better than absolutely nothing.

So I urge you all to fill this. There used to be a time where we had a signup sheet, we put it on the wall and people would put their names next to it. Then mysteriously, the signup sheet disappeared. As, I'm not sure why actually, but and so we would just leave it directly on there. I'm not quite sure what else to do.

I could sing and dance for people to put their input there. If there is any other suggestion as to – what we could do. I see Cheryl. Start with Rinalia, and then move on to something a bit...

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Because I'm outgoing. You're coming back in another capacity. Rinalia for the transcript. I actually like the Skype short reporting that's been done as a running commentary, which Sala does really well. I think we should just adopt that, and not do so much reporting because it adds an extra burden to people.

I feel that if there are specific topics that are really of interest, you should review the recording or the transcript at the end of the week, or a month afterwards. Why create more work?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sala. So the only work that one has... Oh, am I saying Sala? Sorry, more of this red drink in a moment. Thank you Rinalia. The only thing that it might create less work for those people typing in the Skype, it creates more work for staff who have to basically choose... It doesn't?

So we can interspace the drivel that I put on the Skype chat with the useful information that's on there. I thought maybe another channel for the reports? So if people want to just, we can keep a Skype channel for people to provide their reports, so we've got one after the other?

Separate channel, yeah, for the reports, and a separate channel for the discussion. Heidi.

HEIDI: Thank you Olivier. This is Heidi for the record. Rinalia, in your very good suggestion, did you apply that the Skype chats would then be posted? No, Rinalia is shaking her head no. So basically, it would just be for on the spot updates, and then if there would be more detail wish at a later date, they could refer to the recording or the transcript.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I kind of missed that. I think a brain cell popped in the middle of that. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: I actually would prefer to have all of the reports in one place so that you can back in time and refer to what it is and kind of... Much as I think Skype is a lovely, not everybody is on it all of the time. So in the interests of actually having one place where we can go to find everything, could we please have one place?

I don't care where it is, but I would rather it be on the ICANN website, so it's accessible for everyone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. So I guess the place, really, that's where it is. And what we can do, actually, is to put the reports as comments on there and then staff will cut and paste them over to the table. If people don't want to be going and dealing with the heavy Wiki.

I'm not looking at Matt, so Matt shouldn't be looking at me thinking, "What in the world are you dumping on my shoulders?" But that's effectively the thing. You might be noticing that by now we're trying to waste time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr is very good at that, hitting with her name.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I'm many things, thank you Olivier. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I wanted to do a couple of things, and I'm glad I listened to you two before I jumped in. Way back in the dim, dark, distant past, one of the reasons we were asking for these reports, was it was a mechanism for metrics, and now we've come up with a whole new framework.

So let's get too concerned about this. But so put that into perspective. It used to be a metrics measure. I hear what you're saying, and in fact I think it's interesting, Rinalia, that you should bring it up and no one objected, because when that was done in an informal sense it was objection on the Skype chat, that it was filling up with stuff, and if they were interested in that, they'd be sitting in on the meetings, or listening to the transcript, or going to the Adobe room.

So I just wanted to say, no one in this circle has said that to you, but you may very well get that response if you use the same channel. So think about what Olivier has said about using a separate channel. I, too, would think that doing a, while it's there, while it's happening, couple of points, and having it captured is a smart way for the use of time.

And I think it would be a very worthwhile experiment. I encourage you to do so, but maybe choose a separate channel. And we already take what is glorified chat, another mechanism of instant messaging, and have those formal records of informal mechanisms of communication, because almost all of our meetings, and our formal meeting pages, have now Adobe Connect room chat in it.

So there is a precedence set for taking all the spelling errors and everything else, and not getting too worried about it. So Holly, I'm thinking probably do both, but be very careful if you put it in the chat, because 20 people here might think it's a good idea, another 40 who aren't here may really not appreciate it, and that's certainly is what happened last time.

Next, second channel, probably worthwhile, you can always cut and paste. The other thing I wanted to mention, however, Olivier, is – and it could be useful on your separate Skype channel, is for people to make it clear what room they're in, and when they're moving into another room, because not only is it just handy, it does give us all an idea of where people are.

And it's not unusual for someone to be going, "Well, hang on, I'm in that meeting. Mary is here, where is Mary?" I mean, you can perhaps even sit together and do a little bit of comparison of who is typing what, or more importantly you can say, "Mary isn't here." And Mary is telling us a [?] and perhaps we shouldn't mark her off.

Remember that at this meeting, four metrics, every one of you will be noted. I believe it's 30 or 45 minutes, a third or a halfway into any one of the meetings, in attendance register. And if you don't know what Julia looks like, please make yourself obvious to us all. If you're not marked off by her, you're not marked off in metrics.

So...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Julia is about to get a lot of free drinks all week from everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Make it your business to be marked off.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The first thing, and when you have a regulator of some sort, is you make sure no one is identified so they cannot be bribed. You just go on to make someone very, very happy for the whole week.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we can probably out the bribers, it's not too much of a problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Just a couple of more things before, well the first thing is it appears Theresa Swinehart might not be able to join us until about 10 minutes times, and I'm concerned that this is going to delay us further.

So what I suggest is to reschedule her visit to some further time later on in the week. If you wish to do an ad, we've got a couple of commercial breaks that will fill up the time. Okay, well, go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I just wanted to... I've been looking at my calendar, Julia, and I actually can't find the public Nom Com meeting in my calendar. It could be just my ability to not see it here. But the advertisement I wanted to do was

for everyone to come along to the session, that will be at least on the main calendar if not on my personal one, for the nominating committee meeting.

Yjroi is at the table, I hope that he has got it in his calendar, and he can save my lack of actual fact to present with you, but under Yjro's tutelage, and guidance, and leadership, the nominating committee of 2013 is made huge, in my opinion, and it is a vast opinion, steps forward in taking some of the mystery to the dark corners and the darkened curtains of what Nom Com does in process.

And the opportunity, if you all come along, and you should all come along and bring your friends, is that at this particular meeting, you also see a bit of transition work which is going to include reporting from the 2013 Nom Com into the 2014 Nom Com and the public record.

So if I feel busted enough to toss it to you, to say that you can actually give them the date and time? Because I'm damned if I can find it in my calendar.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much Cheryl. Yjro, you want to say a couple of words quickly?

YJRO LANSIPURO: Yeah, thank you. Yeah, it's been quite the journey. The Nom Com issues here, and when we started, we didn't quite know where we would arrive. But anyway, I am honestly happy that we did our job, we

did a little bit more than what was originally asked from us, and then we got the nomination selection of Wolfgang [?] just in time.

As Cheryl said, one of the big things – apart from doing the job, we were given, or wanted to enhance the institutional confidence of the Nom Com process. Because the Nom Com process is really, it's fundamental to the multi-stakeholder process approach of ICANN. And basically, we decided to strike a new balance between openness and confidentiality.

They are both enormously important, and I think that perhaps we succeeded. So, please come to the open meeting of the Nom Com. We present our report there, we present the recommendations of the 2013 Nom Com to the 2014, and I really hope that we get participants from all constituencies and stakeholder groups for that meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Yjro. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: May I express my full satisfaction by the selection of the appointment of the Nom Com this year? I am really happy, and in French they say... The last wonderful thing is the selection of Wolfgang. I hope that, I'm sure that next year it will be as good as this year, because there is always Cheryl there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Just full of praise, thank you very much Tijani. I think that we now have... Is it Sylvia who is going to tell us a little bit about what's coming up this evening and then later on in the week?

SYLVIA: Okay. I have few announcements. For tonight, you are cordially invited to the ICANN 15 anniversary celebration. It's at 19 until 20:30 in [?] AB. Then we have tomorrow...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Where is [?]?

SYLVIA: [?] AB.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just around the corner. Okay. Just to make sure.

SYLVIA: For women, the women's breakfast, tomorrow at 7 AM until 8:30 at Catalina's.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Just opposite here.

SYLVIA: And tomorrow morning, the Welcome Ceremony at 8:30 until 10 AM [?] AB.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. And of course there is the SO and AC discussion that goes on immediately afterwards, after the welcome ceremony. And the subject of this will be Internet governance discussion, Montevideo plus the upcoming Brazil event. I call it event these days, because I don't know what it's called. Heidi?

HEIDI: Just to add that the first At Large meeting tomorrow will be the Future Challenges working group session at 12:00 to 13:00 in this room, the Golden Horn.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Heidi and one question which was asked today of me was, whether any of the meetings are closed. Any of the At Large meetings are closed. For example, the metrics meeting this morning, was that a closed meeting? It was open.

So the question is, are all of our meetings at the moment set as being open or closed? The Future Challenges...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, in the past, the Future Challenges meetings were closed where this one is not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you for this information. Great, so you all are invited to come in bright and early tomorrow, but until then, I hope you have all a very good evening. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Before we quit, I have a personal request. I have a local SIM for my phone, and I haven't managed to figure out how to add money to it yet. If anyone knows how, please tell me.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Alan. I'm not sure that needed to be on the record, but it's very kind of you to let the world know you've got a SIM. Very soon, Alan's number will appear online and you can call him if you need to talk to him. Thanks to everyone, and I do have to ask everyone to thank the interpreters for the incredible work they've done today.

Oh, and we have Portuguese for the first time. So when, next time Cheryl swears on the English channel, I'll be able to find out what those words are in Portuguese for the first time. That's great.

And of course, I have to thank the AV staff for having done a pretty good job of our technical work today. And thanks to our staff who have had very little break as such, and this really is the first day, isn't it? Yes. You will notice they're all sitting here, that's because they're chained to the desk and Cheryl will be providing them with a key in a moment.

Thanks to all of you for having lasted the whole day. This really is great to see you all, and see you later in the week. And of course, thanks to the people who have been following us remotely. I have noticed there are quite a few actually, so I don't know how you were able to have a stay online, but it's really great to see you all, and see you later in the week.

And this meeting is now adjourned. Good-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]