

---

BUENOS AIRES – ALAC Policy Discussion - Part I  
Tuesday, November 19, 2013 – 10:00 to 12:00  
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

MATT ASHIANI: The time is 9:52 AM, November 19, 2013. In ten minutes' time, we will begin the ALAC Policy Discussion, Part I, at ICANN 48 in Buenos Aires.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Heidi. Heidi. The question was asked where is the ALAC Board cocktail this evening because no one knows. Okay.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, everybody. We're working on a slightly compressed timeframe right now, so rather than running really long as has sometimes been the case here, I'd rather try and start on time and quickly. So right now it is 10:06 Buenos Aires time. This is the At-Large Policy Development meeting. Are we recording yet? Do we have interpretation on?

Okay. First order of business is not in the agenda that everybody has, but we need – by the way, do we need quorum to get the consensus about the timetable? Okay, yesterday Olivier sent out an urgent call regarding the timetable for the Board member selection process. It had some changes to it, but we really needed to do it quickly so that we can get underway with the Board selection process. He asked if there were any dissension or any comment to send it in. I don't believe anything has been received to date. Does anybody have any questions or comments or objections based on the e-mail that Olivier sent

---

*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.*

---

yesterday? Okay, looking around the table, I see nothing. So staff, can we take that as a consent to this or do you need something more? Oh, Rinalia, go ahead.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Evan. This is about the timeline of the Board seat 15 selection?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That is correct.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes. I sent an e-mail in response to that call for consensus highlighting the need to make sure that the call for references go out early and the form and format to be fixed early as well.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Right. I remember that, but that wasn't necessarily an objection to the timeline, just making sure that adequate notice was given because in the month of December, of course, people are on the move and so we need to give lots of notice for that kind of thing. I think that's well taken. Is that a reasonable note to add to the comments? Okay, taken. Any other commentary to this? Okay, we'll consider this to be approved by consensus, and moving on.

The next order of business is hearing from some working groups. I will ask the presenters to please operate on something of a condensed timeline. We have a little change in plans. George Sadowsky from the

---

ICANN Board wants to address us at 11:45, and so we need to get these reports done a little faster than usual. So if you can, please keep things brief. The first presenter will be Carlton on the Expert Working Group. Carlton already presented yesterday a detailed thing, so I guess you're going to – go ahead. So Carlton has some slides.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

So while Matt helps me with queuing up the slides there – go back. So a couple of slides up. I will tell you what has been happening with the EWG. That first slide kind of encapsulates what has happened until now.

We had Initial Report published on 24 June, and in that report we reported two things of significance that came out of the deliberations. One, we thought the one-size-fits-all WHOIS paradigm needed to be abandoned for one that was more purpose driven, and in doing so we would have addressed the issues of privacy and accuracy and accountability in the design as well as implementation.

We've had several community consultations beginning in Beijing. The community consultations took place face-to-face. We had a wiki that was set up to receive input, and we had e-mail lists. And from that, we went into long, intense discussions, we had weekly calls, one additional face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, and we issued an update on 11 November. That update is quite long, but we have made some significant strides. Can I have the next slide, please, Matt?

This is just some of the pushback we got from the initial report 24 June. Constituents were concerned that there was going to be data latency. And the data latency issue came out of the fact that we thought that if

---

we were going to manage accuracy and transparency and privacy and all that, some kind of federated or centralized system needed to be put together, that that was the time.

And if you understand how the data flow is in the registration system where registrars get the data, they pass it up to registries, and we would have had a central system for publication of registrant data because that's how, if you think about it, if you now have 20-odd gTLDs and you're expanding to almost 2,000, then tracking every single one in different places is going to be a formidable exercise. So the idea was that you consolidated registrant data for registration data services purposes and then you would put all the safeguards and the controls in one place.

This was the situation that we had originally thought would have been responsive to the concerns. And the pushback was, "Well, you're going to have data latency problem because you're not actually getting rid of the chain, so the time it takes you to consolidate the data could be old."

The next one is obvious. They thought it's going to be big data – and I'm sure most of you understand what the implications are for big data – and it would mean that it would be a big target for attack and therefore you would have increased the risk for leakage and so on.

There is increased risk of insider abuse. The idea is if you consolidate all the data in one place from all of the gTLDs, then the insiders – the people who run the data service – would have access to all of that data, and therefore it has heightened the risk and, of course, the outcome from having that data to be exploited.

---

Some persons were concerned that the registries and registrars no longer control delivery of registration data. I guess you know where that one came from. But they were genuine concerns. So next slide, please, Matt.

So we looked at some things that we thought we should make some adjustments. We did not retreat from the idea that you would have some measure of public and some measure of gated data elements in the record. That is to say some elements would be publicly available anonymously, but other elements depending on purpose would be behind the screen, gated, and you would have to go through some kind of qualification regime to get access to those elements that are gated and for a purpose.

Validation of the data including reusable contacts. If you were here with the SSAC report, you would have known that we got into trouble with the SSAC because we proposed a validation regime that was kind of different from what they were proposing. We looked at it again and then we established that SSAC validation regime seems to be the one to adopt, and so we adopted that in full.

The issue of privacy and proxy services is still the vexed issue. We thought to make it more amenable to discussion we would change that and call it shielded services. As most of you know if you've been following the WHOIS conundrum over time, you know that the difference between a privacy and a proxy service depends on the origination of the data that is recorded. If I have a proxy registration, what happens is that I register for you and I am the one who is seen as

---

the registrant of record. That's different from the privacy where the prominent owner of the domain is not at all recorded anywhere.

And so we thought we would have to reform that, and there have been long discussions about how we go about that. We raised an issue of something called secured, protected credentials, and this was to address cases in which users genuinely needed to be protected because serious harm would come to them if the information about their ownership of the domain would be publicly available or even gated. And that is intended to make sure that nobody is left out and address real issues – human rights campaigners, political operators in some countries are likely constituents of that service.

We have a big problem with jurisdiction and applicable law issues, and I'm not the lawyer in the group but unfortunately maybe I'm the one leading the sub-team.

Let me kind of explain what the issue is. If you look at the way the law works in every country and national law, there are specific laws pertaining to privacy and consumer protection. And these are the two areas of law that we are most concerned with with registration data. And because the legal frameworks are not the same in every country, in looking at this you have to find a harmonized place where you can deal with the legal and jurisdictional issues.

And so the thinking was if you start with the most restrictive legal framework that is available today, then perhaps you could arrive at a solution where everything else fits into that someplace. That is the idea. And so we looked at the laws pertaining to data privacy and the laws pertaining to consumer protection. And with respect to the laws

---

pertaining to data privacy, clearly the European data protection regime is probably the most stringent. And the [inaudible] people argued with me, but I did a lot of research. I read a lot. German data protection, consumer protection law is probably the most stringent.

So if you look at the headings in each law and you look at what they are concerned about, you could then decide what the framework ought to be to harmonize with those legal regimes. And so we said, “What do we do then if we were to address this?” Since ICANN is not a treaty organization and since you have to come up with a framework that is universal, the way we could [treat] that is to determine what we call binding corporate rules.

And so the privacy expert on the panel, a Canadian lady named Stephanie Perrin, we worked. She led in this effort of developing a framework of what we call binding corporate rules. Essentially all it does is say, “Here are the main headers for data protection and consumer protection that you need to address. Here are some guidelines for you to develop these rules. And we have to develop these rules that are harmonized so it will harmonize the practice across the board.” And we produced something we proposed that not everybody in the group is comfortable with the details yet, so we are working through that still.

The other issue is how you access that data. You have to have an access protocol. And what you see there, EPP and RDAP, are the access protocol methodologies that we see. Because remember now, you want an access protocol that is not only capable of saying these are the data elements I seek, but you need to know whether or not based on the

---

purpose you should be accessing those data elements. So you have to have an access protocol that takes care of that.

And then we did a comparison to make it even more understandable what we were agreeing to and what we were trying to change, and we had an implementation model. So we had a centralized model, a distributed model, and we did the pros and cons around that. Final slide, thanks, Matt.

Next steps, quickly. So we have some gaps, and we thought we would take a hiatus and do some research. And those are the elements that we still think we need to research: ccTLD on commercial validation practices. We are looking to see what we can learn from that so that we can see how we can validate users and validate elements and so on. We need to do a risk/impact analysis of what we are proposing. If you're going to propose a new system, an important system of this that's going to impact stakeholders, you better have a sense of how it's going to impact current practice and where you want to go. So you have to do a risk impact analysis.

Proxy practices, we need a lot more information on that because we have to come up with a framework for shielded services that we think is useful. We need some more –9 cost analysis is big. We are proposing something that is changing, new. There's going to be a cost associated with it. We at least need to know where the stakeholder interests are with respect to costs and how those may be [remediated].

We're going to go into final deliberations around about March, just in time for the Singapore meeting. We expect to have a full report and a



---

final report delivered to the Board either at the Singapore meeting or just before the London meeting. So that's where we are. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, Carlton. Any comments or questions at this point? Okay, I see Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you. Garth Bruen, chair of NARALO. Carlton, I understand that within this plan there are going to be attempts to increase the validation and the verification of the data. Is this correct still?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, Garth. One of the things that we are very concerned about is actually specifying what the validation requirements are, what the verification requirements are for the data. Recall that we are getting the data from the existing channels, right? And we know the problems with the data quality from the existing channels. So before we get to publication of the data, we are going to insist – at least this recommendation is right now – that we must adopt very stringent validation and verification regimes for the data.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, thank you. So following up on that point, is there a plan in place to reprocess the existing data that may exist in varying formats?

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: That is, indeed, one of the issues that we are facing. Now whether or not we're going to recommend that the existing data be scrubbed before it gets to whatever system we're proposing here or whether there's going to be verification over time based on reports.

GARTH BRUEN: Just as a recommendation, because domain contracts are for a year and they have to be renewed, is that at the point of renewal they have to comply with the new format? That would just be my only suggestion.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, that is one of the elements that is in discussion. Some of us said, "Well, before you put it in the new system, we should do everything we need to ensure that the data is verified and qualified." And there was pushback from some that said, "Well, no. That would be too humongous an exercise. What you should do is to meet the requirement for valid verified data over time to take into account the cycle of renewals."

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I saw Holly and Sala in the queue, but we are really pressed for time so I'm going to ask you to direct your questions to Carlton on the ALAC mailing list. We really have to move on in the meeting unless there's something urgent right now. Is it urgent, Sala? Okay, Sala, and make it quick.

---

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you very much. Firstly for the record, and also this is directed to Carlton, ALAC, and also the leadership team, this thing has been reported by Verisign to be worth \$6.2 billion in 2012 – big data, that is – and \$48.3 billion in 2018. That’s a compound growth of 45%. Impact to global Internet users is massive. On that note, what I propose to Carlton is, you probably already have done this and it’s probably already going, but there needs to be some sort of mechanism to allow for input into the framework for discussions feeding back into the working group, Carlton, and that’s a polite suggestion.

The second thing is there’s a big data conference that’s happening in Indonesia, and the invitations will be out in February. I strongly suggest that the EWG be present at that meeting and happy to talk offline. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, thanks, Sala. In the interest of brevity and to make sure that we have room for speakers that are coming in – we don’t have authority over their schedule – we’ll move right on to Sandra on the issue of outreach. Thank you very much. Do we have the slides up?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I can start already. Thank you. Well, after three years of collaborative work within At-Large, ALAC, and the community, we made it. We had a first our pilot leadership training program. [applause] Thank you. Which was taking place under the umbrella of the ICANN Academy Working Group Project. We were very happy that we could combine our effort from the working group to give some sort of orientation training for

---

incoming and current leaders with the facilitation skills training, which was proposed and under the [inaudible] of ICANN staff. And overall the program was four days.

This is the list of participants. We had participants nearly from all stakeholder groups except the ASO and RSSAC, but all other groups were represented. There was a good mixture between incoming and current leaders, and all sessions were facilitated by experienced leaders so we did not assign any additional, so to say, trainers. We called them finally session facilitators, and it was truly an effort from the community to the community and should developed that way. It was very well received.

Now the question as I heard the feedback so far within ICANN and it was mentioned in the opening and welcoming speech by Fadi and Steve. I don't think the question is if we proceed with the project; the question is only how we proceed with the project. And there are various ideas on the table. We are still seeking for feedback from participants. We will have a feedback session tomorrow at 9:00. I don't know the room at the moment, but I can tell you later. And it's in the official program. You can read it there. So we will have the official feedback session from participants there, and we will then explore how to develop this project further. And I assume the next training program will probably take place in a year's time at the AGM in Los Angeles, I guess.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Room Atalya. Room Atalya.

---

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Tijani. So let me know if you have any questions here or on the corridor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks very much, Sandra, and thank you for keeping things brief. Does anyone have any questions or comments for Sandra? I think we're all agreed that this was a fairly phenomenal program that happened this week, and I really want to thank you and the team for doing it. And I really think this needs some applause.

[applause]

This has been a fantastic first step not only in what you actually accomplished in the content of the program but also in the way that the rest of the ICANN community was brought together. What started out as being thought of as just an ALAC only program turned into something that was community wide, and I think we really did a service to the rest of the community and I think it was recognized.

Okay, moving right along. Next up is Dev on outreach and also the Technology Taskforce. And if there's any chance you could do both of them by the time our next speaker comes in at about a quarter to, that would be great.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I'll do my best. Okay. Regarding the outreach subcommittee, the ALAC selected me as chair of the outreach subcommittee and a call went out for members to repopulate the working groups, and a lot of

---

RALOs answered the call and we have good diverse members from all the RALOs, which is great.

One of the things that we have been focusing on is the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program that has been organized by ICANN. So what this Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program (CROPP) it provides a framework in which each of the five RALOs will have available five regional outreach trips up to three days funded in fiscal 2014, which means this is June 2014. So similar to Heidi's budget, the RALO budget requests will be evaluated by the finance and budget subcommittee.

We have developed a CROPP Review Team. The CROPP Review Team will then review and approve the RALO travel requests to ensure that the objectives of the travel requests are in line with the ICANN strategic and regional engagement strategies. Confirm with development stakeholder engagement vice presidents that the proposed goals of the travel requests are consistent with ICANN's strategic and regional engagement strategies, and then submit the request to ICANN after approval by the CROPP Review Team.

So the CROPP Review Team is a joint working group. It's comprised of two members from each region, one member being from the outreach subcommittee itself and one from the ICANN finance and budget subcommittee. So therefore there are ten members in this working group. So this CROPP Review Team has been constituted, the wiki page is up, and I think the e-mail should be going out very soon before the end of this meeting announcing to the RALOs how they can submit their travel requests.

---

Now the thing is that one of the key things to note for this CROPP program and the travel requests, so given that the travel request requires a minimum of two weeks processing by the Review Team and plus six weeks by ICANN itself for constituency travel and so forth to organize the travel, it means that the RALO leaders in conjunction with the outreach subcommittee members from the region should submit their outreach travel requests eight weeks before any such travel to an event for outreach purposes.

Just also to clarify two things, the proposed trips must originate and conclude within the same region, and also it must include an alternate traveler in case the main traveler is unable to attend the meeting due to unforeseen circumstances.

Let's see. Now another key important thing is that the CROPP funding is limited to the transportation, lodging, and a per diem for three days/two nights per traveler. It does not cover meeting logistics like, say, a booth space or like visa fees or anything of that sort. So that's something that you need to consider.

And the travel request can't be used for travel to a regularly scheduled ICANN meeting. So in other words it can't be used as a fellowship type program. You have five travel allocations. So if you want to send more than one traveler to an outreach event, you can do so. So if you want to send two persons or even five persons to one event if you think that will achieve the purpose for going to this event, then you can do so.

Another thing also is that after the request is approved, you have to then post a trip assessment three weeks after the event to ensure that, well, the goals that were stated were met. So, yeah. Also the RALO

---

travel a requests, you have to really consider the purpose and goals of the travel request. And again, it has to be consistent with any regional engagement strategy and/or ICANN's overall mission and specify the proposed outcomes. And the proposed outcomes should be a clear deliverable that can be measured and documented.

I think that's a summary of the outreach. I can pause her for questions.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. Glenn, go ahead.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Dev, I know you went through what was a qualified expense and not, but many conferences require a registration fee. I know you're saying that booth space is not available. What about registration fees?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: The answer is no. The CROPP program itself does not cover any such meeting logistics. So registration fees for the conference, those types of things aren't covered by the program.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Evan. What I want to emphasize here is that the CROPP has to finish by 13 of June. That means that any program has to be finished before 13 of June. That means that we have seven months remaining,



---

seven months. When you know that you need two months for the procedure to get the project accepted, that means that you have only five months.

So I want to urge you all, all RALOs, I don't want that one RALO don't apply this year. There is money available. This is a pilot project. If we don't make use of it, it will not be done in the future. So we have to make use of it, and we have to make use of it in a proper manner. That's why we need to work now, start now. We have to start now. If we don't start now, we will not manage to do it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. Any other comments? Okay. Sorry, I have Fatimata and then Sala. Fatimata, go ahead.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA:

Thank you, Evan. Fatimata Seye Sylla, chair of AFRALO. This is just to put another emphasis on the fact that as RALOs maybe we should just start out identifying the events we might be attending just to go fast and start writing the projects. We really don't have time. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. I guess I would note and I guess [Wolf] would back me up on this that a couple of us have been coming up with ideas for these events for quite some years now. Sorry, Tijani, go ahead.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. It is not only attending events. It is an outreach operation, so you can imagine other things to do outreach. And you need the results. Part of the project is the report where you will define the result of your work.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, Sala, you are next, and then Wolf.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Dev, congratulations, first of all. And second of all, I just would like to assure you and the working group quite aside from the event that you are planning for that we have been aggressively doing outreach as well in our communities and happy to say that there's lots and lots of interest. It's just a matter of receiving them soon. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Next, I have Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Evan. I would like to support what Tijani said already. I think it would be a sort of wrong interpretation to define ATLAS II just as an event, just as a conference. I think as we have a rather good tradition already at EuroDIG. EuroDIG is not just another conference or event. It's a process. And the process starts at the end of the yearly event going one year to the next event, including the call for proposals, etc.

So we proved already with launching the survey and consulting our member organizations that we have taken the first step in the process

---

and on our way to ATLAS II. And there will be several intermediate steps in between until we reach finally summer next year in London the end of the process and the event. And we must assure not only by the survey. We must assure by any further planning steps that the process will stay inclusive. Inclusive is one of the key principles I think any planning for ATLAS II has to be designed and has to be implemented.

And I think these are, or should be, the key principles for the next steps. This should be a sort of mandate for all subgroups in the planning process, whether it's the program or event planning itself as it's a public relation, etc. I repeatedly discussed with Olivier over the last days.

We have more or less assured by a high quorum of participation in the survey that a vast majority of our members from all RALOs will be present in London, but I think we should think about any further mobilization ideas that people bring more inputs – not just what they mentioned in the survey but bring some more ideas, bring some more inputs on the way to London. And I think Evan made a reference before that we have already experienced [the summit one], etc. in Mexico.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

No. I was referring to the proposal we had made for the various outreach meetings to be able to go to places like [CVID] and so on.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Outreach is one other point which is also part of our duties on the way following the milestones to London, but I think we are in a particular situation now. The framework where ICANN is at the moment with the Montevideo declaration, with the summit in Brazil in spring

---

next year, the whole NSA debate, these are huge issues and challenges for our communities, for the end users, etc. and there is still a lot of work ahead to concentrate on these issues etc. and to really make the summit with our community a big thing and a big bang. Thanks.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. On that last comment, I guess Dev if you would like to continue on the issue of the Technology Taskforce. So we have also Dev who is going right in from one topic to the next, but the topic itself is very different. And so this is now a report on the Technology Taskforce.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Okay, thank you. Well, there are quite a lot of things, but I guess we are not going to have time to go through every single one. We've had about 12 meetings since the Durban meeting in July. One of the key things we have done is we have been focusing on comparing various Web conferencing solutions. And I will just post these links in the chat.

So we have evaluated several solutions, and on the wiki page we have broken down the evaluation of these Web conferencing solutions by various criterion. We've evaluated at least five to six Web conferencing solutions so far, and typically we will set up a separate meeting to evaluate that.

So we have been using Lucid Meetings, which is an alternative to Adobe Connect for conducting a meeting. And we have given ongoing feedback for the second version of Lucid Meetings that has been deployed for use [between] ICANN and we have given ongoing feedback on beta testing new features in Lucid, such as the Web voice over IP solution.

---

We've created and updated the At-Large calendar page to help our users to subscribe to the At-Large calendar. One of the key issues denoted in previous meetings was that persons complained, "I don't know where the At-Large meetings are or the working group calls. How do I subscribe to it?" So we created a wiki page for that and also provided information on how to use it, whether you're using Google Calendar, Outlook, Yahoo Calendar, and so forth, whether you're using various iOS devices, Android devices, and so forth.

Also, we've also completed a one-page about Adobe Connect, and what we've done was also try to identify the key issues that have repeatedly been asked by At-Large when they use Adobe Connect: "How do I connect my microphone to the Adobe Connect so I can speak using my computer headset?" So we've, in fact, we've done several animations on that wiki page.

Also, what we've done is the updating regarding the social media. We had a post on the ALAC-Announce mailing list posted to the wiki and then also posted to our Twitter and Facebook accounts. We've been discussing various concepts to have a curation editing working group to [really] update the social media posts to include content other than e-mails from the ALAC-Announce mailing list. The suggestions of contents include things like reports from working groups, the RALOs themselves contacted to submit a monthly report that could be sent out to all on the social media, and also audio/visual content from At-Large from the various face-to-face public meetings.

In line with that, we've also developed a central repository of video and pictures captured by At-Large members that can be used by such

---

working groups to be shared by At-Large. [Glenn] has been very prolific in capturing a lot of videos and pictures from the face-to-face meetings, and the need arose as to how can we share this effectively because of the size of files and so forth. So we're using a service called Copy.com to share the content. And Copy.com also allows links to it, so anybody could download a video or picture or whatever.

Work is ongoing to improve the templates for content posting on ALAC-Announce because often we have noted that, well, there's often lots of confusion based on the template that's used that sometimes the information could be clarified or enhanced in a better way. Election results, for example, is probably one example where there's a lot of user confusion on these issues whenever such results are posted. So work is ongoing to look at those templates.

Also, what we've been looking at is also for ideas for improving the organization of At-Large content. Right now, we are focusing on At-Large working groups, and we've kind of broken it down into two stages, so to speak.

Once we document the tools used to organize the content created by At-Large working groups and sort of like a high-level approach looking at the various tools – we used the wiki, we used Adobe Connect, we used Time and Date to convert that date and times, and so forth – and then the next step would then be to document in table form the issues noted regarding content of At-Large working groups and then come up with specific recommendations.

I think it's easy to say that, well, we want to improve the organization of content, but the devil's in the details. What's the exact issue that's

---

being talked about and what's the specific recommendation that could be done to alleviate the issue? And that work is ongoing.

Also, we've been looking at machine translation and comparing the website translation tools from Microsoft and Google for the At-Large website. We've got it down to a form where we can seek additional advice from multilingual speakers so that they can compare these sites side-by-side. And I think we can stop there and pause for questions.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. I'm going to actually delay the questions right now because of other timing. If you've got some questions regarding the Technology Taskforce, forward it to Dev or to the ALAC mailing list. If there's something that you want to bring up for the record, we can do this after the next speaker. And without further ado, I'd like to go right into introducing George Sadowsky, a long-time participant and member of the ICANN Board who has asked to speak to us. And without anything more, go ahead, George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Thanks, Evan, and thanks for having me. I just came from the NCUC to talk about OneNet and the importance of participation in it as a contribution to the upcoming conference and as a general contribution to understanding Internet governance and helping to rationalize and improve it. And then I heard that somebody said that – Olivier, is he here? – yeah, that you made the statement that the ALAC is not civil society. So that challenged me because I think you are, and I think what

---

I just talked to the NCUC about is relevant for this group also. So let me start by...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you. ALAC is not solely civil society. We do have other organizations. We're just multi-stakeholder, I guess, or partially multi-stakeholder.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay. So let me give a – this is a personal view. I don't represent ICANN or the board here. In 2003, 2005 at the at the WSIS, there was a clear delineation of stakeholders in the IG process. The civil society, the technical community, government, and business.

What has happened as a result of that is that the civil society mantle has really fallen upon or been taken by, advertently or inadvertently, a few groups of civil society advocates who have maintained a very intense set of conversations between then and now. And they have been relied upon to a fair extent by the IGF process by the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group and the administration of the MAG to provide members to the MAG to participate in program creation for the IGF and so on.

So the civil society flag has been carried by these groups. Some of them are representatives of civil society organizations. Some of them are people who just have an interest in the field, and some of them I must say who are just underemployed elsewhere.

I'd like to consider a different definition of civil society, and that is if you start with everybody on the planet, all seven billion of us, and then you



---

subtract out the governmental interests and you subtract out the business interests and maybe you subtract out the technical interests – I’m not sure about that, but let’s do it – then everybody else, all the rest of us, large pieces of each one of us are civil society.

And if you start with this definition of civil society and you look at the representation that civil society has had in Internet governance meetings, decisions, discussions, there’s a vast difference. What has happened I think – and this is a personal view – is that the civil society organizations that are most visible in the Internet governance debate are also those which are not particularly interested in dialoguing with the rest of us with other sectors.

And in fact, one of the reasons I think this is an urgent issue is that the Best Bits organization, which I think is really a very good organization, has a leader who has questioned on the list whether Best Bits people or whether Best Bits should participate in the OneNet initiative or whether they should open their own independent civil society channel right into the Brazilian government to state their views.

I think this is really regrettable. It’s against the notion of multi-stakeholder discussion of any kind of resolution of issues between stakeholder groups if you’re using that model. And therefore I think it’s a matter of great urgency that we look civil society as a very broad and inclusive set of people and interests and that we – as well as our people in our organizations that we belong to, our friends, our neighbors – that we all participate in this dialogue that’s coming up and we essentially work against the notion that civil society only talks to government and they don’t talk to the rest of us.

---

The One Net list is set up. It has some birthing pains. We're working on those, but I think it's important that the conversation be multi-sectorial and that we all contribute to it and we get the best variety of ideas, the greatest distribution of ideas into the conversation. To the extent we can enrich that conversation with good ideas, we can help make the result better. And so I would encourage you to take this initiative very seriously and not only participate but encourage others you know to participate so that we have a robust dialogue going both within the expanded view of the civil society sector as well as cross-sectorial. Let me stop there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. I have a queue building. First, I have Alan. Unfortunately, because of the nature of the conversation, I need to inject myself in here for a couple of reasons, and then I have Sala. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I have to leave 12 seconds ago, so I appreciate being allowed to speak first. I believe I was the original source of Olivier's statement saying we are not civil society, which was a shortened version. The original version was we do not fit the model of what civil society people in ICANN believe they are. So I think it maps exactly to what you just said. We may well be civil society but not in the context of other civil society advocates who espouse the name within ICANN. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

And, George, I would add to that I probably was one of the other voices also that added to that. My experiences were based on a couple of things, some of which predate ICANN. Glenn McKnight, who is also in the room, and I were in Geneva, were at WSIS. We had a delegation of 35 people promoting open source.

We were pretty well shunned by the civil society group, actually ended up writing a piece for Harvard called “Upstairs, Downstairs” on what we were hoping to do and what we actually did do. We spent all our time in, I think it was called ICT4D, that sort of development trade show that went on at the other side of the floor.

And also putting on my hat as the ALAC liaison to NCSG, I can tell you about the extreme difficulty we have finding areas of mutual agreement. So we have two supposedly civil society groups within the ICANN sphere that find very little commonality in the things that matter to us. And even when we find things that matter to us, we have a hard time coming to agreement. And I’m just saying – so on one hand I’m really happy to hear that the intention is to be inclusive. I’m just saying, at least personally, I’ve seen experiences where the inclusivity is sometimes lip service, and I hope in this instance it’s more than that.

I have Sala, and then I have Tijani.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO:

I’ll first say that I’m not speaking as ALAC now, but I’m speaking as one of the leaders in Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus. I will also say that our membership spreads across the vast constituencies within these corridors of Sheraton, including the Board, NPOC, NCUC,

---

At-Large. When I first took up the mantle to join ALAC, I met extreme resistance from not only within my constituency the civil society group that I represent or that I help coordinate but also from some of the – I shouldn't say some – a part of the leadership here in ALAC, particularly because of this coalition.

And explicitly with what you were saying, Evan, what was expressly told to me when I first joined the ALAC was that ALAC is not civil society. However, having said that, I will say that the At-Large community has been participating in past and previous IGFs in various hats and capacities.

If anything needs to happen now – and I understand where you're coming from, George – it's that we need to build bridges. I for one can say – and this time I'm not speaking as one of the two coordinators of Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus – we've been working at bridging gaps with other civil society groups to come to the INET table, to come and have that dialogue. So that is happening outside of the mailing list that you're usually privy to.

In relation to an open dialogue and in relation to protection of global public interests, I will for the record state that frankly we were not pleased with how the procedures and content for the Brazil summit was hijacked and that we were not part of the discussions. When I say the policy content was hijacked, it was that it was not put to us that public policy would not be discussed in Brazil. So we're in the process of liaising with other civil society organizations, aggregators to form a coalition to field our civil society representatives to Brazil and to the

---

INET, and so this is stealing process and so I'd like to say that for the record.

And now I'm going to put my ALAC hat back on and say this. When Rinalia facilitated the session on IDNs at the IGF, she literally hoisted the At-Large flag. She showed that civil society is very much involved in technical policy processes, is very much on the ball with global public interests and touching the heart of something that's very core to humanity which is access. And politics aside, what groups need to know regardless of the polarizations is this. We need to find the common denominator, and it's not politics. It's not politics. It's how do we preserve and protect global public interests?

And I would recommend to ALAC leadership and ALAC ExCom and also the At-Large community, particularly RALO leadership, that at the end of the day there's a time to make our voice heard in the preservation and protection of global public interests. It's now, and not just within the corridors of Sheraton. Thank you, George and Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, thank you. In the queue I have Tijani, and then I have Holly. And after that – sorry? Oh, and Rinalia. And then after that, I'll close it and George will give you the last word on that. Okay, so Tijani, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. Thank you, Evan. Thank you, George, for coming and for addressing this subject. The civil society started to work with the other stakeholders for the first time in the summit. Before they were in the road demonstrating, having a confrontation with police while the

---

governments were meeting in their closed room, etc. So the first experience of a multi-stakeholder meeting was the summit. And in the summit, the civil society included the technical community. There were four components, four stakeholders: governments, private sector, civil society, and international organizations. And I was on the Civil Society Bureau representing the family of science and technology, so the technology was included in the civil society.

Now, are we civil society? We are mostly civil society. That's right. We are not only civil society, but we are mostly civil society. And I want to emphasize the fact that if we are majority civil society, we have to consider you are right, George, to come here to speak to civil society because we are mostly civil society.

We are in a crucial phase, and civil society has to have an important role to play. And we as At-Large have a bigger role perhaps because we have a good representation in the regions. So thank you for coming, and thank you to make this outreach more or less for this subject. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, thank you. Next in the queue I have Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just a question, George. What is your practical response or actions that need to be taken? I mean, there's always going to be a debate what is or is not civil society. I think ALAC is a little bit broader than that, but then your definition of civil society it's all of us so I think we're pretty inclusive. But what is it? Are there things that have to happen to

---

actually – is the term so critical that we need to change it, or can we live with the different definitions of it?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Next is Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Chair. The differences among groups civil society have existed since time immemorial. It will not be resolved in the near future. But the key question that we must ask is, do we care about the issues that are coming up in Brazil? And I think the answer is that we do care, and because we care we do need to engage.

Therefore, I think that we will accept the invitation to engage in OneNet because OneNet is open, and it allows for participation. But also the At-Large community has been asked to help mobilize a groundswell of a social movement at the national level leading into Brazil. So I think that we may participate and catalyze in multiple channels, and I think that is basically aligned with what you want, George. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. And as I promised, George, you get the last word.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay, thanks. Well, Holly, that's an interesting question. Do we need another term, more vocabulary? I don't think so. I think that what's happened is we need to redefine the term civil society. I'm thinking of "take back Wall Street." I think we need to take back civil society as a

---

term because the people who speak for it now – I think there are some people in this room who speak for it. Sala is the coordinator of one of the lists.

The motivations are good. The substance can be very good. I can agree with a lot of what I read. I can disagree with a lot of what I read too. The problem is what appears to be the attempt to, consciously or unconsciously, monopolize one's position in the field. And what I suggest is that when you speak you say – well, you have to paraphrase this – “I'm as much civil society as you are, and here's what I believe. And I represent civil society, you represent civil society” and so on and so forth.

To say that the range of opinions that come from civil society are quite diverse, but the number of people who have them are quite large and are entitled to as much consideration of those opinions as are the people who are the self-identified representatives of civil society. How's that? Again, I want to stress these are my own opinions, and they're clearly subject to debate.

Tijani raised an interesting point. I've never really understood why there is a distrust of the technical community by some aspects of civil society. And I think that the fact that they were merged initially was a good thing. It was the right initial identification. The problem is that the technical community has issues that are totally divorced from civil society, and that is to make the Internet run and run well and to make sure that the ways in which it is expanded are ways which will allow it to flourish and not to be limited either by technology or by government or other sectorial interference.



---

For example, so when Rinalia runs her workshop on IDNs, she is being a member of the technical community. This has nothing to do with rights. It has to do with will the Internet break or will it run well if we adopt a certain policy with respect to how IDNs are allowed in the root and the second level and so on. At the same time, when Rinalia leaves that room and puts the technical considerations behind, she's as much civil society as anyone else. There is no inherent conflict between being technical and being concerned about individual rights in various dimensions.

And yet, the problem is that on the Best Bits list there was an issue they raised about, "Should we let the technical community be the mediator of our goals, or our concerns?" I just don't understand it. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I can tell you where does it come from, this [section] between technical community and civil society. When they formed the first MAG, they distributed the seats according to the [inaudible], and they created this technical community because they think that they need absolutely people from technical community in the MAG. That's why now the technical community is a site.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

I was there. With respect to – let's see, Sala raised an interesting. Well, let me branch off from what Sala said. It seems to me that Rinalia is right. The civil society has so many differing points of view, there will not be agreement. Getting basic agreement on things at the very top level it's really easy. We all believe in freedom of expression. Once you get down into the details, the differences start to emerge.

---

And what seems to happen in the civil society lists – and I will take the IGC list as a specific example – is that the differences become more important than the goals, and so you get a bifurcation, a polarization of the opinions of the people on the list and then something kicks in. In economics there's something called Gresham's Law, which is if you have two kinds of currency in circulation, the bad money drives out the good.

And I think what happens here in these lists is that often the differences become so dominant that you get arguments, and most people aren't interested in those arguments. They're interested in furthering the goals, and so the list goes downhill. And I think that quite frankly, personal opinion, that's exactly what happened to the IGC list and it doesn't have nearly as much value as it had, say, five or six years ago.

So I think the lesson there is not to let the differences dominate. Recognize them, understand them, explore them, but don't let them dominate and subtract from the ultimate goals to the extent that there can be agreement on those goals.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

George, one last thing. Do you have any specific takeaways for us in ALAC to further what you just said? I don't think there's a lot of disagreement, but in terms of is there something we can specifically do here to go along with what you're saying?

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Well, on an individual basis I'd say – and this is going back to Holly – be vocal. Be vocal. Be visible. Claim that you are representing civil society and goals, as you are. On an organizational basis, I don't know. I don't

---

know enough exactly about the parameters under which you operate, but I would say that if you want to make statements that say, “Well, we are concerned about the following issues. We believe that we should be in this discourse,” I don't know. I'm not sure I can give you good advice on that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. And on that note, George, thank you for coming. It's a worthwhile important issue, and I'm glad you brought it. And so thank you for coming.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Next up on our docket is a presentation. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, hardly a presentation, but it is Cheryl.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. You have the floor for whatever it is you would like to talk about.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, now I am on the record. I will behave. Thank you very much for the opportunity to come and brief the At-Large Advisory Committee, the regional leads, and of course all of the members of the various ALSes, the At-Large Structures, or simply people in the other parts of

---

the ICANN community who have interest in knowing what other people do.

And that's what constituency day, I guess, tends to put us into sort of silos because it's seen as an opportunity for us to work within our groups, but I'm noticing with great joy some faces that are around this room that are clearly not the inner circle of the 15-person ALAC, otherwise the room would be a lot smaller and the 20-person regional lead and ALAC.

So welcome one and all, and I hope to actually have a fairly interactive, albeit short, time talking to you about the At-Large Advisory Committee Metrics. Okay? Just so we all know what we're talking about. Have I got the correct topic at the correct time? That's always good. If Heidi tells me no, I stop and I change to another topic, but I don't have to by the look of it.

Why I'm pleased to see more than the 15-person ALAC at this table is that the 15-person ALAC has already accepted and endorsed what is their new rules of procedure. And in their new rules of procedure, there are clearly outlined expectations for them, and there are some measures – we will call them metrics from now on – that can be looked at as performance indicators for them. In fact, I should be saying for you. "Them" is a bit of an at distance term.

So the ALAC is going to be doing a professional job and hopefully meeting its community's expectations. What the Metrics Working Group is doing is trying to create some mechanisms that the community, the At-Large Structures, the RALOs or simply people who have an interest in this. Because remember the ALAC has a mandate to

---

work in the best interests of the small case at large, that's the Internet using public, and of course registrants, but it's a lot more than just people who are members of our structures.

So anyone should be interested to know whether or not the people who have been put in as thought leaders and as, in some cases, actual representatives and in other cases people to bring in more independent voices that they are doing what they've been given their role to do.

So therefore we need a way to let you know whether or not they're doing what we consider the bare minimum and the basics or, indeed as was brought up in our meetings recently, whether they're doing such a superb job they're going above and beyond the call of duty. They are doing not only attendance at meetings and contribution in those meetings and turning up to the face-to-face meetings that happen around the world, but they are also in not just one work group but they may be in a leadership role, acting as liaisons, doing a lot of other work on your behalf.

I've got around the room two of our three leads. And with two of our three leads from the working group, I'm going to be so bold as to speak briefly of Maureen Hilyard, and then I'm going to ask Tijani very briefly to outline what you're doing. And most importantly, and I want to give you the lion's share of the time, Dev is running the bit that is going to be the interface between what we think you want to see, and you need to tell us/him is that what you want to see and how you want to see it.

And we also might look at a bit of crowdsourcing because that's kind of what we've got to do these days. And you might have some ideas. You might have some concepts that giving particularly Dev's sub-team,

---

which is all about the how we show it, what tools do we use part of the equation, one of you might quickly – we might have app for that by the end of the day, and that would be nice too, wouldn't it, Dev?

So let me speak on behalf of Maureen just briefly. Maureen's role, and she's luckily as a result of this meeting and meetings we've had – sorry, not this physical meeting now; this ICANN meeting and meetings we've held before this physical meeting now – is managing to get additional representation from each of the Regional At-Large Organizations to help her. But what Maureen is doing is acting as an interface keeping the At-Large Structures and the regions up-to-date with what we're doing as a work group and collecting good ideas and pieces of information back from the At-Large Structures and the regional organizations into us.

And if you wouldn't mind having a look at the links that are on your agenda, they will take you to our most recent meeting page. In our most recent meeting page is a synopsis and report from Maureen, and I would encourage you all to read it. I'd also encourage you to contact her via staff – that's easy to do: [staff@atlarge.icann.org](mailto:staff@atlarge.icann.org) – and ask them to pass it on to Maureen if you have a good idea or a suggestion.

So now, Tijani, if I can give you just a couple of moments just to bring everyone up-to-speed on how we've cut up these “thou shalt be at meetings and thou shalt do some sort of performance” into some measurables and also some consequences that we've got as a – we won't call it a straw man. I think it's past being a straw man. It's a proposal. Over to you, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Cheryl. This work has begun before for the ALSes, but now we are talking about the ALAC, so it is now adapted to the ALAC. We need to know how we speak about the performance. What does it mean, performance? We have to find what are the elements that can give us the opportunity to measure the performance.

And we thought about grouping them and detailing them. They are detailed now. The attendance of the meetings, of the calls, the participation, the contribution during those meetings and calls but also the contribution on the mailing list, the contribution in their working groups, etc. This is the second element. And the third element is voting. Voting can be for election, but also it is also for adoption of statements, etc.

So those are the three main elements of the participation that we considered in our proposal. Now since we defined those elements, we tried to find a way to give measurement for them. And that's how we said when we speak, for example, for attendance how many call per how many months the member have to attend and participate in to be considered as active? This is one kind of measurement. So we set a number of such measurements without putting the values because the values have to be defined together. It's work that everyone has to participate in.

And Maureen, as she said, will be the interface. She will collect your point of view. And you, please, please, please, since you are here, go in touch with her and tell her what is your feeling. It is very important because we tried this exercise before and we found very divergent point of view. And we don't want to propose metrics – yes, this is the

---

problem. So we have put letters, and you are asked to propose figures so that we can continue and finalize those metrics.

At the end when we have defined all of this we try to put some, how to say, remediation measurements that are under rule of procedure. We didn't [invent] them. So according to the parameters that you will define, we can continue and finalize the remediation. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Tijani. And one of the things I'd really like to give credit to AFRALO and the leadership of AFRALO at this table is to say that you were the first group to address this issue at the At-Large Structure end, and it was your work that made the proceeding as effective as I believe this proposal is.

This is very short order for the development of this type of proposed set of guidelines, and I would like everyone around the table to recognize that this has come out of AFRALO. And we thank you deeply for doing a good amount of work ahead of us, so bravo. [applause]

Hopefully, I've filibustered just long enough for Dev to get his act together because I gave him virtually no time in my last meeting and that was very unfair but everyone else had so much to say. So the rest of the time is up to you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH:

Thank you, Cheryl. So trying to have measurements for all of these metrics and so forth can be a time consuming affair, and I think one of the challenges is to try to come up and to present it as simple as



---

possible whether a person is, well, doing the work that is required of him as a member or not. And I think, first, tracking the metrics and then presenting an effective summary of those metrics is the challenge I'm trying to work on.

So in terms of things like the meeting attendance, which is probably one of the key statistics that can be measured, attendance is typically kept for all of the various ALAC conference calls and working groups. And we've looked at the ways of how this could be automated in a way that we can just go and automate that to summarize it on a page.

So there has been some progress on that in that we can pull the information into a spreadsheet and then the spreadsheet can do the calculations and then be uploaded back to the wiki so that, well, we can tabulate the number of meetings that persons in the working group have attended or how much they have not attended and so forth.

In terms of things like face-to-face meetings at the ICANN public meetings where there are ALAC members attending and so forth, one of the things that we're looking at is looking at a mobile application that staff could use to better quickly write down the attendance record at a meeting rather than pen and paper, which works. I mean, hey, when technology fails, it works. But it is tedious, and then there's a period where you have to then take all that information and input that into the computer in order to do the summaries and so forth. So we looked at a mobile app. We're going to try to beta test that and see how well that works. It's an application called Attendance2, and it's an iOS application.

In terms of things like the criterion such as things like words spoken during a teleconference, what we could be looking at is because now

---

there are transcripts from the various working groups and conference calls and so forth, whether some sort of statistical analysis can be performed and then attributed to, well, the number of words.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Too much is what you're saying?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Well, or whether persons don't say.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Watch it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, you're supposed to say no.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I didn't finish. Okay. And that's not the case. But the idea is to come up with some sort of statistical analysis to see, well, if a person is present, but may not be contributing anything. So perhaps something can be done in that regard.

Obviously, the challenge is, of course, in terms of things like quality of contributions. That's something I don't think that couldn't be effectively measured automatically, and I think those type of subjective criteria would then have to be some sort of analysis that will have to be done on top of the statistics.

---

The statistics can, however, I think show a gap. When I say a gap, I should say where there's an absence of attendance, an absence in contributions and so forth and that could be a flag to say, "Hey, something is wrong here." And so that corrective action can be taken, the person contacted to find out what's wrong and so forth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As per the rules specified.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: As per the rules specified. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Dev. We're going to wrap up in a moment, but I just wanted to pose some questions to the audience seeing as I doubt I'll get questions from the audience. Last time we went down this murky and exciting pathway, we had produced – and it still exists – a mechanism that had our names for the ALAC members.

The columns then had the expected places and numbers of times one had to be there. So if it had been 7 out of the possible 12 meetings, it said 7, right? And of course, the actual face-to-face meetings. And one was either present or absent at these things. There was no valuing. You were just physically there if not mentally, hopefully, there as well.

Now what happened then is a macro was entered and a color coding kind of happened. And so you had people that were green and people that were yellow and, sadly, one or two people who occasionally went red. Now that was, I think, quite reasonable that the community who

---

votes or selects you to be here have that type of feedback. But it was felt that that was insulting and of damage to reputation and that there should be some flexibility and, and, and...

So what we need from you is to clearly, clearly articulate to your working group – because it's your working group – how you want this information shown. We could link next to people's names a hyperlink to a page that has a repository of everything they do, everywhere they go, everything indeed statistically analyzed they say. But I would suggest not one of you would use it. It would be information overload.

So you need to tell us how you want this information shared with you and how much of this information you want in what sort of layers because it may very well be that all you want is a how many times people have been present, absent, or excused. If that's the case, let us know.

If you want a full scale analysis of how many times and how long the sentences are because we can do it on the transcripts, remember ladies and gentlemen, everything you say in the wonderful world of ALAC – which is a goldfish bowl, it is a sphere of glass and you operate within it – unless it is in camera, unless it is taken off the record, and then when you come back on the record, you still have a record of why you went off the record and what happened as a result for that period of time. Everything is recorded, is transcribed, and frequently into at least three languages. So we can do the steps if that's what you want, but you need to tell us what you want and what will be useful.

I want to close with a plea, and the plea is I have and I appreciate, love, admire, and respect a great little working team, little working group. We

---

need more people to input. Not necessarily more people to join, but more people to input. If you have a thought, let them know. If you want to contribute at a deeper level, feel free to join us.

But don't come at the end of the process, which is what Tijani was saying, when we are putting out something which then may have consequences because once we set benchmarks at a certain level then the next thing I as an individual member of an At-Large Structure is going to say is, "Well, I want my regional leadership team to be doing this as well." Next thing I'm going to say, "And I want the executive committee of my At-Large Structure to be doing it."

So we've got to be careful what we wish for here. So we need to get it right, but please work with us before it becomes a penultimate draft, alright? If you can do that, we'll all be happy and you'll know far more about what hard work is done, how the majority of the people you put your trust in leadership in really represent your interests and those of the Internet end user and registrant very well.

But what I'd like to think will also happen, and this I need to hear from you as well, is you'll also find out those who work exceptionally hard and do extraordinarily large amounts of work because we should also have little gold stars next to those that do amazing things. Tijani, the world's shortest answer before I close.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Cheryl. I think also that the group needs more air, new air, so please join us. Please, join us. If you feel that your RALO is not well represented, please, send other people. We need them. This will avoid

---

conflict at the end. If we have every RALO represented, we will do something that reflects the point of view of all RALOs. If you are not well represented, please, change your representative or add other representatives. Add.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Because we don't have the metrics and measures done, I think we have to add. We can't just change them just yet. Thank you very much, Evan. I appreciate the time on behalf of our working group.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Thanks a lot, Cheryl. Before she goes, are there any last comments or questions? Okay. Thanks very much.

Following my own advice, the last presentation on the agenda is actually left to me and it has to do with the issue of gTLD metrics. I will keep this extremely brief. Yes, I'm capable of that, Holly, on a good day. Matt, could you put the slide up?

Essentially, what this group is, it's an implementation based outgrowth of the GNSO working group on consumer metrics. And so this was a very long process that had a lot of activity in it. It was the GNSO working group that started to define a set of metrics, measurements that had to be taken during and after the gTLD expansion launch to determine whether or not this was indeed serving the public interest or by whatever means to be considered a success or not.

There was some controversy during this in the sense that some of the metrics that At-Large wanted to put into that effort did not get in.

---

Subsequently, At-Large had its own effort, contributed its own metrics. As a result, the Board created a resolution that directed staff to implement both the sets of GNSO metrics and ALAC metrics, which was a bit of an achievement for us.

We're now at the implementation phase, and so another working group has been created to oversee the implementation of the metrics. It's an extremely broad-based group. There are a lot of names on the group that are not necessarily familiar faces. Matt, if you could click on the link that says "Team Composition and SOIs" about midway on the page there. There's a link midway on that. Yes. Right.

There are a lot of names on that list and not a lot of them are familiar to me. They represent a very diverse group of people. In the first conference call we had, I was pleasantly surprised to find a lot of people that were end users that basically say, "I operate a small business, and this impacts me" or "I use the Internet, and this impacts me." And it's a very, very diverse group of people. They're required to put in statements of interest so we get to see how many of them have vested interests in this and not.

I myself am coming into this cautiously. When it was first created, it looked like it might be an attempt to claw back some of the gains that At-Large had made in adding new metrics to the process. With myself and a number of other At-Large advocates on here, I'm fairly confident that that's not going to happen on a widespread basis. I believe this is a very good faith attempt to make sure that the metrics are carried out as expected.

---

Like I say, a wide range of things to measure whether or not the registries and the new TLDs that come out, whether there are complaints against them, and in fact to try and measure whether or not the use of the DNS increases or decreases as a result of the TLD expansion.

That is, when people have a choice, do they choose between, say, dot-com and one of the new TLDs, or do they simply switch from using a memorable domain name to using things like search engines or QR codes or other ways to get at information that don't even use memorable domain names. At one point I said they don't use the DNS. They'll all use domain names, but some of them could just be machine readable ones that come as a result of being pointed by a URL shortener or a QR code or a search engine.

So in terms of trying to determine whether or not the gTLD expansion serves the public interest, it's necessary to have a wide range of measurements. Not only is there a greater choice between TLDs, well, if we're going from 32 to many hundreds, the answer to that one is obvious. But whether or not that expansion is actually benefiting end users or whether it's causing them to turn from domain names to search engines or whether it's causing greater confusion, that's the kind of thing that's of interest to At-Large.

And I believe the representation on this group is going to try and maintain that as they roll this thing out and try and determine what ICANN can actually implement from the shopping list the metrics provided, that they'll pick ones that will actually serve our needs as well as the industry's. That's all I had to say about this.



---

Okay. I have Eduardo and then Holly. Okay, Eduardo, go ahead.

[EDUARDO DIAZ]:

Thank you, Evan. I have a question. Once we start collecting all these metrics to see if this works or not, is there going to be a consequence on the result of these metrics? Is that planned?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

What gets done with these metrics? At one level, I don't even think they've thought that through. At the other end, there are people that are going to use this to evaluate whether or not the program was a success. It's going to drive, I believe, what happens with future rounds. And certainly external organizations will be able to use this to evaluate whether or not the program, in fact, served the public interest.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may, directly to that point, the purpose is specific. It is to enable the work of the Consumer Choice, Confidence, and Trust Review Team that is an AoC mandated activity just like the WHOIS has been, Stability, Security, and Resilience has been, and of course the ATRT has been. So that's the primary purpose, right? Because even the definitions of these things weren't clear.

It's up to that Review Team when it is formed, and that is formed and starts operating. Let me quote section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments because I do actually have it all committed to memory. The part of it that I want you to know is it says, "When and if new gTLDs

---

have been in operation for 12 months,” then this new Review Team has a job to do. That last part, it’s me taking shorthand.

That said, we have our New gTLDs in the root now. That doesn’t mean they’re in operation, alright? So don’t think it’s in 12 months’ time from this month. The Affirmation of Commitments does say once they’ve been in operation, not just inserted into the root.

But it was recognized in the work that Evan referred to earlier and the team that he was a part of that if you’re going to gather all these statistics and measurables and you’re going to get all this information, surely it has greater use than just for this Review Team. The primary purpose is the Review Team, and a whole lot of hopefully very useful secondary purposes need to be identified.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay, Eduardo, does that answer? Okay. Next in the queue is Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just to sort of go back to what the metrics used to be and wondering and hoping they’re still captured and, first of all, making the point I hope the metrics are going to be in place so that when we review in 12 months we’ll have some baseline data as well as some 12-month-old data. I think that was a problem that we were concerned with. Like if we don’t put the metrics in place now and do the measurements now, comparison is going to be very difficult.

But two points. One actually relates to the [picks] today, and that is are we going to have some kind of measurement or even if we’re getting

---

complaints which aren't going to be judged as complaints but they're going to be judged as something like "I am confused because I think that dot-green should mean something. I don't think as an end user I don't understand how that's being used." So the sorts of complaints that don't actually necessitate harm but indicate things aren't complied with. I'm trusting we're going to capture that stuff somewhere.

And the other thing is, are we going to have a metric about defensive registrations because that was another way of saying have they added to or simply added cost to.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I don't know if I can give you a complete answer to those. Certainly, my own personal intention through my involvement with this was exactly for that kind of reason. And you're right. Part of what we had to do was make sure that there was a sufficiently complete set of metrics done at the beginning because this is all going to be a whittling down process.

You had the original working group that created a set of metrics. Then you had ALAC that created a set of metrics. Now you have the group that is constituted right now. That's now going to be taking these metrics, determining which of those cost too much, which can be implemented in a speedy way or whatever.

Well, now it's the implementation phase. So the GNSO and ALAC have said these are the things that by policy we think we need to measure. Now this implementation group is going to say which ones can we actually do? Now staff is going to come back. Which ones are going to

---

be too difficult? In fact, some of the metrics involve surveys of the end user population. Is this confusing? Is it too difficult to use?

In terms of how do you measure the proportion of registrations that are defensive, that's going to be very difficult to do unless you actually go to the registrant community and ask them, "How many of your domains have been purchased defensively?" Some of that has been put forward in the metrics.

It's totally possible that ICANN may come back and say some of these are simply going to be too expensive if they involve a worldwide survey of registrants of whether or not this was a benefit to them. What we have right now is a list of metrics that have been put forward by GNSO and by ALAC. Now we have to go through the process of what's actually doable.

Yes, there's a genuine fear that some of the more necessary metrics may get culled as a result of being considered too difficult, too costly or whatever, and they may in fact by our measure be the most important ones. That's yet to be seen.

The first meeting of this group – there's a meeting of the group being held tomorrow at 4:00 here at the conference. It hasn't even picked a chair yet, so it's very, very new in its operation. It has only had one meeting. I imagine that it will be picking a chair tomorrow, but that's how new things are. So there's not very much to report on the actual meat of what's being done there.

So that's where things are. It's at the very early stage, but it's late in the process because all of the metrics have already been created. I don't

---

think this group is capable of adding new metrics that haven't already been defined. It's just culling the ones that have already been put forward. So all I can hope right now and my purpose in the group is to make sure that as they end up whittling down to the ones that are doable, that the ones that remain include the ones that are important to At-Large.

Okay, next in the queue is Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Sorry, I'm going to withdraw my comment. Too much of a tangent.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, I have Rinalia next.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Evan. I was just curious whether you think the process can be politicized in such a way where the At-Large metrics will actually be eliminated.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That's a loaded question. And my views, I guess, have been fairly well known in that I've had difficulties with the working group from the beginning and that's what led to ALAC in fact creating a set of additional metrics. It was very good news that the Board accepted both our report and the GNSO report and said all these metrics need to be considered.

Do I have a fear that what we worked so hard to get at at the working group and policy process is now going to be chipped away now that it's

---

implementation? Absolutely. Is this a concern of mine? Absolutely. What gives me optimism in the group is having gone through the first conference call and heard the voices of a number of people on the group who I had never heard from before some of whom are genuinely angry, some of whom are genuinely confused and saying, "I'm a small business owner. This is impacting me, and I need to get some metrics that are going to help me."

The voices I've heard in this group so far have given me optimism that this is not going to get bulldozed for political purposes. Does that mean it won't still happen? I don't know, but that's one of the reasons I'm there to at least give my best shot. And if this group turns out and politicizes the implementation in a way that causes the hard-earned At-Large metrics to be dropped, you'll hear from me very quickly.

Is there anybody else with comments? Garth, are you sure?

GARTH BRUEN:

I just wanted to add to your list of other ways to get to Internet information. You talked about codes and search engines. We have a growing specter of alternative DNS that needs to be added to the discussion.

It used to be extremely obscure and difficult and extremely geeky to get to. That is no longer the case. There are five-second browsers that can be installed and apps that can be downloaded that completely avoid anything that ICANN has any control over. And the consumer, the end user, is not even going to be aware of the fact that they're using an alternative DNS system.

---

And this has the potential to impact new gTLDs in lots of different ways. It could potentially make them irrelevant. It definitely is going to cause confusion because within these alternate DNS systems there are many, many collisions with new gTLDs. And I have never seen a panel discussion at ICANN meetings about alternate DNS, and it's something that needs to be discussed.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks, Garth. You're absolutely right. In fact, I believe some of the original metrics that the ALAC put in had to do with assorted alternative methods. Essentially from an end user perspective of dealing with, how does somebody who wants information find the people that are providing that information? And the path you take to get there could be memorable domain names, could be an alternate DNS, could be QR codes, could be a URL shortener, could be a Facebook landing page that takes you somewhere. So there are all sorts of different ways.

And so the challenge with the metrics was to see, in terms of consumer confidence, if the TLD expansion reduces consumer confidence in the DNS, there are alternative ways for somebody to get to the information they want. That kind of data is something I think ICANN needs to have even if the results aren't positive. If they are positive, we can be sure ICANN will want to use them and champion them. But if they're not positive, the world needs to know that too and certainly our community does. Sala, go ahead.

---

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Just very quickly, ICANN has a strategy panel on unique identifiers, and there are some really, really neat people on it like Goeff Huston and whatnot who have written extensively on the issue too. So it's going to be really interesting to see what they come up with. So what I suggest is for those who are interested in dotless domains, they can monitor that page.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I thought the dotless domains issue was dead.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I'm sorry. My apologies. Not dotless domains. On unique identifiers. I'm a bit incoherent at the moment.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's getting on lunch. I think you're not the only one who is getting a little lagged from this. Okay. So any other questions or comments? If not, okay, we have the luxury of ending five minutes early. So thank you all, and we will see you all.

The next meeting here is the ATRT-2, and that happens – okay, the next ALAC meeting is at 14:30, which is two and a half hours from now. But there is also the, okay, sorry. We have the 15 ALAC members who are meeting with the ccNSO in Retiro A. The next official meeting of the entire At-Large community is at 2:30, and a LACRALO meeting starts in this same room in 30 minutes. Okay, see you all then.



---

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]