STEVE CROCKER: Good afternoon, everybody. This is the time in which the board gets to meet with ALAC, and it's one in a series of our constituency day -- this is an extended constituency day.

Probably not many of you are able to remember the international geophysical year, which lasted 18 months and led to many jokes about how long a year was, so this is the international geophysical constituency day.

We're here to -- mainly to listen and to engage in the topics of your interest. As I've said many, many times, we like to use this time for substantive and direct interaction, dispense with formalities, and be civil but not -- but not just pro forma.

So let's just get right into it.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So Alan, which question or issue would you like to address first?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll say let's do the easy one first, and we probably couldn't have said that a while ago.

Let's do accountability.

[Laughter]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yay!

[Applause]

ALAN GREENBERG: When we were asked --

STEVE CROCKER: Next?

ALAN GREENBERG: When we were asked to set this agenda, we really didn't know where we would be. I think we've already made our statement. I don't think there's anything further to discuss on it.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. So what is the next topic that you would like to address?

ALAN GREENBERG: I have to stretch this out. We have to use the whole hour.

The next one is the issue of the highly regulated new gTLDs that were identified by the GAC in Beijing. There's a set of -- a large set that were classed as Category 1, Safeguard 1 to 8, TLDs.

The board implemented, I believe, either five or six of the safeguards pretty much verbatim, the way the GAC requested, and a few of them were done at a significantly different level.

This has been an issue which has come up regularly for the last three years, I guess.

At the Los Angeles meeting, we provided advice to the board to simply freeze the whole program until these were addressed. Clearly that was not -- that advice was not followed, as such.

However, a set of meetings were convened which ultimately did not go anywhere. The ALAC did a summary review, a very quick review, of the 60 or so TLDs or strings to identify which ones we thought were still problematic based on the rules that the registry had already said they would implement. We found a significant number of them to be essentially not a problem at all, another subset to be potentially problematic -- and we said "potentially" because the details of what the registry was going to do were not clear -- and a small set where we believed there was a significant public interest problem.

We have gone back and forth. Ron Andruff and the business constituency had made a proposal to set up a review committee, including ALAC, GAC, GNSO, representatives from the various groups, to do a detailed review, with the intent of, once we identified the problems, somehow passing them back to the board or at that point the new gTLD program committee to resolve.

From our perspective, we don't think the board has the jurisdiction to easily resolve issues in contracts that are already signed, so our concern at this point is not fixing the problems but with the recognition that there is an ongoing review, AoC review, looking at similar subjects. There is a GNSO PDP that has just been launched to set the rules for the next time around. We really don't want to have to relive this again. Some of us have done it enough times already that if we can set rules in the future that address these kind of issues ahead of time, then we should.

The GAC has indicated to us that they are willing to participate in some sort of an effort, and we're asking for such an effort to be initiated, and it's not within the purview of the ALAC to simply form a cross-constituency group on our own and it's quite clear some of the parties may not really want to do it. So we're tossing it back to you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan.

Cherine, would you like to address this concern?

CHERINE CHALABY: Well, first of all, I'd like to say thank you to the ALAC for the advice you sent us recently, and we know -- and I know personally -- that consumer protection is something that you hold very close to your heart. So it is something that we close -- we hold close to our heart, too. And while I'm thanking you, I'd also like to thank Mr. Andruff for his persistent pursuit of the issue of consumer trust. And it may not be the solution he may have proposed that will be implemented, but I think having raised the issue on several times, it has brought it to all of our attention and I'm very grateful for that.

So let's talk about the future and how we can move forward in trying to resolve this issue collectively together.

I'm glad you said this, Alan, and I think it's something we'd like to confirm. I think for the board to unilaterally go back and ask the existing contracted parties to change their contracts is something that is not practical and we will not take such a unilateral action. And you know that we've had a couple of PICs meetings last year where the board facilitated a meeting

between the ALAC, the GAC, the registries and the registrars, and we looked at various alternatives. One of them was additional voluntary PICs, to include up-front validation, and that idea, we were not able to pursue it.

So what do we do next?

So there's two suggestions facing us here.

One is, let's create a new cross-community working group to focus on these issues and then bring these issues up to the board and to the rest of the community and then we make sure that those issues regarding the safeguards are being taken into account in the PDP and also the other working groups that are working on consumer trust at the moment.

The alternative is for us, rather than create a working group, to actually -- the board to send your advice, with support from the board, demanding from -- or requesting, of course -- sorry, I'll not use "demanding" -- requesting from those various groups that are currently working on those safeguards and those PICs issues to take into account the issues that we discussed about those sensitive highly regulated strings.

The thing we want to avoid is creating a duplicate -- a lot of duplication, so what I suggest to the ALAC and Alan, if that's okay with you, why don't we call a meeting next week, a

telephone call, where the ALAC, the GAC, and the GNSO get together again, facilitated by us, and discuss whether, if we set up this group, will there be duplication, and are the three parties involved willing to volunteer people to this group.

Because unless the three parties put people to work on this issue together, it's not going to go further.

So before we take this to the board and before responding officially to you, would that be an acceptable path forward? To have a conference call next week between the three parties involved, facilitated by us, to see if there's merit in creating this group without creating duplication or there's a quicker way of doing it, because I know that the GNSO will be looking at safeguards and I know also that the cross-community -- the -- sorry, the AoC review team on consumer trust is looking particularly at the PICs and safeguards.

So before we just dismiss the idea of a group, let's get it -- let's get together and see if this is -- if this is something that can be put together and that doesn't duplicate the others.

What's your reaction to this idea, or the ALAC reaction?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I guess the first part of the reaction is, I'm only the chair, I can't make decisions. That's a line I learned from Steve.

[Laughter]

But I think the ALAC would likely be amenable to that in theory.

The potential problem -- and maybe that's what we'll have to discuss on the phone call -- is to actually make it happen.

There's no easy way to add a bunch of ALAC people and a bunch of GAC people and a bunch of registry people onto the CCT review, and I don't know of a way we can mandate that a GNSO PDP go through this exercise if the group communally says, "Nah." So as long as it doesn't fall through some huge crack, I don't see why it couldn't be the methodology we use in lieu of a separate committee.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. So I think we have a way forward. Let's give this one more try and see if there's willingness.

If not, the next course of action would be for the board to consider writing to these -- to the GNSO and to the AoC review team with requests to consider very specifically the issues about consumer trust and consumer protection related to these sensitive strings, okay? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we have a wrap-up meeting just following this, and I'll make sure that we -- the ALAC either agrees or formally disagrees with this methodology to go forward. Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Excellent. Shall we move on to the next topic, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. The next item is also something we've been talking about for a good number of months and we're now trying to get closer to actually doing it.

To very briefly summarize, for people who are new to the community, ALAC, which is composed of the five regional at-large organizations, has on a semi-regular basis brought people from the ALSes, from the organizations in the field, to typically ICANN meetings, occasionally other places, to meet in a general assembly.

The process started prior to the actual current ALAC existing because to form the RALOs, we had to bring people together to talk to each other.

Once that process was completed, there was a summit -- perhaps a slightly pompous name, but nevertheless we brought people from all ALSes around the world to a meeting that was actually held in Mexico City.

Our intent, which we actually followed through on, is that following that summit meeting, we then held general assemblies whenever we were in the right region for a RALO, and we scheduled one general assembly over the next four years, one general assembly per RALO over the next four years, and there was another at-large summit that was held in London a number of years ago.

It's an exceedingly difficult process because, number one, the summits are moderately expensive. We're flying a large number of people, some of them from halfway around the world. So it's more expensive than a regional meeting but it comes only once every N years. Five is the interval we've been looking at in the -- well, in the only one case we have.

Every year, we try to schedule some general assemblies and it's sort of an accident of the budget, almost, whether we manage to get one or not. For instance, there was one that was -- we had requested to be held here at this meeting but because of the high-level meeting, it was deemed to be there was too much to try to organize at once, so this one -- that one was deferred.

It makes sense in our mind to get some sort of predictability as we go forward, so that, number one, we don't have these budget peaks that suddenly come up in a given year which will strain the ICANN budget, we have a level of predictability that we know we will be able to have the five general assemblies over a four-year period without having to worry about what the regional split is.

So everyone we've talked to basically says, "Yeah, it would be a good idea," so we're putting together a white paper to describe it. We're going to be ready to submit that hopefully within a few weeks. And that's the general thing.

I'll turn to Olivier, who has been the person actually writing this document, to add anything that I've missed.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Olivier Crepin-Leblond. I'd like to thank the ALAC for inviting me at the head table to share a few insights into the document. I'm going to be very brief because I think that Alan has pretty much gone through the whole -- well, everything I was going to say.

Just to give you an idea of the structure of the document, we'll start with an historical background. Then we'll have a

discussion and several points about why face-to-face meetings are really important for the ALAC, in particular.

Then we have a section on why a multiyear budget is better. I think that you will all agree that predictability in budget processes is something that is really something we need to promote in ICANN, so the advantages of budget predictability, when it comes down to our processes are concerned, is laid out.

And then we have a final proposal, sort of a full proposal, that provides both historical details in a table as to what our previous cycle has been so far, and extrapolating on this previous cycle which has worked pretty well for us, looking at future years, so as to bring us to a summit and interspersed by general assemblies in between.

The cycle at the moment, as it's looked at on our time line, is a five-year cycle, as Alan has mentioned earlier. And as they say in other places, it's coming soon to a screen near you. So thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, both, for the explanation. Asha, would you like to respond?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yes. Asha Hemrajani, for the record. First of all, hello, ALAC.

So I wanted to thank you, Alan and Olivier, for bringing this up. I can certainly see the interest and the importance of having these general assemblies.   But as you mentioned, Alan, predictability is very important, so the board, and in particular the Board Finance Committee, would be very, very interested to have these multiyear budget plans because multiyear budget plans help us with predictability. It's important to give us a multi- -- give us a good -- a multiyear perspective because that's part of good governance and it helps us with planning for the future.

So we highly encourage you to submit these plans. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: On a personal level, I'm also very and fully supportive of this, and I recall having a meeting with Olivier in London about -- what was it, two years ago or something like that? -- where we

discussed this, and I think the time -- the time has come where we need to move forward and put this into concrete future multiyear plans, so that's a good idea. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Is there any advice that the two of you would like to give them in terms of time line for submission?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: I think Alan mentioned to me earlier that you could get something to us fairly soon, in the next two weeks. Is that right, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is our intent.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Good. Looking forward to it. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes. So I see Sebastien standing there, Olivier and Tijani wanting to make a response or comment.

Sebastien, is it about this topic? Please. No audio.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Now audio is coming.

Thank you very much. I think that this topic, as it is addressed in this room, is extraordinary. You know what the name of the room is. It is the Atlas room, and so the name that we chose for our summit in Mexico back in 2009, as well as the name that we chose for London, was also Atlas, and so, you know, we talked about Atlas I, ATLAS II, and now we are addressing that topic as ATLAS III in this room in Marrakech called Atlas.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Wonderful coincidence.

Olivier, do you mind if I give the floor to Tijani first? Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Rinalia. And thank you, board members, to be supportive to this proposal. I think that even if we call it multiyear budget programming, I would like it to be included in the core budget of ICANN, not a special request, yearly special request -- not a multiyear yearly special request. Because this is the way to make it sustainable, and this is the way to -- not to argue each time we will have it or not. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Fully agree with Tijani. I mean, we want to take it out of the annual special request and make it an integral part of the project as we go forward. That's the aim. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Asha, you wanted to comment as well?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Nothing more than -- I mean, to -- I agree with what Cherine has said. The whole point is to give us that long-term perspective so that it helps us with our planning so that you don't have to have this argument every year. So thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Good. Fewer arguments is great.

Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. I just wanted to add it was two years ago that we had a chat with Cherine. It really does feel like a long process to reach and to draft this document. The document is pretty much written, but it is just making sure we have a complex topic that is

enumerated and described in an easy, comprehensible way because we do plan to also share this document with the other communities. We are well aware that it's not only the board that will have a say in this matter but the rest of ICANN.

So that's the final touches, as you know, for something to be -- I wouldn't say perfect but close to great, I think may be one of the words, whichever. The final touches do take time.

And that's it. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. Asha?

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Yeah. That's why I think in response to your comment that, Olivier, we have been waiting for a long time and we are very keen to hear -- very keen to get these plans from you ASAP.

Alan mentioned something -- or was it Rinalia -- that said -- asked about whether there was any tips or any advice on how this plan should be submitted and in what form and that sort of thing.

So I wanted to ask, Xavier, if you had anything to add or any advice to give on this?

EN

XAVIER CALVEZ: It looks like I have something to add.

[Laughter]

Olivier made half of the points I was going to make on the importance to ensure that when we discuss this plan, it happens also with the rest of the community.

From maybe a process perspective, I think the idea makes a lot of sense and there's consensus here on that idea, Olivier. And I discussed it in 2012. So this is even older than London, and we agreed that it made sense.

And Olivier will remember me telling him as well that we also need to convince the rest of the community that it makes sense to happen because we would be committing resources long-term to support meetings for the At-Large, and other communities could be interested as well. So we just need to take this into account as part of the process of evaluation of that program. I'm sure the roadmap just needs to be updated from the version Olivier had sent to me in 2012.

So it's an easy exercise to start, I think, but we need to make sure we go through the process of evaluation and be able to contain also consensus from the rest of the community that that did make sense to them as it does make sense to all of us. So we just need to go through the process of evaluation because we

would be committing resources long-term. And it's important that we do that adequately both from a fiduciary and financial standpoint as well as from a consensus standpoint of the community.

But I think that if we feel we have all the good arguments, then we can do that well together. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Xavier.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia. Just to complete or belabor the history, this issue of multiyear budgets, specifically in relation to the GAs and summits, was raised with CFOs well before Xavier was even here. So it's been going on for a while.

[Laughter]

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay, let's stop digging holes and let's just lift ourselves out of it. We are in mutual agreement, and it is a very good place to be in.

Shall we move to the next topic, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, certainly. This topic is mislabeled. And it's not mislabeled by an accident but mislabeled in our minds because it had to become a budget issue.

I'll give you three examples. But let me make it clear, we're not here to have the board resolve the issues or even have the financial people resolve the issues. We raise them as budget issues because in two of the three cases of examples, they are issues that have been irking us for years and we have not been able to get anyone's attention to actually even have a conversation about them. Putting them in as a budget request seemed to be an effective way of catching people's attention.

In the third one, it doesn't go back years but it's an example that I think of lack of cohesiveness in how we do things. I'm just bringing it to the attention -- I don't think these are things that could be fixed at the financial level. They are almost cultural issues that we want to make the board aware of.

Please, we are not trying to fix the problems. That's not why they're there.

The three examples are relatively simple. The first one is in 2008 to support our Latin American/Caribbean region where a significant number of the people speak English and Spanish and don't speak both of them, we implement -- ICANN implemented a translation service that anything sent on our email list got

translated into the other language. It has been horrible. It has probably caused more problems than it fixed because of the misunderstandings generated and the difficulty in using the tool.

We have had ICANN staff on occasion -- I won't say working on their own time because I don't know how the clocks for ICANN staff work. But essentially on a volunteer basis when he got around to it, and it has gone over various people. We are still not at a stage where we can get anyone's attention. So we decided to put in -- that ALAC should put in a budget request to give I.T. resources to fix the problem. Again, it was purely a way of catching people's attention.

The second one is -- and forgive me -- it's a travel issue. The ALAC is allocated a certain number of travel slots, as is every other AC and SO. In our case, we have a certain number of them that can only be used for very specific cases. And as it turns out, we are not allowed to use them most of the time. We feel this is somewhat unreasonable. We are talking about money that's already budgeted, and At-Large should be given a little bit of flexibility in how it works in these kind of things. Again, it probably has already been fixed now that we raised the issue that way.

The third one is a slightly different character. We have a new meeting strategy where for the C meetings, the last day is designated as a day for capacity-building, onboarding new people, team building, that kind of thing. We believe that if the board had approved that kind of strategy, there should be a budget allocation that allows these things to actually be done. And normally this requires facilitators and services that are a little bit outside of our norm. And, yet, we have to put in special budget requests to address these kind of things.

So, again, it's a plea that when we do things, let's do them cohesively. And for the first two items, let's make sure there are mechanisms that an AC or SO can escalate things without having to wait eight years and use a rather artificial means to escalate it. That's the sum total.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Alan. We heard you very clearly. You said earlier that there was a lack of cohesiveness in how we address things or issues, and you've identified gaps in your advisory committee, three specific ones as examples. I think that's been noted by the board.

Does any member of the board want to comment on the principle of it in terms of why do we have gaps? Perhaps it might be a good idea to have a better understanding of why there was

a breakdown in process or lack of which for the ALAC to raise this issue and get a resolution. Okay. So then let's just touch on this a little bit. Ashwin, can I ask you to step forward, please? Do you have a sense of what broke down and what could be fixed?

ASHWIN RANGAN: Thank you. Yes, I do. We've lacked for a central ticketing mechanism where all requests that are coming in from SOs and ACs can be logged and tracked from an improvement of services perspective. That's something that's been handled in the very recent past.

With that said, the specific issue of the translator is also something that has been discussed with the technology task force as recently as during this meeting. The translators are as good as the technology behind them, the vocabulary in the technology, the dictionary systems behind the vocabulary.

They rely upon the input streams and the punctuations in the input streams. We'd observed that there were two problems with what was being input. One is that the subject matter text would be mangled. And as it went along, as Alan said, it would get worse and worse and worse leading to really unexpected sort of translations.

And the second is if even a single punctuation were missed or inappropriately placed, the language-to-language translation would get confused, resulting in misrepresentation of what was trying to be conveyed. So we've put a mechanism in through which it will reflect backward if the meaning is lost so that the sender gets an opportunity to fix the punctuation and then resend it.

We've done the necessary technology work. And this work piece is now in the hands of the ALAC membership to do some testing. When once we get a green signal saying it has been tested and found acceptable, we will then take it to production. That process, that whole process, will take probably a month or so. So I hope that that addresses the first of the three topics.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I think the larger question is that when there was a problem and it was filed, there was no way to resolve it. I think you are here now, and there is a ticketing system. So when something like this comes about, it will be addressed with alacrity.

ASHWIN RANGAN: Absolutely.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you.

David Olive, did you want to respond to any of that in terms of breakdown in process?

DAVID OLIVE: Yes, I would like to respond, if I could, to all three.

One, of course, is when we get requests such as Ash just mentioned, in the past, we would have to give it to another department and remind them Ashwin has established a much better system for tracking that and putting that on the agenda as well as a steering committee to look at prioritization. So that process has really been improved for the SO/AC tools that we're looking for.

In terms of travel, yes, we try to be as flexible as we can within the allocated numbers. ALAC is allocated 27 funded travelers for each ICANN meeting, 25 of them were established and two were the extra.

And we just would be happy to be flexible, and I'll work with Alan to adjust that within the 27 traveling slots.

And on the third point, in terms of the last day of facilitation, we tried to address this issue by using some experts and training of the trainers. And this is through the academy and through other

onboarding systems we've looked at for the leadership role, for example. And so we have a cadre of community and staff people who could provide that training.

It was a hope that that would be a very cost effective way rather than having some sort of outside coordinator.

Again, it depended upon the need. This was all a part of our ongoing learning and leadership development and training program for the SOs and the ACs.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, David.

Do you have -- do you want to respond, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a very minor -- not to Steve but to Ashwin. Everything Ash said is correct. But this is a multi- -- it was a multifaceted problem. For instance, many people get a lot of email. And most of us look at the subject line for triage to see is it something I want to look at.

Because subject lines in Spanish will have accented characters, what gets inserted along the way is the 12 or 15-character string of the name of the character set. And that completely takes over

the subject line so the subject lines have no content whatsoever anymore.

All we were asking initially was don't translate the subject line. And, yet, that was one of the things that has lurked for years and now is being addressed. But it's -- it was the inability to, you know, really get the problems addressed and there's multiple problems. And I thank Ash -- and I think we're headed in a good direction, if we can formally put a request in and makes sure it gets tracked. Thank you.

ASHWIN RANGAN: You're welcome. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: David, did you have a follow-up? Okay.

So, Alan, are you comfortable with where we are on this issue? Good.

Let's move to the next one.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're going to have to really stretch this one out so we use our full-time.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: End early.

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: This is one that is near and dear to us. We talk a lot in ICANN these days about the public interest. Well, from an At-Large point of view, the public interest has a number of implications, but a very large one is: How does what we do impact on the average user? Can they trust the Domain Name System? Can they put -- can they use the system reliably? And that translates from our point of view to consumer trust.

And I'd like to turn it over to Garth to do an initial discussion of that, and then we have some other speakers who have also indicated.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you, Alan. Thank you, board. Garth Bruen, ALAC North America. A clear definition of consumer trust may be illusive and difficult to make agreeable to all parties. But this is why we need to aggressively pursue tangible results for the benefit of the whole community. It's that important, and we need to work on it.

So 18 months or so ago, the outgoing -- the current outgoing CEO announced that ICANN would create in staff a consumer safeguards director. This post is still empty, and we have asked about this in meetings, in formal letters. We have been told about budget issues, problems finding the right candidate. I understand the usual difficulties, but the lack of results on this creates the appearance of a lack of passion and attention for the topic. External observers might assume that consumer trust is simply not a priority. In general, there is no clear space where ICANN is speaking directly to consumers in terms of the content. Content on the site, not content on the Internet.

ALAC members speak directly to consumers. We talk to them all the time. And they ask us what's going on. And this is our job, as ALAC members, to tell them what's going on.

So in lieu of having real movements like the hiring of a consumer safeguards director, what can I show the consumer as proof that ICANN is making consumer trust a priority? Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Garth.

Bruce?

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, Rinalia.

Yeah, I think consumer trust, just to sort of provide context, is in our commitment to the U.S. government as part of the Affirmation of Commitments. We undertook to look at consumer trust as part of the rollout of new gTLDs. And amongst other topics, we were looking at competition, looking at security and stability, and consumer trust was one of those issues. Then the GNSO subsequently was then doing some work on defining the term "consumer trust" and so they have defined trust as it relates to ICANN's mission.

So I just want to be very clear here. ICANN's mission is purely allocating Internet identifiers. We allocate domain names. We allocate blocks of IP addresses to the regional Internet registries. So we don't deal with what's in an email, don't deal with what's on a Web site, but we do allocate these identifiers.

And so our role in consumer trust here is to make sure that there's consistency in name resolution so that when you use a name as part of email or use a name as part of accessing an Internet location, you actually get to where you want to get to, and some of the things that we've put in place there, for example, is the rollout of DNSSEC in the root to provide some stronger technical mechanisms to ensure that a name can't be manipulated as it is translated from a name into an IP address.

Another part of consumer confidence here is confidence that the -- specifically with respect to gTLDs, that the registry operator is operating the TLD in compliance with the agreement that they have with ICANN, and that compliance agreement really has three parts to it.

One is compliance with the provisions in the agreement. Secondly is compliance with the ICANN policies that are developed in the GNSO. And third is compliance with national laws as it relates to the role of that TLD.

It's not ICANN's job to actually execute on those national laws, so each country has its own consumer trust laws, but clearly if we were notified by a relevant government body that a particular registry operator was not complying with the law, then that is an opportunity for ICANN to take -- to look at the compliance.

And the third part of consumer trust is clearly compliance itself, in that we have a compliance function at ICANN, and the role of that compliance function is to make sure that ICANN follows up on complaints from the Internet users to any of the things that I've suggested, whether it's domain names not resolving, whether it's people not adhering to the terms of their agreement, or people not following ICANN policy. So that's the role of compliance.

With respect to the role, Garth, that you've noted that ICANN is committed to filling, we are still committed to filling that role and I'll ask Allen Grogan to come up and just provide the community with an update on recruiting for that role, if Allen's around in the room next to you. Ah, right next to me.

ALLEN GROGAN: Right underneath your arm.

Sure. Happy to address the issue.

So as Garth alluded to, there are several reasons why the role hasn't been filled. Part of the reason was that at the time that it was announced, it wasn't budgeted for. I have been interviewing a number of candidates, both internally and externally, over the last several months. Fadi and I sent correspondence to the ALAC late last year in which each of us indicated that we were optimistic that we would either be in a position to fill that role or at least announce who was going to fill that role by this meeting. Unfortunately that was overly optimistic. We have not yet extended an offer to any candidate.

So I -- I have committed to put a public job posting out to interview additional candidates for that role.

The ALAC also asked me yesterday if I would share with them any job description that was provided to the candidates that

we've previously interviewed. Since I met with the ALAC yesterday, I've confirmed that there was no HR job description in writing that was provided to those candidates, so I don't have that to provide, but we will be working on developing a formal job description and posting it shortly after this meeting, and if anyone from ALAC has suggestions on what they believe should be included in that job description, please drop me an email and I'm happy to consider your input.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Allen.

Leon Sanchez.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Rinalia. This is Leon Sanchez. And I just want to point out the piece of advice that the ALAC sent to the board in regard to the PDP for review of the rights protection mechanisms, and I just want to remind that consumer trust is also built upon rights protection mechanisms. I mean, we are talking about a healthy DNS here, so I think that the healthier the DNS we can have, the more trust we will be building on the consumers and on our users of this DNS.

So I would strongly encourage the board to include measures into this PDP, or whatever the outcome is from this PDP, to

actually have a look at particularly the Trademark Clearinghouse, because the Trademark Clearinghouse, I believe that hasn't delivered as it was supposed to, and we have provided you, in this piece of advice, with some data that I think that might be useful for you to assess and to consider when it comes to thinking if we should have a single provider as the gatekeeper to access a rights protection mechanism like the Trademark Clearinghouse or should we open -- should we be opening to multiple players so this reduces the barrier of entrance to users that are also trademark holders but that don't have these big budgets to be allocated to protect their rights within the DNS space.

So I would certainly be happy to help in this effort, and I just want to put this back onto the table so that the board doesn't miss this point.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. We'll make sure that we don't miss it. And if we do, you will, of course, raise it to our attention to remind us.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. One of the things Bruce mentioned is related to another one of the reasons that we haven't mentioned but one of the reasons that this item is on the agenda today.

The AoC does refer to consumer trust. The way we read those words, it referred to consumer trust. When we pointed out to the CCWG accountability that they were not moving that part into the mission and core values of ICANN, the response was the reference in the AoC is purely in response -- in regard to new gTLDs, and if we were to put a general statement in that consumer trust is relevant to old TLDs also, we would be widening the mission of ICANN.

And there was a fair amount of vehemence in this, and we hopefully believed that we care about consumer trust for the old TLDs as well as the new TLDs. Certainly at this point they are predominant. And it was put on the agenda here to get some level of affirmation that, indeed, ICANN does care and it won't -- it won't disappear from compliance's mission or suddenly be qualified only for new gTLDs because clearly the consumers still use occasional dot coms, dot orgs, and dot nets, and plus the other ones. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Bruce, you wanted to respond to this and also to Leon's earlier comment on rights protection mechanism and TMCH?

BRUCE TONKIN: Okay. Sure. Thanks, Rinalia.

Just responding to Leon's question, it sounds like that's input into the GNSO policy development process where you're suggesting that rights protection mechanisms become part of presumably -- or additional rights protection mechanisms become part of future gTLDs. So, yeah, definitely encourage you to continue to raise those issues as part of the policy development process.

And certainly if they don't take those comments into account, you know, you have the opportunity to raise those again to the board and we will then essentially forward your advice on to the GNSO to respond to.

With respect to Alan's question about old versus new gTLDs, the actual compliance function is the same. So as I noted before, our role -- compliance's role here is that we have agreements with gTLD operators and the gTLDs need to comply with the terms of those agreements, the policies that are developed by the community, and relevant national laws. Those three requirements are the same for old and new gTLDs.

If you wish to create new policies that relate to existing gTLD agreements, we've actually built that process in with the -- in the

contract the -- which is quite unusual, actually, but we have it in our contracts that a gTLD operator has to comply with future policies that are developed.

So as soon as a policy is developed, that applies to all gTLDs whether they're new or old. And so if -- if you wanted to look at, you know, mechanisms of, you know, improving the interests of end users, you should actively, as you are now, continue to participate in that policy process. Once the policy comes out of that process and is approved by the board, then all gTLD operators must be compliant and the compliance function will look at that policy for all gTLDs.

So there really is no distinction between old and new.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Bruce.

Alan, do you have afterthoughts?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was going to tackle it off line, but I will -- since you've given me the opportunity to --

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: We have eight minutes left.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will not take eight minutes. Other people may. I won't.

Two issues on that.

The part of it that bothered us was the claim that -- the claim by some people, not the board, that if we addressed consumer trust for all gTLDs, we were widening the scope of ICANN and widening our mandate, and that I found somewhat problematic.

And the second thing is, indeed, we do have a PDP process but only certain things are eligible for that consensus policy, and not necessarily ones that relate to this. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN: Well, that's the whole flow, Alan.

So essentially, ICANN has quite a limited mission, and that mission is in respect to the allocation of Internet identifiers, including domain names and IP addresses. That's all we do.

And then the ability that we have in contracts to impose policies on the operators as to the allocation of those names is constrained to that mission.

So basically, changes need to be reasonably necessary that require global coordination and that relate to the allocation of those names.

Examples of things that have been put in there to protect consumers are the transfers policy, for example. This protects consumers that once you've registered your domain name with a particular registrar, you have the ability to transfer that name to another registrar. That enhances competition in one and secondly provides consumer trust.

Other examples that the GNSO has done is with respect to expiry names processes. In the past, there was some confusion, I guess, about when a domain name expires in the directory service. Basically the date of the expiry is there. What happens after that expires. And as part of the consumer protection, registrars need to give adequate notice when a name is expiring and there's a whole bunch of terms and conditions now that are part of the agreement.

So these are all changes that provide consumer protection and consumer trust.

So those are the sorts of things that the ALAC should continue to be involved in.

What it's not, though, being very clear again, it's not about the content of Web sites, it's not about the content of emails. That's not our job. So the policy development process is constrained by the mission of ICANN, and when the CCWG -- their role was

not to change the mission of ICANN. Their role was to improve our accountability to that mission.

Now, there was some work on the mission to provide more clarity of that, but the aim wasn't to change ICANN's mission. It's still limited to the allocation of Internet identifiers. So that's all we do.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Is that all, Bruce, or --

BRUCE TONKIN: That is all.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you very much.

[Laughter]

Any other issues from the ALAC side?

We do have to move -- wrap up the meeting, so Garth? Okay. I give you the -- Tijani. A short one, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Very, very short. Only to ask for support to Joseph and the constituency travel. He cannot run this work alone. I know that

you have a new platform that you are making -- working, but I think you need human support because when you send an email and you don't receive an answer, a reply, it's very, very bad.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Tijani. We've taken note of that and we've also received some other feedback on that. Alan, last words.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for inviting us. This has, I think, been a productive meeting and I look forward to continuing the discussion on all of these items off line. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, ALAC and the at-large.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]