

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Welcome, everyone, to this first session, this first webinar for capacity building. It belongs to the framework of a program we have organized for AFRALO. It is actually the beginning of a series of webinars that we had asked for for this program.

CAMILA: I'm sorry. Fatimata's audio is too choppy. It's hard to follow.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Fatimata is inaudible at the moment. We're trying to get back to her.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: As I was saying, the purpose of these meetings is for it to be a first session of capacity building. It's just the first in a series of sessions. Tijani was going to explain why we asked for these capacity building programs to be done online.

I would really like for everyone to gain awareness of what we do and we had a favorable response from ICANN, so that everyone can be more prepared to participate at the activities that we organize. I'm going to give the floor to Tijani now, who's going to be telling us about the context of this virtual capacity building program for AFRALO. Tijani, you have the floor.

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.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Fatimata. This is Tijani speaking. I would like to go back to remind everyone how the creation of ALSs was done a couple of years ago. We had little participation from the community back then, and we tried to analyze the real [inaudible] to see why our members did not participate in ICANN's activities. The main reason was a great volume of documents that we had received, so we didn't have enough time to read it all. Then the documents were mainly in English, and the jargon that they used was not really accessible to everyone.

So the solution could only be to have an adapted solution, and even to give our members the information and the knowledge that they needed in order to better understand the debate and the discussions with their specific terminology and to participate actively. And the end of a struggle which took about two years, we managed to organize the face-to-face capacity building session [inaudible] 2011 and training sessions showed the failures that we were trying to cover with this training, and that allowed us to participate at the second At-Large summit in London if adopted, and I think it is going to be adopted in an effective manner in a real and effective way, so that Africa's voice can be transmitted.

That's more or less why we have organized this virtual capacity building session. I think there are going to be many people who will follow this training, because the efforts that we have made for this training is significant, particularly from ICANN and its staff. Thank you.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: This is Fatimata speaking. Thank you Tijani. I don't know whether [inaudible] would like to ask any questions regarding what Tijani said. Okay. Thank you, Pierre. You can go on.

PIERRE DANDJINO: I have a couple of questions for Tijani. I think that what was said about the program is very valid and I would like you to explain why you say that it was insufficient in terms of what we have done.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Well, in fact, the program was too short. We had organized a training session in little time which was quite heavy on the attendance and it wasn't enough. And certain participants said that at the end of the training they still couldn't understand some items in the training sessions. We also noticed – and we included this in our report that we sent for ICANN – the fact that the training was provided by ICANN staff and they had organized this as if it had been a presentation for their colleagues. It wasn't a specific presentation for training.

So the teaching aspect wasn't there and certain trainers had done a great job, [inaudible] I remember. His presentation was very good. It was well understood, well received, well followed because he had done it for the training purposes.

The other trainer, though, had prepared presentation as if it had been a presentation for the GAC or for At-Large in general terms. That's more or less what I mean by failure or insufficiency. I can send you a report if you want.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just wanted to ask you about this because I was interested in the profile of the attendance to the [inaudible] session.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you, Tijani. Thank you, Pierre. I would like to add that we should have taken into account the level of the participants who took part in that training session.

ALIOUNE BADARA TRAORE: Good evening, everyone. This is Alioune joining.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Good evening and welcome. You got here at the right time because we're about to start with the training. Pierre, we're going to give you the floor so that you can make your presentation.

PIERRE DANDJINOU: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for having invited me to this training session. I prepared a PowerPoint which is in English and I'm going to try and present it in French while taking into account everyone's profile.

So we're going to address the mission, the structure, and the constituencies of ICANN, and when we consider these three points, we have a feeling that everyone should know about it. So I can go over this

very quickly, and if you have questions regarding that, we can make them at the end of the presentation.

CAMILA: Fatimata is speaking, but she's incomprehensible.

PIERRE DANDJINOU: I'm sorry, Fatimata, I could not understand you. You need what?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: We need for these presentations to be done as if we had no idea what ICANN is.

PIERRE DANJINOU: In the following slides – I think my presentation has nine slides all in all – but this is precisely for an audience from [everywhere in the world] and I think everyone should note this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: We can only see the first page.

PIERRE DANJINOU: Okay. Here you see the entire word. So as I was saying, the purpose is for everyone at every point in the [world] to be able to communicate so we have a bit of an idea what ICANN is. This is merely a diagram, but it tends to show people that the Internet actually favors communication.

Now how does ICANN work on that? That should be dealt with through its structure, through its functions, and its constituencies. Olivier, please try and change pages as I go. I have stated all these items in the agenda. This is applied where I've mentioned everything I would like to cover. And we're going to go into the mission now.

I have included the drawing that ICANN published and their motto is "One world, one Internet." This is in fact I think not only at the Internet level and not only an ICANN [inaudible] but also for every other organization, and that is the Internet. ICANN is not the only organization working for the way Internet works. ICANN has a particular mission that needs to be understood. If you get to read it – I think the size is a bit small – but the mission is stated there.

What ICANN does is manage what we call identifiers. Identifiers are what help us communicate. That's what everyone needs to have. Domain names and IP addresses. Of course ICANN has other resources because we have the root and we have databases and I think we should take into account that what it does, first and foremost, is the coordination of these identifiers which could evolve. That's, I think, our beginning. We should start by that point and it's a specific view to ICANN.

So that would enable us to have one global Internet – an Internet which is open and accessible to all. And that's ICANN's mission – to guarantee that coordination for the community.

So how is that mission carried out? ICANN organizes a number of structures which enable us to perform these functions. I have included a

number of functions here. It's not that they're the only ones, but these are the ones that are most feasible for IP addresses.

We have the domain name system, which is also a key aspect here, and then we have a number of resources such as the metrics of protocols, the server system for the root server which needs upkeeping, and the assignment of domain names.

ICANN has launched an [operation space] with a number of domain names. We have IDNs also – that's Internationalized Domain Names – which have to be assigned. So we're trying to have the structure for this all to be organized so there are no issues in the [inaudible] of the Internet. And we have country code domain names, and then we have other domain names which are different systems. It's our function.

So in order to guarantee that these functions are available, ICANN is organized in a certain way. Of course we have a work group we call [inaudible] formed by those who work at ICANN on an everyday basis. But in fact, ICANN structure is much larger because other than the staff, we have a number of people who work for support whether it is at the addressing level, at the domain name level, or at the generic domain name level.

So all that is structured with the board, and that board has to follow up on that management. So the staff who had this general structure so that they can guarantee certain structures and certain policies that the board asked for.

But there's also many other entities working within this structure. For instance, we have some entities which are not really visible, but they

advise us and they help us take decisions. For instance, At-Large is the place where the community gets to be heard, to make itself heard. Then we have structure which enables the government to act – that's the GAC. We've also got other committees which work on DNSs. Then there's also entities working and advising us on security and stability.

For this set of committees, we should add another number of entities which work in advising ICANN on more technical stuff. For those people who work on protocols and evolution, which is very important; and then we have technical liaisons who work to guarantee ICANN with a number of advices that they provide. So those are the committees who work with the structures at ICANN and which appear at ICANN, and they all belong to ICANN and [feed] it.

The chart that I have included here shows that ICANN will manage this multi-stakeholder process and they guarantee the participation of all because they contribute to ICANN's mission.

You see here, the communications are conveyed through the world. There's a Civil Society. There's the Security and Stability advisors, registries and registrars, [inaudible] and nonprofit organizations, government, other organizations and everyone contributes to ICANN's meeting.

And then on top of ICANN, have the ICANN board, who has to give approval, once they have received the advice from all the others, they need to be able to show all that advice through policy. So they need to registering everything in their policies that they approve. [inaudible]

So while there is constituencies or any other committee, it's what everyone needs to understand and [inaudible] ICANN is made up of big structure.

We mentioned constituencies. We mentioned mission and function. So I think everyone is going to be able to understand how ICANN works.

I would like to stop here. I don't have much time. I would like to hear questions if you have any. I would like to thank you for your attention. Thank you.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you very much, Pierre. Thank you for your presentation. It was very clear. Of course it's what we expected, because we know you. Does anyone have any questions for Pierre?

AZIZ HILALI: I have a question I would like to ask. Fatimata, can I ask my question?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yes, of course.

AZIZ HILALI: Okay. Thank you, Pierre, for your presentation. We have a feeling we know all these constituencies at ICANN, but every time I see one of these presentations, I learn something new. So thank you, Pierre, for your presentation.

I have a short question regarding what [inaudible] told us and [inaudible] regarding the importance of the multi-stakeholder model and the staff who should be present in Africa starting with the CEO. And there's a number of staff members who will present the different regions of Africa. It's nice to know where they are, whether they have advanced, whether you have already made a call for applications.

Then I'd also like to know something about the other thing that Fadi has said. It was that the number of credited domain names would be increased. So I would like to know what we've done since the Beijing meeting.

Last question. So it's three questions, actually, that I have. So far we've organized African AFRALO meetings for the African community and we prepared statements. We are always asked whether as AFRALO and AfrICANN make a follow up of these statements or just make these statements.

So, for instance, we drafted statements at Costa Rica and at Beijing and we would like to know what has happened with what we said. That's it. Thank you.

PIERRE DANDJINOU: So that's not really a question.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you, Aziz, for your question. I know that Pierre is going to answer. But I would like to take questions about the presentation. I would like you to put yourself in the shoes of someone who has just joined ICANN

and who would like to understand Pierre's presentation. So we would like to know whether this presentation is what it should be, whether we should add something, whether we should improve something. I'm certain we all have questions, but the next questions we will be taking and what I would like to hear is mostly about this presentation so Pierre can go on and answer it. Thank you.

PIERRE DANDJINO:

Thank you very much. I think I agree with Fatimata. I think Aziz has asked questions here and he would like to get a reply. I would like to try and answer them very briefly. I think the commitment that Fadi made, I think it's something that he always spoke of. We had to have [inaudible] to see where we were when he started.

And now regarding the hiring of staff that we were going to take on in the organization, we have already sent a request to ICANN, but right now the concentration and the focus is on the hiring of the manager.

Given that for all regions we started having a vice president and a manager per region, we [inaudible] for Africa. So the manager came from Africa, actually. So we are receiving applications from members. The process has already started to find a manager here, and I think we will have one before the Durban meeting because we are quite advanced in the process. So for fiscal year 2014, I am sure we will have someone.

And [regards to registrars] ICANN can only certify a few if people apply. We're still working with ICANN on that aspect. Nothing has changed to the best of my knowledge. We are having discussions with registrars

and we have received applications from Ghana and Nigeria and those are registers who are already operational, so we do have a few African registrars.

But there's been a change from 5 to 25 registrars in Africa, so that's already a big change and we need to see if more people would be interested in being registered.

So all we know, the AFRALO AfrICANN meeting and the statement [inaudible] were request from both groups and it was more recommendations that they gave. I know you want feedback and I know that staff receiving this sort of statement have to see that these statements be voted and then whether they should be posted or not. And if they need to be posted, they will be.

I'm not sure what should be done. That's what I understand regarding the statement of AFRALO. I'm told that the board will not necessarily act upon what you add to the statement. They would only like to know whether there is consensus in the community regarding your statement and whether there's been a reaction or not to that statement.

SILVIA VIVANCO

I understand what you're saying. We need to follow on what is said. So that's what I have to go with regards to Aziz's question. So thank you very much. If you want to ask any questions or make suggestions from our presentation, I'm ready to hear you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Fatimata, we cannot hear you. I don't know if I'm the only one but at least I, Gisella, cannot hear you.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: No, I cannot year you, Fatimata.

AZIA HILALI: Yes. We cannot understand.

GISELLA GRUBER: It is completely inaudible. Everyone has confirmed. Tijani, maybe you can take over.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Fatimata is asking whether there is any other questions. I see no hands raised on the Adobe Connect room. So we could perhaps go straight to Olivier's presentation. Yes, Victor is raising his hand. Okay, Victor, you have the floor. Victor, are you muted? His volume is too low. Victor, your audio is too low. We cannot hear you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Tijani, this is Gisella speaking. I'm just saying that Victor is only on Adobe Connect, so unfortunately we cannot try and improve his audio. So then, Victor, can you write? Maybe you can type your question on Adobe Connect. Okay. Thank you, Pierre, for the presentation.

VICTOR NDONNANG: My question is regarding the relation between ICANN and the ccNSO. Because in many countries, ccTLDs are considered part of the national sovereignty. So I would like to know what the liability is regarding ccNSO, meaning why ICANN has to manage ccTLDs.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry to interrupt. This is Gisella speaking. I'm just asking whether someone who could hear the question could repeat it so that we can interpret it into the English channel.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Victor is asking what the relationship between ICANN and the government is regarding the ccTLDs. He's saying that most ccTLDs consider their code to be part of the national sovereignty, so he would like to know what the relationship is between ICANN and the ccTLD.

PIERRE DANDJINO: Can I answer? All in all, it could be considered as ccTLDs were part of the national sovereignty of countries, yes. But actually, ccTLDs cannot work on their own. They're not standalone codes. They have to work with IANA. So there should be a number of accreditations and there should be contact at the technical level and of a communication level.

So the question was regarding the relationship between ICANN and ccNSO. Let us not forget that the ccTLD codes are part of a system and they have a particular relationship among themselves. They do not have the same contract as registrars. Registrars work on the basis of ICANN's accreditation, and so the contract is not so much as independent.

In the case of ccTLDs, ICANN stopped negotiating contracts a long time ago, and it didn't work and I'd say there's a relationship with some [inaudible]. Of course the ccNSO provides advice as all the other sub working organizations. But it's not done by ICANN. This is IANA's domain and ICANN works with IANA.

So to clarify, the ccTLDs are different in terms of their relationship with ICANN. ccTLDs are much more anchored in that their contract with ICANN will of course be useful to ICANN's purpose, but the ccTLD belongs to a country, and that's a country who has a contract for that name, and if a country needs to be heard, it needs to have one single voice before ICANN. That's not always the case.

So we have a feeling that there's a relationship between both, but I've also said that ccTLDs did not depend on ICANN. In any event, their contract is with IANA, not with ICANN. That's the big picture that I'm going to provide as an answer here. I hope you understood, Victor, and if you don't have another question, we could go on.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Pierre, for your reply. I'd say that ccTLDs and ICANN aren't really independent from each other, but they are closely bound, I'd say. As Pierre just explained, it all comes from IANA. And then in the second place, I think the only difference with gTLDs is that ccTLD registers do not pay to ICANN. ccTLD registers do not pay to ICANN. That's the difference.

I think it's a country – say, Germany, for instance. Olivier does not like my example. I don't think there is an issue in this situation. Yes, I see

what Olivier is writing. There are some who pay, yes, but they pay it voluntarily. Nothing binds them to paying ICANN. I think that's the difference. Thank you. Now are there any other questions? Is that [inaudible]? Am I wrong or am I right?

PIERRE DANDJINOU:

You're right. There is a possibility of signing a contract, yes. There was a discussion regarding whether we should have contracts with ccTLDs by given that there was no consensus, some countries are willing to sign contracts with ICANN where there are others who are not ready to do so. Yes, exactly. Okay. Any other questions? Yes, there is a [region] question from [inaudible]

Let me check. Yes, have you seen it? It's not [inaudible]. She's saying that the allocation of DNSs at ICANN – and ICANN actually manages IP addresses and DNSs and organizes public meetings, so what is the biggest stake for the next ICANN meeting in Durban for an African ALS and how can we proceed in order to register a subject to the agenda at ICANN's meetings? Now, having explained the new domain name system with the answers that we have received for this new domain name system.

I don't really have a feeling that there are greater stakes here, or greater implication. There might be a greater implication because Fatimata said, yes, we're going through the first accreditation. I think we're going to go on working on the assessment, taking into account the system that we have just started working with. So I don't really see any greater stakes here. Of course Africa wants to take part in the

debate of course, and it's not that evident that it will happen, but it will be interesting to note that Africa is taking part in this discussion somewhere. If I'm not mistaken, there are people who participate here and we have other members working on that as well. So that's good news in itself. So that's pretty much what I have to say.

Now your question, Hadja, was very good and it's about how we register someone from one day to the next. It's a good question and I think there is a structure who deals with ICANN meetings and the accreditation and I'm sure it takes logistics and lots of work to organize this meeting. I know, for instance, that Fadi is involved in this process hands on and if it were to coincide with the framework of what we are doing, we should of course take care of such matters.

I'm not sure how we would proceed, but if anyone knows, you are welcome to say. I'm sure these meetings are organized with lots of time so everyone has enough time to register beforehand. That's what I would say to Hadja.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Pierre, for your reply. I have a different answer for Hadja regarding the people you want to register for ICANN meetings. As you know, ICANN meetings, there are different constituencies who participate, and if constituency has an agenda. Of course there are subjects which are common to all constituencies and which are discussed and [inaudible] at the public forum, for instance, or at general meetings and at open sessions.

But if, for instance, an ALS from Africa wants to add something to ICANN's agenda, they need to do it through the RALO and they have to propose it for ALAC to add it to their agenda. If the subject or the theme is interesting, of course it will be added. I think it should be done through constituencies and even ICANN can take the subject. If ALAC thinks it is a very important subject, it can be taken to a higher level and it can become an item to be discussed with the others because we have meetings with the board at every ICANN meeting. That's all. Other questions?

Seeing that there are no more questions, I'm going to give the floor to Olivier Crépin-Leblond for him to tell us what the role of At-Large is within ICANN. Olivier, you have the floor.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. I have pushed the buttons to unmute myself and I'm now ready to begin my presentation. [We're still] with ALAC. You should see it on the screen. It's also a presentation which was prepared for our Beijing meetings. I'm sorry for it being in English, but I think you'll already be acquainted with many of the things that Pierre has so properly explained. So how people participate and what ICANN structure is. So I think we're going to be able to go over some of these items more swiftly.

So in the first slide, we have the multi-stakeholder model. Do you all see it on your screens? Yes, okay. Great. Pierre has already explained the different constituencies and supporting organizations and advisory committees at ICANN. You'll see that they all represent a part of this

chart in ICANN with the board of directors in the middle on top, which seems to be the center point or the most important, and the chairman and the president of ICANN – the chairman of ICANN – has said several times the discussion should be had in everything that surrounds ICANN. So everything surrounding ICANN are the different supporting organizations in At-Large in the different advisory committees with the GAC. It's much more important than the discussions that are had with the board itself.

So in the following slide, we have eliminated the board and we showed the different multi-stakeholder models we have in ICANN. [inaudible] we mentioned regarding IP addresses and regional Internet registries and local Internet registries, that's a multi-stakeholder model. The GNSO – the Generic Names Supporting Organization – [inaudible]

CAMILA: I'm sorry, but we are hearing music.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The ccNSO, which is country code operators; and then At-Large of course is a huge multi-stakeholder model. It's not a multi-stakeholder system which is complete, because it's somewhat separated, but it's a whole system. There's also government, of course, but they have their own side – their own group – in ICANN and they make their contributions and the discussions that they hold, and that is all proposed for ICANN's policy.

Then there's the other advisory committees, which have been separated here with a dotted line and they deal with security and stability of the system – of the domain name system – and with the addresses assignment and the system. So that's the model, pretty much.

The At-Large model, I think you must have seen it several times already. It is a model which is distributed in five geographical regions, and of course AFRALO for Africa and is the AfrICANN regional At-Large organization in the group, the entire African continent and you'll see the other regions on the map as well. So AFRALO has to select two people for them to participate at ALAC.

And there's the Nominating Committee who has independent meetings and we've all heard of this because there's been calls for members in this committee recently and Nominating Committee has one person from each region, so each region has 2.3 people. As you see, every region then has 3 people in different colors here, which makes up a complete commission of the At-Large Advisory Committee made up of 15 people who then meet the different chairs of each region and they decide who is going to chair the directory. Right now [inaudible] is taking the 15th seat in the Board of Administration.

So what does At-Large do? What do we do? We have over 150 At-Large structures. I think everyone knows what we do. We reply to public comment period. We make comments on everything that goes on at ICANN whether it's while there's an open public comment period or not.

So I would like to walk you through the people that is used so that you can all make comments, because I see that our structure is quite known right now by the ALSs, but the process of making policies which are generated by people is not that much well done.

So we work on a bottom-up approach that's from the bottom upward. As you see, the system, At-Large structures are over 150 structures and each of them has an important relationship with their RALOs – that's the Regional At-Large Organizations.

So in theory, all the initiatives made should start with ALSs, then go through their RALOs and from the bottom up be transmitted to ALAC so that ALAC itself can discuss them. In general, we consider whether three out of five of the RALOs that make up our committee are concerned by one particular aspect or subject, and so there's most members concerned about the subject, then that subject is dealt with and we have mailing lists on which we exchange on each subject or else on an informal e-mail. There is a formal process in place, which in fact is the writing and the drafting of a statement and we release statement of ALAC where we provide advice to other entities in ICANN from time to time, and most of the time to the board itself. And that is certainly considered to be [proper advice].

As you see, what we write in our statements is not only serious, but everything that's written there has to be accepted by all ALAC members, so it's quite a formal process.

For instance, we're going to see the public comment – the response to public comment period. It's very hard to read in English and speak in

French. I'm sorry. I hope you'll get to see this chart, that it's not too small for you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's too small.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you see it better now? You should see the entire screen.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's not synched.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. It's not synched?

AZIZ HILALI: You can see it if you click on "Full Screen."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Exactly, yes. Thank you, Aziz. If you click on "Full Screen" you can read, but I have a huge screen and I can see it even it is small. If you have a small screen, you should click on the "Full Screen" button and you will see the slide in a bigger size.

At ICANN, there may be a call for comments. So at that point, the discussion immediately starts on ALAC's side and then on the RALO side also through their ALAC members, but through the leaders as well. They

can start their own discussions without discussing the necessary information for the preparation of our reply from ALSs.

Now, ALSs submit comment to reply to that. They follow in dialogue, and if they decide that a statement should be written at that point, someone will volunteer and it could be a member of ALAC, a member of ALAC's executive committee, or even a member from an ALS. It's not necessary to have a member of ALAC to draft a statement in its first version – I should say the first draft – for that statement.

Now if there's consensus during the discussions which follow this first version we prepare a final version and ALAC will then write and finalize the statement. But in order to give full treatment to [inaudible], ALAC then must ratify it by taking a vote which generally lasts a fortnight so that everyone has enough time to read the document and see whether they agree with what has been written. It is only after everyone has voted and after the statement is ratified that it will be sent as a response to the questions that ICANN asked at the beginning.

The only problem with this process is that it takes 21 days from one end to the other, and that's where it's actually stressing to get to have the input from the grassroots, as we say – from the ALSs and the users themselves. It's stressing because we need to act very quickly and we will need the processes that are discussed that are considered, and it's sometimes very complex issues that we have to deal with and we need to get the help of the people who are in charge of RALOs, of everyone who participates at ALAC in order to add to this understanding that users have in the entire [work].

Next, as regards to the response to public comment request, there's another system where ALAC needs to comment on every issue and everything that has to do with ICANN and there's a similar process. It starts with an ALS, in fact, and ALS comments on what they would like for ALAC to do, and then they start at the RALO level. They discuss it with the RALO and then the RALO can eventually discuss it through the secretariat or through their ALAC members to see if there's consensus from different RALOs for a statement to be written and then as of that moment, ALAC will follow its regular procedure with comments and the input and everything. It comes from different members of the community and ALAC.

But because we have to remember that all this is done through our Wiki system, so it's completely transparent. Once we have reached consensus at ALAC level, there is a first draft which is published on the Wiki and you'll see the system with second and third versions, and then the written version – the drafted version – is a presentation of a final statement and once it is finalized, it is going to be sent either for the board or the person – the interested party.

What's important here and what's interesting is that there are no time constraints unless the statement or the advice itself needs to be sent to the board for a meeting, which will be held in the next 10 or 20 days, because the board does not meet every day as you know. ALAC only meets once every month. So if we send or submit our comment, once the meeting has finished, they won't be taken into account. That's how it happens. There are several pages which are very important which I check myself every day and I hope you'll be able to check them yourself because these are the [sites] on which we have development for ALAC

and for At-Large. We all developed these document direct correspondence because it's everything that has sent by ALAC for procedures – for response procedures to public comments. There is [inaudible] procedures.

The next slide, which is ALAC policy development, At-Large policy development. You see the link here. There is a big chart on that side and I thank Matt for having created that chart. And on it, you will see everything we're doing at the drafting of statements level.

And then a quick reminder is that much of the work that goes into the preparation of discussions is done in our working groups. You have here a link to At-Large's Working Group. I invite you all to participate in these working groups because it is very important to have experts in each of these groups.

That's my entire presentation. I'm sorry for having taken so much time, but I had to speak very slowly because of the interpreters and I hope it was comprehensible to all. I'm open to your questions.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA:

Thank you, Olivier. I'm not sure whether Fatimata is back with us if she would like to resume her chairmanship. If not, has anyone got any questions for Olivier?

AZIZ HILALI:

This is Aziz speaking.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, Aziz. Go on.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you, Tijani. I would simply like to remind Olivier very much for his presentation as it was very [inaudible] and it shows what a great job ALAC does, how much they work. ALAC has much evolved in the past few years. I have witnessed this revolution, so I would like to thank him for his great work.

The only question I have for Olivier will give us an idea of the work that's done at ALAC level, and that's regarding the number of statements that are sent to the board and the percentage for [inaudible] of the important items that ALAC has discussed, which are sent at ICANN level and which had a result at the ICANN board level. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this question. In regards to the number of statements we sent last year, there is a record – I think Heidi has the exact number and she might add it on the chat. Indeed I do wonder sometimes whether it's better to have more statements or whether it's better to draft statements which are more followed by our corresponding.

It's clear that drafting more statements shows that we work more at ALAC level and at the community level as well – not only in ALAC but in all regions. That's also a reason to celebrate.

Now, at the ICANN level, whether the results have had a proportion to the number of statements, I'm not sure. I'm not 100% convinced of this

because a couple of year ago we started – we were sort of discriminated in a matter of speaking during a number of years and ALAC was not taken seriously. So it takes time to get the trust of those who make final decisions in ICANN.

It's [inaudible] to the point where ICANN showed a great change at their leadership level and Pierre actually is [inaudible] consequences and there have been many consequences. I think we are in a good direction right now and I do feel that – I see we have 15 policy advice statements. Thank you, Heidi, for those figures. And the replies we get from the board and from the other groups at ICANN and even from the GAC and that everyone is interested in what we state – what our community has to say. Often these statements that are taken into account.

So we have seen changes, which had a direct relationship to ALAC's advice. I commend us all on that and it's something which has been possible thanks to the work of this community. It isn't the work that one or two people did, but a result of the professionalism that everyone has contributed with here. I think it's very good. There's lots to be done, but we are on the good direction and the right direction.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I have more information from Heidi here on the chat. We submitted [50] statements in 2012. These are general statements not only for the board, because not all statements are sent to the board.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: In the GNSO process, in the ccNSO process – in all processes which take place – a small part is directly related to the board and it had a great impact. That's it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Anyone have any other questions for Olivier? Otherwise I'd say Olivier...

VICTOR NDONNANG: I have a question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I see, regarding what you have added on the bottom-up system, is that all the arrows are only pointing one way. Is there a bilateral relationship? Because, I mean, it's not only that the ALSs send information to the RALO and ALAC. There's also information going the other way. But the decision-making process is generally done from the bottom-up as you said. Yes, Victor, you have the floor.

VICTOR NDONNANG: Thank you, Tijani. Thank you, Olivier. This is Victor speaking. Can you all hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, we can hear you very well.

VICTOR NDONNANG: Okay. So thank you, Olivier, for this clear presentation that you just made. I just have a short question. Seeing your presentation there is a – let me see how I'm going to put this. ALAC should be the voice of Internet users in ICANN, and from your presentation, I get a feeling – and I might have got a wrong idea – but we feel that in order to participate at ICANN formerly you need to be a part of an ALS. Is it possible for an end user who is not part of an ALS to formerly participate at ALAC? Thank you.

Then my second question regards the power of the At-Large community within ICANN, whether they can just make comments or whether they can also see the work of all the other constituencies, whether the GNSO or the board or even the staff.

I'm sorry. It's not that I mean to insist on ccNSO, but during the last AFRALO AfrICANN meeting, the statements that we tried to – what we tried to convey through our statements had a mention on the management of ccTLDs and someone in the ccNSO community asked us to withdraw that from our statement because At-Large has not [inaudible] to provide to the ccNSO. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Victor. I'm going to answer your two questions. The first regarding end users and the importance for an end user to participate – to be a part of an ALS in order to participate at ALAC. Yes, I'd say.

When we think of formal participation, it is necessary. It will depend of course on regions, because some regions have taken measures in order to enable the participation of individuals, but that's usually done by

creating a special ALS for individuals. Still, for end users, if you want to participate in the policy making process, if you want to participate [inaudible] at the RALO or the ALAC level, it is important to be a part of an ALS. That's the case for AFRALO.

Yet nothing stops an end user that is an independent individual to participate at working groups or to provide their advice in the decisions that take place. It's an open community, so everything is done in the open. There are no barriers to entry, except as I say, at the politics level, if you want to have a formal position. But if you want to take part in working groups and submit your comments for the discussions that are held, there is no problem. Everyone can participate there.

Now does ALAC have certain power over the other supporting organizations through SOs? ALAC has no power. We make comments on what goes on throughout ICANN, throughout the ecosystem of ICANN. Now, from time to time, there's also other questions raised and whether commenting on something could be negative and generating a poor climate in ICANN's organization by simply criticizing and not providing a solution.

Many times we have been asked to be constructive. For the recent discussions, I do not have exact details regarding the ccNSO, but I know that the ccNSO currently works a lot to go on working in this evolutionary direction, as is the case of the entirety of ICANN. But sometimes we cannot find a solution without knowing every single aspect. So proposing a solution without knowing every implication could be more negative than it will help.

In general terms, [inaudible] the discussions that we held for the GNSO or for the liaisons to the GNSO, our liaisons for the GNSO, that's the same thing as we do for the ccNSO. We have liaisons for both. In fact, I see that our liaison is actually participating at this call, so maybe she can comment on this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I see that Victor still raises his hand. Okay, he has put it down. Okay, Yaovi?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you very much. This is Yaovi speaking. Can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, loud and clear.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Okay, thank you very much. Given that our liaison is here, I'd just like to make sure that Olivier will get back to me. But these SOs take part in consultations and discussions and comments. The procedure has been the same for a while now. I would like to hear from them regarding the participation. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Yaovi. Olivier, do you want to say anything?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I may have misunderstood what Yaovi said because I couldn't really understand what Yaovi was saying. But then he wanted to know what the impact on the changes of public comment periods were. Is that correct?

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Yaovi. The first version – okay. The ATRT Accountability and Transparency Review Team – this is a committee which met a number of year ago and they went over this public comment period system and they thought that most of the public comments made didn't involve discussion within the different parties at ICANN. Each commentator said what they had to do and didn't take into account what the other said, and so they decided to propose a system where there would be a first period with initial comments and a second comment period on the comments that others had made.

It wasn't a very good idea, but finally when it was created, the current version or the ATRT – the second version of ATRT – which is considering this. It is hard to implement because that gives us 21 days for the first part of the comments, and then a further 21 days for replies. So that gives us a total of 42 days, which is a long time when we have a process working in order to get comments. But we work against the clock and it's a short period for an organization such as ALAC, because in 21 days, we need to get from ALAC to the RALOs and then to the ALSs and the ALSs I think must ask their members, and then the communication

should go back from the members to the ALS to the RALO to ALAC. So it's very hard.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. Yaovi, you're still raising your hand. Unless you have something to do, I'm going to give the floor to Cheryl who is with us. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Tijani. Thank you very much for what I think is very important [inaudible] other regions will be following with the capacity building – online capacity building – work that you're all doing. As you know, [inaudible] of AFRALO and I want to congratulate you on [inaudible] look forward to the other sessions that will come in the future.

To put on my Country Code Numbers Support Organization (ccNSO) liaison hat, [inaudible] that I am a director of a ccTLD operator. So I do have an intimate knowledge of ccTLD activities.

I just wanted to make sure that a [new] point was made here, and that is to do with when an individual is interested in [inaudible] or indeed a group, like an At-Large structure, I think that domain names in many countries the most exposure they will have will be to their country code. So in .au in Australia and .uk in the United Kingdom and [inaudible] countries, many of us will be most familiar with interacting in fact with [inaudible] of country code and not necessarily a generic.

When we come into the world of ICANN, we need to synch in a two-layer approach. We have, through our At-Large structure and through At-Large and through the ALAC, in all the ways that Olivier has described today an ideal opportunity to influence policy that ICANN is interested in both in the generic names, GNSO work groups and opportunities for public comment. But also directly into deliberation of those country codes [inaudible] all the country codes worldwide.

So those country code operators who have banded together and joined into what's called a Country Code Name Support Organization – the ccNSO part of ICANN. And there, there is a sharing and a development of policies which have a more global impact and who certainly do have exactly the same opportunity to insert our opinion and end users. We've done it with internationalized domain names in the [inaudible] and in the formal policy development process that [inaudible] done recently, and that's very much an ICANN and [inaudible] matter.

We've also done it – and are continuing to do it – in some of the review processes. This is something that I know many of you will be interested in, and that's the group delegation and re-delegation of country code names.

That [inaudible] is still going on, and every time a section of that work is completed, it goes out for public comment – and please feel free to ask ALSs in a region or of course every individual make an input on those public comments. If anyone has told you that there is any [inaudible] to you having input into our ccNSO or GNSO public comment, they are misleading you. You have every right and you should be putting in your input as part of the bottom-up process.

But there is a second opportunity specifically within country. Every country code operator has [inaudible] in the best interest of [inaudible] Internet community. [inaudible] Australia was actively engaged with what's called our local Internet community, and in a very short time in the future, we will be [inaudible] not so much local Internet community [inaudible] interested party [inaudible] would include the end users, the top people within groups who would be involved in At-Large, but also with [inaudible] document interest, business interest and other interests who believe they have a stake or a claim of interest in ccTLD.

That's also locally. You also should be inputting your views and your groups' interests directly into those processes when they offer themselves.

As mentioned, I believe At-Large is interested in ccTLD activities and in ccNSO matters, but that we probably need to have a separate piece of work done to [inaudible] and all of the other regions basic information, and I would suggest that Olivier and Heidi discuss that with [inaudible] as to whether we can put [inaudible] to make sure everyone understands the ccNSO as well as they do the GNSO, because the GNSO is far more active in policy development processes and we're far more used to working with them.

Thank you for your time. I do hope that I haven't taken too long. I just wanted to be very sure that we are clear that there is no impediment to an At-Large structure. All the regions [inaudible] input into policy development, public comment [inaudible] ccNSO calls for. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Cheryl. Thank you for having participated here. Olivier, Fatimata has asked a question. It wasn't so much about [inaudible] proposition. She said she would like to see you add into presentation how to become an ALS, how to participate without joining an ALS, and then the role of liaisons at ALAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. And thank you, Fatimata, for your suggestion. It's a great idea. I think we'll be able to add that to make a super presentation, which is much more representative than what we have right now. That presentation is actually rather short. There is an even shorter version of this, which is presented to the fellows. But it's a good idea to add the information on becoming an ALS and participating as an end user who's not affiliated to an ALS and the roles of liaisons at ALAC. We'll write this down as an action item. Gisella, did you hear that? This is an action item. Heidi, have you taken down this action item?

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Are there any other questions or comments? We have very little time left. I see no hands raised. [inaudible] has all been very clear.

AZIZI HILALI: I just want to ask Olivier a very short question. When we speak of [reflections] on perspective and the future of ALAC, I would like to see how Olivier thinks it will evolve – whether there will changes in their structure or the way people participate and what we do right now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, do you want to reply?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani; and thank you, Aziz. I don't have time to reply. I'm going to try and go fast. I think we're going to go on transmitting our message towards end users and Internet users throughout the world. I hope we'll get to have even more and greater replies from people and even more people engaged in these decisions to really establish the relation with users and to bring the voice of all these end users into ICANN's processes. It is very important that this be done and it should actually really work because ICANN is at a position today where public interest is a priority.

Without ALAC, the end user [inaudible] chances of being heard and these [proposals] being followed. ICANN is today a multi-stakeholder organization. So without there being this balance at the [inaudible] level, there will not be any balance at the policy level. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. We are almost at the end of our session. Anyone want to say anything before we go? Good. So it has all been clear. Thank you very much. Thank you, Pierre Dandjinou, for your presentation and

for taking all these questions. I would also like to thank Olivier for his presentation and patience in taking questions and thank you all for having attended this webinar. Thank you the members of staff – Gisella, Heidi. And thank you to the interpreters. Good evening.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]