
DURBAN – ALAC Executive Committee
Friday, July 19, 2013 – 09:00 to 12:00
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

MATT ASHTIANI: Welcome, everyone to the ALAC Executive Committee Meeting on Friday, the 19th of July, 2013. This is Matt Ashtiani for the record. Please remember to state your name before speaking, which once again I did not do. Please remember to speak slowly and clearly for the interpretation which will happen later.

If I can please ask everyone to state their name for the record so we can have an attendance list. We'd also like to note that Cheryl Langdon-Orr has given her apologies, as she is unable to attend this meeting due to other commitments.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Good morning. Dev Anand Teelucksingh, ALAC member, selected by LACRALO.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC member.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, ALAC member.

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.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer, SSAC liaison.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg, ALAC member from North America, liaison to the GNSO, member of the ATRT, and generally someone who is so exhausted – don't rely on anything I say.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Carlton Samuels, ALAC member and Vice Chair.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Evan Leibovitch, North American region, ALAC member – I'm just happy to be awake – and Vice Chair in my good moments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crépin-Leblond, ALAC Chair.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

MATT ASHTIANI: Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco, ICANN staff.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet, Board member.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, until I hear otherwise, Chair of NARALO.

[DAVID COLB]: David [Colb], contractor to ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, everyone. David, could you just say a couple of words because contractor to ICANN. They are quite a few, so in what capacity?

[DAVID COLB]: Well, okay. I'm here to observe meeting process and look at efficiencies and inefficiencies and make some recommendations. And so, I've been in the entire ICANN meeting, sitting in on sessions. You probably wondered "Who is that guy with the staff tag?" That's me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, David. You've got big customers for inefficiencies here at least as far as I'm concerned. Okay. Let's move on then. Let's start and be efficient. As Rinalia would tell me, let's pay attention and go to the first part of our ALAC Executive Committee Meeting.

The first thing is the report from the ALAC liaisons. And I see to my left Alan Greenberg who's going to speak to us about the GNSO.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Unlike most of these meetings, I actually have a bunch of things to report. First – how do we do this? First...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, you're losing points at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know, I know. But there's only so many days of five hours sleep that I can fake. After that...Okay. You may recall a little while ago I mentioned that the GNSO was reviewing its rule on how soon – when motions had to be made to be valid at a GNSO Meeting. The previous rule was something like seven or eight days. And there was a debate at one point that someone had not submitted the motion quick enough because although they had submitted it seven days or whatever the number was, they hadn't submitted it seven times 24 hours ahead of time. There was a significant amount of discussion of exactly what did seven days mean.

So they changed the rule to now be I think closer to ten days but ten calendar dates before and at 23:59 UTC or something like that was the point of demarcation. If we submitted before that, it was a valid motion. If we submitted after that, even by a small amount, it was not a valid motion.

I found that whole process somewhat appalling. The concept is to make sure to give constituencies and stakeholder groups enough time to consider a motion. But doing it to the second didn't seem all that

relevant to me. In any case, they passed it. I believe they passed it unanimously after a very significant amounts of discussion.

The PDP on locking domain names during a UDRP has been one of the more remarkable PDPs in that a bunch of people came together with some pretty diverse views and some vested interests. Not all of which coincide with each other, but all which had an interest in seeing some problems fixed.

The PDP has worked very effectively. Conscious decisions were made. I can see they have the full attention of the audience, which is very distracting actually. Our observer can note that.

The final report was issued a few weeks ago. GNSO Council last weekend decided that they would put it on the agenda, bypassing the ten-day posting rule. The whole room was surveyed and everyone agreed. It came up at the council meeting at which point it was announced by one of the constituencies that they had voted unanimously to request a deferral because the posting deadline had not been met. The GNSO does not formally on its books have a rule saying we can waive rules by unanimous consent.

After a significant discussion about the optics of taking what is probably the fastest PDP and certainly one of the most successful from the point of view of how it actually ran and delaying it for another month or so – until the next meeting – it was a rather interesting discussion.

The bottom line is that it was delayed. There will be a special meeting held in two weeks, which is the minimum you can do to schedule an urgent meeting. It will be passed unanimously because the group that

objected said, “We support it fully. We just refused to let [us] modify our rules.”

The optics of that was rather interesting. The positions taken were rather interesting. There were people agreeing that “Let’s just pass it, if everyone agrees.” And not the people I would have thought because they were some of the more process-oriented people that said this is stupid. So that was the fun part. It makes good listening if you want to back to the MP3. I can point you into where it was, in any case.

Next issue is if you remember correctly, several years go or a year and a half ago, the GNSO formed a small working group in which I participated to a drafting team, to look at what issues were of importance to the GNSO and cross-constituency working groups.

That action raised some flack in both the ccNSO and the ALAC and that how can the GNSO decide on the rules for cross-constituency working groups without talking to the other working groups. At that point, I didn’t have a real problem because the GNSO really was trying to get its own ducks in order, so to speak, and decide what was important to it. All the other groups were at that point asked, “What do you think of this?”

The ALAC either consciously chose to not do it or we forgot. I don’t remember which. I don’t remember a conscious discussion of it. The ccNSO eventually after being prompted at one of the joint meetings at an ICANN meeting went off, chartered a little group and came back with a critique of what they would like to see and what they did not like in the GNSO ones and have submitted that. The GNSO now has to

somehow integrate those two and I suggested that it might be wise to ask the ALAC again so they don't integrate those two and then come to us so we have to triangulate with both organizations and, in fact, some of the things the ccNSO said where our comment what we would say. So I've been asked to come back to the ALAC and ask the ALAC to provide a similar input into the GNSO so we can then form a group and try to get this all done.

That's something that I think has some urgency. I'll be sending a note, an e-mail, but it has some urgency and I think we have to address it.

There's a lot of things going on. I'm starting to have some hope that the IGO-INGO issue of protecting their names is going to have – is going to be solvable. The GAC Communiqué was very enlightening in that they seem to be saying they're not looking for blocking of names but just a process by which they can vet – hit names that overlap with it, which is a far more viable process. Not a perfect one but far more viable – if I'm reading the GAC Communiqué properly.

The Policy and Implementation Working Group has been chartered and a solicitation has gone out for working group members. I would suggest that if the concept is of interest, we may want to get a bunch of ALAC people involved. I'm starting to see significant traction for changing the terminology and coming to the conclusion that there are in fact three phases to the process policy which may include some implementation but the line of demarcation is when GNSO PDP or other policy process stops. That group might have included policy implementation but it's certainly the thing called policy stops.

The next phase is what I'm calling implementation planning and it still involves the community. The process by which this is done however is not at all clear, and that I think is one of the things this working group may be focusing on. Then there's what has come to be called execution which is the mechanical part of putting the policy in place and is largely a staff issue. So that should be interesting.

Lastly, again those of you with a very long memory will recall that after the 2009 RAA was put in place, a group was chartered including the ALAC to look at what else needs to be done to the RAA. A significant number of those things and some others have been put into the new RAA which is just approved. When that process started – the last negotiations – the Board requested an issue report on the other things. We don't quite know what was going to go into the RAA, but the stuff that wasn't covered that was on the laundry list that was written in 2009 would be covered by another PDP to be kicked off once the RAA was signed.

If you go into the archives, the final issue report was issued I believe in December 2012. And that PDP will be starting relatively soon, and again I think is of some issue, some interest to the ALAC. And lastly, there will either be the same PDP or another one – it's not clear to me at this point – on privacy and proxies services which I think also is of some interest to the ALAC.

So there's going to be a whole bunch of things going on that I think if we – to quote what someone said in the open session, "If we walk the walk that goes along with the talk," we really need to have active

participation in those working groups because they're all things that we claim have been important to us. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Do we have any questions? Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Good morning. This is Evan, for the record. What's the status on the GNSO review? I had heard that there was a talk of postponing it and I'm not quite sure what the situation is. Is there a timetable established at this point or has it been deferred?

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, I believe we were proceeding with the idea that it was going to be starting I think early next year. Sébastien may give me a more accurate set of words. I believe the Board has essentially suspended all reviews at this point and is rethinking the whole process to retool it in some different way. And I believe there either is or will be a public comment asking for input on what does the community think we should do.

There's a general perception that we are over reviewed, a lack of conviction that the current review process is particularly effective and stuff like that. So at this point, it is definitely on hold. The GNSO is actively discussing should they do a self-study or self-review. There are a number of people in the GNSO who feels strongly that we do need a review at this time, so there may be something done driven by the Board. There may be something done driven elsewhere.

Sébastien, did I get that close to right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the record, there's a thumbs up from Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, Alan, completely you are right. May I just add one thing? It's that the question is more to decide if we still do silo review or if we try to have a more holistic system [inaudible] of the organization and the fact that there is ATRT-2 going on and also the strategic planning going on could have consequences. Both of them could have consequences of the future organization of ICANN globally.

It's why I think we will suggest – as Board, we will suggest to postpone those review and it's true for the GNSO, but it may also become true for the NomCom. I don't know what you know about that, but the NomCom we, as a Board, received a request from [inaudible] to have a seat on the NomCom.

We discussed within the Board to [inaudible] Improvement Committee if we do a small review of the NomCom to see how we can accommodate this request or not accommodate this request. And then the question was, but if we do that now in one year also we would have to have a full review of the NomCom, then why we don't do the full review now? And for the same reason, that for the GNSO, we will suggest to postpone. It's not yet finalized. It's still in discussion within the Board, but it's my feeling that it will served. It's a way to go. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Follow up from Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The issue of the NomCom is particularly interesting for the GNSO. When the GNSO was reorganized then the associated bylaws changed. The only thing they did not change was the NomCom seats. The NomCom seats are still sitting as they were for the old GNSO. That is one for each of the contracted parties, one for what was NCUC now NCSG, and one each for the intellectual property in ISP constituencies and two for the business constituency because they had one for big businesses and one for small businesses. Therefore, if you look at the stakeholder groups, three of the stakeholder groups have one representative and one has four. Not quite balanced.

Essentially, you have one for each of the former constituencies, but except two for business. NCSG now has two constituencies and they're saying therefore clearly we should have one because that seems to be the mode of operation. One could have made a simple change of taking away one of the business ones for which there's not clear justification based on today's rules and given it to NPOC that, of course, would say if you had another constituency next week, you have the issue again. However, the reason it wasn't touched last time had nothing to do with because we didn't know how it could be done. There was no interest in riling up the commercial stakeholder group who already felt they had gone from three counselors to two and to change the seats. So everyone chose to simply "Let's not mention it."

I don't know why the NCSG didn't push the issue at that point but they didn't. So it's a rather unbalanced, completely illogical organization and the last NomCom review didn't bother commenting on it either. So we're in this funny situation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien Bachollet?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I totally agree with Alan again. And if you take a step up, we have one representative from the other SO and several from the GNSO and it's also at that level imbalance. Then if we open this Pandora's box, ALAC, At-Large have five representatives. Then you can see where we can go in the direction of having the same number for each SO and ACs and what would be the consequences for the GNSO but also for At-Large. So it's something we need to think about if we – the time where the review of the NomCom welcome how At-Large want to react on any changes on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. One I guess needs to also remember, the reason why the ALAC has five people on the NomCom, the very fact being that the ALAC did have Board members. And then when the Board members were stripped away from the structure, these were replaced by members of ALAC – or members of At-Large – on the nominating committee that can select Board members every year. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's a wholly consistent and marvelous rationale which completely crumbles when you see the GNSO which does have two Board members has seven members on the NomCom. Just a comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Without getting into the history of it, I think we're just looking at one of the inadequacies of the history of ICANN in its early days. Anyway, trial by error – more than trial by error and success. Any other points or comments on Alan's report?

I have a question to anyone who actually is very well aware of the AOC and also – the Affirmation of Commitments, sorry – and also the ICANN by-laws. I guess Alan is probably the person to speak to. Aren't the review processes limited in time as far as their launch is concerned? Is there a time limit basically? You mentioned earlier that it was thought the GNSO review process might be delayed? Is there a limit by how much it could be delayed by?

ALAN GREENBERG: My recollection is the original rule was they have to be done every three years and that was changed to five. It was never particularly specific whether it has to launch three or five years after the launch of the last one – the completion of the last one. I remember completion number usable for ALAC and GNSO have taken three years or so. But in any case, the Board has chosen to delay or extend or whatever. So, yes, there are mandated times which apparently we're not considering as absolute to our credit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Delayed until further notice. Is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: There's a public comment field. Public comment opener will be opened. Everything is subject to delay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. The reason of course for my question is due to the accountability and transparency aspect to this. The review process of all of ICANN is seen as one of the primary pillars of the accountability and transparency of ICANN and the fact that the organization keeps on reinventing itself in order to keep up with times, with changes in the overall environment and also keeping up with the improvements I guess that ICANN has to constantly perform. So delay over process needs to be carefully evaluated. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's quite interesting. It's not clear the ATRT review is supposed to be reviewing the structural review process as opposed to just the AOC reviews, but we have chosen at this point to potentially put comments in on the overall process. That's one of the reasons for what may be overlap right now. And one of the issues of if you look at the questions the ATRT asked, every AC and SO is, does the current organization of ICANN help or hurt our ability to do are meant to meet our mission? That part clearly is within the scope of the current ATRT Review Team and is clearly related to not a silo review but an overall structural review.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Of course, those reviews take an enormous amount of volunteer time and the amount of time taking the process is time not taken on policy as we all know.

Any other questions or comments? I'm seeing no one putting their hand up. The next person would be Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the ccNSO report. But as you've heard earlier, Matt has said she is not able to join us due to other commitments. Cheryl has made it known that she will post her report in writing soon.

Could I perhaps ask ALAC staff to take an action item? When Cheryl has published her report, this is reported to the ExCom so that we can look over it in time. Please don't ask me to say this again. Thank you. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: In Toronto, we decided to put two persons that are booking Cheryl in the ccNSO liaison position. I don't know why we don't have one of them to report if they are there to help her.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Noted. I'm afraid I don't have an answer for you. Okay, the next liaison report is going to come from Julie Hammer who is our SSAC liaison. Julie, you have the floor.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Olivier. Julie Hammer, SSAC liaison. Once again, this week it's been a really, really busy week, and I think for the whole community,

the New gTLD issue was one of the most penetrating topics of conversation. From my perspective, there were three aspects of it that were discussed a great deal. The internal name certificate issue that was initially discussed at the last meeting and a lot of action has happened since then. The namespace collision issue and dotless domains.

For the first one, I think you're all aware that the CAB Forum and various browser manufacturers, in particular Mozilla, have taken some good action there. It's certainly not solved, but there's a lot going on. On the topics of namespace collisions and dotless domains, you will be aware that the Board has commissioned studies on both of those topics – two separate studies.

In fact, the dotless domains – I want to be honest – I don't think it was the Board that tasked that one. That sort of seemed to come out of somewhere other than the Board. The Board certainly tasked the namespace collision studies but I haven't found the Board resolution that tasked the dotless domain studies. But in any case, both of those studies have draft reports in. I believe the staff are reviewing them.

Those reports have also been made available to SSAC. And SSAC will comment after they have been released. The SSAC is aware that it is inappropriate to comment on those reports before they released because then SSAC become complacent in whatever their outcomes or recommendations might be. Those reports have been made available to SSAC.

My perception from what I've heard this week is that there is general community awareness about these issues and a pretty good

understanding, but I think there's still in some areas of the community a little bit of misunderstanding about the difference between the internal name certificates issue and the namespace collisions. And certainly, the implications for users who may have never heard of ICANN is something that's at the forefront of everybody's – well, not everybody, but many minds. So I think on the new gTLDs, there's going to be a lot becoming public in the very near future with those reports being made available and ICANN staff needing to propose some recommendations to the Board out of them.

One of the things that SSAC has also been looking at is we've been asked a lot, why aren't your recommendations being implemented? How many of your recommendations going back over past SSAC reports have been implemented? If not, why not? And obviously SSAC has no power to require organizations to implement recommendations, but it is a way that we need – we would be well advised to do some work in looking back over past reports and getting a better understanding of what has been implemented to what degree, what not has been implemented and perhaps getting an understanding of why not.

And very closely related to that issue is the issue of SSAC itself promoting its recommendations. I prefer the term promoting to the term “evangelizing” but I know that evangelizing is a common terminology in ICANN and you all understand what I mean by that.

So I think we need to look in SSAC at doing that to a more than we have in the past and I think that there's a very real place for the ALAC to assist in that regard. And, in fact, Russ Mundy and Heidi and I were having a little conversation about that briefly last night and I think

there's a role for me to play there and there's a role for ALAC in assisting to get the knowledge of SSAC recommendations to the community out there. And I think that's Heidi was saying that that's linked in to the ALAC outreach program as well, so I think that there's obviously opportunity for me to work harder in that regard.

I'm probably not the best person to talk about this topic but I'll just mention that there have been two meetings on the IDN Variants issue which the SSAC Chair has been involved in and I sat in on the last one. And just a couple of hours ago, Patrick, the Chair of SSAC, made visible to the meeting which included the Board of IDN, working group and members of ALAC – the [advanced] notice of the SSAC recommendations in their pending report. So hopefully that was useful exposure, and as soon as that report becomes public, I'll make sure that it is brought to your attention if somebody doesn't beat me to it.

Olivier, there's also I think the issue of the DNSRMF Working Group and the DSSA but because you're co-chair of that group, I think it's probably more appropriate for you to cover that topic at a time that you wish to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Julie. Just a couple of complementary add-ons to your report. First, noting that the GAC has released its advice yesterday, and thanks to the work of the ALAC, effectively driving the SSAC recommendations forward. The GAC has included recommendation number eight or advice number eight – DNS security and stability – and I'll swiftly read through it. "The GAC shares the security and stability concerns expressed by the SSAC regarding internal name certificates

and dotless domains. The GAC request the ICANN Board to provide a written briefing about how ICANN considers this SSAC advice with the view to implementation as soon as possible. The GAC believes that all such stability and security analysis should be made publicly available prior to the delegations of the New gTLDs.”

And then number two, “the GAC advises the ICANN Board to as a matter of urgency consider the recommendations contained in the SSAC report on dotless domains SAC053 and internal name certificates SAC057.” So good work for the SSAC.

JULIE HAMMER:

Julie Hammer for the record. And I think it could work for the ALAC too because that ALAC statement was very welcomed by SSAC and a number of the individuals on the internal mailing list were very pleased to see it. Very welcome indeed. And yeah, I think that that’s sort of working together, that does achieve results.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Julie. And so just to brush the – close the box on this, the DSSA which you’ve mentioned earlier, the DSSA Working Group has met during the – this ICANN meeting to find out really what is it it’s place after the release of the latest report from the Westlake Consultancy that was asked by the Board DNS Risk Management Framework team, and the DSSA has decided to go back to its chartering organizations. The GNSO, the ccNSO, the ALAC, and I forget all of the other speakers because there are quite a few of them. SSAC as well, that’s right. And to ask those organizations first send its final reports and ask those

organizations as to what to do next. And if what to do next means “Well, you’re finished with your job, thank you very much,” then the DSSA has said that they are ready to close the working group down.

It is firstly, I’ve taken my personal feeling on this. It’s unfortunate. It was a community led incentive for her, something that was very truly bottom-up and truly crossed community and I think that the work of the working group was very good indeed but it is understood that the working group is suffering from volunteer fatigue. It has been in operation for more than two years, if not more than that and would need – if it was to get on to some more work will probably need refreshing with some new members and new blood added to it. Any questions or comments? Rinalia Abdul Rahi?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you, Chair. I would like to say that your recommendation or suggestion that the ALAC be one of the conduits to channel SSAC advice is actually very much welcome and I think one of the more concrete areas where we will be doing that would be in the area of IDNs continuously as we will move forward on all the issues that we are grappling with New gTLD implementation and ccTLD implementation related to IDNs.

Although I’m not the IDN policy liaison, I think it would be appropriate for me to raise some things that’s related the IDN that has happened at this meeting that’s related to the security concerns.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Well, I was going to treat this in the IDN liaison report.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Is that on the agenda?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is on the agenda. Yes. But we're still dealing with specifically with SSAC at the moment, so any other questions regarding SSAC first?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: On the SSAC issues and recommendations, there is somehow the expectation that it's an either/or. The community wants the language script in the Internet and there is the perception that they want this irrespective of the security and stability of the DNS and I think that this is not true. I think the way that we have come forward even though there is vocal demands from some parts of language communities around the world, I think there is sort of like an agreement that we want a stable and secure Internet otherwise we would not have the language scripts on the Internet itself. I'll just stop there and I'll come back to it on the IDN reporting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia. Any other questions or comments? And seeing no one, I have the floor back to Rinalia Abdul Rahim for the IDN liaison.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: This is not a report from the IDN policy liaison. It's just an impression that I carried as Vice Chair of the IDN Working Group and having seen the IDN related meetings here.

Leading up to Durban, the At-Large community has worked on two statements to ICANN related to IDNs. One is on Trademark Clearing House and IDN Variant specifically the issue of the Trademark Clearing House not supporting IDN Variants, and the other one is on the implementation of TLD basically, the implementation of TLD overall.

And I think that the statements made a real impact in ICANN because the Board has come out to say, "We would like to have a dialogue with you to address the concerns that you have." And it's the first time that I've seen real constructive dialogue at a working level from members of the Board variant group and the Board new detail deprogram committee with IDN staff in attendance plus all other relevant parties and that sort of is unprecedented and that's really an amazing progress.

Also another interesting thing that I've observed is that in the IDN program update the ALAC comment on the implementation of IDN Variant TLD was put up and addressed one by one and we were the only community or constituency group that make the deadline to submit their response. Other groups are still formulating their response and the IDN staff took the opportunity to address our concerns directly. I think that is quite beneficial for our community.

And also in the Board meeting when we had an interaction with Board members, and Thomas Narten raised the issue well, "Do you want it fast or do you want a secure and stable Internet?" My response was, "We

want both certainly not to at the cost of a stable and secure Internet.” If it’s possible to have both we would like to have both and I think that would – that theme would continue to run throughout our work on IDN and IDN Variants.

One more thing I want to flag is that there is one concrete collaboration that is coming up at the Internet Governance Forum between the At-Large specifically through the Asia Pacific Regional At-Large organization and ICANN the organization and on the topic of what’s next in terms of innovation and the Internet putting linguistic diversity into the root. And this kind of collaboration is also unprecedented in the world of At-Large itself because typically the RALOs do their own workshops and ICANN does its own workshop, and this time around we’re working together to introduce the topic of IDN and IDN Variant introduction into the root. What are the community concerns and what are the expert consideration of what’s possible, what’s safe, and what can we manage? So I think that’s quite a victory. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you so much, Rinalia. And just for the record, Edmon Chung was earlier at the meeting we had earlier this morning but he had to leave due to his early flight. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was struck by a comment Rinalia made that due to us getting in and detailed and early response it was inspected or commented on paragraph by paragraph.

That highlights something that we've talked about on occasion. Our statements are starting to be looked at and are no longer immediately put into the circular bucket. That puts a certain onus as to make sure all of our statements are say exactly what we want them to say down to the word and we cannot be quite as relaxed as we have been in the past occasionally of putting out statements which may include aspects that don't have full support.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good/bad news.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Any questions or comments? Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm simply making a general note here that this kind of thing where we are specifically being listened to, our actions are specifically leading to effect. I think these needs to be sort of noted and recorded almost in a separate column.

At the beginning of the week we were talking about metrics for At-Large rather than – and as well as hours worked as well as statements created. I think we need to start measuring wins, things that we can show demonstrably where we have affected ICANN outputs. There's

been a number of them this week and as I listen to the SSAC report and as I listen to IDN report, I'm seeing more and more examples of wins where we are influencing actual policy where we actually influencing and affecting things. This together with a number of things this week to do with consumer metrics, to do with ATLAS II, to do with a number of things, I think needs to be almost recorded on its own in a separate area.

So, for instance, when we do outreach and we go and we say, this is why to join ALAC, it's one thing to say, "Well this is the size of the organization. This is the description of the organization." But also if somebody says, "Well, what do you actually accomplish?" And this way, I can say to those people that do that and say that. I can give "This is what we did week," not "This is how many meetings we had or how many hours we put in or how many different people we saw their slide decks." But literally, at the end of the week what was changed in ICANN because we were here.

I think I would like to see if we can record that kind of things separately and have it available to people as we do outreach and have it available as At-Large has advanced within ICANN simply as a matter of to me what is probably the most important metric that we have here and that is what we actually get them at the end of the day. So it's a general comment in a lot of what we've been doing here.

Going back to getting the approval of funding for ATLAS and all through the week we've been seeing significant achievements by At-Large. I think we need to record these, I think we need to play this up and I think they've become an integral part of our outreach. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Carlton Samuels and then Tijani Ben Jemaa. We do have to move forward. David Olive is with us. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Chair. I want to strongly support Evan on that observation. I think it's important for us to find a way to put out the wins that we've had and we should not scrimp in showing that it's a long, hard slug to get to where we are, and it's very, very important as part of the outreach to let people see where we're coming from and what we've got in the end. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Just to support what Evan said and I think that we have to separate the work and the achievement. As he said, we can put metrics for the work and metrics for the achievement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani, and I hope that Heidi is listening. And she's not. You'll have to listen to the recording of the meeting afterwards. In your spare time, which I know that might be in a few 10-15 years or so.

We now have David Olive who has joined us. David is the Vice President for Policy Development, and welcome. Welcome to the skillet session

that I just started. We've just turned the heat up and we're very happy to see you with us here. So the floor is yours.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you very much, Olivier, and members of the executive committee. It's my pleasure every ICANN meeting to have this quieter time to talk to you and have be a little more reflective. It is sometimes known as the Joan of Arc session but I don't mean that's going to happen today, but I'm happy to be here.

I have two things on my agenda. One is somewhat of a policy development update and two some SOAC engagement issues. But before I go to that, I'd like to just open by saying I was listening to your conversations and one could come up with the idea of "be careful what you ask for, you may get it." And ALAC has been talking about how effective have they been, who listens to us, who reads our reports, and you're seeing some of that that I've never doubted before and I've been in this job three years and always listened carefully to ALAC and the At-Large community.

As our early warning and grassroots indicators – or put it another way, it's the multi stakeholder model working thanks to you, your hard work that's showing not only the ICANN community but others in the multi stakeholder internet ecosystem, that this can work. From the ALSs to the RALOs to the executive committee here to the larger ICANN work not just in gTLDs but SSAC reports, IDN reports showing the interest and breath of your work and how the comments there are needed from up

here to the ALS in the country. That's a great link to our world in policy development and inputs into ICANN and so I thank you for that activity.

I know because I have some of my policy staff here, Heidi, Matt, Silvia and others who work hard with you to make your work well-known in the community but also have an impact. So I thank Olivier and this group for your leadership of making the multi stakeholder model work for all of us at ICANN. Thank you.

In terms of the policy development process and activities of Beijing to Durban, I must say that the last time I spoke to you in Beijing we are again talking about how best to make an impact, the use of your statements and— we heard you obviously and we see some improvements in particular the graphic I liked.

And if you looked at the latest Durban policy update, we focused on this as well as using graphics or infographics where we could to describe in a quick picture what you do and how you do it. And I think this is very, very helpful and if you notice on the policy update, we have this for the GNSO and the ccNSO and this really stemmed from some work we were doing with the GAC for early policy engagement and we shared that with you and our staff because we do talked to each other and work together on the policy development team, came together and through Matt and others, we're able to take this and use it for your community to focus your attention, to help you in looking at issues and commenting on those issues. I'm glad to see that as well.

We also find on your website the early policy development pages – again, another element of providing a summary; again, trying to make it

digestible and understandable to your communities so that they can have meaningful comments and inputs. I'm delighted to see the reaction to that.

We hear what you've done in just a matter of the policy statements here in preparation for Durban and your discussions with other groups and the SOs and the ACs. To that extent, that's very, very good and I thank you for those inputs.

Yes, of course, with other groups in the policy development process, the ccNSO was active, the GNSO was active. You've heard some of their work through your liaisons – Alan Greenberg for the GNSO in particular – and I don't have to go through that with you.

Again, we urge you to use the tools of myICANN to be informed, as well as the policy update on what other SOs and ACs are doing in their areas. We promote your work, obviously, there as well.

In the areas of SO-AC engagement, I would like to just talk about some of these areas where it's basically work and cooperation between and among the supporting organizations and advisory committees. And to that extent, of course, Tijani, you're here but Fatimata and Aziz are not. Thank you for bringing AFRALO work to Durban.

But it becomes a hallmark. When ICANN is in another region, we turn to who for that link? To the At-Large group. And you come up with wonderful interesting programs. You perform and are effective in showing the activity and engagement of the group from At-Large within that region. That, again, shows that the multi-stakeholder model is there, and alive and well.

But in particular, here at AFRALO, it was a wonderful program and everyone took note of that and the engagement of the 16 people from the area. You saw the blog that went up. It's another example of how we should reinforce that and show the wider community that this is the hard work of the At-Large community and that the multi-stakeholder system is here, and alive and well. Thank you for that.

In other areas, in particular, I'd like to note as we're trying to further engage some of our other supporting organizations or advisory committees to work together. In particular, we're looking to advance and promote the activities. ICANN has names and numbers; we focus on names. We tend to forget a little bit about the numbers, so the addressing counsel – the ASO and the Number Resource Council (NRO) – were here and, wonderfully, they came and talked to you.

Again, the flexibility of your group to have a discussion with them and what's going on in the numbers space. This is an excellent example of the cross-communications that you're having, so I thank you for that – the IDN meeting, Rinalia, as well as your multi-stakeholder round table. Not to give you other ideas, but maybe in the future to focus on IPB6 Uptake or something with the ASO, or focus on other interests that may be of interest. But I hope that will continue.

The topic you picked was a good one, and I think it was well received by people here. So if you're planning on next steps, please continue to do that. And obviously the IDN sessions and the informal one I said that was well-attended – indeed.

So to that extent, I'm happy to hear the vibrancy and activity of this group, and I know Fadi recognizes this and has talked to other members

of the group. This is an important way to show how ICANN is evolving and changing.

So the ASOs can become more involved, we're going to try to get them here in larger programs and integrated with our programs. That was one major area of focus for me here in Durban. The other area was, of course, the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC).

As you saw in the Board resolution, they are now reformulating themselves, reorganizing themselves, to be a little bit more active than in the past. This is, again, trying to bring that other component of ICANN into relationships with other SOs and ACS and active in the ICANN meeting. The Board passed the resolution that appointed some members of their advisory committee, and they'll be more in evidence with us in future meetings. We have to think of ways to talk to them and hear about their issues and what might be of concern for the ALAC with those groups. We'll be working with you to help on that when they get more organized at ICANN meetings. That is the SO and AC engagement.

The only final comment I would have before I open up to questions is that if you notice on my e-mails, I am now officially a resident of Turkey. The office is open there. I have an apartment with actual furniture, so I can go back to my home there as opposed to a hotel. That's a very good thing. We're beginning to look at moving some people and employing some people there for the corporate functions – HR, meetings team, compliance, legal, and others. I'm there for policy at the beginning.

We've established a good relationship with the Turkish Internet Improvements Board, as it's called – a multi-stakeholder group of

government, civil society, academics, and the business community. They asked me to address them. I did, before leaving for Durban. I was well received and welcomed there. We had two senior members of the Turkish government here – the GAC representative as well as the chairman of their ICT regulatory body – both here in Durban. I was able to have meetings with them, and Fadi met with them as well.

We're on our way to moving toward those regional hubs to have meetings there and whatnot. In fact, I will have my policy team leaders meeting in Istanbul. That's requiring Heidi to take the long flight, and I can go just a block to my office for planning sessions and whatnot. But others we hope to have more meetings of ICANN there. I know the Board has expressed an interest so I am going to be busy, but we happen to welcome you if you're in that region. Pleased to have you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, David. Without turning this place into a Taksim Square, let's turn up the heat. First question from Rinalia Abdul Rahim. Then I've got Al an, Tijani, and Evan. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier. David, I was very pleased that we finally have a vice president for outreach for the Asia region and I know that the hub is being set up in Singapore, and you are now a hub in Istanbul. I was wondering what would be the commonality that is going to be carried out at these hubs, and what would be the differentiation in terms of ICANN's core work? That's the first question.

The second part of it is that at this meeting, as usual, we have many conflicting schedules and there are lots of good sessions that we couldn't attend. There was one in particular that I was very keen on, and that was the briefing to the GAC on the TLD Market. I was wondering if a webinar can be organized for our community for that because I think that would be really useful to give us an idea of what we're dealing with, and we'll be most appreciative if that could be made possible. Thank you.

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you, Rinalia. Let me take the last point first, if I could. I missed that meeting, too, which looked to very interesting on the TLD marketplace. It would just be an area of looking at who presented to try to get that webinar. I think that would be great. If, indeed, that session had notes or recording, we could also, that would be a starting point. But I think we could try to replicate that as a webinar. I think it would be very interesting and we'll try to work on that, to talk to the organizers.

In terms of the regional hubs versus the engagement offices, the difference there is that we're trying to decentralize, if you will, the centralized corporate functions that were known to be in LA. We'd have to wake for LA to wake up. Even when I was in Washington, I had to do that. Now I'm in Turkey and still have to do that in some cases.

We're hoping to then create similar support systems so that they can take care of the time zones. For Istanbul it would be Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. For Los Angeles it would be North and South America. And for Singapore it will be the Asia Pacific.

The difference between what I'm doing and what Kuek has to do in the Asia Pacific is that he's really going to focus more on the engagement side. He's vice president of engagement first there. Then we're also in parallel process looking to what corporate functions can move there. In my case, I have three regional vice presidents working on Europe, the Middle East, and Africa, plus engagement offices there. Those people report to Sally Costerton and Tarek Kamel.

I'm there providing the services of the regional hubs to them. So to that extent, we're still working on what elements – as I mentioned, compliance and whatnot – to work for that and those stakeholders and constituents in those areas. As we move along, I'll continue to run policy from Istanbul on my global conference call. We used to be at 11 a.m. Washington, D.C. time. It's now 5 p.m. Turkish time so I can have a late dinner later, and half of my staff are in the European area.

And then of course I'll be engaging with Nigel and [Vinny] and Pierre and Baher and their groups as well. As they're continuing to do and implement their strategies, I'll be supportive of that. So I have two hats. I am Vice President of Policy Development Support and head of the Istanbul regional hub. I'm looking forward to working with both of those, but I still have a prime focus and a fondness for my policy development team.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, David. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. David, a number of things struck me this week as I was listening to various talks. The first is that yours is probably the group within ICANN that is most dependent on successfully attracting volunteers into the ACs and SOs, and you have a vested interest in ensuring that works.

The second thing which may seem unrelated – but most of the people in this room will see the link really clearly – is that with ICANN building the various regional offices and hubs (and I can't remember the term used for the lesser centers)–

DAVID OLIVE: Engagement offices.

ALAN GREENBERG: Engagement centers – ICANN's travel expenses are going to be going through the roof. I would like that to be remembered as we talk about how to make sure we have volunteers. ICANN volunteers are sometimes dealt with from the point of view of travel funds in a – well, the word "humane" has been used in a negative context – that is, "lack of."

"Penny pinching" is another word that has been used, and all sorts of things which not only decrease our effectiveness, but increase the level of – not sure if this is an adjective – demeaningness, or something like that.

So as ICANN's travel expenses are going to be going very high for very valid reasons, let's make sure that we don't try to get the savings out of how we treat volunteers. What we're spending on volunteer support is

going to be a pittance compared to the other similarly related expenses for staff, and it has to be kept in balance. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: David?

DAVID OLIVE: Thanks you, Alan, for that. As one knows the glamorous nature of international travel these days, first you have the airport strip tease and then you go through security and then you're in the bus. I came over from Istanbul on the New Airbus 380 – the new double-decker. The first time I was on that one, I got lost on the place trying to find the men's room.

But I take your point. The hope is that travel would be somewhat more localized, and I'm finding, as well, it's an easier and cheaper flight for me to go and see my team in Brussels, for example, than it is when I was in Washington or the like.

I'm now trying to remind my headquarter people when they say, "Why aren't you coming to visit us in LA?" I turn it around and say, "Well I'm the other hub. Why don't you come and visit me in Istanbul?" We're going to see more of that.

But your point is well taken about the need to treat our volunteers with courtesy, respect and [all] because they are traveling that glamorous bus distance as well. That's not easy. It's tiring. I take that point and I'll make those comments.

In terms of successfully attracting more people for inputs – I focus particular on the policy development process, but more generally on ICANN activities – this is an evolving role I have in terms of SO-AC engagement. We're trying to create staff for that and, obviously, At-Large is a critical first step because of the ALSs and RALOs, to be able to do that.

Hopefully, with our matrixing between the regional and the global – again a new exercise for us and we'll be learning as we go along the way – a way to have a touch point or a contact point closer to the groups that you are working with and supporting to have that link.

I've been talking to the regional vice presidents. Suggestion number one is get to know all your ALSs and get to know all of the RALO leaders because they're in your region. That's a great source of information, support, and engagement. Hear what they're doing. Try to be involved in their programming and their events that they're attending.

The two obviously would be with the CCTLD community, GAC members, any Board members, any ExCom members in your zone. That's the way you start the process, and they're working on that as well as their engagement with governments.

All of this has to be done as we mature and as ICANN evolves. You heard on the public forum the dot-berlin regional groups when I'm thinking of a new constituency, the brand members new constituencies. So we have to be prepared for and welcome new entrants, and a lot of them will come through the At-Large Structures.

To that extend, the ATLAS Summit is a wonderful way to focus attention on the role of ALAC and At-Large in our whole community. I wish you well, and we're going to work to that event in London with you and with others at ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, David. Do you want to follow up? We need to move a bit swiftly. Cherine Chalaby has made it here. Alan, follow up.

ALAN GREENBERG: A very short one. I was prompted by your facetious comments on the luxury travel that we all experience. A number of years ago there was a motivational psychology named Frederick Herzberg whom you may be familiar with. He developed the concept of hygiene factors, motivational factors. Hygiene factors and salary is one of them among employees which good value do not make you happy. Bad values make you very unhappy.

There are some people, no doubt, in ICANN who are in this for the travel. I'm quite positive there are. For most of us, it's a hygiene factor. It doesn't make us happy, but treating us poorly in a variety of different ways makes us really unhappy.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. David, you said that you have two hats, and that's right. I would say one is central and the other is regional, but it's not right since Fadi said that the three hubs have the same level. So there is not central. The three are central, the three hubs. So I would say one is horizontal and the other is vertical. Do you think that you will manage to do both with success and with efficiency – first question?

Second point, you spoke about it, but I still have a question. The community in your region – when they want to do something, when they have something to do – shall they go to their vice presidents (Middle East, Africa, etc., or Europe) or should they come to you? How it will be managed?

DAVID OLIVE:

Very good question. My answer to that is they should go to the vice presidents in the regional. They're running the regional strategy and the regional engagement. Yes, in a sense, they report generally in the matrix to the regional headquarter hub, but they report directly to Sally and to Tarek. That should be it. I am not there to have another layer of coordination. They're already doing quite well.

I'm there to facilitate their work when they come to us if they need sort of human resources or IT support or the corporate support functions. My role is to help make sure that they get the answers to that and facilitate their work. My job is not to interfere with or be another layer to do that

Obviously if someone comes to me with the question, "Who do I go to?" I'm happy to tell them, "See Baher," and work with that and to make

sure there's a follow-up on that. But, no, I'm not the overall micromanager of that project. I don't mean to do that. We don't need to do that. I hope that clarifies that.

In terms of can I manage both horizontally and vertically, it's a new challenge that I relish. I look forward to that. I'm excited to be back living overseas as I have in the past in my career. I've done that and I've worked in those environments. It'll be a challenge and you'll judge me on that, but I hope I can succeed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, David. Just a quick follow-up question. Do you now have an organizational chart that's been published?

DAVID OLIVE: Organizational chart of ICANN?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Who reports to who, what department to what, etc. We understand it's a matrix, but the matrix in some people looks more like a bowl of spaghetti. Do you understand?

DAVID OLIVE: I thought there was. Let me check. I thought there was one on the website, but I will check and send it to you.

[ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, David, there isn't one for the general organizations and there certainly isn't one for your organizations. When you hire new people – and I can give some recent examples – I don't have a clue where they report. Your titles are so obscure, that I never know if you've hired a more senior person or a more junior person. When Mary Wong was added, the description sounds like she reports to you. I suspect I know who she reports to, but we don't know for sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Evan Leibovitch, and then we're going to have to move on.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, David. A couple of things. Number one, just a very quick comment on what you said just a moment ago. You were talking about new constituencies like community TLD applicants and that kind of thing. You briefly in passing suggested these might be good candidates for ALSs and I'm not quite sure that's totally appropriate. The way in for a new applicant or registry, I don't think it fits in with the ALS which I typically think of as groups that otherwise would have very little to do with ICANN but come in here to represent very disinterested parties.

I've got two questions. One of which is, I'd like to know what your view is on the role of outside research, whether it's academic, whether it's opinion polls, whether it's any kind of outside information that helps to guide various things – whether it's assisting At-Large in understanding a public interest point of view on things of regard to ICANN or of the role of academic in doing scholarly research on issues related to ICANN.

What kind of information like that is already being collected, and does At-Large have a role to play, in your mind, of how that's done?

My last question is, at the very beginning you talked about how well we're doing, could you take a moment at this point to tell me what you still think our weaknesses are? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: David?

DAVID OLIVE: No, I didn't mean to say that we have an established recognition and procedure for constituencies within the GNSO. I was referring to that, Evan, and not the ALSs. I think I was trying to refer to the fact that there will also be structural changes as we move forward with the new gTLD program and the changes in our SOs and ACs, that there will be maybe new entrants coming in, or which ALSs would be one portal for that. I didn't mean to say that they were to be members of the ALSs – though they could be if they're involved in the country or the region. They can have two hats.

In terms of outside research, you saw on the public forum this woman from the university talking about international law and studies like that. We do, on occasion, when looking at questions, look to outside consultants for that who provide that information. Obviously we're always looking for that, and that could be pointed to or inputted to our activities and processes. When we have working groups, let's say, of the CCNSO or the GNSO, I know the CCNSO work with UNESCO on some of the geographical names. The GNSO working groups will bring to our

attention and bring to the working groups' attention the collected academics and/or legal research that may be related to those points.

So to that extent, if you come across and see things of interest, indeed, bring them to our attention and maybe we could also put it on the website as a bibliography or things to do there.

To that extent, we encourage and we want to hear more about research that's directed in and around Internet governance or at ICANN in particular.

Weaknesses? I always like those questions. I haven't really focused on that, but I would have to say think about how you can better integrate the grassroot At-Large, the regional structures, into your At-Large activities, and also to have more cross interactions with the ASO with the IDNs and whatnot. That's always something that we can improve on, and I'd hope you would also do that as well to break down some of the silos that we have at ICANN and have cross ideas and cross workings of the various groups. I would say that's about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, David. Two last things before we close and move on with Cherine Chalaby. You mentioned earlier a number of new documents and so on that were created by staff with the help of the community, and I must say that they are absolutely fantastic. I'm really delighted to see them, and we have to thank our staff for working on this although we do need a better front end.

The reason for it being that there are a lot of hidden gems around now on our websites, etc., or forests, but the front end just looks so terrible

and you just don't find any of the information. When are we going to be able to move forward with this?

DAVID OLIVE:

Thank you. I'm glad you asked that. Quickly. I'm sorry, Cherine, to take one more minute of your time. We're obviously looking at how to revamp the website because it is a huge and vast information storage and archives, but not easy to get through.

Also take into account with the new digital platform and particularly the online learning, what we're trying to do now – and think of these in terms of what you do; you all used to do reports or slides or whatnot (I tell this to my staff) – make sure that you think of it in context of what curriculum it could be – Policy 101, IDNs 101 – that we can then group. You've done a wonderful job with "The Beginner's Guide to..." in the At-Large.

Put those into reference points so they can be part of introductory courses, advanced courses, middle courses. This is wonderful content that you produce and we want to reuse and use in these types of vibrant courses. Please take that into account, and we're working on that for both the online platform and the revamping of the website.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. One small, tiny note from Evan and then we'll have to move on. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, this is good not only with David here, but also a couple of Board members. You talk about getting out of siloes and doing more communications with other groups. I'll put in one more plug for cross-community working groups and to try and make that happen and just leave that on the table with anyone here that's interested in hearing that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Before you go, before you let off, David, one final stab. 16 young people from the area and from Africa – which we're delighted with and which we're all delighted with – "Sponsored by Google." Why not "Sponsored by ICANN"?

DAVID OLIVE: Good role for the fellowship, and we'll have to work on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. [applause]

Joining us as David runs away – and he can stay. You're very welcome to stay, absolutely; have a life when it's Cherine's turn to answer questions – welcome Cherine Chalaby who has several hats, as many people have in ICANN. You are the chair of the Board/New gTLD Committee, and you are also the chair of the Board Finance Committee as well. I don't know which hat you want to start wearing first, or do you wish to just answer on any of these two?

CHERINE CHALABY:

I just want to start with something. By the way, Chris Desspain is here and obviously Sébastien as Board members are here, and Erika's here. They're not here because I was afraid to be grilled by you guys, and I'm sure they'll let me fry in front of you. I want to start because I'm personally confused in what capacity I'm here. Let me tell you why I'm saying this.

I'm new to ICANN even though I've been here two and a half years. I've not done this before, and I stick too much to governance things. To me, in my brain, it says the following – and this is why my colleagues are here who have more experience to help – that the chairman of the Board speaks on behalf of the Board, the CEO speaks on behalf of the organization, and frankly no Board member can speak either on behalf of the Board or on behalf of the organization, especially when we are travelling at the expense of ICANN. So we are here in an official capacity.

I'm not here in a personal capacity to express my views, so I have no idea who am I in this meeting because I cannot talk on behalf of the Board, and in principle I should not talk in a personal capacity because I am on ICANN business. So I don't know what am I going to say and how do I say things. I need help from my fellow Board members because, in principles, I'm not authority to be here to say anything formal or anything on a personal level.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: This is not stonewalling. This is a serious part of the discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you speak on behalf of your two hats – in other words, as chair of the Board Finance Committee?

CHERINE CHALABY: I'm not authorized because this is part of the Board, and unless I have authority from the Chairman to say, "Go and speak on behalf of the..." it is part of the Board, these committees. I do not know and I'd like to have this discussion before we start so I'd know what to say. Maybe my colleagues would help me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Charine. We'll have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Let the Board member help him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Erika Mann.

ERIKA MANN: I think you described this well, but I think you can still have an exchange. You can't make recommendations, you can't go into any kind of Board-related decision-making or even with regard to recommendations. But it's still possible for you as the chair of the gTLD committee to hear, to listen, and I would say even to respond in some

way in laying down or reasoning why certain things happened in certain ways because they're already on public records in most cases.

I wouldn't worry about these kinds of things. If I would be in your position, I wouldn't worry too much about this. As long as you keep the decision-making [inaudible] absolutely [inaudible] aside.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Did you want to help as well, Chris Disspain?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Olivier. Maybe an example might be helpful. I think it would be perfectly fine, for example, to talk about what's the likely process for dealing with the GAC advice that arrived yesterday, but it certainly wouldn't be appropriate to ask the question, "What do you think about the GAC advice" – apart from perhaps saying, "It's a very nice font."

So I don't think there's an issue in that sort of sense, and I understand completely what you're saying. The challenge is that – and this has got nothing to do with At-Large – but the challenge is that oftentimes what happens is, "He said in this meeting that..." and that becomes very challenging.

Having said that, I think if you look at the continuum of the 100% corporate governance view which is effectively that you shouldn't say anything, and the 0% corporate governance view which is that you tell everybody everything that's ever happened ever, as long as we stick to 75% towards the 100% we'll be fine and I can't see a problem with that. But, Cherine, I give you my undertaking to sit here while you're grilled

and to advise you if I think we're overstepping the line in any way – not that you would because, you know, you're perfect...

CHERINE CHALABY:

I am making this point because I see a lot of my fellow Board members in many cases say, "I am expressing my personal view," and I say – this is me because I've been on so many Boards – you cannot express a personal view if you are on ICANN business and ICANN has paid for your travel, for your hotel, for all of this. You can only speak as a Board member. Outside this meeting, you can. You can at other times, but not when you're on ICANN business that you suddenly say, "Oh well, the Board says this but my view is different." You can't do that.

Anyway, I still say for the record, I cannot here represent the Finance Committee because there's no [inaudible] of the Finance Committee, or the New gTLD Committee because there's no [inaudible], nor the board because I have no authority to represent the Board.

Let's get going with a question and see how this takes us, but it is an important discipline for all of us going forward. It's not that we're here to worry about the question, but it's in what capacity and what role from a governance perspective. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Cherine, and you've already generated a few. There's Evan, Alan, and Sébastien. Evan first.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. One thing about the nature of today is that – well, now I’m speaking personally. I’m on ICANN business, so cut my pay in half. Or double it if the result is the same. I guess what we were hoping for – at least what I hope for – is on the Friday sessions, that things are a little bit more relaxed. There are fewer shirts, more t-shirts. The pressure is off.

We’ve already had the formal engagement with the Board. That’s already taken place, so this isn’t meant to be just ALAC Board Engagement Part 2. It’s meant to be something a little looser, a little bit more, I guess, for you to have a little bit more confidence that we’re doing things in the right direction; we’re trying to hear from you.

Whether you put on a hat, take off a hat, switch hats, or go without a hat, it doesn’t matter to me. I want to hear from you what you think about things. Your choice, right? It’s your choice, essentially. Or even just at the end of the week, a theme that you saw that’s worth following up on.

These are questions that you have based not just on the interaction with us, but of anything else you’ve seen that you think is something that we could pick up on or anything like this. At least what I hope to get out of our Friday sessions is something a little different from what happens Monday to Thursday. Maybe this is too much to ask to say, “Take of the shield a bit. This is a little bit of a better atmosphere than it is from Monday to Thursday.”

But at least in my own mind our Friday meetings have typically been a little bit more relaxed, a little bit more open. In fact, I find that kind of exchange very often better and different from the kind of very, very

formalized “We are talking to you as this body to this body.” At least my own intention is that it takes a different form for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan, it depends on which side of the barbecue you sit on, though.

CHERINE CHALABY: Not really. I take the point, but on the other hand, these are recorded conversations, recorded minutes, and published minutes. So people are going to read this and say, “In what capacity Cherine was talking?” I don’t know in what capacity I’m talking because I have no authority to talk in any capacity at this meeting. That’s all.

So if you switch off the recorder and want to roll the sleeves and put on the t-shirt and let’s have a friendly conversation, I’m very happy to do that. But if you’re going to have formal recording and this is going to be in the public domain, then we have to be careful what are we trying to achieve.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cherine, you’re presenting this from the quandary that you are presented with, but to varying degrees I think almost everyone at ICANN has a related problem. Certainly, what you’ve said is almost identical to the rationale that GAC has used why they can’t participate in any activities – that is, someone is going to presume, no matter what

disclaimers they say, that they are speaking on either the behalf of the GAC or the behalf of their country. The disclaimers may cover them legally, but they don't cover people's impressions.

It's true for many of the people around this table. It's certainly true for people in the GNSO. Other than a few of us who happened to be unemployed at the moment, there are varying degrees. So if we honor this at the extreme level, the whole multi-stakeholder model just breaks down. If you were to ask me how you should treat it, I think you need to be empowered to speak on your own personal behalf even though your own ICANN's dime.

Yes, some people will ignore the words you say in your disclaimer and will presume you're speaking as a Board member, and I think that's one of the liabilities. I was struck as I started working on the ATRT that we have GAC members who sit on the ATRT and talk in recorded conversations and transcribed conversations and never once do they say, "It is going to be taken that what I'm saying is on behalf of my country or on behalf of GAC."

They are equal members in the group and they participate without fear of those associations being made, even though they're being broadcast, transcribed, and recorded. I think we need to somehow move into that model in general in the ICANN environment so that we can get productive discussions going across our boundaries.

And in the case of a Board member, as I said, I think you need the dispensation to say, yes, you're on ICANN's dime but you are allowed to speak not necessarily your position, but your understanding of how, what the mindset...

What we're looking for in a GAC member participating in a GNSO working group is the mindset of GAC members. You may be able to give us some insight as to how the GAC will respond. It's not a guarantee. It's not even how your country might respond, but it might. I think that's what we're looking for in all of our interactions, and yes, some people will misunderstand. That's life.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Okay, let's get on. I made the point and I accept. The only thing is that we as Board members sign on a particular code of conduct and particular obligations. Very easily, someone say I've breached my step [inaudible]. I don't have an authorization. I came willingly on my own, so I'm not scared to give my opinion as you know. Yesterday we were at the public meeting and I spoke for three hours, but I was talking openly on behalf of the Board and seeking my colleagues also to talk openly. I just want to make sure we do it right, that's all. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Cherine, we have Sébastien Bachollet next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Maybe you say something and we say something, but if in ICANN we can't talk together, then we are dead and the people who are on the dime of ICANN are more than the Board member. Finally, you are the chair of the Board regarding the New gTLD and I don't see how you can escape from that hat. You are the only voice [audio cuts off]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, he feels we interrupted him when he [audio cuts off]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien, continue. Sorry.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If you take the hat of the chair of the Board committee on the New gTLD program, you are the chair of the Board in that specific capacity. Then you can't escape to be the voice of the Board of ICANN on that specific topic because we give to this committee the full power of the Board, and you are sharing it. You are the same possibility as the chair of the Board regarding this subject.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, let's move on beyond that point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think these are all procedural things, and I think we've got an idea now of where we stand. Rinalia Abdul Rahim, let's move on.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate your concern and I understand that it's quite real for you because you take your responsibility very seriously, but I do wish that these issues were sorted out before the meeting

started because then we would know exactly where we stand and we can proceed with the issues that we both care about.

Anyway, my question. The Board is tasked with one of its responsibilities, in my understanding, any Board would be responsible to see that an organization has a strategy, it is a good strategy for the organization. Fadi has proceeded now with this strategy engagement process of asking for feedback from the community, and one key aspect of that – and that falls into David Olive’s responsibility – is the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model because with the New gTLD Program, the jurisdiction between stakeholder groups is blurring, and that’s going to affect how policies are developed in ICANN and how we’re going to proceed.

I wanted to know if there are some thoughts in your mind in terms of how this would inform the strategy of ICANN and when we could really have a position to have a restructured stakeholder group or whatever it is, structure within ICANN itself? Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Thank you. Very good point. If, on a personal level, you’d asked me five years from now, “If you were to look back, what would be a couple of things related to the discussion you said,” I would say there are two things we would need to achieve as part of the strategic plan and in relation to newcomers in the multi-stakeholder model.

I’m going to read two statements that I personally wrote to clarify my own thinking. The first one is, “ICANN has to gain a global image and posture” – I’m using my words very carefully – “that it is fully inclusive

of all stakeholder groups across all geographies and across all interests.”
If we can achieve this as part of something we do [inaudible] important.

The second thing is, “ICANN has to solidify the global understanding and acceptance of its legitimate role in Internet governance as a transnational and multi-stakeholder organization.

There is a danger that we cannot achieve these two things if we remain with the current structure and if we remain a closed club where newcomers cannot come in, and if we don’t evolve the multi-stakeholder model that we have today. How, I don’t know. But I know that, in my personal view, these are two very clear objectives that we should achieve, and it should be in our strategic planning.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Follow-up from Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Just a quick follow-up. In your mind, what are the closed dimensions of ICANN today that need to be addressed?

CHERINE CHALABY: I don’t know this from experience, but what I hear is there are the SOs and ACs who could be seen as silos whereas the existing membership and the New gTLD program is going to create new members and new players as they’re coming, and you could see it yesterday. Suddenly, it’s not the same number of people speaking in the microphone. There was a lot of new faces and even people said, “I am here for the first time.” I am sure that our new players have to come in. And how do we, each SO

and AC, how do we embrace them? How do we open the door and take them in? Maybe we have to internally reorganize and restructure, but accommodate the new environment. That's my take on that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia.

CHERINE CHALABY: Did I answer your question?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: You did, Cherine. The main question is how are we going to do it? Because I think it's quite hard.

CHERINE CHALABY: Right. I don't know how. Maybe another Board member can answer that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Suddenly ten hands go all around. We've got Erika. We've got Carlton and Chris as well.

ERIKA MANN: He was first.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, he was first. David was the fastest on the trigger. You win the prize.

DAVID OLIVE:

The “how” has to come from the community and that’s why we’re having a five-year strategic plan, including the panels that are going to specifically focus on those areas. Beth Novak is the one person looking at multi-stakeholder evolution as other outside and other new ideas to engage. I share with Cherine those concerns, and he’s got them right on. But I don’t have the master plan of then how that works to changing the boxes of the organizational structure. That is yet to be seen by the community and how that best fits.

The point is that the current organizational structures were really mapped to the existence of ICANN and the Internet in 1998 and modified somewhat several years later, but we have to look at the next five years. We would hope that the structures would map the 2018 version of the environment, the stakeholders, and how we develop. That was the aspirational look at things. I don’t have the precise details. We’re hoping to hear more from the community.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Just a quick comment on that. The strategy process that was launched where different groups were started – I see that as clearly input to what we’re trying to achieve here. The thing is, when you say the answers comes from the community, the community is self-interested in its silo composition, so it will advocate for a position that benefits itself – in some cases. Maybe not all cases.

The question that comes to my mind is who will look at it from the holistic point of view and put it together so that it is all-embracing and fair? Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY:

The answer is clearly that, at the end, the Board will have to sign off on the strategic plan. The Board has a responsibility to ensure that all stakeholders' views are presented, and that's the role of every Board member – never to act on behalf of a single stakeholder, but on behalf of all of the interests of all of the stakeholders.

The other thing is that Fadi announced those strategic planning panels. They will have a group that will include outside as well as community members so they by, default, are going to be objective in taking inputs and try and come up with a recommendation that they have to feed back into the community which I hope is a balanced view taking into account the view of all stakeholders rather than a particularly narrow strip.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Cherine. We've got Erica, Carlton, and then Chris. Erica?

ERIKA MANN:

My understanding is – but maybe because I'm German and I sometimes tend to think too pragmatic – I don't think it is all too complicated to imagine the next step we have to take as long as we don't think we are looking for the perfect solutions.

So when I see and when I look at the composition, in a moment – how the differ and communities operate and function – I see three things probably which I would argue are missing or they we should undertake the next steps to become more inclusive.

One would be cross-functioning approaches which I think is extremely important. They can't work all the time, but they have a limited purpose to clarify a few things as quickly as possible and then bring it back to the community.

The second – gaps which are there, which I always find completely amazing in our environment. For example, we had a long chat yesterday, with this great expertise which we have in the room. There are so many lawyers present from all the different environments.

You hardly find this anywhere, so why haven't we, until now, had at least a group where we meet when a certain topic needs to be sorted out. We just meet, identify the topic, and then try to find not the solution, but to prepare the path for a solution. That's something I'm hoping to work on to bring this, ideally. In Buenos Aires, we have the first meeting.

Then I think, what is new? What is missing? Because we have so many new business models arising and we see so many different players, I don't think they have to be becoming one of the new silos. At least we should look at them. What is the specific need? What is missing? How can one include them into what the others are already doing? Is there something new which needs to be created?

So back pragmatic: next steps, what can be done, always looking at the core of ICANN. I'm always worried if we go too much to want to embrace the whole world. I think the core of our function... But then we should really understand what is missing right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Erica. Carlton Samuels is next.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Olivier.

CHERINE CHALABY: Carlton, [inaudible]? Sorry. Given that you're right –we should have sorted this issue before coming, and frankly I only thought about it this morning given the whirlwind we've been in – I'm very happy to stay longer if it doesn't impinge on your time table, and compensate for this 15 minutes or so that we've wasted up front. I'm very happy to do that. Okay? If it's respective and doesn't impinge on your schedule.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cherine. I'm sure we'll be able to accommodate a few more minutes. Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Olivier. Carlton Samuels for the record. It seems to me we have three things of moment. There are the issues; there are the interests; and then there are the structures. The issues are cross-cutting. The interests are siloed. The structures are siloed.

If we're going to deal with the interests effectively, it means that the structures as well as the interests, we have to find a way to converge them. Maybe this new strategy committee might come up with a way that we can evolve the structures to enable it to handle these cross-

cutting issues much more effectively. It seems to me that's where the [model] is.

I'm kind of hopeful with what I've seen in development this past week that there is a recognition that multi-stakeholder truly involves us understanding where issues converge and what might be possible to solve them. It seems to me that there's a lot more good will, if you could say that, to find solutions to cross-cutting issues. That's what I see.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. Next is Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Olivier. I may have misunderstood Rinalia's question, but when she asked it, the first thing I thought of was what you're talking about is ICANN 3.0. If that's what you're talking about, then actually the strategic planning has nothing to do with that. The strategic planning exercise is about what we currently have, and what the strategic plan for the next five years is.

If what you're actually talking about is the next version of ICANN, that has got nothing to do with the strategic planning exercise. When we went through ICANN 2.0, we ran ICANN 1.0 – or some would say 0.5 at the time – whilst we were working out what to do, and then we implemented the changes. But that's not strategy. That's much more to do with the over-arching structure of the organization.

You can lump it in with strategy, but our strategy as such is built around dealing with what we're going to do in the next five years that feeds into the operational plan. The two things are connected but different in my view.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Cherine? And then Alan afterwards.

CHERINE CHALABY: Sorry, Alan, but I'm just not 100% in line with that thought. No, it was Chris's thought on that. The reason for that is the mission we have in ICANN describes what we do. What we've never had is a proper vision. The one you see – "One World, One Internet" – is not a vision of ICANN. It's a vision of the marketplace outside there.

A strategic plan has to start with a vision of how we're going to be doing things and what kind of role and image we would have in five years from now. Okay? So it has a futuristic event.

Now, I cannot see how, in trying to fulfill our role and trying to do things and try to position ourselves in the Internet governance and this and this and this, we will avoid looking internally at ourselves. It is not just in external things. We need to because we may not be able to deliver unless we look inside and how we operate from the inside. So it's nuance on what you said, Chris, but I feel strongly about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think the relationship between the plan and the organization structure is that the structure can facilitate or hinder execution of the plan, and that's the link between them which makes it important to make sure you have a structure that works. I'll give a specific example which came up earlier in our talk and in some other things we've done this week. One can consider a natural companion organization to ALAC and At-Large is NCSG. We're users, civil society. They're the natural groups that have some affinity towards each other. Evan reported earlier today on a meeting between ALAC and NCSG, and the outcome of that meeting is we have very little in common. On specific subjects they wanted to talk about, we tended to disagree or agree only peripherally.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Alan, it's Evan. It's worse than that. There were some specific areas where they were at polar opposites with us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, no. When I say disagree, I don't just mean we don't happen to agree. I mean sometimes we're opposite. The group that we have never met with before – and I'm actually going to be suggesting that we start doing it – is the group that causes people to bristle very much sometimes in ICANN and that's the Intellectual Property Constituency because their protection of brands and our protection of users happens to coincide very closely most of the time. They may be a bit more overreaching than we are, but there's a lot of coincidence.

So it's very hard looking at organizational structures because the ones that – excuse me – the ones that seem the natural ones to put together sometimes are the least productive ones, and yet on occasion we do work with NCSG and we come up with a joint statement because there happens to be a coincidence on that subject at that point in time. So it's a difficult issue. That's one of the reasons I think we're stuck with the organizational structure we have now that has lived so long is it's not clear what the next one is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Next is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, there. Since we're talking in some cases about ICANN 3.0 and our overreaching and the sort of parallel process of the five-year plan and the even larger satellite view, I just wanted to put in a plug for the fact that At-Large already appears to want to be tackling this. We have a working group called Future Challenges that, in fact, exists to try and act proactively and not reactively to get us off of the wheel where we're constantly reacting to public currents here and to something there and to try and take a proactive.

We've already put out one white paper. I don't know if it has made it to the Board. And the intention is if there is engagement you're looking for, the members of that working group, many of whom are at this table right now, are eager to engage in that kind of high-level look in parallel with the strategic plan. So I think you're going to find a lot of affinity in here of people that want to work with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Any follow up or questions? I think we've touched on this quite well. I wonder whether we could move a little bit and have a look at the At-Large Summit and a little follow up on the At-Large Summit as we are today. I know that we've spoken about it on a number of times during the week with our community and discussed the progress and how things are moving and so on.

I guess I just wanted to find out on a procedural question where we were with regards to the Board, how the whole thing will be integrated, and when the Board expects to be voting on it. Or not voting on this but voting – I guess, it's in the budget as far as I understand, but the question is when is the budget going to be voted, I guess?

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, I can explain the process here. We published the budget for FY14 for public comments, and in that budget that was published the amount for the At-Large Summit was not included. And the reason it was not included is we had not had an opportunity. A couple of reasons, one is to review the costing in some detail and recommend it to the Board. Secondly, I think we decided – or finance decided – that it was not going to be included in the fast track SO and AC requests because it was going to happen in June, although there is a lot of preparation that needs to on, and that the amount in itself was bigger than all the requests put together and it was a not recurring amount.

So eventually after the budget was posted, we got together. We passed it through the finance committee, and we agreed that even though we had planned to approve the budget here in Durban, we said that this would not be good practice just to sweep it in, include it, and just sign

off on it without really being open with the rest of the community because there's nothing to be embarrassed about. But I think it's fair enough we should put it because otherwise people will say, "Why do you approve this and not approve that." In addition, there were other items. The strategic panels that Fadi has talked about would cost about \$3.2 million, right? We have to be very clear and put those out also for public comment. And there was some acceleration of cost for the new gTLD work that we're doing earlier to the tune of \$4.2 million. So if you add it all up, that brings you about \$7, \$8, whatever, \$9 million that has to be put out and for people to see it visibly and get some comments. Okay?

I do not know the exact mechanism by which this was put out in public comment, but I don't think it was put out in the normal way of "Here is a public comment. Comment 21 days and another 21 days." I think it went to – Sébastien knows more than I do – but it went to a selective list and it was put somewhere on some website plus it was open to discussion during this week so people could attend and see we're looking for comments on that.

The upshot of all this is that we are going to meet the Finance Committee one more time in early August because the Board is meeting on the 22nd of August, so we wanted to give about 10 days to a couple of weeks for the Board to look at the budget in greater detail. So we're going to meet, recommend the budget, and very clearly in there have new, extraordinary items or lines separate one for ATLAS which is \$750,00 or \$800,000 – I don't know the exact number – and the strategic panels.

We had a debate whether we show them as a separate line or we should augment the constituency and deal with it. We prefer not to change the constituency that was there but be very clear and very explicit and very transparent.

So the answer to your question is sometime in early August before the Board meets, the Finance Committee is going to meet to review and approve the budget and recommend it to the Board and on it will be a specific line for At-Large Summit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cherine. Sébastien, an update, please.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess it is a process where we are, and we are waiting for the input of the community of the new items within the finances. It seems that there are other items it will be raised anyhow by some participant member of the community about the budget in general, then we wait for that. BFC will work once again on the budget, and then the Board will decide end of August about that. But from my point of view what was important is to have that included in the budget. Now I don't see in the discussion, I heard here, I don't see so pushback about this subject and I think it's in good shape. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Any questions or comments from Excom members or others around the table? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Ah, Rinalia Abdul Rahim. Somebody has not been behaving

and has broken their microphone. Can you all check if your mic is properly plugged in at the back?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mine is working.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Working here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This one is working.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So you're back on. You're back on, plugged in.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Well, anyway, Rinalia for the transcript. In terms of the budget for the ATLAS, I think that's a budget for the actual summit itself, correct? Okay. So there is no foreseen activities in terms of lead up to the summit, and in my experience of two world summits and two global conferences a critical preparation to enable really meaningful discussions and to be ready for outcomes is that you need to have lead up activities or events. And I understand if there's not funding for it.

I don't think that planning has gone into the level at our end that this is something that we need to do. We know that RALOs need to get ready. They need to do their own set of activities. There may overarching thematic issues that need to be discussed on a global level prior to getting to the summit itself, but I'm just saying that this could be a gap. And if there were needs that arise for this, could that be accommodated?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Chris Disspain?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We have asked on a number of occasions for a clear understanding that the amount of money requested for this is what it would be. And so the answer is as far as I'm aware, no. There isn't anything, we haven't been asked for anything. And to be blunt, the proposal was the proposal and we've dealt with it and unless there's a major catastrophe between now and August when we meet, then it's going to be in the budget. And on a higher level, and speaking personally, part of the problem with these things is when everyone sits around and talks about them, extraordinary items get looked at and often are dealt with very sympathetically but always in the background is the question, "Are we sure that this is actually what we're being asked for and this is going to encompass everything?"

From a professional point of view, it's important that we can rely on that because otherwise what happens is the funding is provided but no one is happy because it turns out that there was a greater expectation

that no one else knew about. So really as far as we're concerned, assuming we pass it, that's it. That's the budget.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, I agree with Chris with a little caveat. We don't get into such detail in their budget. They have a budget. They will have a budget for their project. How will they use it? Is it used for previous activity, for traveling people, for organizing [inaudible] meeting or whatever? It's their choice now. They ask us – if [inaudible] the BFC – and then the Board. They ask us for a quantity of money. They have to organize their project, and if they want to take money for one part or another, it's their decision with the staff but not our...

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I may have misunderstood. I thought that the question was about additional money rather than how you spend the money within the budget.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but our answer must be if you need additional money, you can come to us, but for the moment you have money and use it. And then if you need more, come back to us but we will see what we can do. But for the moment, I hope that it's enough.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes. When the budget for ATLAS was submitted to us, we did due diligence on the cost, not on the list of tasks. So we looked at, okay, you've asked for travel cost, accommodation cost, meeting room cost, and we went through are these costs reasonable. That's our job. We did not analyze in detail the steps. Were you going to meet so many times? While you're there, you're going to have so many coffees so many things. So we assumed when the budget was presented to us that it's an all-encompassing budget for achieving the success of the summit, and our role is to see whether the cost is reasonable.

So by analyzing the various items of cost, we came up with the budget is reasonable and we didn't even cut anything into it. We felt that this was fine. We did not go through whether it had preparation time or not, but it's a good point. That is a good point. If what you're saying is not included, then it's not included. So you'll have to find a way of managing with that budget now, but next time make sure that it is included and we will respect that definitely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cherine. I think I need to point out though that what Rinalia did say was somehow misleading in the fact that there is an organization committee that the ALAC has put together and that has a lot of members of At-Large and that are working and that are supported in working together. There are conference calls, etc. So there is something that is going on leading to this. Maybe the concern is

whether the rest of ICANN is in sync with what we are working on. In other words, there's obviously going to be a lot of publicity going on around this event and this, I firmly believe, is not something that will just benefit At-Large. It's something that will benefit all of ICANN, and I would really like to see the communications department work on this and I definitely do not think that's actually part of the budget for this summit.

We're not advertising the summit. We're advertising ICANN. You as the Board – and this is why I'm happy that we have many Board members around here – but you as the Board have to make sure that ICANN is able to pick up that opportunity to be able to showcase the multi-stakeholder model as much as it can. And this is not an added cost. It's not a question of cost; it's a question of opportunity and being able to seize that opportunity. Chris Disspain?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Olivier. Yes, but let me turn that around and say you actually need to liaise with communications about what it is that you want. It's only our job to get involved if there's an issue, and I'm sure that this is already happening. You've pointed out there's a committee and blah, blah, blah, so that's all good. Within the communications budget there is obviously a scope for spending communications money with a particular flavor. So it's under the ICANN umbrella, but it's a particular flavor – it's the At-Large or it's new gTLDs or it is whatever it is – and that's a matter for you guys to go and negotiate. And I'd hate it for this not to happen simply because you're expecting us to do something. I think really we would become involved if there's a problem, I mean,

rather than us actually taking the lead to make this happen. It's for you to do that, and you should be empowered enough to do so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chris. Entirely in agreement with you. This is just for Board members to be vigilant that this happens. I think there's nothing worse than arriving next June and – okay, the summit does get funded – we all arrive next June and the Board and other parts of ICANN have scheduled all sorts of things that clash with the summit in certain ways or things that are just not as coordinated, should I say. Coordination part on one side, there's a whole thing. It's a very big thing for this community, and it's obviously something that's expensive and we're well aware of that. We have a committee that is working overtime to work on this, and we want to make sure that this is something that everyone will benefit from. David?

DAVID OLIVE: Not to speak for Sally Costerton, but I know full well that this group and Sally have been talking about this early on, even before this budget was done for the event. She's aware of the themes and aware of how this would fit into the promotion of the ICANN meeting in London, so that has been already started.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: One more thing. Perhaps a concrete and practical suggestion for you. Because this is so important and because you have such high expectations of it, may I suggest that you write to the Board and – once it's approved, the budget's approved – you write to the Board and you set out for us what your expectations are. And you tell us, "We would very much like it to be as un-conflicted against as possible" – all of that stuff. And if you do that formally from the ALAC, that I think will be a very sensible way of going forward because that will put it on our radar and we'll be able to deal with it. And I mean a formal communication so that it's not, you know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Chris. We actually have written down in the proposal what the expectations are, I guess as a summary. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, just to say that this [notice] was in few people and start by the Chair of the Board, and we didn't distribute within the Board because we can't ask them. They've already done the work, then it's our internal process that we need to manage. But if after the budget, we can after [inaudible] budget, they are taking into account your input they are willing to write something with less in a way a requesting but more in explaining, it will be good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Chris and then Alan Greenberg.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I agree, but maybe I haven't made it clear. There is a difference between a list of expectations and a proposal and a letter from you that actually sets out what it is you expect and gives us the feeling of the spirit. Your request of budget funds by definition is dry and budget-y. I want us to be as excited about this as you are, and the stepping point off for that is for you to actually tell us how excited you are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Chris. Alan Greenberg.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm excited about it without this note, frankly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go on, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: The comment about scheduling clashes rang a bell with me. Sébastien just used the expression "we'll take your input into account." Someone on the Board said that yesterday, and there was a strong reaction about it that we don't just want our input taken into account, we actually want something done. I sit on a number of groups in both ALAC and GNSO that end up scheduling sessions at ICANN meetings, and invariably the words that come back from staff are, "That is where they have put us; we can't do anything about it. The schedule is very tight. We can't do anything about it." I think the message we're trying to send is we need to get in early and get the attention of the "they" that we really need to make sure we don't mess this up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Evan, I still have you on the list. I'm not quite sure whether that was an old Evan or a new Evan. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but to answer Alan, yes, I hope that you will be here and that you will be [inaudible] but I guess we are showing into the into the [Board] that with the budget we are already taking some action. And the question about the organization of the meeting, it's very important. It's why I think you need to have the internal working group about our organizing the summit, but we will need to find a way to have a real good alignment with the rest of the meeting or with the ICANN meeting in conjunction with what you are doing. And there is a link here. We need to be set up with staff.

I don't think we need to be involved, but if you need our help I am sure that Chris and myself can help you about the organization of the meeting. And we also take all that inputs not for London but more generally speaking in the Meeting Strategy Working Group because it's a very important and relevant topic for the future of those meetings. But keep in mind that it's essential that you have an internal working group on how to organize, but be in link with the full meeting of ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sébastien, it's already done since members of the Meeting Strategy Working Group are already members of the ATLAS II Working Group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Everything gets done before we even talk about it. Okay, I think time is of the essence. We have a number of other items afterwards. Just wanted to record the action item that we have from this discussion which is once the FY14 budget is approved, the ALAC – maybe we should say and if the summit is approved as well, just in case – the ALAC is to send a note to the Board explaining the plans for the summit as well as set out the excitement and expectations of the ALAC on holding their second summit. I'm not quite sure how excited I am reading the action item itself, but hopefully we'll be a lot more excited afterwards. It sounds very...it's the Friday morning thing.

And with this, I think we need to thank you all – Sébastien, Erika, Cherine, and Chris – for having joined us. I hope it wasn't too hot for you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] very disappointed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, no, it was certainly very useful for us.

CHERINE CHALABY: You don't want us to stay more?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're very welcome to remain here for the rest of the day. They do turn off the lights at 12, so please try and find your way out before then.

CHERINE CHALABY: No, I mean to be grilled a bit more.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No. I mean a grilling is just one of these things. It's when people resist that we start grilling them; when they comply it's fine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Can I say something. First of all, I want to apologize for bringing that subject, but it's not something as I said I've thought of before. But recently because of the position I'm in new gTLD, I've been lobbied substantially and I really took a very hard line just say nothing because it's unfair to a nobody. And part of that you become a little bit rigid during this phase, but thank you for your remarks and making this easier to talk. And I actually enjoyed this, so thank you very much. And I hope we answered some of your questions openly and was honest.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, Cherine, it's Olivier speaking. One last question for you. Would you be ready to do this again?

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes, but I would clarify my role before coming to the meeting. Thank you so much.

[ALAN GREENBERG]: Next time you can't extract promises not to ask you hard questions.

CHERINE CHALABY: Right, okay. It was a good baptism of fire. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, gentlemen, and lady, of course.

So I'm told that everything turns off at 12 sharp, so we do need to plow forward with this, and I'm sorry to all the Board members.

The next item on our agenda is the creation of a ccNSO/At-Large task force to prepare a ccNSO/ALAC meeting in Buenos Aires. We have been contacted by Bart who is ccNSO staff member in charge, and through him because we have asked in the past that we would be meeting with the ccNSO at some point rather than just have an ad hoc ccNSO/ALAC meeting, he's suggesting was that a quick, small task force would be put together to put together the agenda. And that's the way the ccNSO works.

It's a lot more careful in the way that it moves forward, and therefore we have been invited to build that task force, and I therefore open the floor for any suggestions as to what candidates we could suggest. We do have one small problem in that our ccNSO liaison Cheryl Langdon-Orr is pretty busy and is going to be busier and busier as she is going to take on the position of Chair of the Nominating Committee. In which case, we do need to find either replacements or I've heard the word maybe, yes, maybe she correct. I'm not sure when this is ratified, but she is one of the candidates for it. So the question really is, who can we put first to

lead that task force, and then can we identify any members that would be possible. And I see Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Can you please, Olivier, repeat the objective of this task force.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. The objective of the task force is actually not a huge thing. It's to organize the ccNSO/ALAC one hour in – I believe it would be one hour – in Buenos Aires. I don't imagine it to be having two or three calls a week discussing things to the extent that we spent a significant amount of time on it. But it is the wish of the ccNSO to be able to have that task force, perhaps on their side more importantly than on our side.

I know that on the ALAC, we are quite open as to who can take part in what. It might be that there is some complication of some sort on the ccNSO, and they need to have specific members that will take part on the task force. My feeling here is rather than opening it up and saying as many people as possible to put on that task force, I see this as really a very sidetrack and I'm concerned that having more and more task forces sidetracks people into things which are really not that productive – I mean, one hour at the end. So we just need to set a couple of people to be able to be on this. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that we can ask other ALAC members to be involved.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, but you know there are two ways to get volunteers: you can ask volunteers or you can designate volunteers. That's the way. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I guess I'm just asking what's this doing on the Friday Excom schedule? There are all sorts of other things we should be doing, and filling At-Large people for a liaison with the ccNSO is something that's either ALAC-wide or beyond. Why is it here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. It's here because otherwise it gets dropped. And it was already before this meeting – before the Durban meeting – it was already on the agenda and it got dropped somehow. So this is just a reminder. As you can see, it was only for 10 minutes, and I think we can even take five minutes on it. This is one where we need to start this ASAP. Perhaps the decision of this committee is to just say, "Well, let's put it over to our next ALAC call."

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I would suggest if moving faster putting it out on the mailing list and starting to call for volunteers. Why do we need to wait for the call?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Specifically, my answer was because I don't want to have 30 volunteers for something that just needs two people.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: That's my suggestion. We have to mention that we need three people for that only.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so I think we've got an answer now to our question. Send out a call on the mailing list for three people. The first three – well, maybe not the first three – but people will answer, and we'll choose three people. Alright, next one, number five.

MATT ASHTIANI: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Read the AI as you intended it to be recorded.

MATT ASHTIANI: No, no, no, not this time. Ron Sherwood has asked that it be noted that he would like to be a member of the committee.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And I think Ron is a de facto member of the committee since he is the liaison to the ALAC from the ccNSO, or is it the other way around? I always get the direction wrong. So I would imagine, yes, Ron would need to be.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But not from our side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Our side, their side, whichever side – we’re all the same side. Over to Silvia, please.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Olivier, if you can state the action item as you would like it recorded.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You see? I knew that was coming up. So the action item is for a call to be sent out to the ALAC mailing list asking for volunteers for the ALAC/ccNSO meeting preparation task force for Buenos Aires. Please don’t add more words to this. I mean, come on. We’ve already spent so much time on this. Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Just to make it difficult for you, I have a question for clarification. Do you want to put a qualifier to say that the people who volunteer should have knowledge of ccNSO or just leave it open and see what you get? That’s just a question. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia. I think we’ll leave it open. I’ll make an executive decision on this. We’ll leave it open, and we’ll make a choice from that pool, but we will note that Ron Sherwood is already a member of that task force. Yes, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that in the mail that will be sent, we need to tell people to send their willing to be on this group to the staff only so that after that you'll have all the names and you choose. If they are on the mailing list and you appoint the last one who came, it will be a problem for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think they can send their interest directly to staff and not to the mailing list, and we need to move on. I see from the corner of my eye Evan pointing to his watch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just my wrist.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Wrist. From the side thing, you think there's a watch there. That's good. It means it doesn't need to be there to actually be pointed at. Pulling candidates for the ICANN Strategy Panels. We have a similar potential question with regards to these Strategy Panels which Fadi has suggested, in fact, has put forward that he is going to create with the sort of Net demigods and so on as they call them. What process would you say we would pursue for this, bearing in mind we cannot just send candidates, but what the ALAC can do is to recommend candidates, let's say. Sébastien?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, just a question. The same thing here. You are talking about the President's Strategy Committee becomes the ICANN strategy partners.

There is no two types of panels or two types of committees. There are just these five ones.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, that's correct. Yes.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Because I was thinking that you were saying that we are the same thing to do for them. But I wanted just to add one point that you will have to do the same thing to suggest candidates for the last review, the one on consumer and so on because it's now a decision of the Board that we will request to have candidates for that. And the CEO and the Chair of the GAC will decide because it will be the first step to work out on the data to be gathered. And you can take a little advance that you will have this five plus the other one. Even if it's not exactly the same process, it will be good to have the candidates for that too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien, for mentioning this. And I actually thought about that yesterday but didn't have time to add it to this. So thank you for this. So that's another thing that we have to think about. Note, I said think about; we don't need to take a decision today. What's the time scale which you expect to have for these panels and for what you've mentioned on the follow up?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: There is no date anywhere. Panels I guess will be [inaudible] a few reasons. The first one is that there are just very few numbers of people

within those panels. It's seven maximum; it could be four or five. And if you want to have one in some, you need to go quickly. The second one is just the decision yesterday and the times that the Chair and the Chair of the GAC and the CEO put in place the process. It will take a few weeks, I guess. Then my guess is that if by September you have names for this last review panel, review committee, it will be a good framework.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sébastien. Did you say review committee? I thought it was an implementation review committee. Is it the metrics we're speaking about?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You know we have the ATRT, the WHOIS, the Security, and the last one about gTLD consumer trust and so on and so forth. That's the fourth one from the AOC. It was decided yesterday to set it up now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Sébastien. I thought that you mentioned the follow up from the Board decision yesterday to proceed forward with the Consumer Trust, Consumer Metrics.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's the same, sir.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is the same, but that is an implementation committee, isn't it?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so it's a Board-led consumer. Okay, fine. I think I've got it.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: No, no. It's not Board at all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It was GNSO and ALAC that made the recommendation. Those ones went to the Board. The Board has now taken that and says, "Right, let's pass this on over to the Review Team itself." Is that correct?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We decide to create the Review Team to take that into account, to pass that to them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I love the bureaucracy here. Fantastic. Okay, well, thanks very much for this, Sébastien. Let's move on to the next thing, and that's reviewing the At-Large website URL. I'm not quite sure what this is supposed to be, and it's supposed to be five minutes means, Matt, you have one.

MATT ASHTIANI: This was regarding needing to type www-dot before the actual website.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, here we go. So thank you very much for this reminder, Matt. This is another enormous, very interesting piece of news or item. If you go and use your Web browser, to get to the At-Large website you have to www.atlarge.icann.org, but you can do gnso.icann.org, you can do ccnso.icann.org. You can do pretty much all of the other parts of ICANN without doing www. So noting this, I sent a note over to Heidi for her to send a note over to IT, and IT responded and said, “Ah, no, but we were told specifically by Nick Ashton-Hart that you wanted www.atlarge.icann.org. This is an executive decision. You have to decide on this.”

So I’m basically asking the Excom to perhaps make a decision now – an executive decision – to remove www. or to be able to use www.atlarge.icann.org or just atlarge.icann.org. I think I’ve gone through the rationale for this. Any questions, comments? And afterwards, maybe we can reach a decision.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I opt for the most simple, direct way, probably the shortest one, so atlarge.icann.org.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let me be clear. At the moment, you can only have www.atlarge.icann.org or nothing. The choice is to basically have either that or atlarge. In fact, we can have both. So the choice I was going to say is to say whichever. We can have with the www. or without the www.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Why is this at the Excom and not in the technology task force where it belongs?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a decision, and a decision...oh, yeah, good. You've been cut off now. It's a decision, and a decision you cannot make in the task force. The task force would take a call to do that, would then pass it on to the ALAC who would vote on it or something. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I happen to have faced this exact question in another part of my life recently. The www-dot is redundant. The fact that you're doing a web query implies it. It was invented many years ago, and it was used. We should not require it, but we have to support it, otherwise a million bookmarks don't work. So the answer is really simple, I think. We should be allowed to get to our page with it or without it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Anyone against this? I don't want any more comments, thank you. Just anybody against it? I see everyone is in agreement. Okay, then make it so, please. Just tell them the Excom has... thank you. Every time I live it's...okay, next one.

Next steps to Buenos Aires, that's the next part, and we still have for ALAC for LACRALO. We did the action items yesterday, and so I don't think we need to look at them again. We've got an enormous amount of work coming up for us in the lead to Buenos Aires. This summer, as you know, the Europeans take a lot of holidays. I think other parts of the

world also do take a little break. We just have to move forward, and I'm afraid there's not going to be much of a holiday for many of us. The push to Buenos Aires is one where we've got to prepare for a lot of the LACRALO events and things that will take place. I wonder if we have anyone from the region who wishes to say something. First, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I will not speak about LACRALO, but I will speak about the preparation for the summit, and it is something that has to start now – today. We have less than one year. It is very difficult to prepare our ALSs to be effective and efficient in the summit, and we need to have a program for that – roadmap if you want. And I suggest that all the secretaries of the RALOs plus the ATLAS Working Group plus the Capacity Building Working Group sit together and find a way to prepare our ALSs. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Tijani, and I'd like to ask everyone around the table to relay this message to their respective regions. It's good to have things like that said at meetings, but then it has to reach our ALSs. And it really is their summit, it's not ours, so they have to push forward on this. Rinalia. Are you in mourning? You have a piece of tape around.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

I don't know. Whatever. Not relevant. Going to the point, by November you would have about six months before ATLAS happens. So if you want to be really effective, you should set already milestones that you want for November in preparation for ATLAS itself, and you should schedule

sufficient meeting time of the organizing committee in Buenos Aires – bearing in mind that we have a lot of conflicting meetings, etc. – but it would important for them to have sufficient time to work through all the issues that are required for preparation. And I think the most important one, I know the logistics aspect of event planning draw a lot of attention and energy because decisions need to be made early or whatever it is, but the content preparation one is actually really important and needs to start as soon as possible. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. The status as it is at the moment is that the Survey Working Group or sub working group has prepared a survey. We have a milestone calendar which Eduardo Diaz has very kindly put together, and it has been agreed that this is a correct calendar to move forward with. And the suggestion has been made to use Gantt charts to be able to follow that project. It needs to be done this way because there are so many separate threads and so many deadlines with interlinked processes and critical paths that will need to be achieved in order to get to the time. One year sounds, exactly as you said, sounds like a lot but it isn't. Any other comments or questions on this? I don't see anyone. Okay. Yes, Matt.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hello. Ron Sherwood would like to make a comment regarding the website. He says that he just typed atlarge.icann.org into three different browsers and all failed, but when he used www.icann.org, it appears that the www. is also required for this URL.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Matt. So let me just be more clear again. The problem is exactly as I said it: atlarge.icann.org does not work at the moment. We have just decided with consensus that we can use www.atlarge.icann.org and we should be able to use atlarge.icann.org. Hopefully, IT will follow up on that, and we'll be able to have that working in a few days' time.

And now we're down to the last item in our agenda, and that is the any other business part. Going once.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, this is Evan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan Leibovitch, go ahead.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Given that we have a whopping 10 minutes left before the lights are turned out here...sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Nine minutes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Nine? Oh, alright. I'll speak fast since we're not be translated. Interpreted is the word.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Interpreted.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you. Okay, there went another minute. I just want to raise the issue that I did with David, and that was about the issue of research. One of the things that I'm going to try and take back to the Future Challenges Working Group and to encourage everyone here at the table to think of is that how we can try and use various research techniques to broaden our scope. As ICANN starts talking about the public interest more and more and tries to redefine it more and more and as we start getting a greater voice within At-Large, we're going to start to get challenged more on the basis of our authority of speaking. That is, how can 100 or even 200 or 300 or more, but how can a few hundred ALSs really give us the authority with which to speak on the behalf of billions of Internet users?

And I think one of the things that can be our tool to help us give us the authority and the credibility to be able to make this is to start looking for research – whether it's academic, whether it's opinion polling, or whether it's anything like that. I think we're going to need to start to focus on this a little bit more. I mean, when ICANN did the New gTLD Program, did they ever actually ask the public, "Is this something you want?" As a body that claims to represent the public interest, the public wasn't consulted. And while that particular story is a done deal, as things go on I think we have an obligation to do whatever we can to make sure what the global community thinks of issues. We do our best to do things like introductory guides and things like that and education, but I also think that there is going to be a wealth of academic research

and potentially other kinds of research that are out there that will help us.

When I posed the question to David, and he said, “Well, we hire outside consultants to give us our research,” I suspect there’s a great many more sources of that kind of thing than we may be aware of. So I would ask the people at this table to go out to your regions and see if we can find sources of research that will give us a better understanding of how to get the information we do, how to bring the public interest point of view into ICANN. There are various organizations I can think of such as the DiploFoundation that may be of use in helping us do this kind of thing. And I just want to toss this out as a forward-thinking issue as we go forward.

I intend to raise it with the Future Challenges Committee, and I think that this could be something that might be an interesting future focus on us. We saw that Sally had this public interest thing on her agenda that appeared and then mysteriously vanished from the myICANN website. Clearly, this is on the radar of people here, so I think we ought to be proactive and not reactive as these questions are being asked. And the one thing I think can help guide us and help give us a little bit more authority to be able to speak on the point of view of the billions of Internet users is through solicitation and, in fact, when necessary perhaps the commission of research in order to help us understand what we’re doing and bring the point of view to ICANN. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. We have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

-
- TIJANI BEN JEMAA:** I think, Evan, that you are right, and I would ask you to send this particular point to the RALOs or ask the staff to do so, so that they will see in their region if there is something.
- EVAN LEIBOVITCH:** Okay, I'm not doing this with the intention of creating an action item this late in the week and this late in the day, but just sort of to give notice that I'm intending to bring this forward first to the Future Challenges Committee and then to see from that what strategy is worthwhile taking with ALSs, RALOs, and perhaps even getting ICANN involved in commissioning some research that will help us give us the information we need to give good advice.
- OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you, Evan. We have Silvia.
- SILVIA VIVANCO:** Yes. I just wanted to suggest maybe we can add that as an agenda item for the next RALO secretariat meeting that we are going to have every month. So we could add that item for discussion.
- EVAN LEIBOVITCH:** You're welcome to do that. My first inclination right now is to go to the Future Challenges Group and to plot a strategy based on that. If you think it's worth adding to any other groups' agendas, that's fine with me. I'm more than happy to talk about the issue. I'm simply raising it now. It certainly has not been put forth and discussed in any volume.

I'm simply planting the seed now and have no idea in which direction it will grow.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. I saw Cintra putting her hand up in response. Cintra, you need to?

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thank you. This actually is not in response to what Evan said. I am not sure if it was on the agenda today, but at the NCSG/ALAC meeting a call was really sent out for more coordination between the NCSG and ALAC in terms of perhaps writing a joint statement or just really focusing on the fact that there have been clear instances, such as with the TM Plus 50 debacle, for want of a better word, where staff has really I guess come in to play with the policy development process. So I know we're at the end of a meeting, but perhaps this can be put on the agenda for the next meeting if it wasn't discussed today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Cintra, this is Evan. I'm not totally sure what it is you're asking for. We had a meeting with the NCSG. We bandied around a possible number of ideas of things that could be done at the public forum. Nothing came of that. It seems at this point that one of the few things we have in common, in fact, is asking for them to bring back Board meetings or at

least more ICANN meetings on Friday so things aren't quite compressed for all of us.

But we had a really hard time at that meeting coming up with a meeting of the minds on just about anything. Anyone that was there sort of figured that what was important to us wasn't important to NCSG; what was important to NCSG was less important to us. As Alan can back me up on issue such as the TMCH [and 50], there are a lot of things in what is intended to be implemented that I don't think ALAC really even has a problem with that are really, really upsetting to NCSG. And likewise that there are things like the dotless domains that are a high concern to us that aren't even on their radar. I mean, we tried to do that this week, and it really was difficult to do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. Any other business? Well, this is great. For the first time, we're not actually late, and that's of course because we had the Damocles sword over our head. We have about one minute and 30 seconds left of network time or anything like this. You're not going to fill this. It's a question. You're not going to get the answer recorded. Go ahead, Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I don't really care about recording, but I would like to hear from the efficiency expert on what he thought about the meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do you really want to know?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The first minute will be on the record.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was just doing my e-mail. I don't know. I wasn't paying attention. No, I'm kidding. Yes, I've sat in on several sessions week of a lot of the different committees. Just general observations: just the fact that you've moved through your entire agenda and you're on time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: First time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And that's just strictly from having me here. I mean, that's just amazing right there. So sometimes that works. But, yes, there are some general observations. There are some more specific things I'd be happy to provide feedback on, but I guess in general you're constricted by the flow of what you have to do here and that you're in transcribed meetings. So there is a protocol that has to be followed.

So one of my challenges is kind of looking at, so how can we work with that and work within that to make things flow better? And having someone to hold you to task. Even though it's an agenda item, it has to be covered, but let's move on. That kind of facilitation is an important piece of these things. I've seen sessions this week where that wasn't there, and it just said, oh, suddenly people just voted with their feet and left the meeting because it was time to move to another session. So I thought this was efficient, pretty effective. You moved through your

agenda. I think everybody had voice that wanted voice in the meeting. So those things were all in place.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well, thank you very much for this feedback, and thanks to all of you for having come here one last 10-second measure of thanks, and this is really for South Africa. I think we've had a meeting for the first time in a long time where we've had absolutely very little to complain about – and we're known to complain from time to time – but on this occasion the transport was great, the hotel was great.

Certainly, my own feeling, the facilities here were great, although I hope we would have had Segways to go from one end to the other end because of the mile-long building. But the food has been great. No, it has been really enjoyable, and I hope that for all of you it has been as enjoyable as for me. So thanks to our staff one more time. And thanks to the AV crew who have patiently waited. And, of course, thanks to whoever is behind the scenes to let our Internet work, which is pretty incredible.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Olivier, and this also, thanks to Gisela who is [inaudible] who did a lot, a lot, a lot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And finally, thanks to meeting staff. They've done a great job on this one. This meeting is now adjourned. Goodbye.

[END OF AUDIO]