BUENOS AIRES – Joint ALAC/ccNSO Meeting
Tuesday, November 19, 2013 – 12:30 to 13:30
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good afternoon everybody. This is the meeting of the ccNSO with the ALAC. Welcome everyone. It's great to see you all here. It's been quite a while since the ALAC and the ccNSO have met, and I think it's a meeting long overdue because we do have a lot of points in common. The first one being that we're all very geographically distributed. With me as Byron Holland, I'll hand the floor over to Byron to start with the meeting.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Olivier. Let me just finish swallowing that bite. Thank you very much. I know that the ccNSO was pleased that we were able to reestablish this meeting. As you've said, certainly of all the groups, I think there is much, if not most overlap between for one the diversity and two the geographical representation. Often we come from particular jurisdictions that have very specific needs and requirements that we as cc's have to attend to, and I'm sure members of the ALAC have to attend to.

We are going to have a bit of an introduction. We're going to ask people to state their name, where they're from and what their affiliation would be. Then we're going to hand it over to Cheryl and Ron, who have done

a considerable amount of work on creating the Agenda for the meeting and some of the issues.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We can do that, but I think we need to take the time now to recognize the fact that there's been considerable contribution from the ccNSO, beyond Ron, in this Agenda, and I think we need to recognize Katrina in particular for having the Agenda as it is, in this form, in front of you, which is a greatly cut-down version of what it was to begin with. I want to make sure it's not seen as some of us not working when some of us may not have. Katrina, thank you for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, maybe we can start with the introductions being the first thing? Let's go anti-clockwise and start with Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you. My name is Eduardo Diaz, I'm from Puerto Rico. I'm the elected representative for the NARALO into the ALAC.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: My name's Glenn McKnight. I'm from Canada and I'm with the incoming Secretariat for NARALO.

HONG XUE: My name is Hong Xue from China. I'm a ccNSO Councilor appointed by NomCom.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa.   I'm a member of ALAC representing the AFRALO region.

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: Jordi Iparraguirre from Catalonia. I'm a RALO Board Member and ccNSO Board Councilor nominated by NomCom.

SPEAKER: [inaudible .kr? 00:40:56], ccNSO Council.

RUDOLF MAYER: Rudolf Mayer, ccNSO Council. I'm also the CEO of SIDN, the registry for .nl, the Netherlands ccTLD.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim, from Malaysia. I'm a member of the ALAC on the Executive Committee.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, also a member of the ALAC.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Evan Leibovitch, Vice Chair of the ALAC, from Toronto, the home of the world's finest mayor. [laughter]

CARLTON SAMUELS:	Carlton Samuels. I'm from Jamaica and I'm a Vice Chair of the ALAC, completing my second term on the ALAC from the NomCom process.

BYRON HOLLAND:	I'm Byron Holland, CEO of SIRA, the registry operator for .ca and the freshly lamented Chair of the ccNSO. I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge Katrina, who's led the Program Working Group for the entire two days of the ccNSO's activities, and has already kicked it off with some really great panel work in our meeting. I'm sure this will be the same.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Olivier Crépin-Leblond, ALAC Chair. It's my fourth year soon, I'm finishing the third. I'm coming from France and the UK. I'm a bit confused between the two countries.

JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Hello, I'm Julia Charvolen and I work for ICANN staff.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

MATT ASHTIANI:	Matt Ashtiani, ICANN staff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl Langdon-Orr from Australia. Ten-year veteran now of the Board of the .au domain administrations. I sit firmly in the ccNSO world there. I also happen to have done a few things with the ALAC and currently serve as the ALAC's liaison to the ccNSO.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Sandra Hoferichter from Germany. I'm the EURALO Representative to the ALAC.

SPEAKER: My name is [inaudible 00:43:20]. I'm a student from the National School in Córdoba, Argentina.

BIKRAM SHRESTHA: My name is Bikram Shrestha. I am from Nepal.

SPEAKER: I am [inaudible 00:43:30] from Albania, a NomCom appointee to the ccNSO Council.

KATRINA SATAKI: Katrina Sataki, ccNSO Council from the European region. I'm the CEO of .lv, Latvia and I must note that everything is team work. Thank you Cheryl.

MARGARITA VALDES: Hello, my name is Margarita. I'm from Chile. I'm the Legal and Business Manager in .cl and a ccNSO Councilor.

DORIS: Hi, I'm Doris [inaudible 00:44:06] from the US Virgin Islands, and I'm the administrator for .vi, the US Virgin Islands.

WALTER CIPRIANO: Hello everybody. My name is Walter Cipriano in representation of UTN, the National Technical University from Argentina.

MAUREEN HILLYARD: Hi, I'm Maureen Hillyard. I'm from the Cook Islands. I'm incoming ALAC and incoming ccNSO Liaison.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Hi, I'm Keith Davidson from New Zealand. I'm the International Director for Internet NZ, which is the operator of the .nz domain name space. I'm also Vice Chair of the ccNSO Council and Internet NZ is an unusual animal, as it not only operates the ccTLD but is a recognized At-Large structure in ICANN as well. Even though I very rarely attend At-Large meetings we now have a bit more presence happening. I'd encourage ccTLDs who have broader structures to also engage in At-Large.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Keith. We're going to move into the next part of our Agenda. At the same time, we do have more members here; more

members of the ALAC that are here, however there were other meetings clashing with this one. One notable one is Alan Greenberg, who's with the ATRT 2, so he's one of the Vice Chairs. He couldn't let the Chair alone, especially at this moment.

Now, the next part of the Agenda is the roles and scopes of both organizations, and I thought I'd give a very short intro of what the ALAC does. In fact it's not only the ALAC it's the At-Large community. The ALAC itself is the 15-member Committee of the At-Large community. Three members per region. We've got ICANN's five regions. Two members are selected by their RALO, and one member is selected per region by the NomCom.

So we do have quite a diverse group that is hopefully gender balanced as well, if the NomCom does their job well. We also have the same footprint, as I mentioned earlier, a very wide spread footprint as far as geographic diversity is concerned. The ALAC is mandated by the ICANN bylaws to comment on anything and everything that is ICANN-related.

That could be policy issues, any issue that effectively affects Internet end users. As we know, with 2.4 billion users out there, there's obviously a lot of input. We cannot say that we represent them, but what we do it try to act in the best interest of those Internet users out there.

I emphasize the word "users" not "customers" because sometimes customers or consumers might be seen as just being people that purchase domain names. There are a lot of people impacted by the DNS out there that do not purchase domain names, but are impacted by the policies that ICANN develops, and of course by the IANA function.

That's the quick scope of the ALAC. We work all in consensus as a bottom-up way, so effectively when we have to build statements, a first draft is put on a public Wiki page. Someone volunteers to hold the pen, puts a first draft up, and then we get feedback and sometimes after two or three iterations of this we end up with a text that is then presented to the At-Large Advisory Committee itself that votes on the text.

Only when the text is voted on does it then become a statement that we can either sent to the public comment period, or that we send to the Board, or to whomever that text should be sent to. That's one thing. We relay the ICANN message to users worldwide. I forgot to mention what an At-Large structure is; that could be any kind of organization that deals with Internet end users.

Not purely civil society – we're dealing also with some commercial organizations that actually deal with Internet users. It could be Internet Society Chapters, it could be organizations that provide computing facilities for deprived communities. It's very, very wide-spread as well, very diverse. That's pretty much how we do things. We do the statements, we relay the ICANN message to the users worldwide, and we also bring in the input and involve more users in the processes of ICANN.

We somehow act as a bridge, if you want, between ICANN, the "ivory tower" as one could call them sometimes, and the outside world. So we are very outward facing on this, and I guess that many of our members are involved in other fora, such as the Internet Government Forum, etc., outside those walls. I'm sure a lot of them also interact with their local

cc operator in various other fora in local IGFs. That's pretty much the ALAC.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks Olivier. In terms of the ccNSO, our organization is in fact ten years old as part of ICANN, but certainly there are many cc's who've been in and around the space much longer than that, and certainly many who preceded ICANN by some period. We currently have 143 members. I think that's the most current count. 143 cc operators have membership in the ccNSO.

But that's not exclusive. We also let any ccTLD operator participate. Our meetings are open; not only to the cc community but by and large anybody who wants to see what the cc community is up to. I think it's very important to note that this is a voluntary organization in that there's no mandate for a cc operator to be part of it, and therefore they participate by choice.

That's very important. We do do policy development, though we don't often do formal PDPs. We certainly have, but it is not something we engage in very often. Most of our work is done through Working Groups, of which we have half a dozen at the current time. Some are cc membership only, and we also do a fair amount of Cross-Community Working Groups.

We have Working Groups that are primarily internal, like the Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group, which Rudolf is a Chair of. We have the Finance Working Group, which is examining how cc's

compensate ICANN. That's because not only is this a voluntary-based organization, but because we have our own national jurisdictions we're not bound by any sort of contract for the most part, to ICANN.

We operate on our own, and as such any contribution we make to ICANN is in itself voluntary. The Finance Working Group is looking at that. We've had a joint IDN Working Group with the gNSO. We've had the DSSA Working Group, which was a security-oriented Working Group that had multiple community members on it. Those are some of the key Working Groups that either come to a final report or recommendation that would then come to the Council.

The Council is made up of three Councilors per region, as well as NomCom Councilors, and that gives us quite a balanced representation from around the ICANN globe, or sphere. Because the organization is voluntary; because we all as individual actors operate in our own legal jurisdictions, there are some benefits to that in that we typically don't compete. As a result, the organization internally is quite collegial, and often working to very similar goals, and we're very open and transparent about the issues and the learnings that we can share.

A big part too of what we do is share best practices, particularly around operations, security, and governance to some degree. Because we have that collegial environment it tends to be very open and transparent and frank, as well. In spite of being all cc operators, and as seen from the outside we may appear to be a relatively homogeneous body, the fact is once you get inside we have dramatically different sizes – from 13+ million registrations down to single digit thousands registrations.

We have different business models, we have different governance structures. We're operated in entirely different ways; from almost totally commercial to working out of universities or government departments or private, not-for-profit corporations. So there's a broad diversity of cc's, even though possibly from the outside we might tend to be perceived as similar in nature. That, I think, gives the quick overview of the ccNSO. Any questions? Yes?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Byron. I was wondering, could you give a breakdown in terms of percentage – what percentage of the ccNSO members would be governmental vis-à-vis the other sectors?

BYRON HOLLAND: Off the top of my head I would be hard-pressed to give you a crisp number on that. It's something we could probably come back to you on and take it to the list. Katrina, do you have a comment on that?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. I don't know about the entire ccTLD sphere, but if we look at the CENTR organization, they also have regional organizations. CENTR is a regional organization for European ccTLDs. 80% of our members are not-for-profit. Not so many are governmental, in fact there are very few of them who should be considered as governmental. Perhaps in other regions the situation might be different, but basically we're not-for-profit, most of them.

BYRON HOLLAND: Perhaps another way to triangulate a response to that question is if you look at the total number of domains held by the entire cc community, it's roughly 42-43% of total domains in the world. Of that cc community, the very significant majority would be under the administration of TLD operators that are private, not-for-profit corporations.

Each jurisdiction has its own legal flavor of that, but the massive majority would be held under that kind of organizational structure.

HOLLY RAICHE: We Australians are terribly polite. Given that, what would be the nature of the difference or the non-difference between say the positions that the ccTLDs would take, and a government position, as perhaps articulated in GAC? Is there any correspondence at all, or not?

BYRON HOLLAND: I would say my colleagues are free to chime in, because I think the key there is each cc operator has a different relationship with its national government. There's no one in here that I could probably say has the exact same relationship with their government as I do. There are probably common themes. Maybe of us would have a constructive positive relationship.

In Canada it's very arms-length. We have no formal contact. We have no real formal relationship. I do have a Government of Canada representative who sits ex-officio on my Board with no voting rights. We

have a collegial good relationship, but they don't tell us what to do, we don't ask for their permission or input, per se.

Of course, all of us typically… The flow of delegation now typically flows through the government of the land, and the government of the land in the Internet community figure out how that should be enacted. Commonly it's in some kind of not-for-profit corporation in many jurisdictions, but certainly not all. Keith and then [inaudible 00:58:27]?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Just to develop that debate a little bit further there, there seems to be a two-way matrix of either being part of government as a ccTLD or at arms-length of the government. Then on the other matrix, either having a friendly relationship with the government or a hostile relationship with the government, or a hostile non-relationship with the government.

It's probably worth noting that the original delegations were often made to universities or earlier, doctors of the Internet, and subsequent re-delegations to other bodies who've been able to more appropriately cope with the cope of the growth of the ccTLD along the way. But RFC 1591 was the founding process, or the first enshrinement of the principles of the delegation.

SPEAKER: I would just like to point out that although .kr is considered as a part of the governmental organization, since 2004 because we had the law, KISA is actually a relatively independent organization, so I would describe the

relationship between KISA and the government more as cooperative, rather than any kind of unison relationship.

MARGARITA VALDES: Something that I think when she asked the question was sometimes people want to know if a ccTLD has a good relationship with the GAC, for example. But the answer is no, because sometimes the ccTLDs are very active in the ccNSO environment, but the government are not present in the GAC.

In the case of Chile, we have been very active since the beginning, but our government sometimes yes, sometimes no. It depends on what coalition of the government are more or not involved in Internet matters, for example. The thing that we can say in that matter is that normally the ccTLDs have a continuous work, and sometimes the authorities could change, but the work is done anyway.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think you had quite a good tour of how diverse we can be, and really we're just getting started on the diversity. But that gives you a sense of how different the relationships and structures can be.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Byron, has anyone done a study or a typography of that particular relationship, or the diversity of the ccNSO? Because I'm really interested to understand the complexity of it. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: I don't think we have done that as such, no. One thing the regional organizations do is some very good work in understanding the relationship and differences within their regions, but at a global level that's not something the ccNSO has really engaged in. Margarita, did you want to follow up with that?

MARGARITA VALDES: Yes. I think the best way to find that information is going to the directory of the RALOs. I can give you the information of the Latin American and Caribbean region, but you can ask anyway. Probably if you look for the websites of the RALOs, it's more than sure that you could find some of these studies in terms of this information.

BYRON HOLLAND: Were there any further questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rudolf?

RUDOLF MAYER: Rudolf Mayer from .nl. I know that CENTR does a lot of research into this and they have quite a big database. I think most of that information is available publicly online; centr.org.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you.

ICANN 48 · 17-21 Nov 2013

BYRON HOLLAND: Are there any other questions around that issue? No? Okay. I think the next thing on the Agenda was really around potential areas for collaboration. That's where a lot of work was done by Katrina and Ron and Cheryl. On that note I think we'll pass it over to that team.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm going to jump in. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript.   I think while I'm saying that, one of the points of transparency that the At-Large AC in particular, but the At-Large community in general, have keen on is a little bit unique – everything we do is recorded. Everything has an .mp3 posted up online. Everything we say in those is transcribed and often in three languages.

So when you're engaging with us and we constantly say our names, yes, it is crazy, but if you read 55 pages of transcript and it looks like a monologue of one rather schizophrenic mind-flow, you'll know why. When it comes to transcription it's important that you actually interspace your name. Some of us have sufficiently well-known voices that the transcribers know when it's Olivier, and even if he doesn't say his name he's correctly identified, but we do do that as part of our transparency.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cheryl. Just to add to this, we also conduct our meetings in three languages. We have interpretation provided. So it makes it even worse when you're on another language channel and the interpreter

seems to be talking to themselves back and forth. Very confusing. I've tried it and it's terrible.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll follow on from that, because I can see a question coming from Byron – how does that work? Is that what you'd like to know?

BYRON HOLLAND: No, nothing so interesting. Unfortunately just a reminder that we have to go to the GAC at ten minutes to. I just want to be conscious of that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's fine. Ron hasn't been able to join us online. That's unfortunate. Ron and a previous ccNSO Liaison did do a body of work in the distant past, which looked at some mapping exercises about where At-Large structures were, geographically speaking, and where ccNSO members were, geographically speaking. We also heard at that time that GAC was also interested in that.

I know Ron would want to proffer that to look at that information again as ccNSO's grown into the low 140s and ALAC's now sitting at the 160 mark might be worthwhile doing. That's something that, if you all think that's worthwhile, your liaisons Ron and Maureen could put up a small project on and see whether that's worthwhile doing. I think it probably would be worthwhile doing.

The areas of collaboration I would like to suggest fall into two entirely different but not unrelated camps. One of them is what I would call in

the ICANN sphere. For example, we should be collaborating a lot more by having At-Large input into the public comments that your Working Groups put out.

The Framework of Interpretation Working Group is a clear example where more input during those public comments on each of those chapters, from community, could be driven effectively if we get out At-Large structures to get engaged with reading that early. Maybe having a webinar to explain what questions and answers are on certain things?

So if we were able to work with someone from a ccNSO Working Group, have a little webinar to explain to our people, "That's recorded, even they're not on the webinar they can go to it later on demand," and then we might get more input into calls for public comment. Of course that's if you want public comment. [laughs]

I understand the principle of putting it out there and hoping nobody notices, but if you actually want public comment that would be one space in areas of collaboration. That's one of the examples of two inwardly-to-ICANN looking ones. We in the At-Large community, the ALSes are usually a significant part, but often perhaps not unnecessarily tapped part of your individual Internet communities.

We've attracted some people into the ICANN world, which may not be your local Internet society. There might be an opportunity locally for if one was doing a local Internet governance forum or a meeting on a particular topic, to get not just the usual suspects involved in local ccNSO activities and ccTLD activities. I think that's another area where we would probably need to share what's happening and when.

So there may be an opportunity to perhaps share some calendar space or have a list for updating, so if Australia's doing something we can let people know. The final thing, before I ask Katrina and Margarita to put their two cents-worth in is that having meetings like this is in fact starting to build collaboration and understanding. We still have At-Large structures who do not understand the c and the g community. It's in everyone's best interest to educate them and getting to know them is a good way of doing that.

Finally, you – putting on my AUDA hat – we, as a ccTLD, are constantly funding activities in our region and in our country. I would like to think that some of us, particularly when we get into sub-regional and regional funding, could work smarter, not harder.   I would rather have coordinated approach, taken perhaps through a small clustering of ccTLD operators, getting people both in our country and external to our country, who we support, going to things like summer schools and training and things like that.

But right now that's very ad hoc, and perhaps we could look at being a little bit more coordinated about that. I know, Keith, that everyone would understand what Pacific Partners does, but perhaps at a future time that type of model could be introduced to the At-Large AC so that they understand as well. Now I'm going to stop. [laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I think that the most important thing is to build bridges between ccNSO operators and ALSes, since we are everywhere in the world so normally we can do that. Ron and Rudi have already done a stocktaking, more of less, of the situation where we have ccTLDs and ALSes at the same time.

Now we have to build the bridges. The bridges exist for some countries. I know that for my country there is no problem. I participated in the review of the charter of our ccTLD, and also for the new charter of the IDN ccTLD for Tunisia. We are always in contact. When I do an event they are part of it, so there's no problem for our country.

But I think that it's a problem for a lot of countries. There are some ccTLDs who don't want anyone to touch them. They think that it's their propriety and normally those in civil society or those ALSes don't have to be involved in it.

Once we build those bridges there are a lot of things to do together – a lot. For example, our participation in the international fora. If we can coordinate it, it will be very good, it will be for the benefit of the multistakeholder model. This is one area where I see that our cooperation is important.

Also, for any kind of training or capacity building that can be done for the ALSes, the help of the ccTLDs will be very good, because they have technical knowledge for this area, and also they have the means, the locals, the logistical things – so they can help also. So those are examples, but I think there are a lot of opportunities for cooperation.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. I hear that we had a hard stop on this room of 20 minutes ago. It's so hard that we went straight through it. I'm afraid we have to end this meeting prematurely. Just to close off – the work we've done with the ASO recently was to do the same sort of mapping exercise and also look at the regional leadership in each one of the parts of the world.

There's been extensive collaboration, with our members going to the local RIR meetings, etc., and I think this could be an opportunity for us to explore this. I was going to suggest that we do this for Singapore?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. On that note, for our Council we have to go to the GAC right now. Thank you very much for the opportunity to have this meeting. It's unfortunate that it was a little bit rushed, but nonetheless I think it shows that there is opportunity for further work together and collaboration. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Byron. Thank you everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]