
SINGAPORE – ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session
Sunday, March 23rd 2014 – 09:00 to 18:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, ladies and gentlemen in the translation booths, we're ready to start actually listening to your very lovely voices. If we can please start with English talking into French, please. If you can continue talking for me, please. We have a bit of a buffer to deal with. Okay. We're very happy with French now. Thank you very much. That is good. Can I hear the Spanish, please? Yes, Spanish please. Spanish, thank you very much. If I could now hear the Chinese interpreter, please. We can hear you. If you could just continue talking, that would be great. I won't make you work anymore. That's fine. Thank you very much, Chinese.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning, ladies and gentleman. We're just doing an audio test on the phone bridge to make sure that everybody on the phone can hear us and the quality is good. So the Adigo operator will let us know. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good morning, Adigo. Can you talk back to us in the room, please? Good morning, Adigo. Can you hear us? Good morning, Adigo. She's not getting anything. I beg to differ. That's fine. That's where it should be. Now she hears you? Good morning, Adigo. If you could talk back to me, operator, that would be sensational. I can hear you loud and clear.

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.

Good morning or good evening from wherever you are. If you could give me a ten count, that would be sensational. Can you hear me, Adigo operator? That was fantastic. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Quick announcement. There is a laptop case at the back of the room. If anybody's forgotten it there, could they please take it? Oh, and there's a laptop inside the laptop case as well.

Okay, everyone. Start taking your seats please. We're going to start in one minute. Okay, we'll start in 30 seconds. If you could please take your positions. Take your seats, please. Let's have the recording on, please.

Well, good morning, everybody. If I could please ask you to take your seats, we're starting. I think we have a technical issue here at the moment, because we can hear – I think it's Chinese – being interpreted on the speakers. Let's start again.

Good morning, everybody. Welcome, this is the ALAC and Regional Leadership Meeting. Today we are on Sunday. Yes, it's Sunday, the 23rd of March, 2014. Welcome, everyone. I see a lot of sleepy faces here after such long flights. Well, some of us not such long flights, I guess. Thank you for all arriving in time, or just about in time.

Today we've got a very long day of meetings. The first thing we're going to do is to actually do a quick around the table introduction from every person around the table because we have a number of new people that have joined us. So let's start. Well, let's start in a clockwise fashion and let's start with the far right – or my far right. First, with Cheryl.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Good morning. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I have served with the Asia-Pacific Regional At-Large Organization over the years as a member of the Internet Society of Australia, which is a chapter of ISOC and an At-Large Structure. My current role is as the 2014 Nominating Committee chair, but I have also had a little bit to do with the ccNSO, and I occasionally play in the GNSO puddle, as well as other things. Thank you.

RON SHERWOOD: Good morning. I'm Ron Sherwood. I'm trustee of dot-vi and a member of ccNSO, and I am the ccNSO liaison to ALAC and have been for a number of years now.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPUR: Good morning. Yrjö Länsipur from ISOC Finland. I'm the associate chair of the 2014 Nominating Committee.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Good morning. My name is Sandra Hoferichter. I'm the EURALO representative to the ALAC.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Good morning, everyone. My name is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. I'm the ALAC member from LACRALO.



BERAN GILLEN: Good morning, everyone. My name is Beran Gillen. I'm the ALAC member for – as you can see, I'm new – AFRALO.

AZIZ HILALI: Good morning. I am Aziz Hilali, AFRALO chair.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: My name is [inaudible]. I am a member of AFRALO and a member of ALAC.

FOUAD BAJWA: Good morning, everyone. Fouad Bajwa. I am the co-vice chair of APRALO.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani Ben Jemaa, ALAC vice chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg. I'm the NomCom appointee from North America. I've been on the ALAC off and on for the last almost eight years now and I've been the GNSO liaison from the ALAC for the same period of time. And last year I was on the ATRT-2 and I'm not anymore, but my job is still to beat people up to make comments so the board implements what we said.

LEON SANCHEZ: Good morning. I'm Leon Sanchez. I'm the NomCom appointee for LACRALO for the ALAC.



ARIEL LIANG: Good morning, everyone. This is Ariel Liang, ICANN staff.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to jump in. Ariel, of course, is the replacement for Matt Ashtiani. So, welcome, Ariel.

ARIEL LIANG: Thank you, thank you. Happy to be here.

GISELLA GRUBER: Good morning. Gisella Gruber. ICANN staff.

ALAN GREENBERG: And goddess.

GISELLA GRUBER: Mother goddess.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Good morning. I'm Silvia Vivanco.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Heidi Ullrich, ICANN staff.

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



EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Evan Leibovitch, vice chair from NARALO.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Maureen Hilyard, APRALO rep on the ALAC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche. APRALO, Internet Society of Australia, and on the executive.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Good morning, everyone. Siranush Vardanyan, APRALO acting chair.

JULIE HAMMER: Good morning, everyone. Julie Hammer, SSAC liaison from the ALAC.

GARTH BRUEN: Garth Bruen, NARALO chair.

RAFID FATANI: Rafid Fatani, NomCom appointee for ALAC APRALO.

YJ PARK: Good morning, YJ Park from APRALO.

PAVAN BUDHRANI: Morning. Pavan Budhrani, APRALO Secretariat.



YULIYA MORENETS: Good morning. Yuliya Morenets, EURALO Secretariat.

WOLF LUDWIG: Wolf Ludwig, EURALO Chair.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Good morning. Fatima Cambronero, ALAC member by LACRALO.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Good morning. Sylvia Herlein Leite, LACRALO secretary.

JOSE ARCE: Good morning, everyone. I am Jose Arce, LACRALO chair.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Good morning. This is Eduardo Diaz, ALAC NARALO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have one more person who has been flying around the table with a camera, and that's . . .

GLEN MCKNIGHT: . . . obvious. Glen McKnight from NARALO Secretariat.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Glen. Behind me we have a few more people that are not sitting at the table.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sébastien Bachollet. I'm an ICANN board member. Thank you.

CHESTER SOONG: Chester Soong from ISOC Hong Kong chapter.

OKSANA PRYHODKO: Oksana Prykhodko, Ukraine. EURALO proxy for Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] Chinese Domain Names [inaudible]

AMRIKA RANJITSINGH: Amrika Ranjitsingh from the Trinidad and Tobago Computer Society.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And two more people.

CARLOS REYES: Carlos Reyes, ICANN staff.

SUSIE JOHNSON: Susie Johnson, ICANN staff.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. The mic has probably run out of battery. I don't know. Okay. There's one more announcement, of course, and that has to be – Dev Anand Teelucksingh, you have to tell something to us.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you, Olivier. I just want to say I'm very happy to say I've proposed to Amrika Ranjitsingh.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could we have the answer please? I take it, for those people who are participating remotely, this is a yes. So thank you very much. I note your wisdom in asking before the ICANN meeting and not at the end of the ICANN week, which is very, very good indeed. I'll have to think of that in the future.

So there are a few ground rules that we have to pursue throughout the week. The first one is the fact that these meetings are all interpreted. They're interpreted in English if you speak another language than English, but they're also interpreted in Spanish, in French, and in Chinese which is really great. The only thing, though, is you do have to say your name before you start speaking so as for the interpreters not to start talking about some kind of schizophrenic conversation – people talking to themselves or arguing with themselves. So please, that's something very important. Say your name before you start speaking.

Second thing, speak slowly, which is something that Heidi will remind me all along the morning and the afternoon. The other thing, of course, is that everything here is transcribed and is recorded. You will notice there are two cameras. Now we've upgraded from one. So at least the



upper part of your body should look pretty much okay. The lower part, it doesn't matter, except if the cameras are [wrong] and fall under the table. But that's a different thing.

Thanks for all this. Is there any other announcement that we need to make before we start on our work, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Just also, we have a very packed schedule today and all through the week. We have 24 meetings. So time-keeping is very important. I think maybe, Olivier, if we could also – do you want to have a separate timekeeper? Who would like to be a timekeeper for today? Holly, okay. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Heidi. And Holly, no need to remind us we're late already. So let's move on directly to the next part of our agenda and that's the first of the discussions that we are going to have. We're starting with a hot topic, and that's the ATLAS-II, the At-Large Summit. You will see, if you don't have your agenda page on the paper, you can see it on the right-hand screen. We have until 9:45, which is just about a half-an-hour or so – a bit less than half-an-hour.

For this subject, I'm going to ask for a quick update from Eduardo Diaz Rivera.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a quick update on the ATLAS-II. We have been having meetings. There is an organizing committee having a



meeting for organizing the ATLAS every two weeks since I think last year. Things are moving along very well. The events agenda have been set up mostly, and the thematic sessions have been identified.

A survey was sent out to all the ALSes to define which thematic sessions they wanted to go to. There is also an activity that we're going [to call], it's called Fair of Opportunities and it's going to be mostly a networking activity that is going to happen during the time, and thus has been coordinated by Glen.

There is also going to be a mentoring program where we are planning to have newcomers or ALSes that have never been here in ICANN and assign them to some of us to help them going through the ICANN meeting and to have somebody to ask questions to.

There is also a return of investments that [Cheryl] is leading, and she will be working very hard after the meeting is done to get all the reports and making sense of how effective this meeting was, just to make sure that the things that did not work – learning lessons and things like that.

Also, we are putting together a newsletter that is going to come out. Five newsletters are going to come out before the meeting, just to keep the momentum going of things that might happen. The first one is going to come out around one month – sometime in April. And there will be a daily newsletter coming out every day during the summit, just to let you know what things are happening there. There's also going to be a webpage somewhere that you can go to to find out things that are going to be happening during the summit.



So other than that, Olivier, if you have something to add, please to do.
Thank you so much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eduardo. And before I open the floor for questions, just one more bit of housekeeping. If you want to ask questions or intervene, you've got a name card in front of you. If you can put it sideways, then I can see who wants to speak. For those people who are online, please put your hand up. I notice we do have three remote participants at the moment: Allan Skuce, Derek, and Gordon Chilcott. And I don't know what time it is in the States at the moment, but it's seems pretty late. So flip the clock.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's 9:30.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So it's the evening in the U.S. Okay, excellent. Just one more thing, Eduardo. I wanted to ask people around the table, who at the moment is in an ATLAS-II working group? There's quite a few, but I notice there are also some who are not in ATLAS-II working groups. Now, this is a real priority for us. This is a really, really big thing. All of the ALSes are going to be in London. You have to really consider joining at least ATLAS-II working group. We need all the help we can have. Not only that, but you will be also the liaisons to your own region to get your own ALSes in your part of the world to feel already involved before ATLAS-II even starts. This is a buildup, now, that we have and the clock has started running.



So I open the floor for questions and interventions. First, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr and then we'll have Garth Bruen and I'll take the list as it happens. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to pick up an opportunity here – thank you, Eduardo for mentioning the very important return on investments work that we will be doing. Because I won't be able to join you, I'll be an apology for some of the organizing committee meetings later in the week, I just wondered if you would allow me to mention to everyone at this table – but also those online – that if you have a particular passion for the arcane and magical world of return on investments, we do have an opening.

We've got I think three people who have put their hands up to date, but it is open. As a work group, you would be more than welcome. I'm looking at you, Rafid, quite deliberately. We'll just put Rafid's name down now – thank you – to work on the return of investments. But some of our work will, in fact, be going on between this meeting and London, because we'll be framing some of our deliverables. We'll be looking at what we will and will not be seeing as value-adds or general expectations, and we'll also start to get the real data sets. You'll know how many travelers and how much will they cost and what the rooms will be. So that will all come to us during. So there is some pre-work, but it will be running more intensely after. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. Next is Garth Bruen.



GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Garth Bruen, NARALO chair. As somebody whose very first ICANN meeting was the 2009 summit in Mexico City, I really kept in mind some of the pieces that I thought worked well and some of the pieces I thought didn't work and needed to be fixed the next time around.

And one of the things that I've done as chair of NARALO is I've gone to all of our ALSes and communicated with them one-on-one about what they can get out of this and what their responsibilities are, and I want to make sure that all of our ALS representatives are on a working group. And I've been pushing for this really, really hard within our membership.

And I'm also asking all of them to bring something to the table. I want to hear what their issues are, because what's the point of them coming to these meetings if they're not going to be involved in the policy discussion? So I want to hear what they have to say, so I'm asking them to really think about this question and bring something of value to the meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth. Next we have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. I would like to thank Garth for being sure that all the ALSes will be on the working groups – excuse me, on the thematic groups. I can notice that a lot of the ALSes didn't subscribe to any of the groups and this is a very, very difficult thing for us because we would be



obliged to assign them to groups. Perhaps they will not be happy [for it]. So the best is every RALO try to make all the ALSes subscribe to one of the groups. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Next we have Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a suggestion. Silvia, if we can resend the e-mail that lists all of the working committees so that everybody who hasn't put their hand up – and I'm one of them – could do so, that will just make sure that everybody has to be – it will let people know what's available and where the vacancies are. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly. And we actually have a list of the ATLAS-II working groups on the screen internally. So for those people listening to us or watching us remotely, you just have to go to the Wiki page which is referenced in the chat.

I wanted to maybe take a minute for each one of those sub-working groups to see if their chair could tell us what is the next work that this working group has to do, because it's difficult to track. And I know that, for example, the Survey group has already done much work, but there's very little left to do. So it's a bit silly to join the Survey group now after the train – I was going to say the train has sailed. The ship has sailed.



So the Survey group, we had Wolf Ludwig in charge of this. As we said, that's pretty much finished its work. The Events group, Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. We have already more or less the schedule – the events already more or less set now. We are working with the meeting staff to fix the problem of the rooms, because it seems that the venue is tight. Right now, we don't know, but they are willing to make their best to find the right room for the right event, but we are still trying with them. Otherwise, everything is already more or less set. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Can you just remind us what does the Events group do? Is it just events or is it the agenda or what?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It is to fix the agenda for the whole week and to try to assign each slot of time to the adequate event.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Does this include the Fair of Opportunities?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I gather there's still some work to do in that.



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. The Fair of Opportunities has a subgroup working on it. So I am only in charge of finding the venue and give them a slot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Next is Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was going to say that Glen is leading that group, so I guess he can tell us some of the things that he's doing there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Glen McKnight?

GLEN MCKNIGHT: Great. Good morning, everyone. Yes, we are going to have a meeting tomorrow with our group for their progress. We are nailing down the location and the venue itself. So we don't really have a lot of firm details for you right now, but it's going to be an exciting event. It's going to be more networking rather than a lot of speeches, but there will be some brief speeches as well. But I think it's a great opportunity.

So what we have is each of the RALOs will have a table, so each region needs to assign someone to make sure they're responsible for the table. Judith is our representative from NARALO, so please have your literature there for the event. But it looks like an exciting opportunity. Thank you.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Glen. Is this meeting that you're speaking about on the agenda at the moment?

GLEN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. It's tomorrow.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Tomorrow has 24 hours.

GLEN MCKNIGHT: I'll get back to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. If you could check and pass this on to At-Large staff, because they believe it's not on the agenda, and if they can't find it, I don't know if anybody else can find it. All right, thank you. Holly. And please turn your mic off, thank you.

Okay. The next one, if we can go back to the working groups page. Sorry, I didn't see the corner of my eye. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. If this is the way you wanted to do this. Forgive me, what is the difference between the Communications group and the Public Relations group?



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Evan. We'll come to this in a second as we go through the list of working groups. Hopefully we can find the difference between the two. Garth Bruen?

GARTH BRUEN: I just want to note that, as we go through this, we really have to put ourselves in the position of being somebody who doesn't understand what goes on at the ICANN meetings and to try and think about what it means to be somebody who is not exposed to this environment. And if we communicate the working group functions back to new ALSes, we have to be as clear as possible. Some of this isn't even clear to me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth. So the next working group is the Sponsors Working Group and I'm chairing this. And the quick review on this is sponsorship proposals have been sent to several potential sponsors. There has been a list suggested of additional sponsors that could be contacted. Unfortunately, not without an actual contact point. So please, can we try and suggest the contact points for each one of these additional sponsors? We will go and get the sponsors to – well, go and contact those potential sponsors.

I'm glad to announce so far we have had \$10,000 pledged by Google with a potential pledge for more, if needed. And we will see how that goes on. Ideally, I'd like to have more than just one sponsor. This is not a Google meeting. But the others have also said they're currently working on it and we should have some good news soon. Holly Raiche?



HOLLY RAICHE: Aside from the fact that you've got four minutes, it would be helpful – even if I don't join – to understand, to have a bit of a budget so if you're approaching organizations, you can say, "These are the things that we want to do. These are the amounts that we need to do X." Then you can actually have a name attached to an event or something. It would be a much easier sell. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Holly. Actually, there is a sponsorship proposal which was shared with the working groups. So that's actually been sent to the sponsors. The sums which have been pledged so far don't cover a full event, but we've also said that it is possible to share sponsorship, several sponsors for one event. There is a proposal for a lunch, a proposal for a dinner, and of course the Fair of Opportunities, which needs sponsorship as well.

Let's move on to the next Working Group quickly. I'm aware that we are already running out of time, somehow. The next one is the Logistics group and that is just about to start work. The reason being that so far, we haven't started with regards to the visa situation, etc. There's already some progress as far as visas are concerned. There should be a form that you fill and then you get an invitation letter and so on. This is all taken care of at the moment, and the Logistics group is going to continue and also do some work with regards to people coming into the hotel, SIM cards, etc.



Some of the work has already been done by the IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force) that met last month in London. There was a mailing list. We saw a lot of input there from participants as to tips, restaurants, places where you can get cheap food, etc., around. So that's all the Logistics.

Next group, please. Public Relations group. And this is where Evan's question comes into play. Let's have a quick rundown from Murray McKercher. I know he's remotely. I'm not sure whether we can have him speak. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

He put in the response already in the Adobe chat.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you. That's a good point. Thanks very much, Eduardo. So the Public Relations group is responsible for coordinating all media tours, press kits, in-house promotions and pre-recording of lead figures around ICANN in support of the ATLAS-II effort. The team should also coordinate the recording and dissemination of testimonials during and after the meeting outcome, event public relation support, and coordination with all working groups to join the ATLAS-II sub-working group and to just follow the instructions and sign up to the mailing list. And I believe the mailing list instructions are on the Wiki page for this.

Let's go to the next. First, we have Wolf Ludwig. Wolf, you have the floor.



WOLF LUDWIG: Just a short note. I think I've repeatedly asked being part of this sub-working group as well, and I'm still not listed among the members of this group. That's all. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. Carlos, did you take note of this please? Thank you. We have Carlos Reyes who is coordinating all of this in the room. Let's go with the next group, please. Return on Investment. We've just touched on it already with Cheryl, so we can move to the next one, the Fair of Opportunities. For this, is it going to be Glen or is it going to be...? Glen McKnight, you're the chair. The Fair of Opportunities.

GLEN MCKNIGHT: I covered it, but there was one error that I stated earlier that I thought the meeting was on Monday. I verified it with my colleague. It's on Wednesday morning. That's just my last update. But I'm really pleased to hear that Google is kicking in \$10,000. We just have to make sure we get the rest and have a really good party. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Glen. I believe you didn't pronounce the word "party." I think you said "fair" and "working" evening. We don't have parties in At-Large.

Coming back, next page, please. Next working group. We've got the Communications Working Group. The person in charge of this one is Eduardo Diaz.



EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Both of the people are not here: Natalia and Carlos. I can say that this group is mostly responsible for coordinating the newsletter and the webpage. So everybody is welcome to collaborate with this group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eduardo. I believe that some members of the community will be interviewed in Singapore in order to be able to fill the newsletter and provide some input and get our ALSes to fully embrace the spirit of ATLAS-II. Next working group, please? That's the Mentoring Program Working Group. Fatima Cambroneró is in charge of this.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. I will speak in Spanish.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For those people who are not aware, you do have your headphones. Go ahead, Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much. I will speak in Spanish. The objective of the mentoring program is to prepare participants – the attendees – to this summit before the summit. The idea is to create different groups of mentor groups, and those who are the mentees. And for that purpose, we are kindly inviting ALAC members, representatives of ALAC and



regional leaders, to act as mentors. At least the idea is that each of the members take one ALS or one ALS representative to guide that representative before the meeting so that they can discuss different topics or items that they need to discuss or if they need any guidelines so that they can make the most of the London meeting.

And after the meeting, the idea is to guide these participants and tell them which meetings they should attend or the different meetings they could attend in the general agenda. This has to do with what Garth was saying before. The idea is to help new members, the attendees, the newcomers for them to understand how the ICANN meeting works and how to make the most of these activities and meetings. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. We have first Wolf Ludwig. Then we'll have Cheryl and then Tijani. Wolf?

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, just a short comment on this as far as I have understood the idea and concept behind the issue of this mentoring group. I think it's very important that each RALO selects the highest skilled possible people for this issue, because from my point of view, from Europe, it makes only sense if the mentors from our region have a very detailed knowledge on all aspects of their RALO, have detailed knowledge of all aspects of ALAC and history and needs to know a lot of background information to be really useful for a newcomer, because there will be all sorts of questions from newcomers and it would be in certain cases, in my humble



opinion, very sensitive if a mentor at a certain point looks stupid not knowing much about his or her own region or ALAC in general.

Therefore I think we should really take a lot of attention on this point. I would, from my region, prefer to have less people, but people with a high degree of knowledge than having two or three more which are not far beyond a newcomer's level as well, because they've never attended an ICANN meeting and very basic things like this. Thanks a lot.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolf. Next is Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I'll just say the queue is closed. At the moment, in the queue I've got Cheryl, Tijani, and Fatima. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Wolf, I'm following on with you. The reason I put this up is I think what you need to do – sorry, Fatima, it's your group – needs to do is work on two things. One, an appropriate little orientation package which can reside online for your mentees and your mentors to get access to. But that's just a good piece of knowledge work that needs to be done for ALAC anyway, so there's no downside of doing that.

But mentoring is actually an art form, even though this is a fairly short-term relationship, and I would strongly encourage you to put together a mentor kit as well.

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



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Two points. First of all, I would like to agree with what Wolf said, because it is not important to have more mentors. It's important to have mentors that can really mentor the newcomers. That's right. Because it happened before. We put people who are in need of mentoring as a mentor, so it is a problem.

Second point, there is another activity related to the summit which is not inside the Summit Working Group, which is capacity building to be given to the ALSes before the summit. And the Capacity Building Working Group is working on that. We are more or less advanced in the process, but we have a small delay that we will try to recover just after Singapore. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Finally, Fatima Cambronerero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you. I appreciate the comments you've made. I will take them into account. With respect to the original draft of the program, it's considered basis of obligations before becoming mentors. The idea is that anyone who has the capabilities to become a mentor should be a mentor in order to convey the knowledge appropriately. A person who knows the historical perspective, the context of ALAC, might not have the ability to convey that knowledge to the persons who are in need of that. I appreciate that again, and I will take note of your comments.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. Just to remind everyone, there are several more ATLAS-II-related meetings in the week, so I expect this discussion to continue afterwards.

In the meantime, we have a number of people who have arrived in the room. But before this, we have to introduce a number of other mentees who are following another program. Heidi, just a couple of words about this program, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi, everyone. We are really, really very pleased to announce that you are the lucky recipients of a pilot program that ICANN has just started just for Singapore and for London. This is called the ICANN Mentor Program. So it's apart from the At-Large Mentoring Program that you just heard about. This is actually part of the fellowship program, and it's again, At-Large. We're going to be doing – for Singapore, we are very pleased. I'm going to let them introduce themselves. They're going to be with us in Singapore on all the way through London and then at the Summit, as well. I'm going to have them introduce themselves and their mentors, who are ALAC members, and then Gisella is going to say a few words about how that program fits in. Anthony?

ANTHONY NIIGANII: Hello. My name is Anthony Niiganii. I come from Canada. I am Swampy Cree from the community of Pimicikamak Cree Nation and it's a great honor to be one of the first participants – or the guinea pigs – in the program. My mentor is Eduardo Diaz and I'm very honored to have him as my mentor. Thank you.



UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone. My name is [inaudible]. I come from an organization called ITOCA (Information Training and Outreach Center for Africa). We're based in South Africa. But originally, I am from Zimbabwe. So you can see I look like my president. I'm glad to be part of the mentorship program, and being one of the guinea pigs.

Fortunately for me, I've got two mentors, Tijani and I'm still to meet Philip Johnson. Oh, okay. Thank you very much. I'm looking forward to learning from everyone besides my mentors. Is it restricted to only my mentors? Oh, okay. Thank you for having me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, [inaudible]. You're allowed to speak to everybody here and everybody is allowed to speak to you.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Hi, everyone. My name is Gunela Astbrink. I'm from Australia and the director of the Internet Society of Australia and a member of a Pacific Island chapter of ISOC. My mentor is Maureen Hilyard. I'm delighted to have Maureen as a mentor. We have worked together over a number of years, and so it's a very easy transition – hopefully for both of us – as we talk about ICANN and the various processes. I'm very much looking forward to immersing myself more and more. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. I'm going to just hand it to Gisella, who's going to be coordinating this program with Janice.



GISELLA GRUBER:

Thank you. Just to say that our mentees will be spending this week – they'll be spending quite a few sessions in the ALAC as well. Their mentors will be advising them on which are the most appropriate sessions to attend.

They'll be having very early starts from Monday through to Thursday attending the fellowship sessions, and they will be touching base with their mentors every day. And then we'll arrive on Thursday afternoon – time yet to be defined – where we'll have a group overview of the week, how their week went with their mentors. Then prepare for the next three months leading us up to London on the work that needs to be done, their input. Then we'll be meeting up with them again in London and taking this program further. So thank you very much. Welcome and I'm looking forward to working with you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Gisella. Welcome to our mentees. It's really exciting to see another pilot program starting with At-Large. I look forward to seeing great results from this.

Without further ado, we need to move to the next part of our agenda, ladies and gentlemen. We have the pleasure to have Sally Costerton with the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team that is joining us. Sally, could you please take place at the table? And whilst you sit down, perhaps we could have the regional vice presidents introduce themselves, please.



With apologies for the crunch, but we, for some reason, have been given a short or a narrower head table than we usually have which is a bit of a concern. It's all very collegial over here. Let's have a quick round of introductions, please.

SALLY COSTERTON: Good morning. Sally Costerton for the record, head of Stakeholder Engagement. And I'm going to ask the Stakeholder Engagement Team to introduce themselves in turn, starting on my left here with Kuek.

KUEK YU-CHUANG: Thank you very much. First and foremost, welcome to Singapore. I cannot express how important it is to have the meetings here, so allow me a little bit more time than my colleagues, if I may. It really is a homecoming. Singapore was the venue of the very first ICANN meetings. In 2011, we had a new gTLD program.

We are gathered here in Singapore again for a very historic ICANN meeting. Many of you have contributed with your wisdom, with your input in the journey. We look forward to hear from you even more along the way.

But put those issues aside. I'm very happy that, as hosts, we have the APRALO showcase, as well, with this fantastic crew here that has been putting it together. It's happening on Wednesday. I think the importance of that is for the world to really see the kind of diversity within the region, Asia-Pacific, that I share with Save. I really hope that you can encourage people to come, because that's what we are going to see there.



I also wanted to call out the fact that this time around, we have a program called NextGen@ICANN, where we get tertiary students to join us at the meetings. Please say “hi” when you see them. We want this to be as welcoming as possible because we really want to be as inclusive as we can. And I’ve taken up way more than my five minutes of fame, so I’m going to pass this to Save.

SAVE VOCEA:

Good morning all. I’m happy to be here. My name is Save Vocea. I was originally born in Fiji, so I look after the Pacific Islands and Australia/New Zealand in terms of engagement. For many times in the past, when I came to ICANN there was very little visibility in the Oceania region, except for Australia and New Zealand turning up. But now at this meeting, we’re having a bit more of a Pacific Islands participation. Great to see them, and I’ll be talking to many of them.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Hello. Good morning, everyone. My name is Rodrigo De La Parra for the record. I’m vice president for Latin America and the Caribbean. I’m happy to be here and greet all my colleagues from the region.

CHRIS MONDINI:

Hi, I’m Chris Mondini. I’m vice president for Global Stakeholder Engagement for the North America region, happy to be here.

PIERRE DANDJINOU:

My name is Pierre Dandjinou. I’m vice president for Africa. Always happy to be with At-Large.



VENI MARKOVSKI: Hi, I'm Veni Markovski. Until yesterday I was VP for Russia, CIS, and Eastern Europe and now I'm dealing with issues related to the U.N. and Global Cyber Security Corporation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good luck, Veni.

MICHAEL YAKUSHEV: Hello. I am Michael Yakushev. Since yesterday, I am VP for Russia and the region. I know many of you and I'm very happy to see you again and to work with you. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Michael. Okay. Let's go back to Sally Costerton.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you very much, Olivier. It's always good to be here. I always know it's the beginning of an ICANN meeting and it feels like we're all getting back in the groove.

Every time we come to see you, I think we have a few more people than we did the last time. That will stop soon. Apart from anything, we should run out of chairs. Yes, I think we have this time.

But there's a very serious reason. When I very first came to meet you as a group, when I very first joined ICANN, we were a very small team. Fadi had asked me to build a world-class global engagement team, precisely



so that we could support, in a way, what is your core mission. So expanding the ICANN community, particularly focusing on getting close to stakeholders, bringing people in.

I remember the first time I met Olivier. He explained to me the concept of bringing people from the edge to the middle. In fact, that concept has driven pretty much our whole engagement strategy. The idea of how do we support at the center, our community here? Many of you who I know now, we work closely with solving problems, using our bottom-up stakeholder model to sometimes do very difficult things together, as well as the process of just cranking the machine to make sure that, as much as we can, we raise awareness of why people should come to ICANN and we facilitate the process of bringing them to ICANN – either physically, in the way that we’re doing today, with mentors, fellowship programs, but also virtually.

Some of the work that you’re going to hear from Chris Gift, in a minute, has been incredibly driven by the engagement agenda. We have worked very hard with you and many of you have been closely involved in that to make sure that we provide the right digital platforms to expand our engagement much more than we can if we just rely on people alone.

But at the end of the day, as I’ve said before and some of you have heard me say before, when I came to ICANN, I thought that it was about technology or perhaps about policy. As every day passes, I realize it’s actually really about people and about our ability to work together and support each other, and to understand each other. Some of the programs that this team is involved in – most of the programs this team is involved in – are about that. About how do we make sure that we



create points of relevance and understanding so that the people who need to come and join our community – who sometimes don't even realize they do need to join – really know how to and are motivated to come and working in partnership with you to do that.

So I'm happy to say that I think we made a lot of headway. I'm very proud of the people on this team. I hope that you will all get to know them well. We have one more joiner who's not here today because he's not arriving until tomorrow, but we have announced it, which is somebody who some of you also might know who is a chap called Jean-Jacques Sahel, who is currently at Microsoft but is joining on the 22nd of April to become our new VP for Stakeholder Engagement in Europe. And Nigel Hickson who is the current European VP is moving into Geneva to work with Tarek Kamel looking after IGOs worldwide.

So that's a kind of update as to where we are, and that's pretty much us complete, now. I think we've finished our family. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sally. Whilst you were speaking, and you spoke, "Nigel Hickson," he mysteriously appeared in the room. Nigel, can you please introduce yourself?

NIGEL HICKSON: Hello. I know most of you and it's great to be here again. As Sally said, I'm sort of transitioning. I'm sort of moving south from Brussels to Geneva to work there with the ITU and a number of the other government organizations, the U.N. and various people. I'll continue my relationship with EURALO and I'll continue my relationship with ALAC.



It's always a pleasure to be involved in the work you do. Thank you very much for making me so welcome over the years.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Congratulations, Nigel. Now we open the floor for questions. So there are no questions at the moment. Everybody is mute. Oh, we do have one question. Oksana Prykhodko?

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: I have no questions. I have only one comment. I am from Ukraine and I saw in comments some concerns regarding Mr. Yakushev's citizenship. Mr. Yakushev is citizen of Russia. Ukraine is in a stage of war with Russia. It does not mean that Ukrainian people in the stage of war with Russian people. It means that we are against Russian government positions and the only one solution for me for Mr. Yakushev conflict of citizenship to provide Mr. Yakushev with Ukrainian citizenship. You're welcome. We highly appreciate your appointment. For us, your appointment is more accountability, more transparency, more clearly understanding of the role of each stakeholder within our region.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Oksana. Michael?

MICHAEL YAKUSHEV: Thank you very much. I have to answer. My mother is from Kiev, from Ukraine. So I'm very proud and very thankful. Thank you.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Michael. Okay, more questions. We have a bit of time. Oh, sorry, I didn't see Garth Bruen.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Garth Bruen, NARALO. Just following instructions. In NARALO, we've really been pounding the pavement doing outreach and recruitment for new At-Large Structures. We've actually developed a framework for recruitment that has been extremely effective. I think that in the last month, we've had four or five new applicants. We're having discussions with at least a dozen groups. And these are very, very serious organizations. These are organizations that represent journalists online, that represent digital survivors of sexual abuse, disabled people struggling to use the Internet.

As I hear their stories and I meet with them, I'm overwhelmed by the fact that they haven't been here all along. I know that you're ramping up staff and you're deploying resources, but we definitely need the assistance and we definitely need the help. We're looking for more coordination and more cooperation. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Chris, do you want to comment on that? You might have to come up here, I think, or sit with him.

CHRIS MONDINI: Hi, it's Chris Mondini, North America. Thanks very much for the comments and thanks for the expression of the need for coordination and support. I think that we have made strides. I want to commend you.



It's been quite striking, the speed with which some of our working together is bearing fruit with these new applications.

I would actually commend to the entire group what the NARALO has done to take advantage and make the most of the Community Outreach Pilot Program. Across the constituencies that participate in this group, NARALO is in the lead in terms of making the most of these resources that are available and converting that into actual results.

So Garth, Evan, and a number of others from NARALO have already been doing that, and I think that it speaks well for the success of the investment. And when you look at the success of the investment, it suggests that we're onto something that works. So discussing how we can continue to help and support is very, very high on our agenda.

I see, really going forward, as we're in this period, we are under quite a bit of scrutiny on – broadly speaking – the ICANN model on multi-stakeholderism on what it means on geographical diversity, on diversity of user groups, user populations.

I think that success in this area will also be a way to demonstrate success of the ICANN model. So I believe very strongly that we should build on the success that you've alluded to, Garth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chris. We have José Arce.

JOSÉ ARCE: Good morning, everybody.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have interpretation, and that's what it's for. Go ahead, José.

JOSÉ ARCE: Good morning, everybody. I was reading the list and I noticed the high number of new applications of NARALO. So first of all, let me congratulate you, Garth – you and the entire team – and also say that in our region as well as in the others, we are conducting the CROPP program. David is in charge of this program, which is precisely for the purposes of doing outreach and bring ALSes and groups and disseminate and raise awareness on ICANN and ALAC's mission in the Latin America and Caribbean region.

We're conducting the strategy program. Fatima and [Dev] are working very hard. I don't know, Rodrigo, if you want to say anything in particular about the engagement process, the strategy for the region?

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you, José. Let's continue in Spanish, as you have the headsets. Yes, indeed. In Latin America and the Caribbean, in this Working Group for Strategy, we are now in the phase of implementation of various projects and we've had active participation of the [LACRALO] people which are working exceptionally there. In particular, Fatima and Dev. I believe that out of the 40 projects we have, the one that has made most progress is the Communications program and they are both in charge of this program.



We have a newsletter that is circulated throughout the area among all actors. We are about to introduce the first draft of the website targeted to regional activities. So let me commend the coordination efforts which have been successful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rodrigo. I've got a lot of people putting their hands up at the moment. We first had a question on the Adobe chat from Murray McKercher. Then afterwards on the list, I have a lot of other people. Let's start with Murray McKercher's question. It's for Sally Costerton.

"The public relations task for ATLAS-II will be significant. As the chair of the sub-working group, I will appreciate any logistical support from your newly-mentioned VPs."

SALLY COSTERTON: So the public relations team, the [Coms] team, at ICANN have been working closely with the team here – the Communications Team in ATLAS – and that will continue. I will certainly make sure that any regional outreach and regional communications and press relations that need to be done, and that's coordinated with the regional media team.

We now have two regional [Coms] people. One in Latin America, based out of the operation in Montevideo, the House of Internet; and one now here in Singapore, who's been here two-and-a-half weeks. And we're about to make an offer to a candidate who will be based in Istanbul. So we will have, relatively speaking, local language [Coms] people outside the United States for the first time in ICANN's history and we'll make



sure that the ATLAS team maximizes the use of that. And if they need input from the Regional Engagement guys as well, of course the [Coms] team can facilitate that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sally. Obviously the maximum exposure for this is really important. I think that will really influence the return on investment afterwards. And as we know, at the moment, there are a lot of cameras pointed at ICANN with all of the changes that are taking place.

We've got a rather long queue. Fouad Bajwa, Alan Greenberg, Glen McKnight so far. I don't know whose card – Sandra Hoferichter. Okay. Start with Fouad Bajwa.

FOUAD BAJWA: Thank you, Olivier. This is Fouad Bajwa, co-vice chair of APRALO. Sally, as someone hasn't shown up – they're probably coming from the Middle Eastern region. Pakistan is included as part of the 22 countries of the region created which is called the Middle East and adjoining countries region. And as part of this, we have a Middle East Strategy Working Group, which had done this work last year and it came up with a three-year strategy for the region. And it spans through from Pakistan all the way down to the end of the Arab-speaking world in the Northern African part.

What's happening so far is we recently concluded the DNS forum in Dubai. That was our first interaction and our colleagues from Global Stakeholder Engagement from NARALO, from North American region,



was also there. [inaudible] also participated. The DNS industry also participated. So the first round of interactions with the stimulation of the DNS industry was created.

The second most interesting thing we are going for is we're going to have the first Middle East and adjoining countries Internet governance summer school soon. By "soon," I mean less than two or three months. That's going to be a big opportunity to start stimulating the young minds to participate Internet governance processes, and moreover, the DNS ecosystem within those 22 countries.

And then, of course, we have a much larger program which spans – we're starting work soon for year 2015. This is like sort of an update on what's happening around in our part of the world.

So as far as APRALO is concerned, our members have been active participants of that working group. We contributed extremely. I sort of coordinate – I wouldn't say lead, but sort of stimulate the task force on capacity building and awareness. There's also another colleague who's working on a task force for Arabic IDNs. So there's a significant amount of work going on in that part of the region. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

I just wanted to thank you for sharing. It's great. It's amazing how far we've come. When we first met, we wouldn't have had all these stories to tell each other. It's just really great to hear so many successes. The Middle Eastern strategy came after the Latin America strategy. But you're right, very happy that it's going so well and very glad. I know the staff are very grateful. [Fortunately], Bahir has had an operation on his



Achilles' heel; otherwise he'd be here in person. Congratulations on the work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sally. I've closed the queue. So far, I still have Alan Greenberg, Glen McKnight, Sandra Hoferichter, and Aziz Hilali. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a very quick comment. I was fortunate to be one of the small group of people that Sally brought together for a dinner on her first meeting. What struck me was, despite her vast background, her first instincts were to listen. The same can be true for a lot of people she's recruited. I think that's a really important characteristic. Despite their background, I've not seen people come in and preach, but listen and try to solve real problems. So I thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Here, here! Glen McKnight?

GLEN MCKNIGHT: I'd like to congratulate Michael in his appointment. I remember meeting him last year in another hat I was wearing. Great choice. Also, back to Chris. Evan and I were part of the first CROPP event at NTEN. It's a not-for-profit organization.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What's CROPP?



GLEN MCKNIGHT: The CROPP event we did in Washington.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But what's the CROPP? You're using acronyms. We've got newcomers here. Community Regional Outreach Pilot Program, correct?

GLEN MCKNIGHT: I think a few people are going to do acronyms, Olivier. Okay, we were at NTEN, another acronym. It's a not-for-profit technology conference of 2,200 people. My colleague down there, Evan and I, we took advantage of the opportunity because Nancy from PIR was talking about the gTLD program to the delegates and we just immediately got on local not-for-profit radio talking about the gTLD program.

So I want to tell this group, if you're taking advantage of the CROPP program, which is a great program, make sure you're proactive. Volunteer to be a facilitator. Do birds of a feather. Do a number of things so that you can get out and reach out. And to my esteemed chair lady beside me, I made sure we got out NomCom bookmarks to as many potential directors and other people as well.

SALLY COSTERTON: Leaders.

GLEN MCKNIGHT: Leaders. Thank you.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Glen. And yes, a very, very successful trip. So thanks very much. There are pictures also, at the moment, in the trip report and so on, so really great.

Next is Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. Sally, I know you are pretty aware of the ICANN Academy Working Group.

SALLY COSTERTON: Just a bit.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I just want to give you a short update here and invite you – you probably won't have the time, but maybe some of your vice presidents – to participate in the meeting on Wednesday, which is from 11:00 to 12:00 in this room. This working group, beside working on the next pilot leadership training program, which is going to happen hopefully in Los Angeles, we are still looking into a model framework, how we can best describe a broader ICANN Academy.

There is a new mode up now, and I just sent it to the working group for comments and we will discuss this on Wednesday, which goes far beyond education. So far, we were talking about one-dimensional model which was sort of a pyramid where you can go up. But after the Pilot Leadership Training Program in Buenos Aires, there was the idea of



seeing this more as a model of a circular model, where you are constantly in a movement in a circle. You can enter it from different angles – as a fellow, as an observer, as an expert, as a contributor, as a leader and so on and so forth.

I think this model is much better descriptive of what ICANN is actually – well, how ICANN could be best accessible. And I think this goes very much into your department. I think it would be good if you or your team, your vice presidents, can collaborate with our working group, because I think there are many synergies. Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON:

Thank you, Sandra. So it's 11:00-12:00 on Wednesday in this room? As many of us as possible will come and join you. Thank you. Sounds very interesting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Sandra. Next is Aziz Hilali.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you, Olivier. I will speak in French. I wanted to talk about the Africa region and the activities that we do in Africa. First of all, I would like to talk about the meeting that happened in Africa – AFRALO Africa – for all of Africa. It's going to happen Wednesday at 2:30 p.m. Everybody's invited. We're going to talk about the issues of Africa, the new initiatives taken by ICANN to engage everybody in the process.

And I would like to say that with the new AFRALO, we're going to talk at the CROPP level, the CROPP Pilot Program. And with Tijani, who is at the



head of the selection process committee group, the MSPC, and committee evaluation of the candidates to the board represented by two people that couldn't make it, [inaudible]. I wanted to think about Fatimata. She was not able to come to Singapore because she lost her husband a few days ago. It's a sad occurrence. Pierre Dandjinou is our president, and he's going to present to us the African strategy on Wednesday, and we're going to evaluate the situation one year after the start of our African strategy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Siranush Vardanyan?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: I just would like to thank your team. Asia Pacific is in a very lucky position. So we had four VPs covering our region. And I would like also to welcome Michael Yakushev to be the fifth one, because Armenia is in Asia Pacific also will be covered by Yakushev's Eastern European one. So, thank you. We are getting enormous support from our VPs. So, thank you very much.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you. Thank you so much. I know we've run over time, I think, haven't we, Olivier? Although I really would quite like to stay here all day, I've got to say this is a really good meeting. But thank you for your kind words. I know the team really appreciates, it as I do. Getting to know you all and working with you has been one of the highlights of certainly my time at ICANN. I thank you all for your good humor and your tenacity and for keeping us honest, which I know that you will do



and continue to do. Looking forward to continuing to working with you in the future, but it's been a great journey so far. Thank you for your support, for your kind words.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sally. Earlier you said that ICANN was full of great people. I was going to say thank you for coming with your great team, but I think I'll say thank you for coming with your great team of great people. It's great to see you here. Thank you.

Okay, now we have a two- or three-minute coffee break. The coffee break runs until half-past. I know they're very punctual here. You're going to have to run to get your coffee, then bring it back here. We'll take a five-, six-minute break please. It's enough time for you to get your coffees and come back here. Thank you.

Okay. Please take your seats, ladies and gentlemen. We'll be starting in a minute-and-a-half, 90 seconds. Take your seats, please, ladies and gentlemen. Come on, everyone, take your seats, please. All right, let's get the recording on, please, again.

Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. This is the next part of our morning session, if I can ask everyone to take their seats please. I'm really sorry, but we have a very packed morning. Whatever time we're missing now is going to be less time for lunch. And if we have less time for lunch, we'll be a bit grumpy in the afternoon. At least I will be.

So let's move immediately to the next part of our agenda, and that's an interaction and conversation with Duncan Burns, who is VP for Global Communications, and also Chris Gift, who is VP for the Online



Community Services. And I note that we also have Jim Trengrove in the room. He was hiding in the corner. Welcome, gentlemen. I hand the floor over to you. Go ahead, Duncan.

DUNCAN BURNS:

Thank you. Good morning, everyone, good to see you again. I won't take too long to talk about what we've been up to, because we also want to show a short video. When we met last in BA, I was talking to you about some of the internationalization we were trying to do within the communications team in terms of hiring people in-region. So I wanted to confirm that we've hired an APAC Communications director we based in our Singapore hub – Liana Teo. She couldn't be here for this meeting, because she has an APAC commitment. So she'll be responsible with really trying to develop content, engagement, support, communication in the community groups in APAC.

I have got to make a job offer today, tomorrow to our [inaudible] candidate, who will be based in Istanbul. Again, she'll be covering Europe, Middle East, and Africa in trying to support our communications, get closer to the community, build engagement, awareness, etc.

The other theme I wanted to touch on was we had been working very closely with my policy staff colleagues to try and support as best we can what ALAC's communications needs might be. So there's a new ALS beginning's guide, which has been published, which I hope you've all seen. If not, it's got an orange front cover. It's about 26 pages. It's a work of art.



Keeping that trend going, we are also – and several of you, and Eduardo, who’s done one. We’ve actually show a different one, Eduardo, so you may be okay – all trying to get videos of every ALS that we can then, once we’ve got them all together, package them together and that sort of introductory guide. Our goal for that is to do it by London and ATLAS. Jim, is this the video we want to show? Are we able to show the video?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We’re going to need the [sound] for this, please. Has this been tested?

DUNCAN BURNS: While they’re getting their set. For example, in NARALO, of 20-odd total, in contact with 16 so far, we’ve completed 15 videos. In LACRALO, we’ve completed eight and have another nine in content. So we’re making quite a bit of progress. You have a lot of ALSes, so it’s going to take us a little bit of time to cover everyone, but we will get there. I promise. It’s wonderful. And really using that, if we can get that ready and packaged in a way that’s digestible obviously online.

I know we’re also talking separately about support for ATLAS. We’ve had discussions with your policy team about how newsletters beforehand drive awareness, understanding what the agenda is, what we can do during your meeting in London, particularly to make it mobile, accessible so that people on-the-go can understand where they’ve got to be, what the next agenda item is. Nothing too heavy. There’s a bit of tweaking we have to do there. We are working quite closely on that.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Duncan. In the meantime, Susie has very kindly shared that beginners' guide to At-Large Structures with the very, very fancy orange cover. Very orangey. At least it stands out. I've noticed we are also having in our information packs, we also a purple cover guide, as well. If you're not able to read, you'll be able to recognize the colors and know what they relate to.

Is the video ready now? The audio is not ready yet. We don't have enough people in the audience that know lip synching, so we'll have to wait.

DUNCAN BURNS: We can always send her our [inaudible] it's on YouTube. There are various videos. I think this touches, also, on what Chris will come onto in a second, when he talks about our web strategies. You can have the greatest platform ever, but if you don't have the content, if you don't have the engagement to use it, it's not going to do much.

So we've been working very closely to align communications and then the web services – online services – team so that when we have a new site, when it starts to really roll out, that it's fit for purpose and is able to cope with different languages, different types of content that people can understand. We really come at it. We're trying to help everyone through that sort of engagement funnel, if you think about it.

So the people who may not be used to ICANN can find out what it is, who they are, what role they might play, where they might fit. I don't



want to steal too much of Chris's thunder. So if it's not working – I'd be happy to take any questions or maybe Chris goes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Duncan. May I say, the last time I sat where I'm sitting at the moment was in 2011, and it seems that I'm coming to another organization, another conference, today. None of what you are proposing, what you're showing at the moment, was ready in 2011. In fact, I don't even think that any of this was in the process of being made. So it's really extremely welcome to have all of this material, now that we are able to share with our At-Large Structures, that we are able to share with even potential applicants to come and bring their input to the ICANN model. This is really, really valuable documentation.

I remember – back in 2011 – being asked, “Do you have some paperwork or something that you can share with us so we know at least what ICANN and what At-Large is all about?” and the answer was, “Oh, we have a website. Just check the website,” which was a few years out-of-date. Now we've got this, and this is really great.

Questions? Let's start with Tijani Ben Jemaa, and then Glen McKnight. In the meantime, between every few questions we'll see if the video can work. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Shall I speak French?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There are headsets for everyone.



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, fantastic. Proceed forward.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: So my conception of communication is not to have beautiful brochures and speeches from ICANN people. This is something useful. This is something necessary, but this is not the best way of communicating for ICANN. For me, the best communication is to have an active participation in the big forums, the big meetings that talk about the Internet as a whole, and a strong communication, a strong participation, to talk about content, not only to show that ICANN is there.

That is why, when we were in Buenos Aires, I thought about preparing for Istanbul – the IGF in Istanbul. I was in touch with Duncan and I hope that we'll be able to do a lot for the IGF in Istanbul to make sure that the ICANN participation is strong and that it is impactful and useful and constructive. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Duncan?

DUNCAN BURNS: I agree. We'll try and find some time while we're here together to talk that through. I think maximizing what we, collectively as ICANN – not staff, but community as well – do in these venues and these fora.



It's also why we're working very closely with the regional vice presidents you just heard from as they develop with the community regional strategies to support those – I know there's one for Middle East and Africa – where they want more communications, how we build an understanding what the multi-stakeholder model is, for example. Why it's important, why it matters. So I had a meeting this morning on that, particularly for the Middle East. We're doing the same with Pierre as well. But I totally agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Duncan. Next is Glen McKnight.

GLEN MCKNIGHT: Duncan, have you seen the ten tips I did for [Kelsey] on how to improve your video quality for the Skype interviews? It's Dogs, Pets, and Video Performance Never Behave When They Want To. We posted in the Adobe chat with our technical committee the ten suggestions to make sure your Skype interview works really well.

As you can see on our associate from ISOC Canada, the second person, you see a lot of the ceiling, you'll see dogs barking. It's for all the ALAC members here, please look at that document before you have the Skype interview.

DUNCAN BURNS: Thank you. I agree. As we really start to use Skype more and more to reduce costs, remembering a little bit of the art of the filming is important. So thank you.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Duncan. Anymore questions? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Oh, Maureen Hilyard and then Evan Leibovitch. Maureen, you have the floor.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you, Duncan. Just reminding you that in the Pacific region, we've got 22 different countries still island nations. Getting information out to these islands is actually really, really difficult and also we haven't, as yet, been able to identify, for example, who would be a good contact to actually get ICANN information out to. But also, it's not just the fact that it's hard copy. Even for soft copy, it may be difficult for some as well.

DUNCAN BURNS: I think this is where – and Chris can talk a bit about how we're trying to use the website and make it responsive so it's a bit more achieving to people's bandwidth constraints.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi, there. At this point, what kind of a social media strategy exists? My participation in Facebook on ICANN issues is totally user-generated, informal, unmanaged. It works very well in the community, but it doesn't serve well to bring other people in. Whereas there's been a



concern about, “Let’s create a new platform within ICANN,” as opposed to leveraging things that already exist.

So does there exist a social media strategy in a sense? “Here’s our taxonomy of hashtags that we would like you to use on these various things that exist posted somewhere for various issues.” I don’t care about the choice of tool – whether it’s Facebook or Google+ or whatever – but the idea is does there exist a specific strategy that’s available somewhere, and under which of you does this come? Thanks.

DUNCAN BURNS:

There is. Actually, it’s mostly me, but some of Chris. Because as you’ll see when he talks through the new site, if you’re unable to easily share, if you’re unable to easily guide people to content – because you can be in whatever platform you want, if the content isn’t interesting, the discussion isn’t there.

I think being good at social media is a goal for all of us. I think it’s always going to be a journey. There’s always more you can do and you can do better. I think where ICANN’s been good is they’re quite good at broadcasting. We’re quite good at broadcasting. What we’re not great at yet is the engagement in that discussion and that piece [mix]. So we do have social media guidelines for staff and encourage people what to do, what good practice is, best practice is.

I don’t think we’ve yet got a public, “Here are the hashtags, here are the platforms we’re on.” We have some of that. There’s a bit, for example, in the meeting guide about where to go to, what hashtag for the meeting. But I do think there’s more we can do.



So we have one employee focused on social media. We're likely trying out a more senior expertise as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Duncan. Leon Sanchez is next.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. Going one step forward of what Evan has just said, I see that there are several accounts on Twitter, on Facebook, everything. But I see them as a [inaudible] lateral channel between users and ICANN. There's no conversation between users in Twitter. ICANN only posts news and links to their website and everything. But if I tweet to the ICANN account on Twitter, I won't even get any feedback from them.

So I think we've got to push that strategy into a 2.0 world in which we are really building this conversation between users and ICANN, so we can better engage with users and make them engage with ICANN.

DUNCAN BURNS: Thank you, Leon. I couldn't agree more. It's one my goals for the year, both personally and that Sally has set for me is to try and crack that nut of how we can really drive the engagement and be responsive managing the resourcing of that, but also actually just making it happen. And we're not there yet. You're right. I hope by the time we talk in London, we'll have improved somewhat, and maybe this time next year we'll have improved enormously.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Duncan. I'm going to close the queue, but we still have Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Garth Bruen. So Cheryl first, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. I wanted to know whether or not, as we start doing more of this conversation, outreach and reactivity – and we need to be agile. We have tools in the plans for agility, I would suggest, for at least local responses. I must say, I found it amusing the morning I was flying to Singapore to get an early morning e-mail from my oncologist, and my oncologist says, "Check this out," and gives me a link to why ICANN should stay under U.S. control article in LinkedIn.

Now, I've assured him and his group and that's fine. But we almost need a point of contact, if not globally, at least with the VCs, that someone – and not just me – should be responding to that. Because, for example, this particular paper had five points – all valid, but only two of them relevant to ICANN and IANA. They're easy gains and they give us good profile, but we need the tools and we need the discipline to do it properly.

So I would much rather have preferred to just answer my darling professor, "[inaudible]. Fear not, all as well," and someone write a corporate response than basically take my valuable time to do it.

DUNCAN BURNS: Thank you, Cheryl. So I agree. I think part of the goal for having local communications people is they can work hand-in-hand with the regional vice presidents and really build that community interaction and understanding what FAQs might be out there, what information is out



there, who might respond, who might not. To that and some of the misinformation, we then created a fact sheet – a blog page on behalf of Fadi – talking about some of the myths that were being put out there around that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If I may just respond. I hear that, I agree with that, but these are live conversations going on in social media platforms. We need to be able to have people who at least can give the guideline to whoever is able to engage in this conversation. We don't want misinformation going out. So if we don't, these are fast-moving things, they happen. If people are in these spaces, we need a conduit and then make sure we give the right links and the right information.

But it's not just a matter of us, again, publishing. You're putting stuff out. Come on. LinkedIn is going to what with Fadi's blog? Give a what, really? We have to get it into that platform, and that's what we need to be doing more effectively. Thanks.

DUNCAN BURNS: Agree.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Having worked in some large corporations, sometimes when big announcements take place, a song sheet is being distributed, which effectively has nothing to do with singing but with actually having sort of an official-ish kind of line where there's fact-based information that can be shared freely with anybody



asking questions, and that anybody in the community here, you have a lot more At-Large Structures than people working in your department. You could say that this is an extension of your department around the world and they would be able to follow that.

Quickly moving on, Garth Bruen, and then I think we'll have the video immediately after that. Garth, you have the floor.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Garth Bruen, NARALO. As we consider various tools and communication and forums and portals, in addition to making the communications two-way – which is critical, otherwise it's somewhat pointless – we really need to adopt a workflow model, because we're here to accomplish things. We're here to make changes, get things done, do important work.

So I think that the tools that we adopt need to be focused on having an end result. There needs to be an agenda. There needs to be something to achieve at the end of it, otherwise we're just talking. And there are plenty of Internet forums in the world where people are just talking, and it just goes around and around in circles. We want to have something that we can have an end to and that needs to be agenda-driven. Thank you.

CHRIS GIFT:

Garth, I absolutely agree. I think what we also want to think about is – because I sort of view that work as somewhat separate from the engagement. I know it is a continuum, but the supporting an agenda-driven work with that has an artifact produced of some type, whether



it's a decision or a document, is really done at a working group level. I see you're shaking your head.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no, it's quite all right. It's a dialogue. I don't disagree. What I'm going to talk about is how we're addressing the first problem of engagement. I do very much believe that over the next year, year-and-a-half, 18 months, we need to address exactly what you're talking about. How do we provide tools that better support decision-making within ICANN? That is a project that I think we all need to participate in. It is very, very critical to the work. So I'll address that in my discussion.

GARTH BRUEN: Just quickly, the best route to engagement is a demonstration of success to these people we're trying to engage.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Garth. Now we're going to go over to the video, if we can launch it please.

DHARMA DAILEY: I'm Dharma Dailey. We are the co-chairs of the Emerging Futures Network, a small, North American ALS started by open-source developers and now run by us.

We make our experience as user researchers and system design and development available to the ICANN community.



We take interesting policies that impact Internet users. We are particularly interested in the consumer concerns of domain registrants and the broader issues of DNS maintenance that impact all Internet users, such as security and privacy.

Since signing the NARALO agreement with ICANN in June 2007, EFN has [inaudible] projects that make our use of our professional experience to make specific contributions to the At-Large community.

In 2009, we surveyed NARALO members for the issues that most impacted Internet users. The summary brief was shared with the ICANN board. In Mexico City, we initiated a poster session for ALSes from all regions. In 2013, I was elected and served as Interim NARALO Secretary for ICANN 47. We also supported survey development for the ATLAS-II meeting in London 2014.

Thanks for taking an interest in our ALS. Feel free to contact us if you have any questions or comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Absolutely great. Thank you. So thanks very much for coordinating this. I think it's an excellent thing and it's a very good start. You still have plenty of ALSes that are there for you to interview, and of course, the number of ALSes is growing as well, so you're going to have to go faster than the number of applications we're receiving and that's going to be the rabbit you're going to have to run after. Moving swiftly on to Chris Gift. The floor is yours, Chris.



CHRIS GIFT:

Thank you very much, Olivier. This is Chris Gift, vice president of Online Community Services. Again, thank you for allowing me to speak with you. I am going to take the majority of my time to talk about the imminent update of the new icann.org website, because I think it should be of interest to everybody in this room. So if we could just go ahead and move to the next slide, if you will.

Just as a reminder to everybody, new.icann.org has been up since Buenos Aires, so feel free to go look at it at any time. I'll touch on a little bit more on some of this in just a minute. So even while we're discussing, feel free to go take a look and navigate through the website. The next slide, please. I'm going to move through these very rapidly.

Status is we are basically done with adding new features to the website. We are on fit and finish, which means we are still in the QA process and we are continuing to work on the website, so it is by no means done when you do navigate to it or go take a look. There's still quite a bit of things we need to fix. Nonetheless, we are aiming for a launch in April, so where we will swap out the existing icann.org with the new icann.org.

So please, again, while this launch is scheduled for April, please go to the website. There is a mechanism for feedback on the website. It's in the bottom right-hand corner. Please fill it out. If you see any issues with content, with features, with anything on the website, please complete that feedback box. We do look at it every day to see if there's anything new from the community.

One thing I do want to talk about is I do want to thank very much the Digital Advisory Group and people who participated in the ICANN labs. I



would like to remind everybody that from the very beginning, this work has been something that we have done with that group and they have been very, very active.

At first, we were meeting once a week, but we decided that was a little too much. And then we ended up with every other week, where we have a very intensive discussion every week. They have been very critical, very vociferous about what needed to be in the website, which has been fantastic – truly, truly fantastic.

One of the things that they were a strong advocate for was – if you recall, we were very focused on newcomers, with this new website design and building this platform, which is very important for all of us, to ensure that new people could come and learn about ICANN and join in the process and engage.

But they were also very clear while that was very noble that we needed to continue to support ICANN veterans and continue to support the work that is ongoing. So they were very focused on making sure we had features and content that enabled that and continued to support that. I do very much want to thank them.

I'm not thanking them because their work is done – unfortunately not. I'm probably going to thank them again in London. I'm probably going to thank them again in Los Angeles, because this work is never done on this website. We will always be updating it and adding new things, so we will always need participation in that.

So I beg of you, if there are any other people who are interested in this process, please join the group. It is open to anybody and everybody, and



I know a few of you in this room are on it. Next slide please, Ariel. I am not going to spend much time – that’s two slides. Back one. Little bit more, little bit more. There you go.

There’s a lot that’s new on the website. I’m not going to walk through all of these. You can go to the website itself and look. There are a lot of new things. If you can go to the next slide, please. Just scroll down a bit.

Much of it’s supporting new engagement, as much of you were talking about just a few minutes ago. A new logged-in experience for people to be able to surface information that’s important to them. We’re very focused on people being able to find information that’s important and engage with that information. Next slide, please. Keep those going down to – yes, there we go, there we go.

But I actually want to take the next couple of minutes to talk about what’s next, all right? Because I know that you’re saying, “Well, it’s not even launched yet and you’re already talking about what’s next.” But I do think it’s very important to do so.

There are two things on the plate immediately after we launch. One is obviously fixing anything that may be broken. So we’re very focused on that, and that will be the core concern for the couple of months right after.

But immediately after that, we want to work on translation, because while we feel we’ve improved the experience a bit, it’s not nearly where we ought to be and we recognize that. It got to be too much for us to handle all at once. And I know Cheryl was in many of those conversations. So we’ve set that aside to work on some more after that,



but it is going to be a pilot program, because we want to experiment with, how do we translate all this content? There is so much content on here. What we want to experiment and try is how we enable the community to translate some of this content?

So we have ICANN translators. We have, then, a wider network of ICANN translators. But how do we engage the community to participate in this process? So that's going to be the experiment. How do we do that? What are the tools that are necessary to allow people to participate in that?

Along those lines is obviously accessibility upgrade. So we want to make sure that while we are hitting the standards, we want to exceed those standards. And I know there's a great deal of expertise around accessibility in this room. I will be reaching out, but I also beg you to participate in this – in terms of the Digital Engagement Advisory Group – because it will greatly help us if you could help us get there. So please participate and help us.

Two more things I want to touch on. One is Peer Advisory Network, which Tijani has been a part of. But that is enabling people to find and work with mentors digitally. How do we scale that process? Because we have found that people who are successful when they join had a mentor. So how do we scale that in a way that's possible? So Tijani and some others were part of an experiment passed last summer, where we tried different mechanisms. It was successful, but we couldn't finish it off, and so we're going to pick up that work again and finish that work off and then add that to the site.



Most importantly, the last one I'll end on, is what I'm calling engagement pathways and this came up again. The Advisory Group brought this up in October of last year. They were saying it's great that ICANN is seeking to engage and people are going to engage the website, but the reality they were saying is that the work does not happen at ICANN. It happens in the SO/ACs. Yes, it is all one community. Absolutely. But it's not going to happen on the website. It has to happen in the structures. It has to happen in the constituencies.

So if we're engaging somebody on icann.org, how do we get that person – that individual – to the appropriate structure, to the appropriate constituency?

So we had a good e-mail dialogue and some dialogue in several meetings about how that would be possible. And again, it came up the decision was that is something we need to think more about and we need to experiment about, because we also have to say, okay, how do the SO and ACs capture this person? They come to the website, we get them to the right place. Are you ready to capture? So again, that's going to be work we're going to engage in next year as well.

And I think that's about it for the update. Questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chris. You mentioned earlier the accessibility upgrade, and I think that Cheryl Langdon-Orr might be speaking to this as the chair of the At-Large ad hoc ICANN Accessibility Working Group. Cheryl, you have the floor.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Olivier. I didn't put my card up for that, but I'm more than happy to address, it as well. If you know me, I'll always take an opportunity. I do look forward to you and your team, Chris, when you're doing the necessary tweaks – and they are, my dear, necessary tweaks – for accessibility. And I like the idea of becoming our best practice model for everyone else, because boy, we're not there yet. So let's fix that. That's happy.

We do have this new ad hoc group. I know you know about it, but it would be important to make your staff, and indeed any of your subbies and contractors very aware that we are a resource that will give brutal honesty on the effectiveness – or otherwise – of what is proposed, and that we will be aiming for a KISS approach. Keeping It Simple Stupid does work, but we are also having a meeting this week. Heidi or Gisella will give you the exact time and one or other of your people are more than welcome there, because we will be looking at some of our planning and high level things. So let me extend the invitation to that.

However, what I wanted to talk about, not surprisingly enough, was the translation issue. It will be an issue for some time, but it's going to be an issue with the greatest challenges in the region we're currently in – the Asia Pacific region.

Let me think. Last time I checked, I believe in official languages we were probably about 56 or 58 languages in the region. So we're not talking, "Can we do Spanish or French?" They're no-brainers. That's easy. To be a genuinely open, inclusive – and this is where the next five billion Internet users are. So we've got to add at least 20 of those languages, even if we don't get to some of the perhaps more obscure. We need to



do smart choice on what is or is not worthy of translation. Otherwise, it just becomes the noise-to-usefulness ratio is an issue. You probably need to engage a user focus group. I would encourage that to be within the regional vice presidencies models.

Without stealing Kuek's thunder here, he and his team are already looking at local language workshops and how we can get better get the necessary material that ICANN is producing into local languages to meet Asia Pacific needs, and that might be a good pilot for you, for example, to start working on.

But that model will require ICANN to let go of the reins, to say, "You can do the local language yourselves and we will have to trust you, end-user groups," and many of them will be the At-Large Structures here, but it could be the network operators or insert whatever part of the great tapestry we're talking about.

So what we'll have to do is have plain language, fairly uniform pro forma material and the type of material that must be, could be, and should be – because they're all different things – translated needs to work.

For working groups, however, we have the opportunity – and I've seen someone sat here on ICANN staff some years ago, actually literally in this room, it was the last time we met in Singapore, and he scripted up for me – literally while I was watching it – a real-time translation tool to run in an Adobe chat module. They're out there. These things can be used. Let's not necessarily build our own when we can get something simple and cheap and cheerful.



It's not perfect, but we don't need "perfect" for conversational dialogue. We need "perfect" for things like protocols and pro forma documents and stuff like that.

You've got a huge job. We appreciate the huge job, but we will keep barking and biting at your heels. Do take it as friendly advice, but beware. We do growl.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Cheryl. Chris?

CHRIS GIFT: Thank you very much, Cheryl. Yes, I count on you guys barking. like I said earlier. It's very important. About the translation, Nora Abusitta, who is responsible for translation, unfortunately couldn't make this meeting. But I will say that we do have this idea – which I know has been floated at ICANN before – but I'd like to resurrect it or readdress it, this idea that we can categorize content. Each category would have a different translation mechanism associated to it.

So we could say, like I said earlier, you could have a Category 1 or Category A which is done by official ICANN translators and so on and so forth.

The one thing I want to stress, though, is defining those categories to me is a community effort. It's not an ICANN staff effort. I think, when Nora and I have talked about this, we wanted to start a group to say, "Okay, what are these categories?" I think you'll see from us very, very



shortly, where we can launch that so that we can then better inform the rest of this work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chris. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Chris, please, when I first met you, I had a lot of questions to ask you but you already answered those questions, so thank you very much. Now, I had some questions about ICANN Labs and ICANN Learn platform and I think that for ICANN Learn, I've seen your agenda for the 2015 and I think you have to discuss with the community to know how ICANN Learn must change in the future.

It is important to know how we can go from the first stage to the real program stage for precise people, something very useful – really useful – a real capacity building program, because now it is not a capacity building program. It is just a tool, an information tool. So for this program, you need to have some more contact with the community to know how to evolve in the future.

CHRIS GIFT: Thank you, Tijani. You are right. You are really right. I think we need to create another group. Maybe not another group, because we have so many groups, but maybe we can work with the Digital Engagement Group on this issue, or maybe we can try to work with other persons to work on this issue.



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think we have to post it to the ICANN users, the ICANN community, so people will tell us how they see this evolution. There is a small group working on that issue, but the feedback of the community is very important on that issue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any other questions? We are a little bit late, so please, we need to be brief. Sandra Hoferichter, you have the floor.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. Chris, I think you have a really difficult task to set up a new website. You should be honored, because this is really difficult. I like to catch up on what Tijani just said on the learning efforts within ICANN. You know we are working within the ICANN Academy Working Group, and from this perspective I was just searching the different resources which has been just set up.

There's ICANN Learn, there's ICANN Labs, and then you have various entries on the new icann.org and I think, overall, it's very confusing. There are too many ways to get in and it's not as simple as it should be for somebody who is new or even for somebody who is already experienced within ICANN to enter this. There are too many resources and you should maybe concentrate on one source and do it very clear on that one.

I agree with what Tijani said, that the ICANN learning platform at the moment is not a learning platform per se. It is an information platform. We discovered this for the pilot Leadership Training Program in Buenos



Aires when we had just a compendium of presentations outdated from 2011. This should be changed immediately to make it a real learning platform.

When I just look at the new icann.org, I can see there is a button “Get Started.” I think this is very clear. This is very prominent. This is very clear, and when you click on that button, you can dive deeper into the process.

From my point of view, this might be the strongest road to get into ICANN. With all the others, ICANN Labs, ICANN Learn, it’s a little bit difficult. I think they have all their value once they are on a stage – once they are more developed. But at the moment, it is very confusing.

At the Academy Working Group, we are looking into a new model and I forwarded this to you in Los Angeles already. This has been advanced. We will discuss this on Wednesday, and I think there could be some elements which might make it easier for somebody to enter ICANN. I really would encourage you and also Nora to collaborate more with the community, because I think there are some ideas. At the moment, I see those things going in parallel and not going together, what ICANN staff is doing and what the community is doing. I would wish to have a more deeper conversation with you and also Sally’s team on that. Thank you.

CHRIS GIFT:

I’ll just briefly respond. Thank you very much, Sandra. I agree with what you say about too many resources. We’re in the process of trying to consolidate them. Getting started, as you saw, is the beginning of that. We are going to integrate the ICANN Learn. We’re going to integrate



more fully the labs. We've got all of these things started and now we're trying to bring them together. Please be patient. It will take a little bit of time for us to finish that work off.

With respect to the rest, absolutely. I plan to attend the academy session on Wednesday. We can talk further about that, then.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chris. We're going to have to finish the session. Just one thing, though. We do need an actually even shorter deadline. We've got a summit with 160 At-Large Structures in June. You've got a few months.

And I wasn't laughing on this one, and that the truth. But with this, thank you very much, Duncan. Thank you, Chris, and thanks to Jim Trengrove, who is also with us. And with apologies to Sébastien Bachollet and his team. We are very much behind time, but it was important to speak to you.

Let's have Sébastien join us at the table with the Meeting Strategy Working Group. We have five members of At-Large, one from each region, who are a part of this Meeting Strategy Working Group. Recommendations for public comment are currently on the screen and are currently being published, and of course the At-Large community is going to be deeply impacted by these recommendations. So Sébastien, without any further ado, I know you're rushed for time. I'll hand the floor over to you.



SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Thank you, everybody, for giving us the opportunity to present our recommendations. We are going to do it in different languages. It's a good thing, because we are going to work in the public meeting on Monday, on Wednesday, in the same way with other members of the community. So it's a good test for us. Thank you for your participation, first.

Now, I'm going to be very brief because I want to give the floor to other persons. I want to tell you that we implement a hashtag to allow you to participate to the dialogue. We will present you that on Monday and we will post it on the meeting room so as everybody can see it and use this hashtag. Next slide, please.

The current situation, you know it. I'm going to summarize it. We have three meetings per year within the five regions of the world. Those meetings are always the same with more and more people every time and more and more sessions, so we need to find more rooms, more place, venues with enough hotel rooms. This is a situation in which we are. We have more sessions, so we need to work out the agenda and it's difficult.

I'm going to leave soon because I have another meeting. It isn't that your comments are not important for me, but I need to be in the next meeting of the board. I need to participate to the next meeting of the board. So this is our situation. I'm going to give the floor to – who is the next speaker on that issue?



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Who are the members of the meeting strategy working? They are going to speak here. All of them are going to take the floor here, so you are going to discover them. Sylvia, this is your turn. You have the floor.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: So what we have tried to do – in fact, what we have done by now – is having heard all the members of the community and our proposal is to keep our three annual meetings, but we have tried to structure them in a different way so that we do not have time conflicts. So next slide, please.

We will have three meetings, as you can see. The first A is the first meeting of the year, if we consider the year from January to December. The period of time is exactly the same that we have here. In the middle of the year, we will focus on the ACs and SOs, and this will have a shorter time. If you pay attention to Meeting B, that would be a shorter meeting than the one that we are holding right now. Perhaps it will take three or four days.

And then the final meeting – this is the annual general meeting – that would be a longer meeting. The idea was to restructure this so that we do not have so many conflicts and so that we can make the most and that the community can participate, engage in a better way and make the most of the time, taking into account the communication among the different working groups that belong to ICANN. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sylvia. Next is Tijani Ben Jemaa. And we need the next slide as well, is that correct?



TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. I was supposed to speak French, but Sébastien took my language. So shall I speak Chinese? It's the only language which is translated here. Okay. So I will speak French. Thank you very much.

I am going to speak about rotation. You remember about the staff proposal one year ago? They proposed to work in a different way so as to have meetings organized in some cities in a permanent way.

So the proposal was to have some hubs to organize the meetings in venue in which we have enough rooms. This was the idea. The original rotation will be lost if we work like that. We won't have this rotation among the five regions. We are going to have two regions where the meetings will take place, and then they will have some region with very few meetings.

And we don't accept that and our working group didn't want to apply this system and we wanted to maintain the rotation among the five regions so as to have, in five years, a meeting in each region of each kind, because now we have three kinds of meetings. So after five years, each region had the same kind of meetings.

What is interest of that? Before, we weren't able to go to region without any big venues to organize a meeting. Now we have the Meeting B in the middle of the year, a smaller meeting, so we can go in region where the venue is not so important because it's a smaller meeting, we don't need a big ceremony, etc.

So we will have a good rotation. We will be able to work in other regions, and we are going to keep the rotation system as it was, so it is



very good for us, for ICANN, and for all the regions and for the less-developed region. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Now we have Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. Sandra speaking in German.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sandra, do you need the pointer? Sandra, do you need the pointer? Tijani is going to pass you the laser pointer in case you need to point to the slide. Thank you.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Okay. Then it's Sandra speaking in English because I have a pointer now. One of the challenges of current ICANN meetings – and I think you all know that – is that it's very difficult to participate in other working groups where the ALAC should actually participate but get the ALAC internal work done on the same time.

We have so many meetings for the ALAC only. Other constituencies have the same problem and it's really hard and the multi-stakeholder model is not sustainable when those groups do not adequately interact with each other. So we were also thinking about opportunities, how to improve that.

ICANN staff will have, in the future, take care of adequate time allocation to allow internal SO and AC work and allow adequate time for



the cross-community interaction. For instance, at the smaller Meeting B, this will be the focus meeting for getting the work done, to keep it short. We were thinking about possibilities and there is nothing carved in stone yet, but we were thinking about possibilities to say, “Okay, we have internal work from 9:00 to 3:00 and we have cross-community work from 3:00 onwards,” so that all the groups are very clear and there is less time conflicting, there are less time conflicts in the future.

These will, of course, also apply for the other two meetings – for the A meeting and the C meeting – but for the B meeting, is it utmost important and it will be the main focus besides outreach in this meeting. Well, I actually don’t need the pointer. Yes, that’s actually it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sandra. The pointer is just for you to speak English. Now that you give the pointer to the next person, then you can revert back to German. Next we have Satish Babu. Next we have Satish Babu. Satish, you have the floor.

SATISH BABU: Thank you, Olivier. The next point that the working group discussed was the public forum. There was this comment that the current format of the public forum does not perhaps give sufficient time for the board to respond in depth.

So the working group proposes a change to the public forum format, and also the frequency. Currently, we have public forum in all the three ICANN meetings. This is supposed to be cut to two, which means the



smaller meeting – the B meeting – will not have a public forum, whereas A and C will continue to have a public forum.

And the current format of the public forum is of the same length, but we are proposing two public forum sessions: a shorter one at the beginning of the meeting and a longer one at the end of the meeting. The idea here is that the shorter one is to get the feedback from a board perspective, from the different constituencies within ICANN, especially as we try to be much more transparent in the future. The working group felt that the board should respond meaningfully and that they should be given sufficient time to respond.

So the initial part of the 90-minute initial part of the public forum session is to gather more feedback. It's more to listen than to answer. And the two-hour session at the end of the meeting is for the board to respond in sufficient detail and in depth. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Satish. I certainly have a few questions on this, but we'll go through all of the different participants and then we'll move and have questions afterwards. The pointer is coming over to Eduardo, who otherwise would've spoken in Spanish, but will now address us in English thanks to this device. Very helpful, indeed. Eduardo, you have the floor. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Hello. I will speak in Spanish because I have my pointer in Spanish. Basically, and to sum up, what we try to do in our working group is to give more time to the SOs and ACs for them to work internally, at an



internal level. We tried to reduce the amount of conflicts among the different organizations so that they can have the opportunity to interact in a better way.

Basically, this meeting – Meeting B – which is a meeting that will be carried out in the middle of the year, this is a short meeting and we can hold this meeting in different regions around the world, in places where there was not enough room to hold such a meeting. So this is what we are now dealing with. Thank you very much. Back to you, Mr. Chair.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, I'm being totally distracted by Heidi. We're speaking about holidays and all sorts of things. Nothing to do with this. Voila! Now I'm going to speak in French. The floor is now open for questions. Fatima Cambronero starts.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Olivier. I have some questions for the members of this working group. What I did not understand perhaps, when it comes to the duration of the meeting, the Meeting B would be shorter in terms of the region or shorter in which sense?

My second question is: At-Large, what is the most important meeting in terms of the work to be done? Meeting B should have a greater relevance or importance regarding or in comparison with Meeting A or B, or this will be exactly the same? I am asking this in relation to the work that ALAC should carry out. These are my questions.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Fatima. Anybody wishes to answer this? Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: All the meetings are important for At-Large. The meeting in the middle is shorter in terms of time because it would take only five days. There will be no public forum. There will be no welcome ceremony. All these activities will not be included. This meeting will be focused on outreach, and on the internal work of the SOs and ACs and the work on activities among them. But all the meetings will be very important for At-Large. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next is Aziz Hilali.

AZIZ HILALI: Thank you, Olivier. My question is more or less the same of Fatima's question. I wanted to highlight the fact that when we look at the ICANN's meeting today, we have very few African countries who can answer to this kind of needs. So only three or four countries can meet the criteria of the ICANN's meetings. So I wanted to know if the working group did analyze the problem of the different sessions having taken place at the same moment, so maybe we can find a better way to organize the sessions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is there anybody wishing to reply to this? Tijani?



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Aziz. This was a good question. You are speaking about something which is wrong. Many countries in Africa can have C meetings, but the issue is not here. The new strategy will allow the countries who don't have big venue, will allow these countries to organize the ICANN meeting, because a B meeting is a meeting without public forum and without opening ceremony. So this new strategy will solve those problems you are speaking about. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Sandra, did you want to add to this? No? Okay. We've already got Leon Sanchez, Evan Leibovitch and Rinalia Abdul Rahim in the queue. I think we might have a problem with time, so let's have – and [Haja], a very short one. You haven't spoken yet. So let's start with Leon, please.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Olivier. Meeting B will deal with the substantive issues in terms of policies and the session making within the ICANN community. It seems that these meetings should be more inclusive [than] the longer meeting. I understand the fact that there are certain venues that might not allow the fact of having so many attendees, and that's why we might think that in this Meeting B, there will be less attendance or fewer attendees. I know that there are remote participation channels, but I believe during this meeting the most important topics will be dealt with and this meeting will have the greater participation by the community.



So I think that this meeting – the one in the middle of the year – should be the longer meeting, where there will be more participation and perhaps the third meeting should be shorter. So that would be my suggestion. We should be more inclusive in terms of, in this meeting where the substantive and important issues will be dealt with.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] from Sandra and a response from Eduardo. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. In response to what Leon said, Leon you must consider that a usual ICANN meeting, as we have it now, there are any participants which do not contribute to any stakeholder group – AC or SO. So the middle meeting will concentrate on the work of the AC and SOs and on outreach. So all the other participants which are here to doing their business or which are here for networking and so on, they might not be interested in coming to this meeting where the stakeholder group interaction and the internal work of a stakeholder group is taking place. So therefore we can consider this meeting a smaller one.

It will also provide an opportunity to go into remote areas, and I'd like to state here not only Africa and Latin America has remote areas, but there are also remote areas in Europe which are not able to host a big ICANN meeting and might be very interested in hosting a smaller ICANN meeting.

On the same time, outreach of all those ACs and SOs is a focus on the middle meeting. So to say we are in an area and the experts are in an



area which work closely together with each other, which getting their internal work done and doing well-organized outreach at the same time. While on the other two meetings – and especially the big meeting, the C meeting [inaudible] C meeting – more participants like the media and people who want to do their business and all those things are participating in the other meetings, which have more visibility for the global world and so on and so forth.

So therefore, this is actually the idea behind making the B meeting smaller but more focused and the A meeting and the C meeting a bit broader and a bit more global. I hope this makes it clearer for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sandra. Can I just ask for everyone to keep their intervention short? We're running way behind time at the moment. Next is Eduardo and then we'll go back to our queue. It's very helpful. Then I'll close this.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Along the lines of Sandra's words, what we're trying to do is to reduce the number of days in one meeting because of the time it took to people to attend the conferences. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Next on the list is Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you, Olivier. My concern about meetings – and I guess I'll focus on the A and C ones – you'd need to look no further than what we're



going through this week, then, to see that we have tomorrow a whole number of meetings that have last-minute schedule changes, that have last-minute conflicts. Things are packed in so tight, so difficult that almost everybody has situations where they need to go to more than one and be in the same place.

This is not something that can be dealt with simply by being able to remotely participate by having your body in one meeting and your Adobe Connect in another. You're not going to be adequately participating in either.

So I want to know what the meeting group is going to be doing. As far as At-Large is concerned, it was a catastrophe getting rid of Friday. I want to know how the meeting group is going to be addressing this and also to give a little bit of slack, not to pile in every single hour of every single day in a meeting, so we don't have a situation where the CEO, when he wants to have something that brings together the community on an ad hoc thing has to call something for 7:00 in the morning.

I would like to see perhaps a little bit of slack. I'd like to see a little bit of consideration. And I hope that the lessons learned from what I really believe to be the catastrophe of getting rid of Fridays is being considered as you go forward with this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Tijani Ben Jemaa for a response.



TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. First, I want to ask Aziz another question about the problem among [decisions], a way to reduce that problem. I'm going to answer part of your question, Evan. The way we can solve that problem, we can try to work – for some days, we can work with the SO and AC. What is the problem today? We are working with ALAC and we have a cross-constituency meeting, so we need to go another place.

So if we split the two things, if we do ALAC work on some days, you are not going to participate to other meetings. So this is what we try to do. This is your new way we found to avoid conflicts. There will be some conflicts if people still organize the meetings at the last minute, of course.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

And for further response, Sylvia Herlein Leite.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE:

I want to ask both Leon and Evan and the other participants to be so kind to post this. This is open for public comment, so we'd like to see all comments and additional ideas for an additional analysis, so that we can readjust the group proposal to the community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Sylvia. I had anticipated what you were going to say, so the link is actually in the chat. I really invite all participants here to really put their input into this. I'm sure the ALAC is going to file a statement. Evan, you wanted to add a follow-up?



EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Tijani, I just wanted to address what you'd said a moment ago. At least it's been my experience that the problems in these meetings happen not when the ACs and SOs are meeting amongst themselves, like we have today. We're all in this room. That's not a conflict.

But the conflict happens when we try and do the cross-community work. For instance, on the Mondays when we're doing things that are topic-based and there's multiple topics and people have to be spread between them. So that's my concern. On the days when the ACs and SOs on constituency day or on Sunday when ALAC meets, those haven't been the problems. The panics have been trying to get people together on subject-based things and closing the silos. I think it's a good thing and the situation we have makes that very difficult.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Evan. Two more people in the queue and I note that Xavier Calvez has arrived in the room, so we'll have to go on with the rest of our sessions. Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just wondering whether the working group looked at the spacing between the A, B, and C meeting to see whether or not there can be sufficient time for regional input to come in on policy issues. Because one of the concerns that had happened before was that there is a lack of meaningful input into policy from developing regions.

And so if we push most of the policy work to the regions to work in between the ICANN meetings, there would need to be sufficient time



for that to come into the formal ICANN meetings itself and I was just wondering whether it was looked at. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia. Do we have an answer on this? Sandra Hoferichter?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Rinalia. This is actually a good question, but I must admit, the working group did not look in this issue. I assume that with the involvement and the elaboration of the B meeting, this will become more important, because this is about regional input and output. I think as far as this is going to be evolved, this will – or maybe this is an issue ahead and this will become later and topic for discussion once the system is up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sandra. And a final question from Hadja Ouattara. Hadja, you have the floor.

HADJA OUATTARA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to say that I support the location of ICANN meetings for regions, because each time that a meeting is held within a region, it allows for great participation of local population. So when it comes to hosting and accommodation and transport within the region, the local population is able to participate at the meeting, to attend. So the rotation within the five regions is very important to me and I think the matter of visas must be well-considered so that we have great participation. Thank you.



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

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Hadja. As you saw, we considered this matter of rotation thoroughly, and don't stress. There's going to be rotation between all five regions. The matter of visas was also well-discussed and the deliverables of visas are now part of the criteria for the choice of the organization of ICANN meetings locations, yes.

And, of course, we'll always have some people who will not be able to get a visa because they have personal issues, which are not general issues, but from now on if a country does not accept to give visas, which does not replace its way of delivering visas, we'll be forced not to organize meetings there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. We haven't got very much time left. We've kind of run out of time totally. If it's just 30 seconds.

JULIE HAMMER: Thirty seconds, I don't know if I should continue in French or in English. Somehow, I wanted just to thank you for the organization of visas for London meeting. For example, I've already received the invitation letter, so I'm pretty sure we have enough time to prepare this and I wanted to thank the staff and everybody. Thanks.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's right. Thank you very much, Julie. It's good to hear that the invitation letters for the London meeting are being sent out and that's a reminder for anyone who needs an invitation letter. You can fill your details in. Has it been translated to the other languages yet?

JULIE HAMMER: Not yet. It's in progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Goodness gracious, in progress. Well, fair enough. We might as well employ someone who is not knowledge of any language or whatever. We might as well employ Australians to do the job for us and it will be done very quickly. Let's just go on.

Thanks very much to all of the members of the working group. As you all know, we have a public comment page that is open at the moment. I think that it will be very good for the transcript of this session to be made available by the time we fill the details for this.

The initial comment period is closed already. We are now in the reply comment period. But as you know, the At-Large community has been able to file comments at any time, so we need to have a process to file a comment ASAP.

Tijani and Eduardo and that's – just Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that the comment period has been extended. So it's not closed now.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fantastic. Thank you very much for this news, and thanks to all of the work that you've all done on that. It's a very, very thorny issue and this is really great.

And so now inviting Xavier Calvez to the table. Xavier is the Chief Financial Officer of ICANN. Welcome, Xavier. Xavier has his little card that will appear on the table. I know that you have your handheld mic because you don't like sitting down. You want to interact with everyone. And so, you have the floor. You may speak French or English. That's up to you. Of course, we have interpretation in this room.

XAVIER CALVEZ: It's up to me, if I remember to speak French.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And the mic doesn't work. That doesn't help. Can someone check the mics please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is there anyone on the phone?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, there are remote participants, we have as well, so you will need a mic. There you go, that one works. Welcome, Xavier.



XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. First, as Susanna Bennett, our COO, was also invited to participate to this session and could not because she had a conflict with the board workshop, so she sends her apologies. And of course, if there was any comment or question that would be addressed more particularly to her, I can take them and pass them on to her and ensure that they are being responded. So feel free to let me know if that would be the case.

I have suggested to use just a few slides to go over the FY15 operating plan and budget process, presuming that this is of interest to this group. But I'm not wanting to exclude, as a result, anything else. I'm just trying to use this as a start for the conversation, and of course expect that you would raise any subject that you would like to touch, whether they are related to the operating plan and budget or not. It sounds like I've chosen to speak English.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I heard that.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I'm going to try to switch now to French. So the first slide we see here is a presentation or introduction of the planning on the operating plan and budget process for FY15. It's a bit small to look at it from here, but more or less, what we find in Singapore now, since we're here, is that we are almost at the end of the operating plan. Thank you.

We're finishing the operating plan, throughout which we're also trying to recover all of the comments that will be made on the information we shared with you two weeks ago in the event of a call, at which many of



you participated. So we started to recover the input on this operating plan. We started two weeks ago and we'll have more throughout this meeting at Singapore. We'll have two sessions, one on Wednesday and one on Thursday, to allow for as many people as possible to participate in the review of our operating plan and for them to be able to make comments as well.

And the next stage will be to finish with the help of all those comments – and with the work on the staff, as well – to be able to finalize this operating plan on one side, and then the budget that supports this operating plan on the other side, and to publish all of it for a public comment session which, should start with the target date which would be April 24th. That's until June 4th or 5th, as I recall.

And then after this public comments period, we'll of course consider all the comments made throughout the public comments period. We'll try to address those comments, to answer to them, to make the necessary changes to the budget – if applicable – so that we can follow-up on the comments received and then to have our drafts reviewed – an updated draft that would be by the Finance Committee in the board, which would then recommend to the Board of Administrators and the Board of Directors the approval of the FY15 budget now. Are there any comments at this stage? Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Xavier, I'll say this. I will never get tired of repeating it. I understand we're at a transition stage, because the strategy plan is not yet ready and this year, once again, we'll be in a transition period.



But I think, in the future, interaction with the community should be more thorough and it should be done at an earlier stage, as well, because if you want us to have an impact on this budget, then we should have an early interaction and a repeater interaction – what we’d received last year and we couldn’t make this year, either.

So, in the future – as of next year – we should absolutely have more interactions so that we can provide you with our point of view so that it can have an impact in the planning. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Tijani. As you know, we’re absolutely on this. So as you say, we’ve tried for a year-and-a-half already to define a process that advances towards that target and it’s been hard to implement this, because at the same time, the organization has implemented the management project system which finally prevented us from developing what we wanted to achieve, but it is our endeavor to do it because we understand it is a need to be honest.

I myself and the organization are not satisfied, either, with the way in which we act today because it’s not easy. I mean, it does not properly support, as you’re saying, the transmission of information. It’s not efficient enough.

And we don’t have substantial information, either, because what we would like to have is to allow for an access to information which would then allow you to make comments on the substance, on the contents, on the entire plans so that that information may be taken into account in the way that we finalize and we fine-tune these projects.



So it's clear – in a different sense, as well, I think – because the subject of the operating plan or of the budget are complex matters. There's plenty of information to be reviewed. There's plenty of information interacting between itself and it is a complicated matter. And these matters should of course receive communication methods which should be adapted to themselves.

So it's very well saying all this, but how will we define it? I would wish to be able to launch in London – as we had done two years ago in Prague, in fact – the start of a process of definition with the community for a planning process. What's our planning process which would be the target in a 12-month period, which would go from the strategic plan to an operating plan to a budget?

We should define it together so that it is shaped in a way such that it would allow to integrate, at the right time, enough and properly the communication between staff and community and from the community to the staff, as well, so that we can finalize this budget with an input that will have been formulated and understood and taken into account and confirmed as well.

What I mean is that, as you know, we're having a hard time in communicating information and receiving feedback, in being able to say, "What should we do with this feedback?" and then to show you what we've done with the feedback. "This is what we did." "We did nothing." "This is why," etc.

So the entire communication process should be – I cannot recall the French word – but it should be embedded, so integrated, within the development process as we develop the plan. And I think – with the



little perspective I have of the past two years – is that we haven't managed to really achieve this over the last two or three years.

So we should have a possibility of creating a process which already embeds this issue with communication and which can find solutions to address these issues and which can integrate them into the calendar and into the process.

What we have done so far is to develop a plan and then to try and integrate it in the more marginal way. That will never work, neither for you nor for the staff. So we should develop a process that's really integrated and which of course integrates the beginning, which is a strategic plan, until the budget process.

So I think we should all be aligned on this need. We should all consider and agree on the fact that it is real and that it is a real need. It's a good starting point if we can all agree on the fact that we need this.

Now, the question is: how should we do this? That's what I would like to work on between June and October 2014.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have – well, first, I'm going to start with Jean-Jacques Subrenat because he hasn't spoken yet, and then Siranush Vardanyan. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Thank you, Xavier, for your explanations. I'd just like to underline the importance of Tijani's comments.



And I would also like to stress the fact that it's really important, as compared to a couple of years ago, that the budget available from ICANN, their revenues are much higher, much greater. I remember when I was a member of the Board, the budget was about \$60 million or \$65 million. Currently, there's rather about \$200 million available.

So never mind the figures. Even if it's \$120 million or \$600 million, it doesn't change. The fact is it's a matter of scale. So I would only just like to stress the importance of Tijani's comments in that context. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Yes, that's understood. And it's true, we could discuss figures if necessary, but regardless of figures I understand what you're saying. We should indeed organize this participation, regardless of figures. But taking into account the increase in our figures, it is all the more necessary and we'll agree there.

So to be honest, I'm not trying to divert the conversation towards a different matter, and that's something that everyone thinks of and speaks of these days, with the dis-involvement of the American government in the IANA contract, our public exposure will be even greater than it was already.

So the way we manage our accountability and transparency is going to have to be supported by processes which have to be stronger, more efficient, and which allow us to measure their efficiency and which are adapted to our needs. So that will require, as regards the planning



process, it will take a lot of work that we'll have to undertake in the next six months.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Siranush Vardanyan?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Xavier. Thank you, Xavier. It's really very important and highly appreciated, this type of communication and discussions.

Just for public record, I would like to ask when you're going to approve the projects submitted from our community within FY15 budget for everyone to be aware? Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Next slide, please. This slide corresponds to the part of the budget process which regards SO and AC additional budget requests. We call it Community Special Requests here. It's not necessarily the good terms, but that's not too serious a mistake.

As you know, the end of the submission process was on March 7th, and so we started reviewing all of the requests that had been submitted to that date. We now have a first draft of most of those requests, with the first draft of the decision that we suggested regarding those requests.

One of the exercises we're carrying out is also to try and correlate those requests with the CROPP program, to know whether some of those requests are already included in the CROPP program or not. If they are,



the requests would be removed because it's being fulfilled within the CROPP program. And if they're not included in the CROPP program, that request is going to be considered as a request.

One of the elements – I'm finishing on timing – so we're going on with this review. And the approval of requests is planned to take place at the end of April. So it should be the 16th or the 17th of April. That's where we're going to submit to the finance committee of the Board of directors the list of requests and the suggested decision.

The finance committee is going to review that and either approve it or not. And if it is approved, it's going to recommend to the Board of directors that it be approved as a request and then to allow for them to go through and to be planned and to take place.

Of course, we won't expect to have global approval of the budget before we can approve this. The approval of the overall ICANN budget will take place in June, but the approval of those requests will take place at the end of April. It's the Board of directors which will approve it. And the goal of these exceptions to the process would be to plan those actions which would take place as of July 1st. So that's the timing.

One of the elements we're trying to review, related to the CROPP process, is if some actions required or which were requested are within the CROPP. What we try to see is whether we can identify, within the CROPP, the actions that are planned and that would be related to the beginning of the financial year. That's between July and September, more or less. Because should that be the case, the approval of the budget around June 25th would not allow for the planning of those



activities which would take place between July 1st and August 31st, more or less.

So we're trying to see whether it would be possible to identify these actions which are included within the CROPP, or the budget that's related to the CROPP, to see whether we can have those actions approved for the CROPP, they're being specific to the CROPP, at the same time as they are presented before April 1st so that we can allow for planning.

I hope that's clear. I hope I haven't confused you more than I clarified.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Xavier. There's so much French and Spanish here, it doesn't feel like an ICANN meeting. I was just going to give the floor, just very briefly, to Cheryl Langdon-Orr because she's been very vocal regarding this problem in the Asia-Pacific region having a lot of events in July/August/September time. And will this be able to fill the problem that you've faced in the past years?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It will be of some assistance. It is unfortunate that we in our outreach for the CROPP pilot, of course, have made it very clear to date that you cannot put anything in after 30 June. And we'd identified that that simply won't work for Asia-Pacific.

Now, we will, and we in fact did put in an exception, to attend regional IGF which occurs in August and therefore would fit into this September-



time as an exception. So this may be one of those that gets transferred from the exceptions budget requests into CROPP if CROPP continues.

But if we now make our outreach in Asia-Pacific and we assume that CROPP will continue – and that’s not an assumption we’ve made to date – if we are able to make that, then what you may see is a second year of CROPP (which I assume still has two Ps and therefore still is a pilot) may have reasonable Asia-Pacific engagement. But we’ve been quite literally unable to find anything that is appropriate enough to run in the half a year we had this time around.

I still am not convinced that we’ve got it right for Asia-Pacific, however, and it’s all about things happening around the December/January time where, of course, we have various lunar festivals. Look, if you do something on an equinox or a vernal equinox or a lunar festival, you’re not going to get the engagement you need out of Asia-Pacific. We still need to look at some of those issues for the timing, but it’s in transition. I’m slightly happier, Olivier, if that helps you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. I see a number of people bopping away and very happy and with big smiles. So they’re probably happier than you are, but that’s a good barometer.

Tijani Ben Jemaa is next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Xavier, I’m happy you mentioned the CROPP program. And, in fact, I’m afraid it’s going to be a bit too late to be able



to express our CROPP purpose for next year, because a budget for those activities should be decided at the same time as all the rest of our requests if we wanted to actually start at the beginning of the fiscal year.

But I think the solution would be to decide to have this program for next year and to integrate it in the future to our operating budget for ICANN so that we can then have an envelope that's dedicated to the CROPP program and so that we can also present our requests or prepare our actions with enough time and so that we can have activities between July and September. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I think that is the goal that we all think of. Even if there were a second pilot year for the CROPP program, the purpose is whether to see whether or not it works, whether or not it should be integrated ultimately. So I think – and I'm not directly involved in the CROPP – but from what I know, it is the intent of the people who are developing these sort of programs.

The CROPP is actually a list of activities which are offered to a number of regions with an application process. So should we not be able to easily determine which would be the activities that are included within the perimeter of the CROPP, which would take place within the first months of the year – I'm thinking out loud, so I'm not sure whether I'm going to say something that makes sense. I'm trying to consider it as a potential solution. And if it is, I could see – or staff see – if we can implement it. But do you think it would be a potential solution if we

were to take the CROPP as a whole and to have it approved at the end of April instead of at the end of June?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that would entirely solve the issue, right?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay, we'll try and do that. I'll see if it's possible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I see Cheryl Langdon-Orr's thumbs up. Thumbs up as translated in French is "pouces en l'air," which doesn't mean anything in French, but there you go. Okay. Well, actually, in France when you do that, you usually are by the side of the road and wishing to go elsewhere for free, basically. That's hitchhiking. That's absolutely perfect. Fantastic.

Okay. Any other questions or comments with regards to finance matters? We have Sivasubramanian Muthusamy who has to step up to the table to speak. Siva, you have the floor.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: I'm from ISOC India Chennai ALS, and I'm giving a suggestion in the context of a special budgeting request. I think you could take it to the finance committee in ICANN.

The example is from the government of India. In India, the government spends money under two very broad heads. One is plan expenditure, which is entirely expenditure based on budget reallocations decided at



the beginning of the year. And the other head is non-plan expenditure. Non-plan expenditure, the concept is that not everything can be planned in advance, and there are contingencies and there are change of plans and so on.

So I don't know if ICANN has a provision similar to a non-plan expenditure provision. So what you could need if you spend \$50 million on a budgeted process, you probably need at least half of that set aside to be decided on, from time to time, under some strict criteria within.

So that should solve most of the special requests and the problem that Cheryl was talking about that in Asia-Pacific does not work this way, that we can't decide within a stipulated time and so on. So I think you could think about it. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Since you asked the question in English, I'll respond in English. So there is a contingency as a matter of practice in the ICANN budget. It has been historically relatively small. Two or three years ago, I think it was \$1.5 million.

We have, over the past two years – Akram Atallah, when he was the COO, and I had decided to try to bring it to a more substantial level. We are trying to plan on an ongoing basis for at least 5% of the budget – let me finish – 5% of the budget is about \$4 million to \$5 million right now. That's one thing.

So there is a contingency, but we are not necessarily looking at the contingency in the exact same fashion that you were just taking it as an



example. This contingency is definitely designed to be used for entirely unplanned expenses.

The general approach – even though there’s not been a lot of usage of that mechanism in the past – the general approach is it has to be really significant expenses that cannot be absorbed in the defined budget.

What I mean by that is – and I’m hoping I’m not going to lose everyone with this comment – the budget is the financial translation of an action plan. It is not a bucket with money in it and until there is money in it, you can spend it and once there’s no money in it, you cannot spend anything anymore. That’s not what the budget is.

The budget is the financial translation of an action plan. If the action plan changes because an action that was planned is not going to happen and another action that was not planned is going to happen, there’s puts and takes and there is an available amount of money to be spent.

So what I mean by that is it’s not because an action is not planned at the beginning of the year and therefore included explicitly in the budget that it cannot happen. And exactly to your point, not everything is planned at any point of time. We plan right now between 3 and 15 months ahead, so of course the budget is obsolete the day after it’s been approved – obsolete from the perspective that things have changed already by the time it’s approved from the time that it was designed.

So there’s always changes, and the reality is always different than the budget. By the way, over the past five years, as far as I can tell, we’ve spent less money than we budgeted for.



So those two elements: the fact that the budget is the quantification of an action plan and, therefore, the actions within it can change. And if there's an action that's suggested to happen because we all think it needs to happen, it qualifies, it's not budgeted, that is fine. It can still happen. Something else is not happening anyway somewhere else in the organization; therefore, there's a plus here and there's a minus there and we live within that.

On a monthly basis, we close our books. We look at what the expenses have been, what the revenues have been, and we look at the variances – and there's always variances. We've never budgeted exactly things the way that they should happen, or very rarely, so there's always variances.

And we monitor those variances on a monthly basis, and we create forecasts, so that we say, "Okay, so based on what's happened and what we think it going to happen, we think the rest of the year is going to look like this," and our full-year financial statement would look like that.

And that allows us to say, "Well, we have room here and we have room there and we have negative variances in another place and the bottom line is we're fine." That's the type of exercise that we do.

So a long way of saying that between the contingency that we have in place, which is to the point that I made about 5%, and the fact that there are puts and takes in managing the budget on an ongoing basis, it does allow for unplanned actions to happen.



It doesn't mean that something that was unplanned if there is room will happen. It still needs to make sense. It needs to be approved. It needs to qualify for criteria of evaluation and so on, but it's possible.

Having said that, if we are speaking more specifically about the CROPP? What I was just discussing with Tijani as a potential solution to the need, if we have an approval earlier of the second year of the CROPP program, then we address, I think, the need that Cheryl was pointing out, too. So I will work on that with Rob Hoggarth and David Olive to try to see if we can do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. We have one more question from Fatima Cambronerero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: I would like to go back to what Cheryl was saying regarding the CROPP program. In Latin America and the Caribbean, our LACRALO region, we have a similar problem in terms of the events that are being carried out and that could be used to perform outreach.

We have in April the NETmundial meeting in Brazil. This was not a convenient meeting so it took outreach in terms of ICANN. And in the second part of the year – in July, specifically speaking – we will have the LACIGF. This is the regional IGF for Latin America and the Caribbean region. And this would be the right place for us to carry out ICANN outreach in terms of our activities, but this is outside the CROPP program.



So I would like to humbly ask you, as we are volunteers, we work voluntarily within ICANN to continue with this program so that we can continue with our outreach and so that we can continue engaging more organizations within our RALO, specifically speaking. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I would like to speak in French. So if I understand well, I think, yes, I understand well, and I am going to try to work with our team to have this CROPP approved in advance so as these actions can be submit and financed.

Now, just to clarify, I'm not the person who decide what is going to take place and what is not going to take place. If the CFO has to decide if we are going to do some outreach in Latin America or in another meeting, I would have a lot of activities and a lot of responsibilities. It's not the case.

So the person who is taking care of the CROPP into the staff is Rob Hoggarth, and I'm going to speak with him about the decision we made earlier to see if it is a possibility or a solution. And I will repeat to him what you told me about the importance of this program for the outreach actions. Thank you very much.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Xavier. We have some more minutes, because Theresa Swinehart didn't arrive. There is another question. I'm going to ask it in English.

So there is also another parallel process to the budget request and that's, of course, the strategic planning process. And we haven't touched on it here, but I know that you're shepherding because, well, both have to be in sync with each other. And the last call that did take place was not that smooth, because there have been some changes again in the strategic planning process. And I'm not quite sure how the two are now being synchronized with each other.

Every year we are told, "This is the last year that we have changes. There are improvements this year, and so we're a little bit late on this, so we'll have to shorten the amount of time that the community will have to bring feedback into the process, and next year will be better." And the next year we have a same continuous change going on and, again, a shortened amount of time for the community to fully engage in the process.

Do you foresee a time when there will be no change? What is the progress on the evolution that you've pushed so far?

XAVIER CALVEZ: So if anyone can guarantee that the future doesn't bear any change, I'll look up to them to make some bets in the stock market.

So first of all, I want to make sure I understand correctly. I don't think the strategic planning process in progress has changed since middle or late of last year. So currently, unless I'm mistaken – and Denise or



Theresa could speak more specifically about it – but we are now finalizing a draft five-year strategic plan that will be submitted to public comment. I think it’s imminent. I think in Singapore, there is the decision by the Board to approve the draft for public comment.

So that’s been the plan for a while. Actually, it was originally planned in April, and it’s been advanced. So it’s not been delayed. It’s actually been advanced to March, unless I’m mistaken. So I’m hoping I’m answering that part of your question.

The FY15 operating plan and budget process since September or October, we know that it will not be based – and it would not have been based – on an updated strategic plan, because that plan is being developed, as we just spoke about, with a conclusion time for June in London.

So the FY15 planning process has been going as anticipated with this parallel development of the strategic plan while the operating plan is being conducted without strategic input. And the operating plan, just to be clear on that specific aspect, has been developed on the basis of carrying out the activities that had been last year identified as consistent with the strategic plan. So it’s not like it’s been happening in a complete vacuum because there was no strategic plan to go by.

And, of course, we have internally with the staff, we have coordinated the communication on where the strategic plan development is going, to ensure that there is nothing erratic in the operating plan versus what the draft of the strategic plan could include so that there’s no conflict there at the end.



I want to speak about change versus no change and transition. The way I want to formulate it – and thank you for the opportunity to explain this – is that we are putting in place the various pieces of an infrastructure for managing the organization.

You may have heard me speak about the AtTask tool, basically our project management system. We've implemented it end of 2012. So last fiscal year was the first year that we put in place this management tool. This is a very comprehensive tool to manage everything that the organization does.

The first year of implementation is not the last year of implementation. What I mean by that is it is a complex tool, and it addresses an extensive and complex subject. So we are now currently in FY14, in the second year of implementation. We are using it better, but we're not there yet, either. My expectation is that in FY15, we're going to continue evolving on how we use our management system. That's one piece.

Another piece is the dashboard. So we're developing a dashboard, which are basically a compilation of metrics that help monitor the work of the organization and its progress. There are financial metrics, there are operational metrics for every single part of what the organization does.

That is a tool that also will take several iterations to come to maturation. We started it small, because starting it big would take a lot of effort and focus off the organization, and as you must have noticed, that's not the only thing that's going on at ICANN right now.



So we have started it small, and it will continue evolving. So I think next year will be the first year where we're going to have a full scope of metrics in the dashboard, but we will learn, therefore, next year on how to use it.

And of course, we're going to connect the first piece that I mentioned, our project management system, with the second piece that I mentioned, which is the metrics of the dashboard. So this is another tool that we have started this year in FY14, and I think it's going to take another good two years to really come to maturation in how the organization uses it and how the organization uses it to communicate with the community but outside as well.

So in my views, we are in an evolution path. And it's an evolution path for the better, by the way. If we would not change how we have been working before, you should tell us, "Guys, you're not putting in place what you should be putting in place." So we have engaged into that path, and it's a long path and it's a demanding one.

And the staff who is here can tell you that it is demanding to use our project management system. It is demanding to put in place a process of producing metrics on a monthly basis that monitor the work that we do. It's an extra work, but it's also the work that lets you understand whether you meet your objectives or not, whether you actually deliver and make progress.

I didn't suggest that we go on the next slide, and I won't do it now because Theresa is now here, but this next slide was intending to provide an overview of the various pieces that I'm talking about. And I



think the evolution that we have engaged ourselves over the past two years is going to continue.

So I don't think there's an FY15 transition year in the sense of there was a before and there's an after right away tomorrow. Things have changed last year. Things are changing this year. And we'll continue putting pieces of this puzzle in place in the next year and the following year and for the better. And we're going to learn through that.

Now the challenge, I think, for us all is this is change management, so we needed to put in place the mechanisms that allow us collectively to be all on board at the same time, with the same understanding on how we're moving forward.

And this is what Tijani and I, with his question and my answer, were talking about earlier is that we need to put in place the mechanisms, design the mechanisms of interaction that allow timely, quality communication between the staff and the community and back from the community to the staff so that this development is collaborative.

And this is not an easy exercise. You guys know it better than me, I'm sure. Designing something so complex at 2,000 people is a lot more difficult than at 5 people; and at 5 people, it's not easy to begin with. So it's not an easy task, but it's the one that we need to take on.

And I know Theresa is very, very aware and very much driving putting – from a strategic standpoint – in place the tools to help ensuring that this communication in this direct, immediate, timely involvement effectively happens.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Xavier. And it sounds as though you were dropped with a parachute in the deepest part of the jungle, but hopefully there is a clearing appearing slowly on the horizon.

We've run out of time, Tijani, as I see that Theresa Swinehart has joined us. But first, thank you very much, Xavier, for this very extensive work that you're doing.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you for the opportunity to come and speak in front of you, as always.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, moving swiftly on then, that brings us over to strategy, and that's a good bridge, actually. So joining us, we have Theresa Swinehart, who is the senior advisor to the president on strategy. Welcome, Theresa. And I think I can just hand the floor over to you directly. Do you have slides to share?

THERESA SWINEHART: I don't, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You don't? Okay, fine. Then the floor is yours, Theresa Swinehart.

THERESA SWINEHART: Just as a quick reminder, how long do I have?



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You have as much time as you want, but we do have lunch after you, I think. Yeah, you just stand between us and lunch, so it's up to you. Theoretically, we are 15 minutes late, so if we can just have it to 1:15 – if that's okay with you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Okay. I'm going to keep this quick because that's the absolute worst thing is to be between everybody and lunch. Sorry. I'm sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We've pretty much finished the supply of candies around the table, so we're still on a sugar high at the moment and it might take a little while for us to come down.

THERESA SWINEHART: Excellent.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's fine. You have a bit more time.

THERESA SWINEHART: Okay. Well, if it's any consolation whatsoever, I haven't had lunch yet either. So between my stomach and your stomachs, we'll make good progress. I have to say, you guys have a cold room in here. Okay. I just wanted to observe that fact.

I'm going to run through very quickly – let me first get rid of the candy – some key elements that our team is working on. I'm overseeing what's



called the Strategic Initiatives Group. There are a lot of people doing a lot of work, so the credit goes to them to doing the work. And I'll just talk about it, and I'll help get some feedback.

Couple key areas: you'll have seen that the recommendations and output of the strategy panels are out there. Those are for community input and discussion for uses the community feels they would like to. The areas that are informative to the strategic planning process, please help identify those. And otherwise, please have ideas about how you might want to use or not use them in any way.

So I just wanted to flag that those are out there for discussion, and each of them focuses on a very different area and may be of interest to At-Large to take a look at.

So we have that. Then the strategic planning process, we're also going to be putting out the revised strategic plan for public comment as well.

Let me just touch quickly on the areas that I did want to highlight here – in particular because we have two events tomorrow – are around the ICANN globalization. The first is an event and a launching to identify the mechanisms for a process in order to – ICANN is facilitating together with the affected parties on what an eventual proposal for mechanisms would look like for the transition out of the USG role in the IANA function itself.

And so I wanted to flag this, really, for everybody to ensure that they're able to be there tomorrow. It's at 10:30. Participate in this discussion. This is really the launch of the process, and the input from this discussion, which I'd like to suggest would look at what kinds of



principles are relevant for a good process. How do we make a really good credible process for this dialogue? And what inputs from your own experiences in ALAC and elsewhere are lessons learned and good things and bad things that you feel could be effective there. And also what kinds of mechanisms from your own experience have you seen work well and don't work well?

Because I think each of our experiences in different multi-stakeholder processes gives us an opportunity for lessons learned of what works well and best practices and also what's not effective. But primarily for how we can ensure also a good global reach and transparency on that as well.

So that morning session will be the launch of identifying what areas will constitute a process. That, then, will be posted on the 7th of April for community input and feedback on what kind of process will be put into place to then come up with the proposal for enabling the transition of the USG role. So I want to flag that.

In the afternoon, we've been hearing quite a bit of conversation around, not ICANN accountability more generally, but ICANN accountability and whether that changes with the change in the US relationship in the context of the IANA function and that eventual transition. So that seems like a topic that's coming up in different dialogues amongst the community members. It seems like that would be a good dialogue to be having with the community.

So the afternoon session that had a label of ICANN Globalization will look at ICANN accountability and how do we ensure that that evolves very well, as we look at this phase of the relationship with the IANA



function, as well. So that will be in the afternoon. Again, input/dialogue is very important for that, so I also wanted to flag that. That will be at 5:30 tomorrow afternoon.

So these are two very important tracks in relation to ICANN's overall globalization, the transition in the context of the IANA function. There, I just want to make sure that ICANN has one aspect of a role in the IANA function. There's obviously the relationships also with the IETF and the IEB, the regional Internet registries, so it's not just names, but it's names, numbers, and protocol parameters. So that dialogue and where we go in the process will involve all the effected parties, not just ICANN directly. So we are facilitating it, but it will be a facilitation and a process that will involve all the affected parties overall.

I think with that, I'm actually in light of the lunch issue and your time issue, going to just see whether there are specific areas I can elaborate on. We have the ATRT-2 recommendations that obviously will be looked at, and there's a session on Wednesday for that. Happy to talk about that as well. But instead of me talking so much, maybe people want to have questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Theresa. So the floor is now open for questions, and fastest in raising her card is Holly Raiche. You win first prize for the card-raising competition. Go ahead. And then we'll have Wolf Ludwig afterwards. Very quick. Holly first and then Wolf.



HOLLY RAICHE:

I guess I'm a little bit confused because we're talking about process or are we talking about a process to define a process? And my fear about discussions is we're going to wind up talking about processes to get processes and not get to the final process that's going to produce an outcome.

So is there a way of talking about where we think we want to be, which is ultimately managing IANA? And are we talking about the process of getting there and what we mean by "there"? Is that a summation of what you hope to get out of it?

THERESA SWINEHART:

I agree that it's a bit...The announcement of NTIA asked ICANN to convene global stakeholders, including affected parties, to develop a proposal to transition the current role of the USG. So we are to convene globally with the affected parties.

So in order to do that and in order to develop a proposal for this transition, yes, I mean, I could wake up one morning and come up with a way to do that. And I'm sure Leon could, as well. And I'm sure, Holly, you could as well. We could all just wake up one morning and come up with something. But we as a community actually need to talk about what would be an effective process to reach that ability to do that.

We shouldn't spend too much time on it. I think we all have lessons learned of what's effective and what's not. I think we all have ideas about what principles might be very important – open, transparent, multi-stakeholder – I don't want to pre-presume anything. We may have ideas about what mechanisms are effective: engaging with the



community, ensuring it's multi-stakeholder. On Friday, I heard some ideas of people like working groups or not working groups, different things.

All we need to do is just brainstorm together a little bit and consolidate that. And then from that consolidation, we'll post it on the 7th of April and put that out for community comment. So we have agreement among the community of we have the most credible process in place that's capturing all of the lessons learned, all of the best practices, experiences, and just putting it together and trying to refine it. That, after a 30-day comment period, should start the work on the substantive areas.

Now, one important thing though is some of the substantive dialogues have been going on in the communities for a long time. So the IETF, for example, has been having conversations about their role and strengthening and improving their role in the relationship to the protocol parameter space that is part of the IANA function.

So we are not reinventing the wheel or anything, but now that we're coming to this phase of the dialogue, we want to make sure that we have a process that's going to work, that's really gold-plated, really exceptional, that's engaging all the parties, and that can build on the substantive work and get the substantive work consolidated that's already been going on in many different places. I hope that clarifies it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Next, we have, is it Wolf Ludwig or Yuliya? Yuliya Morenets.



YULIYA MORENETS: Yes, thank you. I was just wondering about the deadline for comments. Somehow, I missed the deadline. I got the date when it will be posted for comments, but the deadline, I missed this. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: We haven't fixed a final deadline. All I know is what we've identified is we're launching the process here, and by the 7th of April, we should be able to have pulled together all the different input we've received in order to post that. But even that, we need to see what we get as feedback overall, and then we can identify the deadline.

YULIYA MORENETS: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Theresa. So Wolf Ludwig.

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, there will be in a couple of weeks, in one month, a very important meeting somewhere in Latin America. I think it's Brazil in São Paulo. I think in ICANN's globalization efforts, this meeting might be a very important element. What are your expectations for São Paulo, Theresa?

THERESA SWINEHART: Oh, that's a hard one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: They get harder.



THERESA SWINEHART: I certainly can't predict what the outcome will be or full expectations. There have been over 180 submissions, which I find really very encouraging, and all of them obviously good submissions and, really, contributions to an important discussion.

The ICANN globalization and the dialogue around the IANA itself, that dialogue is being facilitated by ICANN with the affected parties. That is the specific request, and that is what will be occurring. And, of course, the discussions will occur in other forums as well, and hopefully those discussions will provide their input into the process that's put into place.

I think the other important element though – and this is where I would think the meeting in the Latin American country would be focused – is also on the broader Internet governance space and how, as we look at Internet policy issues that are in the broader Internet governance space that don't have to do with areas under the Regional Internet Registries remit or the ICANN remit or, I don't know, other entities' remits, how do we strengthen that broader Internet governance space so that it retains a truly multi-stakeholder approach and so that there's an evolution of clarity around where and how to address Internet policy issues overall?

You know, we have the Internet Governance Forum, which does amazing things. We have initiatives that everybody is involved in in different places. But as the next three billion users come online and as initiatives and issues arise – you know, issues that were important three years ago are not necessarily the same issues that are important today – as we move to mobile devices and that raises a range of other issues, as



we look at the development aspect of it and the capacity aspect of it, where is that dialogue going?

And I think the Brazil meeting has a good opportunity to look at that broader space, and I think many of the contributions are focused on that. And I think that's an important opportunity to help strengthen the broader Internet governance sphere and dialogue that's quite important. And it's very complimentary, of course, to everything that we're doing. But it's important also from a standpoint of ensuring that issues that maybe some unbeknownst may think would be appropriate to raise in ICANN, but are really outside of its remit, there's clarity about where to address those issues. So I hope that answers the question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Theresa. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Hello, Theresa. Nice to see you. Theresa, a few years ago, we were together in a very exciting group, which was the president's strategy committee. And we had prepared together, with some other people we know well, the Improving Institutional Confidence.

I come to this because one of the real difficulties, I think, right now for ICANN and for the whole Internet I-organizations cloud is that we will not necessarily be able to guarantee a truly equal stakeholder model. Multi-stakeholder, sure, but can we keep it an equal stakeholder model, as Fadi Chehadé pointed out after he became the president and CEO? I think that's really one of the challenges.



So as someone who has worked for government for a long time, I'd like to ask you: my view is that it will become more and more difficult to maintain this multi-equal stakeholder model because, simply, governments – many of which were asleep when the Internet was created – are in a catching-up process right now. That may not be true of the U.S. government, but it has been true for many others. So there will be a natural sociological tendency for them to want to weigh more than other stakeholders in the whole outfit. Give me your view on that.

THERESA SWINEHART:

I think it's going to be one of the areas that – I mean, first of all Jean-Jacques, to see a former Board member, it's a great privilege. And to have worked with you on that committee was really a lot of work that we're starting to see come into conversations now, so I think that really warrants some highlighting.

Look, I think as more people come online and as the Internet becomes an increasingly important part of the global economy and a global social network in the way people are communicating and living their day-to-day lives, governments are, of course, going to become interested, without a doubt, and as are new stakeholders and new interest groups.

So part of, I think, evolving the multi-stakeholder model is how does it scale and how does it evolve to retain the multi-stakeholder element but yet ensure that it is open for new participants and new interests that are evolving over time? We have no idea what the interests are going to be five years from now. By "we" I'm not saying ICANN; by "we," I'm saying as a global community that's engaged in Internet policy issues.



I think what's most important is that whatever mechanisms we're putting into place and whatever models that are evolving and whatever work we're doing is scalable, and is scalable for new participants and is open to that. And that's going to include governments, of course, and it's going to include new interest groups. The mobile industry is not an industry that one may have traditionally seen in an Internet governance dialogue five years ago or ten years ago, but certainly it is an interest group that's going to be showing up in other places.

So I oftentimes – and I've heard this in various conversations – as we're having a conversation about multi-stakeholder, we also need to think about it from a multi-interest standpoint. And then we also need to be thinking about how we ensure that the model in this kind of approach is as open and scalable as possible and flexible for adjusting to change, without losing the value and the principles that it brings. I don't know if that answers the question, but I don't have a solution. It's just what we all have a responsibility to keep an eye on the ball for.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. Before going into my original question, if you could just elaborate for a moment, Theresa, on the difference you perceive between multi-stakeholder and multi-interest? I never perceived that there was a difference between them, that one indicated and almost implied the other – so that one first.



And the other one, if you could touch on briefly, when the strategy panels first came out, the very first thing that I heard from multiple places: “This is ICANN becoming more top-down rather than bottom-up.” That this was something that was being posed from on high. That you had the CEO that was saying, “I’m going to handpick people that I think are going to be best posed to advise me.” Whereas, here we had supposedly this multi-stakeholder thing of which we’re all proud and trying to defend that was essentially being said, “Okay, that isn’t sufficient. I have to bring in outside experts.”

And so you have a double concern that, number one, this was seen to be top-down rather than bottom-up, and likewise almost an admission that the voices that exist in the multi-stakeholder model in ICANN right now are insufficient to provide sufficient advice. So could you possibly address those issues? Thanks.

THERESA SWINEHART:

You’re actually touching on two things that have been, I think, in conversations over the past couple of years around different areas.

So I’m not suggesting multi-stakeholder versus multi-interest. I think what I’m raising here – and this has come up in different conversations over the years as we’re looking at things – if I, as an individual user, have multiple interests. I have an interest to be able to be online. I have interest in order to protect my privacy. And each of those interests are potentially touched upon and advocated and worked on through different stakeholder groups.



So I think business is a good example in this context. A tech company will have an interest in engineering and in innovation and in technology. They will also have an interest in protecting their users. They'll also have an interest in what their product is and ensuring that their product can evolve.

And those interests are often reflected in different stakeholder groups. Civil society may, for example, represent and ensure that the consumer interests are dealt with. The engineering group or the technical community or technical stakeholder group may be where many of their engineers are working.

So what I mean by multiple interests is that as we're looking at stakeholders and we look at defining stakeholder groupings – we have it so divided up in business, civil society, and others in the broader Internet governance space – many of those stakeholder categories, however we would choose to try to categorize them, they themselves will also have multiple interests that are touched upon in other stakeholder groups.

So I'm not trying to add a level of complexity to the multi-stakeholder model. I'm just saying that it's not always as clean cut when we look at the traditional stakeholder model.

Now, Olivier and I have had this conversation, I think, at one point because in the ICANN model, we actually are more focused on the interest space than the stakeholder space. So I think ALAC is one example where you have different stakeholders who have an interest in a certain area. In the GNSO, you have different stakeholders who have a certain interest in that specific area in the GNSO. So we have to look at

how these things are structured. I'm not trying to make it complex. I'm just saying that it's not always clear lined.

On the top-down versus bottom-up: this is also an area I've been giving some thought to. So when we talk about top-down, do we mean that an idea or something came from something that's in a perceived hierarchical structure, or is it that a final decision has been made?

And I raise this question because one of the values of a multi-stakeholder or open process – whatever one calls it – is that ideas and thoughts can come from a variety of places. A business organization or a trade association can have an idea, and that can put it into the dialogue.

Top-down, the question to me is really: is it that a top-down decision has been made and implemented, or is it that an idea has come from something that may be from a different avenue than is traditionally the case?

And I don't know the answer, but it's a question I raise, because as I'm trying to understand where we're looking at ensuring that new ideas can come in from multiple angles and from multiple avenues and that we ensure that the multi-stakeholder processes are accessible to a wide range of views that are then part of a process and eventually, if there's consensus, adopted for whichever topic area is under consideration. We don't want to be excluding new thought.

The issue, from my perspective, is is that you want to ensure that decisions aren't taken that are not reflective of a consensus, of a multi-stakeholder, of a full dialogue, that have not gone through a full

process. So that's my thinking right now, but I don't have the full answer for you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, if I could just follow up on that, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Very briefly, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Then I guess my answer to that is that if this was a matter of ICANN saying, "We wanted fresh ideas and new ideas," it still seems like the community was not asked that question and these panels were just made. If there was a budget allocated of \$2 million to finding new ideas, there could have been a request made to the community and saying, "If there is a way for the communities themselves to say, 'Okay. We need some innovation. We need some ideas.'"

For instance, At-Large, the staff we've got is constantly spinning its wheels just to help us on what we're doing. If we were to say we needed a survey or we needed some research in our request to come up with some innovative ideas, that budget doesn't exist. That's really hard to come up with.

And so to see ourselves stymied and not being able to get the resources necessary to do that innovation we're capable of doing, well then saying, "Oh, I'm waving my wand. Poof! We now have some new strategy panels from up above to give some ideas." If the request was for innovation and ideas, perhaps that might have been asked of the



community first before just saying, “I’ve come up with these ideas,” themselves. The decision is still very much top-down, not just in the decision-making but even in the opportunity to do this.

I mean, I personally have seen it seems to me that there’s a bit of a comment saying, “The communities can’t be asked to come up with the innovation. It still has to be brought in from outside.” I find that troubling, and I find that a little bit of not having sufficient faith in the multi-stakeholder model that I think should be there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Theresa, do you wish to respond to this, or would you just have more questions? We’ve got a few more. You’ll find out, actually, that we did mention lunch earlier. People around this table are machines, I think. They don’t need to eat. They don’t need to breathe or water or whatever. That’s the mad thing.

THERESA SWINEHEART: That’s fine.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We still have...Let’s have a look. We’ve still got Leon Sanchez and Rinalia Abdul Rahim in the queue, so let’s just take both.

THERESA SWINEHART: I’ve got about another, I think, I’ve got about another ten minutes, and then I’ve got another meeting.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll keep the questions short. Leon, you have the floor. Leon Sanchez.

LEON SANCHEZ: Which steps will you take to guarantee that this is a bottom-up community-driven process? And second: what if we miss the deadline? I mean, we have until 2015 to finish this process. Is there a plan B? This is going to be quite complicated, and what happens if we do miss that deadline?

THERESA SWINEHART: I think we should just take this one step at a time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Rinalia Abdul Rahim?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Theresa, I'm curious about your personal view regarding NETmundial, because I know you've observed multi-stakeholderism for a long time. And the meeting is really important, because it lies outside of the normal Internet ecosystem and community. And it can capture global attention, especially for those who haven't decided yet whether or not they are for multi-stakeholder approaches or not.

And I'm curious as to how much engagement of support of governments in the process, vis-à-vis the other sectorial members. I know civil society is heavily on board. Business, I'm not so sure about; I think there is some presence. But what is your sense of that? Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: I think there's actually been a very strong interest – including by governments – to participate in it and to engage. I understand that the European Commission is having the commissioner herself go and that there's many governments that are committed and are attending very strongly.

So my personal view is that it's actually a very interesting opportunity. To receive over 180 submissions for a meeting – and we've all worked with the IGF and we've all worked with different forums – that's fairly significant, as far as contributions go, to a discussion.

And given the interest by governments and business and civil society and technical and the stakeholders to be engaging in the discussions is an interesting sort of kind of multi-stakeholder conference in a different way than I've seen before. It's not to say that any of them are better or not. It's just an interesting kind of model.

So I'm optimistic that it should contribute a really good dialogue and hopefully be one stop in a path of multiple dialogues around some of these very, very important issues that are happening in different forums and bring a new way for some of the stakeholders to engage and then take that dialogue to many of the other forums that are existing.

So that's just my personal observation. I have not been watching it as closely as others have, but I just was struck by the number of submissions and the interest and certainly look forward to seeing where it's going to go. And I know that there's going to be quite a bit of work, also, looking at remote hub abilities, and I'm really looking forward to



seeing how the lessons learned and experiences on ensuring remote participation can be very effective and used in that event as well. I'm sure I'm as curious as you are to see how it goes, and I look forward to a really good discussion there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Theresa. Three last tricky questions – or maybe two, if I can remember the last one. Yeah, well, you can't get out of this room without having a couple of them. And you found the room to be cold, so let's warm this place up a little bit.

THERESA SWINEHART: Oh, no. I'm warming up alright.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So the first one is: our spies in the GNSO tell us that in the interactions and discussions that you've had with the GNSO council and the rest of the GNSO, that of course this subject, the subject of the IANA transition has been touched on. And there hasn't been any allusion made of the working group, which was started by the ALAC and by the NCSG, which then ended up as a cross-community working group on Internet governance. It appeared to be a bit out of the picture, somehow.

At the moment, it looks as though a lot of emphasis has been put on the strategic panels that are, as we said earlier from Evan, that are top-down, there doesn't seem to be much of a cross-community involvement so far for the IANA contract evolution. Do you see the

cross-community working group as being one of those avenues that will bring the input in?

THERESA SWINEHART:

It's a very good question. Well, everybody heard the day of the announcement, so we're sort of fresh in this process. And the conversation tomorrow is looking at, as we talked about earlier, on what are the principles and mechanisms to get the process started. How the input into the process is then done is also the responsibility of the respective stakeholder groups in order to do that.

So I'm not excluding or precluding or prejudging anything whatsoever. We're facilitating a dialogue in relation to the directly-affected parties, because that's what the issue is about, right? As I mentioned, there's also a separate conversation which is focused on the ICANN accountability aspect, which I know is dear to the hearts of many. And how that, then, is done within the respective stakeholder communities and interested parties communities, I think, is really part of the work of those respective organizations and entities.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Theresa. Second tricky question: you speak about, well, a few weeks ago – in fact, not a few weeks, a few days ago – the word “globalization” was on everybody's mouths. Suddenly I see “IANA transition,” “IANA accountability,” but the “globalization” word has disappeared.

Now, bearing in mind the ALAC is globally distributed and bearing in mind it appears – and I'm not going to link the two issues together – but



some do say that the U.S. government recent move was in response to some criticism that the U.S. was controlling this function somehow, globalization was in everybody's minds. But is it still globalization? Are we still speaking about IANA globalization, IANA function globalization, or is it out of the picture already?

THERESA SWINEHART:

No, I think it's part of that conversation. I mean, it's an element of it, absolutely. I mean, the IANA transition and the ICANN accountability are key ICANN globalization and stakeholder globalization aspects.

And I think, just to be clear, the announcement that occurred is reflective of the fact that there's been an evolution in the organization and that it was felt that it is now a good opportunity and the organizations have evolved to the point in order to have this conversation of what a transition could look like.

So I would really say the credit goes to the work that ALAC and everybody else has done to get the respect of organizations to a place where we can actually have this conversation about a transition.

So I think it's a very important thing to recognize that you don't just wake up one day and have this idea. This is something which is the result of many years of work in getting ICANN and the other organizations to where they are to be able to have this dialogue on the transition.

What that also does though, it means that we all need to work together in order to make sure we're successful in it. So I think now the real work starts because we've created the base, and now the real work starts to



make sure that this transition is successful and it's effective for everybody.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Theresa. And third and last.

THERESA SWINEHART: Oh, one more?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: One more, and then you're set free. There was discussion already engaged by several organizations providing a possible solution to the current oversight by the U.S. government. And you mentioned the June meeting being a milestone date. Can you elaborate on this? I mean, are you looking at solutions to be presented by the June meeting, or is it just the start of the process?

THERESA SWINEHART: So we're starting the process. We're not having the conversation on the solutions; we are starting the process. The conversation on the solutions happens as a contribution, then, into when the process itself on looking at what solutions there are.

And I think it's important to realize that there's already been conversations in the IETF and others around their respective functions. So I would anticipate that people are just going to continue to build on that. I don't know if that answers your question. Oh, on the dates, I'm sorry.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You mentioned the London meeting.

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes, I'm sorry. The dates.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a deadline for what? For answers? Deadline for starting the process?

THERESA SWINEHART: No, no, no, no, no. So on the process document that was posted, we had identified some key milestone dates. The key milestone dates are actually just milestone dates. Regional Internet registries, the country code operator organizations, the regional organizations, the IETF – they all have meetings, as do the ccNSO and everybody else. So on those milestone dates, those were just identified as such.

We anticipate – and I would certainly anticipate – that each of those respective entities and forums is going to be having their dialogue. I can certainly not predetermine what the dates are, whether in London, the process which is identified and the process that is adopted will have reached a certain point of work that they want to engage in a community discussion on something or there's a draft or who knows? That's very premature to determine that.

We obviously have a 2015 September date to be working towards as a community, but working backwards, I guess, we'll have to figure that

out once we have the process put into place and agreement on what the timeline is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, thank you very much, Theresa. Thanks for spending a bit more time than originally scheduled with us. And with this, I'd like to have everyone thank you.

And now, I hand over the floor to Gisella Gruber, who is going to be telling us housekeeping notes since this is the end of our morning session. Gisella, you have the floor.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you. Just a few housekeeping notes: you can keep your computers here. Tech staff will be remaining in the room throughout the lunch session.

For lunch, you have a deli, which is opened on the fourth floor here, next to the business center, where you can get some takeaway food. And also, if you just want to go down into the marketplace, there are many food options down there, which I'm sure you've all seen.

And also, the Fairmont and Swissôtel are offering 20% discount on all food and beverages at the main restaurants and bars if you show your badge. Even if you go to the Fairmont and you're not residing at the Fairmont, it doesn't matter. You're an ICANN participant. What I'm going to do is I'm going to send the list around. As one of the places, for instance, the Antidote only applies a 20% discount for the drinks and



not on the food. And just added, ask for confirmation, Equinox is offering the 20% as well.

And we will reconvene here at – what time? – 2:30 p.m., 14:30.

Oh, sorry, last but not least, the gala tickets. You need to go and pick up the gala tickets from the Newcomers Lounge and have this stamped. This will just be a backup, should you forget your gala tickets. So if you can all just go via the Newcomers Lounge as soon as possible. Unfortunately, we're not able to go and pick them up for everyone.

Thank you, and bon appétit.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella. Just one more thing: please be back here at 2:30. We have a very, very packed afternoon. We're starting with ICANN Compliance with Maguy Serad, and we've got a lot of questions and a lot of things for the whole afternoon. So if we start late, we won't have enough time and we'll run out of time later on.

Thanks, everyone. Thanks for having survived, and reconvene very soon.

[BREAK]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, ladies and gentlemen, we'll start in one minute.



Okay, let's have the recording on, please. Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome back from your short lunch. We appreciate you managed to come back in time, which is great.

We have Maguy Serad, who is Senior – no, no Vice President of Contractual Compliance.

MAGUY SERAD: Senior member.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Senior member, as well. And Owen Smigelski?

MAGUY SERAD: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Who is working with her in the Compliance department. We have a statement, I think, that the ALAC has drafted and sent to you, Maguy, in the past few weeks, and I think that might be the core topic for today. I'm not sure whether you have anything to put on the table yourself, whether there's anything you wish to provide.

So maybe shall we start with the presentation and then go with the topic?

MAGUY SERAD: Yeah, I'm not even ten minutes [inaudible].



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Let's start with the presentation.

MAGUY SERAD: Who's conducting this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ariel Liang, who is not here – Gisella will be running the presentation.

MAGUY SERAD: Gisella, you might want to put the PPT because – or is this a PDF? It's not showing properly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maguy, you have the floor.

MAGUY SERAD: Okay, good afternoon everyone. With me in the audience is Owen Smigelski, but also I'd like to introduce our new team members. I also have Roger Lim. Roger, if you'd raise your hand, please. Roger is our Singapore staff. Compliance is officially global now – the three hubs. We also have Sumi Lee and Yungsheng Wang in the back. So next slide, please, Gisella.

We have a brief update to you. And encourage you please to join us Wednesday morning session for more detailed data and updates on many areas from the 2013 RAA and the registry agreement. Next slide, please.



So global presence in Singapore, we have established. We are in the process of continuing the growth of the Singapore office. The bulk WHOIS inaccuracy submission, we had started at the 100 submission per user per week, but over a month or so ago, if not more, it was increased to 300 submissions per user per week. Compliance has completed all the requirements for the 2013 RAA and New Registry Agreement readiness. That includes web forms, Learn More, templates, training – all the required material for us to be ready to manage, oversee and enforce the contracts.

The year two audit program, we will be reporting on that in London at ICANN 50 with all the results, but if you're following our monthly updates, you will see our progress and where we are in those phases. There is also a big effort launched with the New Registry Agreement audit plan and detailing. It's in progress and we will be sharing the plans at ICANN 50.

For your reference, we will not review these, but the last bullet is a follow-up I had committed to the ALAC team members. You were interested in learning more about the closure codes? I've provided slides for you at the end for your reference. Please, if you have any questions, let us know. Next, please.

I'm going to share this with you, because this really touches the whole ICANN world. The line in red – since we launched the 2013 RAA and the New Registry Agreement, we have been preparing and building what we call Learn More. I had shared that with you last year. Look at the volume. Since we stopped building and putting all these FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) or also referred to as Learn Mores, our



volume on the webpage views went up to 25,000. People are going. They're learning. They're reading. And interestingly enough, we are getting questions through compliance@ICANN.org for clarification or our reviews. The bottom part is just some web views about the metrics we have online. Next, please.

We provided this for your reference later. We're not going to talk to each topic, but what I'm going to do is turn it over to Owen. We highlighted the topics that are of concern to this community, which represents the public interest, and we wanted to provide you a brief update how is the contract helping the public interest in this aspect in those three areas that we've had dialogue about in this forum.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

Thank you, Maguy. Thank you. I'm just going to jump on. You can see there's the other complaint types there. If you have any other questions, you can either follow-up with us later or at our Wednesday session. But we want to focus on more the ones that might have impact for ALAC.

One we want to highlight is the abuse reports, which are, there are two types of it under Section 3.18. There is law enforcement, which is one that got a lot of press, which is the, "Registrar must respond within 24 hours, 7 days a week, 365 days a year to well-founded reports from law enforcement." But they also must – that first bullet point – respond to any types of abuse reports, including illegal activity from the public at large, and that they must investigate and respond appropriately, that the information must be abuse information. There must be an e-mail address on their website, as well as in the WHOIS output now, for every



domain name that they have registered. That's for all gTLDs sponsored by the registrar.

In addition, registrars must take action on these abuse reports, and they can't state that there has to be some sort of court order requiring them to take action on this. Compliance has seen a number of reports that have come in about either the registrar is not responding to complaints from the public, or demonstrating that they have – oh, sorry. Apologies for speaking too quickly there, but we have seen reports come in of either registrars not taking action or registrars delaying and then taking action once ICANN did follow-up, and these have been for malicious websites, spamming, illegal pharmaceuticals, and the registrars are responding to those ICANN inquiries. Next slide, please.

There is, in the 2013 RAA, a temporary specification on privacy and proxy registrations. This is until the Privacy Proxy Accreditation Working Group comes up with new terms, which is ongoing and Compliance has been engaged. Compliance is seeing some increased difficulties with some registrars in terms of what these definitions are. What exactly is a privacy service and what is a proxy service? You can see those definitions up there, and then registrars have been taking action to make modifications to their systems to make sure that they are compliant. Then also even, if there is privacy/proxy information in the WHOIS output, it must be verified and validated as required by the 2013 RAA. Next slide, please.

The 2013 RAA also has had some impact on existing complaints or matters that Compliance has already been involved with, such as registrar contact information. In addition to what was previously



required – address, e-mail address – now they have to provide additional information such as officer information, contact information, actual addresses where the registrar can be reached, if it's a postal address, and some other things in there.

Another one that has been quite a big change has been the WHOIS verification and validation requirements. That occurs for new domains that are registered with the registrar. The WHOIS Accuracy Program specification is the part of the 2013 RAA that covered this. That went into effect on January 1st, so any domain newly registered after January 1st of this year has to go through this verification and validation process. As you can see, they have to verify the e-mail address, or if there is an account holder, that also must be verified. Domain names must be suspended after 15 days for either provisional false information or failure to respond to WHOIS inaccuracy complaints.

Registrars must also actually validate that the information provided in the fields – name, e-mail, address, telephone number – match requirements for being an actual, say, valid telephone number.

What is one thing that is still pending is the cross-field validation, which is another separate working group is on that, and you may have seen there was a PDP that went out probably in the last few weeks for that. What that will do is be a method for determining if there's a street listed that it matches with the city and the postal code. That's not yet a requirement.

We are seeing that there has been some difficulties with registrars conforming to all of these requirements, and Compliance has been working with them to detail what is required, what we are expecting,



and in all these cases, getting the documentation to show that the required verification and validation and sometimes re-validation and re-verification are indeed being performed.

There's some changes in the data retention, which you probably have seen some of the things are ongoing with that, and the requirements for what they do for the registrant benefits and responsibilities has also changed. Next slide, please.

As I mentioned, we had some difficulties with the WHOIS inaccuracy under the 2013 RAA, and what this shows is the steps that are now required. We're calling it two concurrent parallel tracks that registrars must do, and this is what Compliance is requiring the registrars to demonstrate for every WHOIS inaccuracy complaint under the 2013 RAA.

At the top, you see the registrar receives a WHOIS inaccuracy complaint. They must verify the e-mail and investigate the complaint. The e-mail must be verified, even if the complaint is not about the e-mail address. So if there is now a WHOIS inaccuracy complaint about a postal mail address, they must also verify the e-mail address, even if it had been verified two months previously. It's a requirement under the contract now. And that's not just sending an e-mail that isn't returned. There must be an affirmative response from the other end of that e-mail, whether it's clicking a link or responding with a certain code, or calling a telephone number, but the registrant must have an affirmative response. Otherwise, that domain must be suspended.

Concurrent to that, you see the three options that a registrar must do, and now the contract clearly states they must take reasonable steps to investigate, and reasonable steps to correct.

The three options allowed by the 2013 RAA are that the WHOIS has been updated and if it has been updated, there must be documentation and validation of those updates. It must be suspended within 15 days. It can also be deleted at the registrar's discretion. Then if it was verified correct, the registrar must provide documentation of that and that those fields were indeed validated as well, too. Next slide.

MAGUY SERAD:

So we've left this slide in here to give the audience an idea what are the different areas for the registry agreement. We will be talking to some more of this in our Wednesday session. Next slide, please.

Now it gets us to the topic that we started with, Olivier, and I'm not sure who's facilitating this, but at this point, based on this statement received from ALAC, ICANN is requesting clarification to the issue. It is not clear what is the issue at-hand that we're trying to address, what is expected outcome, and how would that benefit the public interest? So I would like to turn this over to you, Olivier, or I think I heard you said Alan – whoever's facilitating this session – to bring more clarity to this topic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Maguy. I'll turn it over to Alan Greenberg. I note that Evan Leibovitch has put his card up, and Garth Bruen also has. But



Alan, if you could take us through this since you held the pen on this statement, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I'm assuming that they don't want to ask – do they want to ask questions about the presentation or just stay in queue at this point? My preference is to go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's the last slide, so that's a good bridge now to the issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If I could have my presentation on, but stay on the title page, please?

Alright. The history of this is we were talking – and you've been part of some of these discussions – and at this point, the bulk submission was 100. I know it's been raised to 300. After thinking it through, I basically came to the conclusion that raising that number to something reasonably high is a lose-lose game.

If someone were to submit 10,000 requests to you in a week, it's going to backlog you horrendously. Quality of the work will probably go down. You'll stop responding to the individual other ones that will come in or you'll slow down the 10,000 such that it will take you 2 years to go through them. It doesn't seem to be a win-win situation.

Moreover, if someone is going to submit that many, they probably had some algorithm, some methodology to putting them together – they're



not random – and for you to handle them one by one seems to be a waste of time.

So that was the rationale for saying, “If there are indeed related issues, give us a method to put to submit them to you.” We were not asking for a huge program to be put in place, just for you to be receptive.

In parallel with making that recommendation, we also, because of some frustration on some people’s parts about simply making even single requests, we put a test complaint in under my name on behalf of the ALAC. You may or may not have noticed it. And if we could go to the first slide, please.

Okay, the domain we put a complaint in was called RapeTube. It happens to be a particularly offensive site. But ICANN doesn’t monitor content, and that’s not our job. The complaint was made on the grounds that the contact information was invalid. It was invalid on several grounds. The mailing address – physical address – is an address that doesn’t exist. It is not even of a form that would exist in that city. The postal code is not a valid postal code.

The e-mail address is nominally through a privacy service. The address is contact@privacy-protect.cn – that is a domain that doesn’t exist. It’s not in the root zone. There’s no A record. There’s no MX record. No e-mail can work, so it’s broken.

We put the process through and your machinery ground away and eventually we got an answer back saying the registrar had responded. We checked and indeed the domain had been put on client hold, which essentially takes it out of the root zone. Didn’t change any of the



contact information, but the domain was unusable. I guess as an editorial comment, I'll say, "I hope he didn't put too much time into it." Next slide, please.

Because if you look at it today, as of – what is the date? I think as of the 12th of March, I'm not sure of the date – client hold is gone. The domain is now serviceable again. Still has bad contact information. I guess to be blunt, they don't really give a damn. They satisfied you. They put it on hold for the couple of days you looked at it, and it's back again. So the process is broken. Now, let's go to the next slide.

contact@privacyprotect-cn is currently used – this is according to one of the domain name services – by 1,175 other domains, most of them gTLDs. I suspect the rest of them .cns, but I don't know.

That's the kind of problem we're talking about. This is the poster child. We want to be able to say, "There are over 1,000 domains using this invalid address." Some of them use the same mailing address as the one we specified. Many of them, in fact, don't use that address. They use a real address in that city. It's a restaurant. The restaurant claims they know nothing about a privacy service, but I didn't visit the restaurant. But the e-mail address is still wrong.

There's no point, in my mind, in anyone submitting 1,100 individual complaints to you, each of which might be responded to, and then the client hold will be taken off the day after. It's a fool's game. It wastes our time. It wastes your time, and it doesn't protect the users, which is what we're trying to do. So that was the source. That class of problem is not unique. Next slide, please.



Again, we weren't asking for a huge program to be built and for you to spend a year. We're saying, "Be receptive." Put a web form up. Simply say, "Here's an e-mail address, if you have these." Only tell your friends about it if necessary, but give the people who care about these kinds of things a way of reporting the problems.

It's a win-win situation. The submitter doesn't waste time. You don't waste time discovering the pattern. It's presented to you as a fait accompli, and ultimately, we're fixing the Internet. That's what we're supposed to be doing.

You're not here to have good statistics. You're here to make sure the RAA is adhered to, and that's the target. ICANN is close to deploying their own process for verifying e-mail addresses and verifying contact information – I'm sorry. Their planned methodology says if they start noticing a lot of hits on a single registrar, they're going to hit that registrar again and really look at it in depth. So they're going to be generating the exact kind of complaint that we're talking about, and you're going to have to gear up to respond to them. Why not allow other people who are in a position to feed you good information to do the same thing? That's the whole rationale.

The timing was marvelous in that we – I presume you know all about the whole EnCirca situation, where a registrar was put out of business – a registrar, by the way, we know you had been warned about before, about having bad contact information and illegal pharmaceuticals. EnCirca, in their wisdom, did something they're not required to do. They're required to act if someone tells them – sorry – they're required to act if someone tells them about a problem. They went and



investigated themselves, decided that the contact information looked fake, found out that most of the sites in fact were related to illicit pharmaceuticals, and simply disabled them.

It should never have gotten to that stage. Compliance has to get a process not just where you're making good statistics, but where you're really addressing the problem that is plaguing the Internet. We're really trying to help you want it. I think we need to move forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, and thank you for this clarification. Does this help you? In the meantime, Evan Leibovitch.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Alan, thank you for the comments and the feedback. We do have some of the concerns with putting up a different form for everything. At some point, there's a form for too many things and people won't be able to do that. For something like this, that may not be something that happens every day – it might happen once a month or something – you can always e-mail compliance@ICANN.org and provide details and facts about those.

We do work with a number of groups that have contacted us. In particular, there's one involved with online pharma enforcement who has reached out and inquired, "What does the new 2013 RAA require? What types of reports can be provided to registrars? What would suffice? How long would Compliance have to wait?" and then what the next steps are. So we certainly have worked with them outside of those normal complaint forms to address those types of issues that they



identified and are able to then take some actions and work with them to get those reports resolved.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's good, and thank you. It is important, at the same time, to make sure these enter into your tracking system and get reported on.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Yes.

MAGUY SERAD: I think the short answer, Alan –

ALAN GREENBERG: And certainly we're asking for a form on the web.

MAGUY SERAD: Right. So the short answer: there is a way to report. And to your point – thank you for clarifying, first of all, and if we can have access to that presentation, that would be helpful, and if we have further questions, will you be the contact to obtain clarity on it?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm as good a contact as you can wish right now.

MAGUY SERAD: That's a good wish, Alan.



ALAN GREENBERG: By the way, it would be nice to have a response back on that first issue of the flip-flopping client hold. It puts the whole thing – it makes the whole thing a sham. It really does.

MAGUY SERAD: Okay, so if we make on this topic for the ALAC statement, the issue at hand, I think based on this presentation, if we can have that, it's clear what you are trying to address is more of a generic approach to addressing complaints. But if have certain examples in existence today, that will be helpful. Send us an e-mail at compliance@ICANN.org to kind of just put some framework on it, and we can work with the community and with yourselves on addressing those issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will follow up on that with help of some of my friends.

MAGUY SERAD: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: But let's make it clear, the examples we use today are not necessarily the issue. We need to be able to have an ongoing dialogue, and that's the kind of thing that was not clear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan.



MAGUY SERAD: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's go through our queue. We've got Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. We had the advantage of Owen and myself being able to talk on the plane yesterday, and I wanted to go back to one word in what Alan said that I think is at the heart of this, and the word is "pattern."

Rather than complaining about a specific domain, the ability to complain about a pattern of abuse, almost as if you could submit a form that had wild cards in it. And so this is going to be a challenge of figuring out the right way to do it, and figuring out that people that are submitting have to know what they're doing before coming in.

But this is a process that can be worked through, and so I think at the end of the day, the clarification you're asking for I think comes down to what Alan was saying about we're looking for ways that somebody can submit a pattern of abuse. That pattern may apply to one domain, it could apply to 1,000, but if you could say, "We have this many domains. They all point to the same bad address. We have this number of domains. They all exhibit this common bad character," and it makes it easier on you, because then you're not tracking the domains one by one. You're establishing the pattern. So if we can agree on it – first of all, that does that answer the question of clarification?



MAGUY SERAD: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. So moving on from then, perhaps the suggestion is, “How can we work together to make something that works for you?” I’m not talking about what frequency of submission. I’m not talking about how many different forms, but figuring out a way that we now can track this down and saying, “Here’s how you complain about a domain. Here’s how you make a complaint about 300 discrete domains and that doesn’t change.” But also, I think what’s going to be most valuable is, “How do we track down this pattern of abuse?” Where you can basically say, “We found a whole bunch of things, and there may be even more than we found, but the one thing they have in common is a certain pattern that we’ve been able to identify that can be tracked back to abusive behavior.”

MAGUY SERAD: The answer, Evan, is similar to what I have shared just now with Alan. Please send us [whoever] has knowledge as a pattern of the issues, because it’s going to be of a different nature. It depends where it’s coming from. If you would send it to compliance@ICANN.org, you have our commitment of the review, follow-up and follow-through. Follow-up and follow-through may require clarification from the submitter so that we know we’re looking at it from the right perspective, and then we will commit to following up, following through and responding to it.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maguy. I think the real concern here is when we say “pattern of abuse” is effectively the serial offenders – the one that are often backed by organized crime and other such organizations, and the pattern of cat-and-mouse game that is going back and forth. They have huge resources and they’d probably tire you out. They probably have a lot more people working for them than your department. We have to see this. This is something which has been of grave concern to this community. Garth Bruen is next.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I would like to jump from failed WHOIS enforcement to failed UDRP enforcement. Right now, there is a website in operation that is selling counterfeit industrial-level electronic equipment. This is a grave, grave danger to the public, and we know that there are lots of these operations out there. The only difference in this one is that in October, ICANN Compliance received a notice from the National Arbitration Forum about this particular site, and that the registrar had failed in the UDRP process to either transfer the domain or even respond to the process. This website is still active and up and running.

This is very, very similar to the situation that Alan referred to with EnCirca, and the registrar that received a bunch of their fake pharmaceutical domains from, which also had unenforced UDRPs against it going back to 2011.

So I guess my question to you is, when you get these notices from the arbitration forums, what do you do with them?



OWEN SMIGELSKI: Some of those complaints that you're referring to happened before there was the consolidated tool, and there were some communication difficulties which we acknowledge.

Since we've been aware of these concerns and we moved to the new tool, we also have reached out to the UDRP providers and requested that they actually do submit complaints into our system for that for the verification. That is something that Compliance has breached and ultimately terminated a registrar for, for failing to respond to UDRP requests. That is something that goes on. We do take inquiries from providers and request the verification.

With regards to non-implementation, I'm not aware of any time that there's been a non-implementation complaint received by ICANN and that we haven't gone through the process and either determined whether it was one that should or should not have been implemented. I can't speak about one just in theory without knowing exactly what the specific facts are.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I can show you ten examples and I've forwarded them to the Chair. The Chair has the entire report. I just want to clarify what you said. So all of the arbitration enforcement requests that you've received prior to this year went into a black hole, that's what you're saying?

OWEN SMIGLESKI: No, that's not. What I was saying is that there had been some problems, globally, in Compliance with issues and communications difficulties. You say speak to a bunch of examples, which I don't want to address



individually without knowing what the specific details are, but there was a registrar – I don't remember the exact date, it was within the last year or so – that was terminated for not responding to UDRP verification requests.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Owen. We have a question for a participant who's behind Maureen. I'm afraid I don't know his name. Could you please introduce yourself?

ETUATE COCKER: Hello, my name is Etuate, I'm a fellow. My question is, with regards to the same issue that he raised, what happens to the ccTLDs that ICANN does not have the control of of the registration of domains? They can do whatever they want to do, really? You don't have control of it. Is there a specific attempt by ICANN to resolve the issue?

My other question is, with regards to the way the registration of the top-level domains are done, is there a specific mechanism that, once the user has registered a domain, the domain of that specific e-mail address should be looked up by the system to see if it is valid? If there is an A record, an MX record that is related to the domain? And then finally, once they submit it, it goes through the system. That way, there is no such thing as user looking up the A records and there is nothing pointing there.

OWEN SMIGELSKI:

With regards to the ccTLDs, that's outside of ICANN's mandate, so there is nothing we can do for that. We are contractual Compliance and it's the contracts that are signed with the registrar's registries that contracted parties.

If we do receive a complaint regarding a ccTLD, our closure to the reporter does give them a list to IANA of all the ccTLD delegations where there's further information for them to do. We just don't ignore a complaint that we can't address. If it's something about spam or website content, we will say, "Go to this trade organization or law enforcement," as it would be, so we do kind of point them in the direction that they could go to address that.

With regards to verification of an e-mail address, this was something that was brought up during the 2013 RAA negotiations. I know some wanted it to be verified before the domain could go into the root. Some wanted it to be after it went into the root. And in a compromise, it was that the e-mail address must be verified within 15 calendar days of the registration of the domain name, and there must be an affirmative response from the registrant at the other end of that e-mail address.

So it can't just be, "Oh, the e-mail didn't bounce," or whatever, so you don't have to look up A records, MX records, anything like that. It is send e-mail, does the person respond in some manner? That's what is going now on under the 2013 RAA for all new domain registrations, inbound transfers of domain names of existing ones, renewals, as well as anything further that receives a WHOIS inaccuracy complaint.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Owen. And now we have – well it says Leon Sanchez on the card, but I think it's Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is Alan Greenberg. My card fell on the floor. Thank you, Leon. A couple things just in response to that gentleman. Although ICANN Compliance has no responsibility for ccTLDs, many ccTLDs treat this very seriously and do respond to problems like this, so it's not as if this is necessarily a black hole.

I just want to add one comment, and it's important. We're not naïve. If the registrar that we were talking about earlier were to put a valid e-mail address in and a valid street address with a valid postal zone in this little town in France, we would have no longer any complaint. They may have a problem with law enforcement and UDRP and things, because they now have someone that's reachable. That's not my problem. We know that will not necessarily fix the ills of the internet, but we have to make a start somewhere. So don't believe that we're naïve that fixing an e-mail address fixes the problems, but as long as we're ignoring things like that, we don't have a chance of making any gains.

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

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. To fully agreeing with what Alan's saying, mission creep is always an issue here. We do what you can here without dealing with content.



I want to change the subject slightly to the issue of public interest commitments. This is something that, I don't know if you're aware, but just recently there was a public comment period that was announced of an ALAC initiative public comment process that essentially asserts from research that we've done from our own analysis of the PICs that they're useless.

And so I want to get your perspective on this, because when we started looking at this, it seemed, number one, it's a very, very difficult process. Having resolution providers in an adversarial process where somebody has to demonstrate that they're impacted and then go and deal with it, that was one problem.

But even so, it seemed on our analysis of things that there are very few remedies, even if somebody should win. Essentially, if a TLD doesn't comply with their own PIC, are there any remedies short of shutting them down? If somebody is saying something that the TLD done has abrogated their own voluntary PIC, what are the options that are open, short of an off-on switch for the TLD itself?

And so if you could make any comments about the role of Compliance with the PICs, and if there's a problem with their evaluation, we need to know about it. But so far it is seen to be that the entire regime of the PICs right now is on a really, really shaky foundation. Thanks.

MAGUY SERAD:

I'll address the latter part, and then hopefully through our dialogue – and I've asked Sumi to join me.



So the role of Compliance in the PIC is two-fold. First of all, we have not received any PIC complaints. Does that mean we're not looking for them? That's part of that approach we have also. We refer to it as preventive, but in reality – and Alan made the comment – “What are you preventing?” It's more of a monitoring.

So for Compliance, if and when a report, if we start with that aspect, if a report is received, the process goes through the first 30 days between the registry operator and the reporter to resolve it. Then it comes to Compliance. We expect that.

In absence of any action taken, we can always enforce the process for non-response. But at the end of the 30 days, we would follow up and follow through on what was the resolution. If it's resolved, it's documented and closed. If it's not resolved, then based on the complexity and the scope of it and the breadth of it, we may make a decision to go to the standing panel or for us to internally take it on and review it.

What we're working towards now, Evan, is how can we proactively take actions instead of waiting on a report to happen? So in this, we work by trimesters based on the ICANN meeting. So in this upcoming trimester – it started last trimester, also – our risk and audit manager has been focusing on the PICs specifically and looking at what kind of risks arise and how can we put the audit plan to work on that? We're going to do some sampling and work in T3 in the process of building the bigger New Registry Agreement audit plan.

So with that, I'm going to turn it a little bit to Sumi [inaudible].



SUMI LEE: Sure. Hi. So continuing what Maguy just mentioned, the registry and the reporter, they have 30 days to resolve the dispute. And if they can't settle it, then ICANN will be referred with the case and we will investigate, or it will go the standing panel, like we said.

The standing panel has 15 days to return a decision to ICANN. As Maguy mentioned, following our process, if the reporter prevails, ICANN will send a notice of breach to the registry operator and follow through with our process. They would have 30 days to cure. And if they don't cure, then we proceed with the breach and further Compliance action after that. I don't know if there were any questions.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Does that go as far as shutting down the registry?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Microphones, please, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. I was just asking, what is the logical conclusion of going down this path?

SUMI LEE: Yes, that would be the logical conclusion, that if they are unable to cure or remediate, if they propose a remediation plan, Compliance would look at that. But if they're unable to do those things, yes, that would be the logical path, that we would terminate the registry agreement.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sumi. On the subject of PICs, the ALAC is going to bring this up to the board because there seems to be some confusion with regards to what PICs we're speaking out.

Informal conversation with some board members has shown that the PICs which are to be enforced are those that are part of the registry agreement that was signed between ICANN and the registry.

Which is not necessarily and in fact is not the so-called voluntary PICs that the applicants have submitted, which some of us have noted in our public comment period on the policy advisory boards as having lines which say, "If, after a year, for all sorts of business reasons we think the PICs shouldn't be valid anymore, then we reserve the right to cancel them all together."

Clearly a bit of confusion in there, and we will obtain some more clarity from the Board about this, because there's PIC and PIC and we need to know which is what. Last few words, Maguy Serad?

SUMI LEE: If I may clarify, Olivier, were you stating or making a comment that the voluntary PICs and the mandatory base agreement PICs, that they're both not being enforced or...? If you could clarify that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was making the comment that there's some confusion as to why would there be a voluntary PIC that is apparently not part of the contract while there is a mandatory PIC that is part of the contract, and the two seem



to be totally unrelated to each other. It looks, if there is no contract related to the voluntary PICs, it looks as though the voluntary PICs are just smoke.

SUMI LEE: If I may address that, yes, actually the voluntary PICs and the mandatory PICs are both enforceable and Compliance will take action and look at – yes, they are within scope.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Thank you for putting this to the record. I think we shall be taking this up with the Board, then, because the content of some of those voluntary PICs actually says, “We reserve the right to not observe any of these commitments.” It’s one of these things. But that’s not for you to reply. I think that’s probably for the Board to deal with.

I got quite a few cards that came up. I think Alan was first, then we’ve got Holly and we’re really over time, as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, fine. Alan, and Holly, and then we’ll let you go. Oh, and Carlton as well, Carlton, as well, you’ll be number three. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think there’s a number of questions here. Part of it is we have been told, and we won’t bother mentioning who told us, that although the mandatory PICs are part of the contract, the voluntary PICs are not, and therefore they’re a complete sham.



SUMI LEE: If I may, I'm not sure if it's a semantics issue. The mandatory ones are within the contract in terms of the basic agreement. The voluntary ones are contained in the specification, so perhaps that, if you dice it with words, in that sense it's not part of the base agreement.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, the message we got was that they were not incorporated into each individual contract. That may well be wrong and this is a red herring and that's fine. It can be fixed.

However, that's not why I raised my point. The original one – I'll be very quick, Olivier – every time we've mentioned, in a formal venue, the PICs, our answer is the DRP. I have mentioned to Maguy this before, and she gave me a similar answer to what we have here, that is Compliance will respond to complaints that PICs aren't being honored. Can we please get that documented formally so we don't have to have this debate again in London?

MAGUY SERAD: So if it's not any formal than what already is on the ICANN.org website, there is a form where a reporter can go and file a report, and it begins with Compliance.

ALAN GREENBERG: It would be nice if somewhere it says, "ICANN Compliance will follow up on such complaints," not just the presence of a form.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Holly, and then Carlton, and by the way, you're stopping us from having coffee, so it has to be quick. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm just pointing out that we've asked you the question about the enforceability of the voluntary ones before, and your answer was, "They're not enforceable." So if you're saying differently now, I'm just a little bit puzzled.

SUMI LEE: I apologize, but if you could give me a little bit of background [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: The background was simply when we were talking about the fact that these were statements that people were asked to contribute that were not a part of the contract, and then we had a discussion about whether they were enforceable or not, and we came away with a very distinct impression that they were not enforceable, as opposed to what's in the contract.

So we have always mentally distinguished between what somebody has volunteered that is not something that they formally committed to as not enforceable, and I know that you think lawyers come with really sort of wonderful ways with words, but that is the outcome.



MAGUY SERAD: So Holly, if I may take it back, let me go look back through our notes because I don't want to claim senior moment here, but let us go back through notes from previous ICANN meetings.

HOLLY RAICHE: I just remember Alan also asking, as well, and I remember listening to the answer that Alan was given.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Final question or comment from Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Olivier. There are a couple of issues. First of all, if you look at ICANN, I'm amazed at how you could have a voluntary submission be seen as a part of the contract and enforceable; where in some of them it clearly says we can change our minds at any time about this.

It's a little bit like, when I first saw it, I thought you're talking up a girl and tell her, "We're going to marry you. We're going to marry you" And then it happens and you say, "By the way, that was just love talk. It's nothing."

But here's the problem. There are two sets – it is alleged that there are two sets of PICs. There's one that is in the interface of the registry contract, and that is alleged to be fully enforceable on the contract law. Then there's another set in the specifications, which is where most of the community and user-related commitments are made, that were not enforceable. That is what we were told.



If you look at them, because in some of them – and I’ve looked at them – some of them have specific clauses that says, “If things get rough on me, I might just walk away from all of this,” and that’s it. Those are the ones that I declared were not worth a warm bucket of spit, because every time if I run into a difficulty, I can simply away, and they were voluntary anyways, so I have the right to change of my mind.

That is where the issue is right now. It seems to me that we’re going round and round in circles, but the real issue is the specifications that are intended for community support or action are voluntary and not enforceable on contract.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. We really are way beyond the allocated time for this session. Alan, we have to finish. One more.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, just a clarification. I think there’s more than a subtle difference between a specification which is enforceable but also allows the registry to change it. We’re confusing the two things. A specification which says, as some of them do, “Two years after the beginning, I can unilaterally delete it all,” still is enforceable. It just may have nothing to enforce two years later. And those are two separate issues, and I don’t think we should converge them on the same thing.

One is whether ICANN should be willing to accept a PIC which says, “I can change it if I don’t like it,” and that’s different from whether it’s enforceable, based on whatever the words are that are there today. I think we got to be careful not to confuse the two.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I think this is something which we will obtain clarity with the Board – hopefully obtain clarity from the Board. This session has really run over time. I would really like to thank very much Maguy and her crew for coming to see us.

One takeaway, which I do remember, is that Garth has sent the issue of Compliance with regards to UDRP and has asked that this be forwarded to you, so I shall be forwarding it over to you, affording you the details over to you.

MAGUY SERAD: May I ask one more takeaway? Could we have Alan's presentation, please? Is that going to be published, or do we have access to it? Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so these are two action items.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would volunteer but for some reason I can't upload that from this room. It doesn't work.

MAGUY SERAD: Okay. Well, thank you very much for your time and contributions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so there are two action items, and I hope staff has taken them. Action item number one, staff has to send the UDRP relating to



Compliance report, which Garth has drafted and forwarded to the ALAC list. Garth, please.

GARTH BRUEN: Yes. And, Olivier, just as a note, there were also the additional complaints concerning the Biz King sites that I've forwarded as well, and that should go to them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so we shall be forwarding both of these. Okay, that's one. And the second one is for staff to forward Alan's presentation to Compliance, as well. Thank you.

Now we're going to go into a five-minute break, five-minute break. I know we've had only one session, but there's hopefully still coffee outside. Grab your coffee and come back in, and we'll have the reports from our working groups.

Okay, we'll start again in one minute. If I could ask someone to go and corral the troops outside, please? Cheryl, before we start, can we move your report to after the meeting with the SSAC, if that's possible? Yeah? Okay, let's do that then.

So the only thing we'll have is first – well, actually, your report. We'll just have the Metrics Working Group, so you can't take a [bio] break. You're having anyway. But Patrik isn't here yet for the SSAC. Let's see what we can do.

Okay, let's have the recording on, please. Okay, thank you. Good afternoon again. This is the ALAC Regional Leadership Working Session,



afternoon session. If I could ask everyone to sit down, please and stop making noise behind my back or I shall start throwing things at people.

We are going to have a little change at the moment. There's a couple things we need to address. Before we meet with the SSAC, the first thing we need to address is the results from the second round of the election, and for this, I hand the floor over to Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. So now everyone has voted and we didn't have one of the candidates with more than 50% of the votes. And more than that, we have the two last ones having the same score, so we have to break this tie before, and then we have to vote between Rinalia and the remaining one from the two candidates. So please, it is already been changed because it wasn't foreseen to be that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Just to be clear, Tijani, the two candidates that are at the moment tied are...?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan Greenberg and Sébastien Bachollet. So what we'll do now, we will do a tie-breaking between Alan and Sébastien. The vote will start as soon as Ariel will be ready, and we close on Monday at 17:50.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Singapore time?



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Singapore time, always. The final vote - I hope it will be the final – the final vote will open on Monday at 18:00 Singapore time, and we close as planned on Wednesday 26th at 14:00. This is the change, and please, Oliver, try to ask people to come in this room tomorrow at 17:50.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. So tomorrow at 17:50 is the end of the tour and alternative naming mechanisms to the DNS, and so we need to have everyone where to hear the results of the tie and then proceed forward with the next level.

I've got several hands up. First, we have Holly Raiche, and then Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a question. Why do we have to be here? Because we've all got computers and we can get e-mails. I just think we'll reach more people that way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Holly. Okay, we'll have an answer to that in a second. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Chair. My question goes also to Tijani, so I'll wait until he's ready.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So Tijani, question number one from Holly Raiche, why do we have to be here face-to-face? Why can't we just receive the results by e-mail?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, it is not necessary, but for those who want to be here to hear live the result, they can come. But the most important thing is that we will start the second vote at 18:00. We can give you the result at 17:50, and we will start the vote 18:00.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Tijani. Next question is from Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. I have two points for the Chair of the ALAC and for Tijani as Chair of the selection committee. My first point is that I had sent an e-mail after I knew I was not anymore on the preselected list saying that since I was no longer a candidate, probably I could vote. But Tijani kindly sent me an extract of the relevant bylaws, by which it is said that a candidate, even when he is no longer a candidate, shall not take part in the electoral process.

So I want to recognize that publically that my question has been properly answered, too, and I thank you. Therefore, I say with great pleasure that Oksana, who has been designated or chosen as my replacement, she shall cast the vote according to her conscience, without any instructions from me, naturally. That was my first point.

My second point is that I'm not completely aware of the degree of transparency which is practiced in ALAC on this vote, as compared with

other votes within ICANN. I say this not as a criticism of the ALAC, but because when I was on the board of ICANN, had made some very strong remarks – written and oral – about the way elections were carried out in the board – for instance, for Chair or vice-Chair of the board of ICANN. So I would like to make sure that the ALAC holds itself to the same high standards as the rest of ICANN.

I would like to know, perhaps not now but when you declare the final results, the winner. I really want to know exactly the number of votes which were given to each candidate at each step. Can you already not give me the answer, but at least assure me that will be the case? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Jean-Jacques, for this question. Yes, you're right. It is not a lack of transparency. It is we're of influence. We try to limit the influence of each step of vote on the next step. Let me tell you what I think, and I said it when we were writing the white paper of this selection.

I don't understand why, for the first round, if one of the candidates has more than 50%, why he is not declared the winner. It's more simple and it's more democratic. But the system is like this, so we have to do it in multiple steps, trying to not influence the next step by the first step. We try not to declare everything, but once the winner is announced, you



will have all the information with the most detail of every step of the election, including the figures.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, and I think that closes this additional item that we've had today. So just as a recap for those people who just stepped back in the room, another round is going to deal with a tie-breaker between Sébastien Bachollet and Alan Greenberg. The round starts today – now – and it will – or shortly – and will end on Monday afternoon at 17:50 Singapore time.

Now we can go back to our regularly scheduled program and I'm glad to have next to me Patrik Fälström, Chair of the SSAC, and Jim Galvin, Vice-Chair of the SSAC, two stars who have visited us before. And we have several questions, and actually first, I think we have a set of slides from you guys? We have a set of slides and we'll just be going through the slides, and then afterwards, opening the floor for questions. Patrik, you have the floor.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much for that. This time, I'm really happy to see that we got quite a long time compared to the other meetings that me and SSAC have had with some other groups, and I would like to specifically thank Julie Hammer, the liaison, for working with both groups to be able to manage to get this, because I think you did actually a lot of the footwork here. So thank you.

To start with, I do so we that we have quite a large number of SSAC members in the room. So can SSAC members stand up or raise their



hands so the rest of you see who they are? Good. Okay, you can sit down now.

So of course, it all sounds like all of us know each other, but also I also [think they] would know that there are newcomers that listen in and they're also in the room. So we'll go through a little bit on SSAC and activity updates. Please, next slide.

So SSAC (the Security and Stability Advisory Committee of ICANN) is producing a number of reports. Two of them – the latest ones we have produced – we're going to give an update to you here, and at the end, we'll open up for question and answers.

But on the other hand, if it is the case that you have questions directly related to the slides that we are showing, I don't mind being interrupted, as long it is something you think actually can be resolved pretty quickly. Otherwise, we'll postpone all the questions until the end, so we have as much time as possible to questions related to the content and other issues. Next slide, please.

SSAC was initiated in 2001 and began operation 2002. It provides guidance not only to ICANN Board, but we also give recommendations to other supporting organizations, advisory committees, and I do know that the ALAC is one of the groups that I have picked up some [of our] recommendations.

Our charter more explicitly is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters related to the security and integrity of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. This is really important to remember



when thinking about within what context [we are] giving our recommendations. Are we okay to...? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's a problem or something. Okay, let's move on.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Should I move on? Is there a question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think it's unrelated to this.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay. It's a little bit disturbing to have unrelated discussions. I don't mind having other discussions, but I think they could move to other corners of the room, at least, so we concentrate around the table to what the interaction between ALAC and SSAC, thank you.

So the members of the Board of SSAC at the moment are 40. They're appointed to ICANN Board for three-year terms. So every year, we are doing a review of one-third of the members. Next slide, please.

The current activities of SSAC includes a membership committee that do the review of the members, both [exist] the third of the members, but also people that apply as members of SSAC.

We have one activity related to the DNSSEC workshop that we have on the Wednesday of every ICANN meeting.

We have one work party on [inaudible] metrics.



We have an initiative on outreach to law enforcement.

We have a workshop at the Internet Governance Forum that is in early September this year.

We have one work party on the public suffix list and issues related to that.

We are in the creation, but it's not yet created, but I would like to tell you anyways, even though it's not listed here because it's not a work party yet. We will discuss that on Tuesday. It's work related to the globalization of the IANA function. Next slide, please.

If we look at our publications by category, if we look at the DNS security-related, you see that we have produced quite a large number of documents related to that. Next slide, please.

If we look at DNS abuse, we have the report 625 that you will hear a little bit more about a little bit later today. We are doing some work on the internationalized domain names, where we did comment on the user experiencing implications and active variant TLDs, where we had quite a lot of comments related to – and this might be interesting for ALAC – we have pretty strong recommendations on what I would say are issues with non-ASCII characters in relationship and variance in relationship with the trademark clearinghouse.

That is something that is worked on at the moment, and we see positive – from our perspective – we see positive movement from people that picked our recommendation, but that work has not concluded yet, which means we cannot say whether all of those issues are resolved yet. If you were to think about asking about it, I could as well answer



immediately. And then we're looking at WHOIS-related issues. Next, please.

So the first document I would like to present to you – I'm doing that myself – is an advisory on DNS search list processing – SSAC 64. So in document #64, we examined how current operating systems and application processes search lists. And I will explain a little bit further on what that means. It looks at and highlights security and stability implications with some behaviors, and it also proposes a straw man on how to improve the search list processing. Next, please.

So the question then, of course, is, "What is search list processing?" In short, one could say that the operating system or application or a combination thereof that is connected to the Internet that do DNS lookups can be configured to have a default domain name or a list of default domain names. When a user then want to use a domain name by typing it in, having it in the configuration file, etc., it's not only that domain name that is typed that is looked up in DNS, but a concatenation of what is typed in and what is configured in the search list.

For example, if it is the case that there is a search list of somedomain.com, somedomain2.com, and the user types "system" in the browser, the operating system will try both system.somedomain1.com, system.somedomain2.com, and "system" in some order. Next slide, please.

The first problem that we looked at is that unfortunately, even though there is an RFC that talks about sort of "recommendation behavior," we do see that there is actually not standardized what the behavior is in the



applications. We found these categories that you see on this screen on how this actually works, everything from “never apply the search list,” to even “append www to,” whatever you type in the browser, which is sort of additional behavior on top of normal traditional search list algorithms. Next slide, please.

The next issue we looked at is, given that we have search list issues, that implies that an application will query for many more domain names than the one that is actually intended or the one that works. And in certain situations, the DNS lookup itself implies leakage of privacy and leakage of other kinds of information, or risks for privacy and query leakage. So we are looking at the various implications and risks involved. For example, when a laptop is moved from corporate to home network, where you might have different behavior and different configuration of search lists. Next slide, please.

On top of that, we are looking at the number of queries for various top-level domains that does not exist to the root servers, and this is a graph that we presented in a version of this draft we presented many years ago, in the document when we pointed out that there are many queries for top-level domains that does not exist. We have updated the data collection and we see here that – it’s impossible to read, of course, what’s on this slide – but let me tell you, to the left, which is by far the most-queried-for top-level non-existing top-level domain is home, and the next one is corp, and the rest are sort of much smaller number of queries. Next slide, please.

If we look at logarithmic y-axis, it looks like this, which means that it’s a little bit easier to look at the data. But we did choose to present both



graphs so people really understand what we're talking about here. Some things are easier to see on a linear y-axis and some of course are easier to see on a logarithmic y-axis. Next slide, please.

So what is really happening is that here's one example of a traditional search path lookup, what happens: an end-user types in or sends to their server a query for dot-dot-dot-dot-corp; the domain name system responds that the dot-dot-dot-dot-corp does not exist. The application then tries dot-dot-dot-dot-corp.corp.example.com, which doesn't exist. It then tries dot-dot-dot-dot-corp.[inaudible]example.com that does not exist. Then it tries a couple of other kind of things until it queries finally dot-dot-dot-dot-corp.example.com, where it gets back a response: [19.220.210].

If you look at this series of queries, which is the result of the user typing in dot-dot-dot-dot-corp, that is a series of queries which relies on the fact that, for example, the first query for dot-dot-dot-dot-corp is given an MX domain, which means this domain name does not exist. This whole algorithm relies on domain names not existing in the global DNS.

So if suddenly, in this example, .corp is actually allocated as a TLD and someone registered the subdomain dot-dot-dot-dot, the first query will actually give back a result. Which means that after step two, the algorithm stops, terminates, and returns whatever the IP address is for dot-dot-dot-dot-corp. Next slide, please.

So to be able to mitigate some of these risks, we come up with a straw man proposal that implies, first of all, that administrators – which includes DHCP server administrators – should configure the search list explicitly and must not use implicit search lists.



We also suggest that unqualified single-label domain names are never queried directly, which also matches an earlier SSAC report that says you should never have A records or other things than MX records, etc., for top-level domains.

The third proposal is that [M]-qualified multi-label domain names should never use search lists. And the reason why we have this straw man proposal – it consists of three parts. One is that there should not be an implicit search list. The second and third, together, means that for each domain name or string that people type in or configure in their applications either are the subject of search lists or not. The problem today that is non-standardized is that it's not really known whether search list processing will take place or not. Next slide, please.

So with this straw man proposal and these findings, we have a couple recommendations which basically encourage the ITF, ICANN, SO and ACs, and DNS operations community to consider the proposed behavior and do whatever is needed to get that deployed, which includes to ask the ICANN staff to work with the DNS community and the ITF to update the current ROCs, which are not clear enough or which could be more clear.

The last thing is that we are re-emphasizing the previous work we have [been] done regarding mitigation of name collision, because this search list processing was of course – and we already mentioned – that this was one of the various different kinds of parameters when talking about name-space collision issues. We mentioned it before, but this report is going into the detail of this specific vector of the sort of attack surface



related to name-space collision. So with that, I would like to hand over to Merike, which is going to describe SSAC 65.

MERIKE KAE0:

Hello there. So we finished SSAC 065, which I am very grateful to the entire group that actually helped me finish this. So as an overview, currently we have a large problem with distributed denial of service attacks, which basically use DNS reflection and amplification to generate large amounts of traffic – I we're talking 300 gigabits or more to a victim.

And so underlying many of these attacks is something called a source address forgery, or spoofing. What happens is that basically, the attacker would generate and transmit you to p-packets that seem to come from the victim's IP addresses, so they're actually forging, i.e., spoofing the victim's IP address.

It uses any type of query response protocol, which is – well, we're going to mainly talk about DNS, but also NTP or SNMP. SNMP is used for e-mail; NTP is used to network time information. And these protocols can be then used to reflect and/or amplify the responses to achieve a track data rates that exceed, in many times that victim's capacity. I mean, if you think about 300 gigabits, that's a lot of traffic, and DNS is especially susceptible, also, to these attacks. Next slide, please. And we have a nice error.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is this an SSAC-generated error?



MERIKE KAEO: It's on a need-to-know basis. But I'll just speak to the document, primarily.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This appears to be a network problem. This appears to be a network problem. Is it working now? Perhaps we should send Patrik out of this room into the network operations room and fix it.

In the meantime, I also have to offer my apologies to Julie Hammer, who is our SSAC liaison and who is actually leading this session. So Julie, I also officially hand the floor over to you.

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Shying away when things go wrong, excellent. I'm jumping off. See you later.

MERIKE KAEO: Alright. Okay, the next slide, it's unfortunate that we can't see it, because it's actually a graphic that kind of show how DNS is abused to have two different kinds of DNS amplification attacks that use forged IP addresses.

So in one of the attacks, you're abusing open recursive DNS servers, and the other one, the abuses of authoritative DNS servers. The primary



point is is that these attacks really happen because people are able to spoof a victim's IP address.

So this is the point that we really want to hit home is that we need to pay attention to the fact that people are allowed and are capable of spoofing IP addresses. So how do we actually figure out how we can actually stop this? There are technical means that people can deploy, which they haven't deployed yet. So again, this is an overview of the document that is available. Here's the next slide, actually.

So if we look at it, overall, we realize that, as we look at the problem, is that really the basic controls for network access and DNS security are not as widely implemented as they could and should be. And this work was also based on SSAC 004 and 008, and as we looked at it, these techniques to actually secure DNS infrastructures are known. We're trying to figure out, what is that people, why is it that people aren't deploying them as widely as they could be?

And if you look at why these attacks are increasing, it's also because you have a higher Internet speed connections, you have a lot of hosting providers, whereas an attacker could potentially have access to thousands of machines to actually generate this traffic. So as the Internet grows, the attack surface is also a lot bigger. Next slide, please.

So with SSAC 065, we basically explore several unresolved critical design and deployment issues, and also make some recommendations to ICANN and the operators of Internet infrastructure, as well as manufacturers, to take specific actions. The next couple of slides will list the six recommendations.



I do want to point out the very first recommendation is a recommendation specifically to ICANN. The other recommendations are more targeted at the multi-stakeholder constituency of ICANN, because it's not necessarily something that ICANN would have control over. But we did feel that, because of the multi-constituency that ICANN has, that we really wanted to comprehensively make recommendations for everyone. So the previous slide, please, where I can actually talk about the first recommendation. Yeah, this one, thank you.

So specifically, the first recommendation for ICANN is that ICANN should help facilitate an Internet-wide community effort to reduce the number of open resolvers and networks that allow network spoofing. And this effort should involve measurement efforts and outreach. Yes, question?

HOLLY RAICHE:

From a completely ignorant point of view, how wide is this problem that you've identified? And given that you first noticed the problem in SSAC 004 and then 008, what is the likelihood of this problem being addressed and how would you address it? Evan, you're next.

MERIKE KAE0:

I will answer this, although I do want to go through at least the other points as well. But the problem, I think, has gotten worse because of the fact that you have so many hosting providers and much larger bandwidth available.

I think people have, absolutely, in many communities, understood that this is a severe problem. There are people trying to measure and test.



There are also people trying to reach out to, specifically, home router vendors, because those are a really huge part of the problem. There's millions of them out there. Let me please continue with the rest of the points, and then...yeah. Thank you.

So in addition, the recommendation that the SSAC is making for basically the multi-stakeholder constituency, which would include the manufacturers and also anybody running any kind of Internet infrastructure, is that all network operators should take immediate steps to prevent network address spoofing.

Number three, recursive DNS server operators should take immediate steps to secure any open recursive DNS resolvers, the unmanaged ones.

Recommendation number four is that authoritative DNS server operators should support efforts to investigate authoritative response rate limiting. So there's efforts to see whether or not rate limiting will actually help solve part of the problem. Next slide, please. Okay. And the diagram that was missing before is on the right hand screen.

Number five, the recommendation is that DNS server operators should put in place operational processes to ensure that their DNS software is regularly updated and communicate with software vendors to keep abreast of the latest developments, because we're finding is that people set it up, their domains resolve, and that's it, that's all they ever do. And they don't realize that some of their infrastructure is creating huge issues from a security-stability point of view.

And then number six is really critical. This is the one where manufacturers or configurators of customer premise equipment – these



are your home routers, your cable modems, your DSL modems – and they should take immediate steps to secure these devices, because they found to be a big part of the problem. One of the problems is also that they're not field-operatable. When the security issues are found, they don't get fixed, unless someone actually purchases a new device. And so we do recommend that people aggressively replace the installed base of non-upgradable devices with upgradeable devices. And so those are the six recommendations that we've made for this particular issue.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi. I have a question based on the recommendations. At the threat of sounding like I want to dumb things down, you are talking to ALAC, and when I think of issues like this, I think of "How do I go home and explain this kind of thing to my family?" When I say, "Oh, I want to go home and tell everybody they need to reduce their open resolvers," they're going to lock me away again.

And so I guess one of the things I'm asking for is, is there a process within SSAC to try and make, shall we say, a more-accessible version of this kind of recommendation, so that for end-users, the kind of people we're talking to – anyone who's using broadband is going to have a router in their house that's going to have, possibly exhibit the kind of problems you're talking about – is there something that we can, say, talk to the ALSes and to the end-user community of what can they do? It sounds like a lot of what you're recommending is directed at the ISP community and at others. But you're here talking to us, so what can we do, specifically, to help implement the kind of things you're asking for?



PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

So I think that's a very good point. One thing that we have done lately is that we have decided that, first of all – well, let me take a step back.

We do know that we have the problem at SSAC that either we are not technically detailed enough, or we are sort of writing things in too much details, depending on the audience.

What we decided to do is that we had two choices. Either that we tried to write reports that are digestible easily for everyone immediately, or we write reports that actually can be used and/or targeted exactly at the audience that we are trying to write the recommendations to.

In this case, we're a little bit unfortunate when we meet you at ALAC that these two reports, both of them, are very highly technical, as you point out, and are directed, as said, to a different audience.

So I think the important message to all of you has to do with regardless of whether you understand what the content is of the documents, what is really important is that the vendors – so for example, when you or your organizations do some kind of procurement processes, you should sort of add this to, this is really important, to remember these things when purchasing equipment and when talking to ISPs, etc.

If it is the case that you understand a little bit of this, the only problem is that you have to sell the idea at home, of course, the argument is you go home and say, "Oh, SSAC told me that I need to buy more toys. Can I please do that?" And then you use that as an argument to spend more money.



To really answer your question, and I intentionally decided to do this last, is to say that we in SSAC, to be able to make whatever we are doing more digestible, we have been working for the last six months with the communications team in ICANN for important recommendations and documents, to be able to produce podcasts and videos and more what could be viewed as – I don't want to use the word sort of "marketing material," because it sounds like we are selling something, but on the other hand, we are selling our own reports. So to some degree, it's the right terminology.

Unfortunately, we are producing these reports now. The first thing we are envisioning doing is between now and May, just explaining to the community and others what SSAC is and what we're doing. Then we're looking at sort of the next round before London to talk about the things that are more technical issues that are related to our reports.

But the whole idea is that, let's say, from September, October, November of 2014, that we are able to do these more easily-digestible descriptions of our reports together with the ICANN communication team. Not for all of the reports, but for some of them. Just like we today already decided to translate some of our reports into other languages than English. So what we are doing is that we are trying to come up with better material.

Now, which one of the reports we are going to do this kind of work with is something that we need input on. For example, translation to other languages is something we got lot of good feedback from GAC, that they wanted it. But, for usability and how to understand the reports, I am



[wishing quite a lot] and hope that we will get quite a lot of help from you and ALAC.

JULIE HAMMER: Alan Greenberg, you have a question?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, you caught me at the wrong time. A follow-on to Evan: it sounds almost if indeed a large part of the problem are home routers and it's a hard sell telling someone to go shell out \$100 or whatever for a replacement if they seem to think it's working. It almost sounds as if we have to make available what I would call "test suites," some sort of program they can download from the ICANN site, a trusted place, to say, "Yes, you are in good shape," "No, you are not in good shape." And something which can end up going into local newspapers – in the computer column or whatever – to catch people's eye, because that's the only place you're...The traditional mechanisms, even if you tell the ISPs, no one looks at what ISPs send you. You almost have to get into the press.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: I have SSAC people behind me, which are jumping up and down, and they are far too nice. They should come and whack me in the head and say they want to answer the question, so come on. Come on, come over here and answer the question.



The recommendations we have is very much targeted at the vendors, of course. But I think to the general community, the general recommendation – they're still not coming up here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] handheld mics.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay, okay, so let me then finish my thought. I think, to the general user, I think the general recommendation is that if it is the case that you get the indication on your operating system by your vendor that there is software to upgrade it, please do. There's a different problem to make the vendors actually fix the code, but when an upgrade exists, it's actually pretty darn good to do that. And I want to pass on to the ones with the microphone.

RICK WESSON: My name is Rick Wesson, and I sit on the Security and Stability Committee. And two points that I think will help clarify some of the issues about home routers versus other kinds of routers.

So there are millions of these devices on the Internet that you know about. We don't actually know the portion that are on home routers versus the portion that are on high-speed networks that are in collocation services. And so we're talking about millions of devices globally, but I can't tell you how many are in the homes.



We know that some of them have the capability of being configured in such a way so that they could amplify DNS attacks. We know that. Now, if there was a research capability that ICANN had, we would certainly task them – or at least, attempt to task them – to answer this question.

Right now, all of this information is developed by individuals that do it just for free. I don't think any of them are on the Security and Stability Committee, but we happen to know them. And they're just members of the community that go out and do this research to try and help make the Internet a better place.

So we don't have those answers yet, but it would be great if we had the capability to task someone within ICANN to help answer these questions.

MERIKE KAE0:

Merike Kaeo, also a member of SSAC. So I do want to iterate, actually, what Patrik just said, because this problem actually impacts the entire community of the Internet. And so as far as what the home user really needs to be aware of is the fact that if there's an upgrade available, please upgrade.

There's much bigger and important things that ISPs and those that can have leverage in terms of what equipment you buy, but that's something I think not for this particular group. But at least from the home constituency, let's encourage them to upgrade when it's possible.

JULIE HAMMER:

Olivier, you have a question?



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Julie. Two things. First, with regards to the beginners' guides. The ALAC has published some beginners' guide to At-Large, and in fact, there's actually quite a few beginners' guides that were published by ICANN on other matters. Have you been approached by ICANN, or have you approached ICANN, to publish some beginners' guides on some of the more consumer-related SSAC risks that you have found out?

JIM GALVIN: I'll just comment that no, SSAC has not been approached to do that, but it is true that the security team at ICANN does do some of that and they do produce some documents. And in fact, they participate a great deal in educational opportunities and workshops in various parts of the world. So are you looking at examples of them there, or...?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We're looking at examples of pretty-colored purple policy advice in the At-Large Advisory Committee, and Beginners' Guide to At-Large Strategy. These are things which were done actually by ICANN staff, with work from the community and with input from the community. And it might worth you getting help, as well, on this.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: So the formal answer is no, but on the other hand, as Jim said, once again let me reiterate it, that we are working very closely together with



the security team at ICANN, which is part of [staff], so there is quite a lot of information sharing in between.

JULIE HAMMER: I'll just identify, I have Yuliya next, then Holly, then Alan, then Evan. Oh, was there someone in the audience? I think they were first, actually. So if we take that question, then Yuliya.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I didn't have my second point I wanted to make.

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, my apologies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You get the stress of being the Chair. I'm enjoying this. The second one was, I seem to remember that there is going to be a set of capacity building online webinars that will take place. One of them will actually be run by you, Madame Chair.

JULIE HAMMER: We're still talking about that. We have a question from the audience.

ETUATE COCKER: My name is Etuate, I am a fellow. My question is, looking at the recursive DNS lookup, what's the difference between that and resolvers that does not look up information with a root that has not been signed



with the DNSSEC? When looking at it, there's no difference, really, unless DNSSEC is even rendered, then we have a legitimate response from the root.

The other thing that I wanted to say is just a comment. Unfortunately for Microsoft Windows, there will be a problem for open-source software. There are existing utilities that enable you to just look up DNS servers that has been DNSSEC-enabled. And I think Unbound can do that as well. So an end-user can just look up a DNS server that is already DNSSEC-enabled.

MERIKE KAE0:

Yeah, so, this problem, DNSSEC will not help with. And partly, it is because the initial query is spoofed. So to everybody else, it looks valid. And the problem is actually that with DNSSEC, it's a really great amplification vector, because you have such a large packet that you get back from the response, because it's DNSSEC-signed.

So the real critical point here is to understand that the thing that is causing and exasperating these issues is the ability to be able to spoof and forge queries. So that is the aspect that we really have to be careful of, and also the fact that we need to be able to close any unmanaged, recursive DNS servers. And most vendors have the capability of either having them fully-opened, and probably by default, many of them are that.

Also, there's another point for ALAC. There's a lot of user guides out there that teach you how to configure an open recursive resolver. And all of the guides usually make it very wide open. So it would be really



great to create user guides that actually show configuration examples, where you close these open recursive DNS servers. Oh, and that's listed in SSAC 04, as my colleague was just telling me.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Merike. Yuliya, please.

YULIYA MORENETS: Thank you so much. I will speak now, not on behalf of EURALO Secretariat, but on behalf of our ALS. Actually, we do work on cybercrime, cyber security.

And [inaudible], thanks so much for very interesting report. We do work from legal perspective. Coming from this or with this background I would say, speaking about the recommendations, I would suggest to have something very short for end-users, like an action points, what to do.

Because if we have the reports in a very comprehensive language, the question is, I'm pretty sure the users we work with, the communities we work with, they will not read these reports. First of all, they don't know where to get these reports. Second, it will be long, and etc. So I would suggest really to have something very short, like action points, for end-users. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Point taken, thank you very much for very good input.



JULIE HAMMER: Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just another comment. I know that, not just because I'm a member of the Internet Society Australian Chapter, but going out to related groups with the kind of simplification guide and asking them to outreach, because I think the suggestion that was made – I'm not sure if it was Alan – but getting into the daily papers, getting into the IT, getting into the sorts of papers that people read every day, will actually get a message out really, really well. The SSAC papers are really, I've got to say, they're very comprehensive and I enjoy reading them, and they're also...Not too many people go to the ICANN website.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Holly. Can I just clarify real quick – Gared, did you want to respond to one of the...? Okay. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just a follow-up on my previous comment. These days, an awful lot of the routers in homes are actually built into the modems the ISP supplies. But for those that aren't, a message from the ISP saying, "Get one of our new modems, it's safer," is going to be looked at with a fair amount of question by many consumers.

I really think that, ultimately, we need to plan a public relations campaign, and that's what it is, which will get to the users directly and



give them some mechanism to understand whether they have a problem or not, and how to fix it. The ISPs are probably not the vector that's going to work in many of the cases.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Both yes and no. I still think that ISPs are pretty important, to get them to wake up, because just like you were saying, many modems are actually distributed by the ISPs.

And I've been working with one ISP, for example, that contacted me because they had distributed about 150,000 modems to their users, and afterwards, a bug was detected and the software was not upgradable over remote. They were in contact with the vendor, and the vendor didn't understand what the problem was, so they asked me to call the vendor and talk to them.

This, of course, was a mistake that the ISP had to learn the hard way. They will not repeat that mistake, not that specific ISP. But there are millions of ISPs, and we don't really have the time to have all of them make the same mistake before.

So anyways, my point is, I think it's really important that we remember that some of these things – for example, the choice of modems – is really a one-sided market where the consumer don't have any choice. And if you have a one-sided market instead of two-sided markets, it is a high responsibility on whoever is actually doing the distribution. So I think the end-users, unfortunately, I must say, they will buy the modem that has the prettiest color, the right size of their choice, or those kind of constraints, and of course, price. And the strongest recommendation,

once again, I think, after listening to my fellow SSAC members, is probably to upgrade the software when there is an announcement that there is software to be upgraded.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for clarity, I wasn't suggesting we ignore the ISPs. They are a crucial vector, but they're probably not the right vector to get to those who own individual modems.

JUILE HAMMER: Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi. I guess I'd like to step back and generalize this a bit. There's an awful lot of, "Do this, do this, do this, and expect this and hope for this," and so on. I'm going to invoke an ICANN obscenity term, which is policy versus implementation. I think it's relevant here.

And what I mean by that is, it's one thing to come up with, "Okay, we've identified the problem at a technical level, and we have some ideas of what might be done." And the recommendations that you've got there are all valid, but they're kind of squishy in that they're not easily translated into specific things to do.

I think there might be a rule for ALAC or people from ALAC to work with SSAC on a specific level – that is, designate specific people in ALAC that don't necessarily get involved in identifying the problems at a technical



level. But then once the SSAC has done that, to perhaps help make some recommendations that will identify some of these things.

It's easy to say, "Okay, upgrade your routers when you can." Well, I consider myself reasonably informed about this, I don't just by the prettiest router, and I never get informed by the manufacturer when they're doing an upgrade. It's sort of if you go to their website, or whatever, they have different ways of doing this. If I have a hard time keeping up with this, I know what people less sophisticated than the folks in this room will be able to do.

I'm simply going to suggest at a higher level, not specifically for this, but perhaps we can make some kind of mechanism to identify some people within the At-Large community, that when SSAC identifies something that has possible publicly-facing solutions, they're publicly facing recommendations, to get these people involved and to help make some of these recommendations specific enough so that they can actually be targeted at this audience. Not just for this, but for others.

Here we are, you're already referencing single-digit SSAC recommendations that now have to be revised and brought out again, because the original ones weren't being looked at. I'm hoping that maybe by doing something like this, we make it a bit more accessible.

We can't do anything to what you say to the ISPs. But when you're doing something that's going to involve something public facing, perhaps there's a rule that we can play, since we, coming from the ALS world, from the public At-Large world, may have a bit of an idea of how to make this kind of thing better, from a public-facing point of view.



JULIE HAMMER:

Jim Galvin.

JIM GALVIN:

Yes, Evan, I want to thank you for that, and let me go back and remember something that Patrik had said early in his presentation, and use that to shape what you were suggesting.

When SSAC writes reports, and it does it to work products, it has a particular audience in mind. And when it does its recommendations, it has to make a choice. In particular, you have the spectrum of, is it directed at a user community, or a technical community? And there's a range in there. In the case of this particular report, it was driven more towards a technical community, and ISPs, and operators, and that sort of thing.

And then as Patrik also stated it at one point, there's a place for what's interesting to you, and what you would like to do with it. And so maybe I'd like to turn this around and turn it into an ask of ALAC. Just as we get advice on what to translate our documents into and make them useful, we made a particular choice in the production of this document, but clearly there's a great deal of interest here in ALAC for this document and maybe more generally, the ask of ALAC is when you see a particular topic that looks interesting to you and you'd like to explore it from your particular perspective and then expand on it, then you should make that ask of us to want to work with us to produce that kind of work and go forward with it.



An alternative, rather than reaching out to us, is, since one of our recommendations, especially in SSAC 65 here, was to direct ICANN staff to create and facilitate an outreach program to make all of this more visible. I think there's also an opportunity for you to desire to work directly with ICANN staff, if they should begin to execute on that recommendation. You should seek to work with them, in order to produce this work in a form which is suitable for your constituency and your users. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Jim. I have a question from Robert Guerra and a final question from Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and then we'll close it off.

ROBERT GUERRA:

Hi. I just maybe wanted to add a couple things to what Jim mentioned and what Merike mentioned at the beginning. I think it's a real multistakeholder issue. Just to say that it's SSAC, it's a variety of different stakeholders that are involved, ISPs and many others.

It's an issue that's been around for a long time. SSAC had an advisory back in 2006, SSAC 008, and others before that mentioned this problem, so it's not something new. But what's happened is that it's gotten into the press a lot more, and users, if they feel anything, they feel their Internet's really slow. With Internet users wanting a faster and faster speed, that may be one way to approach users.

In terms of maybe suggestions, in terms of moving this conversation forward, definitely the education piece that's been mentioned I think



could be of interest. And I think with ALAC having its summit in London in June, having a more in-depth situation that explains A, DDoS generally, and two, the particular advisory and what that means, in terms of what others can do, will be particularly useful.

One can get into the weeds in terms of ISPs, modems, and other things. It's a very complicated issue. A lot of people have been working on this for a long time. And different companies, I think maybe going forward, in terms of best practices, there may be companies or others that may have modems that update themselves. I think that larger conversation isn't here, but we're just flagging it that the scale and the magnitude of this problem has gotten significantly worse over the last couple of months, given some of the attacks. That's why we're flagging it, and we're flagging a ways possible forward. Things that ALAC can do, in terms of adding to that, would be most welcome. Those are my comments. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you. Rinalia, last question.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Question for Patrik, actually. The Root Zone Label Generation Rules Project is ongoing, pertaining to IDNA labels. The Integration Panel has produced a Maximal Starting Repertoire. And I was wondering whether the SSAC would be commenting on that repertoire, or whether you foresee the SSAC commenting on the proposal for Label Generation Rules that would come out from the language community, the generation panels? Thank you.



PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Thank you for the question. SSAC so far has concentrated, regarding the very end product, to look at whether we believe that the process itself, with the Label Generation Rules sort collection mechanism, and then the integration panel, whether that process is stable enough.

Our conclusion is that it is, as long as final conclusions of what is to be applied is a decision taken by the integration panel. What we have already said is that it's the decision by integration panel which is the important part, given how the design is made.

We have not looked into the situation further, and as it is now, we do not see any reason to look at what is actually produced. That can of course be triggered, as with everything else, but the only thing we're looking at is the process itself, and we are continuing to keep our eyes on the process, and that the process itself is followed.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks, Rinalia. And on behalf of the ALAC, I think we've gone a little over time. But can I, on your behalf, thank Patrik and Jim and all the members of the SSAC for an excellent session? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Julie. I've just put my card up to ask myself a question, which doesn't make sense at this time of the day.

The question is actually, do we have an action item from this session? And I think the answer is yes. I have heard this, and may I suggest the



following? If staff could meet, please make a note of this because, yeah, Ariel, you're the only one left standing this afternoon. ALAC to make a request for a beginners' guide from staff regarding the SSAC advisory reports, which will have been identified by the ALAC as directly affecting end-users. Are we okay with that?

Let me say it again, pay attention. ALAC to make a request for a beginners' guide from staff regarding the SSAC advisory reports, which will have been identified by the ALAC as directly affecting end-users.

Holly, and then Evan.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think this is a follow-on action item, which is we should actually start reading them, as some of us have, to actually identify. Because if you read some of them, they're written in plain English, and they're very simple to follow, and some of them are just hints for what registrars should do to protect. And it's not all technical, and it's also valuable. So we have a role in that as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. Ariel, do you have the action item? Okay, thank you, Matt. So, Patrik Fälström.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Before I run away, let me say that I, from SSAC point of view, we would support ALAC in coming up with something which is like that. I, of course, don't go into the wording. Let me recommend that you, when



you can draw this conclusion, that you could actually tag that onto one of the specific recommendations that we just heard Jim pointing out in SSAC 065, we actually do recommend ICANN to do exactly what you were saying, but for this specific report.

So your conclusion, what I read from the consensus of the room, where there is consensus, is that you take that recommendation and you make it more generic – not only for this report, but for all the other reports. And yes, I can say that we are supporting that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Patrik. Evan, you wanted to say something?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Coming out of this, one of the things that I think might be worth considering is resurrecting the Technical Working Group that existed in ALAC once upon a time, perhaps to do this very kind of thing. And maybe it's out of bounds right now, but when I listen to the SSAC talking about us being able to work together with them on making what they'd saying accessible, I think it might be worth resurrecting this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. The action item asks for staff to also work with us, because ICANN has staff dedicated to security and stability, etc. Tijani Ben Jemaa?



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank Olivier. Before we start this session with Steve, I'd like to complete information I gave regarding the selection of the Board director.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Tijani, no, we can't do it. We'll do it after Steve Crocker. There is a part of our afternoon which is reserved for this, so we'll do it afterwards.

And so with this, I now invite Steve Crocker to the table. Welcome, Steve, Chairman of the Board of ICANN. This is not a skillet session, but you've got a lot more people around to ask you questions. First, I'll hand the floor over to you. Steve Crocker.

STEVE CROCKER: I was going to make reference to the skillet session myself, because it feels I'm now Pavlovian-trained. I sit down and I'm geared up and I'm ready for sessions. They're quite enjoyable, actually – a little bit bracing, but quite enjoyable. So now I'm supposed to keep you entertained in a polite way, I guess. More of a Crock-Pot, yes. And unintended as I know that was, I've been saddled with that particular pun all my life.

So it is always my pleasure to be with you guys. I say this each and every time, but I've been enormously impressed over more than the decade I've been involved with ICANN to see the growth, the maturation, the – “penetration” is the word I was going to use, but it doesn't convey exactly the traction that you have all had in affecting the way ICANN works. I see Cheryl down there. It's been really a pleasure to watch.



I put a lot of energy into helping build SSAC, and I was watching Patrik and company and feeling a twinge of both wistfulness and quite a bit of pride, actually, at how well SSAC had come along.

I remember vividly, while I was actively and vigorously working on that, watching ALAC, and it felt like ALAC was moving along even faster, and I took some lessons from some of the organization. So congratulations. You guys are effective, certainly matching the intention and the vision when ALAC was set up, probably far exceeding the expectations of many at the time.

So I understand that there's an election underway, and that you guys are making it as interesting and exciting as you can. We, too, are eager to see what the results are. I'll borrow a line from a conversation I had with Larry Strickling, when we were searching for CEOs and I checked with him to see if he had any guidance or any dangerous signals that I should pay attention to. And he said, quite properly, "We'll work with anybody you send us."

That's obviously an ambiguous statement that could be taken multiple ways. But even though I say it kind of tongue-in-cheek, we're looking forward to whatever the outcome is and we'll try to make it an interesting engagement for whoever shows up.

ATLAS-II is coming, yes? This is a big deal. Not only a big deal for you, but it's going to compete for cycles at the same time as the regular program in London.

Earlier today – I'm trying to remember the exact setting, I remember – we had a briefing to the board on the various things that are going on,



and David Olive's group took us through every one of the components. And when we talked about ALAC, we certainly talked about the At-Large Summit. And since we had the appropriate staff in the room, we said, "Let's pay attention to the fact that there will be competition for time, and let's find a way to anticipate and work that the best we can, and have Board members be available to attend as much, or at least, some portion." So that's visible to us, that's in our consciousness. My expectation is it will be probably Heidi. Right? It's your job to knit that together?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Karim and I have been in touch.

STEVE CROCKER: All right, good. So, we're there. Probably, if there's a capsule summary of the big issues or the big flow that we can educate the Board in advance, before they get to London, that would be worth doing. I'm just thinking. Good.

So in addition to creating meetings and everything, the notes here say you actually got some work done. Sixteen policy advice statements since Buenos Aires? How do we keep track of all that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You have a tool on the Board that you rolled out to keep track of it, apparently.



STEVE CROCKER:

Right on cue. Thank you very much, Olivier. I don't actually know how we're doing. We're in a bit of overload, and I need to circle back around and see. What's your feeling of how we're doing in that process? We all know the history here, from how do we get your attention and you said, "Why don't you put numbers on it and send it in and we'll keep track of it." We've spun that up. But the real proof in the pudding is whether or not any of that is working. What's the view from your end?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Steve. I'm not quite sure if I want to answer this myself, or let community members answer this.

I think that everyone is feeling an overload at the moment, in any case. There is just so much going on, it's understandable that some of it falls between chairs or between the cracks.

It is true that we have sent a number of statements, and we're yet to receive answers on some of them. I know that some of them relate to the new gTLD process, so that's not something that involves the whole Board. With regards to others, they just have to be tracked. If there is a lack of tracking, perhaps we could actually ask At-Large staff to track with Board staff to see if there is anything that still needs to be done at the moment.

I haven't gotten much else to tell you about. We are sending several statements. One of the concerns is when we sent longer statements, we were told by the Board that the statements are too long and need to be summarized. When we send summarized statements, we receive answers from the Board that teach us things that we didn't put – we



receive history lessons. We're a bit concerned because we didn't include the history lesson in our statement due to the fact it would have been a bit too long. We're still a little concerned of the actual format by which we should provide the statements to the board. Perhaps Evan could say a few words? Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Steve, you're going to be hearing a bit from us this week over the public comment period on the PIC stuff that was started by ALAC at the beginning of this week. The substance of the comments on this, I'll leave to our meeting with the Board, but the question that I have of you today has to do with the process of this.

This is something that was started by a handful of people in the business community together with a handful of people in ALAC and eventually got endorsed by ALAC. It was sent to the Board, and I guess it was punted to the new gTLD committee, that essentially looked at it, looked at a request for a public comment process, and then rejected it – or at least, punted it back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Evan, if I can go into details. Actually, it was a staff member replied, rejecting the process.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

That was then followed up by the chair of the new gTLD Program Committee, backing up the staff member on why it was rejected. So, eventually, ALAC initiated the public comment process on its own.



But the question I have, rather than dealing with the substance of the issue, is asking about why something that came up, that was a request simply for a public comment process, that was bottom-up in this way, why would that be rejected? And so that's my question, more on the process, than on the substance of what was included.

STEVE CROCKER:

And so there's no mystery here, I was not aware of any of that. I've only recently joined the new gTLD Program Committee, having removed some tangential conflicts that kept me out of it for a while, so I'm not up to speed on it. Was there any explanation given as to why it was rejected, or just a flat no?

EVEVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Nothing that I recall being satisfactory, though I don't remember the details.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Essentially, it said that the concept had already been considered by the new gTLD committee, and therefore, it was a bit too late. I'm interpreting words, to some extent.



STEVE CROCKER: I was just going to guess that, one way or another, it might have been viewed as already within the scope of what they had considered or dealt with. Anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: The new gTLD committee had considered it, there's no question. But what that letter was that was being asked was not asking for them to consider it, it was asking to be put out for public comment.

STEVE CROCKER: But then the natural question is, to what end? No, seriously, I'll ask you, what is it you had in mind by getting public comment? Where did you want it to go after that?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The answer to that is actually at the end of the current public comment that the ALAC put out, which is essentially open-ended. Once we see the public comment, we'll see what action is subsequent to that.

I don't think there was an intent. The whole point behind putting this out is not having necessarily an intended output, saying, "There's been interest, there's been a concern," specifically that the PIC process as it exists is significantly flawed, to the point of almost uselessness, and saying, "Let's get the comment and not prejudge what the comment is going to be. Let's not prejudge what the result of that is going to be. Let's ask for the comment, and defer judgment on how we're going to act on it until we see what the comment is."



STEVE CROCKER:

Well, it seems to me that you're making a pretty clear statement going in, as you just did now, that you thought that the process was broken and now you're looking for possibly ways to modify it or open it back up, a perfectly reasonable thing to want to do. As I said, I don't have enough information to know what the rest of the thought process is.

Well, one of the things about multi-stakeholderism is that there's plenty of room for contention about everything, from substance, process, and so forth.

I have these notes, I think Heidi prepared this for me. This item says, "Congratulate the ALAC." I didn't think it was time to laugh yet, so you guys must know more about this than I do. Do I have to finish this? "Congratulate the ALAC posting a public comment, the ALAC's third in its history, on the Proposal for the Use of Mandatory Policy Advisory Boards for Regulated Industry Sector and Consumer-Trust-Sensitive New gTLD Strings. I look forward to the community input on this topic." I have to confess, I don't actually understand what this means.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Steve. I'm glad you sympathize with what I receive daily, and have to make sense of, which means that sometimes it comes out in a slightly different way than it was originally intended. But anyway, Heidi, perhaps...? No. I'm sorry. Congratulations!



STEVE CROCKER: I didn't mean to say anything nasty about you, Heidi, but I genuinely didn't understand what this is all about.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's the third one we've ever put out in our history, so it's something that should be perhaps congratulated [inaudible].

STEVE CROCKER: So let me break it into pieces. Posting a public comment – now, this doesn't mean that you've submitted public comments to something else that's been posted, this means initiating your own public comment? Ah. So that was the first thing that I didn't understand. There are several others in here, too.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So what you're being asked to congratulate us on is, essentially, ALAC having initiated a public comment process, having asked the Board for it and been rejected and then doing it ourselves.

STEVE CROCKER: Now, so you know what was going on in my mind, is this something that we, the Board, really wants to encourage you to do more of? But, congratulations, nonetheless.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, let's get back to the script, please. What's the next line?



STEVE CROCKER: You sure you want to know? I'll tell you what it says here: "I wish you a productive, interesting and successful week of meetings." That wasn't what I was going to say. That exhausts the prepared remarks. I still feel twinges here, that I need the skillet version of this. What would you like to talk about that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for the brisk introduction, Steve. Now, we will open the floor for questions. Immediately, I see Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. As always, it's such a pleasure to hear the Chair of the Board speak to us. This time, with notes from ourselves, actually.

But Steve, looking forward, what I see is an unusual moment. In the past we've had crucial moments – the launching of new gTLDs, the end of the previous arrangement with the U.S. government, which was transformed into the affirmation of commitments – various stages in the life of ICANN, which were important. I think that what we are facing now, in sociological terms, is a whole new ballgame.

ICANN sees itself as part of a very complicated system of organizations, all dealing with the Internet in various capacities. And at the center of all this, I think that the necessity of guaranteeing the rights of Internet users is evermore to the point.



So what I would like to say to the Board through you is that, whereas we will continue always being sensitive and attentive to security matters, to the infrastructure, to the various layers of the Internet, I think what I want to point out is how important it is, now more than ever, that you place the Internet user at the center of everything: in terms of user rights, in terms of privacy, in terms of access, in terms of globalization.

So the new CEO – well, he’s no longer that new –but under the guidance of the Board and yourself, Steve, the CEO has gone on that road, wanting to open up an office in Geneva, etc., as part of it.

But I just wanted to underline, once again how important the human element, and therefore, the user perspective, is now of prime importance. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. And I have always treasured the erudition and depth of feeling that you’ve brought to proceedings, particularly the time you were on the Board.

Let me take what you’re saying and dig into it a little bit, because it’s an important theme, and I’ll just get right down to it.

As an organization, there’s no question that we value diversity, we value engagement by people from all over the world. And we also take seriously protection of human rights and other whole lists of rights in every aspect, from the way run as an organization – just our employment and interactions internally – up through decisions that we make about policies and how we administer those.



That said, if you turn this around, and you say, let's say you and I were having a conversation not here and not in this venue, but we're having a polite conversation in some nice place – a Paris bistro. We say, "This business of human rights and the Internet is extremely important and we – you and I – are going to devote our lives to this particular aspect." And the next part of the conversation is, what is the best way that we could do that? Where would we apply our energies?

ICANN couldn't possibly be the optimum place to do that. Plenty of other things to do. I'm not sure what the best one is, but ICANN has such a narrow and restricted mandate at its core that we could certainly screw things up and we certainly make life hard in various ways, and we shouldn't do that. But in terms of addressing the real life issues, we're no more the right venue for addressing human rights on the Internet in its largest thing than we are for addressing poverty or climate change. I'm going overboard a little bit, but not by much.

Fundamental things like access to the network, digital divide and so forth are really outside of our scope in every way. We don't have the resources, we don't have the mandate, we don't have the skill set. And although many of us – and I'll count you and me both – have strong feelings about all that, there's a very, very sharp limit on what we can actually accomplish in the venue, within ICANN, to facilitate it. That's my picture.

So you can take that either as a statement, or as a kind of provocative form of a question. What would you have us do that is a substantive embodiment of the principle that you had just espoused?



JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Steve. If I may, Olivier, just reply briefly? Just among many other possible examples, I'll mention one, which is that ICANN, in its technical capacity, can and should, in fact, orientate service providers, manufacturers, software providers, etc., to a very simple thing in which default settings are automatically in favor of privacy, rather than the other way around.

For instance, although I've been in this business now as a volunteer for years, I'm still surprised that 9 times out of 10 or 99 out of 100, you're required to tick a box, which allows the company, the provider, to have maximum data, rather than the reverse.

When I was on the Board, maybe you remember, I said this on several occasions, that we should really encourage the technical community to reverse the mentality and to make revelation or communication of personal data a conscious act, rather than a default setting. But that's only one example, of course.

The other thing, Steve, if I may, you spoke of human rights. I'm not suggesting that we replace the Red Cross or the Red Crescent. I was speaking about Internet user rights, which is much more restricted, of course. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER: The Internet Engineering Task Force, which is an older and, in many ways, more established than we are – and organized a little less formally with fewer lawyers and more techies – just finished a meeting in London



at the same hotel that we're going to be in for the ICANN meeting in June.

But their previous meeting, which was in Vancouver several months ago, was an extraordinary meeting because as a group, they reacted in a more political way than they ever have before. Exactly on the point of saying that privacy is important.

And their focus was what can they do, in both the existing set of protocols and future protocols, to examine what the consequences are from a privacy perspective?

So a particular, just to drill down to a particular example, when you make a DNS query, your machine sends out a query saying, "I want the address of such-and-such a host," and eventually, you get the answer back, presumably. How sensitive is that information? Well, it could be viewed as very sensitive, because it tells what you're going after, never mind what the content is, but it tells what you're interested in. So you're going after a medical site or you're going after a sexual site or you're going after something else, that becomes instantly available.

There's never been a focus within the IETF on that consequence before. There is now. And they're now talking about it. I don't know how successful they'll be. How do they cloak the queries so that it is not so easy to see what it is that you're trying to get an answer to?

So that, I think, is very much along the lines that you're talking about, and yet it falls well short of the device manufacturers and the default settings, because that – if I can be bold enough to speak, to guess what the IETF would say – they say they control, they don't control but they



worry about and specify protocols, but they don't have anything to say about the end systems that actually implement them, the user settings, all of that, that's outside of their scope.

Well, if that's outside of their scope and it's outside of our scope, where is the right place? I'm not sure I know the answer to that. There may be a need to create other venues and so forth, and consumer market, consumer organizations and so forth. I think that may be the necessary answer.

So I empathize a lot with the kind of concerns that you're talking about, but I worry on behalf of ICANN. It's two sides of the same thing. I worry that ICANN will get distorted if we push too hard at it, and I worry that ICANN is not nearly adequate to do that job.

And so if you want that job done, rather than take an ill-fitting vessel that we are, build new vessels, build new organizations, and really go at that. There are a number of organizations I know that are. My son's now working for Electronic Frontier Foundations. There's EPIC, and both of these are U.S.-based, and I'm sure there are corresponding organizations around the world.

Sorry to go on so long, but I think this is an important point about how do we reconcile the broader set of instincts, impulses, and desires that we have, versus the specific setting of the organization that we're in here.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steve. The queue is closed already, but we still have two persons. First, Evan Leibovitch and then Garth Bruen. So, Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. Steve, you asked about being provocative with referring to human rights and perhaps I can be provocative back in possibly giving an answer that might have an ICANN relevancy. And this has been a corridor discussion I've heard, it hasn't been at the table.

But perhaps human rights can be used to help define this nebulous, mushy term called "public interest," in the sense that, every time we hear the term "public interest" bandied about in an ICANN context, it seems like it's one of these, "It's in the eye of the beholder," kind of thing. That, to a business interest, public interest, it means this. Within ALAC, it means something else. Within the government, it means something else.

But perhaps an objective frame of reference could be something like human rights, that is already treaty-based, that is already something that is far more defined than the squishy thing called "public interest." So perhaps we can use that within ICANN to help set the frames of that, so every time that ALAC says that we're trying to do something in the public interest and it comes back on as, "Well, who are you to define what this is?" and defining the public interest ends up being an impediment to moving forward as opposed to anything else. Perhaps human rights, in the frames you've used it, has an ICANN context being usable this way.



STEVE CROCKER: Two quick thoughts. Even if you take a well-defined basis, treaty definitions of human rights, translating how that relates to anything that we're working on still becomes a challenge.

And the other is, there has been a recent attempt at directly trying to define and expand the notion of what public interest means. Fadi started up four strategy panels, I think that's the term. One of them was focused on public interest. Nii Quaynor headed it up. All of the panels have delivered reports.

Have you all read that report and, if you have, what is your thoughts about it? I'm quite interested, actually. We can wait, leave it as an open question, if you want. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steve. The queue is closed. We just have Garth Bruen, and then we have to finish.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Was that an answer to the question, Rinalia? Oh, okay, sorry, Garth. We have an answer to Steve's question. So, Rinalia Abdul Rahim.



RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier. You asked a question about the Public Responsibility Framework Strategy document.

STEVE CROCKER: Is that the formal title? Maybe so.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: The one that Nii Quaynor –

STEVE CROCKER: Nii Quaynor, yes.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: When the community was briefed about that particular strategy, my specific impression was that I really liked that it's focused on development, focusing on the needs of developing countries, in particular, and on capacity building, because it will enhance the engagement of people in the ICANN process. And that was one aspect that I really liked. Other than that, I didn't really have much of a reaction to it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rinalia. Garth Bruen.



GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you. I feel like we frequently get an answer of, “We don’t do that, we don’t do this,” even when it is something that may be in a contract or bylaws. And I want to echo what Jean-Jacques said and Evan said.

I think that there are always opportunities for ICANN to do something. And it may not be able to do everything for everybody all the time, but there are definitely areas where it can and should do something.

I met with a blind user group at MIT and they have pointed out a number of things which content providers can do to improve their experience on the Internet. This is a perfect place for ICANN to fit in, from the top down, to be able to say, “Well, these are the standards that we’re going to implement and these are the standards that the registrars should implement and all of our contracted parties should implement,” and help drive solutions down throughout the industry. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Garth. Okay, we are really running out of time today. We’re completely out of time, so I’m afraid we can’t accept any further questions or comments. But thank you very much for joining us, Steve.

We have a meeting with the Board on Tuesday morning, from 8:30 onwards. And I think one of the main discussions will be about the PICs – Public Interest Commitments – and there will be a request for clarification from the Board regarding these. We had a meeting with Compliance earlier today, and there seemed to be some confusion as to whether they were enforceable, whether they were not, whether some



were voluntary, whether some were mandated in a contract or not. Anyway, it's a bit of a handful, and we look forward to discussing this and other issues, which we have transmitted to the Board earlier. So thanks for joining us.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And of course, we'll let you relax for the rest of week until Friday, when you're back with us. Much appreciated. Now we're going to move with the next part of our agenda and shuffle things around again quickly.

The first thing we need to deal with is a quick follow-up from Tijani with regards to the election process, and then we're going to go over to the working group reports. There are two reports that we need to go through, and immediately after that, we will have Fadi Chehadé, ICANN President and CEO, who will come and speak to us. So Tijani Ben Jemaa, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier, let me complete what I said a few minutes ago. Tomorrow, at 17:50, if we have the tie broken, it will be as I said. But if the tie is not broken, we will proceed to tie-breaking physical draw. So you will have to be here. We will tell you if we have the results earlier, we will send you an e-mail and tell you what happened. If we don't have the results earlier, you have to be here so that, if the tie is still there, we have to make a physical draw. Thank you.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Can you explain what a physical draw is? Take the names out of a hat, is that correct? Okay. Jean-Jacques Subrenat. And Garth, are you still in the queue, or...? No, because your name card is up. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. This is a question to Tijani, mainly, and the members of his committee. This may be already clear for most of the people in the ALAC. It is not for me – that’s why I take the liberty of putting this question more clearly than I did before the SSAC meeting.

You said that there would be a draw. I understood wrongly, perhaps, that it would be a draw between the two final candidates, or is it that you have still three people, and that one of them is still in the running, but you have to determine between the other two who will become the final number two or number one?

So, I would like you to clarify this. Maybe it’s because I spent almost 24 hours traveling from home to here. Constituency Travel had me go through Peking from Paris. Maybe that’s why I’m a bit off-phase. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I arrived at the same time as you arrived. What I want to say is that the tie-breaking is between the two tied persons, the two people at the last position. The tie-breaking, it is between those two persons. We have one who isn’t tied, so this person



will go to the next steps of the voting, okay. Yes, that's it, exactly. So if the electronic vote will give us the tie broken, it is finished. We will run the next vote with Rinalia and one of the two other candidates. If this tie is not broken, we will do it by draw.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Are we all clear about this? I see a few faces around the table. We're all fine with it? Okay, fantastic. Thank you. This now takes us – yes, a draw is from a hat, with a hand. We don't have a machine or anything like this. Rafid Fatani.

RAFID FATANI: Will the results come out momentarily after the vote is closed at six-something today?

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: The vote result has already been announced. We don't have anyone with more than 50% of the votes, and we have the two last candidates have the same score. We have the break this tie before, and the vote between Rinalia and the one who [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Yeah, I know we all dozed off at the time when it was announced, myself included – and I actually announced it myself, so I must have been speaking in my sleep.



Let's move on swiftly to the next part of our agenda, which was supposed to take place at the beginning of this afternoon. Ladies and gentlemen, please. I know you'd like to discuss this, but you can discuss this all night long and not sleep for a third night running. We can now have the working group updates, and the first one is the ICANN Accessibility Task Force. I hand the floor over to Cheryl Langdon-Orr, since the two working groups are under her stewardship and she may delegate to whomever she wishes to do so, or do it herself. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you very much. And what I'm going to try and do in the interests of time is ask Dev to take particular attention now and be prepared, because I'm going to jump to metrics very quickly. So if you'll forgive me, it'll say "ALAC Metrics" up there for a moment, but I will give a lip service to the matter of our Accessibility Task Force.

I would like to have had the full 15 minutes, but I can tell we're not going to get enough time in today to do justice to it. So I would like to just invite any and all of view, both in this room and remotely and, of course, anyone else who's interested who is not in the ALAC At-Large room today, to join us in this room, which is VIP, tomorrow at 2:00 until 3:00 in the afternoon, where our Accessibility Task Force will be holding a meeting. That's probably the most appropriate form of update that you could get. You can jump in with us, contribute to it, and see what work we will be getting on with.



In addition to the published agenda, however – and you’ve all got a copy of the published agenda, and it is online – we have received, and I will integrate into the agenda for tomorrow, a proposal from Gunela, to get us kick-started on some suggested objectives. I’ll just take you all briefly through these so you can give some feedback to people if you need to.

Currently, and this will be on the table tomorrow for discussion, we’re looking at potential objectives and actions, which will be primarily around building a culture of accessibility; disability awareness toolkit to be developed; a disability awareness training system to be provided; to look towards having some keynote speakers at future ICANN meetings that would include representatives from the disability community; to offer a disability showcase event occasionally at ICANN meetings, demonstrating the innovative and amazing ways – and the “amazing” is my words, not Gunela’s – that the disability sector use the Internet and indeed, the DNS; to look towards accessibility champions; and so on, and so forth.

So there’s a lot on tomorrow’s agenda. You are welcome. It is here, 2:00, and I look forward to seeing a number of you at that time.

Moving right along to ALAC Metrics, and most importantly, it’s gained me a little bit more time for ALAC Metrics, which I desperately needed to do. If I could have the next slide, please. This is going to be a whirlwind tour.

Metrics back in 2008, ladies and gentlemen. Whoa, back a bit. Whoa, let’s just calm down a tiny bit, that’s fine. Metrics back in 2008 looked



very thrilling and exciting. It had very non-flexible measurements: how many meetings you had attended; a proportion of meetings that you did attend was acceptable as “okay” or “not okay” or “absolutely not good enough” – that’s the red, the green, and we never had any yellow up on this screen; and the things like the amount of votes that ALAC members were engaged in were recorded in this way. It was a bizarrely manual, and in some cases, quite inflammatory, mechanism. It was public. It is a good idea done badly. We’re not going to recreate this monster, fear not. Next slide, please.

We did have a number of commitments listed publicly. This is a sample of the types of activities where every ALAC member was listed and their particular policy and administration commitments were listed. I think we also believed that just putting things out to the public record does not make a good metric. Next slide, please – I told you that it’d be whirlwind.

But now we’re here in a whole new world, and you all know this by heart because you agreed to it, you voted to it, and you now live by it, so I’m not going to go through Section 9 – specifically 9.2 – but ladies and gentleman, you’ve all signed up to have particular measures, particular performance expectations, and particular possibilities for remediation. And now we are going to move into our next slide with a larger piece of text so you can all read it, and this is the exciting bit.

The ALAC, as we recognize, and At-Large are unique inasmuch as we do receive significant funding, predominantly in the way of travel and other activity expenses. And for this reason, apart from a myriad of others, it



is essential that our accountability and transparency and our performance indicators, metrics, and remediation are above reproach.

And if we move to the next slide, which is the last one I'll be talking about, if I follow my script, which isn't done by Heidi but is in fact done by Maureen, effectively we're going to now show you where we're up to now. You do have agreement already that meeting attendance and a variety of metrics around meetings, participation decisions and the votes of the ALAC, and participation and roles played in the ALAC in working groups, as well as those of other bodies will be metrics that we will be measuring.

And at this point, we've actually done a couple of experiments which look at attendance, not only at ICANN meetings, which is one way of doing things, but also trying to find out how we can effectively measure not just the hot – presumably while you're still alive – body in the room, but whether or not you are contributing. And there's some exciting things to show you, which is why I'm rushing to get through my part. I'll come back at the end to manage questions, but with apologies to the interpretation team, sorry, I really had to rush. I'm now going to ask you for the next slide and hand over to Maureen, who's going to move fairly quickly through a small slide deck. We'll then go to Dev, who has a larger slide deck, but it's "ooh" and "ahh" stuff, and then come back for questions. Over to you, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Cheryl, but actually, Tijani's got three slides.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh my God. I do apologize. Tijani, you are in fact written there, but unfortunately it was in my handwriting. So very, very briefly, you've got slides seven to nine. So you're on slide – I think we go back one to slide seven, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you, Cheryl. As Cheryl just said, we have to define the participation and involvement criteria, and she already mentioned three of them. I will add only one, which is the self-reporting that may be one of the criteria for participation and involvement and commitment. And so I will go to the next slide, please, next slide.

Any member of ALAC may be in one of the following statuses: active, less active, and standby. To be active, those figures that you have here are only for example. They are not the definitive figures. We have to agree on all of them. So to be "active," you, for example, you have to be performing at 60% or more than 60% of each of the criteria we mentioned. And "less active" will be between 40% and 60%, for example, and "standby" would be less than 40%. This metrics threshold should apply for each criterion alone. If a member meets the metric of one of the four criterias over a period of time, he or she may be considered as "active." Next slide, please.

For the remediation, "less active" members are contacted by the ALAC Chair, notifying them that they are not seen participating and involved in the activities of ALAC and ICANN, and they have the opportunity to give their rationales. They can say, "Your records are not exact," or they can give viable reasons for their lack of involvements. The rationale that



they will give will be basis of the decision, whether they have to stay in the “less active” position, or go to the “active” one.

“Active” members who have the metrics of one or more criterion not met will still be considered as “active,” but they will be subject to the remediation actions of the “less active” members. I explained that. We said that if you are performing in one criteria, you are considered as “active.” This is to encourage people to continue – not to be disappointed. But you will be reminded by the Chair that you are not performing in the other areas and the other criterias, and if you improve yourself, you’ll stay in this position. Otherwise, you will go to the “less active” position.

If there is no improvement after a period of time, the “less active” members will go to the “standby situation.” That means that you will lose your voter rights, and you will be removed from the column for any vote. People at a “standby” situation will be notified of the status change, and they may regain their original position in a “less active” status, or they may be – or they may go to the remediation more, important remediation steps – which is the Rule of Procedure 9.7. That gives the right to the ALAC and each Chair to take concrete action. The last of them will be the removal of the member. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Can I have the next slide, please, Ariel? Okay, well what we did was the measures that Tijani has actually just mentioned, when I talked to the RALOs, and between Buenos Aires and since it was my role to basically get feedback from everyone about the proposed metrics, and what people felt about those.



And of course, feedback varied, from extremes of people not wanting to have any kind of metric to the other extreme, where we're actually being asked to analyze contributions that were made in meetings.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Word by word.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Word – yeah, yeah. Actual contributions. Positive, negative – an absolute analysis. So what we had to do was actually look at something that was perhaps going to provide a bit of a balance. And this is something that we spent quite a lot of time in the working group talking about. Can I have the next slide, please, Ariel? Wait a minute, one back.

Okay. So the recommendations that came from the contributors from the RALOs, from the ALSes – and I do thank you very much for your contributions because they certainly gave us a lot to talk about. So the key thing – the key significant feature of that feedback – was to do with the leadership: the leadership that we, as ALAC members, demonstrate on this particular body with some key indicators to do with the amount of time and commitment that people give to their ALAC work, mentoring work, the participation and contribution that they make to the working groups – all these sorts of things ended up into trying to devise some sort of way in which we could measure this without going overboard, but at the same time, making it meaningful. Next, please.

So what we've actually come up with is two-fold, and in this, with respect to this, Dev has actually produced a model which is very much



based on data that is actually already available within our system, and so he will explain it very shortly.

But the other side of things is some input that, yeah, people can make – okay, I’m going first – that ALAC members can make for themselves. And this is in the way of a report, and it doesn’t – what we’re saying is that the report doesn’t have to be – I sort of initially said we’ll do it monthly. It doesn’t have to be done monthly. It can be done in whatever time frame you negotiate with your RALO, because they’re the ones that you’re actually accountable to. So the next one, please, Ariel.

Okay, so I’m used to writing a monthly report for the leadership team, so it’s no big deal for me to write up a report on what I’m doing. And I’m offering a report on what I’m doing in the ALAC, but it doesn’t necessarily have to be this way. It can be whatever you guys negotiate within your RALO.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Dev.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Dev. Next?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Queue Dev’s slides, please. Okay, just start for us, Dev. Let’s go.



DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. So the challenge as pointed out in the ALAC Rules of Procedure 9.2 – next slide – is that a variety of metrics will be maintained, and that sounds simple or straightforward to do, but it's very tedious to do. It's very time-consuming. So how do we try to reduce – make it less that? So next slide.

So looking at the meeting, "Attends the face-to-face meetings." A time sheet is kept filled-out by At-Large staff at regular intervals during the face-to-face meeting. But that's, again, my very minor process. Bringing new stats back to our spreadsheet is, again, time-consuming. That's a repeating thing, here. So a possible approach we looked at was using a mobile app to aid in recording attendance. Next slide.

And one of the apps we looked at was an iOS, which is an iPhone or iPad app called Attendance 2. And let us go the next slide. Next slide – [good].

So this is something the screen shot from this application. We can import and enroll users with pictures and so forth. The middle screen shows that you can add the various dates. And the third picture on the right, you can just tap on the status to indicate when a person is present, absent, or sends apologies. And then that could be imported easily back to a spreadsheet. So that was one thing we looked at. Next slide.

So in looking at meeting attendance for the conference calls now, the roll call is done by staff at the beginning and kept up-to-date during the call and then uploaded to the Wiki. Next slide.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry, Dev. I'm going to stop you there. We'll have to take a hiatus because our [CEO's] ended, and he's already had a busy-enough day. Hold your thoughts, ladies and gentlemen. There's a lot more to come and it's even more exciting. Back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And yes, we are at the end of this session and thank you for all the work that this working group has done – very impressive work in a very short amount of time regarding metrics.

Now I have the pleasure to welcome Fadi Chehadé, President and CEO of ICANN, who is joining us here. Fadi, we had Steve Crocker here earlier visiting us, and we had an excellent session with him. And I guess that we will start the same way we started with Steve, which is to hand you the floor, and to start with what you wish to speak about with us, and then of course, we'll speak to you but what we want to talk to you about.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Thank you. Good afternoon. Happy to be here. I think most of you know that the next few days will be momentous in many ways, and we will be talking about big and interesting things and all the changes that were seeing. I'd rather leave it open for you to ask questions about the areas of big announcements and historic announcements for ICANN.

I'll just make two comments that are more macro-level comments. The first is that we are clearly entering a very different new phase at ICANN – very different phase. And it won't happen in a day. It's not like there is a switch that will be flipped. But there is no question that if you add up



the last 15 years and the next phase, we have a very specific crossing point right now. We haven't crossed it. We have been given the raft to cross it, but we have not crossed to the other bank.

The world is going to be watching us starting tomorrow morning and to see if we're able to do that. "Agence France-Press" just released a big story telling the world about tomorrow. That will be just giving more people eyes and ears towards what starts tomorrow morning and how the world sees us. Therefore, I just – as a very, very important and, in my opinion, critical element of the fabric of ICANN, the ALAC has a huge responsibility to help us in this new phase, in making sure that ICANN appears to be an organization ready and able to deal with the challenges ahead.

The U.S. government's withdrawal from our affairs is much, much more complicated than many of us know. There are huge legal issues. There are huge geopolitical issues. There are things that we saw that we didn't see that were happening that are now going to all be untangled – some publically, some less publically. But I want you to know that this is now on the move. In other words, it's happening. It is starting to happen. There is equally a massive campaign in the United States now to stop it. So let's not fuel that campaign in the sense that if we continue to appear to be unready for the task ahead, we will be fueling the campaign.

Today there are people who are spending large sums of money, we confirmed, so that when you search for Internet Governance on Google, you get an ad from somebody sending you somewhere to disparage the decision of NTIA. So there's money being spent. There is a massive



effort. I spoke, for example, to Newt Gingrich, who's one of the leaders of the Tea Party, and it is very clear that there are now forces being amassed to bring us back into the U.S. fold.

We're taking care of that. There's quite a bit of working going on to avert that, but I want you to be aware that we have all of us and equal responsibility not to fuel that movement, but rather to assert, without any doubt, that this community is ready. It's very important.

The second thing I wanted to mention quickly is what I call "The engine is overheating" issue. Our engines are overheating. My engine is overheating. The Board's engine is overheating. Staff is overheating, and much, much more importantly, the community – the volunteers, you, everyone – is overheating. There's a lot on our plates.

That problem – there are two ways to address that problem. Or maybe three. I will mention the least likely first. The least likely is that we stop most of the engines and we say, "Look, there is so much we can do at a time. Let's just do sequentially what we can take care of." And this is hard for me to say, but there are some pressures now on ICANN that do not allow us to do that. There are certain things that need to happen now.

I'll give you an example of that. Tomorrow, we start the process of creating a process to replace the U.S. government role, right? In parallel, we cannot not start the process to globalize the commitments. So some people would say, "Listen, we have enough on our plate. Let's focus on replacing the U.S. government." The problem is, if you replace the U.S. government, the U.S. government really has two roles with ICANN – not one. They have one role that is exemplified in the contract we have with



them to manage – to have oversight over the IANA functions. But they also have a role with us in the AoC. They are the co-signer of the Affirmation of Commitment.

So we could say, “Oh no, we can only take care of one.” But you know what will happen if we only focus on IANA? All the discussion in the IANA track will be about ICANN commitments and ICANN globalization.

But we can’t confuse these two issues. These are very different. And why they’re important to us as ICANN – and I’m sorry I’m going into that detail, but there is a lot of subtleties to these things that I’m trying to convey to you – the discussion on how to replace IANA, the U.S. government has clearly said in their announcement cannot be done just by ICANN. It’s a discussion where we are asked to lead, to convene, to facilitate, to engage, but not just the ICANN community – the global community. Everyone is involved.

Whereas the discussion about how we globalize ICANN frankly is our business. How do we make ICANN a more accountable organization is our business.

So these are very different discussions, and the kind of people you will engage on these tracks are very different again.

So I’m just giving you examples of how there are tracks, now, because of the maturity of ICANN and the phase we’re getting into that requires us to start doing what we hadn’t done before, which is to start organizing ourselves to work on multiple tracks where not every person is on all tracks, where we start thinking, “Hey Alan, why don’t you take care of



this track and report to us while you take care of that track and we share.”

But today, we want to all deal with everything on the table. It’s not going to be possible moving forward. So this calls for us as communities to organize, to build plans of how we engage on multiple tracks, and if we don’t do that, we’re going to miss the need for us to be present and to make sure that ALAC and every group has representation on all the issues on hand right now.

I said there are two things to do, so the first was to organize ourselves and decide how we, in a way, divide ourselves across all things but stay involved. The second thing we need to do is to really agree amongst us what is the activities map from the priority standpoint.

If I told you my three spheres of activities fall into three buckets, one is ICANN core operations – ICANN core work. Two is now the whole ICANN globalization issue, which is both IANA and ICANN accountability, both of them. And then three, it’s global Internet governance, which was everything we did at Buenos Aires almost – or least it was a big thing in Buenos Aires.

So now you have three buckets. We must prioritize. These are huge buckets. Which one comes first? Which one comes second, and which one comes third? Can we agree on this? I don’t know. Do we have the capacity as a community to agree on this? Now, I need to know because I have 250 people and \$100 million that I need to direct, but it’s not for me to decide. It’s for us to decide.



So these are the kinds of things I'm going to be engaging with you deeply on because, frankly, it's getting serious and complicated. "Are we up to that task?" is what the world will be asking tomorrow morning. We could have, in the next few weeks, either press reports saying, "These guys weren't ready for this," or, "These guys look – they're ready for this." The difference between these two is a fine line.

So we have quite a bit to do. We have quite a bit to do, but I view Singapore as a moment of stepping back, taking stock, understanding what's in front of us, and moving forward. Not in unison – it doesn't mean we all have to be in agreement. That's okay. We can continue being the way we are – inclusive of all ideas, consensus-builders, and that's tough work. But at the same time, we need to be aligned. We need to be aligned on the goals.

So I'm here for your questions and happy to answer them. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

There's an old saying about sausages and government laws, that they're really ugly to watch being made. The concept of trying to get agreement in a multistakeholder environment like ours on something this crucial in public easily rivals those, and I think the real challenge is going to be – we talk a lot about bottom-up here. But pure bottom-up takes a long time to coalesce – if it coalesces, and let's assume it will coalesce.

I think somehow we need a melding of not direction from the top, but enough leadership. I don't know what this means and how exactly the form it has to take, but there's got to be enough so that we're not just doing a Brownie in motion random walk for the first three months to try



to find how to coalesce and where the commonalities are. I don't have any of the answers, but I can imagine real chaos for a while, and as you say, the world is watching.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. We have a queue that has grown very fast, incredibly fast. Just a quick comment with regards to communities needing to organize on how to engage in multiple tracks. The At-Large community, I'm sure, will be glad to share best practice on engaging multiple tracks. We have really 16 statements since the Buenos Aires meeting on a very diverse set of – 16, yeah – a very set of subjects, and we have more than a dozen working groups working in parallel, and some of us have more than 1 brain, apparently.

So let's move on now. We have Garth, Tijani, Fatima, Holly, Jean-Jacques, and Sandra, and Evan completely at the end of the queue. I'm afraid you're going to have to stand for a while. So we'll start with Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I find it somewhat ironic that you've brought to us an example of your message getting hijacked in search engines and being diverted to misinformation because somebody funded it. And this is exactly what Internet users and businesses have been complaining about for years. Millions of messages are being hijacked every day, and when people bring these complaints to ICANN, ICANN says, "We don't do that." If you really want the community support, you have to start listening for real. Thank you.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Garth. Next we have Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. You said, Fadi, that the engines are overheating. I am afraid there will be more heating in the future, and our duty is to make them – is to avoid the burn. And I am sure we will manage to do so. We are crossing a historical moment. The Internet is crossing a historical moment, and ICANN is also crossing this moment. And I think that, if we want to be on the safe side, we have to stick to the multistakeholder model in this transition, and as you said before, multi-ACORN stakeholder model.

So if we go in this way, I think we will manage to find the right solutions – the right way – to make the transition in the [good]. The most important thing for me is to be aware that those who are using the Internet, they are the most important people that you have to listen to, because they are the client, they are your customer. They are the people who use the Internet, so they have really a say and an important say. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Next is Fatima Cambroneró.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Olivier. I will speak in Spanish. As you told us, Fadi, all these continuous processes in which ICANN is participating in this NETmundial meeting, the process that will start after the decision of the [NATA]. I



can't to get involved. I'm concerned about this. Maybe we are going out of the mission of ICANN if we have to participate in all these processes, if we decide to participate in them. I'm concerned about the fact that the representatives of the users will have to participate in these processes. And when doing so, we don't pay enough attention to the role of advising the Board in issues related to the interests or issues that are important for the users. This is being mentioned in some discussion lists. If the community's going to participate in these processes, or if this role of active stakeholders is just going to be left to the staff and not to the community. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. I guess I'd just like to register a little bit of an alarm here that we don't get stampeded – that we feel, yes, the world is watching, but what my – I guess my sixth sense says is that should never be an excuse to actually move forward with processes we haven't thought out with agreement that isn't there. And there's going to be enormous pressure to have a united front that's not there, and to present agreement that's not there. So I don't envy your job, but I also don't envy our job.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly, and actually, just following on from what you just said, I have noted that some organizations have already produced some suggested solutions, some suggested scenarios – regarding the IANA contract and what happens next. Isn't this just



inclined to actually start a stampede of some sort, because the contract itself runs out in 18 months, while ISOC certainly has come up with ideas? The ITF has discussed a few suggestions last week. There have also been some suggestions by the Internet – the IGP. I think Milton Mueller has produced a paper. The RIRs are also producing some potential solutions. There is an enormous amount of frenzy that is going on around this. Is this going to just speed up the process, or is it just going to make it more chaotic, or...? It's very open.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Are we new here? This is the multistakeholder process. People will express themselves. They will come up with ideas. That's fine. What is important – and I want to clarify because you make a good point, Holly – this is not about being stampeded or being united, even. It's about looking prepared. This is – someone from South Africa was telling me they have a joke or some story in South Africa that a boy chases a girl for months after after month, begging her for a date, and she always ignores him. And then one day, she surprises him and says, "Yeah, let's go on a day tonight." He was so startled, he walked away. He didn't know how to deal with it.

And so we've been asking for this for 15 years. Okay, it now happened. Are we going to look startled and walk away? Or are we going to say, "Okay. We welcome it. We understand this is complex." But hey, if we – if we – the multistakeholder community par excellence cannot engage in organized chaos to get through this, then, frankly, it will be organized chaos. And we're warning people already. I'm going to do some press interviews to tell people, "Look, this is not going to be nice little flags



and people standing up and spending ten minutes telling people how nice they are and then telling them to go to Hell.” This is not how we work at ICANN. People are honest. They stand up. They speak their minds. They’re passionate. This is important to us. So you have to live with the fact it’s chaotic.

However – however – there is difference between chaos and between people who are deliberately trying to make us look bad. And I know them. There’s many of them. This is not good, and I can’t be the one constantly running around to find the foxes. Each of us should find the foxes in our homes and tell them to get out or to stop being disruptive. They can be tough. I know this community. We are tough on each other, and I like that. That’s what makes us good.

But when people become deliberately destructive, they should be called out. They should be called out. We do this in our families. We do this in our villages. This is a family. Somebody’s disruptive and we know them, somebody’s doing things that, frankly, are not in the interest of the multistakeholder model, we should call them out. We should call them out. “This is not part of the multistakeholder process.” We expect everyone to participate in an orderly, constructive way.

You saw what happened on our own 1Net list. This is remarkable. If people don’t know us and they follow this list, they think we’re out of control. It’s not right. It’s good to have debate. It’s good to engage. But it’s not good to be attacking others and bringing people down. It’s not right. It’s not the community we want.

As to NETmundial, Fatima, I just want to be clear – and I will say this tomorrow morning when I speak – we engaged – “we” meaning ICANN



– we engaged in Internet governance to protect ICANN. There was a level of pressure on us and a level of pressure on the ICANN model and the ICANN mission that was getting so high that we had to engage in Internet governance issues. It is not, in my opinion, long-term our job. We should participate in Internet governance. We have Tarek and his team, of course they should participate and have the ICANN agenda on there, but we did in the last six months is far more than participate. We actually, for all practical purposes, took a global leap. Me going to Dilma, talking to her about doing NETmundial – that shouldn't be my normal job. I shouldn't be going as ICANN leader talking to the head of the state, energizing her focus on Internet governance. That's not my job. Let me be very clear about that.

But we did it because no one was taking the lead, and we found ourselves in September, nine months after the wicket, and nothing. Nothing. All we had was defensive ideas for the next WTDC, and the next – defensive, defensive. We can't continue to be defensive. The forces were amassing and our arguments since the wicket have only gotten weaker, unfortunately.

So we got engaged. We did what we had to do, but now, as I told the board, I think we hit the top of our engagement. We need to, after NETmundial, coming back to our home and letting the world and hopefully having energized the world to lead in Internet governance. But we should not be continuing to spend our treasure, our focus, our money, our time on something when we have, as you said very well, here at ICANN.



We have some big work to do. We have to globalize our ICANN accountability and structures, and we have to respond to a U.S. government opening that may close. It may close. There are people actively trying to close it. So we need to respond forcefully – organized in organized chaos, but organized nonetheless – and make sure that we don't let destruction eat us from inside. We shouldn't. Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Fadi. We have a long queue, which is closed now. We have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Sandra Hoferichter, Evan Leibovitch, Fouad Bajwa, and YJ Park closing the queue. So let's go and have brief comments, please, or brief questions to Fadi. Jean-Jacques Subrenat is next.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Chair. Hello, Fadi. Nice to see you again. You spoke about three baskets or three buckets, rather. I'd just like to make a brief comment on that notion. I think that, in the longer term, beyond six months, we will find out what you know already, it's that the IANA question and globalization do have many commonalities. You cannot really settle one without the other. That was just a remark in passing.

But I think about the ICANN structures and methods. This is something very striking for someone who's been on the Board, etc., it's that we're still operating to a large extent – and the Board is still operating – in pioneer mode. The volunteers on the Board are still taking care of things which could be taken care of partly by staff or partly by the other parts of the community. So that's part of the overheating problem.



I think that one of the things which we could do is to end this incessant cycle of soul-searching, of the constant review. We must do reviews, naturally, but I think they're still too close, one to the other. There's not enough breathing space. And often in discussions I have with staff, I realize that it's very difficult for them to get things achieved because you go from one of the three yearly meetings to another without having enough space or time to actually deal with the problems.

So I would say, first is to convince the oversight authorities that, yes, for oversight and accountability, but two, know that on this frequency it is damaging.

My second point is that, because of the pioneer approach in which we are still living, we tend to have our own standards instead of accepting a certain number of very normal best practices in large organizations. That's explained because we come from where we come – small organization, etc. The budget now is more than twice what it used to be in 2009, 2010.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is year 200 [inaudible].

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: That's right. So it's more than three times the amount in, let's say, end of 2010. So I think that because of all that, you should pursue it even more strongly than you have done so far, all the stakeholders and certainly the governments represented in GAC that there's a change of mentality which has to come about, and that, in turn, will help you to



address the two other major factors, which are IANA contract and globalization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Next it's Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. I have two questions and a comment. My first question –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sandra, briefly, please.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You can get your two questions and a comment, but brief, please.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Yes. My first question is, Fadi, do you think that the structure of the SOs and ACs might change in the future, or their role, especially looking at the role of the GAC? My second question: what do you think can the ALAC do in order to help implementing or getting this process on its way? I think – you don't have to answer this question about what the ALAC can do – but I think we should get into a dialogue which is broader than the Board and ALAC meeting on a Tuesday morning in order to find



out how the ALAC can meaningfully contribute to this process, and what we can actually do.

My comment is the Meeting Strategy Working Group recently finished its work, and we were also discussing how the ICANN structure might change in the future. We were not aware of this big step or this big change ahead of us, and this might even change the structure more than we expected and more than we put flexibility into the model. So it might be an idea to have an ongoing group which is looking into the effectiveness of meetings. So to say, let's Meeting Strategy Working Group going on to revisit the future development because I think that this future change might affect the meeting strategy more than we were thinking about it at the moment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sandra. Fadi, yes, you're very welcome to answer.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Just very quickly. Thank you, Sandra. On your first question, do the SO, AC structures, will they change? Might they change? Should they change? That's clearly not a discussion that I can engage in. This is for all of us to have that discussion.

But what I will point to, and this important for all of us to realize, tomorrow, on Monday – tomorrow's Monday, right? – there will be two sessions. Please note this. This is very important. There is session right after my opening speech from 10:30 to 12:30 or something like that. That session is going to be focused on the process to replace the U.S. stewardship of IANA.



At 5:00 p.m. tomorrow, there is a second session that is about how we're going to look at the accountability of ICANN as an organization, because there are people who are worried how to replace the U.S. government oversight, and there are people who are worried when the U.S. government withdraws, how will we keep ICANN itself "accountable"?

One place you could start discussing our structures, our Board structure, as Jean-Jacques was saying, this should be in the second session. In the morning session, let's keep this very clinical. The morning session is at IANA. "The U.S. government did A, B, C." We're going to explain that. "Now A, B, C's gone. How do you replace A, B, C?" It's not overcomplicated. It's pretty straightforward.

The afternoon session is a broader discussion, because now we're talking about ICANN globalization and accountability. These are broader subjects where something like this could come up.

As to what the ALAC can do? Boy, the ALAC has been probably one of our most active organs. If I look at the numbers of the things you're doing and ATLAS coming up and all of this, you guys have been – you've been overheating ICANN. You're as equally contributing to my work. Thank you very much. You do quite a bit, and you're adding so many ALSes. It's just incredible how you are performing now.

Now, some of that energy will need to be now put to use to support some of these programs. I have a thoughtful answer as to what ALAC can do, but it will take time, and there is a long queue. May I propose that I come back to you through Olivier with some thoughts – some specific things, some ideas, just for your consideration. It's not for me to



tell you what to do, but I'll share with you some ideas as to what you can do.

But one thing for sure, I mentioned earlier, please make sure, if destructive voices rise in the community, that we, as community members, take action. Secondly, please make sure people understand these two tracks I just talked about tomorrow so we don't have people standing in the morning and saying, "We need to reform how the Board works." "Okay, we're not here to do this, sir. Thank you very much. Come back at 5:00. Right now we're talking about IANA."

Or people may come up in the morning and start saying, "We want to talk about the mechanism to replace the U.S. government." "No, this is not the time to do this now. Now we're just agreeing on a process. What is the process? How are we –" because as Alan said, we don't want the chaos. We want to agree on a process. Once the process is agreed, we can talk about the substance.

So tomorrow, we need to be organized. These are two ways you can make sure your communities who are here appreciate so we are successful in front of the whole planet on Monday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fadi. Just to let you know, the morning session, I think, will probably be filled with the full attendance from At-Large and from the ALAC. The afternoon session, unfortunately, clashes with already-scheduled programs for the At-Large community, including one where the At-Large leadership team meets with the GAC. So it's going to be a difficult one to have a full house, but I'm sure we will arrange



ourselves to send some people to the afternoon session. But it is unfortunate that we have a clash at this time.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

And again – thanks for that, by the way – but again, none of this was on the agenda until the U.S. government made their announcement, so we were trying to adjust for that. But I apologize for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Fadi. It always raises a few smiles to blame the U.S. government for things. Down to Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi there. Hi, Fadi. A quick comment on something you've been talking about, about the destructive elements and that kind of thing. I would just caution about making a distinction between disruptive and skeptical in that I found, for instance, when, in my early days in ALAC and we came across people who said, "Well, maybe the gTLD expansion isn't such a good idea," and the response was, "Well, how dare you? What are you trying to do to us? What will people think of us if we advance that? We're too far along on this," and so on. It's important to make sure that comments that may be disruptive or skeptical or things like that, that there's a distinction made between that and something that's merely disruptive or obstructionist or that kind of thing.

The other thing is, when you do that thoughtful consultation with Olivier, perhaps you might want to do that in the form of a conference call that others are able to listen in to, so that regardless of where



people are, that you can do this and have people listen in and just you with the community. That might be a really good way to do that.

And my last thing is a question for you. And could you spend, in the context of what you've been talking about, reflect on something you said when you said when you first came into ICANN. You used the term multi-equal-stakeholderism a lot. I don't hear it as much but I imagine it's still top-of-mind. Could you reflect a little bit, as we're going forward into tomorrow and beyond, how the concept of multi-equal stakeholderism, how that's evolved since you've come in, and what needs to be done going forward?

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Thank you. Thank you, Evan, and I concur with your two first comments. I did not mean that we shouldn't accept or listen to skeptical views. We need skeptical views, and we need different views, but there's a definite difference between that and a destructive effort. There are also, we're now discovering, a lot of destructive efforts within our community that are being paid by special interests. This is what I mean by destructive: people who have an agenda and who are working towards that.

Now, in terms of your question, when you really think about it, when I came to ICANN, what was the single biggest factor that broke the promise of multi-equal stakeholders? What is the one biggest inequality that I went from capital to capital, from country to country, and people said, "How could you claim you have a multi-equal stakeholder environment when the U.S. government had an outsized involvement in your affairs?"



A week-and-a-half ago, I was addressing all the ministers of the commonwealth countries – ICT ministers in London. And one minister from Africa stood up and he said, “Fadi, you have a contract with the U.S. government to perform your core functions. Right or wrong?” I said, “The only answer is ‘right.’” “So you are an agent of the U.S. government.” I said, “No, this is a strong word. I’m not quite an agent of the U.S. government.” And he said that in front of 50 ministers.

So the biggest problem I had, and you are very perceptive, I stopped using the term “multi-equal stakeholder” because I couldn’t stand behind it. I couldn’t. And that’s why we put this effort. This didn’t come easily, Evan. You know that. We worked extremely hard to explain to various organs of the U.S. government that the time has come to make ICANN multi-equal stakeholder, and that’s what we did. That was the biggest nut we had to crack, and we did.

So now that this is behind us, we can move forward and reuse the term and reuse it forcefully, because that’s what we just achieved, and it is on my agenda for tomorrow’s speech, unless you have –do you work for the NSA? You saw my speech already.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I’m Canadian. We don’t do that.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Okay.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So the answer to this was, “I’m Canadian. We don’t do that.” But of course, as we know, Americans are not allowed to spy on Americans, but Canadians are, so we’ll have to work this one out later.

Final question. We still have two minutes – actually, one-and-a-half minutes – to speak to Fadi Chehadé. YJ Park?

YJ PARK: Yeah, it will be very short. First of all, thank you for your explanation about all those efforts. And the one question I wanted to ask to you is about any coordination effort from ICANN in terms of this other Internet governance-related dialogue.

For example, the World Economic Forum recently set up its global commission on Internet governance, and so I wonder whether ICANN wanted to – is doing any coordination work to help build more kind of consensus about this IANA transition issues.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yeah. YJ, we were working closely with the WEF. The WEF is my partner on the high-level panel of present [inaudible] where they’re hosting our next meeting in Dubai, and we will be supporting them in that effort. I’m also working closely with Carl Bildt, the foreign minister of Sweden, on his commission, and he’s attending our next meeting as well.

So again, back to Fatima’s question, there is a lot going on in global Internet governance. I’m hoping we can support and enable, but scale back our massive involvement in that area, which we energized. Let’s put it this way. I want to tell you this. You’ll appreciate it. The chairman



of the wicket. The chairman of the wicket, Mohamed Al-Ghanim, who's the regulator of the UAE, is also on our panel now. You know he stood up at the recent ITU meeting in Bangkok and publically told the ITU attendees that the efforts that have been energized by ICANN have now completely taken the initiative on Internet governance away from the ITU, and this is the chairman of the wicket.

So we have achieved something together. It's good. But we also have to know, as good leaders, when is the time to throttle back and come back home and take care of our own. Now is the time to start throttling back – not to stop, because we have NETmundial and we committed to get NETmundial through. So we will do that, and then the panel will be finished on the 5th of May. So from now until May, I can't quite throttle back, but I need to start thinking on the 6th of May who's going to keep that energy going. We can't walk away. We will remain involved, but we need to bring others to the table. That's what we will do.

If I could make just one last comment, unless there is a question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's one more question. I did forget one person, and that's Fouad Bajwa. Fouad?

FOUAD BAJWA: It was basically a feeling which I've had from 14th of September, 2012, when you officially took your role. There was a sense you [generated], which was very welcomed by the broader communities. And when I say I even talk about civil society and so forth, having been part of the Internet Governance Forum [inaudible] organizing [inaudible] for IGFs.



In the days of Rod Beckstrom, there was one thing I felt, and this was before I joined ALAC, and I wrote in detail to Rod and sort of gave him an outlook for the next two years, where I saw him fumbling and tumbling and just falling down in terms of Internet governance.

And somehow this was more – for the past one-and-a-half years have been more about seeing and listening how you’ve been going about dealing with these issues, and how the community – okay, there was a bit of depression, seeing some of the kind of faces and being IG veterans, we would want to see less around you, and actually dealing with a lot of guidance on the issues.

And at the same time, there’s a lot of lacking. The resource you had in the ICANN community – the Internet community – you’ve dubbed that [weightless]. That’s a fact. That’s what remains. And when you touched upon the strategy panel, which itself is a strategy, you missed out a lot on the opportunity you had within your communities. And to tell you the truth, that has been painful. Even as members of the community, that has been painful.

But then we wanted to sit back – not most, I would speak for myself – again sit back and just watch how the fumbling and tumbling goes on because we do have our effect from outside ICANN and other communities and, of course from [inaudible] and there are a number of other groups which are getting together and [inaudible].

The objective which I’m going to share is that please don’t miss out on this powerful resource you have. And there’s still time for you to reevaluate your panel strategy and look at bringing in this rich resource you have, who have some form of – for example, if you’re going to be



dealing with certain lobbying issues in the future, a future model of governance of the Internet resources, my country would be there. There will be a number of other South Asian countries who influence these countries, who try to fight for the issues on the ground of users and even provide advice to technical communities, to the business communities, and so forth. You're seeing a bit of our work in ICANN's corporation in the Middle East. It gives you a very big example for what –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fouad, I did ask for interventions to be short, please.

FOUAD BAJWA: Yep. So the kind of ecosystem we're trying to build. So again, I would sort of request you – and so the question would be over here is you should revisit the strategy panel. People are really good but you're missing out a huge resource who can help you strategize for the future.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Thank you, Fouad. Let me first clarify: the strategy panels are done. They finished their work and they're gone. Their work is output for us to listen to, throw away, use, not use – it's up to us.

Secondly, I think now is the time for our community to engage in the strategy discussion. We needed, as always we do in any organization, to bring outsiders to give us insight. If I implement their insight, then I would have betrayed my community. But we asked for their insight as input to our process. We can take it, use it, throw it away – it's up to us.



But there were some good ideas. Even the GNSO yesterday said there are some good ideas in some of these reports. It's up to us to ferret them, use them, and throw away what we don't need. But it's always good to get an outside view.

There's a very – sometimes – I come from a church that is sometimes very closed. We have a joke in our church that when somebody dies from our church and goes to Heaven and they're showing them the various groups in Heaven, they close the doors and tell them, "Shh. There is no one here but you guys. Everybody else is not here." So we sometimes become like this. We become insular. So it's okay to have outside opinion.

The question is, "What do you do with that outside opinion?" If I implement it, then I would have betrayed you. But if we refuse it, then we become insular, and that's not good. That means we will rot, as well.

So I agree with you. Now I need you, for example, to take their input and ferret it. Are we reading their input now and using it for the next phase of making our strategic plan? That's what we should be asking for.

On that note though, you know that the Board has set up six advisory teams, right? I just submitted to the Board that we should scrap them. So on Thursday, at the public forum, I will be introducing a resolution with the Board to scrap them. Why? Because again, the community felt that we're doing another top-down set of groups. They were not top-down, by the way. People misunderstood what these were. This was simply asking the Board to go out and work with the community. These were efforts for me to say, "Okay, which four Board members will lead



the dialogue in the community?” But people misunderstood them, so I told the Board, “You know what? Let’s take them off the list. Anyway, we have so much to do with the U.S. decision, the events of that are ahead of us. Let’s focus on these things.”

Look, I’m with you and I will do everything I can to leverage this great force we have on the ground, but also appreciate that from our perspective, we need to bring in that view, and we should welcome and use it and dispose of it when we don’t need it.

I want to tell you a bit of a personal story before I leave you. I did not think we would be here a year-and-a-half ago. I can assure you of that. There has been some very, very powerful things that occurred to ICANN in the last few months. But I want to tell you a particular story. Larry Strickling, who runs NTIA and who’s here – many of you may have seen him or talked to him – had to make some big decisions in the last few weeks, and these were really big decisions, even for him. I’m telling you this because he’s in the hallways and he will be here for another 24 hours. If you see him, I’m asking you personally: please come up to him. If you can get over that, hug him. But if you can’t hug him, at least shake his hand and thank him for the courage of his decision.

One day, I’m going to write down what this man had to go through and we had to go through for him to make that decision. But he was very courageous and extremely generous. When he called me a few minutes after the announcement to congratulate me and I to talk to him, I thanked him for his courage, and he told me – I’m now quoting him – he said, “The ICANN community earned it in spades.” What an impressive endorsement for who we are, that he took risks personally. As he told



me, he put his own president at risk during an election year. And look at the attacks coming now. But he did it, and he did it because he trusted us. Please don't forget that. First, so that we know who we are, and two, to thank him because the U.S. has been, despite all of what we may want to say about their contract with us, they have been a good steward of ICANN. They have done their job. Let's not forget good deeds. They have been a good steward. And now they trusted us to take on that stewardship with the community. So I urge you, personally, when you see him or you see people from his government, to thank them for their trust, and let's show them we're up to it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fadi. Just one last question. I do have to ask one last question before you go. Will you come to speak to the ALAC and to our 160 At-Large Structures at the At-Large Summit in London?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Of course I am.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Microphone on, please.

FADI CHEHADÉ: Yes, absolutely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fadi Chehadé.



FADI CHEHADÉ: And if you don't like me, I'll be upset.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, we really are beyond our allocated time, but we still are not finished. So we have five minutes of interpretation. Two things: first we have to have a few housekeeping notes with regards to the reports – the reports that we have to file. And we're going to speak to Dev afterwards.

So the reports first: reporting. When you go to sessions – any session – please, there is a Wiki page which is up. Please file a report, even just a few lines, to explain what happened there, what exactly took place, and that will help others who have not been able to take part in the session to have a quick summary of what happened during the session. That's the reporting part. Done.

And I hope that this will be taken up. It's always the same people who file reports, and the majority of people don't, and I think that's not fair. We need to – we're all in many, many different parts of ICANN, and it's really helpful to do this.

Back to Dev Anand Teelucksingh for the end of the metrics presentation. You've got three minutes, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Ah, get me uptight [you guys]. Okay.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If the presentation can be put up, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Yes. Oh, dear. I'll try. Alright. I'll try to plow through this. Pay attention. Okay. Okay. Okay. So meeting attendance on ALAC conference calls, we first looked at using the Wiki itself to generate the reports –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can I please ask you to either sit down or get out, please, because this is introducing interference. Dev, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. So it didn't work well. And so we started looking at another way of collating the meeting attendance reports. Next slide.

So we looked at spreadsheets, and this was a much better approach. Google Sheets and many other spreadsheet programs have functions to import HTML from a web page. Having the data in the spreadsheet makes it easier to slice and dice the information. So, next slide.

So what this [inaudible] was showing is that using one single line in the spreadsheet, I was able to pull in all of the meeting dates for all of the meeting pages for 2013. So that just shows how powerful spreadsheets can be. Next slide.

And so what we can then do is just go to each of those meeting pages, just copy the text from the attendance – next slide.

And once you paste it into Excel in the spreadsheet, we can easily generate a report of seeing who was present, absent, or sent apologies from piecing those two cells. Next slide.

So we can then generate a spreadsheet from this very, very quickly, and collate for ALAC members, how many meetings they attended. And when we have real numbers, but then we can do a graphic. Next slide.

And this is one of the example graphics. And in fact, by looking at it, you could see by the absent and apologies colors, you can see, well, some issues for some ALAC members to be looked at in terms of attendance. Next slide.

Now, participation during the ALAC conference call – how can this be measured? You look at the transcript. So, next slide.

Okay, so if you look at the typical transcript, there's a part in there: the names of the persons is in capital letters, followed by a colon. So, next slide.

What we did, we counted the names in the transcript, followed by the colon. And then by doing that, we counted the number of interventions an ALAC member has made during the call. So, next slide.

By doing that, we can also count the number of interventions made by ALAC members during conference calls. So, there's a final slide.

Okay, so using similar techniques, we can extract information regarding the Adobe Connect chats, [inaudible] votes, and one of the challenges has been the inconsistencies of how the information is put on the Wiki, and this is being looked at by Technology Taskforce. I should also



mention that this could also be used for RALOs in terms of the ALSes' participation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, and you can now take your breath again. Well done. It's really very impressive work. So the floor is open for questions. We haven't got very much time at all, but we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. A remark: thank you again for this huge work which has been done. Like Olivier, I wish to congratulate you and all the other members of the team.

Perhaps a word of caution: I think that this tendency to give figures on everything is understandable in our time, but perhaps one doesn't really capture the quality or the intensity or perhaps the validity of interventions, whether they be written or oral. That's one point.

A second point I'd like to make is I would like for you to make a much clearer difference between what is the official channel of communication – ALAC meetings, specific calls which are programmed, etc. But I feel a bit uneasy about the fact that you go and measure, for instance, the number of lines that people put or do not put on WeChat, or what is it we're using – Skype – for instance.

Because honestly, a few months ago I went through that very pointedly, and out of 900 messages, two-thirds had nothing to do with the actual



work of the ALAC. It was about “My cat,” “My dog,” “My...” etc. Of course, this is a caricature I’m giving you, but you see my point.

So I would really caution against the mixing-up of social media with the official channels of work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I couldn’t agree with you more, Jean-Jacques, about the chat. But French people say, “Le meilleur est l’ennemi du bien,” which means that the best is the enemy of the good. If you want to have everything perfect, perhaps you will not have anything. Dev tried to have elements – to have, if you want, signals of participation. I told them, during the discussion – I’m a member of the working group and I told them I never use the chat because I am always focusing on the debate.

But I am seeing people who said, “Plus one, yes?” etc., etc., which is not a contribution at all. But the people in the working group said that it is, more or less, a contribution. We may give it a smaller weight but we have to take it into account.

So it is, as you said, it is not always significant, but it may be significant. That’s the point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. We’re going to lose the interpreters in a second, and I see so many people put their hands up. I think we might



have to continue this discussion later on. We could stop the interpretation, as well, and thank them for the work they've done so far and add a few more minutes.

Okay, so first, thanks very much to the interpreters for the whole day. We'll spend a few more minutes, then, not interpreted, and there's a whole list, and now I've lost my list. So I think it was Alan, and then there was Maureen and Carlton. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. I guess I'm speaking as perhaps one of the people who started this whole push about six years ago – me and Cheryl. If she's still here, I don't know.

To be quite candid, from a Chair's position or from almost anyone's position, it's sort of obvious who the people are who do nothing. I'm not talking about ranking everyone so we say, "Evan is 3% better than Maureen," or whatever. We're talking about the people who are way, way down at the bottom. It's obvious. The numbers that we should be collecting are ones to demonstrate the case so people find it harder to deny there's an issue. We need to not get too carried away on all sorts of statistics.

Now, I'm not saying any particular one of them is wrong, but let's remember that these aren't going to be the flags that suddenly make us aware of the fact that Greenberg never does anything and doesn't show up at the meeting. We're going to know that. They're just reinforcements and help in the argument and help in the counseling.



So I think we need to make sure we don't get too wrapped up in saying how important is it, and at the same time, not put too much effort into collecting these things which are not going to be the absolutely crucial issues. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I see a lot of people agreeing with this. Next we have Maureen Hilyard.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you for that, Alan. I think Dev and I have actually had little discussions about the work that he was engaging in to put – what he was doing was actually addressing the feedback that was coming back, and people were saying that they wanted information about everyone's contribution at every meeting and all this stuff.

So I think what we said was, "Be careful what you ask for," because it was really – it's over the top. But I think what we'll do is probably come – probably devise something that's a little less onerous, because the information is going to come from the system, but it's just going to be a little bit more simplified. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Maureen. We now have Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Chair. I hate to tell you all this, but the numbers, if it is about contribution, and it's good that you have numbers, the numbers won't



mean a hell of a lot. We need to stop focusing on those numbers. There's a lot more work that gets done back-channel that doesn't show up on the chat, that doesn't show up on the e-mail than you can suppose. Lot of back-channel work gets done, and unless and until you can tell me that that is not important, because sometimes those are the critical bits and pieces of the work that gets done, then you would have done yourself a disservice to the people who are involved in doing the real work.

I am going to urge you all again. Yes, if you like to count and have an exercise, count. But don't – they're not worth a hill of beans when it comes to the real issue – who is contributing what to move this thing forward. So please, go through the exercise if you must, but don't get bogged down in deciding what the numbers mean. They don't mean a hell of a lot. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Carlton. Maureen for a response?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just responding to that, I completely agree with you, and I'm sure that Dev would agree with you, as well, that sometimes numbers don't mean anything. But we were actually also looking at attendance from the point of view that people do turn up. The fact that they turn up is identifying a little commitment to that regular attendance.

But I think that, in order to get the information, it's got to come from somewhere, and from my perspective, the only person who can really



tell you what it is that they're doing is the person themselves. And that's my [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right. Thank you very much. Dev, you don't have anything else to add to this?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I always look at these things, in terms of these indicators, to me, if it's the absence of a person – like if you're not attending the meetings, if you're not participating in the votes – these are the things – those are these worst-case scenarios that I think really bring down the ALAC if a member is really not pulling their weight. And then, for, armed with this information, you can have that – the ALAC Chair can have the conversation with the ALAC member and say, "Hey, from these indicators, you're not attending calls. What's going on?" Start the conversation that way. It's not about the qualitative thing, as Alan was saying: "This one is better than that one," and so forth.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Dev, and that includes leaving the Sunday working session before the end of the working session, perhaps.

For all of those who are here, of course you're going to get green marks and green ticks on your record, so well done for staying here until the end. This has been a very, very long day. I thank you all for having lasted that long and not fallen asleep too many times.



I'd like to thank one more time actually the AV crew, who has done a very, very good job today in getting all this work. And with this, this meeting – oh, and also thank you to the people who are following us remotely. I'm not quite sure how many are still alive, but there are several people still following us remotely, so thanks to you. We have a very long week. This call and this meeting is now adjourned. Good night. Staff is thanked all the time. You'll get your thanks later.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]

