TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and welcome to the Pre ATLAS II webinar on the topic of policy issues on Thursday, the 22nd of May 2014 at 21:00 UTC. I'll go ahead and turn it over to you right now, Tijani.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Yes, go ahead. You are [inaudible].
TERRI AGNEW:	Thank you. We will not be doing a role call as it is a webinar, but if I could please remind everyone on the phone bridge, as well as the computer, to mute your speakers and microphone when not speaking, as well as state your name when speaking not only for transcription purposes but to allow the interpreters to identify you on other language channels. We have Spanish and French interpretation today. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Tijani.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you, Terri. Thank you very much. So Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the seventh webinar, the seventh session of the capacity building, the ATLAS II Organizing Committee and the Capacity Building Working Group are organizing for the ALS representatives prior to the ATLAS II Summit.
	Today we will have Avri Doria as presenter and she will speak about policy issues. So please don't forget to fill in the evaluation sheet to

keep [inaudible] after the session, and to mention anything you want to mention so that [inaudible] can help us to improve the process and the system of these webinars and capacity building programs.

Thank you very much, and over to you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you, Tijani. Hi, everybody. So I guess I can be heard. I guess I can change the slides myself using the buttons here [inaudible], so that's okay. I started with the slide, and a couple people already asked why is the picture of the world upside down, and the answer is that I don't really believe that it is.

But basically, I think that I'm going to try to offer a slightly different – can you hear me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, we hear you, but it is we hear you sometimes and sometimes we don't hear you.

AVRI DORIA: Oh, really? Because I'm using a phone and not the Adobe Connect. I'll try to remain heard.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, please.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. So Heidi hears me clearly. Okay, thanks. Let me go on. So what do I want to do here? Goals for the session. It's another way to look at the ICANN policy processes, partly because I think to understand the policy issues we first have to step back a little. I will not be repeating the material that was in earlier webinars, but it shows the organizations.

Overview of some of the policy issues currently under discussion. Obviously, in an hour – or even in a half-hour – that I'm supposed to be talking, there's not much chance of looking at all of the policy issues. So it's going to be a very brief walkthrough the [inaudible].

Then I want to go briefly into – yes?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible], Avri. I don't see your presentation on the Adobe Connect. Can we upload it?

AVRI DORIA: I can see it on Adobe Connect. I don't know what else. I can see it. I'm changing the slides. I think it's just you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I have a problem with Adobe Connect. Okay. So go ahead, please.

AVRI DORIA: Maybe somebody can send you the slide deck, but people seem to say they can see it. I'm seeing lots of messages in Adobe Connect they can see it.

So then I basically want to look a little at the policy tussle that goes on that gives a context a lot. Then [inaudible] a little bit about policy implementation issue. So moving on from there. And this one, I'd just like to put in. Possibly the most important [inaudible] is acronyms. These are my favorites.

So the first thing is other ways of looking at ICANN. Oops, I went one slide too far. So, there's two views on ICANN. I'm picking two views that are [poles] apart. One, ICANN is a private sector-led multi-stakeholder [inaudible] organization which has staff that assists the community of which it is part with making policies and it's responsible for implementation and enforcement of that policy. That's one way of looking at it.

ICANN is a public nonprofit corporation whose staff is not only responsible for running the organization with a positive cash flow, but must also manage a large noisy community with strong opinions.

A large part of ICANN activity must cope with this tussle and I'll get back to it a little later. ICANN has work to get done and the staff is charged with getting work done, but the community must determine for how it is done and responsible for ICANN policy.

So the point A and point B are indeed both true and it's how that gets balanced and it's how it gets viewed by particular people at particular points in time that creates a lot of issues that we cope with while doing policy at [inaudible].

Now, another issue is the multi-stakeholder [inaudible]. A lot of people that I've talked to over my [years] say, "I don't understand why we have

supporting organizations and why we have advisory committees, and why is this important? What does this have to do with making policy?"

And the metaphor that I use and it's a metaphor that you'll find I torture in this presentation as I go forward is that of a weave where you have the warp yarn, and that's basically what creates the structure, what provides the continuity and strength of fabric. It's the principles and other advice is what I'd equate it to in ICANN, and it's the constant [inaudible] of our principles and the advice of how to deal with our principles that very much needs to be a continuous line to keep what we do together.

Likewise, the supporting organizations I equate to the [inaudible] which provides the pattern of the cloth. It is the specific issue. It focuses on particular things and it was what makes very much the design of the cloth. And it's those two working together.

Now, if I take the metaphor too far, it can build bad implications. But in terms of the policy fabric of ICANN, I find that looking at the matrix of how we go about it important.

So the next thing is just an overview of the range of policy issues. Starting out with ALAC, [inaudible] Advisory Committee. And I'm staying away from [inaudible]. It [inaudible] has a role in every ICANN policy discussion. If it decides it's important to [inaudible] concerns, then it is [inaudible].

Looking through the work that ALAC does at the moment, there is the At-Large Working Group on Future Challenges which has, over the years, tackled [inaudible] problems from the structure of ICANN to

[inaudible] to should contracted parties keep their own rules and so on. At the moment, a lot of its focus is on looking at various future challenges, getting them to where they should be discussed and seeing whether statements are required or working groups are required.

And in fact, I think they've just spun off one if I understand correctly on registration issues that came out of there – or at least that's the way I understand.

There's a group that looks at IDN policy. It tracks all the work that's been done in ICANN or attempts to track all the work, and basically looking again for that user concern. [inaudible] statements, creating issues, [inaudible].

There's the At-Large New gTLD Working Group that has gone through the whole process since the beginning of applications looking at the process, looking at the issues that came up, coming up with ways to do At-Large objections when these were necessary, building up issues, documenting issues, creating papers that [inaudible].

Then there's the At-Large Registration Issues Working Group, which as far as I can tell is just starting. But again, it's looking at the registration issues, looks at the rights and responsibilities of registrants from user perspective, looks at the compliance. These are things that have been a very strong policy trend within At-Large and ALAC for a very long time and contributed many statements and policies on it. Okay, next one.

So the GAC, the Government Advisory Committee. And notice that I am putting [inaudible] down on the bottom of each of these. Again, like ALAC, has a role in any ICANN policy discussion. Its specialty, it's

[inaudible] public policy, taking off from those issues that governments have, that states with sovereignty have in terms of public policy. Within their countries, certainly, but also what affects the international public policy in terms of external events. So they look at that.

Now they have GAC Register of Advice where going through it, these are the main policy issues that they have submitted advice on. On gTLDs, they had 16 items, contractual compliance too, ethics and conflicts of interest too. ICANN Accountability and Transparency, also too. The ICM registry, which is the XXX issue. They submitted one.

On the New gTLD Program, they're up to 76 and a lot of those have to do with various issues, objections and other concerns to do with various new gTLDs, with various [inaudible] contractual issues and so on.

Registry-registrar [inaudible] on WHOIS. WHOIS has very long been one of the policy concerns of the GAC. For a long time, it was a province of law enforcement agencies recently gave their retention and privacy aspects of governments starting to get involved.

We've got SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. They work confidentially. They're one of the groups that really does work very confidentially, partly because they don't want to telegraph the things they're looking into. Very frequently, they're looking into confidential information and so on. But they have done advisories and they've been actually putting out alarms for a long time on various issues that affect DNS.

For example, the DDoS attacks on the DNS infrastructure. They have dealt with many of the issues that have come out in the gTLD program.

In fact, sometimes well before other people realize they were complex. For example, the name collision risk and how one mitigate those. They've been part of the DNS Key rollover security.

Basically, they take very seriously their mandate and they put out very serious well-documented advisories, comments, reports on issues of importance to the stability and the security of the DNS.

There's RSSAC. There's very little to say about it. For a long time, they were fairly dysfunctional. Over the last couple years have reorganized. [inaudible] wasn't able to find any output from the new group, yet I don't think they've gotten that far. But I do think that they've managed to restructure themselves so that the root server operators can indeed be involved in dealing with those issues.

During the new gTLD process, there were frequently issues, but they ended up being taken out to a consultant [inaudible] RSSAC wasn't really functional at that time.

Okay. Then we shift to the supporting organizations. The Address Supporting Organization, it's closely linked to the NRO (the Number Resource Organization) and the RIR (the Regional Internet Registry) work together. And their main outputs over the recent year have been policies for the allocation of iPv6 blocks, policies for the allocation of autonomous system numbers (the ASN block), for the RIRs (the Regional Internet Registries), and global policy for post-exhaustion iPv4 allocation which is a state we are currently in. They also are the ones that created criteria for the establishment of the new regional Internet registries.

So their work is very much done outside the ICANN meeting. In fact, they normally meet with other meetings like the RIR meetings, the IETF meetings. But I think once a year they do at least meet and there are always some of the ASL participants at [inaudible].

There's the ccNSO. And one of the things that I think comes out of this is notice how the concerns of the different groups are. So the ccNSO, which is a forum for country code top-level domain managers. Again, the ccTLDs are a very independent group. They are not regulated by ICANN in the same way that the gTLDs are and [mainly] discuss their issues. And you could see that many of their issues now center around the IANA transition. [inaudible] policy issue. The only reason they deal with ICANN is indeed IANA [inaudible].

They also are doing work on supporting domain name industry in under-served regions. We see some of that work start to come out in a wider scope with reports to be reviewed. The international registration data has been a big issue of theirs for a while because many of them, the ccTLDs are not run in English or a Latin [inaudible] context. And the NETMundial [commission].

They're very active as a group in the world of Internet governance beyond ICANN. Other than maybe GAC, they're probably the most active in terms of looking outward and looking at ICANN, the ccTLD and its role in a larger Internet ecosystem.

And there's the GNSO. This is the one that I am currently part of. I also happen to be an At-Large member. They're working – and in fact, we probably have people in this audience that know these far better than I

do. But there's basically the Inter-Register Transfer Policy. This is part [D]. This is one that's been going on a long time and gets into the nitty-gritty details of what happens when a domain name is transferred from one user to another, from one registrant to another, from one registrar to another. How can that be done safely? How can that be done with security? If a problem happens, how do you deal with it? What are the dispute resolution mechanisms? It's been a group that I've been part of now through the last three parts. I missed Part A.

Then there's locking of a domain name subject to UDRP. I think that's one that Allen was incredibly active with. That's a group that's worth mentioning because it's one that has gone into this new process of having Implementation Review Team.

There's the GNSO Data and Matrix for Policy Making. That's one that was inspired – actually, requested – by the Board. There's Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation. That's a working group effort that came out of a recommendation [inaudible] policy development process.

There's the gTLD Registration Data Services and there's Translation Transliteration of Contact Information. Those two largely came out of other joint work that has been done earlier and Board requests for policy work.

Then there's the [inaudible] Policy Issues and the biggest one of those comments, and in fact anybody going to the upcoming meeting in London will probably hear lots of this, even if they haven't heard it before, because it really is the issue so many people are bluffing about and [inaudible] buzzing about it are complaining that it's interfering

with all the other work that ICANN needs to do. But it's the transition of stewardship of IANA functions, the response to NTIA thing. It was finally ready after 16 years to transition its stewardship role, and it gave a certain number of conditions for doing it and it gave ICANN the responsibility for organizing the effort and arriving at an answer to how this should be done.

It's a very controversial subject. Lots of us are a part of it on one view or other. It's an issue I must admit I am partisan on.

And there's one on enhancing ICANN accountability. ICANN already has some very innovative accountability mechanisms that came out of the Affirmation of Commitments, which was an agreement between the U.S. government Department of Commerce, NTIA, and ICANN that basically set up various review mechanisms, accountability mechanisms, transparency mechanisms.

And these are ongoing, but there's a question of whether this is sufficient, especially in the light of the transition of IANA function. This is an effort that is just starting and it's an effort on which there is currently an open comment period. So let me see where I am on that. Okay, next one.

So that was a quick picture. As I say, it would take many hours and many, many discussions to delve deeper than just the surface of what these issues. But also, hopefully, people notice that each of the different groups really does provide a different set. We had four. We had the ACs that were all providing advice, statements, reports. Basically things that sort of kept us on track, let us know that we are

taking care of public policy correctly – or not, challenging us on the public policy. That we have users concerns in mind – or we don't. Where have we missed the boat? That we're doing the security and stability of the Internet, that the route server operators are operating well and have what they need from the rest of us.

So those are the things that I mentioned. There's a continuity. There's a part that has to remain consistent for ICANN to have a solid policy framework.

On the other hand, then looking at the ccNSO, the GNSO and the ASO, you can see how radically different not only their subjects were in terms of the issues and the policy issues they're looking at, but also just the perspective they take on the world – [inaudible] in a serious concentrated way. Out to the world in terms of their relationship for larger ecosystem, or nitty-gritty details on how a gTLD is run. Very different perspectives on policy, very different sets of problems. Yet, sometimes they all come together. Sometimes, especially at the Board level, these things [get].

So, we have a problem. Each of these supporting organizations is doing its own thing. Each of these advisory committees is also doing its own thing. There's no coordinating saying, "Now you will all work on this." Certainly the environment inside ICANN directs us to various things. Staff helps direct us to particular problems. The Board can certainly try and motivate us all, can send questions, can take actions, etc., that cause all of us to look in the same direction.

But by and large, there is no real coordination. I understand that in the last few years, the chairs of the various supporting organizations, SOs and Advisory Committees (ACs) – or short, SOAC – they meet periodically to coordinate what's important to which one and to find out perhaps where they have commonalities or where they may be running into [inaudible].

So each of these groups is internally consistent. Each of these groups has a consistent way of developing its policies, of [developing] its statements, of developing its position but they're all different. They work on different schedules, except insofar as maybe coordinated by when a face-to-face meeting is going to occur, so there's a little pressure to produce an outcome by a particular time. But by and large, its independent.

And then what happens is the Board receives a recommendation from a supporting organization, and the way the policies are written, it's supposed to accept that [inaudible] and it receives advice from each of several ACs that it should heed.

Sometimes they're incompatible. At that point – and we've seen it over the period – the Board is empowered to make a top-down decision. It's empowered to look at A, B and C and say, "Okay, this is what we should do." And sometimes it does that and sometimes it gets a good reaction when it does and sometimes it gets a bad reaction when it does.

The process can dead end. The process can sort of say, "Well, we don't know what to do" and nothing can happen, or something takes a long time to happen. In either of those cases, it's a poor outcome.

Now, the Board over the last year has really been struggling with how to deal with this particular tussle and the various groups have been dealing with it also. So this is basically the solution space. It's basically a breaking of the silos. It's early engagement.

Now, using a GNSO example, GNSO uses working groups that are charged with finding ICANN consensus among as diverse a group as can be gathered into the working group. And that's part of their mandate and part of what they need to do and part of what the GNSO Council needs to review before approving a recommendation and it's something that the Board needs to look at.

Now there's already been fairly strong participation from At-Large and working groups, but that hasn't really worked for GAC, for SSAC or RSSAC. They have completely different patterns of working, of being able to act as a non-representative to the ways in which they have to interact.

So other means of doing early engagement get looked at, so there's a joint effort between the GNSO and the GAC at the moment, developed method of early engagement. Specific steps are being taken by the GNSO whenever an SSAC report is released to make sure that it is paid attention to. There's those joint working groups have been created over time. I think they work great. Some people think they don't work so great. They certainly don't work consistently.

So there's now an effort to develop a starting process for creating joint working groups. And the whole idea is, to go back to the metaphor that I've tortured, is to not have the Board taking all this stuff and trying to

melt it into one thing but rather to basically be able to come up with a coordinated and successful pattern of policy.

Okay. The last thing I wanted to look at – and it looks like I'm not doing too bad time-wise – is policy and implementation. My slide came out a little funny here. Basically, the problem statement is implementation often seems to ignore policy.

Now, I was careful when I said "often seems." The discussions are not necessarily definitive and sometimes they do, sometimes they don't. It's a matter of discussion, but they seem to. The question then is, what can we do?

A working group was tasked by the GNSO Council with a set of recommendations on how to go about figuring out when this happens, what can be done about it, means to take care of it to come up with criteria for perhaps bringing things together.

Now this one is very much from the focal point of gTLD policies and implementation. That's partly because a) I watch that one carefully as an example but b) also because it is the place wherein a current policy implementation issues and the last year or two of policy implementation on new gTLDs there have been so many instances of apparent incompatibility between policy and implementation that have created great stress in the community and it became a really important issue.

The way this group is going about its work, there's a hope I think that its way of looking at things may be useful to others. But it is looking at it in a GNSO-centric way.

The question becomes, where does policy stop and implementation begin? Or rather, is that even a reasonable question? Does policy every stop, and is implementation a concern from day one?

The group decided to take a step back and develop a working definition of words like stakeholder, policy.

Did I do that? I'm sorry, folks. I keep using my hands when I talk, and I somehow jerk around the display.

So words like policy and policy development, GNSO policy, policy advice, implementation, implement.

It then started to also come up with working principles. I paraphrased these brutally. Multistakeholderism, policy at ICANN comes from the community in a bottom-up manner and must adhere to standards of development. Implementation and policy are rarely, if ever, completely separate. There needs to be a way for policy to check implementation. But the amount of time it takes to do policy should not stall operations.

As I say, I recommend in the document that they say it in a far more precise way. Recommendations – the work is just starting on these.

This is an important part, I believe, in terms of trying to understand that going back to that initial tussle I talked about between: is this a nonprofit corporation that needs to get a job done, or is this a policy-driven, community policy, bottom-up driven organization?

Of course, the answer: it is both of them. But how do we reconcile that without interfering with the community's right and the community's responsibility to make the policy [inaudible] to the end. And it is the

ICANN corporate responsibility to do a good job, to make sure that things comply, to make sure that things are enforced, to make sure that the policy works as an implementation.

There are references on the Policy and Implementation Group. I recommend reading those. The Background Documents, the Staff Discussion Paper is quite good. It looks at it from many different perspectives. It's a good document, a good place to start at. This working group is ongoing, like with most groups, it is a GNSO group. It is open. But anyhow.

Okay, now this last part's the same. I'll go through quickly. I stole them from another presentation on policy process, but I figured it was good to have them as part of this one. I'll just go through it quickly.

How to stay updated – there's a Policy Update Monthly. Do subscribe. There is participation in these webinars prior to every ICANN meeting. The latest updates are gone through. It's important. Also, a good way if you're lazy and don't want to read everything to, in a couple hours, get refreshed on what's important and know where else you need to go study if that's your inclination.

Then there's the policy staff. (As I said, I stole these.) They're all over the world. They support us. They're everywhere. They speak every language. They know everything. They've got experts everywhere. But, no, really. I'm not being facetious. The policy staff is really quite an amazing operation, and they do deal with us noisy and opinionated communities in a very efficient and kind manner.

In fact, there goals: to help us, support us, and to manage the processes. There is the list of names. That's subscribing to them. I put a picture down there of the ICANN Weave. It's not quite the well-ordered organizational thing that I showed up on another slide. It's kind of got lots of different things. The warp is sometimes the weft; the weft is sometimes the warp. It's a very exciting weave, but it is expressive.

Thank you. Any questions? I think I kept myself to 30 minutes. Am I still there? Is anybody else there?

TERRI AGNEW: Avri, yes. Everyone can still hear you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I couldn't hear anybody else.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, we hear you.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. I can put the slides on sync so anybody then can go back to the slides themselves. Alright. Now people can direct themselves to the slides. If they wanted to go back to something to ask about it, they can just go there and tell me which slide it is and other people can go there too.

Questions? I guess, what? Tijani or somebody else will manage the queue? Or do you want me to do that? I see Evan put his hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Avri. Thank you for your presentation. I had [inaudible] before Evan, but he lowered his hand. So it's to Evan.

AVRI DORIA: Okay, so I see an Evan [inaudible] I am unable to [inaudible] question. "[inaudible] ALAC care about the distinction between policy and implementation when it's empowered to advise [inaudible]?"

My quick answer would be because it's a different answer, it's a different process, it's a different [inaudible] looking at. So I think it matters to know when you at the policy end of this, there's a lot that can be contributed in terms of ideas and in terms of that.

Once the policy has been approved and you're looking at the implementation, you're looking at something that has been approved, that they are [inaudible] plan. So it's more a question of analysis or it's a question of raising an alarm and saying, "Wait, wait, wait. [inaudible] implementation. That policy is incomplete. The policy's not working." I think you care because the questions are structured differently.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: [inaudible], you have your hand up. Do you want to continue? Okay, I see that Fatimata is on the chat. "ICANN, IANA, NTIA?"

AVRI DORIA: Okay, as I tried to express, I assume people know that ICANN is Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. God, I never remember these things correctly. IANA is Internet Assigned Numbers Authority. I have to look up what the exact – they're the authority that actually keeps the databases. NTIA is part of U.S. Department of Commerce, the National Telecommunications and Information Agency, I believe.

But I tend to have a very short-term recall on exactly what the letters stand for, but those are the three things. Sorry I did not. I was trying to be very careful to always translate the acronyms, but I didn't do a very good job, obviously.

Any other questions? I think there was another question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Avri. Any other questions?

AVRI DORIA: I saw a couple in the chat as I looked. Oksana has something. Oksana: "Is it possible to track [inaudible] from grassroots [inaudible] comment of any single Internet user or any one ALS?"

I believe in many cases, one could. I don't know about a single ALS. I've seen a track from where ALAC sent something, where the RALOs sent something to the GNSO, and the GNSO sent it to the Board and to various comment streams. I've never actually seen somebody do a timeline and show who input where and what. It would be an interesting picture to see, but certainly anecdotally I have seen the connectivity before that.

There was another question in there about suffrage. I don't think that – it's sort of in a parallel discussion that that comes into the accountability discussion and how decisions are made in [inaudible]. There's not a whole lot of suffrage inside ICANN. There are all kinds of other democratic methods that are used, some of which appear more democratic to some people than they appear to others. But suffrage, [direct] suffrage, is not a feature of ICANN at all.

It's always some kind of representational decision making and whether the representatives are all elected or selected is a fascinating issue. But it doesn't really directly affect the policy because that is dealt with by each of the constituencies, stakeholder groups, supporting organizations, RALOs, etc., in their own bottom-up. They decide how it is they are going to make their decision. There is no top-down [inaudible] suffrage [inaudible].

Some of us, myself included, are strong fans of suffrage, the bottom-up process and such, it's not something that can be applied universally. It's something that some groups do and some groups don't do – kind of like countries. Some of them do voting; some of them, not so much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Avri. I have Evan Leibovitch has a question. Evan, please. Can you speak? Evan?

TERRI AGNEW: Evan does not have audio quality at this time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

TERRI AGNEW: I believe he's typing his questions in the chat.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Okay, I see Evan's question: "Fatimata references a comment I made earlier. I think the relationship between ICANN, IANA, and NTIA are very poorly understood, and this needs to be understood before we can engage in useful end user debate in my opinion."

                           I guess when Fatimata was asking about ICANN, IANA, and NTIA, she wasn't asking me for what the letters mean. She was asking me to answer Evan's question. I apologize for not understanding.

                           I think that you're right. I think that the relationships are explicable. They are understandable. But I don't think a lot of people understand them that well. The real issue among those three that affect the policy making – and it's an issue that I think is being worked out in places like the 1Net discuss list and the IANA transition list and people that participate in those.

                           Anybody that's interested in those issues, I recommend you participate in them even if you think they're noisy because that's where the

discussions of how these relationships look from the various points of view are being discussed.

I tend to think that the understanding is forming in people. I think, obviously, users that need to be educated if they don't have it already, I think that the information is out there. I don't know that anybody has organized a set of webinars for users and others on this whole issue. As I say, I'd love to do one, but I have a point of view. Of course, I can always avoid my point of view, but you know.

Then: "What can At-Large members do to educate themselves on this important [stuff]?"

Two of the things I've mentioned are just put yourself on these mailing lists. I understand that can be a "drinking from a fire hose." Like I said, it's an Americanism, but basically that can require dealing with a lot of information, which is sometimes difficult for people. Some of us tend to love it, but some of us have more difficulty. We have lives or whatever that keep us from that.

I think it would be good to have a set of webinars and a set of debates on these issues. I personally – a lot of people are turned off by debate because it seems confrontational. I personally think for the policy effort to find two champions of an idea who can argue it and can argue it competently and without malice is actually a wonderful way to bring the rest of us into the discussion because we can hear a strong opinion and the reasons for those strong opinions.

I personally believe we don't schedule half enough debates of different positions. We sort of get up there and have everybody try to do

consensus-speak. While consensus is important, consensus-speak at the beginning of a process leaves it hard to basically understand where the differences are and where the differences need to be overcome.

But I don't know of much stuff that's written. I certainly am writing a lot of this stuff all the time, but that's not within an ICANN [platform]. I don't know what to say more than that on how to educate.

I see Olivier has his hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Avri. Okay, there is Garth who is saying that. Okay, but read the question of Garth. Yeah, Olivier, please go ahead.

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

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, can you hear me? You should be able to hear me.

AVRI DORIA: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Yes, we can hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Tijani. Just a quick question to Avri. The ICANN mission is often being mentioned in any type of policy development and work. Yet it's somehow sometimes not quite understood, especially these days when there appears to be also some question regarding more general Internet governance than just things that deal with domain names and identifiers and so on.

How is one able to find out whether something is under ICANN's mission or not, so a part of ICANN's mission or whether one is just dealing with mission creep.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. This is an interesting topic. There are some people that take a very narrow interpretation. In any of these discussions, there are some people that take a very narrow interpretation. There are others of us – and I happen to be on the broader interpretation side of this – that basically look at these issues and realize that anything they touch is, indeed, part of the mission.

I don't happen to be one of those that's terribly concerned about the mission creep because I believe it's a bottom-up organization. If the groups are interested, if the people are interested, then it is something we need to be involved in.

To say that while the whole world is screaming about addresses and names and numbers that we're going to say, "Oh, no, no, no. We have a

purely technical, clerical task here, and we don't need to worry about the Internet governance implications of this and how it is connected to other issues and how we are connected to other organizations."

It basically leaves us vulnerable. It leaves us insulated in our own little box that says, "I count numbers. I give out names. I don't do anything but that. Please don't bother me with the outside world." I think that basically leaves us in trouble.

One can, and some do, very strict interpretation of it's just technical detail. Well, it's not technical detail; it's policy. And policy basically touches on the environment, and the environment touches on policy.

Now, one can question perhaps the spontaneity with which some actions are taken and with which some senior officers make statements about ICANN's position, and that's certainly valid. But to say, "It's none of our business," is something that I certainly would find hard to explain.

Now, I don't understand. Let me see. Now, there was another question up here. There was a Garth question I was told I had to pay attention to. Let me see if I can find it. If anybody else has it, please read it because I'm not paying that much – I have trouble talking and reading at the same time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I have it. Yes, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Avri, Garth said that there is the [factual] relationship description that could take the form of an organized chat to understand. And there is the analysis of the relationship in political terms that could help inform the way forward.

AVRI DORIA: Certainly. The more analysis, the better. And, of course, political understanding is one aspect of it. There's everything from the technical understanding to the political traveling through the techno-political, which is the area that personally I find myself spending most time in.

But certainly, there's an economic analysis. There's a political analysis. There's a sociological analysis. There's a user psychological analysis. There are many different perspectives from which we have to look at this. When we certainly look at the political aspect of the Republicans in Congress basically being on the same side as those that want the U.S. to let go but don't like the way ICANN is doing it at certain times, you find that political things like this makes for strange bedfellows sometimes.

So indeed, I do think a lot of analysis. I hope that we do more analysis. I didn't really prepare myself for a talk on the transition, though I'd be happy to at some point. But basically at this point, we're still very much at ICANN's mercy on it. There's still a lot to be dealt with, but hopefully these webinars, these seminars, these analyses, these writings will all be done in some way.

I see Pastor Peters with a hand up.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, so Peters, please.

PASTOR PETERS: Sorry, it was an error.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

AVRI DORIA: Ah, okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So any other questions to Avri? Okay, Evan noted that the question I asked you was the answer of [Evan] to the Garth question, which was isn't it really the political understanding of those relationships that needs a broader analysis? This was the question of Garth.

AVRI DORIA: Right. Okay, yeah, and I think I addressed that. I think that certainly is one of the aspects. I don't happen to be a political scientist, so I don't happen to look at the whole world from the perspective of the political. But certainly, the financial, the political, the policy, the technical, as I say, the sociological, all of those are things that need to be – economics

– all of those are aspects that need to be analyzed, and I certainly would not exclude political. I don't think that political is the only understanding that we need, but it certainly is an understanding that we need.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Avri. I don't see anyone raising his hand. So if there is no other question, thank Avri for this presentation. Thank you all for coming and attending this webinar. You are [inaudible], and that's very good. Thank you very much.

Don't forget to fill in the evaluation sheets, please. If there is no other question, I have a lot of applause to Avri. Thank you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you very much, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If there is no other question, I will declare this webinar adjourned. Thank you very much, everyone.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. Bye-bye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The staff, the translators, everyone, thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]