LOS ANGELES – Board with the At-Large
Tuesday, October 14, 2014 – 08:30 to 09:30
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, everybody, if he could please take your seats. Good morning, Ray. We're not going to go through each board member. Thank you for coming in early, 8:30 first session of the day for you. I understand this is going to be a long day, but we thought we would start with a little presentation on one of the two topics that we have brought to the board today. Joining me at the table on my left, so on the right of me, is the at-large leadership team. At the far end, we have Fadi Chehade. Next to me, of course Steve and Sebastien. Welcome.

Today, we wanted to give you an update on the at-large summit recommendations which you have received just after the at-large summit took place in London.

There's been some work done. I know that there were some inquiries on the board as to whether these were -- was advice from the at-large or whether these were just wishful thinking or others, and also a little bit of confusion as to how this was to be treated.

Certainly the recommendations themselves are very compressed because they had to all fit in the one document, and so we will be telling you what has taken place since then and what we are doing with them.

Not all recommendations in the declaration were aimed at the board, so what we've done is to take the subset that is aimed at the board, work

---

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.

on it as a matter of priority, and so we will be providing you with those details in a moment.

Steve, do you have any introductory remarks or anything?

STEVE CROCKER: It's -- as usual, it's a pleasure to be here. You know, my standard speech on this is that the board looks forward to these engagements. We like to use the time substantively and we like to get directly into issues and not handle these in a pro forma way, so let's just jump right into it.

Olivier and I have had extensive interactions, particularly on the ATLAS II recommendations. Alan and I have now begun to interact as well. So we've got a bit of continuity during the transition.

So with that, do proceed.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steve.

So the at-large summit, as I said, has produced 43 recommendations, of which 27, I think, are aimed -- 22 are aimed at the board.

Now, what we mean, "are aimed at the board," of course they relate to the board in some way or other or will need some action from the board in the future.

So far, we have not actually expanded on all of the recommendations. What we've done is to put together an ATLAS -- at-large summit post-summit   implementation   team   so   as   to   expand   on   the

recommendations, and so let's go to the first slide and see how we go on this. First slide.

So we'll be telling you details of the post-ATLAS II activities, and let's go to the first slide of that, please.

So effectively, the way that everything has been structured so far, if you look at the bottom of the picture we had five thematic working groups that worked each on a specific theme.

One about the future of multistakeholder models; one about the globalization of ICANN; global Internet, the user perspective; ICANN transparency and accountability; and finally, at-large community engagement in ICANN.

And all of these groups were made up of all of the at-large -- the RALOs -- or the ALS representatives that we had in London. Some of the groups were interpreted because we had a very large group with people that didn't speak English too well.

Others were smaller groups. I think the smallest group had about 25 people, the largest had over 80 or 90 of them.

All of this fed the declaration which had all of their recommendations, and so you can see a word cloud of the different points that were brought forward in those recommendations.

We created, after June, an ATLAS II implementation task force whose job it is to convert the one-liner recommendations that we sent into implementable items that were clearer, that were perhaps more targeted at specific parts of what we needed, and those

recommendations then will be sent separately to the board, to the staff, and to the community for implementation or for, I guess, engagement as a first step, since I think that just pushing things over to the next -- the next level is not the way to do things these days. At ICANN, you do have to interact, and I think we absolutely welcome the interaction, and today's meeting, of course, is already the first step to that interaction.

Next slide, please.

So we've got three recommendations that we believe are pretty much ready for consumption by the board and for action, and let's go into those.

These are the highlights.

Now, you'll note with Recommendation 11, it's on -- because we're now treating each one of these in a separate way in a parallel process, they're not in order anymore, but the number didn't really matter. It's the recommendation itself that matters. And this is, as I said, to be taken as advice.

So the first one is Recommendation 11, where ICANN must implement a range of services to facilitate access according to various criteria: Gender, cultural diversity, and user needs, disabilities, et cetera.

And what we've done as the implementation team is to assign those recommendations for expansion to our working groups. We have an accessibility working group in place. Cheryl Langdon-Orr is the chair of that group. And we also have a technology task force, because this might involve some technology.

So the technology task force was also tasked to work -- to work with this, in coordination with the accessibility working group.

To explain this recommendation, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Oh, that's louder than -- I'll try and modulate so as not to deafen you. And of course it's Dev Anand Teelucksingh who is the chair of the technology task force, so we're a bit of a tag team here today.

Recommendation 11 is not what I would call low-hanging fruit because these issues are going to take time. This is going to take -- as I think to quote you, Steve, back in Singapore meeting, this stuff just needs to get baked into the DNA of the organization.

But that doesn't, we recognize, happen overnight.

But because it's landed on both the technology task force and the accessibility working group -- which actually is a task force, when I last checked, but that's another detail -- we've actually -- because we've been working on these things, we've already got a fair way into making some meaningful outcomes.

The ATLAS Recommendation 11 was talking, of course, about limiting any possible barrier to entry for participation in ICANN, and that's got to do with all forms of communication and it's got to do with things as simple as the meetings facilities. This room is a very good example of a highly accessible meetings facility, that sort of thing.

So what we've given for your later digestion is a couple of links.

The first link is going to take you to the recommendation and a little bit more expansion.

The second link is, in fact, what the accessibility task force has been working on for now three months, and that is the checklist of our recommendations that we've put forward already from outside of the Singapore meeting on what would make ICANN a top-class entity in terms of accessibility.

And we've broken those up now and we have now, as of this morning, 7:00 a.m. -- and thank you to all of the team that turned up this morning, and thank you with particular attention to the senior staff who turn up regularly to our calls and were an integral part of our workshop this morning.

So Laura Bengford and Chris Mondini and Nancy, all an integral part of that, and we've done a SWOT analysis and a SMART analysis, as well as a prioritization on a number of each of these individual points.

So we're a good way ahead there and that link in the future will take you not to a clever dashboard, I regret to say, but to a couple of wiki pages which will be ongoing updates so the ICANN board can know at any time how far we've got along in this particular project.

And I really do want to point out the fact that your key staff are just so engaged and so committed to this, it's going to make a very big difference.

The other thing is -- and there's a link missing here, Dev. I'm not sure why there's a link missing here. I'm going to toss to you because we've done extra work.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you.   Dev Anand Teelucksingh speaking.   I'm the chair of the technology task force. And some of the things that we are looking at as part of our regular technology task force meetings was to look at conferencing alternatives, and one of the links that actually is -- it is under the first link. We've also looked at captioning and doing live transcripts during working group calls and we successfully did a test with a company that had a plug-in for the Adobe Connect and the test will be ongoing as to try to evaluate various technology solutions that could meet this recommendation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Now -- it's Cheryl again, for the record.

The testing needs to be continuous because every time a new update happens, often things change. So it's not as if a task force like the technology task force can have one look at it and assume the tool is there. It is an ongoing thing.

Thank you for your indulgence. We look forward to reporting again and keeping you as a highly accessible organization.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And to avoid cutting the floor, I think we'll probably have all the questions at the end, or Steve, how do you want to play this?

STEVE CROCKER: No, I -- let me ask you to keep track of the time and manage us through it.

I find this to be a very interesting recommendation. I've got a lot of questions, but I'll hold back, but I look forward to engaging.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steve. Let's go to the next recommendation, please, and that's Number 27, and that's a pretty straightforward one.

The board must implement ATRT2 Recommendation 9.1 regarding formal advice from advisory committees.

Now, bearing in mind that this was written in June, before the board decided and agreed and voted on proceeding with implementing all of the ATRT2 recommendations, this can serve as a faster -- a good reminder that we are very focused on this and we hope that the implementation will take place very soon.

STEVE CROCKER: This, I'll respond to.

We are in the process of tightening and sharpening and deepening our mechanisms and processes for this.

I would hope that this will happen without any additional effort from you guys, but don't -- I don't need to tell you not to be shy and vigilant about it. You will.

But this is something that is very high on my priority and very high on our organization's priority.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steve.

Let's go to the next recommendation, please. That's Number 35.

The ICANN board should hold a minimum of one conference call with the at-large community in between ICANN public meetings.

And this really has the aim to enhance communication between the board and the at-large community.

So far, we meet three times a year, once at each one of the ICANN meetings, and there is just so much going on in at-large now with all of the working groups, with all of the processes that are taking place at ICANN, that it was felt by our community that the board could be kept better informed about what we are doing.

Now, I have had some preliminary discussions with Steve about this and I understand your schedule of calls -- or some of your schedule of calls, and it might well be that there would be a subset or maybe any interested board members could join with the at-large community on a session.

It really -- this really is a recommendation to start a process by which we could perhaps have a more constant and ongoing interaction with board members.

Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Let me take the intent and substance behind this and -- with a little bit of latitude about the actual implementation.

Let's imagine, just for the sake of discussion, we're going to have a regularly scheduled call at such and such a time. It makes no sense to have such a call without some preparation for that. What are the topics we're going to talk about, what's the agenda and so forth.

That's really where the real progress is going to be made, where we're going to --

So let's do that, let's have that, and then the precise form of who's on what call or how we engage in that interaction is a logistics challenge.

The board and -- just as ALAC is, we're spread out all over the world. We've found it to be very, very challenging to have conference calls even for the formal business that we do, and we've scaled back and limited them. We used to have three-hour phone call- -- three-hour board meeting calls. We're now down to roughly an hour to an hour and a half, and that's just for the formal business of -- when we need to assemble as a board.

But we will find a way to get the essence of what you're trying to do here. I totally applaud that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Steve.

Let's go to the next.

Now, the other recommendations which we are working on are not what one would call fully cooked yet. They are in the process of being cooked.   As I said, we are expanding on them, so they're not recommendations to be acted on today.

This is just an advance notice of what you are to expect. We're hoping to be complete and to have expanded on the recommendations by the next meeting in Marrakech.

So I think there are quite a few of them as you know. I will go through them and, perhaps, expand a little bit on the sort of thinking that are behind the recommendations and where we are at in the process to be able to have a better drafted and maybe a more complete and actionable recommendation.

Next slide, please.

So this one is recommendation Number 1. ICANN should continue to support outreach programs that engage a broader audience, in order to reinforce participation from all stakeholders. We had a number of assignees to this, and they are currently working to put together a more complete plan explaining that ICANN's efforts to bring in new people should not be limited to people in developing countries but also underrepresented community members that live in developed countries.

You speak about ICANN pretty much in any country in the world. There is a need to go out there and get more people involved, and that's not just for developing economies.

So once we have something a little bit more ready for you on this with maybe a fuller plan on how to do this, suggestions and so on, we'll get back to you on it.

STEVE CROCKER: Maybe it will come with metrics and with targets. I can imagine a form of this in which more, more, more, more and one is never satisfied. How do we get our arms around how much of a priority this is compared to everything else? It is obviously a resource issue. And so it is a question of allocation of resources against some sort of return on investment style of measurement.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much, Steve.

Heidi, is someone taking notes from At-Large? You are. Okay, fantastic.

Next one, please.

ICANN should increase support, budget and staff, to programs having brought valuable members to the community. So, of course, here many questions. That raises many questions. Who are valuable members? What do we mean by support? A whole number of questions that come from that recommendation. And so we've got three working groups working on this at this moment. The capacity-building working group is, of course, one of the primary ones here. But then also the outreach

subcommittee to identify those so-called programs, and our finance and budget subcommittee will then take the output from the capacity-building working group and outreach subcommittee and work with them and with ICANN finance and the various component parts to evaluate what are the resources used so far and if there are any additional funds required for any of this. But we are still some place away from being able to provide you with something fuller than this.

STEVE CROCKER: And how does this coordinate or relate to the previous recommendation?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: They are two different recommendations. I must admit, I didn't actually have a look at the coordination between the two. We've allocated them to different groups because of that. I think that the target at the end of the day is not exactly the same.

Sebastien, perhaps?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If you would allow me to speak in French.

Recommendation number 1, its goal is to bring new participants. Recommendation number 2, its goal is to make sure that these new participants stay and actively participate in ICANN's operations. So I think they are complimentary but they are not the same, even though at first, of course, you are a participant -- first a participant and then you have to find your place within the organization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Merci beaucoup.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

Next slide, please.

This one is a slightly longer one. This one is, I would say, a medium- to long-term one. The current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient as far as automation is concerned. Everyone seems to be running around having to try with an enormous amount of problems in finding the information that they need and also being able to track what is happening.

And so our participants thought that it would be important to implement a workable policy management process system available for use across all of the supporting organizations and advisory committees that would perform a number of things such as enhancing knowledge management, improving the effectiveness of volunteers rather than having to search through the whole ICANN Web site using Google, actually have a way to find information faster, improving the cross-community policy-specific activities, a whole number of things including the development of metrics.

Alan, did you want to say a couple of words? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. You've all heard about inventions that are simultaneously made or almost simultaneously made around the world, completely disconnected, simply because the time had come. This is one of them. We came up with this in ATLAS. At the chairs meeting on Friday, the idea came out independently. And when we met with SSAC, we found they had asked for something similar to this a few months ago. So clearly the time has come, and we're going to have to do something about it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. And the process really with this is start putting together a core set of requirements and needs and then go out there and work with the other supporting organizations and advisory committees and collect what their needs are. We really are looking at doing something that is going to go ICANN-wide and really finding out the needs of all the different component parts of the ICANN community.

Ray?

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Olivier. I would point out that every one of the regional registries does this. They have very accessible, easy-to-find summaries of what policies are under discussion. They regularly report across the board to each other. And in their meetings, as far as what's going on in each other's regions, it's a very effective system.

Those reports are always available and online. And so I don't see where this would apply to them in that all it takes is someone to go take a look.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Ray. And perhaps I think one action item for us then would be to liaise with regional internet registries and get lessons learned from them.

RAY PLZAK: What a shock.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Dev Anand Teelucksingh, the chair of our technology task force, did you want to add a few more elements to this?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh. And, indeed, just to follow what Alan said, this is something that its time has come. The At-Large community has been -- has had challenges in dealing with the policy development process and coming up and responding within timelines and often what we have been doing is doing a manual cut and paste and trying to get information to the various persons.

So, you know, we are going to be looking at the various technologies to minimize and eliminate the manual processes and, again, make us a better At-Large community. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So we have also spoken to Ashwin Rangan, as you know, the chief information and innovation officer. So he is also aware of the work that we are doing here. And, clearly, this is not something that is a three-month or a three-week project. We're looking here at the medium- to long-term as I mentioned earlier. But it is something which I think we all feel is needed now. We're all running around like headless chickens and spending too much time trying to find information, and there needs to be something done about this.

Whether it starts with a document management system, it really needs to have a first step and then go to a fuller system such as that.

Let's go to the next one, please.

Number 5, ICANN should examine how best to ensure that end users remain at the heart of the accountability process in all aspects pertaining to the transition of stewardship of the IANA function.

Now, this recommendation in the next page, which will have another set of recommendations, was assigned to the future challenges working group. For this, I'll hand you over to Evan Leibovitch -- or is it Holly? Holly Raiche who will be speaking to us about this recommendation.

Holly, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. This will be a -- we haven't even decided what to name the working group. But it is very, very clear that we need to do a lot of work on accountability in the context of the transition of stewardship, to feed

into -- and I won't even name all of the groups -- but certainly for the ALAC processes.

And I have to say, yesterday's meeting including hearing both the Secretary of Commerce and particularly Larry Strickling's version -- not version, vision of what he and they would like to see in terms of accountability would provide some very real guidance for the yet-to-be-formed but already working group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Holly.

I think we can go to the next one. This, again, is one of the long-term ones. Now, the next one we've put seven recommendations on one page. They're not really meant at being looked at individually for the time being. It's early in the morning, yes.

And I'll let Evan speak about those. We've put them all on the same page because they are batched together as work for the technology task force which has -- sorry, technology. What am I saying? The future challenges working group which has two co-chairs. We have Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Evan Leibovitch.

I will let Evan take us through this. Let's have some coffee and listen to Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I hope those two things aren't linked.

The reason why these are lumped together is because these were all put together by one of the technology -- one of the task groups at ATLAS II assigned to deal with accountability.

That was brought into our group, which is the future challenges working group, which is chaired by myself and Jean-Jacques, who most of you know.

The point behind future challenges is that it was meant to be almost like a think tank, a very high level part of ALAC that would try and have a forward-looking approach to things as opposed to simply just always reacting to things that were going around. And so accountability has sort of always been one of the things we've been working with.

Because of ATLAS, because of all this work coming out of the thematic groups, the recommendations you see in front of you were all put out by the thematic group. I believe it was the fourth one to deal with accountability, and so there's various facets of that.

So those are now being taken up by the future challenges working group in a more high-level approach. The IANA thing that you saw in the last recommendation, that's dealt with more immediately. The seven that you see in front of you are being taken up by the future challenges group to come up with a sort of overall holistic, if you would, approach to accountability that our group is taking up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Evan.

Let's go to the next one, please.

Now, you've heard about the finance and budget subcommittee in At-Large. There are three recommendations that are aimed directly at the subcommittee itself in addition, of course, to the collaboration that the subcommittee will have to deal with the outreach and with the capacity-building working groups.

So the three here -- the first one is that ICANN should offer a process similar to the community regional outreach pilot program but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel. So the CROPP -- I'm not sure if everyone is aware of the CROPP here. I gather you are -- is sending people from different parts of ICANN actually on specific trips for -- aimed at outreach.

In this recommendation, we are looking at very small sums to help with local organizations requiring documentation from At-Large or documentation about ICANN. Maybe the -- if a local event is to be staged, some of the logistics involved with the event, this sort of thing.

So we're not looking at huge budget requests as such.

At the moment, all extra budget requests have to go -- which are not CROPP related have to go via the extra requests -- yearly extra requests. But as you know, many of the small events that take place around the world are not tabled a year in advance. It sometimes goes on a three-month level or even less -- shorter deadlines and so on. That's one of them. But we still have to do some work on this. As I said, those we're still working on, and you will have a fuller description of what we mean by this.

Number 41 is that the ALAC should work with the ICANN board in seeking additional sources of funding for At-Large activities. You might or might not be aware of this, but the At-Large Summit and also all of the RALO celebration that we have is actually all funded through the use of sponsors. And we've had to find our own sponsors out there. In fact, for the At-Large Summit who we secured in excess of 40,000 -- was it 40,000 pounds or U.S. dollars? U.S. dollars. 40,000 U.S. dollars for all of the additional activities like having -- staging a lunch and things like that.

However, there is today with the freezing of the budget and so on, we do need to continue working and doing a few of these activities because that's what brings the community closer together, the networking, the interaction between our community members. And so those additional sources of funding, I guess we should say additional external sources of funding -- the recommendations here are verbatim how they were on the declaration.

We would like to work with the ICANN board and with ICANN in finding new sponsors. One of the things -- it is true that that there have been some cases whether At-Large could have part of the overall sponsoring fees that were provided to ICANN for a meeting and so on. And the response we received was no, that's not possible. And, therefore, this is why a discussion needs to take place on this. And, of course, we will come with maybe a more focused recommendation on that.

And 42, ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RALO assemblies either at ICANN regional offices or in concert with regional events. Bringing people to an ICANN meeting once is great, but they won't really understand that much. You have to repeat the operation, and

you have to get people from time to time to meet face-to-face. Certainly in cementing the relationship that At-Large structures have with each other and also At-Large structures have with At-Large and with ICANN, the only way to do it is to bring people face-to-face.

Now, we are well aware that the meeting strategy working group and the board is working at the moment on changing the ways meetings might take place during the year. There might be shorter meetings, longer meetings, et cetera. Therefore, this recommendation is somehow kept on the side for the time being until we obtain more clarity about what the board will decide with regards to the way the meetings will be run throughout the world.

It might well be that face-to-face RALO assemblies could be done at very low cost by just having two days face-to-face in an ICANN regional office rather than having to send people from the RALO for a full seven-day or six-day ICANN meeting. And so as soon as we have more clarity about the meeting strategy that you will decide on, we will then start work with the finance and budget subcommittee and come up with a fuller proposal.

Let's go to the next one.

Now, the At-Large Advisory Committee has been tasked with two recommendations. In fact, some of them are somehow low-hanging fruit. Recommendation 9, ICANN should open regional offices with a clear strategy, subject to a cost-benefit analysis, focusing on the areas where the access to the Internet is growing, and where such growth is more likely to occur.

Well, as we know, ICANN has followed such a policy already. So this is really in place, and it might well be that the -- you'll see this recommendation land on your table. And you might probably say, "Well, that's what we're doing today" and, yes, we are pursuing this already. But it is interesting to see that our community really, really appears to be supporting this.

Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: It will be helpful, I think, to understand whether or not the force of this recommendation is to be supportive of what we're doing or whether there is a message that says, no, we want something different. Phrased in this form, it certainly admits to, yes, that's a good idea and we're doing that. And I can't tell at that level whether or not there is perfect synchrony or whether or not it is a complete disconnect.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Steve. And that would be a good action item to try and find out if what ICANN is doing today is the right way to go.

I saw Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. Thanks, Olivier. Just a question. Do you want to wait until you have gone through all of these slides? I have got some high-level questions of principle I wanted to ask, not about the individual recommendations. Would you prefer to wait till the end?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We can do this at the end.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Fine.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We are very close to the end. Just a couple more slides. So thank you.

And then Number 16, ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones. That brings some smile, of course, to people's faces because, yes, we can't do anything about the fact that the earth is round. And you see a lot of very tired people, especially in the Asia-Pacific and antipodes part of the world of which we have many members. But direct communication is important. And this, of course, will need some work out because it's just a one liner here. It is an overall view, and so we will come back to you with a more fleshed-out recommendation.

STEVE CROCKER: We have dialogue that is just starting up of what to do with the auction proceeds, and I've been gathering preliminary information on a range of things.

I must say that what you've just said is the most intriguing idea that has come to mind, which is to use the auction proceeds to deal with the fact that the earth is round and see if we can address that in some fashion.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Steve. We might need to purchase a number of hammers and start hitting the ground and see if we can flatten it.

All right. Let's move on to the next slide, please, and these are the recommendations classed as "Others."

At the moment, we have somehow allocated them to working groups and to an individual, but they're just in the process of being worked on.

So "ICANN should adjust its contractual framework to minimize conflict between its requirements and relevant national laws."

That came as a direct consequence of some of the problems that some European registrars faced with regards to data retention, et cetera, so that's one. It's in my court. I will work on it soon, as soon as I have a bit of time. And I hear that at the end of the week, I might have a bit more time on my hands.

21: "Encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity, and empowerment."

Our outreach subcommittee and our social media working group is working on this, and there is a question whether this is in ICANN's mandate or not, and it's well understood, so we will be working on that.

And then finally, "The roles and jurisdiction of the ombudsman should be expanded. The ICANN Web site should provide a clear and simple way for the public to make complaints."

And I guess that we will probably be working with the ombudsman on this, and the future challenges working group and the social media

working group, who deal with all of our communications and social media, as it says, will be working on this.

Next, please.

That's the questions and answers, so Chris and Ray. So shall we start with Chris Disspain and then Ray Plzak.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Olivier. Look, I just want to ask a sort of series of -- or maybe just one big question for clarification, but before I do, I just want to make it very clear, I'm not in any way -- what I'm about to say isn't in any way against the recommendations of ATLAS, et cetera, but I'm a bit -- I'm lacking a bit of clarity here. And I have actually sort of brought this up before in various different contexts and I'm very, very keen that we get clear about it.

So the ATLAS people met and they made -- they used whatever process they used, sitting around talking, to come up with a series of recommendations, which is fine.

And then you guys, the at-large, picked up those and you're trying to shape them into what?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're trying to shape them into two things.

Things that are actionable. As you will see many of the recommendations --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: -- are not directly actionable because they're just one liners. And also things that will be a first step to interaction with the board in order to be able to interpret these.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Brilliant.

The only thing that concerns me slightly is unless I misheard you, I think you said at the very beginning that we should treat this as advice, and that causes me a problem because my understanding of advice, from all of the SOs and ACs in this process, is that that pertains to policy.

So I want to make sure -- and there are certain processes that arise because of that.

So I want to make sure that -- there's a difference between you talking to us about feeding some stuff into the development of the organization over time, et cetera, and providing us with advice.

So that was my question.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me intercede here.

So I think there are two key points. First of all, the ATLAS II summit report contains a lot of these ideas, and in the dialogue that we had subsequent to receiving the report, there was clarity that that is not in

the form yet for the board to receive and act on; that this process that we're now discussing or hearing about is what will lead to a formal input to the board which we will then consider.

I've carefully avoided using the word "advice" in what I just said because I now want to speak to a different -- my interpretation of the word "advice."

We get inputs from not only the supporting organizations but from expert groups, from the advisory committees, from the review teams, from the accountability -- the AoC process, and what I've been trying to do is to get us to the point where we handle all of that in a not identical but comparable fashion in which we take each one of those things, treat them seriously, track them, respond to them, and so forth, and there's an orderly process for that.

And we will subject this to the same thing.

I'm not eager to get into a dialectic about whether the word "advice" applies only to policy development outputs or to something else, but with a lowercase "a," if you will, from my point of view these are all inputs that we have to treat seriously, be respectful of, and run through a process.

Now, at the end of the day there's questions about, "Well, if we say no, what's the -- what's the process about that? Do we have the right to say no? What's our" --

But well before we get to that point, I think we have an obligation to accept every one of these in good faith and demand clarity and then analysis and then some disposition of it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Steve.

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. You're absolutely right, but it's critical that we are clear whether we're using uppercase A or lowercase a, if -- because we're talking all the time about how we treat uppercase A Advice, et cetera, there are certain rules and regulations that apply to that, there are bylaws that apply to that. So I'm just very, very, very keen to make sure that whilst we may treat them all the same, that it is easy for us to identify that which we both of -- both of us, both at-large and the board, understand as uppercase Advice, and that which we consider to be lowercase advice, and I think the easiest way of doing that is to actually find a different word for the lowercase advice, which would make it very easy for us all to understand and would make it easy for you to communicate to us how you see that stuff.

So "recommendations"? "Inputs"? It doesn't matter. "Suggestions"is? But not "advice."

Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me stir things up a little bit.

To use a different metaphor, I'm going to toss a toss significant and large pebble into the -- into the pond here.

I've had a perception over a period of time that some of the labels that we use don't serve us optimally, and in particular we have a distinction between supporting organizations and advisory committees. Those are labels that were created at the reform period back in 2002.

I think there's a reasonable case to be made that the supporting organizations are aligned to particular constituencies and have a sense to them that are comparable, even though there's significant differences between them.

The advisory committee label, to me, has been less comfortable in the sense that it is a one-size-fits-all label and the sizes have, in fact, varied considerably.

In particular -- and this is just me speaking personally but from the observations that I've been making over time -- that in the case of the ALAC and also in the case of the Governmental Advisory Committee, that they are more similar in some respects to the supporting organizations in the sense of having broad constituencies and so forth and more different, to use an ungrammatical term, from SSAC and RSSAC which are much narrower, more expert, self-selected, and sort of qualitatively different.

So to have processes which are formally rooted in "You're an SO and we treat you -- what you say one way, and you're ALAC and we treat what you say completely differently, of a different status and so forth," in my mind has a degree of discomfort and that we ought to stand back and look at the common sense of what's being said here.

ICANN
LOS ANGELES

And if we have to make, eventually, structural changes or changes in labels, I'm not unhappy about having that conversation.

As I said, I'm deliberately stirring the pot here a little bit and it's off the main line of what you've got -- where you're taking us. I'll stand back and you can recover our direction here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Steve.

I'm a little concerned we're going on a debate about semantics.

I just wanted -- I mean, I know that Fadi wanted to say a word and we also had Alan there, but the ICANN bylaws actually define what advice is for at-large, and it's 4(a) where it says -- and I'll read it because I think that pretty much answers your question about advice -- "The At-Large Advisory Committee is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual Internet users. The role of the ALAC shall be to consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN insofar as they relate to the interests of individual Internet users."

We're not only talking policy. And actually it fleshes this out.

"This includes policies created through ICANN's supporting organizations as well as the many other issues for which community input and advice is appropriate."

And that, I think, leaves a lot more leeway as to what advice is.

The ALAC, which plays an important role in ICANN's accountability mechanisms, also coordinates some of ICANN's outreach to individual Internet users.

So advice is not solely focused on policy. It's actually about a number of other things. And I do appreciate that it uses the lowercase "advice" later than uppercase "Advice" but Fadi and Alan and maybe we can focus back on the at-large summit.

Fadi Chehade.

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Olivier.

Let me suggest a practical approach.

First of all, a thousand thanks for this. This is very helpful. I just read, actually, all 41 again, thanks to Dev sharing with me or me snatching from him this. Thank you for that.

I think there is a value in almost every one of these for us to act upon, and I thank you for that. I think that is very important. Whether it's a big A or a small a, frankly it doesn't matter. This is input from you that is valuable.

Now, from a practical standpoint, so we can move this to reality and to a living document, to make this a living set of recommendations, I suggest that you consider bucketing these.

Some of these are clearly discussions between you and the board. So for example, when -- you know, the one you read, "The board must

implement ATRT Recommendation 9.1 regarding formal advice from advisory committees," this is a discussion that you and the board should track and manage.

Some of these are clearly aimed at staff, and within these, I'd suggest you bucket these in two.

One bucket is things that are aimed at staff that imply new money that needs to be spent, and others that are "Can you do this this way because it's better than that way."

Because the ones that impact budget will need to be dealt with in a unique -- in a specific way.

Now, the ones to the board, I'm not going to get engaged on. That's obviously normal advice and, you know, you would discuss it with the board.

The ones with the staff, my suggestion is after you bucket them, we work with you to embed them into the planning process so that we don't have a third rail now, but rather we put them through the planning process, we commit to track them with you, we make sure that as we plan FY16 and now we're about to publish the five-year plan, if some of these are longer term let's make sure we look at them longer term, some of these are shorter term, let's address them in the FY16 budget, but let's make them part of the planning process. And you have my commitment, Olivier, because I love what's coming here. We just need to translate it into planning, attach money to it, attach projects to it, and get on with it.

And if things affect other communities, you will expect us to work with that part of the community.

If you're asking us to do something that will affect the GNSO or others, then through the now very energized meetings I'm having with you and the other SO/AC leaders, we can use these platforms to say, "Look, ALAC would like to do this. Are you guys okay with that? Can we prioritize this together?"

So I'm very committed to this. Especially the parts related to implementation.

One final comment that I hope you take positively. I don't mean it in a negative way at all, but I think we can work through this together.

Let's be aligned as to how far the recommendations could go before they become difficult for us to implement because you're now starting to tell us not that you need a tool to do XYZ but you're picking the tool.

If you pick the tool, that tool may have security issues that we can't implement. That tool may be incongruent with an architecture we're trying to build to save money.

That tool may be a duplicate of a tool we did for another community. So allow us just a little leeway in fitting this into the -- into an efficient implementation approach.

By all means, give us the specifications. By all means, give us the requirements. And if you have suggested tools, please tell us, "Hey, we looked at this. You may want to use this." But allow us to -- just a little

bit of judgment in making sure we pick what would work for the whole organization in the most efficient way.

I hope you don't take this negatively. I just meant it in a good way. So...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Fadi. I wonder how you've managed to read my notes because that was exactly -- I think we're entirely aligned with what you've told us here.

Alan, was this on the semantics that you wanted to speak? Because if it is, I'm sorry, the -- is it still on the semantics of "advice" or -- because we do have a queue.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was related.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Do we need to address it here?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was going to point out the bylaws. You've already read them. I'm not going to read them again.

As incoming chair, I do commit to make sure that when we send something to the board, it makes really clear if it's something that we simply want you to know or if it is advice or if it's some other category, and we may well need to come up with words to make sure that there's clarity but we will be careful.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan.

We have Ray and Wolfgang and we had another topic but I think we'll probably run out of time for this. We only have four minutes.

Ray Plzak.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Olivier.

I actually have some comments on what you were just talking about, but I also have comments on what was supposed to be the topic at hand, and so I'll take the topic at hand first, which is that almost everything in that list of recommendations has, to some extent, been discussed among members of the board over the years. Not as the board, but as, you know -- shock, shock -- the board members are also Internet end users, every single one of us, and so I would welcome the opportunity, if I could, to interact with various groups here.

Not as a board member but also as an Internet end user who just happens to have a perspective, with the various hats that I've worn over the years.

And so if you would allow me to do that, I would be glad to do so.

So with regard to the other thing, it's important to remember the supporting organizations -- and originally there were three -- were to deal with the administration and management of the technical aspects of a set of unique identifiers. That's what they were formed to do. And of course the PSO went away, and so you don't have that happening with regards to protocol parameters.

And the names area was split into two and you got the ccNSO and the GNSO.

And the ASO still does the other set of identifiers.

And so it's important to remember that that is where the policy is, because ICANN's primary mission and role is that. Everything else is subservient to that, is ancillary to that, and is things done to make sure that that happens in a fair, equitable, and reasonable way.

And so I think we have to keep that in mind.

So the bylaws unfortunately put a loaded word in there when they said "advice," and they loaded it because they differentiated between different groups the impact of that advice, and so as Steve says, it may be time to rethink the use of that word.

I know that when I, along with Heather, were co-chairs of the president's commission or committee or whatever it was on board/GAC relationships prior to ATRT1, the discussions that we had is, "What constitutes GAC advice? When is the GAC giving advice to the board?"

And that issue still resonates with us today.

And so I think that it's very important that we decide. And then maybe, as Steve points out, the use of the term "advisory committee" may be the wrong moniker. Maybe there's something else that could be used.

Now, you quoted your bylaws at me. I'll quote them right back at you.

There is nothing in there that says that you only must provide advice -- excuse the use of that word -- to the board. In fact, it doesn't even mention that you should. It says that you should be -- "provide advice on the activities of ICANN."

Well, the activities of ICANN occur, to a large extent, inside the supporting organizations, and so it would seem to me that some of these things where you're saying, "ICANN, go to the board, ICANN, go to the board," you probably could be much more effective by saying, "This is something that needs to be put across someplace else."

You've been strong proponents of cross-community working groups, so why not use that function to sit down and say, "Okay, here's some things there are" -- because they'll be implemented differently because everybody is different, every supporting organization is different, okay?

And this also begs the issue about devoting your efforts to getting people into the bottom end of these policy processes. You know, there are 13 ICANN meetings a year. There's three of them that are in this format and there's 10 of them that are regional registries, and that's where all the policy is made. The face-to-face policy discussions take place in those 13 meetings.

And so I would be really concerned about how we get the people that we want to engage and participate in ICANN into those processes at the

bottom end because it is only at the bottom that they can be the most effective. When things get to the top, then you have got a lot of yelling, kicking, and screaming over something that could have been resolved very simply a long time ago in a process.

So I agree with Steve. Let's find something else to call this. Maybe something else to call what the GAC gives us. That might be easier. I don't know.

But the point is, is that that is a loaded word. And I would really like you to take to heart what your bylaws say or the ICANN bylaws and actually in my mind, your bylaws shouldn't be in the ICANN bylaws. They should be your bylaws. It's your document. It's how you manage. It is how you do your business. And it is an agreement between you and ICANN as to how you fit into it.

Compare the length of the bylaws entry for the ALAC with the length of the bylaws entry for the ASO, and you'll see what I'm talking about. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Ray. It's Olivier speaking. We actually have also our rules of procedures which are much, much longer than the bylaw entries obviously. But your points are very well-taken.

On the first part you mentioned, I'll ask Heidi to work with you and with the chairs of the working groups that are concerned so you can be put on the mailing lists as an individual user.

And the other points, definitely, we're ready to work on this. Do bear in mind that what you're seeing is 23 or 22 recommendations out of the 43 of which many of them are actually now also going to be parallel processes working with other parts of ICANN.

RAY PLZAK: I understand. But I thought it was a point I would want to make at this point in time.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're three minutes beyond the end of this call -- this meeting. I know that Wolfgang Kleinwachter still wanted to say something. I will leave it to you, Steve, on whether we can extend or not. I don't know what you have afterwards.

STEVE CROCKER: The board is going to be here with the next group, so we have a sort of an easy -- the exception of a need for a break.

Wolfgang, quick.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Yes. I just wanted to make a brief comment on outreach because outreach is important. Outreach means mainly all the distribution of knowledge. And the main vehicle for outreach are your At-Large structures. I think these At-Large structures are distributed around the globe, and it is their responsibility to do it.

In the early times when Vint Cerf was the chair of the board, we had in the ICANN meeting a lecture with the (saying name) University went -- went and gave a lecture. I think in all host countries where we are in the cities, they have a university. We have a ccTLD. We have an ISOC Chapter. That means if you are able to mobilize this on the ground, you know, on the Friday before an ICANN meeting to organize the conference together with the noncommercial user constituencies, which have the context academy, there is no need to reinvent the wheel. It is just to take the existing mechanisms and to make them work and to enhance outreach. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for these comments, Wolfgang. I this I we probably -- I think we probably have to close. Just one thing, a printed document with all of the printed recommendations is available, will be distributed to you right now as the meeting closes. And so you will be able to read through those at your leisure. Bedtime reading if you are interested in this sort of thing. But you will have it all there including all of the other recommendations.

With this, I thank you. And I'm a bit sorry we missed the second part, but I'm sure we can interact in writing for that.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me just take a moment to note that with this, we are bringing Olivier's tenure as chair to a close. It has been four years of really stellar leadership and tremendous productivity from ALAC. On behalf of the board, I want to thank you.

(Standing ovation).

STEVE CROCKER: This goes on for four years now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You haven't quite gotten rid of me because I will be a vice chair of the ALAC. And I know Alan will be a fantastic next chair. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]