
SINGAPORE - ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session

Sunday, February 8, 2015 – 09:00 to 17:30

ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG:

We've tried to arrange the meeting so there aren't too many morning sessions. There are a couple. But as I said, it's going to be a challenging meeting, and I thank you all for participating. A number of ground rules. I really would like to start meetings on time. That means you really have to get here before the meeting, certainly for the first one in the morning.

It's not hard to subtract 10 minutes. There is always going to be some social interactions and things, but the only way we're going to be able to come anywhere near sticking to our agendas, is if we start on time, and that of course, goes for breaks also. So I'm going try to be somewhat of a, you know, cracking the whip to try to make sure that we can do that.

I also have a slight hearing problem. I have a real difficulty speaking over people speaking around the room. So if you really need to talk to someone, go out to the back. It's, I find it very distracting, I know I'm not the only one. Keep interventions short. Sometimes we're going to use our two minute time, or sometimes we're not. Regardless of whether the timer is there, try to keep interventions short.

If you want to support what someone else said, say, "I support what someone else said." Don't repeat it all again. Please. If you find me rambling on, tell me. I will tend to do it just like the rest of you. That's one of the mechanisms. Some people use slightly more violence, but...

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.

If we can get through this meeting, as you might have seen, there is an hour session later on this week on talking about ALS engagement, ALS criteria.

If everyone around the table has an intervention, it's an hour long but we each only have two minutes. So keep things short, but at the same time, I want to hear from people. Everything should not be the same two people speaking, or the same five people speaking.

And lastly, I remind you that according to our rules of procedure, we will be keeping attendance records at each meeting. If you are not going to be here for some reason, please send your regrets, give your regrets, that you have some other conflict. It's not just that you have to show up at the first meeting and after that, you're completely on your own.

And we will, as we go on, be publishing the records, just so you know ahead of time. I don't think I have anything else on ground rules. Are there any other general questions? The last thing on the agenda for this section is simply that, as usual, we will be asking you to submit reports on the meetings you go to. It doesn't have to be more than a few sentences.

There is a self sign-up page, that's pointed to off of the meeting page, okay. It's important. Not everyone can go. At least if you say you were there, and give a one or two sentence thing, people know who to find, how to find you. We're not asking you to write essays on each thing. That might be interesting and useful, but we're not likely to do it. Vanda.



VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. Just remember, last time I saw. There is a kind of behavior that I don't believe is so nice with the people that are our invitees. People with, keep looking to the computer. So at least, make something like that, you know, and pay attention to the invitee people, that we are here. Because it's a little [inaudible] to not pay attention.

If you don't want to think about, you know, you don't. But it's not...

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, may I interrupt Vanda? And also not run videos while you're in the middle of a meeting. Or Adobe Connect with the speakers on.

Sorry Vanda, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: It's just that, you know? Let's do this, something, because it's more nice for the people that we are invited to come and talk to us.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Vanda. But I will note, some people actually use their computers to take notes and things like that. So you can't always presume they're doing their own work, but yes. To the extent possible, let's try to focus on the meetings. Meetings are more and less important for each person depending on the subject, so I think we have to be flexible. Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Alan. This is Leon Sanchez. I don't know if you have already said it, but just a reminder for everyone to state your name before speaking,



because we have remote participants that, and a transcript, that needs to go on the record.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you for the reminder Leon. I'm particularly bad at that. It's Alan Greenberg speaking. So keep on reminding me, I'll try to keep on reminding you. And Gisella will keep on reminding all of us.

Yes, sorry. And Gisella reminded me it's not only for remote participants, it's for the interpreters also.

Any other things that we need to bring up as an introduction? Is Fadi here yet? Okay.

I didn't, but I could. Sorry, Heidi whispers in my ear. She said to mention action items. The various tasks that are being done by staff in the meeting are allocated to different people. When we have action items, we're going to try to be meticulous and say, make sure that when we write it down, we actually understand what it is so when we look at it later, we remember.

That's something that always hasn't happened in the past. We are going to the extent possible, assign them to people, or groups. And when possible, put target dates on them. So we're going to find, we're interrupting ourselves and stopping a little bit to get the action items right. Hopefully it's better than trying to figure out what they are afterwards, and then spend unending time talking about them.

And our first guest is here. I recognize him. Fadi, welcome. I don't think you need an introduction to anyone here. And I will turn the floor



over to you. We have nothing that is on the agenda that we are going to specifically target at you. I guess you would like to spend a few words on introductions, and then I would like to open it up to you.

For you to either ask us questions, or vice versa. It's going to be very informal today.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Well, good morning to you. It's good to be here. It's good to see all of you. First, just my congratulations to Alan. It's the first ICANN meeting where you're chairing this important body.

I think yesterday I described you two in a private meeting, but I can do it publically here, since you're both here, Olivier and Alan, as Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict. [Laughter]

No Benedict is alive, he may be hiding. But when someone asks me, "So how do you feel about Alan's new role?" I said, "I think it's a perfect follow-on to the great work and foundation that Pope John Paul II here, Monsieur Leblond has established." And the reference was, largely as you know, because Pope John Paul II was the Catholic Pope that kind of expanded the reach of the church in ways that will affect the church, I think, for centuries to come.

Just, it's amazing how his reach, and how much he traveled, and how much he reached out, how much he brought... And then Benedict came, he didn't want to leave the Vatican. I mean, he was just a completely different person. He just said, "Okay, now I need to kind of take this to the next level, and deepen the roots of this massive..." And I



think both of you did a little bit of both, but it was just my joking way to explain the difference in styles.

Nothing to do with your beard, or your white hair, or anything.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You came close... It's Alan speaking. You came close to saying what I was going to say, but you didn't get the right criteria. I was selected because we're trying to balance height over the years.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

That too. Anyway. Congratulations Alan. I'm sure all of you, like me, are delighted to see both of them at the table. That's the testament to the kind of organization you are, to have your leaders engaged and remain engaged, and remain fully here.

Look, ICANN 52. Given the weather outside, frankly, I would have rather this been in Marrakesh. To be honest. But anyway, that's a discussion for another day Aziz. And we will be there, we will be there. In fact, I'm trying to come to Rabat as soon as I can, hopefully, in the next couple of weeks. God willing, I will be there.

But in the meantime, we will meet and have another chance to enjoy this wonderful country and wonderful people. You should see how they dealt with us over that change. I don't know if any other people would have done the same. Aziz was gracious, despite enormous pressure. Enormous pressure.

Really, he was getting pressured from all sides. But anyway, that's for another day. Aziz, thank you for being here and continuing your



commitment to this community. Look, we're facing a very, very important time, and ALAC's engagement, substantive engagement in the discussion about how ICANN will proceed through this transition, is most valuable.

Between us, here in this room, you know, all the days and times, for a distant past now of people questioning the value of ALAC and these guys who are not really the contracted parties, my goodness, through this transition, the substance of what you are putting on the table, the professionalism of which you are bringing down the issues.

I mean, I now quote some of the things you are doing, transition, to other groups. Say look, this is a group that is committed, deeply committed to this. And as I said in an interview I just did with an outlet, that it's not the US ending that contract that makes us who we want to be. If that contract ends, or it doesn't end, it will end, but it's not what makes us who we are.

It's how we get there, and how we behave through that process that the world will remember, once this contract is done. And you are very substantive in getting us to the right place there. So I want to thank you for this. And I know it is taking a lot of oxygen from many other things we want to be doing, and therefore I... One of the arguments I use when people say, "Well, let's take our time. What's the rush? Let's take another two years. Let's take another year."

Absolutely, I don't want to rush this because I don't want to just end the US contract for the sake of ending it, I want to do the right thing, like all of you, all of us. But at the same time, I mean, the longer we take to get this done, the longer everything else in our agenda is pretty much on



hold. So let's balance these things and be thoughtful about getting our work done, thoughtfully, well, but also not spending the next two years on this.

Really, we have... I mean, let me give you an example of something you are very focused on, which is the safeguards, and the public interest commitments. I mean, where is the oxygen on that issue? We are fighting for oxygen on that issue, and meanwhile, quite frankly, contracts are being signed, and the machine is moving, and we want to hey, hold on a little bit, and I know you're talking to the GAC, as you should, and I support that.

So I think it's important we put all of these things in context and move forward. I would say, with the footsteps of a determined community, not the dragging footsteps of people who just think we have all the time in the world. We don't. We don't. And politically, once we hit the early part of 2016 and the US electoral process is in full swing, I'd have a very hard time getting attention from the White House or anybody.

They would be very busy with their world, so we don't have... People who are saying we have all of the time in the world, I don't think we have all the time in the world. Let's be candid. One thing I want to inform you of Alan, sorry to do this on the fly, but this is a meeting that happened this morning.

And I will speak to this in my opening remarks. Everybody is talking about ICANN [inaudible] the US government. What is ICANN without the US government? How can we have confidence in an ICANN without the US government? Right? Because they don't know us. They don't



know you. The people who are making these comments in *The Wall Street Journal*, don't know who is ICANN.

They think ICANN is me, or ICANN is the Board, they don't know that this is ICANN. But one of the things that I believe strengthens confidence, is to make sure that when our decisions are being balanced at the ICANN leadership level, and at the ICANN Board, for example, that these decisions are always rooted in the public interest.

That's the way to build confidence, right? Because what is it that people are worried about? They're worried about a government controlling ICANN, or a group of governments controlling ICANN, or frankly a business interest controlling ICANN, or a group of business interests. That's what people are worried about. And how will they control ICANN? Where is the control point? Where is the neck?

The neck is the Board. Right? At the end of the day, that's where the decisions get approved. And therefore, it is very important that our Board remains clear that our fiduciary responsibility is not to the state of California only. It is to the state of California because we are a California corporation. And the Attorney General of California could come at us, and remove the Board. She has the power to remove the Board if we are corrupt or we're not doing our work.

But we're ICANN. We're not just regular corporation. Therefore our fiduciary responsibility is to our community as well, and to the multistakeholder approach, and model of our community, and we need to be clear about that. Therefore, decisions must be rooted in the community interest, and the global public interest. And so on that, I'm going to call for a meeting, tomorrow evening, in my room, or



somewhere, wherever I can find a room, for the leaders of the community who care about the issue of safeguards and picks, and let's have a lively debate.

I'll invite the relevant Board members, and let's talk about it. Let's stop talking to each other, at each other about it. Let's sit down and have an adult talk about it. We cannot keep signing contracts as if we're, the machine is just moving, sorry. We have to think about what it means when you tell me, you know, you've got to be careful who you give the doctor to.

And, you know, the registry says, "Well, we signed the contract, nobody told us we had to be careful. Now you're telling me be careful. You're changing my business plan." They have interests. You have... My job, as a leader at ICANN, is to listen to both sides, and to do the right thing for the public interest. And we will start by doing it, not just talking about it.

So please, I'm asking ALAC, who is very vocal on this issue, and I commend you for that, to actually pick one or two representatives to meet with me. I'm going to invite people from the GNSO, people from the GAC, and others, and I'll invite relevant Board members, and my talk team, so we sit down and listen to each other, all of us, and figure out how to solve that.

I'm not going to finish by thanking you again, as usual, for all of the things you do. The new ALSs, congratulations, but more importantly, the advice you continue to give us, the ATLAS 2 recommendations, which I received note from you that we should pay attention to your Board member.



Is she here? Rinalia? Okay, your Board member, by the way, is doing a yeoman's work. She is superb. She knows exactly how to balance her representation of you, as well as her being a Board member. And again, this is an issue I want to say it one more time, a lot of Board members are always, "Well, am I representing ALAC, or am I Board member?"

There shouldn't be a dichotomy between these two. Yes, of course, you represent ALAC. There is no shame in that. You are the ALAC elected representative, and yes, you are a Board member and you will pay attention to the fiduciary responsibilities of a Board member. But at the same time, you and I Rinalia, are committed to the public interests. That is what unites us.

And so this is clear, and she is doing a very good job at that balance. So thank you for sending her to us. And I assure you that she is the one that reached out to me on the ATLAS 2 recommendations, and I'm listening. And I don't want to throw the book at you. I want to do the right thing.

So if we sit down together, when you're ready Alan, with your team, and we say, "Hey, these are things staff can start moving." I don't want 500 people to tell me what the right thing is to do. If we agree these are the right things to do, let's just move on them, and let's start being productive. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Fadi, on several accounts. Just to comment on the ATLAS recommendations. We had some glorious plans out of ATLAS that have sort of been sidetracked to a little bit because of all of the



IANA and accountability work, and we're not forgetting them, but the progress is somewhat slower than we planned. But we will be talking about it at the Board meeting a little bit, and there will be ongoing work.

It's, perhaps sadly, but nevertheless, not our highest priority right now.

FADI CHEHADÉ: That's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm very encouraged by the news that you gave us today. The way going forward on these picks is not going to be easy. To be quite candid, we boxed ourselves into a corner, that doesn't give us a lot of outs, but I'm encouraged that we're looking for whatever options that we have at this point. So thank you.

And yes, we will participate. I have nothing particularly on my agenda. I'd like to open it up. Do you have any questions for us that you would like to raise? And I know we already have some speakers who want to speak first. Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hi Fadi. How are you?

FADI CHEHADÉ: I am wonderful Vanda. How are you?



VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. Well, considering where we just talk, we are having a very difficult time explaining many calls to myself, just because many people know that I'm engaged, but about what is going on, on the new gTLDs. So, I do believe that there is a lack of advertising, marketing, whatever in the, at the list in South America.

And this maybe, even the biggest guy that just apply for the new gTLD, inside their big companies, there is also lack of information. And they still going talking and the call me, and wow, and what is my commitment with my clients, and what is, going to do that. How can I say this? Or, how can I explain that?

It is something that I'm seeing that we still lack information in the Third World.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Everywhere, even here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, maybe. But I don't know. I just speak for South America, that I'm in touch with. But I don't know. We need more engage for ICANN, to the communication around. And even for LACRALO people, we don't have much, much conditions to touch in many countries the press. So we need, we need more and more, some engagement from the ICANN to help us to explain things to the population. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ: So Vanda, let me react quickly. Thank you for the comment. This is an area where we are trying to find a balance. What is the balance?

ICANN cannot become a trade association for the gTLDs. It is not our business. If we're seen as an organization going out, da, da, da, gTLDs, they'll say, "Wait a second. Why are you doing this? Are you doing this too?"

But you are right, there is a balance between saying, you know, we're just going to, you know, do applications and take money, and do our work in the background, and saying we are not going to, at all, explain to the consumer, which is part of our responsibility, what are the benefits of all of this and why it's happening.

So, to be quite frank, we've been very, very busy with getting the program up and running. And for all practical purposes, the program is now up and running. We've just put the 500th new gTLD in the root, so that's a good thing. Having said that, we are having the first meeting in a long time, with the Domain Name Association, called DNA. This is the first time...

I was one of the people who initially pushed them to happen, and they happen. Thankfully, they're now standing and moving. But now they asked me, "Hey, can you meet with us so we can figure out how to, quote/unquote, cooperate?" So I'll meet them, for the first time, with Akrim, and we'll see what we can do.

But I'm going to take action, so I'll ask you if you can capture this. Let's think together whether the ALSs could be an interesting partner here that actually does not go out and do advertising for the gTLD, but rather does, what I would call, consumer awareness in a positive way, about why these new gTLDs can help the consumer, in a good way, but then you need materials.



I mean, you need people to give you materials in Spanish, and in Portuguese, and in French, and in different languages, that explain the program, why is it good for the public. So let's take note of that. I will ask Theresa, not Theresa, Sally, to follow up with Vanda, and with you, on an idea of how we could potentially work together.

This is not urgent, but I'll add it to our list. And it's something... Did I understand the issue?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Yes. That's the problem.... Sorry, Vanda. It's just about what the corporation needs to know, and the users needs to know, about the new gTLD. What the hell is that? And how there is a benefit to that? Or should I be, you know, afraid of it?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We have eight and a half minutes left. Five speakers already in the queue. And that means 10 for giving Fadi a moment to answer. So keep interventions very short please. Evan next.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Evan Leibovitch, acting chair of NARALO. Hi Fadi. I want to follow up on this, on the issue of, you know, having the Domain Name Association separated and all of that, and the challenge that you have sort of, making some distance between them. Recently when you did a media interview, when you called attention to the duplicate domains, and you, you know, that maybe just maximizing the number of domains out there for its own sake, isn't the best thing.



You immediately got push back from parties that said, ICANN was biting the hand that fed it, and so on. And this goes to some of your earlier comments about, you know, about talking about putting that distance, and being perceived as being in the public interest. What are the challenges that you face in trying to make that distance in the public eye?

And one other small comment that goes to the pick issue, and that is, as you know, this has been on ALAC's plate for a long time. It was only when we did the desperation action of calling for a freeze that this seemed to get anyone's attention. Can you think about ways that we can get your attention that aren't quite so drastic? This has been on our plate for a long time.

So this is as much process as anything. If something is really important to us, how can we do that without having to go to an act of desperation like that? Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

Thank you Evan. And the quick answer to your second question is called Cassia. She can get my attention. If really things are burning you, of course, use the community processes, but please do let me or Akrim know, to get our attention on something where you feel frustrated. See, you can't come to me on everything, but if you're frustrated, which you said you got to before you did the desperate part, please, our community should not reach a level of frustration.

And I don't know. Now of course, I have a million things coming at me. So I have to look at the million things and say, "Okay, which one do we



give attention to?” But it is my job. At the end of the day, if you think you’re getting frustrated, as a community, send me a strong letter, send me a strong signal. Send it to the Board, if you wish, as well, but I react. I don’t overreact, but I react. And we shouldn’t...

But at the same token, Evan, I don’t think it should have gotten to me holding a dinner tomorrow night. It shouldn’t.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I understand. And just as a quick follow up, this was no surprise. There has been multiple ALAC Board meetings that you have attended, where we have raised this, and we got lectured as opposed to, maybe we need to look at this.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

I’m aware of this. I actually watched some of this occur, and I do not, I’m not proud of it. So I’ll be candid with you. But look, the attention is being given now, and I am focused on it personally. A lot of my oxygen, which was on Internet governance last year, is now squarely where it needs to be here, and so that’s also good for all of us, I hope.

And I will pay attention to this. I’m sorry. On your first point, it’s a long answer, but I will simply say, the pressure is on me from the various parties. You didn’t see what I got in letters because of that 10 second comment I made in Switzerland. But they’re very, very mad at me for saying this, and I’m still feeling at their meeting here.

But frankly, I felt that this comment reflects how, for example, my mother feels, my brother feels, you feel. Normal people on the Internet



are concerned about some of these things. So that's my job to speak it.
And I will continue to speak it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you Fadi. May I ask, how much time do you have? Officially you have four minutes left. Five minutes, okay. We have five speakers in the queue.

FADI CHEHADÉ: So let's listen to all five, I'll take note and then I'll...

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So 30 seconds each please. Siva. Glenn, will someone let him get to the microphone so we cannot use all of the 30 seconds waiting?

SIVA [SUBRAMANIYA]: Siva [Subramaniya] from ISOC India [inaudible] ALS. And this is another personal question, it's not just seem to be. You have tried to make changes, you have tried to bring about quite a lot of improvements, and that means changing the existing order of things, which sometimes tends to hurt somebody, or a group of people.

And when that happens, you're either limited in some way, challenged or... You face some resistance, or even sometimes you are under pressure. Has there been any instance where you have been under pressure to do something that we don't want to do, or do not do something that they want to do.



ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I know you are in a hurry, so it's a very short comment. I do agree with Vanda, and Fadi you said it's not our job. If it is for the public comment, public interest, it's your job. It's the job of the...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: [Spanish] Alberto Soto. I hope I will make it in 30 seconds. My contribution about what Vanda said. At LACRALO, we have been working with Rodrigo de la Perra... Based on what Vanda said, at LACRALO we have been working with Rodrigo de la Perra ever since last year, the last meeting, and we will be covering mostly that through webinars, with very specific subject matters for the whole region.

We have selected the issues, and the first one will be in the first week in March. I'd like to work in synergy with other RALOs so that we all do the same, who will be participating, all the multistakeholders in our ecosystems. Thus, the communication that was needed, at least in our region, we already disseminating the information we will start closing this gap. 30 seconds.

ALAN GREENBERG: ...very much. Fatima next.



FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks Alan. This is Fatima for the record. Fadi, I am sure that you saw the different discussion on the different aspects about the NetMundial initiative. And I know that you don't have time here, but I would like to know more about that initiative. And also, if you are planning to make a contradiction about the community, ICANN community, about this initiative. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And lastly, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Going back to the operating plan, and strategic plan, and budget, there is a significant component in this year's plan about the public interest. At the same time, there is, I think, one of the largest segments of the plan is to do with the global domains division. And I quote, "Support the evolution of domain name marketplace to be robust, stable, and trusted."

It's a two-part question. The first part is, what do you call the robust, stable, and trusted marketplace? Is that one where the registries, the registrars are able to sustain themselves? In which case, you are helping them with their business and making sure their business is doing well.

Or, is that one where the identifier system needs to be robust, stable, trusted by end users? I think there is something I didn't quite understand in that. And the second part of my question is in regards to the picks, the public interest commitments. We have been repeatedly told that we're already way too far down the line, having signed



contracts, and so on, with registries to go back and unilaterally change contracts, to the extent that it appears that ICANN is more shy about engaging into changing the contracts, then into pushing for the public interest at all costs.

And I wanted to have your thoughts on that. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADÉ:

I'll go backwards. Olivier, on the... It's never too late to do the right thing. If we take the attitude of, oh, sign the contracts, that's wrong. So let's, as leaders, start talking about what we need to do to actually also your first part of your question, to make sure that this industry looks robust, looks stable, right? That's part of it.

If that industry is not rooted in the right values, and principles, and public interest, it looks like a wobbly industry. Right? So part of robustness is people look at this industry and say, "This is an industry that is serious about what it's doing, and communicates well what it's doing, and is rooted in that."

So on the issue of too late, I think nothing is ever too late to do the right thing. So let's not focus on process. I don't want to throw the book at ALAC or anybody else. I want to do the right thing. I'm committed to this, you know I'm committed to this, and I'm not going to say anymore, I'm going to do something about it. So let's start the process in earnest, let's not imagine that overnight I can take registry and registrar businesses and turn them upside down, I don't think you want to do that.



You just want to get the right thing into that market. Yes, robust, stable, and trusted, it doesn't mean that I want to make their businesses multi-million dollar businesses that are profitable, that's not my business. My business is to make sure that if consumers come to that industry, their interaction with it is a trusted interaction. The interaction with them is a good interaction.

And that means I need to good compliance on them. That means I need to do good communications about what they do and what they can't do. That means I do pay attention to the picks, etc. So we have quite a bit of work to do, because this industry is about to explode. It hasn't started yet. In many ways, there are a few million registrations, but this thing is going to explode.

And when it explodes, ICANN needs to be there and ready to keep it as a trusted industry. Right? Fatima, NMI is a separate industry now. ICANN is one of the supporters of it. And I have very good news that they just announced that the president of Costa Rica agreed to host their first council meetings. So the first inaugural council meeting of NMI, NetMundial Initiative will be in Costa Rica on March 31st.

If the ICANN community wants to engage in the NetMundial activities, and by the way, I'm on the record but it doesn't matter, I think if there is a group in ICANN that should pay close attention to what the issues of NetMundial will be, it's you. Almost more than any other group, because these are all the non number and names and related issues that will start to be addressed, all the privacy issues, all of the security issues, all of the human rights issues, all of the cyber terrorism issues, all of that is going to be addressed there.



And therefore, take a good look at it. The Ambassador of NetMundial, who is here, is Wolfgang Kleinwächter. You all know Wolfgang. So I've been encouraging him to have meetings with the community and spend time. I won't. I'm done. I need to focus on my work here. I did my part, and the community now has a venue, and I hope you use it.

It's a good venue. That's where I stop on NMI. Thank you Fatima. Mr. Soto, it's good to see you here again. I'm glad you stayed with us and I hope you stay for a long time with us. I was very touched by your comments the first time I met you, and I'm happy to see you're working with de la Parra to figure out how we can serve the community and communicate better through the community.

Your contribution is appreciated by me and by many of your colleagues. Thank you. Thank you for your comments there.

Tijani, we will find the balance. It's not an easy balance, but it requires us to all be working together. This is not about me. This is about all of us committed to that. It's not easy, you know that. But I'm committed to that. And finally, Siva, I just want to tell you, have I been asked sometime...?

Have I backed off? I would simply tell you a story, that you may have heard me say before. When I was 18, I was put on a [Laurie] by my father to escape from the war, and I did not see him for years after that, because that [Laurie] drove me to Damascus and I took a flight from there, and I immigrated.

And as my dad put me on that [Laurie], and he didn't know the [Laurie] driver, he literally stopped him in the middle of the street, the bombs



were falling, he said, “Take my boy out of here.” And gave him money to just drop me in Damascus. I was 17 and a half, and my dad told me, “Stick to your principles.”

And as I’m leaving, I’m telling him, “What are these dad?” He said, “You should know them by now. Don’t ask me what your principles are. But these principles that you’ve grown up with, stick with them.” And yes, this is the first job in my life where these principles get really challenged.

I’ve been CEO and led many companies, I’ve never had these moments where I was, oh my God. Do I really have to do this? Because that is, and so no. If my principles, which are mine, my personal commitments to myself, to the community, I don’t compromise on these. On everything else, frankly, I’m willing to compromise.

And some people criticize me for that, but I’m flexible, I’m willing to change, if I make a mistake, I admit it and I move on. But my principles, no. And the principles that I learned at ICANN, my principles at ICANN have actually become stronger and bigger, because it’s not just about me and my commitment to my father and my family, it’s my commitment to all of you, as I’m facing some difficult, difficult decisions, every day, and they’re getting more difficult, unfortunately, because of the pressure on ICANN right now.

So, doing my best, but never easy. And I ask you to call me on it. When you see me stepping out of these principles, call me on it. Have a wonderful week.



ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Fadi. [Applause]

We now have global stakeholder engagement. As Fadi has been talking, Heidi has been passing me notes about who is going to be next, not quite knowing who is showing up in what order, and it's only changed three times in the last 10 minutes. I welcome you and turn the floor over to you.

YU-CHUANG KUEK:

This is Kuek for the record. It's your luck that you're stuck with me, you could have gotten glamorous people like Sally and Tarek, you have me and the rest of the GSE team for now. [Applause]

So first and foremost, before I get into the substantive issues, a warm welcome back to Singapore. We did not expect this, and it is our intention that we go across all of the regions and make sure all the regions have the opportunity. Now that we are here, we are happy that we will have another APRALO showcase, showcasing the diversity of the region.

And we, there are many important things to discuss at this meeting. The gravity of the issues at hand, warrants a lot of attention to the discussion that is going to take place. In the past few days in the week to follow, so if there is anything that the team based here can do for you, do for this group, feel free to reach out to me or anyone else on the team while you're here.

That's the opening spiel. I know we have a packed agenda, and I know that you have two questions that were given to us in advance. Maybe I can suggest this way to structure our time. We'll start by addressing



some of the questions, and that will give us some momentum for discussion. I'm sure that there are other questions beyond these two that you would like to ask my colleagues and myself, but maybe we'll start with question one to begin with.

I believe Tarek and Sally are coming in from another meeting. I think Tarek will be in an excellent position to answer question two as well. So we'll start with question one, which is about how, what kind of opportunities are there for the global stakeholder engagement team? Oh, Tarek is here. I'll answer question one and I'll pass things over to Tarek for question two.

And the community, specifically the At-Large community can work more closely together. I think this question is very close to my heart. Many of the members here from the Asia-Pacific community would have worked with [inaudible], myself, and also my colleague Calvin Wong. Calvin is right now at a newcomer session, it's the nature of the ICANN meetings where everyone is split everywhere. But I think coming from as early as the London meetings, ICANN 50, the APRALO and ourselves have been trying to work out what is the best way for us to have a focused approach, so that we work on our resources together, and we best serve our community?

So when we started off at the London meeting, the focus was on looking at setting common focused regions. Where can we find synergies between the objectives of ALAC as well as the Asia-Pacific hub based in Singapore, with its network across the region? And there was a consultation that happened there. I'm very happy that when we moved over to the Los Angeles meetings, we were able to determine the key



priorities and the deliverables that we want to be held accountable for, in terms of working things out.

Now, there are certain action items that we streamlined to make sure that, you know, things are not conducted in an ad-hoc fashion, that we commit the resources needed to follow through on the projects, and we boil it down to three specific projects. One is on the language localization needs of the region. If you look at the Asia-Pacific community, we are a community of great diversity in terms of languages.

If you look at India itself, I mean, if you think of the official languages, often I think they're 22 official languages, and these are only the official languages. There are other languages beyond that. That was one priority that we identified, that if we want to reach out to different communities in the region, speaking in six UN languages just isn't enough.

The second thing that we wanted to do with is to continue on the capacity work, and what that means specifically from an ALAC perspective. From the Asia-Pacific perspective, we are very lucky that we have [inaudible], who travels frequently around the region to conduct training on, you know, DDOS, how to prevent DDOS attacks, how do you setup DNSSEC. I think the concrete outcomes of his work is that, you know, after a training session on DNSSEC in Indonesia and a training session in [inaudible] to both ccTLDs went on to deploy DNSSEC.

So I think we are getting very concrete outcomes from the training resources that are put in. But from an ALAC perspective, what are we going to do together? So that's the action item number two. The action



item number three is, of course, we continue on our existing work on outreach and awareness, and this obviously is one of the core focus on the global stakeholder engagement team.

So there are great synergies that we can find there. I think on the language, I would like to report on some results that we have, and we don't have the expectation that we're going to solve all the problems overnight. But with the language localization tool kit with our new friends from, I believe, ISOC Delhi, I'm not sure if I'm, yeah.

We have translated basic materials of ICANN into the Hindi language. I think [inaudible] has been working on translating the language localization toolkit into Bengali as well. So if you go to Bangladesh, I think we're often reminded that this is the seventh most populous nation in the world, and yet at the same time, I'll speak very honestly, we've never had our materials out in Bengali.

So these are the concrete things that have been done. I think what is great as well is that we are identifying synergies between what is originating from the ALAC and APRALO with the players outside. So the language localization toolkit was born from a collaboration between KISA in Korea, the Korea Internet and Security Agency with an APAC hub. But it is being made use of in APRALO at ALAC as an example.

But also beyond APRALO, we have had IDIGF, mostly based in Jakarta Indonesia, who has translated a deck into Bahasa Indonesia as well. So I think that there is great progress. I think there is definitely scope for more contents to be added onto the language localization piece.



And suddenly more languages. And while this initiative has started in Asia-Pacific, by no means should it only be limited to the region. We're hoping that when we find some mature fruit, that we can share everything, share experiences across the regions. The second thing on capacity development, I think we're now working very closely together with APRALO. On Wednesday we have our meeting.

And the thinking about this is, is starting with a series of webinars in the region as well. And I'm conscious of the time. I think I've gotten into a little bit more detail than I initially hoped, but also on the outreach and awareness pieces, we obviously have the CROPP program, that I think, you know, warrants further discussion on how we can better coordinate to meet the objectives, but that's an example.

And this time I'm very happy that for our regions, Satish and Maureen will be representing us two weeks later at the APRICOT meetings in Fukuoka. So that's only what we have in the Asia-Pacific region. Let me see if there are any of my colleagues from the other regions who would like to jump in with their points, and then I'll hand things over to Tarek to talk about government engagement. Rodrigo?

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Hi, hello everybody. Given that we have some interpretation now, I'm going to be switching to Spanish, if you don't mind. So if you want to wear your headsets.

Good morning everyone. This is Rodrigo de la Parra speaking for the records. It's a pleasure for me to be here with you, and sharing this



time, and seeing that you have great activity and interaction among the At-Large people, the regional leadership, of course.

What happens with these meetings that have been carried out for some years now, is that we are not able to inform about concrete initiatives with the participation engagement of people, particularly from LACRALO, from my region. In the past, we have been talking about the leadership of Fatima and Dev in the communications projects with a lot of advancements.

On Monday, we will have a very useful and interesting presentation of regional page, webpage, about ICANN and its community. So if you have time, we encourage you to attend that meeting. It will be in this room on Monday, and I hope you can attend that meeting because we are very proud of that. And you should do that because this was led by LACRALO people.

And as I said before, we had shared, or joint, projects. We are trying to deal with initiatives coming from LACRALO such as the webinars that have been implemented, focused on different levels of knowledge regarding different topics. With Vanda, she's leading the LAC space strategy, and we are in our fourth addition of this LAC space. This has been very successful.

So thank you very much Vanda for that. And we are moving forward when it comes to the CROPP program. We are still working on the initiative. We have this global initiative by ICANN, and we are working together with LACRALO people, and we have the initiative of the strategic plan. And we are joining synergies, not to duplicate, but to joint efforts when it comes to the CROPP program.



We are using that platform, but we are also having an additional event, or an additional trip, that might be supported by the strategic plan. But of course, taking into account the guidelines and rules of the CROPP program, because we are working on that joint platform.

And the idea is to keep on adding people to the strategies. We have online webinars, update webinars. We invite people to LACRALO calls. We also have specific sessions where we can say, and show the opportunities that we have. And of course, we report that back to the community.

So these are very interesting sessions, we are moving forward. We have good intentions but also concrete actions, and we also have questions regarding how can we engage in a better with the GSE. And the idea, or the question now is, how we will move forward. The question now is, what is the proposal? What else can we do? And these are the things we're working on.

So that's all for my part. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Tarek, I think we'll turn it over to you now. The question that was asked is, can you give us a briefing, obviously an overview, since we don't have several days, on how you interact with regional governments, how you enhance government relations, with a focus specifically on developing countries. Thank you.



TAREK KAMEL:

Yeah. Good morning everybody. Thank you Alan for inviting me. I'm delighted to be here this morning, and to address this distinguished group. Indeed, the role of governments at ICANN is evolving, and hence our engagement with governments is also evolving accordingly.

The structure that ICANN governments really participate at ICANN through is primarily the GAC, as we all know. Just to give you a number, 10 years ago we had 40 members, today we have 148 members in the GAC, with 32 observers. Even if not all of them are always active, and all of them attend, but this shows that there is an immense interest from governments in participating at ICANN, and in playing a bigger role in shaping the public policies at ICANN, and contributing and providing the right advice to the Board.

This was not at least due to the evolution of the gTLD program. That really has raised the awareness about ICANN specifically in the developing countries, and has motivated many governments in the developing countries to participate and to be part of the decision making process at ICANN within the last four or five years. Before that, when it was just a mere technical operation, that is not touching their interests, I think the participation has been much [inaudible].

But before we talk about our engagement programs very specifically, that we do it in coordination with the GSE program, as a GSE team, I also want to mention a couple of observations that we see that are changing the landscape of the Internet governance globally, and are affecting ICANN very specifically.

In addition to what I have mentioned concerning the increase of participation at the GAC and the global interest [inaudible]. We see an



immense dominance of several security agenda, on many cyber agendas on a national level.

This goes in the developing world, but also unfortunately, in the developed world. It is becoming the top priority for governments as such. And the question then becomes, to all of us as community, including us as a government engagement and GSE team, from governments, how far can you help me? And definitely ICANN has its own remit, and we don't want to expand the remit outside the DNS security, and the security of the DNS system, and DNSSEC, as we do through programs, workshops, and regional workshops that we do through the GTD, but this is definitely not always a satisfying answer to many governments, because specifically in the developing world, they want to see us playing a role, a growing role as ICANN, which the Board actually does not, and ICANN leadership does not, but their pushing us to play a more bigger role in this direction, because they are looking for a simple answer to their solutions and problems.

A one stop shop. Maybe in the developed world, it's a little bit more different. There is more awareness, but still, the problem is there. The next observation that we see, is that there is a shift of decision makings, and governments from individual governments, more to regional forum, and regional [inaudible]. Why?

The agenda is becoming very complex, of Internet governance, At-Large and even ICANN as well. And due to the lack of human resources, many governments start to rely on their neighbors. So let's listen what the neighbors are saying. Maybe they have a solution, maybe they can help. And if not, then go to the neighbors of the neighbors.



Whether do the end at the regional council and the regional forum, whether they are technical, whether they are foreign affairs, whether they are [inaudible]. This happens at the European Union, this happened at the Arab Council of Ministers. This happens at the African Union, in [inaudible], in [inaudible] corporation and [inaudible]. So we see a clear shift of decision making that is going towards the regional forum.

And unfortunately, this is an opportunity, but this is also a threat for our engagement, because this is a decision making process that is being established outside the GAC, to a great extent and on a different level. The third observation that we are seeing within governments themselves a shift of the decision making from the technical agencies, and the technical regulators, and the technical ministers, to include at least foreign affairs as well as security agents as well.

And in many other opportunities the file of IG, including ICANN issues, is starting to be handled from prime minister's office and the like. So this is also putting further pressure on us, on government engagement, while we move forward in our engagements, and we need to make care of that.

But it's not always responsibilities and pressures. It's opportunities as well. We see a positive shift towards the growth and Internet utilization by adding two billion users within the next four or five years, from [inaudible]. So the utilization is clearly shifting towards the south and the east. So the Internet utilization is becoming less western-centric, which creates opportunities for this part of the world as well, not only to governments but other stakeholders to start to play a role in shaping



the future of Internet governance, including ICANN as well, which is a legitimate actually desired, and is positively to be considered, and here definitely ALAC can also help us and play a role.

We also see and know how diversification about core Internet management issues. Things that 10 years ago during the WSAS, and many people here, Alan and [Benjamin] and Olivier and many friends were there, as such were limited only to a group of elite academic people that are coming from the west, about running root servers and core management functions, are available to Europe, and Asia, and other places of the world.

If you couple that with financial capabilities and political will, this could change things on the facts on the ground while we are moving, we are moving forward. Our focus in government engagement [inaudible] two things. The IANA transition process and to provide support to the IANA transition process, to the ICG, and the cross community working group, as well as the subgroups of the ICG, the naming community working group, as well as the other two groups who have finished their work.

And providing the GAC, and through the GAC, the necessary support as ICANN staff, to advocate to the proposal whenever it is ready, and before that, to advocate for the process in order to make sure that it is an inclusive global process, because this provides it with legitimacy and transparency.

This is definitely a difficult job, because if we need to do that, and raise the awareness on that level, that's not easy. The other one is the UN General Assembly meeting which is coming at the end of the year, as such, and which, unfortunately, is coinciding with the outcome of the



IANA process, whatever it is. So there will be repercussions whether positive or negative on that process, and we need to take that into consideration, and prepare as a community, not only in government engagement very carefully.

Although the decision will be taking an intergovernmental process that is [inaudible]. That empowering our outreach [inaudible] together with the GSE team, and the regional vice-presidents, whether in Asia or Africa, in Eastern Europe, Europe, and Latin America and other places in the world, but we are also empowering our presence in Geneva and New York, with outreach to the missions.

You have now the Geneva office, where we outreach to the IGOs and to the missions, because at the end, these are the people specifically in New York, that will close the door, and will take a decision about the future of the WSA as a renewal, and about the future of the IGF, in an intergovernmental process.

They accept input, and there is a process will try to help to make it monthly stakeholder as much as possible, and to work with other organizations, and other colleagues, and other stakeholders to make it multistakeholder, but it is a fact that it is an intergovernmental process, and we need to work on that awareness, specifically that ambassadors in New York or more politicized.

They are not used to the multistakeholder model, and they bargain issues mainly based on as they are used in the peace process and Security Council, non-technical, and non-technical issues. So this is a fact. It's different than Geneva and the team in Geneva, of IGOs that we



are dealing with, but it was clear to us, and to ICANN's management, that we need to expand the outreach, and that's what we are doing.

We are talking to them, and they are giving us feedback, as we call it, a one stop shop, two locations in Geneva and New York, which complements the feedback that we get from the capitals as well, in order to be able to draw an overall strategy for ICANN, while we move forward in government engagement and collective positions.

We'll not be able to do that alone. We need the support of the community. We need the support of other stakeholders, specifically when we talk to governments, we need the support of Civil Society, we need the support of private sector, and as such, in the development as well, in the developing countries.

And the more and more we can develop the DNS industry in the developing world, the more and more we will see that the government engagement at ICANN is becoming more and more pragmatic, business based, and meaningful. Not based on emotions, not based on political position, not based on cultural position, but based on business terms, defending business aspects as it is happening in other parts of the world.

So we are not a big team at the government engagement, we're only five, but we work very closely with the team of Sally and the regional vice-presidents, and make use of their time and capacities, and the regional teams that are there complement each other. We have an engagement plan with the GAC for our outreach, and we look forward what we can do together with the ALAC, in order to empower our outreach and engagement specifically to achieve those two strategic



topics that the Board has identified for us this year, and the management has identified for us this year, as strategic concerning of the government engagement at ICANN.

Thank you very much, and I'm glad to take any comments or questions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Tarek. Before we go to questions, are there any other regional VP's in the room who would like to make any short comments? We have 11 minutes right now, and already one speaker request, but if there is anyone else who would like to make a short, anything else to add, quickly, please do.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL:

Good morning everyone. My name is Jean-Jacques Sahel, regional vice-president for Europe. And I know many of you. And many of you I see a lot. I see Olivier a lot, for instance, he's sometimes my cameraman for the events we co-organize. There is Julia, and Wolf, and Sandra, we work a lot with together. Nice to see you all.

And I actually don't want to talk about Europe as much as I want to talk to you, briefly. I've got 11 minutes, but I won't take all of that, I promise. I want to talk to you about Civil Society engagement, which has got a direct link with our engagement with ALAC and ALS chapters. My role is, beside Europe, is to coordinate our engagement with Civil Society worldwide. And that's where we realized that, as develop materials for Civil Society, we would be remiss if we did not take the opportunity to do more with ALAC and ALS chapters.



And so, effectively building on our experience of working with, [inaudible] people just mentioned, what we're looking to do is engagement that is targeted at Civil Society, not just at the IANA transition, but including, but basically to try and reach out to these communities. And what we like to do is increasingly do that as joint events involving the ALS chapters.

So as a very concrete example I have just reached out a few days ago to Sandra, and Wolfgang, and a few others, to talk about a possible such event in Berlin, sometime in the next few weeks, probably in late March or April, where we will have, in any case, a workshop on IANA stewardship transition open to all stakeholders, but then on the back of that, what we were thinking is to do an event that's sadly broader in terms of substance and topics.

And where we would very much like to have involvement from the ALSs. Jimmy Schultz is also involved in that. And that will, I think, hopefully can serve as a bit of a pilot, and the idea would be that we try and gather the various German speaking ALSs, so not just Germany but also Switzerland and Austria, and try and energize that community around a set of ICANN Internet governance related topics.

So, we'll develop that over the next few weeks with those friends I've mentioned. And I think, hopefully, if that goes well, I would very much like to try and improve the format, and use that. I've got [forts] for doing it, in places in Europe, just because I happen to be based there, so things like places like the Netherlands, London, Copenhagen, but based on the first few experiences that will have, and it will be something that we'd love to roll out regionally.



And for the world generally... I should also mention that we now have a dedicated team within a sort of sub-team, if you will, within the global stakeholder engagement group, which is dedicated to Civil Society engagement, and within that, we'd very much like, is we would comprehensive Civil Society into a wider sense, if you will, so that we encompass NS chapters.

So there is one member of each of our regional teams in Latin, in Asia PAC, Rodrigo is here for Latin, and we're all start to develop to ramp up our activities in this, for this engagement group with the Civil Society and ALS chapters. So expect to see more of us, and I would very much encourage you to come to me proactively, give me ideas. And start thinking about your ALS chapters and how better to reconnect with them.

I think the idea is, you know, we will give them meat, so to speak. We'll give them something to do, and try and empower them, and that just energize them by going to them. And then hopefully, in the long term, it could be self-sustaining. So I just wanted to give you a heads up, and yeah, just encourage you to link up with me, with any ideas that you might have. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Sally Costerton has managed to extract herself from whatever the last meeting she was in to come here. We appreciate you making it. If you have a few words.



SALLY COSTERTON:

Well we have a short time left in this session, so I want to go to questions, but I apologize very much for being a little bit late. Yes, the agendas seem to be all over the place, which is a bit worrying because we haven't really officially started the meeting, but anyway.

I wanted to just let you know on top of what Jean-Jacques is telling you, which is a relatively new initiative for us in the engagement team, building now on what is a complete regional framework around the world. This is really phase two, is deepening that to focus on a matrix, if you like, on a specific stakeholder groups. This is designed to provide kind of dual points of access, and a bit more expertise in specialism within what is now quite a large staffed team.

And I hope that you will work with, not just with your regional vice-president, but in your particular interest area, whether you come from the technical community, or the Civil Society group, or the business group, and some of you will have worked with Christopher Mondini quite extensively if you are, if your aspirations lie there.

Separately, I wanted to let you know that actually during the Los Angeles meeting, again, many of you will know, and Alan was part of this process, we kicked off a series of roundtables with the global leadership at ICANN and some of the leadership groups, well all in fact of the leadership groups in the community. This is the first we're doing it again this time, I think it will probably become a part of ICANN meetings, which will crowd the agenda even further, but that is a consequence of more engagement, sadly.

And one of the things that came out of that was a recognition that Fadi and the global leadership team had when we reflected on what we



heard, that it was time to create closer links between all the parts of the staff capability that if you will face the community, and so we've made some internal management, a slight rearrangement to create a new coordination layer, which brings, for the first time, the policy team, who you know well of course. Heidi is in this group actually, sitting around the table here.

So your voices, you will be pleased to know, are being heard even more loudly than they were before. You can absolutely rely on Heidi to represent your interests. The meetings team, the engagement team, the communications team, the digital engagement team, and Chris Gift, and I think that is it. So we are now having, as it were, a kind of extra layer of coordination.

I wanted to make sure that you knew that, because I do realize that sometimes it can get a bit stuck, this may have less of an issue here, because I think you have smooth relationship with staff, and I hope other groups do too, but I know that silos do exist in ICANN.

We try to remove them, but they, we're doing everything we can to try and create those joining points so that should be less of an issue in terms of... We're looking at things more holistically. And that would include, for example, the oversight of the roll out of the meeting strategy working group plan, which quite a few of you in this table were deeply involved in.

So that will not be handled in a silo. That will be handled in that environment. And so I just wanted to give you that update. And thank you, as ever, for hosting us on this Sunday morning. It's always a pleasure. Thank you.



ALAN GREENBERG;

Thank you very much. You used the term joining points. I'll share with you, at a meeting a day or so ago, the description that I believe, I think it was Fadi, used Sally and David Olive are now joined at the hip. So, I'm not sure that's a particularly attractive description, but it is the one he used.

So, everything that we've heard today is very encouraging, and we look forward to making good use of the people we all have around the world, to work together. So thank you. We have Satish and Tijani next, and then Olivier.

SATISH BABU:

Satish Babu here from APRALO. Two quick observations. The first is on internationalization and language localization. I would like to thank Kuek and his team for the excellent work done on these aspects. From the point of view of the ALAC IDN working group, I welcome the work done and I also call for more work, because not only in South Asia but in different parts of the region, which is very diverse. [Inaudible]

We need more work on language localization. I would also like to point out that the IDN working group asked for a slot during this meeting, but we're not able to meet because [inaudible] I think. So, support I would say also be enabling, you know, things like meetings, basic things. Anyway, that's a very good work that you have done and I hope it will continue.

On the aspect of capacity development, again, good work has been done and I would like to present [inaudible] for it. One of the things



that the governor of India has particularly like, was that in [Nuremberg], one of the ALSs started running a [L Root] copy, and for some reason, the government came out in support.

In fact, they Tweeted, it's very rare of the government of India to do that. Now if capacity building can extend to such things like enabling an ALS to run a copy of the root server, and if that helps to build bridges with the government, I think it's a very welcome step, and we should consider doing that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Sally, do you want to take all of the questions and then answers? Or, your call.

SALLY COSTERTON: I think that one is specifically aimed at Kuek, isn't it? Oh, there he is.

YU-CHUANG KEUK: Thank you Satish for your intervention. This is Keuk for the record. We are absolutely in line in thinking about L Root systems together. I think what was encouraging last quarter was that we had the first L Root instance in India, in partnership with ISOC Calcutta. There were some issues in terms of bandwidth and chocking technical issues that we are trying to resolve.

I think this is something that absolutely we can take up with [NIC C] as well, in terms of the resourcing and coming together. So this is something that is being looked at. I would also like to take this opportunity because not everybody might be aware, that now we have



GSE team member based in New Delhi as well. His name is [inaudible]. Again, he is torn between here and newcomer session. He's there.

But at the APRALO showcase, and then hopefully at the APRALO meeting on Wednesday, I'd be happy to introduce him as well. Thank you Satish.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. Jean-Jacques, I am really happy about your initiatives regarding Civil Society. And I hope you know that the community of At-Large is mostly Civil Society. So, as you proposed, I will perhaps propose that will not only involved in this activities, but also, we will participate in the planning of such activities in the future. And perhaps we can imagine some coordination between our staff, wonderful staff, and your staff to coordinate those activities, and perhaps to build on them, and to find other in the future. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SAHEL: Merci Tijani. I absolutely, if that wasn't clear for the Berlin pilot, as I mentioned, Jimmy and Sandra are very much involved in the planning as is Wolfgang and Janet Hoffman, the [inaudible] academic. And I should also have mentioned that in the, in our internal sub-team for Civil Society engagement, Heidi is also there.

So we have that direct link already. We're already taking onboard. And thank you so much for that. I hope all of you around the table will come



to us effectively, and start thinking about what you would like to do, and we'll make it happen. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking for the transcript. And I have two small questions. One for Tarek. You mentioned government engagement, and you engage with your team with governments in various forums. How does this relate to government engagement in the GAC? And what's the link between the two?

Do you also refer governments to the GAC and so on? And the second question, just to make it faster, is to anyone in the team. The At-Large summit has one recommendation, recommendation number 21, which says, "Encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity, and empowerment."

Does this fall within the ICANN remit? And if it does, then does this fall within the GSC remit?

TAREK KAMEL: Thank you Olivier for the question. Indeed, this is a very important observation. And the ATRT 2 had included in recommendation 6.8 and 6.9, a clear outline, and a clear recommendation of how to enhance government engagement relation in the GSE team, and in the GE team, and the GAC. So we worked with a work group headed by [inaudible] from Lebanon and [Rochelle], and Nigel, and Mandy, and the whole



team, to prepare a couple of engagement recommendations that we have agreed upon together, present to the GAC, approved by the GAC.

And since then, we, and with [Tomas] coming and giving a great push together with his deputy chair for this, we have a monthly, very comprehensive report that we share with the GAC about the government engagement. We make sure that the GAC member is involved as much as we can in the government engagement at different ministries, even if it's not its own ministries.

Indeed, it happens sometimes, that we are not able to enforce the official X or official Y to have the GAC member. I mean, we say but if he does not invite him at the end and we are not able to enforce. But at least we keep him in the picture, and we try to involve him as much as we can.

And not only that, one of our major targets is also to recruit new GAC members. And it is due to different reasons, not only to our efforts, that the number has been increased from even 60, 70 back in Prague in 2012, members, to 148 members at the time being. But this applies as well to the IGOs. We are recruiting more and more IGOs to be observers in the GAC because this gives us some sort of recognition of the role of ICANN as well, and they see what we are doing exactly.

And it helps us while we are moving forward. So we are coordinating now very closely with [Tomas] and his deputies. We have monthly calls. This was not the case in the past, but it is now a very structured coordination, and it's very necessary for the IANA as well.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tarek. Olivier speaking. If I could just add, I think it might be a good idea, because I've seen the work that has been done here, it might be a good idea, that's my personal feeling, that we can also do that with finding At-Large structures, potential At-Large structures, that would be of a good quality of a specific standard.

I know that there are various forums out there that we sometimes cover through At-Large structures, but sometimes we don't and there are thousands of them out there, potential ones out there. So, I don't know whether your team could also help on this.

TAREK KAMEL: So one of the ideas that we can think about together, but we need to coordinate, that was [inaudible] that during the IANA engagement plan, when the proposal is ready, again, someone has to do the advocacy, not the staff itself. The staff will help in doing the advocacy. But then we need the so-called senior ambassadors from the community to talk on behalf of the community, and to go and meet officials in the governments in order to seek their non-objections.

They would not be able to tour 150 capitals, but as well as key governments that have influence in the regional role. And I think ALAC can help us in that by providing us with support in this direction, but as I said, this has to be closely coordinated with [Tomas], and it might be a great idea, because it sends a lot of signals.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll help you if you help us.



TAREK KAMEL: I would propose them, but if Alan also talks to him and so, and I think this would be fine. In my opinion, he would welcome it because he is looking for people to help him in the advocacy and the outreach on a government level, because the scope is huge. And the time is limited.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tarek. I know there has been...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Olivier speaking. My second question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think Sally remembers.

SALLY COSTERTON: Sally for the record. Yes, Olivier asked the question about the ATALS 2 recommendations around raising awareness of the, using the Internet for education...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And encourage public campaigns on using the Internet for education, information, creativity, and empowerment.



SALLY COSTERTON:

Yes. And whether this was in ICANN's remit and if it was, whether it was [inaudible], yeah? It's a very broad objective. I think it's probably the other way around in the sense that that is a bigger objective than the scope of ICANN, and certainly the scope of this team.

However, it's certainly true to say that a key objective of ICANN's engagement strategy is to broaden access to ICANN. I mean, this is really why we did this in the first place, when we first came to ICANN before then, with global partnerships. So in that sense, of course, it is necessary to raise awareness, and it is also necessary to find points of relevance, because just telling people that something exists is not going to... You know, they're going to have to want to come.

So finding the hook, the angle, that is going to connect broader new stakeholders to ICANN is a very central part of what we do. Now, it's not just in this team. There is a very close coordination of this group, as I think most of you are aware, between this team and the communications team. It is specifically in the remit in the communications team to raise awareness.

Finally I would say that, Tarek has talked a couple of times about the work that we're all now handling around facilitating engagement around the transition discussion. And this has been quite noticeable that the link between the multistakeholder model that we use here at ICANN to oversee our work, and that is used by the Internet to oversee its work, is getting a much greater airing because of the transition discussions.

And there are, you know, some challenges with that, not least of which as you all very well know, many people in the world don't understand



what, certainly they don't understand what we do, and they also don't understand how we do it, because it is a very unfamiliar to many people.

But equally, because of the focus that is on ICANN at the moment, it is a very useful mechanism to drive a much greater interest in how we do what we do, and why it's so important for all Internet users to pay attention to ICANN's remit. So we are taking that opportunity to try to get some way towards that goal.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Sally. Olivier has asked for 10 more seconds to say something back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, that already takes five seconds of the time. Do you have contacts at Bloomberg to congratulate them about their wonderful article about the IANA stewardship transition?

SALLY COSTERTON: One of the things that we're engaging in on the IANA stewardship transition communications plan, and it's a very serious point this, is the need to engage bipartisan support in Washington D.C. Those of you who are interested in such things, as they say, inside the Beltway, it is not my specialty subject, I should hasten to add, although it is my team's specialty subject, not this team.



A part from Chris Mondini. It is a challenge. It is a very different discussion, but it is a real challenge in DC to ensure that the voices that are getting behind the transition are not just on the left, or even, and that assumes that everyone on the left is supportive. And it assumes that everyone on the right is not supportive.

But so far, as ever with these things, those who perhaps feel that they, how can I put this diplomatically? Can see no reason why anything should change, to put it that way, tend to be typically more on the right side of US politics, and the publications that support those parties are being more vocal. So the lobbying strategy in Washington is being very closely linked to the media strategy.

And anything that anyone in this group feels that they would like to help with, either in their own region, or if they are involved in DC on these issues, do let me know, and I will, if they have a particular relationships, particular expertise, we are always keen to, as Tarek was saying, you know, make sure that we have visibility of that, as we get into the next stage.

Once there is a proposal, it will become exactly as Tarek says. We will then move into an advocacy stage, because we will have a proposal that we want support for. Right now we're advocating a good process, and this is a slightly different message, but I would like to start preparing that capacity as soon as we can.

I'm conscious of time Alan, we are overrunning horribly. We are being, encroaching on your meeting, but thank you so much for your time.



ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Sally. Luckily, we're overrunning into a break. So we're just not going to give anyone an opportunity for a real break. Just one comment Olivier, I was approached by the Bloomberg reporter to be interviewed, to get a perhaps more balanced position on our side. So I thank you all for coming.

I'm sure there are more questions that haven't had a chance, so maybe a few of you... Maybe a few of you can stick around for a few minutes into the coffee, but I thank you very much. Now, the next session, after the break, will be on the At-Large review. This overlaps with a meeting... Could I have your attention for a moment please?

I guess not. This overlaps with a meeting with the CCWG accountability and the Board. Several members including Leon, I, and I suspect Tijani, will not be here. Olivier will be taking over that session.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you. Also, just to let you know, that coffee and pastries are out in the foyer area, and please to be back on time. We'll be starting at 11 AM with the At-Large review. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

We'll start in one minute, ladies and gentlemen.

Is the presentation ready?

Let's have the recording on please. Good morning everybody. This is the second part of the morning session of the ALAC and Regional Leadership working session. Could I please ask people to take their



seats? Or if you wish to discuss things, please leave the room. Thank you.

So joining us today, after this short, very short, coffee break. We have Larisa Gurnick, from the strategic initiatives director, and we were supposed to have Ray Plzak, the Board member and chair of the structural improvements committee. Unfortunately, Ray is otherwise taken up by other Board matters, so Larisa will hold the flag on this one, and without further ado, I hand the floor over to Larisa Gurnick. Welcome.

LARISA GURNICK:

Thank you very much. And once again, apologies from Ray. He unfortunately is tied up in a mandatory Board meeting, really wanted to be here to do this presentation, but I'll certainly do my best. Thanks for having me. And I'm here to give you a high level overview of the upcoming At-Large review. My team strategic initiatives, provides support to the structural improvements committee, and as such, we've been working very diligently in supporting the work of the GNSO review that's still underway.

So, happy to have that as part of our baseline experience, as we come here to talk to you about steps in planning the At-Large review. Next slide please.

So the purpose for the organizational reviews, of which At-Large is one of the reviews, is to comply with the bylaws requirement, that every structure at ICANN, at every organization at ICANN, be reviewed on a



five-year cycle. So this is the beginning of the five-year cycle, which is why we're here.

But the GNSO structure having gone through the first review of the second cycle, does that make sense? We certainly will be applying lessons learned, and already had what I thought was a very productive session yesterday. Thank you Holly, Cheryl, and Alan. Had an informal discussion with [Jan Wolf] the chair of the GNSO working party, to share experiences and lessons learned to make this process as seamless as possible.

The review is conducted by an independent examiner, and that examiner would be selected through a competitive bidding process. There will be a RFP developed, scope of work defined, criteria developed ahead of time. And I will be working with Holly and others here to make sure that everything is aligned.

And the independent examiner will be ultimately confirmed and selected by the structural improvements committee, and that will be the individual, or a group of individuals doing the work. A concept that was introduced for the GNSO review that has been working quite well, is a working party concept.

And I'm very pleased that we will apply that concept to this review as well. And I'm looking forward to working with Holly, who will be assembling the GNSO, excuse me, the At-Large, take me a little bit, apologies. It just comes right off the tongue. Will be forming the At-Large review working party.



And the whole idea behind this working party is to serve as a liaison between the structural improvements committee, the independent examiner, the At-Large community, and really all the other ICANN stakeholders in participating and helping guide the proceedings of their review.

The work is done independently, of course, but there is a lot of touch points that are very critical, and the insights, knowledge, and depth of experience from the organization that's being reviewed, being interjected in the process early on, is quite important.

In terms of work methods, there are several, and it's a combination of examining documents and records. And if At-Large is anything like the GNSO, there is not going to be any shortage of work for the independent examiner to review lots of records, documents, as well as the proceedings. And we expect that the independent examiner will observe some of the meetings and take part in the meetings, and really learn from that direct experience.

360 is also a concept that was introduced during the GNSO review. And the idea is to collect information from a large and diverse group of people. And the concept of the 360 itself implies that the feedback would come from the At-Large community, it would come from other SOs and ACs, Board, staff, and anybody that has an interest and would like to provide input.

So it's an online survey type tool, and there will be lots of opportunities for the review working party to provide input and help formulate questions so that the outcome is quantitative and qualitative data that's reliable and informative for the purposes of conducting the review.



Another aspect of the work methods is interviews. While we say here that the interviews will be limited just by the sheer magnitude and the complexity of reaching out to a very large group of people, but experiences from the GNSO review certainly point to the fact that online survey tools are very useful, but face to face or one on one interaction with key people that have depth of knowledge, is also very, very important.

So we'll continue to do that. And then review criteria will be developed up front, as really directed by the bylaws. And with the objective and quantifiable and clearly defined from the get go. Next slide please.

I thought it would be helpful for you to understand the review cycle, and this is a generic review cycle that's being applied to all of the reviews. It starts with the planning, and I would say that we are in the early days of the planning phase, generally expect that this phase takes about six months, and that's the opportunity to do exactly what we're doing, reaching out, formulating teams of people, setting out criteria, setting out the competitive bidding process, and moving toward selecting an independent examiner.

Then the next phase is the meat and potatoes of the review, obviously is the conduct of the independent review, which generally takes nine to 12 months. After that, and I will walk you through a process in more detail on the next slide, but the next logical phase is planning the implementation of improvements.

Every review results in an assessment at the end. There is conclusions of things that are working well and those things that can be improved. So for those improvements that would be useful, there is the planning



phase for implementing those improvements. And then actually going through and making those improvements happen.

At the end of that cycle, which could take nine to 12 months, could be shorter, could be longer, really depends on the nature of improvements that would be implemented. At some point that concludes, and all of those improvements become part of the standard operating process, which includes regular reporting, tracking, measuring performance, and monitoring effectiveness. Next slide please.

This is the proposed timeline, and as we uncover very importantly in the conversation yesterday, this is a generic timeline that really needs to be conformed and specifically tailored to the work of your organization...

And also to the fact that we want to make sure to use face to face ICANN meetings as opportunities to encourage participation in face to face interviews, or one on one interviews. They don't have to be face to face, but that's obviously a very important inflection point, as well as ICANN gatherings have proved to be very useful in encouraging people to take part in the 360 assessment.

So with the fact that a new ICANN meeting schedule is upon us, coming in calendar year 16, and the AMB type meetings is something that we have to consider very carefully, we'll be taking a very close look and making sure that the process, the steps, and the timing is such that we consider the gathers of people that will be available, given the fact that we're moving into a new means of conducting ICANN meetings.

So all of this will be reflected in more detailed and targeted time line. Next slide please. Another view of the review process, the review as I

already explained, starts with the examination of documents, records, observations, collecting data through the 360, the interviews and such, and then the next phase is the reporting phase.

And that usually starts with the independent examiner collecting a whole lot of data, and compiling that data into analysis that makes sense and provides them with a logical flow of being able to say, how well have the recommendations from the prior review been implemented? Has that implementation been as effective as it was intended to be? And what are the areas that require some additional work?

The reporting phase starts with what we call working text, and it is not given a draft. It's an early opportunity for the working party to really engage with the independent examiner to make sure that the expertise that's within the organization is imparted on the people that are doing the reviews, so there are no gaps, and if there are any gaps or understanding, or clarity, that's the opportunity to react to the working text, and making necessary corrections and provide any additional data.

And from there, we move into draft report, draft report according with standard ICANN process, gets published for public comment and we'll follow the traditional public comment cycle. And then that leads into the final report, and from there, of course, we move into the implementation phase, and I'll talk about the roles and responsibilities on the next slide. Next slide please.

So there are several parties here that are involved in the review process. First is the structural improvements committee, which is a committee of the Board who has the responsibility to provide oversight over all



organizational reviews. So their role is to really define the scope of the review, in line with the bylaws requirements. And then as the process moves forward, and there is a report that's issued by the independent examiner, they accept the report or they make a recommendation to the Board, that the Board accept the report.

And then that generally results in the Board directing staff and the organization to come up with an implementation plan, and then the implementation plan also goes to the structural improvements committee, and it's their job to then recommend to the Board, again, to approve the implementation plan. For some of you, you may be familiar with a previous construct that had Board working groups that would write a report on the report of the independent examiner, and that was a method that was used in the past.

That is not a method that is currently followed. So the Board working group is not an entity that will be a part of this process, because of that, so it should be much, much more streamlined and efficient. The staff role in this really is to support and project manage the entire process. We assemble the RFP and oversee the competitive bidding process, in line with ICANN procurement policies.

We facilitate the structural improvements committee selection of the independent examiner, monitor the process, and really get involved every step of the way with the working party, with the independent examiner, making sure that information is provided on a timely basis, that the reports come out on schedule, and really just manage the timeline.



At the end of the review where there is an implementation plan, it's also staff, although not my team, it would be the policy staff that provides support to the At-Large organization, that would be working on preparation of the implementation plan, along with all of you. The role of the independent examiner, I think it's pretty clear we already talked about the kinds of things that they do. They are the ones that do the assessment and reach final conclusions.

And then the role of the review working party, which I mentioned in the beginning, is a group of people that would be assembled by your organization to assist in a variety of ways. First on the list is to assist with outreach and engagement, and I couldn't overstate the importance of that role, as we're learning from the GNSO review, to make sure that the outcome of the review is productive and useful.

The input from the community into this process is really vital. So we have a pretty good model for communicating why this is important. We have some established FAQs and various other tools that we've already assembled, and we're certainly going to continue to refine them and make them applicable and useful here, but that's really, really a very key role for the working parties to ensure that when the independent examiner starts looking at all of the collected data, that the data is broad and sufficiently representative for them to form their conclusions.

Part of the responsibilities is also coordinating the 360, making sure that the questions are relevant, clear, applicable, and that the overall structure of how the 360 is put together makes sense for this community.



In terms of coordinating interviews, it's the working party that generally provides some suggestions, who would be the right people to interview to provide or at least, groups of people that would have the perspective, the knowledge, and the understanding to provide the independent examiner with the depth of understanding that they're looking for, as well as providing clarifications and corrections in areas where there might be gaps.

And after the report is issues and it's the implementation phase, the working party, having been there throughout the whole process, and having understood what the recommendations are intended to do, would be the ones to help develop the implementation plan. Next slide please.

I included some information that might be useful. While you see that it's not an oversight, that it says GNSO review, we're just beginning to assemble all of these documents relative to the At-Large review, but looking at what has been put together for the GNSO review, and the structure would certainly give you some ideas of how we've organized it so far.

There is a community Wiki that assembles everything that has to do with the review process, all of the documents, all of the meetings, all of the updates, and everything like that. I thought it might be useful to see the FAQs because they're really intended to be that one of the many engagement and outreach mechanisms to help people understand what is this review all about. Why should I take the time to provide input? Why is this important? Those kinds of things.



You can also get an idea of the kinds of statistics that we've been tracking for the GNSO review, which as I suggested yesterday, it is very useful because when some of these new mechanisms were being put in place for the GNSO, we really didn't have a good base line. We really didn't know what would be a good target for how many people should respond to the 360, and various other.

And that's still evolving, it will continue to evolve, but at least you can see the kinds of data that's being tracked. And of course, myself, as staff contact, I'm happy to answer any questions, and will continue to interact very closely to make sure that this process is useful.

I'll be happy to take questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Larisa. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And you might have noticed, we do have a few gaps in the table, and that's because part of our community, in fact, the majority of our leadership team has been called to appear in the cross community working group on accountability that is taking place at the same time as now.

But we do have a good turnout here, and there is already a queue in operation. I don't know whether, Holly, you wanted to say just a few words since you're the shepherd of the process for At-Large. And then I'll go through the queue. I've got Evan at the moment, Barron, you had your hand up, and Eduardo. Yeah, I'm seeing you. That's fine. Holly Raiche.



HOLLY RAICHE:

First of all, Larisa thank you very much. We had a really good meeting yesterday, and [inaudible] some really interesting things. Just minor little things, but, first of all, everybody is going to put their hand up to be part of the working party, and I thank you already for doing so. But it's also well known that probably a few of you might lose a little bit of interest and will probably be a few of us left standing, maybe.

We have a little bit of a different task to the GNSO, which is what we started to talk about yesterday. GNSO is a particular group. Now we've got three levels, we've actually got ALAC, and we're reviewing ourselves, but in doing so, we're also starting to look at the next couple of levels, which is APRALO, and then the ALSs.

And that starts to raise some really interesting issues, because it's sort of how do we measure ourselves? Do we actually have any measurements? And maybe that's a problem. And what are our metrics? All of those sorts of issues are the things that we're going to be teasing out, and clearly are going to want everybody's thoughts on.

Some of the details which I found really interesting, there was, for the GNSO, a long survey and a short one, because if you're like me, if you are interested, you want to do a short one. If you are interested, you'll do the long one. The independent investigator will have the personal details of who replies, but the people want their responses to remain confidential, then in fact, their name will not be identified with any outcomes at all.

So, in that sense, confidentiality is guaranteed up to that extent. We also were talking about the need to actually go as wide as possible to find the sort of data we want, and that's where I think everybody's brain



that should be in gear, to think about well, what is it that you think we should be questioning about. But we also realize that, given the expertise of the independent investigator, we would want the expertise of that person, or people to be able to understand how to take the information we think we want and frame that into questions that actually produce answers.

There is a real check, a real skill in being able to ask the sort of question that will produce useful answers. So in fact, we had a really interesting meeting to start with. It's going to be a long task. We really do want people to be involved, and with that, then I'll let people start asking questions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly Raiche. Evan Leibovitch is next.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Olivier. I've got three questions. One of which is, since you're doing a competitive selection for who is going to be the reviewer, are you going to get input from people in At-Large about the last time that the review was held? Assuming perhaps that the incumbent may be asking to do it again, considering that they're already doing the GNSO review.

Is there going to be any consideration given to asking people in the ALAC what they thought of the process last time? Considering that the company that did it last time may be asking to do it again. Secondly, to what extent are doing an assessment to the last ALAC review? Because



not all of the recommendations from the last ALAC review were implemented in their entirety.

So I would like, if possible, to make sure that that becomes part of it, because if you do a review, the results of the review are not fully implemented. What are the implications of that? Because that was already the case with the last ALAC review.

And also, given the fact that this time, it is not an ALAC review, but an At-Large review, I would like you to talk about the specifics of how that is different, and given the fact that we are probably the most culturally and linguistically diverse component of ICANN, are your interviews going to be done in multiple languages?

Are your interviews going to be done, you know, reflecting that kind of diversity that may not have existed in any similar review that ICANN has done every before? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly said she can respond to some of this. So Holly and then Larisa.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll let Larisa talk about the selection of the independent review, the selection of the independent investigator. We've already talked yesterday about some of those issues, and the fact that, number one, there are left over recommendations, which is why we're going to go out...

I mean, one of the documents, we have many of the documents we have to look at, are going to start with the last review. What is it that

we found? What is it that we didn't find? And in fact, a lot of things were not covered because in fact, the ALSs, the APRALO structure had just started. So we didn't review it. So that is absolutely front and center on the table, it will be on the table.

And yes, we yesterday said we have to start with the documents. We have to start with our own documents. We're going to have a look with the GNSO documents to see what they did, how they did this, what lessons we can learn from that. In terms of, I think that covers the bit that I wanted to talk about. In terms of the selection, I think you better talk about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Larisa Gurnick.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you. Yeah, thank you for the questions. A couple of things on the assessment of the independent examiner that I would like to share with you. As a matter of process, once an independent examiner completes the review, there will be an assessment. So the working party... And this is a general comment that would apply. The working party, as a body that works very closely with the independent examiner, as well as staff and possibly the structural improvements committee, will have the opportunity to assess how well the independent examiner delivered on the requirements that were set out at the beginning of the process.

So that's something that is being implemented as we speak. We also specifically discussed the fact that several of you would like to provide input, and comments on the individuals that will respond to the RFPs.



Well, in order to preserve the independence, the selection itself will be done by the structural improvements committee, but there will be an opportunity to provide your inputs, concerns, comments, into the process.

And then, by the same token, the independent examiner that will be selected to do the At-Large review, the review working party will, in its turn, have the opportunity to review how effective of a job the independent examiner has done.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

So there is two remaining questions. One of which was unanswered, which is about the diversity issue. Sorry, this is Evan again. And the other thing I wanted to ask was, I wonder if the methods that you've just outlined are going to be totally suitable for At-Large. So give me a moment.

Within most of ICANN, the parties that are involved are self-interested. You have businesses that are here because of financial interests. You have other interests that are here because they have a financial, or career, or whatever reason to be here. At-Large almost by definition, is not that.

It's the rest of the community that just happens to have an interest in At-Large almost as a peripheral thing. Most of the groups that are involved, most of the ALSs are not primarily ICANN focused. It's not. And to that extent, just say putting back a public comments page or whatever, saying, okay, here is a survey or here is a public comment, and to passively just say, okay, here, come in and do this.



I'm wondering if that is going to be sufficient, considering the nature of this community and the factor, to me, I think there is going to be more perhaps of an effort that needs to be made to actively go out to ALSs, and to groups that may not normally participate.

Or they may come in on just a single issue, or something like that. But I'm wondering if the same techniques that work throughout most of the other self-interest communities within ICANN, just won't be sufficient in doing this with At-Large.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm going to take both for a start. We did talk about diversity. We did talk about the need for many languages. So we've already, that's already been spotted as an issue and noted. In terms of the diversity, yes there will be a survey. That's certainly not the only tool. We know we have to identify different people. We have to understand who the key people are.

We actually then have to go out and say, "What is it that we're looking for?" The surveys are going to be just one tool, and we are working through what else we have to do. So in fact, the next six months, or less, is going to be a very busy time saying, what is it that we have to do, in fact, to make this an effective review. And when I said I actually would like input, I was serious.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry. What I was getting at is, even coming to the number of meetings that I have come to, you can see that there is different approaches. There are certain people that are not shy, they'll come out and they'll



talk. And there is other people that you go out of the room, and opinions have to be extracted with a crowbar.

And I'm just thinking that just because they're not, just because they're not outgoing, just because they're not shy or whatever. There is going to be other voices in the room that, given the circumstance even like a meeting, will just shut up and let everyone else talk. But their input, I think, is going to be as valuable, if not even more so than the ones you here all of the time.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I think we appreciate that, and that's why it is sort of, what is it that we have to do? Who are we looking for? And I think we also have a much bigger task because, as I said, we are looking at three levels, not one. It's not just the GNSO review. It's an ALAC review, but it's also a RALO review, and it's also an ALS review. Now that actually starts, look, almost too big.

How are we going to manage it? And how far can we go in looking at those levels? And as part of that, what kind of information are we going to get, that is actually useful and doesn't overwhelm the whole process? And those are big questions. We have a few months to ask the questions and then figure out what the answers are.

I'm taking a deep breath and going, very long process, everybody has already put their hands up, thank you very much. We're going to need the input not just from you Evan, but from everybody else who has not talked.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly and Evan. And may I just remind you kindly to say your name when you take the floor. Larisa Gurnick.

LARISA GURNICK: Hi. Larisa Gurnick. So I wanted to address very specifically the diversity question, and tell you that in terms of the 360, that will be translated as it has been for the GNSO, translated into the six UN languages. And it already came out, the differences, I mean this is really not about comparing this to the other, we're just using that as a reference point because the GNSO review is underway.

In that case, there were very few, if any, requests to provide the answers to the 360 assessment in another language, but the opportunity was certainly there. And we already flagged the fact that one on one interviews with people of the At-Large community, there has to be an accommodation for translations, and an opportunity to conduct those in different languages, so we made note of that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Larisa. Olivier speaking. In the queue I have Barron [Gillian], Eduardo Diaz and Vanda Scartezini. So let's start with Barron [Gillian].

BARRON [GILLIAN]: This is Barron [Gillian] for the record. And Evan stole my question. But I do have a second question. It's to Holly. I just wanted to know whether you would be having a geographically balanced work review party.



HOLLY RAICHE: Well, since everybody in this room have put their hand up, like it or not, I imagine it will be. And you're going to have to beg off if you're not going to participate. Yes, of course.

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

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Eduardo for the record. I have a question about this 360 assessment. I have heard that and have never participated in something like that. How does that work? Does that work like a one to one, I mean, questionnaire. Or where somebody calls somebody and talks? Or is it something that people fill up in the, some kind of survey?

And if this 360 assessment is really for the whole ALAC, I guess, right?
Okay. Thank you. Larisa.

LARISA GURNICK: This is Larisa. Yes. So the 360, the term 360, and we really struggled with whether that's an appropriate term, or whether there was a better term, and in the long run, we ended up with the 360, still bears clarification and explanation. The point of why it's called a 360 is because it's really intended to collect feedback all round, 360 degrees, which means every aspect of the At-Large organization, as well as other organizations, and anybody outside of the At-Large.

So, truly a full 360 perspective. And then in terms of your, the first question, the means of this tool. It's an online tool. It's a fairly, simple,



user-friendly method, whether it's Survey Monkey or something like a Survey Monkey, you know, has yet to be determined, but it's intended to be user-friendly, and simple, to be conducted online, and the data to be captured on the backend for easy reference and analysis by the independent examiner.

So the responses, and fielding of the survey, is all done by the independent examiner. They collect the answers, they know the identities. Staff has nothing to do with that, and that is essentially how it will work.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Larisa. Olivier speaking. Follow up from Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So, there are not one to one interviews, or is that part of the 360 also? That's the other question I had. This is Eduardo.

LARISA GURNICK: Larisa. To answer your question, 360 is the online survey. More of an interactive data gathering tool. Data being quantitative and qualitative. Interviews are separate, and interviews would be conducted, to the extent feasible, in a face to face environment at an ICANN meeting, or some other meeting as would be appropriate, as well as conducted over the phone, or Skype, or some other means.

But that mechanism would be one on one in the sense that, or I suppose that could be two people representing the independent



examiner, having an interview with a single individual, over whatever the suitable mechanism, if it's not face to face.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Larisa. Olivier speaking. And 360 is indeed a bit of a loaded term, as a 360 review is to do with human resources. So I don't know whether you considered that, or that might be the reason why we have a recurring question about what a 360 is. There is no human resources component in the 360 that will be performed in the review, is there?

LARISA GURNICK: No you're right, Olivier. No human resources component. We borrowed the term from a tool that's typically used in a human resources, you know, kind of evaluation of an individual's performance, but only in the sense that it's intended to reach out and gather feedback, not just from one body, but diverse bodies.

And certainly, if there is a better term, we are happy to use any term that makes more sense and resonates. We're definitely not married to the term 360.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Larisa. Vanda Scartezini is next.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. Being very old in this process, around here. What is important, in my opinion, is which questions we're going to do first, not the name of that. I'm going to give you a suggestion for considering the process.



Each RALO has one month call. I believe that any call next month, or this one, whatever, is to be attended by the group that was selected, because they need to at least understand what is going on, and what is cultural behavior of that group.

And so give them space in that to explain their task. It will help to accelerate the process. Just that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Action item on Heidi, or Silvia, or somebody to say, probably I should be... I think that's an excellent suggestion. If I can have maybe five or 10 minutes in the next RALO calls, just to run through what we're doing, would be... And maybe actually the thing to do would be, to circulate the material you sent to me, to each RALO, and then I can talk to that. Thank you Vanda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Holly. Larisa, did you want to respond to that as well?

LARISA GURNICK: Actually, I just have a question. Did you mean...? I mean clearly, the working party to begin the process of engaging the RALOs, but were you also thinking that it would be useful for the independent examiner, both, okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Vanda for the record.



VANDA SCARTEZINI: I would suggest not only us, as a part of group, but independent group, because they don't know what is going on, and they are new in that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think what I was thinking is to at least explain to the RALOs now, what the process is, to get their interest up. To say, "This is what we're going to do. This is how we're going to do it. We're looking for members of committees and so forth." It will start the ball rolling, and then when there is an independent examiner selected, they'll know who that person is, what they're going to do.

From day one, get that interest up.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, it's Vanda. My suggestion is to have the independent group attending that. And Holly for instance, or whoever, can explain, because they knew more easily to deal with that community. But independent group need to understand, and to attend this group, is just listening in, what is going on, you know. What is the cue to the behavior of that group, it's quite important to start thinking how they will address to them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Vanda. Next is Alberto Soto intervening in Spanish.



ALBERTO SOTO:

Sorry for speaking Spanish. Thank you very much. This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much. I share your opinions, your point of views, particularly those from Evan and Vanda. And in LACRALO, in our monthly meeting, we have two cycles, 20 minute slots assigned for this type of situations.

In every single monthly meeting, our next meeting will be February the 23rd, we will have 20 minutes aside for this, and if you need extra time, please let me know, and we will extend that time. My opinion, at least, is that the Internet end user is us, the ones that are here, and not those who are sitting somewhere else, and who do not know anything about ICANN.

I'm sorry for saying this. Why do I say this? Because the individual Internet user, who doesn't exactly know where he is standing, and whether the Internet is working well or not, well that is the biggest problem we have already confirmed that, when we were talking about with the journalist, we were asking us, okay, what is ICANN?

How can ICANN help us? So they don't know anything about ICANN. It is us, the end users, the ones who have the knowledge, and the ones who can participate in the policy making process. So ALAC, in particular, and the ALSs and the RALOs, we are in the position to contribute to this. Why?

For example, in Uruguay, we only have one ALS with 7,000 associates. And in Mexico we have more than 407 [inaudible] has more than 450 associates. And just with this information, you can imagine the amount of people that we have.



Some of them are professional, some of them are professors at universities, some of them are at the missions. But this way of working makes your work very simplified, and even the service might be simplified, because I mean... Today I had 30 minutes to speak, but I was not able to explain what we are doing. According to the ICANN strategic plan, we work with both Rodrigos. Rodrigo [Salcedo] and Rodrigo de la Perra.

So we are developing webinars on different topics. And the first topic will be the Internet users, and the use of the GAC, and the list of entities, and the list of, that each ALS in LACRALO has. Unfortunately, we have many possibilities in the Adobe Connect, but I don't think that those functionalities will be enough for us.

We are assigning priorities to these topic for the GAC and the end users, because we want to encourage and engage governments to participate in the rest of the webinars. Therefore I offer you that in our second webinar in April, the video topic. Perhaps you may have one hour presentation, I mean, the webinar lasts an hour and a half.

So you develop the topic and then have a Q&A session. So you will have the chance of having a great audience, a large audience. All the webinars are open, and they are aimed at not technical people. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alberto Soto. Any response? Larisa Gurnick.



LARISA GURNICK:

This is Larisa. Thank you very much. Certainly very useful information, because throughout the process, we're very eager to have opportunities to reach out and explain, as much as needed, and as much as people have the attention and the interest to hear. So that the conduct of the review and the examination is production.

To go through the review, and not to get broad and diverse feedback from the right people that have the sufficient knowledge and information on the points of view, really would not serve the purpose of the review from anybody's standpoint. So I really appreciate you flagging the webinar, and we will be taking an action item to prepare a presentation, and to use that as an opportunity to engage with the audience, and really do that on a consistent basis throughout the process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Larisa. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And if I made add to what has been said. I'm absolutely very impressed with the way LACRALO is looking into this, and the proactive attitude that is being taken by LACRALO under your leadership, and one of your secretariat... I just wonder, Holly, as the shepherd for the process for At-Large and the fact that the RALOs have a really big defining influence this time around.

Is there a chance for lessons learned for best practices to be shared by the different RALOs and to get the same kind of involvement on each one of the RALOs?



HOLLY RAICHE:

I certainly hope so. I certainly intend so. I mean, I think the first round of discussion with the various RALOs is just going to be, this is what's happening, this is what we're going to be doing. We want your involvement. We want you to understand what we're asking. We want you to think about the fact that we're reviewing the whole process of ALAC, but also RALOs at the very least.

And I would imagine what that will do is then open up the discussion. So when we have an independent investigator, then the independent investigator and maybe me, you, whatever, can then present a much longer presentation in terms of this is what we're looking for, and use that opportunity to, not only to inform, but then to seek feedback.

So I would imagine there is going to be more than one participation. I imagine it's going to be, because if you looked at one of the earlier slides, it's a long process. This next six month period is literally just developing the process. Thinking through the questions we want to ask, thinking through who we want to engage, how we want to engage them.

So it's actually, we've got a fair bit of time to think through the best ways to actually be able to listen to people, and to get the information we want, so that we can understand how ALAC works, how the RALOs work, and how we might improve that. So it's going to be a long conversation. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Holly. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. A little follow up from Alberto Soto.



ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. We have started working with surveys within our region. And I believe that we can continue with the same survey. So I volunteer so that you can send us your surveys, and perhaps we can send you our surveys, they're in Spanish and in English.

Now we have a proposal to have a survey on ICANN risks, so we have generated division because we have the risks unclassified, so we have classified the risks, we have divided the risks, and we're now providing that information to ALAC, if you will.

That survey was made within LACRALO. So I think we can work in a quickly manner. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. There are two on the microphone. Can you turn...?

Sorry.

I'm hearing voices.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Holly is hearing voices.



HOLLY RAICHE:

I'm hearing voices. I've always dreamed of hearing voices. I imagine that there will be a lot of very useful information in the surveys, and probably Larisa, we would be using some of that in terms of what information...

One of the things that came out of yesterday's discussion, when we just started to talk about his was, in fact, the more data you get beforehand, before you develop the questions, the better. You have more of a picture of what it is, either you know or you don't know, and you want to find out. So that sort of information would be very useful, at an early stage, so we can get a feeling about what information is available.

I mean, we do have as Evan pointed out, we've got all of the information that was gathered as part of the 2009 ALAC review. We've got to look at the GNSO reviews that is a lot of information about how that process worked, or didn't work. You can always learn the positive and the negative.

So the more information we have beforehand, the more we're actually able to develop the kinds of questions that are going to help us understand how ALAC and the RALOs can work better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Holly. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And the action item on this, I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, is for Heidi, Larisa, and Holly to coordinate on those surveys, especially looking at the ones that will be supplied by Alberto Soto and LACRALO.

From January 2015 to December 2019, six months okay. Mic, Holly please.



HOLLY RAICHE: The first phase will go to the end of June. We want to be planning what the questions... Well, we want to have the independent investigator on board so that when we develop the questions, we do have the ability, the ability of an investigator to frame the questions in a way that would be meaningful.

So we want to have the people onboard, we want to have all of the information looked at and analyzed so that by the end of June, we will actually be ready to roll, and then we can have the sort of 12 months, well nine to 12 months, which is the next part of the process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Since we have a few more minutes, and I see no one else in the queue, I have a point of clarification with regards to the timeline. Conduct review is shown as being from July 2015 to March 2016. On the next slide, if we could move to the next slide please. We have review, report, implementation plan.

Does that date we have for conduct review incorporate review and report?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. No, I just needed to know. It's great to assume, but it's important to know, and that's great. Well, any other questions or comments from people around the table?

Seeing no hands up, I thank you very much for coming to speak to us about this very important review. I think the community is very excited to go forward with another round of your review-ti-titus. I remember the last one being particularly onerous at the end and saying, let's just get on with it.

But it really is great, and it's one of the key processes that make ICANN accountable, and ICANN's component parts accountable. So we really are looking forward to take part in this, and Holly is going to shepherd this with her expert hand. So thanks very much Larisa. And with this, this session is, I guess, finished. So thank you.

[Applause]

And there might be an announcement. Is the recording finished?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you everyone there is now a 90 minute break, until 13:30, so lunch is lots of places downstairs. You can get lunch. For the members of the finance and budget...

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like to welcome Xavier Calvez, and Carole Cornell, who will be talking about the fiscal year '16 AC/SO special budget request process, and the fiscal year 16 budget and operational plan. I believe.



XAVIER CALVEZ: And [Tarren] Presley who is in my team and works on both subjects with us as well. He's there with us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Carole is starting once she gets her screen working.

CAROLE CORNELL: Good afternoon everyone. This is Carole Cornell, and I'm going to give you an overview presentation on the five year, the draft, five year operating plan, public comments. We've done the analysis, and we have posted it, and I'm going to kind of give you an overview of that analysis today.

You can flip. As you might recall, the planning process that ICANN has been following is, they develop the five year operating plan, and it was approved by the Board back in October. We have been developing as a compliment, if you will, to the strategic plan, a five year operating plan, and we've added some key components to that, such as the key performance indicators, dependencies, phasing.

And then from that, it is a compliment to the annual operating plan and budget. And as we continue through that process, the achievements and progress reporting will be shared, typically through the quarterly stakeholder call, or dashboards, or ICANN meeting reports, things of that nature.

And that kind of completes a cycle of what we're calling the planning process today. Next slide please. Next slide please.



Today we're just going to talk about the five year operating plan from the planning perspective. And Xavier is going to go forward with some of the operating financial information from there. Next slide.

The three key summary of components that we got from the feedback, and I will show you some 100 comments that were received and how they were spread across, but the three key components here are the positive feedback on the development of the initial five year operating plan, from a process and from a format standpoint.

In fact, some of the comments actually said, please try to keep the strategic plan, and the five year operating plan, and the annual operating plan, in the same format for ease of use and for people to see how it's progressing. The second is to include it in our planning process, and so it's not a separate effort, that it's a smooth transition between all of those.

And that was good, positive feedback. And a lot of people liked the general result. The second point was, with respect to, there were out of 100, 38 comments about the key performance indicators. And the answer really, in a nutshell, is we need to work on it more.

Yes, we've put 20 high level, goal level, key performance indicators there, but they need to be more specific, more clarity, maybe with a specific goal. Clarity in what you might call an index, what's included in it. Working with community on defining the best one that tells the metric that the stakeholders would like to see as well.

So that's what I mean about that. It is a good start, and some have good specificity and some are too general and need further



development. But as many of you probably realize that, to find the right one takes a lot of effort to try and agree on what that metric is. And also to be able to collect the appropriate data. So it's a process.

The third item, the introduction of the five year financial model, helps understanding of the ICANN's approach. So having that five year model in place, with some key principles, was also the third point that people talked positively about, and Xavier is going to talk a little bit more about in this presentation.

Next slide please. So, eight different groups provided input, which is, I think very good. It shows there is a lot of interest in this particular area. And of those eight groups, there is approximately 100 divided sections. And what I did with those sections is, we went through and put them in, is there a planning in process related comment? A KPI comment? One on dependency, or phasing, financial model?

And the other category is anything from positive feedback to a typo to those kind of items as well. Next please. So what I... Could we go back just one more time? I'm sorry.

So what I'm going to do now is go for each one of those columns. Planning and process, I'm going to talk a little bit about what the comment overall was as in terms of an analysis, and what the steps are that we're doing to mitigate that analysis or to answer that question.

Please go forward. Thanks. So the first question on the planning process is, there was a lot of improvements made, but there is still more to go. But the overall comment was positive. One of the things that



people asked was, what is the process to update this five year annual plan now that we've put it in place?

So here is the answer, is that we're going to update it each year, and I will talk a little bit more about the steps, individually, which are on that diagram that's a little too small to see, but it's all going to be based off, you know, if you did a year end, what the set of deliverables are, how did the KPIs do? What those then lead to changes and improvements to the next phase.

And the five year allows us, in phasing, what we did in FY 16 as a goal, what we hope to accomplish in 17, and so those will be tweaked as the performance metrics and data shows otherwise. Next please.

Regarding the KPIs. I've kind of shared some of this, but I'll be very specific. Requests for clarification, the definition of the KPIs and their phrasing. We're going to continue to refine them over time as we have lessons learned and improvements, and share it with the community and get their understanding and communication and buy in as well.

The second is, comments and dealing with the development of review process. So the KPIs will be shared but there are a number of mechanisms on how we do it, how we show what that is, and the process itself is somewhat of a collaborative one between.

We might make a recommendation, the community will evaluate, is that the good target? What is the expectation within that parameter? The third one is the quality of them. So as this is an early phase, if you will, of developing some of these KPIs, we might have only a part of an index to share, or we may not have that data in terms of collected material.



So we can't tell you if we're 5% over until we actually do the actual measurements. So setting the target is a little bit of a challenge when you don't know right where you are today. So we're going to be working on those parameters. I would also like to say that there were some clarifications needed in terms of some of the wording, and those will be incorporated into the next version of the five year operating plan. Next slide please.

With regard to dependencies, we actually only got two or three comments, so that would imply that the dependencies are fairly in line with where we want to go and how they were described in the five year plan. 4.3, which has to do with public interest, was probably one of the ones that there needs some further clarification on that, because there is not really a clean definition that the community and all stakeholders have agreed on. It is something that has been started, but it's not finished, and so the dependencies tie into that, and the phrasing of those need to be worked out.

We are going to continue to refine it in the wording of the updated five year operating plan, you'll start to see some of that phraseology change. The next one is with regarding to dependencies, the community bandwidth issue was shown as a dependency for just 2.3, and that's one that is common through the whole operating plan, so we needed to change some of the phrasing to include it in some of those other dependencies, or put it as a phrase that's continual for all of them, and we'll adjust it.

Next slide please. So, with regard to phasing. So phasing in the plan, for everybody's benefit, is what did we want to do and accomplish



within FY 16? What do we want to accomplish in each one in FY 17? And as you can tell, in order to keep the same format, it's one or two sentences per year. So they're high level and global. They're not great detail.

You would find the great detail in the operating plan, in which you would find on our portfolio management system that would have the 300 projects and what we're hoping to accomplish in the key success factors and all of that. These are at a higher level than that. So we need to continue defining and clarifying them, so there is better understanding about what we mean by what we're going to accomplish in a given year.

That is what the comment and the feedback was. Could we define better? What's in what we want to accomplish in that phase? The second item on here is the elimination of the SO and AC process. We actually got some negative feedback and positive feedback on that. But the explanation that Xavier will talk more about a little bit later, is we wouldn't eliminate it until we've improved the planning process and the budgeting process to include how those SO and AC requests occur.

We're not just going to take it away until we have another mechanism that's clearly understood and people feel comfortable about, but to have it as a separate process, is something that we want to improve upon, by making it part of the whole process. The third item here is comments on the underlining strategic plan.

So this is one of the items that if you looked in the other and all of that, we probably had 20 or so comments about the strategic plan, specifically definitions as to what is in each strategic plan. Is there an



overlap or a duplication between 4.1 and 4.2? Another explanation of that was, some people wanted to reword an existing objective and goal.

And the answer really is, not at this time. What we're going to do is we are going to use the five year strategic plan the way it's written, and unless there is a critical significant event, we are going to hold that strategic plan as it's written. Okay? So that foundationally is going to stay in place, as the Board approved it in October and is out there in the community. In fact, you can receive a copy of it in a one page kind of laminated format, if you want to keep it as a reference point.

But we're not going to be changing the strategic plan annually, and therefore the five year operating plan is going to substitute that with what we deliver on a phasing effort. Next slide please. I'm going to, Xavier, do you want to come talk a little bit about the financial model and what was said? Since you helped collaborate and put these points together?

These were the three main points that were brought up in the financial model.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you Carole. So, regarding the financial model description that was in the document suggested to public comment, the main comments were the two first ones. The... First of all, it's usual to have a financial model. That was the first type of comment that we have received, which is what we had always intended to that was one of the main need for information that has been clear over the years, to have a five year,



or a longer term than an annual budget, to have a five year perspective on financial information.

There is a certain amount of requests and questions to clarify what the model will include in the level of detail of it, which is also the substance of the second comment, which is indicating that is, as of yet, challenging to make the link between what are the activities that are in the five year plan, and how these activities translate into resources, and how those resource requirements aggregate into the financial model.

So it's basically the link between the activities that are described in the plan, and the financial model high level view, how would that link transparently together. That's the second comment. It was mainly made by the ccNSO, but I think a few other people had also made that comment.

The third one is a very simple comment relative to one paragraph that is missing the, enough clarity on how we are suggesting to disclose the way the new gTLD expenses are described, but we fixed that in the meantime. And that's it, thank you.

CAROLE CORNELL:

Thank you very much Xavier. Next slide please. As I mentioned before, if you looked at the model, there were about 38 comments in the other category, and many of them had to do with a typo, or a clarification item, or a word change, and those will be updated in the next version of the draft.

In fact, a redline and a clean version of the operating plan was posted when we posted the analysis, and that is available now, and you're

welcome to go through it and see it, and see the changes that have just been started. I think they will be continued as we get input from the Singapore meeting, from stakeholders.

We will go back, we will update the draft, five year operating plan, again, and then the intent is, if we mitigated many of those issues and concerns, we'll present it to the Board in March. The next item on here is request for more information about the plan. The public comment process we're using is the one we're continuing, and we will use it, and it is the update process we've showed you before.

So we kind of clarified that. Last has to do with comments on the strategic plan that came in, again, about quite a few changes that were asked of. And as I've said, we're not going to do them at this time. Next slide please.

What are the steps to get us to completing this first initial five year operating plan? We're going to, as it said, consult here. Continue to take feedback. We're going to update the draft, and we will submit it. And that is the current process we're using to close out this effort.

If you see on the link here, it says public comment report. If you were to go there, it is available, or I know that you, the ALAC turned in comments. Looking at mine, there were about 15 that were turned into different lines in this process. Next slide please.

This is the timeline we have been following. We are on track for completing this in March, as anticipated. It will depend on where the Board meeting is, when we present that document. So, depending on when the Board meeting is, we'll finish it in March, and it make take



until April to actually present it to the Board. It depends on the timing of that session. Next slide please.

This is the process we will do annually, so it says we will take the approved operating plan. We will monitor and report against the performance or the indicators that are shown on the plan. We will provide an explanation and variances, and we will review and update the plan. And then we will consult and submit the plan to the Board. Consult with the community and the stakeholders, and then present to the Board.

And that is timing, and it is anticipated that it will proceed the annual operating plan. So it is the phase just before that in the turning of the calendar year, or a fiscal year calendar, I should say it that way. Next slide please.

Now I'm going to, unless you have any questions, I'm very willing to take questions on the five year operating plan. I was just kind of giving you an overview of the highlights. I'd be happy to sit and talk to you afterwards if you would like more detail, or if you have any questions now, I'd be happy to take them now.

Great. Thank you everybody. I would say, if you take a minute to look through the analysis, there is a one for one. If there was a comment made, we gave an actual analysis and an explanation to the right. So if it was a question for clarity, we would have put the clarification answer in that analysis. So you can actually go back and look at your feedback directly. Thank you everyone. Xavier.



XAVIER CALVEZ:

I was trained to hide behind the camera, but it's moving, with me. Yeah, it's following. There we go. There we go. Is it turning 360? Doesn't look like it, but I was trying to hide behind it, you know? There we go. I know where to come now.

Hello everyone. Yes, I, it occurred to me that that maybe how it's coming through. Thank you for the invitation to come and meet you, it's always a pleasure. Since I'm struggling with my French, I actually will not speak in French, although there is the opportunity, just because there is a lot of technical data here, and I can't speak French about it anymore.

I wanted to take just a few minutes to give you a quick update on something that's happened, I can't remember it right now, but I think like a week ago, or two. The quarterly stakeholder call. I don't know how many of you have had a chance to attend or aware of it, but this is a call that we have now been doing for two consecutive quarters.

The first one was in November 20th. It covered the period from July through September 2014, which was our first fiscal year quarter. Because our fiscal year starts July 1st of every year, and finishes June 30th of every year. The second quarter was from October 1st to December end, and we had quarterly presentation on it, on January 29th.

I have excerpted from the full presentation, which was about an hour presentation, the financial section, and just a few slides out of that financial section, and I wanted to just take a few minutes to go through them. Next.



This is the agenda for the entire call. Just so that you see what was presented, and I will only provide a quick update on some of the slides that I presented during that call for the financial section. But it started with the overview from Fadi, a policy update by David, a management update across the entire organization presented by Sally, the presenter of that section changes ever quarter, so the previous quarter it's [Akrim] who presented this, [Akrim] [inaudible].

This time it was Sally presenting the management update. And for some reason, nobody else but me wants to do the financial update. So I did it. Next slide.

One of the pieces of information that is provided as part of the financial section is this slide showing the, an overview of our revenues at ICANN. And I'll go [inaudible] on it, but the bottom line is that they mainly come from or through the registries, as well as the registrars. They are driven by the number of domain name registrations here on the left, and also driven then by the number of contracted parties on the right.

The revenue driven by the number of name registrations represents about 75% of our revenue, or three-quarters. And when is any name registrations, it's simply there is, as you know, the registries report to ICANN the number of transactions, or registrations, that they have registered during a given period. They provide that information by registrar, and we compile that information in using it, multiplied by the price of the transactions, which are 25 cents for the registries, or 18 cents for the registrars.

This is how we issue bills to the registries and registrars, and collect revenue from them. So this is about 75% of our revenues. The



remainder, 75%, or the revenue driven by the number of contracted parties that we have based on fixed fees, annual fees for the new registries. There is \$25,000 of fixed fee invoiced to each new registry coming out of the new gTLD program.

And for the registrars there is a number of fixed fees like, I mean your registrar apply to be accredited by ICANN, there is an application fee. And once a registrar is accredited, there is an accreditation fee which is annual, \$4,000 per year, and it's fixed. So our revenue is about 25% driven by those fixed fees, which results from the number of registries or registrars that are accredited by ICANN.

Any questions on revenues? Next. Thank you. I thought it would be useful, at a very high level, it's a bit of a busy slide, but it's only trying to give you a sense of the information that we share on a quarterly basis. This is simply breaking down the four boxes that you saw on the previous slide, and pairing each of those revenue drivers to where we expected them to come in for the, in the budget.

So it's comparing to budget. The budget is basically that red vertical line here, and here, for example, it's saying that the registry transaction revenue that we have build, is a bit higher than we thought it would be as per the budget. And here the registry fixed fees are a bit lower than what we expected them to be for the budget.

Overall, our revenue after six months is slightly higher than what the budget assumed it would be. So we're a bit ahead in terms of revenues. Next. The expenses of ICANN. In a similar fashion, we are showing here the total operating expenses, the capital expenses, the expenses that



led us acquire basically assets like it could be furniture, it could be application development or software. These are the capital assets.

And the entire bar here represents the full year budgets. So for example, we have 101 million of operating expenses budget for FY 15. We are about halfway through the year, the budget a bit less because we have some seasonality in our spend, but the budget assumed that we would have about 46 million of spend by the end of December, after six months of activity. And we have about 45 million of spend.

So very close, slightly under. So our revenue is slightly above budget. Our expenses are slightly under budget, which is perfect place to be for a new organization like us. Capital expenses are a little bit below budget as well. At the bottom here we have the specific initiatives costs, the ones in this case, relative to the USG transition project. You may remember that the budget assumed that we would have, for the entire project, seven million of expenses.

It remains a quite high level guess, it's not a very detailed granular one, simply because, at the time, the budget was developed. It was very difficult to actually know what the activities that would be carried out under the various tracks of the USG transition project, would contain and how much they would cost as a result.

So the seven million was a relatively rough global estimate, and we have, I think we have a correction in the latest version of this, but we have spent approximately two million dollars out of the budget at the end of December that was assumed to be three million dollars, and three million was more or less half of what was expected to be spent for the year.



So we expect, actually, that the community driven activities on the USG transition program and projects, will increase now that all of the ramp up activities have now progressed. We expect to see more spend happening in the second half of the year than actually did happen in the first half of the year.

Next. That's it on the financials. There is more information in the presentation on the new gTLD program, as well as a bit more detail on costs. You can find the link to the entire presentation, as well as the recording of the call with the various presenters that I mentioned earlier, on our website. If you just type quarterly stakeholder, you will find the link directly, and you'll find the entire presentation. There is a question.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, this is Eduardo Diaz for the record. You know, you mentioned that must of your budget, most of our budget comes from the registries and the registrars. Like when they do, buy domain names. Right?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Correct. So that's why I said through registries and registrars rather than from.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So my question is, how, what is the process that goes there, that you know that they are providing you what they're sending? I mean, is there an audit? Or is it automatic?



XAVIER CALVEZ:

So the information that we collect on a monthly basis is self-declared by the registries and registrars. We have some mechanisms to corroborate the validity of the information that they're providing. It is challenging to be sure that it is 100% accurate, because there is no other source of data to look at it. But that same information is reported in several different ways, and therefore we are corroborating that the information that is reported by the registries and registrars for our billing purposes, is consistent, at the minimum, with the other source of reporting of the same information.

So that we have some confidence in that, that's one. And second, you pointed out to the question of audit. You may know, and I know Maguy has updated this group and others on the three year audit, that the compliance department has been conducting, of all of the registries and registrars over the past three years. We are now in year three of this audit process.

And the process of reporting the transaction numbers and the registration numbers on a monthly basis, is in the scope of that audit. So that's how we then verify that the registries have a correct mechanism in process to report the correct information on transactions. Follow up question.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I have another question, but it's not related to this. But since you are the money guy, I just want to know why the gala is not happening in the meetings like from Los Angeles on.



XAVIER CALVEZ: This specific, for this specific meeting?

EDUARDO DIAZ: From, since they stopped doing it.

XAVIER CALVEZ: So Los Angeles was the most recent meeting during which we did not have a gala. The gala has been historically an activity that is the result of sponsoring by the host country, or the host of the country where we hold the meeting. And it's an expense that is, as a result, usually incurred by that hosting, and ICANN, historically, was not incurring the costs of the gala.

There are a few exceptions in the past. And simply for Los Angeles, since there was no host, the ability to gather the funds to be able to compensate for no host, we didn't manage to find sufficient interest by enough parties to be able to gather the funds required to have a gala. So that's the story there for Los Angeles.

And for Singapore, it's more a matter of time between the decision to go to Singapore and the actual meeting to be able to organize it.

And there is a couple of questions. Sorry Evan, your colleague there was before you.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think it's about three slides back, where it would be possible to look at the impact of the new gTLD registrations, which has been an enormous number, but it seemed to be less than I thought it was. How do you,



how are you going to deal with the fact that you will get less of the 185,000 but then, or whatever it is, just to apply, as opposed to then you have ongoing costs from the registries?

It seems to me there is... How are you dealing with the balancing between new and ongoing? Thanks.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Can I have the revenue slide? This one. Thank you. So, I want to clarify one thing as part of your question, and you'll correct me if I have misunderstood. You mentioned the 185,000. This is the application fee for new gTLD applicants that was collected three years ago, in 2012, during the opening window. So this is not anywhere here.

However, I think, if I understand correctly your question, I think it's completely relevant to look at this. So, you can see here, this bar is about registry transaction fees. It includes the transaction reported by registries, whether they are old or legacy, or new. In the budget, there was, there is for the entire fiscal year, 15 million of transactions that was assumed to be happening from new TLDs.

This is in regards of a bit more than 150 million of transactions from the legacy registries. So you are correct that there are less new TLD transactions happening than what we have originally planned in the budget, but at the same time, there is also a bit more transactions from the legacy registries happening, which overcompensates the new registries under, lower amount versus what we were planning.

So it's just a matter of at the global level, the net of the two is still a bit favorable. It addresses your...? Okay, thank you. And you mentioned



something which is completely valid and interesting to know. The costs of renting of the organization to be able to handle so many new contracted parties, are effectively being incurred by the organization. You're right about that.

And there could be on a period by period basis some timing differences between the rhythm at which we incur those costs to ramp up our capabilities to support those contracted parties, versus the rhythm at which the revenue come in. So, there is sometimes timing differences between the two, you're correct. Thank you.

Any other questions? Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. One question and one comment. The comment is about optics. The gala has traditionally been outside the expense permit, from the point of view of ICANN. It has been a sponsorship thing. I have already been hearing from constituents in my ALS and elsewhere that are saying, combined with the talk that Fadi made at the LA meeting, it seemed to indicate a new sort of austerity culture within ICANN.

It's almost as if to say, okay, we're doing the gTLD delegations, they got what they wanted, and nobody is sponsoring anything anymore because there is nothing they have to sell. And so I just want to address the optics. And this is even before now seeing that we're going to two meetings without gala, and I'm just saying the optics of this are very poor. And yet they suggest that, okay, ICANN has done the job of selling the new gTLD program, that job of selling it is over, and now it's an execution issue.



And so now there is no longer need to sponsor as many things because nobody has to promote anything here anymore, the way they used to it. I'm simply suggesting that this is an optics issue that might be considered.

My questions, and I don't know if you're getting to it in a future slide, is one that has cropped up a lot, and that has to do with auction revenue. Both the amounts and the proposed how to disperse it. And I'm wondering if you could spend a little bit of time on that, because it's a bit of a hot potato.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Okay. The first subject, so I can see the way you were qualifying it, that the optics may be wrong. And what this says to me is that we need to correct the wrong basis of the erroneous presumptions that are under those optics that are under those you just described, right? Because ICANN has not try to sell the program to anyone, right? It's the community driven program.

So the ICANN's management who says lets sell our program to anyone, and make money out of it. This is obviously completely wrong, but I know you already know that. The, as we said just before, the gala has always been sponsored by a host. Those hosts have never been new applicants for gTLDs. They have been, usually, the ccs or the countries, the governments, that have organized the gala to promote the entry of their country.

So it's not applicants, right? And you made another, in part of the optics, there was another...



EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well also about this. When I think of a gala, I think something that's like a thank you to the volunteers in the community that manage to come here. So I don't see this as something as a part from the ICANN meeting as this is sponsors. While the finance component of it you see as very differently, in terms of what it is as part of the meeting, it seems like a recognition and a chance to, okay, at least for one night of this very solid meeting filled week, to be able to okay, here's a little bit of a thank you. And...

XAVIER CALVEZ: Recognize this, this is not ICANN that organizes the gala. Right? And it's not ICANN trying to thank the volunteers through a gala, because it's not ICANN organizing the gala.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: On the other hand, coming back to Singapore so many times, maybe the first time the country wants to throw a gala and thank you, the second time, okay, we're less interested, and the third time, okay we've thanked you enough.

XAVIER CALVEZ: You can discuss that with the tourism board of Singapore to see if they want to thank more or less ICANN to come. As it relates to this specific meeting, the only thing that I know is that whether or not the tourism board of Singapore would have wanted to organize a gala, it was challenging in the timeframe.



Auction proceeds. So to provide some facts. I didn't put those slides into the presentation, but there are slides in the quarterly presentation that speak about it. As you may remember, there has been six or seven rounds of auctions to happen over the past eight months. And cumulatively as of the end of January, from memory, 33.4 million net proceeds have been collected.

When I say net, it's simply that there have been some auction costs by the auction providers that we pay, and there are netted against those proceeds. Therefore, 34 million dollars of proceeds have been collected. Side note, it was not part of your question but, those proceeds are segregated in a separate bank account, where we have obtained approval from the BSC to recommend to the Board to create an investment management account simply for those proceeds, and that they'll also be segregated, just so that the money produces interest while it is being held.

So the Board has been, started to discuss, and with of course, your input and many other community member's input on, this is more or less about time, if not late, to start discussing how we are going to handle the proceeds, and the disbursement of those proceeds. What are we going to do with those proceeds? So this is the community organized organization that our chairman, Steve Crocker, has repeatedly indicated would be organized, if there would be proceeds we now know that there are proceeds, so I think this process is going to start. Yes.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I guess as a follow on question, so from what I gather from what you're saying, there is a budget, and attached income, and so forth. Quite



separately, there are proceeds, so the assumptions are we will live within this sum, this then will set aside while we decide ways in which to deal with it that will benefit the community, and so what we're looking at with your slides, doesn't represent...

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Actually, there is no per auction proceeds here. This is the, what I would call, the operating ongoing revenue of ICANN. There is no auction proceeds here. There is no application fees from the new gTLD program.

HOLLY RAICHE:

In terms of optics, that's very interesting, because what it says is, ICANN does not depend on, does not need the money that it has gathered. It will do something it, but I think that's quite [inaudible] the ordinary budget slides. A way of saying, by the way, this is how we continue to exist regardless of X amount in this pool.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I agree. And this is simply one of many thousands of slides that have been produced over the past few years, that remains consistent with the design of the new gTLD program, as well as the auction proceeds when they were mentioned in the applicant guidebook, which is that this is segregated money. This is not, you know, this is the program's generated funds, and it's specific to the program, and it's not, from a legal standpoint, it is within the same organization because there is only one legal entity, but from a principle standpoint, it is completely segregated.



There are different bank accounts, different accounting books for both the operations and the new gTLD program, there is a Chinese wall, basically, to be simple and clear. Okay? Any more questions on that section?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: How many more slides do we have? Because we did start a little late, and we actually only have about three minutes left.

XAVIER CALVEZ: What I would suggest to leave it at, there is a bit more, but what I was going to suggest to leave it at is any questions, or concerns, that you would want to raise as a result of the AC and SO additional budget request process. I know you guys have been working on it, including in this meeting, so if there would be any subjects that you would like to address and use our help to do, then let's do that and leave it at that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Once again, we probably got three minutes, but it would be really useful, we have our own sort of set of, these are the things that there is an operating principles. It would be useful if there are guidelines that ICANN has when assessing the kind of special request, as a part from CROPP, what, in your mind, will make a good and willing application, willing. A good and successful application as opposed to one that you would be inclined not to fund?



XAVIER CALVEZ:

So as part of the documents that support the process, which we sent on the 19th of December, there is an application form, there are criteria for the requests. In using those criteria should let you be able to understand is the subjecting scope of the strategy plan. Is it clear? Is the outcome well formatted. So all of those criteria, if every one of them is met 100%, would lead to a very well formulated request, and therefore increase the chances of approval.

So that's the guidance I would suggest to go by. I'm very happy to re-circulate with the help of the staff, that document, so that every one of you can have it. It's not meant to be private. It was sent to the chairs and co-chairs of the SO and AC, as well as all of the other members of the community who have shown interest in the past, in the budget process, that we have email addresses for.

By the way, I'm very happy to collect anyone's email address that we would want to add to our budget distribution list. That would be good. We have tried to add, I think, all of the members of the finance subcommittee in that email address list. And I'm very happy to add, of course, anyone else that is simply open for anyone who has interest. So that document, it's a Word document, couple, three pages I think.

And it should help with that. That's the direct answer to your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Xavier. Alberto Soto had one last question, and maybe then we have to move on. I did have a number of questions for you as well, I



don't know if we can squeeze them. Alberto? He will be speaking in Spanish.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Alberto Soto. 30 seconds. If possible, we would like the information we have received at the RALOs, for example, about the projects we have to submit. If we could get information as soon as possible, because obviously, the requirements have to be analyzed in detail in order to be able to allocate the project. But we have a timeframe which is impossible to comply with, to create a group project that meets all of your requirements. Thank you very much.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

That's the extent of my Spanish, so I will stay there, even though my first name and last name may sound Spanish, they're actually not. So I guess I'm just checking the logistics here, because we have sent the information that I was referring to about a month and a half ago, or two months ago, so we just need to make sure that it gets to everyone.

And [inaudible] maybe, we will re-circulate with the staff that supports this group to make sure that all of the documents that I have sent, again it was the 19th of December, I will forward that email to you Silvia. And if you can make sure it is circulated with everyone.

I apologize, it's in English only. If there are needs for translations, we can do that. It shouldn't be very difficult to do. So I'm happy to do that if it's needed.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Xavier. Just quickly, I had an issue with the graphs of revenue, projected revenue and so on. But you know, I think we'll follow up on that later, because what I did hear was that the new gTLD program was not taken off at the expected speed, so it looks a bit strange that you're actually are exceeding the projected revenues.

XAVIER CALVEZ: We can speak about that...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll speak later. One last thing also, looking at the public comment analysis, and that's directed at Carole, a couple of things. First the pages don't have page numbers, so it's a little difficult to point to them. And then it would probably help to actually have one column which refers to what community made what comment, because here, of course, the ALAC is particularly interested in the answers to its comments, and it was very difficult to find it. And it's a very long document.

It has, I think, 36 pages. Two things that struck in there. One was, why is it a goal to show stable, healthy, year over year growth, in the domain name industry? And the response was a little bit strange. As I said, it's a goal to show stable and healthy year over year growth in the domain name industry because the alternative would be unstable and unhealthy.

Now obviously, if you want to demonstrate itself, it's not going to be unhealthy. So that's an interesting answer. The other one was one which was picked up by another part of ICANN, I don't know who, but it



wasn't picked up by our committee. I'm very concerned about the indication in the FY 17 phasing of SG 1.3.

That SO and AC special request processes are to be discontinued. The finance and budget subcommittee has met just before speaking to you, to finalize its special requests. They're going to disappear.

XAVIER CALVEZ: That's the comment that Carole was making earlier. Not that I want to dodge the question, but if you want me to take more time, we need to take a bit more time?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll follow up. I think a number of us are meeting with you tomorrow, so we might follow up with that, and let's bank this for the future.

XAVIER CALVEZ: But in 10 seconds, this is not a process that's going away, unless we all find that we can find an adequate alternative for it. Let's keep it at that for now, if that's okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Xavier Calvez, Carole Cornell, thank you very much. [Applause]

And as you have noticed, ladies and gentlemen, I'm not Alan Greenberg. However, I've taken on the seat for chairing this session, the end of this session, because Alan was called in another meeting. But taking over for me now will be Julie Hammer, our SSAC liaison, who will be



introducing... Okay. Jim Galvin and anybody else? I think Patrik isn't able to come either.

And with apologies for the delay, but I guess you're quite use to us being a bit late on a Sunday afternoon.

Welcome Jim. Thank you for joining us. Vice-chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. And I hand the floor over to Julie Hammer. Julie, you have the floor.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you very much Olivier. Julie speaking. And as welcoming Jim Galvin, I would also like to welcome the other members of SSAC who are in the audience here, and well as Julie [Helmund], as staff support. So please make them welcome and they will, I'm sure, support Jim in answering any tough questions you might have. So I'll hand straight over to Jim.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. Thank you. And yes, Patrik, unfortunately, sends his apologies. He can't be here, but I suspect he is in the same place that Alan is. So this is how it goes, right?

All right. So the slides have been distributed to you ahead of time. I offer back to you, maybe to Julie, the question whether you want to go through them. Maybe I'll go through the introductory slides, and then pause for a moment to decide whether you want to do the individual presentations, and we'll go from there. Next slide please.



And actually two slides. So just very quickly, as a reminder, SSAC began in 2001 and was operational beginning in 2002. And we have been active since then. Our charter is to advise the ICANN and the ICANN community, and in fact, the community At-Large, on security matters related to our Internet naming and address allocation system.

So, now Patrik and I have both recently, this year, been reelected to three year terms, beginning at the beginning of this year, and our Board liaison will be up for a nomination, again, at the end of this year. And as of this month, we currently have 34 members. And as just a reminder that all members of SSAC are officially appointed by the Board of ICANN.

So next slide. Since Los Angeles, we have published one document, and that's our advisory. This is SSAC's opinion on the IANA stewardship transition. And we do have a set of slides on that activity later on. And prior to that, related to the IANA stewardship transition, we had had two documents, SSAC 67 and 68, both of these were intended to be a factual presentation of, in the first case, a history of the IANA functions, what they are, how they're defined in the contracts, and what is represented there.

And in fact, what they are today. How they've involved. And then of course in 68, we actually took a close look at the contract and described those relationships, and what's actually documented there. And both of these were intended to inform all of the sessions going on in the community.

The SAC 69 is SSAC's view on the security and stability issues that we are encouraging the community to be concerned about, to ask themselves



as they evaluate the changes and process going forward, and suggestions that are going to come from that.

So next slide. A quick look, next slide, quick look at our current work in progress. We have a public service list work party, which is active, and ideally coming to closure fairly soon. So we expect some time in the next quarter here to have that document done and published. We have, SSAC has been participating in the Internet Governance Forum, for five years. And we had a presentation, a panel session that we had organized in the last IGF, and so we're putting together a final advisory, just a summary of the discussion and the activities that happen there in that meeting, and we expect that to be done fairly soon also.

We have a work party, which is really just getting started, related to new gTLDs. We're taking a close look at, you know, all of the recommendations that SSAC has made over the years, that are related to new gTLDs, and some issues related to the program in general, and I believe other groups, and even the ALAC, I think, you have your own work party on that.

So there are various groups within ICANN that are, have a similar kind of work party. And so we're trying to put together a summary of what we think are still open questions, and perhaps new questions that might need to be addressed. We also have a very active work party. Also, I believe, coming to reasonable closure in the not too distant future, right?

I'm looking for [inaudible] to nod yes, so the registrant protection and credential management work party. There is a presentation in the slide deck here about that issue, so we'll have some details there about



what's going on with that work party. And then, of course, we have our membership committee, DNSSEC sessions, and our Board advice tracking.

Let me call about the Board advice tracking work party. This is a new one. It will be an ongoing work party. It was mentioned during the webinar that we had with ALAC a week or so ago, whenever that was. What we're doing in SSAC is, you will recall that the Board put together a Board tracking tool that was available on the website.

And what we had done was, we had decided to take onboard the action of formally tracking our own recommendations over the years. I think, to look and see for our own purposes, that the loop has been closed. That our recommendations were in fact acted on, rather than being completely dependent on the Board to, you know, move forward with that tool.

We just want to make sure... And this is not an attempt for us to have any kind of ongoing activity, let's see, ongoing reaction to the Board. I mean, an action that they could take, of course, is to reject our advice, and ignore us, and that's fine. It's just important that we want to see that the loop is closed and an explicit action was taken, since there have been issues in the recent past, especially related to the new gTLD program, about whether or not all actions have been completed or acted on, that have been made.

So next slide please. This is a quick look at our timeline for these future work parties. As I had said, the public service lists. We, and the advisory in the IGF forum, we are hopeful finished here in this first quarter of 2015. And the registrant protection should finish shortly



after that in the second quarter. And our goal is to finish up with the new gTLD issues in the third quarter.

And, you know, that's as far as we have. Those are the active work parties that will have, or potentially will have, documents at this time. It is important to keep in mind that just because we are working on something, is not a commitment on our part to necessarily publish something. In some cases, we do have an active document, and so the probability is very high, but you know, we always reserve the right at the last minute, to decide that something is not necessary to publish, or inappropriate to our, whatever the circumstances might be.

And that does happen. Next slide. So that brings us to the two presentations that are in the slide deck here. We can talk a little bit about our IANA function stewardship transition, and we also have the registrant protection, potential management work party, and some slides related to its activity. Again, since the slides have been distributed, we can either jump to discussion, or if you would prefer, I can go through the presentations, or we can do one or the other, or both, whichever folks would like.

And let me defer to Julie to ask how you want to do that.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you. Julie Hammer speaking. Can I ask if there is particular interest in discussing SAC 69, which is the IANA stewardship transition? Can I see a show of hands? Yeah.

Certainly Holly, go ahead and ask a question.



HOLLY RAICHE: Public number service, could you explain for this non-technical person?

JIM GALVIN: So the, looking, is Rod in the room? No? Jaap from the work party? We'll let Jaap do it. We like to let other SSAC members speak at these things. Jaap] is one of the members of that work party, and I'll let him speak to what that work party is about.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Is there anything you particularly want to ask? Public service list. Yes, that's one of those things that is not probably defined, but everybody uses it. And that's the reason we are having this working group. The public service list, you'll find in a lot of browsers. It's often based on Mozilla, and so on.

We'll try to say something about what belongs to a certain domain, or a range of domains. As an example, it's now, you have dot CO, dot UK, which is both public. Other ones, you only have dot ML. And so there is a list of these things, what belongs to one authority. And it's used in a lot of browsers to figure out whether or not cookies go off of set domains or not, and have some authorities.

I think Google is using it in a similar way, whether or not the top level domains, if they don't know the domain, they won't allow two people to touch the online working tools, things like that. For instance, CW [inaudible] came into existence. It was unknown in public, [inaudible] so nobody in [inaudible] was able to use Google Tools.



So it's kind of hidden. Other use of the cases that they actually try to confirm problems with IDNs, where characters look alike, and so they say, I mean, we blocked this one but we don't block that one. So there are a lot... The problem with the [inaudible] there are no [inaudible], they're maintained by volunteers, and there is not a proper fuel about that do and what the extent is.

So that's actually the [inaudible] to bring that, something should be happening. [Inaudible] probably that the ITF should actually step up to work on de-bound, which is the domain boundary working group, and we're just trying to come up with a better description of what this public service lists are.

JIM GALVIN:

So yes, the reason for the report is to provide the definition. [Laughter] Now that Jaap has done that, we don't need the report anymore, right? [Laughter]

Okay. So the IANA function stewardship transition. Next slide please. As I had said before, just briefly, so the 69, it complements the other two reports that we've done, the 67 and 68, which were the factual representations of the IANA stewardship function, both the contracts and the actual functions themselves and a description of them.

Okay. So, in this case, what the purpose of SAC 69 is, is it's SSAC's view of the issues and the questions that we believe the community needs to ask itself, in order to ensure that it preserves the security, stability, and resiliency of the IANA functions. Okay, both during the transition, and of course, beyond the transition. And we do make some



recommendations regarding each of the questions and issues that are raised.

But as always, these are intended as input to the community. I mean, it's certainly for the community to evaluate and decide in the full context of everything that's going on, whether or not the recommendations are valid and carry forward. So next slide please.

So obviously, it seems sort of obvious to state this, but we thought it was important to make, you know, clear statements about what it means to maintain stability and resiliency. And so one of the things that's important is, anything that replaces the NTA's final authorization role, okay, should of course be at least as good as the role that NTIA is currently playing.

So that's the first important recommendation. And one of the things that we observed in looking at the overall model for what the IANA stewardship, IANA functions look like, is create a terminology in the form of policy provider, and policy implementer, and the relationships between them. And then observing where we need to identify performance characteristics that are essential at each point in the overall architecture.

We proposed a picture for what the roles exist in the overall system. And it's essential to ensure that those performance values are maintained and managed, publically visible, transparent to the community. We also made a question to NTIA in particular about clarifying the processes and legal framework associated with the root zone maintainer, after the transition.

The root zone maintainer right now obviously is a role, which is held by VeriSign, and they've been doing an exceptionally good job of that over all of the years that that has existed. But it is important, as we move forward and we look at new structures, to consider how that structure will fit into the overall picture. Next slide please.

Another that's important, of course, is that the IANA functions contract, you know, currently held by NTIA, with ICANN, any external controls that might be necessary. You know, what should they look like? What are the requirements and deliverables that are defined in the contract that need to be carried forward into whatever new structure is created?

And then of course, there are some existing mechanisms outside of the contract, you know, will they sufficiently robust to hold accountable the authorities, you know, the roles that exist? Because that's what's important, maintaining the security and stability of the overall system. You just need to make sure that the community has a way to have a transparent view of what's happening, who has done it, and whether or not they're meeting the requirements and the goals in an appropriate way.

Next slide. Another interesting observation that was made is the, because the system currently does have a certain basis in the US, as much as we hate to admit that, it is important to take note of, regardless of where any new structure might exist, there may be issues with government sanctions and restrictions in whatever government the system might exist.

And it's important for whatever proposal is put forward that that question be examined, and considered, and how one would get past



that. So obviously, you know, everybody who... The TLDs need to be able to manage their own TLD, independent of any other sanction that might exist or requirements in any given government.

And then the last couple of recommendations here. The importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence. You know, these are just sort of principles which need to be carried forward and maintained in any new structure. And we just wanted to raise those and call them out so that they are very visible to the community, and they're not overlooked in the evaluation process.

And then, of course, since we made the proposal about policy provider versus policy implementer, you need to ensure that there is a mechanism for evaluating whether those instructions that are handed to a policy implementer, can actually be executed, and are managed, and are clear and implementable. So there is a relationship that has to be defined there, and ensure that that exists.

If you adopt the structure of roles that we had proposed, you need to ensure that the relationship between those roles is managed and maintained. And the next slide. I believe that's it for the IANA document. Any questions on that? You want to pause and do that, or do you want to ask if folks want this presentation?

JULIE HAMMER:

Thanks very much. I think there are some questions now, we'll take a couple of quick questions and then we'll move on to [inaudible] who is co-chair of the work party on registrant protection. She can then present the next one. Okay, so Vanda Scartezini.



VANDA SCARTEZINI: Just quick. Just to recognize that [gills] are very important. I have been used that to explain many calls, that I got from the new gTLD registries in the region, because they are not so well, you know, informed about that. And this raised a lot of questions about, even influence for governments, and these kind of things. So this transition issue is quite important for the people around, and in particular, for someone that are being in the loop of this new registry activities.

So just appreciate that this recommendations are very clear for, and I could translate them easily and pass to you. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you Vanda. And of course, those reports were translated into all five languages, so hopefully that helped as well. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Julie. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And without going into the whole debate of IANA stewardship transition, which I know has taken up the air in most of this meeting and elsewhere before that. Is there an overarching principle that the SSAC took, that there needs to be a new structure created?

You've mentioned a structure, on many occasions, a structure to replace NTIA.



JIM GALVIN: So let me be clear to avoid any confusion. No, SSAC is not recommending any particular structure, or that a new structure needs to be created. So any time that I use that, it was intended to... Our document was intended to reflect the principles, and the guidelines that need to exist, with whatever the community decides needs to happen, as part of this transition. Whether that's a new structure, or a replacement structure, or a tweaking of something that exists...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But you still talk about, yeah, structure, whilst there could be process...

JIM GALVIN: Could be a process, that's true. Whatever the new thing is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we can move on.

JULIE HAMMER: Evan Leibovitch, you have a question?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks Julie. Jim, at previous meetings, you, or rather Patrik, has come and occasionally wanted to get ALAC support for particular SSAC comments that had gone unheeded or ignored, and could have used some ALAC help. Is there anything at all on your plate at this point? Whether it's things that are long ago completed and not looked at, or anything more recent that you would like ALAC to have a look at?



Maybe not things that are absolutely recent, but things that perhaps have some age to them that should have been looked at, that haven't been looked at, that perhaps we can move along. This has happened before, and I'm just wondering if there is anything that isn't in the current list of things that needs attention still.

JIM GALVIN:

So, I'm actually not prepared to speak to historical context. I don't know off the top of my head. I could certainly take as an action item to go back and consider that question, but I do want to observe. I think your question is a nice segue into the next presentation, because I think that asking for ALAC support in, you know, once SSAC is done with its document here for credential management, I think that it is an excellent candidate for more direct involvement from ALAC, for the user community.

It's obviously something which matters to the user community, At-Large. So I know that's only half an answer. I think we can take back as an action to consider whether there is any past work that we would like to raise. I don't have any right now. But if that's okay, and you're nodding, and that's fine, that maybe now is a good time to let Merike who is one of the co-chairs of this work party in SSAC run thorough these slides for you on the registrant protection and credential management work party.

MERIKE KAEO:

Thank you Jim. So my name is Merike Kaeo, and I find it a little bit amusing, it says Ben Butler and me, but [laughter], but me being Merike

Kaeo. So we're both the co-chairs of this particular... It's awesome. Now it just says me on the slide.

Anyway. So next slide please. [Laughter] Yeah, so we had some discussions within SSAC and decided that, you know, there was need for this kind of work, which was specifically to augment the previous work done for best security practices for registries, registrars that have been defined in SAC 040 and 044. And with all of the compromises that have been happening in the last couple of years, we saw that a lot of them dealt with credential compromises. And so we really wanted to see whether or not there were best practice guidelines that we could come up with, for the comprehensive credential life cycle management of domain names.

So the target audience is almost everybody that has anything to do with domain names. So basically, the wider ICANN community, registrars, registries, and registrants, the software developers of applications and tools, because we were thinking about that maybe, you know, we need to create some tools that might make things easier.

DNS service providers, and also web hosting and email service providers, because there are so many credentials that people use, and really looking at the entire domain name life cycle. Next slide please. So, the work will address a number of things. One is the credential life cycle best practices, and these really are how you create, how you distribute, how do you store, how do you renew, transfer, how do you revoke, and how do you recover name credentials.

So it's actually a lot of steps. It's not just create a password and you're done with it. Right? I mean, there are a lot of steps that you have to



think of, of what the entire life cycle. And as we're looking at the credentials, right, what you're looking at, where they used to provide authentication of an entity, either a registrant, or authorized administrator or registrar, or registry. And then also, we're looking at any relevant policy issues that can support or hinder credential management.

Next slide please. So, we have a draft document, and right now, this is basically the outline of it, with some content. So we're trying to detail what is the actual problem and recent attack issues. Also, working through what are all of the credential types that are used throughout the domain name lifecycle, what are the credentials used for, then how do people deal with the credential management life cycle today, and then come up with a practical checklist for best practices and recommendations.

Next slide please. So we have a very aggressive timeline. We are hoping to have the work done, possibly by the end of June. It depends. We're utilizing this particular meeting to get some specific information from registrars and registries, and I think this was also the comment that Jim made in terms of, you know, we're looking for input from basically the wider ICANN community, in terms of current practices with credential life cycle management, and particular where things have been compromised.

And so, people, next slide please. Yeah. So these are the actual questions that we have. And we're going to be presenting this in many different forums. So we would like to know, you know, how do folks currently manage their credentials today? What issues or problems are

being encountered? Best practices state that you should use two factor authentication. What is the problem specifically for smaller registries or registrars?

And also any success and challenges with registrar engagement and password strength. Also, another question is, would you be willing to share specific examples with the SSAC work party, that could be used for information in the document, but will not be cited? And specifically, we're looking for information on how credentials have been compromised.

So this is very, very sensitive. We would be willing to speak one on one and keep it, the information obviously very confidential and anonymous, but we need to know what is happening in reality so that we can also help with the best practices. And then, you know, are there any tools or software development that would help in credential security and management?

And what are the challenges for smaller players? And I believe that's the end of the presentation. Yeah, so I would welcome any questions at this time.

JIM GALVIN:

So from Evan, question?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I don't know if this is in scope, but if you're asking generally about what are the obstacles, having been involved in a number of groups, both from the end user and from say, the small blogger that runs their own



website, and things like that, things like running SSL, things like getting certificates, I don't know how much they're in scope.

But in the general realm of being able to implement security from a small web service provider, and to an end user, there are massive barriers to entry at the user interface level. We're still talking things like, how does an end user do things like GPG, and things like that? And there is real crude tools that are out there. And when I come across people, just the difficulty of getting into this world, of getting a certificate, either you have to go into the rich worlds of the thought, and companies like that, or really, in a sort of, you know, you're at the mercy of service providers that charge an awful lot of money.

The technology should allow easy access, but it's really behind this sort of geek wall that really prevents a lot of casual users that want to concentrate on providing services, on providing information, and there is a real level of technical, there is a real big technical barrier, that's easy to administer and understand for the technical people, but for content related people, for, you know, for those that want to concentrate over what's being delivered over the web as opposed to the technology behind it.

There is massive, massive obstacles. Not in the technology, but I think in the way that it is useable by the people that are supposedly its beneficiaries. Thanks.

MERIKE KAE0:

Thank you for that. And that is also specifically why the work party included the tools and developer of tools because we're very

cognoscente that we have a lot of entities that are not as sophisticated in a small operation. So thank you for that.

JULIE HAMMER: Are there any other questions for Merike? Okay. In that case I'll hand back to... Oh, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Julie. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. We have a working group called the registrant issues working group that deals specifically with issues with registrants, name registrants, etc. Would you think, Holly as one of the co-chairs of the working group, that this could be something that the working group could take up?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think so. And I can see the value of this would be getting it out beyond ALAC, beyond RALOs to everybody else to say, this is here, as a sort of information for all of the people that Evan is talking about. So it's not something so much as we should deal with as we should get out, is the way I see it.

JULIE HAMMER: So, just to... Julie Hammer speaking. Just to summarize Holly. When the report is produced, you would be a really good mechanism for getting the message out there, rather than inputting in the formulation of the report. Yeah. Thanks. Back to you Jim.



JIM GALVIN:

So, just before Merike goes away, I just want to add to this about these questions here. You know, now you know who Merike is if you didn't before. [Laughter] That's right, it's me. Please, do, always in anything that SSAC does, but in particular, on this particular topic, you know, feel free to speak with any SSAC member to offer your input to this.

And if ALAC, in particular, would like to construct something more formal, or even informal, you know, you want to offer some input to this process, and ask these questions and answer them amongst yourselves later, we would welcome that input in any form that you would want to provide it.

And I'm sure that Merike would be very happy to speak with anyone about anything on this list at any time.

MERIKE KAEQ:

Yeah, just a last comment. I mean, I'm here until Friday morning, and I've already, when I've registered, I've met some registrars and was matching this work, and people are very, very... They're offering one on one talks. They probably won't say anything in the community wide basis, but definitely...

Well, especially if you can compromise. It's extremely sensitive. And so all of us in SSAC, while we're here, please, I mean, come talk to us one on one if you have information and that's what we're here for. And we're setting aside time for meetings specifically for that, so thank you.



JIM GALVIN:

Okay, so next slide please. And just as we begin with a somewhat standard set of slides, we'll end here with a couple fo standard slides. Next slide. So just very quickly, we often get a standard set of questions from the community about how we do our work, and I'll just quickly respond by saying that, SSAC will actually engage in answering any particular question any group wants to ask.

So just as a reminder, I believe that most of you here, but for the newcomers, you know, the ALAC can in a semi-formal way, you know, send an email message to Patrik as chair in particular, and ask a specific question if you have something in which you would like SSAC to answer and speak to or respond to. And, you know, please do that. And in any case, we always address any questions from a formal group, but even as an individual, if you have something you'd like to talk about, please do.

Feel free to come by and chat with us at any time. And then the next slide, we always have questions to the community At-Large, and we're always interested in your view on whether or not, you know, our advisories and our recommendations are useful to you. Are they accessible and understandable? Is there a way for us...? Do you have suggestions for us to do a better job of communicating with the community?

Any suggestions for how we might not do things differently? We're always looking for ways to improve what we do. I think all groups want to have an impact in some way, and sometimes that's a little hard to judge, but it's always helpful when you get advice and suggestions from people.



And even if you don't have a formal question that you want to ask, but you have topics that you think we're not looking at that we should, whether as an individual or ALAC as a group, please do come around and suggest them to us. So we're very happy to take on, you know, this advice and suggestions. And I believe that that's it. So if you have another other, next slide, any other questions about any topic at all, and we do have a number of SSAC members in the room here, very happy to chat with you in the four minutes and six seconds that we have remaining.

JULIE HAMMER:

Olivier, did I see your hand up? Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thank you Julie. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And since we had six seconds, I thought I would explain one example of the time when the ALAC did push something forward that the SSAC had said. And that's the name collision, which the reports that the SSAC were, I think, produced two years earlier. The Board didn't take much interest in that, and when in Nairobi, I believe, the SSAC and the ALAC came together, the ALAC pushed the political issue of name collision forward, went to see the GAC, and then the process suddenly became front line news.

But that's one way, I think, in which we can work together, which is really great. You have fantastic information, and of course, all of the knowledge in your advisory committee, the ALAC has the ability to push these at various levels in ICANN.



JULIE HAMMER: Certainly, Heidi, you have some information.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. Just as a follow from the LA meeting with the SSAC, that you might recall that there was a beginner's guide to DNSSEC that was shown by some staff. Just to let you know that is now ready for its second revision. It's on a Wiki page. I'll put that in the AC chat in just a moment. And there will be a review period until the end of the month, for anybody to comment on it.

I've looked at it. It's really an absolutely fantastic guide if you're interested in looking at this for your community. So your comments are very welcome on that. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: And Julie Hammer speaking. Heidi, just to clarify in case there is any confusion. This is a guide that's been put together by the ICANN security staff, not by the SSAC, which is quite a different entity, and I know that it had some doorways being clear, who was putting that together. But it's the ICANN security staff.

I know why Heidi is laughing and we won't go into that. Thank you. So if there are no further questions, I would like to thank Jim and Merike, and all the members of the SSAC who could come here today, and we really appreciate ALAC's interest, as always, in everything that SSAC is doing, and also the assistance that ALAC provides.

So thank you to all of the SSAC members here. Thanks.



JIM GALVIN: Yes, and let me say also just say thank you too. I appreciate the opportunity to come and speak with you. It's always a pleasure to work with the ALAC. It's a good thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jim, and thank you Julie for this exact on time end to this session. Well done. You're very good. Oh, damn, yes you are. Okay. The floor, handing over to Gisella, okay.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Gisella here. Just to say there is coffee outside. There is a coffee break. So if you would like some, 15 minutes. Please reconvene back here in 15 minutes, at half past three, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And in 15 minutes, the topic will be hot topic one, ICANN accountability and transparency. Thank you.

Okay ladies and gentlemen. We're going to start again. Apologies for the delay. We were looking for our venerable chair. This morning, referred to as his holiness by Fadi. I did check how you had to address the Pope. So Pope Benedict, his holiness, or his most highly father or something.

Let's start the recording please.

Well good afternoon everybody. This is the next part of the very long day that we have today, on the hot topic number one, ICANN



accountability and transparency. We actually have two hot topics. First one, ICANN accountability and transparency, and the next one is NTIA, the IANA function stewardship transition, with an update on both topics.

After that, we'll have a discussion with the meeting staff on the ICANN meeting strategy update. And finally, we'll have the signing of the MOU between NARALO and ARIN. So without any further ado, my name is Olivier Crépin-Leblond, I forgot to say that at the beginning. But I'll hand the floor over to Leon Sanchez, who is one of the co-chairs of the cross community working group ICANN accountability. Leon, the floor is yours.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Olivier. This is Leon Sanchez. So we've had very fruitful meetings in accountability working group so far. We had a face to face meeting in Frankfurt in January, and there we finished having the scoping of works from one works and two. And we began also dividing further areas for work.

And we structured the working party, one the working party two, in which working party one is looking at issues to empower over mechanisms that may empower the community, with regards to accountability of course, like maybe recalling Board members, having forced the Board to act on something they haven't acted.

And well then issues that have been posted, and have them brought to the table by the group. And the work party two will be looking into review and redress mechanisms. And we have had a wide discussion as



to how to define review and redress, basically we have discussed, we haven't got into a final definition yet, and the subjects as in many other subjects that we're discussing in the working group, but I feel we have been successful in achieving at least, a level of consensus with regards to meta definitions.

We also began working along with the CWG with regards to legal advice. We formed a sub team on legal advice within the cross community working group, and the work of this sub-team will be to create focused questions that need to be answered by independent legal advice.

And we're not waiting to have that independent legal advice engaged, we are having parallel tracks with regards to legal advice. What we're doing is to turn back to ICANN legal and have them help us answer some of the scoping questions, which are not intended to be the legal advice the cross community working group is looking for, but it might as well help and feed the discussion and the work of the working sub team, the legal working self team.

So today we held a meeting with the Board. We updated them on our timeline. Our timeline is set to deliver at least a proposal from works from one other meeting in Buenos Aries. So for this, we will continue to have the working sessions here in Singapore. We will have two working sessions as well as an engagement session.

And we will also have meeting, a face to face meeting which is tentatively programmed to take place at the end of March. And then we will probably have another face to face meeting in the middle of May, mid-May, and hopefully we will be able to deliver our proposal from work stream one to the Board in our meeting in Buenos Aries.



And... So, as I was saying just a moment ago, we're not waiting to engage with independent legal advice, we are giving... We were taking step forward with regards to legal advice. Legal advice is, I believe, fundamental for the work that's being going on in the cross community working group with regards to accountability. There are many issues that need to be considered, and of course to be taken at a very specific and knowledgeable basis with regards to, for example, California non-profit law, etc.

So we're hoping to engage that legal external advice soon, and try to synchronize our work with the CWG legal client. So I don't, I would, of course, like to open the floor for questions, if you have any, with regards to what we've been doing in the cross community working group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Leon. The floor is open for questions. I don't know, Alan do you wish to take the chair back, or do you wish to take a quick break?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm quite delighted to have you keep it for the moment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I need double my salary. Holly Raiche please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Consider it done.



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

HOLLY RAICHE: You've talked about the process. I mean, I think we all know the main issues. I think, are you looking at accountability for both the external and internal? Or are you looking at accountability just for internal? I mean, I think there are four options on the table. Are you looking at all four? And... I'll let you have the floor.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Holly. For the ones that are not here with us in the room, I assume that when you refer to the options, you referred to the RFP options that are being, exactly, the CWG options that are being discussed so far. Exactly, very busy.

Yes, we are chartered to consider all of the possible scenarios. We haven't, of course, get to that specific point as to where we will be looking at specific proposals. So far, we are trying to keep our work as widely open as to encompass all possible scenarios for the transition. So the answer is we would be considering all possible proposals, because we need to address not only internal, but also, maybe external accountability to ICANN.

And of course, we need to remember that work is being focused in two work streams. Work stream one, which are those measures that need to put in place, or strongly committed before the IANA transition. And work stream two, which has to do with those measures that can be



implemented further from the deadline that we have set for the IANA transition.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Follow up from Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Follow on question. At one point when we were talking about accountability, we were actually talking about accountability of ICANN, not just in case the sky falls in and everything is awful. But improving the accountability, you know, before ground zero.

So I used to think that accountability was increased, I don't know, reporting accountability and stuff. And as an additional issue, what happens if things go completely skew? Are we still actually looking at both kinds of accountability? Or are we just focusing on what if things got really bad?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Holly. This is Leon Sanchez again. We're focusing on both scenarios. We're looking into existing accountability mechanisms, and we're also looking at those mechanisms that might be needed to put in place that are missing on current accountability mechanisms.

So yes, we are looking at both streams, further to dividing our charter into working stream one, working stream two. We also divided the work on four working areas, and then we took a further step, dividing the fourth area into two working parties.



So as you can see, we've been going deeper and deeper as to different subjects that have to do with accountability. So yes, we are looking into both scenarios, the one that you said for existing measures for accountability that are already in our bylaws, etc. And those that need to be maybe created specifically for such situation in which we are going over.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Leon. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Any other questions? Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. This is Seun. I'm looking at the time line for best case of 29, generally. And I'm looking at the time by which the draft proposal that the US one will be released, compared with the time by which the draft proposal of the CWG will be released. And it looks like it's the same period.

Considering that some of the variance of this individual proposal [inaudible] have some [inaudible] in the outcome of WS one, is there any intention of actually trying to walk, to release the WS one proposal [inaudible], in order for it to inform some of the effort of the CWG?

Because at the moment, [inaudible] of them have actually going to be released end of March, according to the timeline I'm looking at. Thank you.



LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Seun. This is Leon Sanchez again. Yes, one of, well the main objective of having this face to face meeting at the end of March would be having document for public comment as you can see in the timeline. So, then we would adjust that document at our face to face meeting in middle of May.

So we can submit this for the chartering organizations, [inaudible] that have charter our working group. And of course, after dual approval, it will be submitted to the Board. So that's how the timeline is at the moment, and we are aware that there have been many comments and maybe assumptions on whether the timeline might be extended. We're not looking into extensions.

We are, what our mindset to accomplish our goals as things stand. And well, if we get to the point in which we need to extend the deadline, that will be considered in its moment. But it's not an option now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Leon. Suen, you have a follow up?

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Sorry, I have a follow up. I think I need to clarify. What I'm asking is whether, based on what you have right now, it looks like the CWG variance of some proposals, the Internet ones, would not actually have enough information to be able to inform the proposal. Because it looks like you guys will be working in parallel.

So what I'm asking is, is that going to, are you going to... Is that intention to fast track this release of the WS one earlier than the time



by which the CWG will have their own first draft proposal? Because the outcome of the WS one will really, really help the CWG in what they're doing. That was the question.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Okay. I think I understand your question. Well, there is no intention to release earlier the works from one document. We have our timeline. We are aware that a lot of the work that's been done in the CWG is tightly linked to what we are doing, the CCWG and that's why we are have coordination calls with the chairs of the CWG as well.

And we've also tried to synchronize our work with regards to legal advice with the CWG legal client, and actually we are holding a meeting for the sub team tonight, only lawyers so that might be poisonous. [Laughter]

So, yes. We're trying to work as close as we can to the CWG, but I don't think it might be possible to release our work stream one document before the time that we have set here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Leon. Olivier speaking. I don't see any hands up at the moment. I have two questions for you, perhaps afterwards, Alan also. The first one, did you say that the legal advice firm that will be selected, or has been selected, I don't even know whether it has or not. Did you say that it is the same firm that will advice both the accountability group and the IANA stewardship transition group?



LEON SANCHEZ: It would most likely... This is Leon Sanchez. It will most likely be the same firm, since we wouldn't want to lose time on engaging with different firms that might come with the same advice and at different time. Yes, what we're trying to do is to synchronize our timelines with the [inaudible] legal client, so we can send the focus questions that we've been working on to the same firm.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Leon. Olivier speaking. And the second question is to do with today, around I think, late morning, several of our members of the working group had to leave to go to the meeting. Was there any update on that? Since many of us couldn't make it there.

Okay. Several members of the cross community working group on accountability left the room this morning, did they go for a great lunch? Or did they have... What work did they have to do? What is the progress report on, as of today, since it changes all of the time?

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm sorry. We went on a tour, yes. [Laughter] But there wasn't enough room for everyone, so we had the tour. As I've said previously, we had a meeting with the Board. We had a meeting with the Board, and the agenda was to update the Board as to what we were doing, what are the steps that we're taking forward in the cross community working group.

We also had an update on the timeline. We also heard some feedback from the Board, very interesting remarks by Bruce Tonkin, which is the Board liaison for the cross community working group and the Board.



And we also address some next steps and a general vision of what we are into.

We also asked the Board to give us guidance as to which would be maybe the no ghost with regards to the outcomes of the cross community working group. That was in the agenda, but we didn't get there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Leon. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One question and one comment. In that Board session today, and I admit, I'm not up on my email, but there was a list of the generic types of accountability that the group is looking at. And several of them said, under certain conditions, excuse me, the community will request Board reconsideration.

The reconsideration word was a lower case R. I assume it is reconsideration as in the English definition of the term, and not the current, the bylaws define reconsideration which is only whether policy has been followed. Am I correct in that?

LEON SANCHEZ: You are correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: In future versions, you may want to make that clearer, because reconsideration has a bad rep right now in ICANN. The comment is on



Seun's question of keeping, of the coordination between the two. And I'm not speaking as the chair, I'm speaking as a member of the accountability CCWG, and obviously, involved person on the CWG, and my perspective is, without...

Perhaps missing one or two of the details, based on the various proposals, what the accountability CCWG is looking at is almost a worst case scenario. That is, what do we need in accountability if the proposal comes out of the CWG that needs the most accountability?

So, what the accountability CCWG is looking at, will provide surplus accountability for some of the proposals. And sufficient accountability for all of them. So the coordination is not really an issue, the only issue is whether the people in the CWG have faith that the CCWG will deliver. That's the hard part.

And delivering that report is not sufficient to that, acceptance of the Board is the requirement on that side. So.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Alan. And finally, to close off, we have a contribution from Sébastien Bachollet, who is one of our members in the IANA cross community working group on accountability.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Hello. We have some interpreters, so I'm going to speak in French. My name is Sébastien Bachollet, I represent EURALO in the cross community working group. And I would like to know what you would



want our message to be. We are your representatives, that's the way it works.

When can we talk about it? When we can talk about the topic, not only the process, and the schedule? What do you want as At-Large? What should we bring to that group? It's very important, we all have an opinion. My opinion is very different from other people. I know so, during the meeting.

In Germany I was the only one to have this opinion, and I didn't agree with the proposal that was made in Germany. Should I always oppose to that group? I don't think we're going in the right direction. Do you agree with what is proposed to us? And should I shut up?

Should I agree with you? It's very important. I think the topic that we did discuss during the conference call, EURALO conference call, I felt that people agreed with the way I see things. And I would like to know, when we can talk about it. You represent the users, At-Large, we have to talk about it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Over to Alan Greenberg. Yuliya as well. Okay, Alan first...

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. Did you say we do or do not?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't believe we have one.



ALAN GREENBERG:

Correct. We do not. The decision was made at the last ICANN meeting in Los Angeles, that anybody who has an interest in accountability, we were expecting to sign up for the CCWG. And there are a significant number of people. That doesn't mean they are active contributors, but there are availing themselves of the information, and that we would convene an ad-hoc group that would meet regularly, consisting of those ALAC At-Large people on the CCWG, to try to present opinions, and try to make sure that the formal members...

Everyone has speaking rights, so it's not restricted to the members, but nevertheless, we want to make sure that at least the members were somewhat in line with each other, or if there were multiple positions that we decide ahead of time there are multiple positions. Due to that simple rush of meetings, we have not convened that group.

That group will be convened very quickly after the Singapore meeting, and will be meeting regularly. So that, to a large extent, is my fault that it wasn't convened. We did decide how to do it, we just never actually got around to actually scheduling a meeting. So that will be rectified.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. So that was an action item that obviously needs to be affected, and the group created, etc. It would obviously help to coordination between our different members, actual members of the group itself.



ALAN GREENBERG: Could I ask staff, this time, to make sure it is an action item? Because it sort of dropped between the cracks, and didn't... Our normal tickers of reminders of things weren't being done, it didn't pop up there so, I do request that, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's Alan...

ALAN GREENBERG: It's an action item with my name on it, to be done within a week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Olivier speaking. We have... We're running out of time, but we have Yuliya, Tijani, and Evan in the queue. We can cut that, and move, I think, the two topics over closely related, IANA stewardship transition, moves pretty much in there. We've spoken so much about it, everyone is a bit sick of any updates. But we can probably just discuss our strategy on this. Yuliya Morenets, you'next.

YULIYA MORENETS: Thank you Olivier. Yuliya Morenets, EURALO Secretariat. I would like just to comment on what was said. I will switch to French, sorry.

So, I would like to answer Sébastien, that's why I speak French. In order to be constructive, and to talk to our RALOs at the European level, I think we should have a summary of the different scenario, and your point of view, Sébastien, is different from others, and I would like to know more about it.



I think it would be very constructive to know more about those different scenarios.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Yuliya. We can do, I'm not sure if we can assign it, but maybe that will be the first call of that working group, of that ad-hoc working group, which can start up as a point of view from the different members, and see if we have significant differences on this. Next in the queue is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Tijani speaking. I think, Olivier, and Yuliya, maybe you wanted to say something else. I think the EURALO position should be well known. We have to meet, we have to coordinate our positions, but what you're asking is that the EURALO position is well known.

Thank you Tijani. I'm going to keep speaking French. So let's make a note, RALOs should be part of this first conference call, so that the positions are well known, and RALOs could discuss it in their own areas.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: You don't want to hear my French. That's it. Sorry. I actually want to follow up on this because at the RALO level, at the ALS level, there is absolutely an overwhelming glut of information. I'm one of the people that Alan referred to earlier as one of the people that subscribed to the mailing lists, wanted to just sort of lurk and listen to what's going on, and I soon found both my mailbox and my brain exploding as a result of what was going on.



Between the working groups, between the discussions, between the papers and the ideas, many of them are total conflicting with each other. There is an absolute impossibility for most people to be able to keep up with what's going on. As you know, I've been here for a few years, and I have a hard time, a very hard time, keeping up with not only what everybody is suggesting, but also from the people within At-Large who are there.

Is there a possibility to follow up on the conversation that's been happening so far here about what the RALOs need and what the ALSs need? Is there a chance to have just, even a blog, or something like that, whether it's a blog... A webinar is actually too much, but just something that says, from the people that are there, who are there, totally committed the way you need to be, to follow this.

Can we hear from the people that are there? Just as an ongoing conversation of what is being, what is being advanced? What is worth our consideration? What is total garbage? And how do ALSs and RALOs help to understand, just to try and make some sense of it? You're there, you're participating in the middle of it.

I'm there and I'm just listening, and I'm finding it absolutely overwhelming, being able to bring this one level further makes it, for people that don't even understand the jargon, is impossible. Absolutely impossible. Is there anything we can do to make this accessible one tiny bit more than it is?



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Olivier speaking. I know that Adam Peek, ICANN staff, has produced a summary of what has been going on. If you have deleted the 1,400 emails in...

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Olivier, this is Evan. I want to interject because what I'm looking for is not something that is generally, that a generic document for everyone. I want something from our ALS, from our At-Large people with our point of view. From the end user's point of view. What is your interpretation of what's going on?

Simply an objective, this is what somebody said, and then this is what somebody said, that is still overwhelming. I'm looking for a little bit of sense of, from our point of view, what looks like sensible from the At-Large view point. That's what I'm asking for. Not just a totally objective listing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan. Alan Greenberg with response. And then we've got Wolf Ludwig and then we have to move on to the next topic. Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. As I said, we should have convened a group earlier, we didn't. My apologies. I can't fix that. I believe we may want to discuss at our closing meeting, or at sometime where we have a moment, to open up the group we just said should only be subscribers to wider, for those who want to be informed, but not subscribers.



At the time we made that decision, we didn't know what volume of email there would be. And yes, it is overwhelming. We can show you how to do filters so it disappears, of course. But, yes, I think that's necessary, and if you look at what we've done on the CWG ad-hoc group, on the transition ad-hoc group, we have taken the time at the meetings to go over summaries of what has happened, what are the general questions on the table today, and then solicited input and feelings.

And that is what we will have to do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Wolf Ludwig is next.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks Olivier. Wolf Ludwig for the record. I was listening to this conversation, this discussion with interest, and I could underline what Yuliya said before, or what Tijani reinterpreted. Regarding the involvement of our members on, let's say, the EURALO level, it's a good idea, but it's also a sort of official thinking. I was subscribed to the CCWG accountability mailing list since December.

And following up, the daily number of mails, since it's work, since it's taking me at least one, two hours a day, I, at the moment, can afford, but I cannot expect, from any of our members, please always keep in mind, we are dealing with volunteers communities.

I cannot expect from any of our members, even those who are strongly interested in the issue, to invest the time to follow up. So, the only



thing what I can recommend at the moment, let's have a close look on the outcomes of the three working groups, of the final papers. The first results of the CCWG accountability group and the others will be presented here in meetings to the broader community in Singapore.

So according to the work planning, after that there should be a kind of a consolidation of the inputs from the working groups. And I think as soon as results, as outcomes have matured, a little bit more, and more details will be known, then I think maybe the better moment to think about how we can share the results with our members.

There is a discussion already, a sort of discussion, we started this discussion at our last monthly call, reflecting what is in the discussion at the moment, and as a first idea, we said, looking at the options, that some people would like to have an external solution, and some people would like to have an internal, ICANN internal solution, said what I know, or what I can guess, a majority of EURALO members, would prefer an internal, ICANN internal solution.

So these are the models in the course of this discussion, we should reflect about. And of course, we should try our best to keep our members informed. But no overdose of information, not to overdo it, and bring them into situations that nobody can really digest what you offer them. This will be the next piece of art we have to deliver. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Wolf. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I think if the accountability ad-hoc working group followed the same sort of path



as the IANA stewardship transition ad-hoc working group, At-Large ad-hoc working group, then we would probably be able to reduce the amount of email through the mailboxes.

I know that the IANA stewardship group has regular calls every week, where there is always an update. So if you haven't been able to read the hundreds of emails in the mailbox, so still are able to keep up to date with what is going on, and I've heard that's been very helpful. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Tijani speaking. I'll speak in French. Wolf, I think we're speaking of two different matters here. What Yuliya had asked was not to share information, which is what you're saying, but that we agree. The group that I belong to, that's the accountability committee, is trying to provide its own viewpoint, and so the better we represent our community, the better, the clearer this idea of a bottom up work will be.

So what Yuliya was trying to say, and that's the view that I share, is that we should organize our work. I think the IANA issues ad-hoc working group, should coordinate with both. We should work on both matters, because they are very closely related. And so if we're going to have more meetings, I think we're going to have a harder time finding the time to follow.

So IANA issues ad-hoc working group should discuss accountability and transition. We're saying why. I mean, we will not get a feel of At-



Large's members viewpoints so that once we're meeting within the group, we can all convey our different opinions.

The idea is not to convey information only.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. Olivier speaking. So we have here a proposal to have the two groups merged, or under the same banner. Yuliya Morenets.

YULIYA MORENETS: Thank you so much. A positive discussion. I wanted to just go on the idea that I presented, that I completely agree with Wolf because we do have a lot of information and the ALSs, they don't have the time. And even us, we receive hundreds of mails, we have to go through, etc.

The idea, you understood correctly actually, is to have a brief kind of summary on the proposed scenarios, and particularly, on the point of view of Sébastien, which is different as I understood, and I follow the last monthly call. In order, like a few lines, in order because I'm not even sure that all ALSs are, you know, knowing about your point of view.

And to have this point of view, and if possible, of course, to get their opinion on this. But of course, without having these hundred emails, etc. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Yuliya. Next we have Fatima Cambroner.



FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks Olivier. This time I will speak in Spanish. Fatima for the record.

I fully agree with what Wolf has been saying. It's impossible to follow up on all of the emails, and those of us who are members of the At-Large, and also of the CWG group, we know it's impossible to keep up with all of the emails, and all of the discussions.

If I understood correctly what Tijani is saying, is that the At-Large, the ad hoc, At-Large group should deal with both issues, accountability and transition. I think that it would be crazy to do this. I'm sorry Tijani. I think we... If we are not able to follow up just on the IANA transition, let alone adding the accountability issue on top of it, I think if we create a group, it should be one group dealing only with accountability because at this point of time, we cannot keep up with everything which is happening.

I of course, I'm for that group to be created. It's not late to create it, but they should be two separate groups. I'm not able to follow up on all of the discussions of the IANA transition group, and I don't think I would be to follow up on this other group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...counter proposal of keeping those two apart. Cheryl Langdon-Orr next, and Cheryl with a hand held mic.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the transcript record. With the greatest respect, I'm going to disagree with you to some extent. And that's playing from the point of view of those of us who are



already committed to keeping up with both pieces of work. And to double just the meeting requirement times, is going to be nothing short of extraordinary.

I don't know where staff will be able to squeeze in the required number of meetings for us to deal with both. I believe, however, we are probably at a point in our transition work, where we may be able to reduce, to some extent, that the, not the regularity, but the total amount of time taken, in some of the work we're doing.

And so I think a proposal such as Tijani has put forward, where the same super group work, but work less on stewardship and more on accountability, would, in my opinion, be manageable. It certainly would be more manageable for those of us who are already committed and drowning, if not waving, in the sea of information that you've all described as difficult.

That would give punctuation points for the regional leadership and the At-Large structure members, to dive in, to look at the outcomes of these conversations, to listen to the transcripts, and to sort of select in their own bite sized pieces what they may need to. So I understand why keeping things to a minimum would be nice, but I actually think you're probably going to kill a few of us in the process of duplication. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Cherl. For a response, Fatima Cambronero.



FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks Olivier. Fatima for the record. Yes, following that way of thinking, I agree, and I know there are no more people to be part of new groups in the RALO. So at LACRALO we are participating in two groups, there are two or three people participating in these groups, and there are no more people available to participate in new groups.

So it's like we have to strike a balance between getting people involved, and continuing discussions based on what you have said. I think there should be a subgroup, there could be a subgroup within the group, which we already have in place.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And just a question for those people who are on the ad-hoc, IANA issues working group. What's the volume of mail like? Is it too much already? I'm speaking of our own ad-hoc IANA issues working group, not the big list.

And I can see something in there then, because clearly some of our members that are able to just about cling on to the big discussions that are taking place out there, perhaps providing updates both during the calls, but sometimes select messages, or select status updates that can be sent to the list, will help everyone else tag along without having the huge volume, and with having a good signal to noise ratio.

Evan Leibovitch first and then Tijani Ben Jemaa.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. My intervention is very quick. And I was just going to suggest that this doesn't have to be a high energy thing. Simply using



something like Up Log or Tweet or something that gives occasional updates without having to go into a long, long, multi-page discussion every time something comes up.

The tools exist to be able to do this on a brief ad-hoc concise basis. Those tools exist, we might as well use them. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Evan. Are you volunteering to write it?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: 140 characters at a time? Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't know if anyone has the time to even write this. I'm getting really confused now. So we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, then we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, that looks very different, then Sandra and then Cheryl. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Okay. Tijani speaking. My suggestion, Olivier, is that to make people interested in the transition, attend the part which is transition. And people interested in accountability, attend the part of the accountability. I propose to split this meeting in two parties.

So, first party would be transition, second party would be accountability.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's progress. Thank you Tijani. Sandra Hoferichter is next.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Olivier. Sandra speaking. I would just like to echo what Evan said, and maybe give some more proposals on how it could be more understandable and transparent for those who are not following closely, but are still interested. And Olivier, I mentioned it already, during the EURALO call, we made, we were asked to fulfill a survey in November last year on three modules, so actually those who are participating in the working group have a sort of a guidance on which position they should take in this working group.

And I was fulfilling that survey, it took a while because if you did it carefully, you had to think about it. And it would have been actually interesting to have a short breakdown of that survey. I know you forwarded me the links, but still it's very difficult to have the survey here, and have the questions there, and then you realize, oh the survey was fulfilled by members of the working group, and by no members of the working group.

And it would have good to have a breakdown to see, okay, members of the working group have this position, others might have another position. So was there confusion? Is there a clarification needed? So this would have been nice. Maybe in the future we can think about things like this.

And then, now that I have the mic, I want to make [laughter]... Okay. I stop here.



I just want to give you short feedback from IANA transition outreach meeting which recently took place, recently in December, in Berlin. I was attending, Jimmy was there as well. And I actually asked technical community, which were giving a presentation, which are also heavily involved to the IANA transition, what they think about the role of the ALAC and the end user, and all that construct.

Well, they didn't address it purely to the ALAC, but I said in some of the SOs and ACs, there is a lot of political discussion about this transition going on. And of course, we all know, it has very grades and [inaudible] value, this transition thing. But when it comes to the function, it is a very easy thing, and it should remain very easy.

And they somehow the feeling that the thing is over politicized, I don't know if this is the right word, politicized from some. And this is actually, in their point of view, critical because this can extend the process, and this might be a reason that at the end, we might miss the deadline in September.

And although that Fadi in the morning said he's not pushing for that deadline, and we might ask for an extension, I think there are some pretty good reasons, also with regard to the IGF extension, that the community, at this point, agrees, agrees rather, maybe quickly, as to why it works, but I don't have a better word in English, I'm sorry.

But agrees, more or less, unanimously, or rather clear so that those who are going to decide about the stewardship, and also about the [inaudible] of the IGF, can see that the multistakeholder model is actually work, and that this community is able to come up with a joint proposal and with a solution. I think that's important.



And I think it's important to decide by September. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sandra Hoferichter. It's Olivier speaking. I'll just respond quickly to your first point, and then I'll let Alan follow up on the rest. With regards to the survey, the working methods during the Frankfurt meeting of the cross community working group on IANA stewardship changed after an hour and a half, going through that very table where we had some, the members of the working group that were there had very clear view from our members, thanks to the survey.

Unfortunately, the chair decided to change the way things were done, and that whole table was dropped over a break. And then we just started building entities and things for the rest of that weekend. That said, the survey itself was not a loss for the members that were there, for the ALAC members that were there, because we actually made use of the responses in the survey, to be able to quickly respond and react to what was being discussed over there.

And I'm sorry not to have perhaps provided an update on this. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll talk first about Sandra's last point. She mentioned the IGF. What does the IGF has to do with IANA accountability? Tijani says nothing. Tijani is wrong. Sorry.

These things are linked in people's minds. And the ability of the multistakeholder model to address the IANA transition, or the inability,



more important of it, will be used against the multistakeholder model, and therefore probably against IGF. There are people talking about essentially holding the funding for IGF hostage based on various decisions, and they are linked.

And they may not, maybe shouldn't be linked, but based on the control on those various people in positions of authority, the upcoming meeting of the UN General Assembly, it's, these things are all linked together unfortunately. So it would be really nice, not necessarily to have a final answer by September, but be perceived as being under control in that timeframe.

So it is somewhat linked. Back on the previous topic of this thing is all too complex, and we need to simplify it. I'm going to say something that people don't want to hear. We're not going to be able to simplify some of this too much. It's a really complex issue. It's being more complex by some of the ways that it is being handled.

And at some level, you either have to decide to dive into it, or trust those who are willing to do it. Because, there is no way we can simplify some of these issues. On the other hand, we can provide overviews, and we need to provide overviews, but if everyone wants to be part of the decision process, they're going to have to dive into the ugly part.

You know, there is no real way around that. But I also agree with Cheryl, as we move through this process, there is not going to be a need to go into the same depth as we have in the past, in some cases. I'm not saying we know how the answers are going to come out, because we don't. There are some really tough decisions to be made, and it's completely unclear how they're going to be made.



But, at best, what we can do is report on it. It's not going to be 140 character Tweets, I'm afraid. But we do need to be better at being concise for those who want to be informed, but don't want to be part of the decision process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. Olivier speaking. I'm closing the queue at this point, as we have four minutes left in here. I still have Sébastien Bachollet and Mohamed El Basher. And then Alan, I'll ask you to give us a one minute update on where we are with the IANA stewardship transition. What the status is today with regards to the different proposals. Sébastien Bachollet.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. It's Sébastien Bachollet speaking. I have a feeling we switched subjects and moved on to IANA transition, but I want to go back to accountability. I think we can always go back to how we're going to report to our members, but what I would like to know is how we're going to ask them what they feel, what their opinion is. How are they going to convey what they feel and think to us?

That's what matter today. On this subject, if we ourselves are not accountable to our members, to the members of the different ALSs which make up our community, how could we ask other parts of the community to be accountable? We have to start working on it ourselves. So in doing so, we have to ask, what our members feel and think.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ...the work practices of the IANA stewardship transition working group, has been tapping into people, into our RALOs and with surveys and so on, and perhaps that's what can follow up on the accountability thread, especially the two are linked together. Mohamed El Basher.

MOHAMED EL BASHER: Thank you Olivier. I would just like to emphasis on what Alan has said. I mean, the world is watching this process, and it has big implications on the multistakeholder model. Really I think it's not just being on ICG, and maybe frustrating waiting for the naming community's proposal, but it's literally, it gives a negative impression about the whole process.

And I'm sure if, hopefully, we can have a breakthrough during this meeting or in the coming weeks, or otherwise, the home model will be really, let's say, tainted really. And this is really an important chance that we can show, that we are able to do something. And I'm happy to give an update about ICG, if you would like.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Mohamed. I have Heidi looking at me with these eyes that say, "Not in your sleep." Or whatever. Finally, Alan Greenberg. I think we might have an update later on in the week, perhaps, if we could. But then I ask Alan Greenberg, really, to tell us, IANA stewardship transition. Where are we? What is the ALAC's point of view, and what solutions are there on the table at the moment?



ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I'm going to address both accountability and IANA transition in this statement. The position that the ALAC has taken, and by the way, we have five reps in each of these groups. We have five reps because we don't necessarily believe that everybody is going to agree with each other. There is no rule that says all five regional people have to be in lockstep.

It's surely a lot nicer, and easier, and helpful, but we have five for a reason. So let's not be afraid of disagreeing, if indeed, we disagree. The position that the ALAC has taken since the start in the CWG transition and followed, but it's very closely linked, to accountability, is we want an ICANN that works. We want a multistakeholder ICANN where the community has control, because that is what multistakeholder is about.

We believe... We have stated clearly that we want sufficient accountability so that the community can control IANA properly, and if we have that, there is no more reason to go to the complexity of an external model. That has uniformly been our position.

And it dictates what we have decided, and it was a very conscious decision. We had, I don't know how many hours of discussions on the IANA transition group, on what position should we take and why are we taking it. And it presumed that we will have strong accountability measures, which essentially say we have to be able, in crucial situations, control the Board.

If the Board, some day, goes completely crazy. That won't be easy. We're multistakeholders because we disagree with each other in many cases. Other one stakeholder will be enough. They would represent everyone because we all think the same. Well, we're multistakeholder



because we disagree. If we ever get to the point where so many of us believe that the Board is out of control, doing the wrong thing, we need to be able to fix it.

Will that likely happen? No. But it's good to have those controls. And if we have those controls, that dictated what solution we liked in the transition model, but it also dictates where we're going in the stewardship, in the accountability model. Now, people are certainly willing to disagree, are capable of disagreeing, and if they have good arguments, maybe all of our minds will be changed.

But the premise is being, we want a strong ICANN. We want an ICANN which is not taken over by the registrars, or the registries, or ALAC, or the non-commercial people, or the IPC. You know? We want multistakeholders represented. We're going to disagree. We're going to have to compromise, it's hard. But that's the kind of ICANN we want.

And the rest of the conclusions, in my mind, fall from that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. And we've reached the end of this session. Just to remind you all, on Tuesday we have an At-Large ad-hoc working group meeting on the transition of US government stewardship and the IANA function. That's at 17:30 in this room, from 17:30 to 19:00. And in there, there will be an update from IANA coordination group.

So Mohamed, you'll be able to do your update at that time. And we'll be discussing the internal to ICANN proposal, the external to ICANN proposal, otherwise known as contract co, and so on. And we'll be



looking at next steps. So I invite you all to be part of that discussion then, an hour and a half.

And with this, I think I can hand the floor back to...

What we can do, indeed, is to add a moment for accountability. We can start discussing that as well, if there is no objection from anyone. But we'll be able to change the agenda once we meet.

And I hand the floor back to Alan Greenberg for the next part of the afternoon. And thanks to the staff that have come in to speak to us about the meeting strategy. And we have Nick Tomasso Nancy Lupiano who are joining us for this.

Over to you Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Nancy has changed a lot. [Laughter]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I blinked and the name changed. I must be hallucinating.

ALAN GREENBERG: Before we start, we have on and off again today, had a timer up, timing people's interventions. Hopefully we will be using it. We have for this session. Someone tell me how long we have. 30 minutes.

So I'm going to use a one minute timer, when it dings, stop talking soon afterwards. We're not going to say you have to stop that minute, but let's try to honor it. The session coming immediately after, this is a

formal signing of a memorandum of agreement, and we really do not want to run into that, and 15 minutes after that, some of us have to leave, regardless of whether we're finished or not.

So we're on a tight time schedule. Thank you Nick and Nancy. [Laughter] I follow instructions. We're told Nancy is here, I believe Nancy is here. I've learned as chair you have to follow instructions from staff. I'll turn it over to you.

NICK TOMASSO:

Well first, I would like to thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to discuss the new meeting strategy with you today. I'm very pleased that we have so many people who are on the meeting strategy working group in the room with us. And our representatives from North Africa, Aziz Hiali, who I have been working with for the last year or so, I'm placing a meeting there.

So I look forward to the discussion. We're here to say that the meeting strategy is adopted. It was developed by a community based working group, many of whom are in this room, and delivered to the ICANN Board of Directors for approval. So what we have now is a plan to follow. Your work, along with us, is to define what your requirements are for each of those meetings within the context of the days that have been set aside.

And we're happy to hear what your needs are, to work with you to develop a schedule within the confines of the three different meeting parameters. And to make it a very valuable tool to doing your business. With that, I'm going to stop talking and turn the microphone over to



[inaudible], to go through some slides that give you an overview of the meeting strategy and what's about to happen, to be implemented in 2016, calendar year 2016.

So with that, [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

And I've been told that you already have lots of questions and know a lot about the strategy, so I'm going to let Sébastien go through the guiding principles, the first slide, if we move forward one here. And then I'll quickly take you through the three meetings that you've been looking at I hear, already in your work space. So Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much. Yeah, the working group, a lot of members are in this room, obviously, but it's important to see what was our guiding principle when we start to work. And we wanted to ensure sufficient face to face time for all of the SO ACs for policy development. And also possibility to admitting cross constituency, cross community interaction, because it's not just important to have societal meeting, but also on the possible changes.

Not because there is a cross community working group, but also because there are topics that you want to discuss together. Promote efficient use of community and ICANN time with reduced session conflicts. That means the idea is to try and find as much as possible, not to have each one of us to go to meeting A, B, sorry meeting alpha, beta, or gamma, because A, B, C is already taken.



And I can't use these letters. But have three meetings at the same time for you, and you don't know which one to go, or you want to go to the suite, and some people are very keen of that, they have their laptop. They can follow one meeting, they have their phone, they follow another meeting, and they are physically in the third one, and they are following also this one.

And I know that some of you, or at least one, but to speak in these three meetings, sometimes saying the same thing to the three, but sometimes saying things very different. And that's something not everybody can do, especially when you are a man, because when you are a man, you can just do one thing. When you are a woman, you can do two things at least, and it's easier for them, but we try to organize a meeting for everybody.

Then try to decrease the number of sessions that could be interesting for a single participant at the same time. And maximize qualitative participation. I will not talk too much about that because we will run out of time for your questions. And also, what we try to end with a solution that can allow growth, if we have more constituency, more participants, more, more, more, or less, less, less, more topics, how we can be enough flexible to do that.

And of course, it's also to increase the credibility of ICANN with a broader global community, not just the participant or the one online, but all the Internet community. Thank you.



UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you. You can go to the next slide. So again, I know that you've seen these, but quickly, we'll run through them. Meeting A is similar to the meetings that we have today. A six day format. The first meeting in the cycle, of course. And the format similar, with the exception of the public forum, which is really split into two so that one of the recommendations was to allow the Board to hear community concerns early in the week, so that we can try and get some resolution before the end of the week, when we meet again.

Go ahead and go to the next slide. Now, I'm skipping to meeting C first, because I know the most questions are on meeting B. So, oh, you don't have to move forward to it though. It's on purpose. Meeting C is our longest meeting, it's the one that's at the end of the year, not in the middle. But we've got a duration of seven days. We have got two days dedicated to intra-community work, meaning you working in your own group, versus inter-community work, where we have got one day of that, where you're interacting with other groups.

So, ALAC is meeting with the ccNSO, or the GNSO, cross community work. Then we've got one day dedicated to internal SO AC work, or cc interaction or both. Two days dedicated to the public forum, the annual general meeting, opening session, and high interest topics.

So again, very similar to what we have now. A day at the end for your wrap-ups. And enough time, hopefully, to get everything we need to get done with no extra days added on, on top of all of this, so it's all planned out. Go ahead and go forward. Trying to leave you time for questions.



Meeting B, this is a four day format. And we're going to have questions. We've got a day of outreach. This is something that is planned, but we don't have a specific model for it yet. I know that's a big question. We still need to work together to figure out exactly it means for you all to do outreach, and whether that means that you're going to go out and talk to people at universities, or whether we're going to bring people into the meetings.

So none of that is decided yet. That's a huge question for some reason. We've got to figure it out together still. There is then three days where we've got two that are intra-community work, and one that's inter-community work. The biggest thing here is that we have no public forum, we have no welcome. We don't have sponsorship, where we're taking up the whole big space for sponsor booths.

So we're getting rid of all of the distractions and giving you time to work. That's really the big one here. I'm going to leave it at that. Should we go through the rest or take questions now? If you don't have questions yet, we'll keep going through it. Yeah, yeah. I knew I wasn't going to get away with that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Evan Leibovitch, acting chair, NARALO. One word that I see missing there, is a word that Chris Mondini has been using a lot, in his solicitation for input from the community, and that's in-reach. Now, for a lot of the constituencies within ICANN, they have financial reasons to be here, that motivates them to get involved.



You have communities, though, that, for instance, in the case of At-Large and the non-contracted part of the GNSO, you have groups that don't necessarily have a financial incentive to be here. And one of the issues that we have is, how do we get people involved? Outreach is one part of it, bringing them in. Keeping them interested once they're here, is as much of a challenge.

And so in some cases it's called capacity building, in some cases it's called mentorship, and in some cases it's called just taking things like, we just went through this meeting about, you know, ICANN accountability, and going through IANA transition. You must have some idea of what it's like.

Can you give somebody an elevator pitch of the IANA transition? Making this kind of thing interesting and relevant to people that don't have a financial interest in being here, is a massive challenge. And so as you're talking about outreach, I'm also wondering what you're thinking about in-reach. This isn't just us talking now.

A recent letter from Chris Mondini also an AC list, basically started soliciting for that. So I'm wondering how this factors into what you're doing. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sébastien, quick answer.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: We try to encapsulate that in the layout of the meetings. So the fact that you have a day dedicated to intra-work, and time where it's really



better organized, that you have your work done inside your group, and then discussion with other group may include whatever you need for your group. And we hope that the way we lay, we organize these three meetings, will help that.

Outreach here, as you see, it's just on one single meeting, why? It's because we, the goal for this B meeting to be able to go in places where we are not used to go. For example, we return to Singapore, we return to Buenos Aires, we return to Rio de Janeiro, but we want to go to Chile, we want to go to Peru, we want to go to some African countries.

We can't go with this huge meeting. Then if we go to those places, we want to take the supporting community to outreach, to go to the local community and to our discussion. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sébastien, I'm sorry Alan, but that didn't totally answer my question. It's one thing to go out and to try and get people from the outside to come in, but if they come in, and then they immediately become dormant because they don't get engaged, that's as much of a challenge.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Evan, noted. Vanda, you had your hand up? No? Sorry, I thought you were putting your hand up. We have a remote question. Let's go to the remote question before we go to me.



ARIEL LIANG: This is Ariel Liang for the record. There is a question from a remote participant, Murray McKercher. Where do remote hubs fit into this strategy?

NICK TOMASSO: The genesis of remote hubs was the NetMundial meeting in Brazil, where it was decided that that would be a value added element for the ICANN meeting to show a truly global outreach. We adopted the cause of the remote hubs for ICANN meetings, and for the last two ICANN meetings, perhaps three, we've had remote hubs on Thursday, which was for the accountability and Internet governance sessions, as well as the public forum.

For this meeting, we're going to have remote hub participation on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday, because we certainly see the value. There is demand, we're working with the ALSs as well as the ISOC chapters. We'll have a total 36 interactions over the course of the three days, 36 participants, 12 per day approximately.

So the remote hub strategy is alive and well, and as far as I'm concerned, will not go away as we continue to move forward with ICANN meetings.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. No other questions other than me? Then I'll put me in the queue. I have a lot of trouble with meeting B. The other meetings have options for the days, this one doesn't. Now the At-Large people on the group tell me yes, but there is going to be flexibility, but it doesn't show up in the chart.



What if we don't have a day's worth of inter-community work to do? Does that mean we have to do nothing? Is that, you know, or do we have the option of using it in other ways. The larger problem is on the outreach. Many of our people are here as vacation time. They have no jobs require this. They're not paid to do this.

They're either taking time away from their families, if it's on a weekend, or very often vacation time, if it's during the week. It's a hard sell to tell someone that they have to come a day early, take a day off work, lose pay perhaps, and that we're going to go out to schools and tell people how important ICANN is.

And if you follow that, some of those people are going to say, "Well, I'm not going to bother coming that day. I'll come a day later. I have important things to do." And at that point, they're travelling half way around the world for a three day meeting, ah, forget it.

So when you follow this through to the conclusion, I understand you've said that you haven't come up with a strategy for it, but the lack of that strategy puts the whole concept in question. If indeed that day must be used for outreach as opposed to other things. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. We have a lot of [inaudible], or leaders of this community, who ask for outreach. The business community, the At-Large community, and others. When we talk about outreach, please don't just say we will go to school to do... I hope that you will go to the future ALSs, that could become an At-Large structure, or group of people who



can be interested in this specific country, or in this specific region to participate with the ICANN work in the future.

The question of, who participates to which day, it's totally open, because for example, for the C meeting, we don't request... I don't think we need to request people to participate to the eight day. And we try to organize that to allow people to come to one part of the meeting, but at the end of this meeting, we must do all of the tasks of each SO and ACs, but also cross community groups, work, and also to have seat a new ALAC, the new GNSO councils, new Board, and so on and so forth.

That's where we try. Now travelling for three day to the other part of the world, for some group, working group, we go for two days, and we cross the world for that. And here it's three days. We don't think that we need more, but if the all communities say, okay, let's do five day meeting and not four day meetings, I am sure that ICANN organizing committee can think about that.

But we try to decrease the time for this specific meeting. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have about seven minutes left. There is a hard stop. We have three people with their cards up. I think it's Evan, Evan is down, Sandra was next and then Vanda. So let's try to keep it short so we can actually finish on time.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Alan, it's Sandra speaking. Just to explain the idea of the outreach a little bit more. I mean, we all agreed that outreach is



important, and we should do more. The smaller meeting allows us to go into remote areas all over the world, and I'm not speaking about Latin America, Africa, also Asia and Europe has remote areas where the big meetings are not possible.

So with this outreach day, we were thinking about actually a possibility, and we should keep that model, that idea flexible. It can be a joint effort from the whole community, so all SOs and ACs together, and on the next occasion, it can be a group voice outreach, so that the ALAC are visiting, or are meeting the At-Large structure in that region.

I think we should try both. Maybe on one time we decide, this one is better than the other one. And maybe not all of the ALAC members really have to come to that outreach day, if there is maybe a joint effort between all SOs and ACs. I don't think that, as Alan mentioned, it will keep away members for only three days, travelling around the world.

I don't think that will be the case, but during that work, we realize that sometimes it's really hard to get the work done, and to really get into the remote areas of our world. Thank you.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

I totally agree. I believe that's the model allow us to do more outreach. And I believe that any community, or in another SO, we're going to have people that is eager to come and to make an effort to outreach, wherever the model is. Probably my opinion is, the model should be invite a specific groups around that remote locations, to stay and come and participate inside this groups, to have a sense of community.



Because when you go out and go there, it's like they don't make the move to participate. And if we invite them, and sit around, and allow them to question something, or make themselves heard, they have a sense that they are participating more.

So I do believe that the format is open enough for these small countries, or I would like to open also the opportunity to, big countries, like Brazil, it's more than one country. And that we have remote areas where it's impossible to have those meetings. So sometimes we need to consider that north part of the country is also remote, and is not like the south.

So, it's happened in other cultures too. So the idea to make this B meeting, I believe, is not all finished, but I do believe that it's very interesting. And I personally support a lot to have this often, you know, in those regions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Any final words? We have about two minutes. Aziz, you wanted to speak. My apologies.

AZIZ HILALI:

Speaking, finish once we have [inaudible], we cannot [inaudible].

First of all, I would like to thank the ICANN team that was done, that was a pleasure to work with them. I worked with them in Marrakesh, I don't know all of the details, all of the different types of meetings, but I wanted to have an idea of the amount of people that would go to B type meeting, meeting B.



And I had a question for Nick. You gave us a document, we found that in our bag, it's according [inaudible] the document in fact, and there is a sentence here that needs to be corrected. I don't know if it's an ICANN document, or local organizer. I'm going to read it in English.

...[inaudible] after the meetings original city, Marrakesh, explained concerns about the participation from African attendees due to the Ebola epidemic in the region.

According to me, there is absolutely no problem, since you came to Marrakesh twice, there is no Ebola in Marrakesh, and there are no issues with that disease in Marrakesh. And there is a declaration that was done, and we did work on it with Fadi, and with [inaudible], regarding the reasons of postponing the Marrakesh meeting.

So I would like it to be corrected. I don't know if it's an official ICANN document.

NICK TOMASSO:

Aziz, you bring up a very valid point. First, let me assure you that that is not an ICANN publication. That publication was created by another organization. It was brought to our attention, [inaudible] who works with all of our sponsorship materials, brought it to ICANN legal, and the decision to let it be placed as part of those marketing materials was made.

It's not our position, as you know, our position remains. ICANN made that decision, there was no decision made by the Moroccan government, and anything that would suggest that is totally untrue. So



we will revisit that document one more time now, but you're absolutely right.

But rest assured, it's not an ICANN document.

ALAN GREENBERG: Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you very much Alan. Fatimata Seye Sylla speaking. I would like to support the type of meetings you did select, and I would like to add one important point. I believe that whatever type of meeting we choose, it's very important to have a good balance between the regions.

What happened with Morocco is not positive. And with Africa, I'm talking about Senegal, or when I talk to my friends, I'm going to Singapore, I'm going to represent Africa. We don't know why we came to Singapore. This is very important to have this balance between different regions, and we have to be on the same level.

We have to have equity, we have to be rationale in our decisions. And we have to project a good image to the entire world. I work a lot with and for ICANN, I'm an integral part of ICANN, but this is not an easy task for us when we talk to our communities.

NICK TOMASSO: Does that warrant a response?



ALAN GREENBERG: I think the proper response is, thank you and understood. [Laughter]

NICK TOMASSO: Thank you Fatimata. Understood.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we, I believe, we have no more speakers who had their hand up earlier. And I call this meeting to an end, hold on. Not allowed to.

This particular part of the meeting to the end. You are not allowed to get up and leave. Thank you.

[Applause]

Nick and Nancy can go.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Excuse me, if I could just call everyone back to order, we are going to start with the final part of the meeting. Thank you Evan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since Evan is dressed far better than I am for this formal occasion, I'm turning the chair over to him for the next 15 minutes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Thanks very much. I know everybody is getting tired, so if we can start soon then we can finish soon. Please, if everyone could be seated. Okay. Thanks very much.



My name is Evan Leibvoitch. I am the acting chair of NARALO. And in that capacity, I'm very, very happy to be here, and essentially conclude a process that has been some time in the works. And formalize a relationship between the North American region of At-Large, and ARIN, which is the RIR for North America. I believe we are the third region to do this. I'm very happy to do it.

Having a relationship between At-Large and the local RIR is very important for a couple of reasons. Number one is, there is a component of ARIN that just does not exist in ICANN, in terms of the subject matter covered, but also in the processes. ARIN provides a model of multistakeholderism that is different from ICANN's, and exposure of our ALSs and our members to that, I think, is going to be very important, as we move forward.

And to see that there is different approaches to being able to bring multiple stakeholders, multiple communities together. And I myself, am very much looking forward to attending the ARIN meeting in San Francisco in a few months. And as you know, from earlier today, we have put in a proposal to have a NARALO General Assembly to take place concurrent with the ARIN meeting in Montreal in October.

If it's approved, I hope that our ALSs can also take advantage of the cross cultural exchange. So I'm very much am looking forward to that. And I'll give the mic over to John.

JOHN CURRAN:

Good afternoon. I'm John Curran. I'm the president and CEO of ARIN, which is the American Registry for Internet Numbers. We serve Canada,



the United States, and about 25 economies in the Caribbean. And we are the regional Internet registry for that particular area.

I'm very happy to be here today. Again, concluding a process that's, we started earlier within NARALO, to have a formal relationship. One that allows us to both do our outreach activities, to keep our communities cross-informed, and to help build just better relationships. It's important, when you look at what we do, and I mean that both organizations, it's important that we're aware that the Internet effects a lot of people.

And to the extent that we can get the message out, that there is policies that are being set, there is important information being communicated. Every method we can use to get that in front of people, we should be leveraging to the maximum opportunity. So we have a memorandum of understanding that helps our two organizations work together. I'm very pleased to be here today.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. And one last comment. I want to acknowledge two people who have also been very important in the work that's been leading up to this. One of whom is Garth Bruen, who is actually the real chair of NARALO. I'm just sitting in for him temporarily.

And so, Garth, if you are listening, thank you for your contribution. And if not, we'll be in touch with you. And the second person is Glenn McKnight, who is right now running the cameras, but long before this, through his activity both with NARALO and through ALAC, has been instrumental in helping us come about.



So I wanted to recognize both of them in advance. And again, thank you both.

[Applause]

I now relinquish control of the meeting back to your fearless chair, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

This session is now over. We reconvene again, Heidi?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

