SINGAPORE - ALAC Work - Part I
Tuesday, February 10, 2015 – 10:00 to 12:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: May I call the meeting to order, please? The first Item on the Agenda is a 20-minute discussion on the ICANN Academy. For a report on the ICANN Academy Working Group I turn it over to Sandra.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you. Sandra Hoferichter speaking. Yesterday's meeting was unfortunately at a time when other people from other communities couldn't attend because they had conflicts with sessions going on in parallel. However I was very happy that many of the At-Large community members could participate, and it was quite a dynamic and active meeting. The main discussion was the first draft of a website. Chris Gift and his team created first draft for a website, our landing page for the overall Academy, and not only the Leadership Training Program, and what it could look like. This was up for discussion. It was a very preliminary design. We agreed on some changes.

I'd like to underline that this landing page is not only for the Leadership Training Program but for the whole Academy approach. This is still misunderstood by the whole community, and the Leadership Training Program, which will probably happen as soon as it's confirmed in the budget in Dublin, the three days before the Dublin Meeting in October 2015. For this Leadership Training Program we'll get a first sub-page ready, including an application form and details about the Program.

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.

Here we have the first slide from yesterday's meeting. It's the first draft of this website. I'll explain the elements. There's a Twitter feed, there's a calendar, there's a member section, and there are sections that lead directly to the existing programs or which may come up in the future. The Working Group yesterday agreed that we don't need a Twitter feed, instead we'd rather have a section where the next five upcoming events are displayed. Also the terminology "academy members" was somehow misunderstood and is misleading because there is no membership in the Academy. It's an open Working Group. It will be a CCWG in the future, or it is and that will be more formalized, and there is not steering committee or no membership.

Still, as it's a very first draft, we can see this more or less as a placeholder. We were very happy to see it's incorporated in the design of the official ICANN.org design. You'll see this in the header. This is actually the same design as you get when you type in ICANN.org and when you're on the homepage of ICANN. It was furthermore agreed - and this was a proposal made by a GAC rep - that it would be very helpful if we tried to look at each program or at the accessibility of the website, of each program, from different angles. So when you come to the Academy page you can either choose "I'm a newcomer," or "I'm experienced" or "I'm a contributor" or "I'll look what's in this section for me", or you can choose by stakeholder group so that you say "I'm in GAC" or "I'm in ALAC" and then look what programs are there. Behind these links you'll sometimes find the same programs, as there are overlaps, as we've already identified in this Working Group.

The idea is to make it as easy as possible to access each program. If we're looking at it through the eyes of a visitor from multiple angles,

EN

that was the main idea of how to revise that first draft. The second Agenda Item was how to transform the Working Group, which is still officially named an Ad-Hoc Working Group under At-Large Leadership into a CCWG, and various options have been discussed. It was proposed that we should not call it an official CCWG, as there are rules and procedures under development, and some of those are already existing, which would not apply to the nature of the Academy Working Group, which is cross-community and inclusive, but it's open, and we do not necessarily need to produce a Charter.

Although we agreed to have some sort of document to explain the mission of this Working Group, so we might end up drafting a Mission Statement. It should of course have more stable backing with Chairs and Co Chairs, but it doesn't necessarily meet the criteria of a CCWG, which as Alan told us, is a Working Group set up for a special purpose with a special result. This is not the case here. This will be a standing, open group, with incoming, outgoing membership for an undefined duration. Once the Academy is fully up and running, I think it will be a permanent standing Working Group or Committee.

The third Agenda Item was to first look out on the next Leadership Training Program. As mentioned already, that depends on whether it's approved on the budget, and it will be around May 2015. So far I don't expect this program will not be approved again, so we're starting to plan the next agenda. The outcome from the LA Meeting was that it should be even more customized to ICANN matters, especially the facilitation skills part, which should be ore customized, purely on ICANN matters and not too general. We will start to set up a Drafting Team for the next

ICANN | 52
Singapore

agenda. This will be circulated by the mailing list as well as the other information I just provided to you here.

Then we will start with the outreach to all SOs and ACs during the Buenos Aires meeting. We'll produce a flyer or postcard that explains in short what the Leadership Training Program is aiming for and who the target groups are, and then most likely it will be the best case if those who participated already in the Leadership Training Program, with the assistance of myself, will reach out to each SO and AC and invite them more personally to send their community members to the next leadership training program. By then we expect to have a sub-page ready, which makes it easier in the process to receive applications, to upload biographies, and to make it more usable for staff who were, in the last two days, handling this more or less very flexibly. We should get into a more professional stage now of how to apply and handle participants and so on. That's from my side. I remain for your questions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Sandra. We started about 10 minutes late unfortunately, so we'll shorten each of the three 20-minute discussions to be about 16-17 minutes so we will end on time. Olivier? We're going to be using a one-minute timer with a beep.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I came out of that meeting early that Sandra was running the other day, unfortunately because I had other commitments. But what I did hear, about not having it as a CCWG, my personal thought is

I'd disagree with this. The CCWG on Internet Governance does not have a set target or defined amount of time. It was created to bring the input of the ICANN community in wider Internet governance issues and to guide ICANN staff and the Board in their deliberations outside of ICANN, so there is some flexibility there, and this is being demonstrated, and the group has been ratified by SOs and ACs out there. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll respond to that, since I'm the one who strongly objected to it being called a CCWG. Number one, if I, as the Chair of ALAC were to go to the other Chairs and say we wanted to set up a CCWG right now, I think I'd be stoned. I'm not all that eager to be stoned. I suspect a slightly different title - and we're just talking about a different title - will be better received and will be better understood by the community. I don't want to have really substantive discussions on the name of a group. We've done that in the past. I don't think it's the best use of time. It's well understood what we're talking about. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Alan, I don't think it's about the name, it's about the nature of the group. It is a CCWG. If we don't call it that, I don't mind, but it is CCWG, and if it's not it will not be an ICANN Academy, it will be an At-Large Academy.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no question we're looking at a cross-community something to oversee the Academy. We cannot legislate participation from all groups. We'll certainly solicit it and strongly encourage it. Thank you. Olivier?

Let's not make the whole session the debate on the name of the group, by the way.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I wanted to add to this. Perhaps one step forward would be to find out under what name umbrella, how this would be something that would be accepted by all SOs or ACs. A Working Party? I don't' know what there is under the ICANN bylaws that allows for something like this. What's clear is that this needs to be formalized otherwise it won't be taken seriously, and that's what I'm really worried about.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's what was agreed to in the Working Group meeting. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Just a very small reply. I agree with Alan that we should not overdo finding a name for it. In fact, this was always called the ICANN Academy Working Group, so I don't think there's any need to change the nature. If we say it's a CCWG and it's the Academy Working Group, I think we just need to fix the structure behind it, but it will always be named ICANN Academy Working Group. I don't think we can force the community to change it and say, "Okay, from now on we say ICANN Academy Working Party or Steering Committee." This wouldn't work. It would always be named Working Group, and we'd just have to find a structure behind it which makes it formal, legal, accountable. Thank you.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.   Any substantive discussion on the issue instead of the name?   Yesterday we did suggest that all adjectives are properly reflected - that it should be a cross-constituency, regionally balanced, gender balanced… We had a few more. Please, let's not talk about the name any further in this meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What I'm pointing at is that we need to formalize this.   if it's not formalized in ICANN, one way or another, it's not going to be taken seriously. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, I think the Working Group made a strong recommendation to that effect right now, and Sandra reported it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But what are the next steps? How can we formalize this? Charter?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we said "mission". There's some strategizing that has to be done, but I don't think it needs to be done with 40 people in the room. This is a reporting session, not the Working Group meeting.   Any other comments? Fatima?

EN

FATIMA SEYE SYLLA: I'd like to know the periodicity of the Leadership Training Program. My question is induced by the fact that if we take the leaders in one year and we train them, and the terms are two to three years, how many leaders will you be training the following year.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I think that's a really good question. I think part of our problem is we use the term "leadership training" in the context that everyone on the ALAC, every regional leader, everyone on the GNSO, is a leader. They are indeed leaders of the overall community, but then there are leaders of the leaders, so I guess maybe they're leaders-squared. I think the real point is ignoring the term "leader" for the moment, the number of people we can process in one session a year is probably insufficient, and I'd like to think that the new Academy, whatever it's named, will be pushing for more than one session a year.

It's certainly easy to do it when people are incoming, but I'd suspect at least a part of those who've been taking it at the annual AGM are people who were around before, and therefore it would not be inappropriate to do it before other meetings also. Whether staff and other people could sustain the load is a different issue. I would think a reasonable thing that would eventually come out of the Academy is more than one of the Leadership Training Programs a year, or ones in parallel or something. I'd hope that would be an initiative that would come out, bottom-up requested, but it remains to be seen. I totally agree with the concept though. Heidi?

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH:
Thank you. One possibility might be to expand the Leadership Training Program to the new meeting B, where you'd have that first day on Saturday to be some sort of engagement or training time, as well as outreach.

ALAN GREENBERG:
Comments? Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:
I am afraid we're still confusing ICANN Academy with Leadership Training. It's not for Leadership Training only. The ICANN Academy was created for the while learning effort in ICANN, but staff asked us to do this model once and now everyone is calling the Leadership Training the Academy. That's not the case, and that's why Sandra is speaking about a CCWG and a Charter, et cetera. She wants to make it more official and recognized so that we can really undertake the work of the Academy. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:
Thank you. For the record, I was not confused. I was talking about one component of the Academy, one that we have some experience with and we think we could probably justify increasing its budget to address a larger part of the community. There was nothing in my mind that said it was the only part of the Academy. It was the part we were talking about in that intervention. Anyone else?

Then we're 17 minutes into the meeting and we said we'll have 17-minute sessions. Thank you Sandra. The next section is the New gTLD

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Working Committee Report. I've discussed with Evan ahead of time that we'll spend a few minutes elaborating on the discussion that was held last night, which unfortunately had to be restricted to a very small number of people. You presumably got a fair amount from what was discussed in the Board Meeting, but I'd like to summarize what happened at that meeting, and then I'll turn it over to Evan for the rest of his session. Who was present? We had three people from At-Large - Olivier, myself and Evan; the people who have been the most actively involved in this.

From the GAC we had four people representing the European Union, the US and something else.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There were two people from the European Union and one person from the US, and the Chair.

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct. That's who I was forgetting. The registries had a number of people here from a number of the prominent registries. Mason Cole was there as the Liaison between the GAC and GNSO, and did not participate actively in the discussion. Ron Andruff was representing the Business Constituency, and James Bladel the registrars, and I think that's all. We started off with the round table, starting with the GAC, the ALAC and then the registries and registrar. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's worth mentioning that the meeting was conducted under Chatham House Rules, so we won't be able to attribute any statement to everyone but we are able to share everything that was shared there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It was convened by the CEO, obviously in conjunction with the New gTLD Process Committee, who had a number of members present. We did a round table with essentially everyone presenting their positions, and then we did a second round of rebuttals. As I said in the meeting, I was somewhat disappointed that there was not a lot of real dialogue, but just restating positions. A number of ideas did come out of the meeting, which may end up becoming real things. I think the point was made by both the GAC and the ALAC that we are not saying that there are 39 TLDs, and it turns out 39 is the current correct number we're looking at.

There are not 39 TLDs that have horrible things associated with them and need to be changed in radical ways. We have always said - and that's what we said in our advice - that we need to convene a group to look at them. My personal belief is that if we did that, probably half of them we'd look at and say, "The GAC was probably over-reaching, there's no real need to have additional protections on these." Fadi, at the end of the intervention, used the example of .dentist as one of them, and he said if he had a domain fadi.dentist, would someone be misled?

I think my personal answer was if someone's going to go to a dentist and let them stick their hands in your mouth, all because they own a domain name, you deserve what you get. But there are other domain names that are more sensitive and need a better level of protection. Some of

ICANN | 52
Singapore

them already have that, and they're not really being questioned. The other issue the ALAC had raised was we've received multiple statements over the years as to how compliance would enforce the contracts and specifically the PICs. These answers have ranged from, "We won't do that at all - file a dispute to go to an independent adjudicator if you have a complaint," which was a really dumb thing to say - that ICANN would not enforce its contracts.

But at one point the answer was, "We'll only enforce judgments from the independent panels," to, "We'll crowd-source, if we get enough complaints about something we'll do something about it." The current position seems to be ICANN will enforce its contracts, and specifically we're asking for a written statement that if complaints come in from groups such as consumer organizations, regulators, governments, they will be both honored and honored promptly. I think if we get that written statement ALAC no longer has a problem on that particular domain. The registries presented a number of what they considered "facts" and although they are indeed facts, I'm not convinced they're very relevant facts, that some of these TLDs have already rolled out domains.

There are 17,000 domains in one of the registries, and so forth, and they haven't seen any complaints. I've also never seen any of these domains live on the Internet with anyone using them, so it's not really surprising. In any case, that's the summary. We didn't really come to any conclusions, and the intent was not to, but it was to simply start the dialogue. It's the first time a meeting like this has been convened, in my memory and knowledge, and I'm very encouraged by the process, if not the specific way the meeting unfolded. Olivier? And we'd like to turn

EN

this back to Evan at some point, because the session was something he was supposed to be running.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I just wanted to reiterate what Cherine Chalaby, the Chair of the New gTLD Program Committee mentioned during the ALAC with the Board Meeting. There were some main points taken out of that meeting, and I thought I'd read through them very briefly for those who weren't able to make it. The first one is to circulate the strings and engage in a triage. At the moment there are 39 strings. We'd then be able to find out what the severity of the potential fraud is on these domains, and also what potential mitigations might already be in place through the PICs that are in the registry contract.

Number two: can we create a database of disclosed information that will help the semantic of the TLD? That's the concept of a trust mark. These are just avenues to explore. Thirdly, there was a need for rationality and proportionality, and I think that fits with the other points, when we start looking at the triage. PIC DRP fast-track, which I think you mentioned in your summary, was also looked at.

ALAN GREENBERG: For clarity, it's PIC compliance fast-track or prioritization. Cherine used the term DRP, but this is not DRP we're talking about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We might need to come back to Cherine on this, to clarify this. Next: proactive rather than reactive monitoring on PIC enforcement.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Number six: to gather more facts so that we can base our arguments on facts rather than anecdotal evidence of data. I'm glad to announce that both members of the Board New gTLD Working Group and myself have been working on this, so we have a lot more data now. Our PICs inside the picket fence was one of the big questions.

This is to tell you any issue, if inside the picket fence - and we're not going to go into a description of what that is - but an issue inside the picket fence would need to be dealt with with a PDP in the GNSO. If they're not inside the picket fence then a PDP would not be effected. Finally: as you mentioned, a letter from Fadi confirming PIC DRP compliance complaint acceptance.

ALAN GREENBERG: As a clarification of what you just said, a PDP on things which are not within the picket fence is quite valid, but it cannot unilaterally change a signed contract. The picket fence issue are things that will immediately alter a contract as it's already signed. There are many PDPs that affect going forward, but are not able to alter contracts. That's the real issue. There's no point in holding a PDP to alter the contracts if it's "outside the picket fence" and therefore can't alter contracts.

The registries, a number of times, have said, "If you don't like what's in the contracts, run a PDP," and we still have not, despite several times asking ICANN and explicitly ICANN Legal, to tell us is it within the picket fence or not - is it within the list of things that will alter a contract? Because if it is, fine. Then that's a good path to go on. If it isn't, let's stop talking about it. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Just a couple of things, follow on. I'm a little concerned about the request for evidence. Coming from a consumer representation background I've heard that enough to say, "There's no evidence anybody was harmed." Well, you don't know, and I do have concerned about what you mean by evidence. How many people have to be dead first? I think we'd better treat that request with a little bit of concern. The next thing is I hope we're going to write this up, because I want to be going back to Australia and one of the things I am is Deputy Chair of the Telecommunications Consumer Group, and I'd like to get their feedback.

I think some of the things to be explored will be - even though I'm not necessarily in favor of the "trusted mark", it is a way of forcing people to put their hand up and say, "Actually, we are going to do something." I do like the idea of proactive monitoring, and I do think it's time for all of us to come back with some really solid responses to what's being suggested.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I have two speakers in the queue right now, Olivier and Cheryl. I know Evan would like at least a few minutes to talk about the New gTLD Working Group. Olivier, you're doing ATLAS. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. In response to your concerns, the requirement of real, factual evidence rather than anecdotal was asked by us, in that we were

ICANN | 52
Singapore

told, "We haven't seen anything, we haven't seen any problems ourselves." I think the ALAC would probably prefer to have well-researched results out there. There are a number of groups that do this. There is the Anti Phishing Working Group that's done work on that. There's also a report by [ARCITELLUS 00:41:16] that is out there, and it shows that the phishing and fraud and so on are a significant concern. There's also a report from AMC that shows a $5.3 billion loss from fraud due to this, so that shows significant concerns. We'd rather have facts than being told, "Oh, there is no problem out there; at least I haven't seen it on my doorstep." Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Perfect segue to what I wanted to say. I think as the ALAC we'd be remissive. We also didn't make sure that we recognized an additional risk when anything happens in new and emerging entrants into the Internet world - in other words those who are less savvy in terms of the phishing and various other things that can happen. Of course, we also shouldn't lose sight of once IDNs become more popular it's going to be exponentially more problematic. Particularly with the case of fraud and particularly with the case of some cultures, it will be extremely difficult to get fact, because it will be seen as personal and embarrassing failure, and it will not become part of the metrics.

So, whilst I'm 100 per cent, as you know, behind getting me the facts, we also need to recognize those facts, as a set, will be limited by the social factors. So as long as we don't lose sight of that, I'm a happy girl.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll point out your comment about certain cultures notwithstanding. Even in societies that are about as in-your-face as in the US, a vast number of personal violations - and I use that term carefully because we're including physical ones and people stealing money from you - are not reported. So the facts are always going to be difficult to point out. We did point out that this is very early in the process, and facts are hard to get. We also pointed out it's rather difficult to prove a negative.

All of that being told, we and - although not in this meeting - at least one Board Member made a very strong statement that we're in this not just to protect the consumers but to protect ICANN. This is not going to look good for ICANN, and a poor ICANN, which is subject to criticism around the world, does not help any of our cases. Any other comments? Evan, the meeting is yours for a couple of minutes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. I'll speak fast. I would speak faster, but we're being interpreted so I'll try and talk… Well. Okay, a couple of things to note: what Alan said about not being able to prove a negative has become very relevant in this. When we're told, "We haven't heard anything," it doesn't necessarily mean that nothing exists, for reasons that have already been mentioned. I want to do a segue into the New gTLD Working Group

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Meeting that's happening later today. We're going to be following up on a few of these.

I personally want to go a little further into the trust mark issue that Olivier and Holly have mentioned. This is the kind of thing that could provide a very good solution, does not require modifying any contracts, and does, at the end of the day, enhance public trust, which is really the end game of what we're trying to do here. We've been challenged to come up with solutions and so that's the kind of thing that we need to look at.

Another thing that was mentioned at the Board Meeting today - and this is probably not specifically to the new gTLD process - but I want to raise it as something ALAC needs to consider, and that is how do we determine what we need to sound an alarm bell about? Because there's been a small number of occasions over the last couple of years where we say, "This is important, this is important," and then they say, "There's no problem." One of the big issues of the meeting yesterday is that half of the room said, "There's no problem," and the other half of the room said, "Yes, there is a problem," and half of the goal of that meeting was just to make sure the other side of the room realized this problem is not going to go away.

It took a call for a freeze at the LA Meeting before this would even get on anybody's radar. We've been speaking about this, about PICs, since the PICs were introduced - we've had a problem with this. It wasn't until we went to this very, very desperation measure of calling for a freeze that we got anyone's attention. We did. It worked, but I'd prefer that we didn't have to go to this level of desperation to get something really

important. Alan, I'm going to ask as a general ALAC thing that perhaps if there's something that needs to be dealt with, how do we raise that alarm? We brought this to Fadi's attention of how did they receive it.

We also need to figure out how we elevate those critical things that we really need to get on their plate. Applications support was one. There's a small number of very high profile things that have to be on ICANN's agenda. We need to figure out a way to elevate that. The last thing is a plug for the New gTLD Working Group. we're going to be taking this into more detail. Heidi asked me at the beginning of this if I had slides. I didn't know what we were going to say until after the Meeting with the Board, so that was hard to do. I invite everybody to come.

This is one of our critical policy issues. We need to talk about this, and I think there are some creative solutions that we can bring to this small, nimble, CCWG, that I think may find some common ground - especially if we do something that doesn't muck with contracts.

ALAN GREENBERG: My only comment about asking should we report here, is this meeting is primarily aimed at ALAC and Regional Leadership. ALAC and Regional Leadership were invited to the Board Meeting. I don't want to spend a lot of time here, repeating what was said there for the few number of people who chose not to attend. Let's not go over everything, over and over again. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Evan, some issues for which we said there is a problem, people said, "No, there's no problem," for example the string similarity and those

singular and plural strings, and the two different panels giving two different assessments of the string, very big problem. Other big problems include the community application. It is some application that was supposed to be a community application and was not accepted as a community application, and yet they are community. So those are issues that are very important for us, because it's a public interest. We need to address them also. PIC is very important, but there are other issues that are important too.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: My quick response to that is that this is beyond the bounds of just the New gTLD Working Group. This is a matter of ALAC and At-Large doing its own triage of what are the things we need to flag as the most important things. That's beyond the scope of what I'm doing right now, but ALAC does need to address it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Other comments? In that case we seem to be finished. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Mr. Chairman. We have a set of slides on the left hand screen, and on the right we have the Agenda. What I wanted to do was first start with the Wiki page we have about the At-Large Summit Follow Up Program. There's a team that's continued, as far as the implementation is concerned, of all of those 49 or so recommendations that came out of the Summit in June 2014. We had to go through a categorizing of the recommendations so as to show the ones that are

aimed at the Board, the ones that are aimed at the ALAC, the ones that are aimed at staff. There are various ones.

You can see a set of Wiki pages that have been built over time - first starting with all of the recommendations and then having a sub-page with the recommendations aimed at the Board. During the last meeting we had in LA we presented a number of recommendations ready for Board action, and there will be a follow up with those, that will take the back channels through staff to find out what the response is of the Board, if a response is requested, et cetera. Now, with regards to the ones we were going to present today to the Board, unfortunately we ran out of time. What I'd suggest is we go quickly through the couple of pages of what we were going to present.

This was just going to be a status update rather than a full request from the Board on these things. The first one was Recommendation 16: ICANN needs to improve their direct communications regardless of time zones. Now, for this we had two assignees. As you know, the follow up was assigned to our various Standing Working Groups that we have, or to the ALAC or to individuals. In this case we had two assignees - the ATLAS II Implementation Team and also the Leadership Team. The status on improving direct communication, regardless of time zones, I think the way it was interpreted is that we're very, very geographically diverse a community, and one of the problems is that up until recent times it was always the same people that suffered, as far as conference calls were concerned, et cetera.

There certainly is now an absolute increase in the rotation of calls. That's part of our DNA. The At-Large calls are about to rotate around

time zones, and making decisions within a 24-hour period is recognized as being a challenge, and this is avoided as much as possible within the At-Large community, but sometimes - and we've seen that in CCWG - others are not aware of this or don't seem to be taking that into account. But the ALAC Members or At-Large Members of those Working Groups have made it clear that a 24-hour turnaround time just doesn't work for them. No action required from the Board on this.

Number 26: current policy management processes within ICANN are insufficient. ICANN must implement a workable policy management process system available for use across all of the SOs and ACs. There were three assignees for this - the Social Media Working Group, the Technology Taskforce, and the Capacity Building Working Group. The status of this project at the moment - and this is a long-term project; we're not looking at just a quick fix - this is a project that really overhauls ICANN's information management system. There are two statuses at the moment. There's one that's an ICANN-wide project, which I know the SO and AC Chairs are involved with directly.

The project overhauls ICANN's project information management system. There's also some work going on between the Technology Taskforce Chair and ICANN staff into the Technology Taskforce building a set of requirements for what we call a policy management process system. Once we have the requirements - and that takes some significant amount of work - then we'll be able to find out whether this is something that's financially viable or possible or even something that's absolutely needed. I call upon anyone that has knowledge of these types of projects to step forward and help with this. Specification design

for such projects is quite a complex task. Let's go to the next page please.

There are two more. 40: ICANN should offer a process similar to the CROPP but applicable to short lead-time budget requests not related to travel. That was allocated to the FBSC and we note on this that as a result a communications budget is available for FY15 and also the ALAC is requesting the Board to ensure that this budget continues to be available in FY16 through the SO and AC special request process. Just to clarify this - because we have been asked the question - what is a process similar to the CROPP but applicable to short lead-time budget requests? We're speaking about promotional material primarily - leaflets but even pens and all sorts of little knick-knacks that would really do great.

You will have noticed that now we actually have these little business cards that we can pass onto people. That's one of these things that went under the comms, that we did not have to ask, "Can we print some business cards to pass onto people?" Next one is 42: ICANN should enable annual face-to-face RALO Assemblies - either at ICANN Regional Offices or in-concert with regional events. The FBSC was assigned this. It met earlier this week and we found that AFRALO, EURALO and NARALO are submitting requests for face-to-face GAs in FY16 requests, and that's within the SO and AC special request process.

So that's also being implemented. That's all for the status at the moment. If you have any questions I'm open to answer them, and of course colleagues in the ATLAS II Implementation Task Force are also

very welcome to add, comment, ask questions or whatever else. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Comments? Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: I just want to mention that the Technology Taskforce will be dealing with that issue, 26, at our meeting, that Judith and I will be Co-Chairing, and Dev will be online. It's at 8:00 am on Thursday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: 26 was policy management process system.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll also point out that as some of you are aware, there is a larger project that is being undertaken by ICANN at the explicit demand of the group of AC and SO Chairs, that there is a significant problem in access to information on the ICANN website. The policy aspect is a sub-set of that. Chris Gift has been very recently taken off of his other responsibilities and put in charge of that project. I've made him aware of what the Technology Taskforce is doing, and there will be contact, and hopefully he will benefit from the work that the group has done, and moreover there'll be an opportunity to make sure his larger project, at the very least, encompasses the kinds of things we see as needed in the policy area. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:	My question: we did spend some time with Ariel and the web designer. What happened with all that? We did spend some time saying, "Wouldn't it be nice if…", so that we could find stuff.
ALAN GREENBERG:	That project is going on. Ariel, I don't know if you want to make any comment, but the problem is larger than the website. The problem is that information is often stored in random places, it's not tagged appropriately so it can be found, it's often duplicated… There's a whole host of problems that involve the web, because the web is our prime vehicle for distribution of information, but it's not a web problem as such. Fatima?
FATIMA SEYE SYLLA:	Thanks Alan. I will speak in Spanish. Now there is Alberto, Chair of LACRALO, who is speaking with an interesting person. That person is interested in being an ALS, so I'll ask a question I'm sure Alberto will ask. If we go back to the previous slide for Recommendation 42, it's dealing with a different financial support to organize GAs in ICANN or regional offices, or in coordination with regional events. In the LACRALO mailing list we were discussing if for the Buenos Aires Meeting it would be possible to have financial support for certain ALSes from Argentina, for them to be able to attend the Meeting, without any need to comply with the same requirements for a regular meeting.
	That is to say without having to be in the same hotel, or complying with certain requirements, for example providing financial support for people coming from the other parts o the country and not from Buenos Aires,

ICANN | 52
Singapore

from the interior part of the country. So my question is: can they be included with this recommendation? Can we include this support for those people coming from cities outside of, or different from the city of the event? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think you can put anything you want in your request, if you can justify it and make a reasonable case for it. Am I speaking out of turn? Sorry, your'e talking about Buenos Aires, which is still this fiscal year. I'd suggest you talk to staff privately, offline, and see if there's a way we can do something at such short notice. For the future, if you're making a request for support for a GA or any sort of thing like this, just do it. I'm not going to guarantee it gets funded, but say what we need. If we don't make clear requests for what we need to be able to engage with our ALSes properly then we'll not have an effective organization. So we need to ask the questions. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Again, for meeting B, that first day of outreach, that might be a really good suggestion to make; to bring in local community members.

ALAN GREENBERG: Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I was going to comment on what Fatima said. When I see that I don't see LACRALO or even APRALO presenting requests for GAs, for whatever reason. I think these GAs are very important to have for outreach and

ICANN | 52
Singapore

engagement of current ALSes, especially if you do it side-by-side with the ICANN Meetings. I suggest LACRALO and APRALO, to submit for GAs and see if you get appointed to do it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why not? 30 seconds.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Siranush Vardanyan for the record. Thank you Chair. APRALO didn't submit any request because the Singapore venue has been changed so quickly. We just knew about it three months ago and it was in fiscal year 15 so we had no chance to apply for any requests, but for the future, in the Asia Pacific region, we're looking forward to that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It may be too much to assume there is a GA in every single ICANN Meeting, but on a regular basis, certainly. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Thank you Alan. As I was saying earlier, not only the Technology Taskforce - that's going to be on Thursday - but back to later today at 2:30 pm, Ashwin will be here talking about the knowledge/information management system. So if you're really keen on item 26 do attend that meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If he calls it a knowledge management system he doesn't walk out of here alive, but other than that, yes. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Glenn said what I was going to say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Getting back to Recommendation 26, Ariel also demonstrated the problem that people were not assigning themselves tasks and following through on what needs to be done when you follow tasks, and the checking of the button. I think it's also difficult for people because they're not really clear on how to do this, and some people are also not listed in profile, so you can't tag them. So that also makes it very difficult to assign a task to someone and to follow up, when not everyone is listed.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. For information, I'd like to avoid any confusion between outreach and GAs. Outreach in meeting B is for people outside of ICANN, to reach out to them, while a GA is not the kind of outreach that can be put in this day. Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I see no hands. We're seven minutes over. Thank you for the discussion. The next one is me. The topic of the meeting is meeting effectiveness. There are a couple of things - I said most of them at the beginning of the meeting - that should become business as usual. They are not, yet. This isn't the main focus of the discussion but I'll repeat them. We really need meetings to start on time. That means if you want to socialize, come early and talk to people. I really want to see people sitting at the table and ready to start on time. It's not fair, when we set up schedules and assign tight time schedules to people that we take significant amounts of time away from them. That's number one.

We're using the timers. Hopefully we'll get a better timer in the future that we can actually read, but we really need to keep interventions short and concise. I think we've done much better in this last hour than we have in the past, in that we've not had people repeating what was said by previous people, just to make sure it's said in their words instead of the other people's words, and I do appreciate that. I'd like to open the table now to a more general discussion of how we can make our meetings more effective. Certainly one of my campaigns is to try and do time management and make sure that we don't, on teleconferences for instance, go way over and ask people to schedule a certain amount of time and then run later.

We're not always going to make it. We're going to occasionally go over, we're going to occasionally re-adjust the schedule - but to try to set reasonable expectations. But I suspect it's a much wider topic than that. What do you want to see in meetings to make them effective? We're asking people often in teleconferences or these meetings, to take time off from your real life - often time off from your jobs, time off from your

ICANN | 52
Singapore

families - to spend time on ICANN. I want people to believe they're using their time effectively.

It may be nice to be able to do your email while a teleconference is going on, and that's productive at one level, but that doesn't really make sure we're addressing whatever the issue is at hand. I'm looking for input and thoughts about what we need to do to make sure that when we ask you to take time away from your real life, for ICANN, that it's being used effectively, productively, and that we get real work done. I don't have a lot of answers, but I'd really like to hear from people. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Holly and I sent, on the list, some ideas about how meetings can be more effective. It was on the list because we've discussed this issue on the list before. I want to repeat what I said. The first thing is the agenda, and I think this is something that's done now. We don't have problems with agendas. The second main thing is not to have very long meetings, because when you exceed 60 minutes of a call your concentration will not be the same and the meeting will not be efficient at all. Third point is the length of intervention of each member. I don't think that someone can speak more than three minutes without repeating himself - whatever the subject is. We have to address exactly what we want to say, and that's all.

Last word: we don't have to take the floor twice for the same subject. Every member doesn't have to take the floor twice for the same subject. Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear - the bell going off doesn't mean you have to stop your sentence in the middle, but it really means you need to stop soon. I have no real problem with people speaking twice on the same subject if they have something different to say, and as discussions evolve that's sometimes the case. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I have a couple of comments. First, I support what you're saying on time-keeping. If we're going to have a one-hour or 90-minute meeting, we should keep it to that time because then you can schedule your personal calendar. I'd say the roll call we do for every meeting, I've seen in other meetings what they do is say, "Whoever's in the Adobe is present and who is in the audio channel can say "I'm here" and that's it." Don't go through the whole list. The other thing is that I see also, when we have an agenda and we have action items, they get repeated. I guess that's for the record.

I'm reading it, what the action item is, so I don't need anyone to repeat it to me, which takes time. We just go and start talking about the action item, and that's just an example. Those are my comments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope you'll find in the ALAC Meetings recently that we don't discuss it as an Action Item and an Agenda Item. I believe we've fixed that, in the case of those meetings in any case. Jimmy?

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

JIMMY SCHULZ: I'm going to talk less than a minute, because a lot of correct things have already been said about how we communicate. That's my point - that we've been talking today and the last couple of days about how to communicate, instead of communicating and discussing issues. I know it's important, but maybe less talk about how to talk and just do it!

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Jimmy. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: First a compliment. I'd like to acknowledge the fact that the meetings have been really close to time. Well done Alan. The next point is if we can have all of the important agenda items up first, so that the people who are there can be part of the important conversations and then the items at the end, if they're less important and somebody has to drop out, at least they've been involved in the really important discussions. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Surely there's nothing on our agenda which aren't important. I'll let that sink in. Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [unclear 01:16:58] something quite different from what we're talking about, but relative, because I was asked from people that are working with the Board to raise one point that's quite important for them. There is business efficiency, business excellence, and to think about how we can implement business efficiency, business excellence, in our task.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

They believe that ALAC can be one of the constituents that can be the first to do that, just because we are talking about that; about how we can be efficient, how we can get the most for our time, and I believe this is a time to raise this point but not to discuss now. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Fatima?

FATIMA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you. I will also avoid repeating what's already been said, but just to note something that in my opinion is relevant, which is that we should try to work with realistic agendas, because sometimes our agendas include so many things that we're not able to discuss them all. Specifically, on the face-to-face meetings, in these we should try to avoid the same [unclear 01:18:44] and extensive meetings we've had for years, with the same people in the same order, speaking about the same issues with the same questions and answers. These are not productive sessions. We do know that when we meet face-to-face and we have actual working meetings, these are more productive than several working teleconferences.

So in my opinion, face-to-face meetings should be more of the working nature, rather than meetings where we report what we have been doing in our Working Groups or in any of our activities. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you Fatima. I put myself in the speaker list. I don't think I have any others in the queue right now, but I will respond directly to you. If you see us doing it, tell us, and when we publish early versions of the agenda… We took a fair amount of the meetings out from this particular meeting that we normally had. We did not meet with Compliance, for instance. There were a number of others that we've routinely done. If you go back a few years we spent a half-hour at each meeting saying the same thing over and over again regarding translation. We don't have those anymore. They may come back one day, but at this point it isn't.

If you see ones that you personally think are not effective uses of our time, call us out on it. Don't wait until after the fact, and if Leon should take on the responsibility of doing the agenda for the next meeting - and we haven't talked about it - I'm sure he'd appreciate an assistant. Two things: number one, responding to Tijani. You said 60-minute meetings should be the limit.   I don't believe ALAC can cover its work in 60 minutes in a month. Does that mean you prefer to have two separate meetings scheduled for an hour each? Can I take a straw poll? Who would prefer two one-hour meetings?

That means perhaps a meeting every two weeks, or a meeting on two consecutive days or something, instead of the two-hour meeting. Who prefers to stay with the two-hour meeting? I'm afraid you lose. The other thing that I'm rather surprised has not come up is mailing lists. As a group we do, with a very few exceptions, a horrible job of addressing issues and discussing things and presenting cases on mailing lists. Every once in a while a subject comes up that there are 30 or 40 emails on a policy subject.   Sometimes it's a process subject; the discussion on should we have open or closed votes for ALS votes was one of the few

that we actually had a substantive discussion on, and pretty well came to closure.

It was interesting in that some people posted a position, and based on what other people said they changed their position, which is exactly what we should be doing to move to some level of compromise, but overall we use our mailing lists pathetically. Those of you who are on any either the CWG or CCWG lists are inundated with mail. Perhaps a bit too much, but there is discussion going on. We don't do that very much and we really need to learn to do it. We can't wait for a face-to-face meeting, when we're so time-constrained, to have every discussion.

There just isn't enough of that. I'm going to encourage people - and I'll do a better job - to raise issues on the mailing list. It doesn't have to be restricted to me. Just a thought on that. Anyone from Australia want to talk? Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: This is why I really wanted the website to be so overhauled. If we actually had a really good place where we could go to one place on the website - policy - and then the links to it or the discussions are - when we actually have a debate about issues and we can use Confluence, we can read each others' comments, comment on them, and we know instead of having a mass of emails and somewhere in there there's a discussion, the discussions are all in one place, easy to read, easy to follow, it's now impossible to find this stuff unless you've touched the email somewhere, and then you can't find the email. There is a tool that would really help that, if it worked.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll give my answer to that. There are tools that are better or worse at some things than others, and there are people who are used to one set of tools than others. We're not going to fix everything, but the point I'm making is… I use the term mailing list, but you could change that to Wiki. We very often have very little discussion on anything. Even if it's on a Wiki, typically there are two people who are commenting back and forth. I have a personal problem with Wikis in that they are pull technologies - you have to go and look at them. I know we have a capability of doing reminders, and I personally get so many reminders I delete them because it messes up my email box.

There's no perfect solution, and I'm really not trying to prescribe what tool we use, but we must start doing more work inter-sessionally, other than the one teleconference a month on the general ALAC work. We need to have substantive discussions, whether it's through email or Wiki or whatever. Because otherwise we end up having so many things to discuss at a meeting like this that we don't give them enough time. It's not only the public meetings - the meetings with ICANN staff that take up our time. There's only a limited number.

There's an hour meeting coming up on talking about ALS criteria and effectiveness. I've raised the issue once or twice on the email and end up getting no response. I know everyone's busy. If you're like me you take the emails that require substantive thinking and put them aside and never get back to them. It's a real problem. We all have time constraints. All I'm saying is we need to get better at it if we're to use

our time effectively at the face-to-face meetings and the teleconferences. Anyone else? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'll put in a plug for the growing use of Skype and real-time messaging that exists. NARALO has a Skype chat that's used internally. It augments the mailing list and has sometimes been very effective, and it's been used within At-Large. It's not used for everything, and one size doesn't fit all. There are some things that require real-time communications in which people can chat and respond immediately, and sometimes you can get things done in a short period of time doing that, without needing… Email is clunky that way.

The good thing about email is it can be archived. Skype chats aren't easily archived, even though some of the alternatives like Google Chat can. But the fact is one size doesn't fit all. There are some times, especially when you're working with long documents and people have long things to say, that email works. Sometimes, when you want to have the online version of a face-to-face conversation, but people can join and leave as they wish, when they're awake, sometimes some of these real-time chat tools have been very effective - at least in my experience. They don't work for everything, but one size isn't going to fit every issue, every problem we have.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think there are lots of tools and we need to try them. Personally, if you look at a Skype chat, if you haven't been around for six hours the chat has gone on, it's wandered off in various social topics, which are not

ICANN | 52
Singapore

necessarily relevant, and I find it very, very hard to scroll through it and to get the substance out of it. So it's fine for people who are there at the time. I'm not sure it's a good way to involve the community in general. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: In NARALO we do use the mailing list if we want to do a quick discussion or get a quick approval among members on a particular issue and the meeting has either happened, or it's going to be too late for discussion. So we do have short, quick discussions on our email list, as Alan can attest to. We could do it more, but a lot of people think they get inundated with emails and so we try and hold them until a meeting, unless it's something urgent. If there was a Wiki page set, we could tell people on Skype chat to, "Look at the Wiki." That could also be something that we might want to look into.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, although I've said we rarely have substantive discussions on the various ALAC lists, we have been very successful on consensus calls on asking for opinions. We do tend to turn those around very quickly, and it's used very effectively. I think that's reduced the number of votes we've had and a number of other things. So we have been doing that very well on the ALAC list, as Judith said, and NARALO said. That's a part we have gotten down properly, so I thank you all for that. Any other comments, last moment? Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I have nothing further to say, at the moment!

ICANN|52
Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: Then I turn it over to the leaders of the At-Large Review Working Party.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you very much. Every five years there is a review. What we've started the process of review of, and I will say ALAC, but I'll point out it's more than that - we've started meetings. We've had a meeting with Alan and we've had a meeting with Larissa, and Ray wasn't able to be there, but from the Structural Improvements Committee - SIC - Larissa is working with Ray. They are part of the Committee. Ray is on the Board. We've had a start of a meeting and gone through these slides. We did have a presentation sometime earlier in the week. These are her slides.

I'll talk to them with the knowledge that we gained from a meeting with her and some of the insights. The basic objective of the review is part of that large objective of the Board, which is accountability and transparency. Number one: are we doing what we say we should be doing? Are we telling people about what we're doing? Are we transparent about what we're doing? Are we effective in what we do? The next statement is learn from the GNSO Review. They've just completed a review, the final report is coming out, and they're learning the lessons from that. So we had a meeting that included somebody named Jan Wolf, who was sharing lessons with Cheryl and myself. I'll share them with you.

There were some insights into some of the things that they learned, and Cheryl has been involved in the 2009 Review, so there's plenty of background information on what to do and what not to do. In terms of

ICANN | 52
Singapore

the process… Could I go about three slides up to talk about the process? Let's go back to the timelines. There's a timeline for this review, which we'll go through here. From now until June there are lots of steps that have to be taken. The Committee has to be formed. I'm leading it. Cheryl is right here. We've already talked to some people who will be leading within their own RALO.

I'd expect within each RALO there will be a group of people who will get together to assist the process. We also have to come up, interestingly, with questions to be asked. What is it we want to ask? What is it we want to know about ourselves, in terms of what will make us more efficient, more effective? The third thing that will be happening from now until June, we have to have an independent examiner that's really the responsibility of ICANN staff to select. This is done on an open basis. There's an RFP that's called.

There's a selection based on the tenders received. In an earlier meeting this week it was decided that the independent examiner who is selected will assist the team in looking at the questions; how they should be framed, how you actually illicit information from people, how you ask the questions, what questions to ask. The other input, which was interesting from Jan Wolf on the GNSO Review was to say, "We did not get all of the data that we thought we wanted." So as ALAC we need to be very clear about what data we want, but also to go more broadly, because it turned out they hadn't asked all the questions that they wound up thinking were necessary.

So one of the cautions was, "Go more broadly," but then we run into a problem of if you're asking people for information and to participate in a

survey, there are some people who'll fill out a whole survey and be really helpful, and there are some people who are really time constrained. So what the GNSO did was have two surveys - a short one for those who had no time, and a longer one for those who really have the time and want to participate. Another issue that came up with the GNSO Review was confidentiality. People don't necessarily want their names associated with comments they make.

They may inhibit what they say, and the way around that… Now, all information that's gained will go to the independent examiner - and that's one of the reasons they're independent - they're not part of ICANN, so they're not going to be influenced one way or another by who said what. But if people want to remain confidential in terms of having information that they give not attributed to them they can say so, and their comments will remain confidential after the initial identification of themselves to the independent examiner. So there are a number of things that are going to happen between now and June.

Let me back up. The scope of the Review - in 2009 the RALOs, the ALSes, they were fairly new concepts and it was decided we just couldn't look at the efficiency and effectiveness. Now we will. In talking with Larissa and her email she clarified the focus of this Review is really going to be on the two tiers that we did not look at last time. That's not to say we're not going to look at, acknowledge, and perhaps address the outcomes of the 2009 Review, because there are still some elements of issues that were identified in that review that, if you look at them, there is something completed.

There are a lot of things in that Report, which I'm sure you're all going to read, that say "completed" but some of them say "completed and ongoing", which is a way of saying those things still need to be picked up as part of the Review. But the focus is going to be on the RALOs and below that, on the ALSes. So when you're thinking about the sorts of information that we should be looking at, those are the levels that we will be looking at. That said, all of you will be involved in thinking through what it is that we should be asking in terms of the structure, the effectiveness of the structure, what the mission is - do the bylaws effect our mission? Are we carrying out our mission?

Yes, there are going to be things about metrics, and this has to be part of the conversation. So from now until June those are the sort of tasks that will be undertaken. One of the things that we decided would be really useful would be for me to talk to each RALO on one of their monthly calls, between now and June, to just explain what it's about, this particular Review, what we'd like all of you to do to ask questions, but mainly to provide feedback. So by the time we arrive at the end of June first milestone there will be an independent examiner in place, and we'll understand very well what information we're seeking.

The third component of what will happen, and is starting to happen now… Can we go to the slide with tasks in it; who does what? The Structural Improvements Committee, which is the high-level Committee, they are the ones who will actually oversight this review, but essentially they're saying, "We're watching you do this. We're not going to do it ourselves." There's a lot of tasks for the staff. You can read them. I suggest you go to the last column, because that's us: assist with

EN

outreach - that means all of you -; contribute to the assessment - that's all of you.

There will be some interviews. I don't think we'll be interviewing ourselves. I think we'll suggest the questions and there will be ways for people to be interviewed. What happened with the last GNSO Review was the independent examiner actually came to LA and spent a lot of time talking to key people and making sure the key people had been interviewed, had been talked to, and their feedback had formed part of the Final Report that's been developed. Our last task is to prepare an Implementation Plan. Now, there are timetables. We do have the GNSO Report, which is just being completed, to have a look at to see what it looks like.

Our Implementation Plan is going to look different because we're not just reviewing ALAC. We're actually more focused on five parts of ALAC that have perhaps different organizational structured, different priorities, different issues. Those will have to be taken into account, and then when you get to the ALSes you have a different set of issues again. So there are some lessons to be learnt but some lessons we're going to have to develop ourselves. Now, can I move back a little? Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm a bit confused because on Sunday we spent an hour on that and we said pretty much the same thing, so I'm wondering…

HOLLY RAICHE: A lot of people weren't here.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, that's their problem because on Sunday everybody was supposed to be here. Sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: Fair comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I interject? We're just a few minutes away from the end of the session and we want a little bit of time for some interaction, because the NomCom will be here soon.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll assume then that everybody will go through these slides by themselves and now's the time for any… I did answer questions some time in the past. Are there questions, before the NomCom gets here? Miss Langdon-Orr?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Why, thank you ma'am! As you know, Holly and I are heading up this particular… I'm not even going to call it a Task Force. I think it's an adventure. Just to pick up on an Action Item that we now need the regions to attend to: we have interacted with key and clearly capable and interested people from the ALAC to ensure we have five Members of the ALAC, one from each region, who can work as part of the Work Party to shepherd this process, right from the very beginning of the scoping and interactions from now on, quite literally.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

But because it's a focus on the regional structures and the ALSes, RALO Leaders, listen carefully. It's expected that you, as a Leader or your *regional delegate* will be an integral and essential and committed part, and if you can find us five names by the end of today - if not, this week - we will appreciate it, because that will then give us our ten-person Committee and we can start running. That's it from me.

HOLLY RAICHE: You've got your orders. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I defer to Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE: Who's that person from Canada?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan, and sorry for interrupting you, but I do have concerns. This is a very important process - we all agree. This is part of the organizational reviews that ICANN performs as part of its accountability, without such reviews. This is what really sets ICANN apart from many other organizations out there. We are an integral, component part of ICANN.   The last set of reviews - and I had just arrived; I was a Newcomer, still bright and happy, and I still had brown hair rather than white - but the last time I was quite baffled to start with, and I know there are quite a few Newcomers here who might be a bit baffled about this - please read the PowerPoint presentation.

It's important and we need this support and the involvement of everyone in At-Large, because this is how we manage to improve ourselves as well - not only improve ICANN, not only be accountability, but also improve ourselves. The number of recommendations that came out of the first At-Large Review at the time was absolutely incredible and really brought the ALAC from version one to version two, and what we're looking for here is to now bring to the next version and be even better and more effective, et cetera. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Mr Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.   Just what I think is a clarification - unless someone disagrees with me - the intended focus of this Review is At-Large below the ALAC level, but just as the intended focus of the GNSO Review was not to be a re-organization of the Council, because there were significant comments along the way that was removed from being out of scope, and as such, issues with the ALAC - if someone believes there are egregious issues or things that must be fixed - are not out of scope. That's not the intended focus.

I'll give one example: there have been a number of people around this table who say this Review, given the maturity of At-Large and ALAC, should be the opportunity to suggest a second Board Member. If that were to come out in the discussion it would not be out of scope just because it's not RALO/ALS-focused. Just a comment.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, that's why I said now is critical, because between now and June we have an opportunity to put everything on the table and say, "This is the sort of thing we want to do." Remember, the focus is below ALAC, but put it all on the table because now's the time to actually establish how wide you want the dataset. Once you start collecting the data you don't want to then discover that you've got issues you hadn't even thought about.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Holly. I now turn the session over to Stéphane, as the esteemed Chair of the NomCom.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much, Alan. As the esteemed Chair of ALAC, thanks for welcoming us. My name is Stéphane Van Gelder. I have with me, so that everyone knows who I am, I have my esteemed Co-Leadership Team Members, one of which you might know. I have Ron Andruff here, the Chair Elect, and Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who is the Associate Chair. I also have with me in the room - you'll recognize us by our red lanyards - some of the Members of the Committee. As you know, ALAC and the At-Large community is well served with five seats on the NomCom, and some of them are in here.

I see Louis, Silvia, John is also on the NomCom, but Satish, Fatimata… Full house. And Leon, who is one of our good appointments, I think. I just wanted to give you a few facts and figures about the current cycle - the idea of us meeting is to tell you where we're at, because we're still in the application period to also encourage you to help us do some

ICANN | 52
Singapore

outreach. I've got a very short presentation. Can I have the first slide put up? Perfect. Just to give you an idea of whom we're recruiting for this year, we're looking for three Members of the Board, three Members of ALAC, and those are obviously by region.

We're looking for one Member for Africa, one Member from the Asia Pac region and one Latin America, two voting Members of the GNSO Council and one Member of the ccNSO Council. I just wanted to give you an idea of the way the Board is currently divided in geo-regions, and tell you about some of the limitations that we have, as a NomCom, in our recruitment work. If you look to the right of your screen there you'll see that one of the regions is heavily over-subscribed. Asia Pacific already has five Board Members from that region. That means that we cannot, this year, select anyone from the Asia Pac region to the Board.

On the other hand, if you look to the other side of your screen, you'll see that North America, Africa, Latin America, they are under-subscribed, and Europe still has one seat open. On those regions, if you know of anyone that might be interested for Board work, please do help us. They can still get in, no problem. Next slide please. This is our timeline. You've seen this before, I'm sure. Most of you are now familiar with the NomCom process. You know that we're currently in the application phase of our work, so up until mid-March people can apply and be considered for one of the positions that I outlined earlier on. Then we'll go into the assessment phase, which will end in the Buenos Aires Meeting week, where we'll do our deliberations and decide who our 2015 slate is.

Just to give you a snapshot of where we are today - important clarification: what you're looking at here is the number of people that have applied for an application form. So they've made an application request. They still have some work to do to complete their application, so it doesn't necessarily mean that they'll all be in the running, but so far you can see that we have a majority of people that have named the Board as their first choice - 43. We've got 11 people that have named GNSO as their first choice, 15 people that have named ALAC as their first choice, and eight people that have named the ccNSO as their first choice.

Let me just explain the choices. People can apply and say, "I'm mostly interested in the Board, but you can also consider me for other positions." If they do that, so if they say, "I want to be considered for the Board but I'm also prepared to be considered for ALAC," then we can do so. If they don't they just run for the Board and we think they might be good ALAC candidates, we can't put them in that position. So it's important, if you're going out there explaining to people - your contacts, your networks - that they should apply, please do help them understand that part of your process; that it's always good to apply for more than one position if you think that's a good fit for you.

I'll just end with on the next slide you've got some links, and perhaps just turn it over to Cheryl. I'm sure she'll have something to say, and Ron maybe. We'll answer any of your questions. Ron?

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you very much Chair. Thank you everyone for giving us the chance to go through all of this. As our Chair explained we have a

number of you that are familiar faces - having worked with you on the NomCom in the past or continuing - so you're one of the groups that really has a very good understanding of what we're doing. As Stéphane pointed out, in terms of Board, Asia Pac is complete. That's not to say you won't have contacts and people in Asia Pac who are Board quality people that could very well be invited to join and to apply for GNSO, ALAC, ccNSO and so forth.

As an example, Dan Reid, who's currently on GNSO Council was certainly Board quality, and Dan now serving in the GNSO Council enables him to get a very clear understanding of this animal called ICANN - how we work, what we're trying to achieve, where the risks are for the institution and so forth. That will enable him that if he ever applies for the Board at a future time, because the dynamics change year-by-year, as many of you know, who've served.

So that will enable him, if he were to choose to be a candidate, to actually step in and serve three strong years, as opposed to one year to learn, second year to get up to speed and by the third year, when their term is coming to a completion, when they're really effective. So think about that in terms of what we're trying to do - so not just for ALAC, but also ccNSO, GNSO, if you saw that slide Stéphane put up you'll see we only have about eight candidates right now for ccNSO and 11 for the other. Those are low numbers, and we'd really like to see in this last month, when the push comes, to see if we can get more candidates in so that the Members of the Committee really have a great pool in each category to work with.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

So we really look to the community for you to think about your Rolodexes and the people you might know, that would really bring something to the party. Because we're going to be going through these next three years with a lot of Board changes, Fadi Chéhade's contract comes to an end in 2017, so there's a lot of what I'll call seismic changes that could occur to the institution. So we really need to find Leaders and bring that new blood into the organization. I just wanted to underscore what our Chair has said. Please give some thought to that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. The spiel that we'd normally give in the other rooms is the success story of sending quality people to the ALAC, and having you, the ALAC, send them onto the Board. I don't need to do that pitch here. The pitch I want to do here is because we need people who are going to be committed, effective, and pretty well hit the ground running in the seats we're providing you, but also in the seats that we're going to be providing into the Board, into the GNSO and into the ccNSO, I think it would be very valuable for you to think of what core characteristics and criteria, perhaps those listed on our Wiki page, when you're reaching out…

Obviously, this network here, along with the constituencies and the GNSO, are perfect fodder for the type of people who want to come in and get to be a leader and a thought leader within ICANN. But if you've got people that are interested in policy then please put their names forward. I think we do need to up the respectability and desirability of the non-Board seats, and it's you in your coffee breaks and your elevator

ICANN | 52
Singapore

chats and in the meetings you have outside ICANN who can help to instigate that change.

But we need people who are, as you know, because you've experienced people appointed by prior NomComs who have not performed, we need people who can commit to perform. At that point I just wanted to take a moment and say: for example, in addition to the huge amount of work you all know you all do, with Leon taking the leadership role in the CCWG, that is an additional - just on that topic alone - minimum eight hours of commitment. I'm glad he's not billing us, because his law firm… He'd be making some money. That's the level of commitment. Step up and shine.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thanks very much Cheryl. If there are any questions from any of you, we'll try and answer them. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can we go back in your presentation down to the current breakdown of the Board please? Thank you. We have 15 people at the moment on the Board. What the graphic doesn't show is who is leaving or who might be leaving, what seats are currently under discussion. You might wish to have this graphic without the three members that need to be renewed, because if it was all three Asia Pac Members, for example, then you might wish to have someone from Asia Pac. At the moment that doesn't help much, thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: We do have that, and that's an excellent opportunity for me to highlight the important and excellent quality work that the NomCom has undertaken now for a few years, ever since Yrjo's leadership, and obviously he's a well-known quantity here as well. But we really have worked very hard - Yrjo, Cheryl and myself, and I'm sure Ron will be taking up that mantle as well - to increase the level of information the NomCom is providing. These kinds of infographics will go to the website. We're trying to provide more information to people on the website.

We're doing regular video interviews to tell people and the community and outside the community where we're at.   We're providing information. For example, to your question, we have some people this year that are up for renewal, and as you know the NomCom selects eight Members of the Board and we rotate, so those are staggered terms and every year we don't always fill three seats. But we're working, and Cheryl's been heavily involved in that as well, in helping me and ICANN staff to build up these infographics so that that information is there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Stéphane. I hope I haven't interrupted you. The question is what seats are under consideration at the moment, please?

RON ANDRUFF: This year, the seats that are open for renewal will be Wolfgang Kleinwachter, Gonzalo Nevarro, and George Sadowsky. I should also point out that you can't just take those individuals, you'd also have to look at the mix - ccNSO Mike Silber's term, his seat would be perhaps renewed or gone, and Ray Plzac, ASO.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Mile Silber's will be renewed. It's been confirmed.

RON ANDRUFF: Okay, so that's the point. These are the other dynamics, just so you're aware.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Plus the dynamics that Ron mentioned earlier on, in terms of leadership changes as well. So when we do our work, and after the close of the application period we've got this slate to look at, we also, as leadership, tell the NomCom to look at those dynamics and look further ahead. Because it's not only about the choices we're making this year. It's also about how that will sit with, for example, a hypothetical CEO change in 2017.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. From what I know, indeed, Mike Silber has been renewed by the ccNSO. Ray Plzak has announced that he will not be seeking re-election, and therefore that would take away one more candidate from North America. Gonzalo Navarro's seat being under consideration, I would guess the NomCom would have to, absolutely, reappoint someone from Latin America and Caribbean, in any way. I'm not sure if there is any… Is the Board allowed not to have someone from one of the regions of the world? I wasn't quite sure whether that was a hard-coded thing. Finally, with the Asia Pacific and Australasia part, that

would mean it's pretty much a waste of time to look for anyone from that part of the world.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just for the record, there's a maximum number, there's a minimum number of one. The ACs and SOs have to name their replacement prior to the NomCom doing their selection. So whether Ray leaving takes one off of North America depends on whether he's replaced by a North American. That's set before the NomCom has to make their decision, so we don't have to worry about that in this group.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: The snapshot you're looking at now is a snapshot of now, and that's the only information we can work on now. But that may change in the future. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I'm glad Olivier raised those points, because I was also wondering which dynamics, and which people we needed to recruit in what area. If you could provide that, or a way that we could see what it is you were looking for… Are you also looking at gender diversity as well as geographic diversity?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: More than just gender diversity, but yes, all diversity: geographic, language, cultural - but regardless of that, it is a meritocracy that wins out.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right, I was just curious about that. Also, since I'm newer here, a question I have is: so there are Board seats from ALAC and then you also… Is the point that you were talking about the ccNSO, is that Liaisons to that?

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: When you say Board seats from ALAC… What we're discussing is the parts of the Board that are selected by the NomCom. There are other paths into the Board, but we're not talking about them. To your question on ccNSO and GNSO Council, they are not Liaisons, they are Council Members. There may be some voting issues - for example on the GNSO Council there are three NCA NomCom appointees and only two of them vote, but because the terms are staggered we don't always elect the same people. But we decide if they go into a voting position or not. Does that help?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: There's a follow up. This is quick.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, we're way over time already. We'd be glad to do a private tutorial afterwards to get you up to speed on that.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: The Chair having spoken…

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: I do have a personal intervention. Thank you for pointing out how important it is for us to provide you with the information on what we're expecting from ALAC Members. I'd suggest it's also important for you to actually post it on the web so other people can see it. Thank you.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: It is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not at this very moment.

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: We're working on it, as you know, Alan, but it is to be on the website, or at least what we do is we put the skillsets from the organizations that send us skillsets and ALAC's always been very good at sending us skillsets, so that's being worked on. We're just updating the data, but it's on, or soon to be on, the website. Thank you very much. If there are no further questions thank you for your time. Always a pleasure. There is another question, but we're going to ask Olivier to ask the question in French.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. I just wanted to say bravo to the people from the NomCom. They're coming from the ALAC community. You are a Member of a RALO.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

STÉPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you very much to [unclear 02:09:25] of that. I should have said it earlier, maybe, but it's my pleasure to have been through that adventure with the creation of a group representing users in Europe. Thank you very much Olivier for reminding me of that.   This is very good. Thank you all very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: My alter ego says that I have to announce that the session is over, and of course thank the interpreters and staff for helping us do this.   The Accessibility Working Group will reconvene here in six minutes. APRALO Meeting at 1:30 pm and we reconvene at 2:30 pm. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]