
TERRI AGNEW: We'll go ahead and begin with our roll call. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the NARALO Monthly Teleconference on Monday, 13th of April 2015 at 19:00 UTC. On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Allan Skuce, Evan Leibovitch, Garth Graham, Glen McKnight, Gordon Chillcott, Tom Lowenhaupt, Joly MacFie, Judith Hellerstein, Leah Symekher, Ron Sherwood and Seth Reiss. I show apologies from Avri Doria. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang and myself Terri Agnew.

Also on the call today is Garth Bruen. Sorry about that, Garth. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you, Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much, everybody. Quickly, the Agenda for today, after roll call, we're going to have some opening comments from myself, and Evan, and then a discussion with Alan's help about ALAC's position. We'll talk about policy development items; community updates from our Working Groups, and then we're going to talk about the elections, appointments, et cetera. Firstly, this is Garth Bruen. Thank you for having me back as Chair. I really appreciate everybody's support whilst I was off.

My wife has finished with her procedures and her treatment and she's doing very well, so gradually things are returning back to normal. It was an extremely hectic period for our whole family, and I really appreciate

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.

everybody's support, and I really appreciate the work that especially Glenn, Evan and Judith, and everybody else really did, and everybody put their shoulders into it to keep everything going. It didn't go unnoticed, or unappreciated people.

Internet users are lucky to have us all watching out for them. We're a great group of people and there just needs to be more of us, but in reference to that - and I did send out an email about this a little while ago - I will not be seeking the Chair again this year. The first reason is definitely due to my absence. I don't think it's fair to other people to come back from an extended absence and expect to continue as the Chair. That's definitely not reasonable. I think the people who took up the work while I was gone deserve their shot, absolutely, and I think they deserve the recognition and the chance to lead as well.

In general, I had never planned on staying the Chair for very long. One of my concerns is that the leadership positions will get stale. We need to renew them, we need to bring new people in with new ideas, so in accordance with that I'm not going to be seeking Chair again. In addition to that, I also want to put more focus into my original project, which had brought me to NARALO and At-Large in the first place. After my father passed away a lot of this work has fallen exclusively to me, so I need to return to that and reorganize and get my focus back together.

I also have a big idea, which I'm not going to discuss specifically. A big idea for At-Large is something I'm going to be developing over the summer, and I can talk to people about it in Buenos Aires. That's something that's going to need more of my attention. Finally - I actually have many reasons for not seeking the Chair - finally, I kept my ear to

the ground and I was doing research, even though I wasn't fully participating - and unfortunately some of the things I've learnt about ICANN's operations in the meantime have given me a guilty conscience about accepting travel funding to go to meetings.

This is not intended to criticize anybody or defame anybody who is an officer in At-Large. This is a great program, it's very important, many people would not be able to participate without the travel funding. I'm saying I, personally, have a conscience issue about this now that I'd be happy to discuss with anybody offline later. With all that said, I have been extremely proud to be the Chair for this time period, and I think some of the things we've done have been amazing. Our focus on recruitment, on outreach to certain communities, especially the Native American community and the disabled communities, I think it's been such important work and I'm really proud of everybody's involvement in that.

I think we can do great things when we put our heads to it. With that being said, I see Evan is maybe on the call. His microphone has a red line through it. Are you able to speak, and do you want to speak, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Before I start, Garth, am I hearing you right that you're not interested in any elected position? When I first heard you were not interested in continuing as Chair I immediately thought of proposing you for ALAC. Am I hearing you that you're not interested in that either, going forward?

GARTH BRUEN: Thanks Evan. Not necessarily. I think that the work we're doing is so important, I'm just saying that I'm very reluctant. I am interested in doing ALAC work because I think what ALAC does is critical to the kinds of things I'm concerned about. The situations that really bother me, that I think need to be fixed, probably can only be done in ALAC. I'm just saying I'm having trouble with this, but I'm not going to let me stop me in the short term. Hopefully that answers the question.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes, it does. Well, I guess that's a tough act to follow, but as I'm in a similar situation in saying that not only am I not running for anything for the 2016 year, I'm actually having to leave my existing positions within ICANN and within NARALO, pretty well effective immediately. I've accepted a job with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. I start a position in Geneva, the end of the month, that essentially involves supervising a network of about 70 telecenters and community access points within refugee camps. It's a phenomenal job.

It's something that, for somebody like me, you get paid to do something you love, and nobody can ask for me. But it is going to suck up almost all my time, not to mention the fact that it literally puts me in a different region. I'm essentially announcing my resignation from my current elected role of Secretariat, and also indicating that I will not be running for anything in the next election.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, Evan, this is amazing. We're all so proud of you. This is such important work, and we're losing you, but a lot of people are getting

you, and it's an amazing thing. As far as our next topic goes, just so everybody's clear about this, Evan, who's our current Secretary, is not going to seek the Secretary position again and is leaving almost immediately for a new job. Myself, I'm not seeking Chair again this year. Glenn has expressed an interest in running for Chair and leaving his ALAC post. Eduardo is term-limited in his ALAC position.

Alan Greenberg, who's the current ALAC Chair, has an ALAC position due to a NomCom appointment, and they're extremely tenuous. I think in order to enhance - especially since Alan is from our region - having the ALAC Chair from your region is really good, it's good for the region. We have discussed the idea of having Alan step into one of these other ALAC positions. We've got a number of positions opening up, and we've already started the nomination process.

In terms of the way that ALAC is structured, I know it can be very complicated, and where all the positions come from can be a complicated thing, so I want to invite Alan to speak about this, if he's able to.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm able to speak, but I'm not quite sure what you want me to speak on.

GARTH BRUEN: We're in this funny situation where we want to move some positions around. There have been some proposals.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I can try. If you go back and read Evan's farewell notice - by the way, before I start, I want to say I've worked with Evan now for nigh-on eight years, and those of us who know us, we often disagree violently on things, and we have, at the same time, worked together unbelievably. I for one am going to miss him. He's a hard act to follow. Garth, if you plan to be on the ALAC, you're going to have big shoes to fill! We're having a fair amount of turnover this time, and at the same time I think there's an overall belief that we have to do it somewhat intelligently.

You'll see I've nominated Eduardo for the NomCom because if you look at the NomCom positions that are filled by other people, most ACs and SOs fill them with their [unclear 00:12:26], to a large extent - people who know ICANN inside out and know the politics and the people, and have lots and lots of contacts. NARALO, for various historical reasons, has tended to fill those with new people who have expressed an interest but not a lot of knowledge. Given that position, those people - and Glenn is one of them - have served us remarkably well.

But I'm suggesting at this point we start looking at the model used by other people and put someone in who can actually yield us a fair amount of power, and do it from a perspective of years of experience within ICANN, and select the next leaders, in particular the Board Members, who are critical to the success of the organization. Or, if you look at some of the things in the past, critical to the failures. That's part of it. What Evan proposed with regard to my seat - and I'm in a bit of an awkward position trying to describe this - I am currently a NomCom appointed.

The chances of being named again are not particularly large. Just due to the way the world has unfolded, I am currently in the first year of a Chair position. Typically our Chairs, in the last number of years, have been there for three or four years and then stayed on for one year as a Vice Chair, essentially mentoring the incoming Chair and to try to make the transition a little easier. I'll speak from personal experience, it's not an easy transition. There's a reasonable chance as a NomCom appointee that I'll simply cease to exist in a year, a year and a half from now, and not be able to either continue being Chair or being able to act as a support person for the incoming Chair.

The suggestion was that if I take an ALAC position instead of the NomCom there's a chance that, should I be viewed as doing a good job by the NARALO, I could be put back in for another term, if that seems to be optimal for the ALAC itself. That's where it stood. Glenn, to be able to facilitate this, stood down from his position, and he perhaps can speak for a minute or two on why he thought that was a good thing. That's where we sit at the moment.

GARTH BRUEN:

Glenn, are you able to speak on that?

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

I sure can. I thought really hard about this, because I do have a two-year period. I've looked at your departure Garth, and Evan's departure, it's really, really big shoes to fill, and I thought we needed someone who had organizational history to contribute. I think many of the concepts you pointed out earlier on, whether it's disabled community, first

nations, or some of the groups in US territories to embrace, engaging more and more of our members, there's so much more to do.

I felt like maybe the position was calling for me to take it on. I decided to take this move. It was a big decision, and I consulted with Evan a lot about it when I heard about his departure, and it took a little while to think about it, but I think it's the right decision.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you Glenn. For those of you who don't know Glenn - and I don't see how that can be possible, because the guy is everywhere, all the time - in terms of having somebody as a Chair, it's a fantastic idea. He's just a really great support, really good at outreach, and just being upfront and talking to people. But as far as the rest of the region goes, anybody who is interested in one of these leadership positions should say so and ask about it. We're here, and I'm talking about this because we want new faces, we want new ideas. That was one of the reasons why we started this recruitment campaign two years ago; because we wanted new faces and new ideas.

But we also need people who understand the ropes and really know the difficulties in terms of navigating the ICANN waters. It's really, really hard. There's just so much going on, and you need as many veterans as you can get. Okay, a couple of structural things for staff. One of them was that change from ISOC San Francisco, that I think you're handling already, I put Leah as the new main contact point for ISOC San Francisco.

The other one I just forwarded you is also a change to a contact from VIBUG, the Visually Impaired and Blind User Group, that meet at MIT.

Bob Resnick is stepping down. It's not Sunish Gupta, and I think Sunish has already sent a couple of items out to the NARALO list, and if we could update their information that would be great too.

Alan also mentioned that the NomCom position is going to the NomCom representative from NARALO, I believe. Louie is the current, and he's been there for two years, and he's term-limited. Do we have to submit someone else to that?

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, the NomCom positions are not selected by the RALOs. There must be one from each region. It's selected by the ALAC, and the RALO makes typically a single recommendation, and in most cases it's accepted by the ALAC. We're obliged to make a recommendation to the ALAC on who we believe is the person to be the delegate from North America on the NomCom. I've done one nomination at this point, although it's still an open race.

GARTH BRUEN:

Great, thank you. Just so everyone's clear, we do have all of these leadership and liaison positions that are now flying through the air, so keep yourself updated. Alan, were you done with your discussion about the previous topic?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think so, unless there are any questions.

GARTH BRUEN:

Okay. This is an opportunity - and on the NARALO mailing list as well - to bring up these issues. There's already been a few comments questioning some of these proposals that have been made. I'd suggest anyone considering running or nominating anybody for one of these positions, go ahead. Or if somebody has a counter-proposal, put that forward as well. Back to the Agenda - ALAC policy development activities. Statements approved by ALAC, potential change to Registrar Accreditation Insurance Agreement - that was adopted. Anybody want to comment on that?

I'm assuming that this has to do with the amount of insurance that the registrar is required to have for their corporation. Okay. We have the IDN TLD LGR procedure implementation, maximal starting repertoire version two. Does anybody know what that has... IDNs are internationalized domain names for the top level domains... Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I put my hand up on the insurance. The issue on insurance is the RAA calls for a very large amount of insurance, in USD, to essentially protect registrants should something happen to the registrar - should they go belly-up or something like that. That amount in developing countries is almost unimaginable, so the question was can the RAA be structured such that this amount was variable depending on the specific circumstances? For a long time, ICANN said no. At-Large was one of the larger people pushing for this, because it essentially says unless you're backed by someone in the north and the west, it's almost impossible to set up a registrar in many countries.

So we're quite pleased that ICANN is looking at this. It's not a done deal. We still have to do something that's viable, and moreover we need to make sure that the registrants will register domains with these registrars are protected, should there be a problem. So it's not an easy road to navigate, but the fact that ICANN is looking at, and soliciting comments, we think - those of us who've worked in developing countries - that this is quite marvelous.

GARTH BRUEN:

I would tend to agree. I do think that a company failing with that level of responsibility, it's something we've had to deal with in terms of a registrar having problems like that. The insurance portion is very important, but how that insurance is dealt with, it needs to be reasonable, and it has to be reasonable to the global marketplace.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's right, and we're recommending - and ICANN is already looking at things like perhaps the amount of insurance is proportional to the number of registrations you had. It makes a certain amount of sense. There are options, and they're looking at it from both a pragmatic point of view, and one that's saying at the same time, "We don't want companies registering in Kenya just to get benefit of lower costs." It's one of these difficult things.

GARTH BRUEN: Right. Maybe this is a silly question, but did the contract language specifying that it was USD, did that limit people to buying US-based insurance?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember the words. Certainly the amount is quoted in USD, so even if the insurance were taken out in a local currency, it would be a huge amount.

GARTH BRUEN: What was it, like \$500,000 or something?

ALAN GREENBERG: Something like that.

GARTH BRUEN: All right. Very interesting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Given that this is a fragile business and companies do fail, it can be expensive.

GARTH BRUEN: It's a serious issue. It's a serious concern. Okay, if nobody has any comments about IDN TLDs, next we have the GNSO Policy Implementation Working Group Final Recommendations Report. Was anybody on that Working Group and wishes to comment on it?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm on it. It's a relatively revolutionary change. It was driven by a lot of issues over the last several years on the new gTLD process where decisions were made during the "implementation", which many but not all people felt were real policy decisions - that is that they had significant impact on the people, on stakeholders, and therefore should not have been made without a true bottom-up development process. This group was put together to look at that issue. The recommendations coming out of it essentially say if it looks like policy and smells like policy, then it is policy and must go to a multistakeholder process to resolve.

That's all well and fine, except certainly from an ALAC perspective we see two potential problems. Number one, things may get referred back to policy processes so often that these things will never end, and progress is really important. The second one is we really fear that the GNSO, as the gTLD policy making organization, may not be capable of making decisions where the public interest is at odds with the interest of the contracted parties - registrars and registries. That, I think, Garth will relate to on his discussions on compliance, but it comes up in a number of other places also, and the ICANN Board - everyone agrees - should not be making policy decisions on their own.

But the ICANN Board does have the ability and a fiduciary requirement to look at the public interest on decisions, and it's not clear the GNSO is under the same mandate. We've raised those two issues, saying we support the concept of what the group is doing, but we've raised those two issues as warning flags, saying we're really concerned. It's one of these things that's good work, but with a "but".

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks. I'll be very brief. I wanted to totally back up what Alan said, but also remind everybody - including ICANN itself, if you take a look at the way they're structured - the GAC and the ALAC, we don't report to the GNSO. Our duty is to report directly to the Board. That is the way that At-Large is designed to channel things. The design of this is meant to be so that the Board, having been advised by governments and end users, are able to take the policy recommendations of the GNSO and apply the public interest to them.

The way ICANN is designed, this is supposed to happen at the Board level. We've made a lot of strides in doing things like CCWGs, but the main point behind that is to bring the process interest involved at the beginning of process, rather than to come in and have us be totally reactive. But the way the design of ICANN is right now, our and the GAC's only channel is technically via the Board.

I'm really happy I'm in some of these CCWGs and it's affected something of a cultural shift, but right now, technically that's still our only way in - for the Board to take what the GNSO does and say, "We've heard this from the GAC, we've heard this from the ALAC, we have to temper what the industry has told us to do," and right now, that's the way ICANN is designed, like it or not. Thanks.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you very much. This is very important. Statements in process being drafted in comment or vote. The draft report and rights protections mechanism review. I'm assuming these are rights for domain owners. Leon Sanchez is drafting this statement. Close is May 1st. Is anybody working on this, aware of it, wants to comment on it? No. Okay. Statements that need to be stalled - none. That's a terrible category. Public comment requests to which ALAC decided not to submit statements: the release of country and territory names within the [unclear 00:29:52], .hamburg and .berlin TLDs. Does anybody want to comment on this, lack of a comment?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will. There have been a number of these comments, essentially in the new gTLD process. New gTLDs are not allowed to use either two-character country codes or full country names, and a number of other geographic words, as second-level domains, but they can ask for permission to do it. There have been a large number of those asking for it. The geographic and territory names are both... brand TLDs and geographic TLDs are allowed to ask for permissions. The ALAC has taken a position consistently saying, "We see country names and country codes being used in second-level in all the existing domains.

No one seems to be confused by any of it, so we have no objection and we actively support it." As you'd expect, some countries support that position and some countries say, "Our territory names are sacred and we object to people using them," so there's a process by which TLDs can ask for permission, country-by-country, and some of them are going through this. But we've taken a position strongly that we don't believe

users get confused by seeing a country code. Canada.com is a newspaper chain here, and no one thinks it's the government.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. I might quibble with that, but I don't have any research handy about that type of confusion. But I'm sure that it does exist among consumers, but I'm not going to quibble it right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sure it is, and ALAC positions are not necessarily unanimous. Everything is subject to reconsideration as well, of course.

GARTH BRUEN: Yes, well, within 15 days anyway!

ALAN GREENBERG: No-no, we can always change our minds.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. I was thinking about Board reconsiderations. Anyway, new public comment requests requiring decision: the Internationalized Registration Data EWG Draft Final Report. I imagine this refers to the ability to register domains using other character sets?

ALAN GREENBERG: To keep the information in other character sets and implicitly to registering other character sets, yes.

GARTH BRUEN: ICANN Draft Operating Plan and Budget. Any issues, concerns there from anybody? Any looming issues about the budget?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is a statement being drafted by Tijani Ben Jema from Tunisia. In generally, ICANN is interacting with the community an immense amount in preparing the budget, so I think we have far fewer problems than we have had in the past. There are a still a number of issues that we're not 100 per cent happy with though.

GARTH BRUEN: Right. Anything in particular?

ALAN GREENBERG: To be honest, I don't remember. I've been focusing so much on the IANA transition and accountability that I've let some of these take a back seat right now.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Proposed implementation of the GNSO PDP recommendation on inter-registrar transfer policy. This would be a change to the way that domain transfers between different registrars would take place?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. This one I don't even remember. Was this C or D?

GARTH BRUEN: Part C.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I remember correctly, Part C has to do with procedures by which domain hijacking and things can be rectified. I think that means making available hotlines and things like that. I may be confusing which of the PDPs is. I think that's C. My recollection was that's a good piece of work with a lot of cooperation among all parties, and we've made a number of comments along the way, but they're relatively minor comments and I don't think there's any reason why we'd want the Board not to go ahead with this.

GARTH BRUEN: All right. Before I close these Items, does anyone have any comments or concerns about any of the policy activities we just went over? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I wanted to add something to the list that isn't on there, and that's because it isn't an official public comment policy, but I wanted to draw attention to it because to me it's one of the most important things At-Large is doing, and Glenn and myself are involved in it. That's has to do with issues regarding highly sensitive TLDs. There's a very high-level discussion going on between Members of At-Large, Members of the contracted community and Members of the GAC and Senior Members of ICANN staff, dealing with the fact that there are a number of strings that have been identified by the GAC and by us as being highly sensitive.

This is everything basically in the fields of finance, gaming and health. You have top-level domains such as .casino, .doctor, .insurance, and a number of those, Glenn is correct in mentioning [.tax 00:36:07] has been a very bad publicity hit, but we're talking about things like .doctor where we have a potential for massive abuse, even far more than we might be seeing in some of the other TLDs. As it stands right now, the registries proposed for .doctor, for instance, has proposed not really an acceptable amount of protection.

The ICANN Board is siding with the GAC and us in saying this needs to be registered, legally recognized doctors. The registry is asking for a reconsideration request, but there's a whole bunch of others like this - .lotto, .dentist, .hospital. There's a number of them. Glenn, myself and some others within At-Large have been heavily involved in this process. It does not see the light of day that much because they're not public meetings, they're not open meetings, but right now - and personally I think it's one of the most important things At-Large is doing right now in trying to protect the public interest. Thanks.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you very much. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I wanted to comment not so much on the specifics, as Evan did, but the overall concept. This came out of the ALAC making a statement that the Board should freeze a whole bunch of these sensitive TLDs and advice to the Board - something we don't often do - that we did in LA. Uncharacteristically and for the first time, instead of saying simply "no",

which was their inclination for a number of quite valid reasons, they said, “Let’s talk about it.” We’ve now had three meetings of a number of people who’ve been involved in this, and people from the Board Sub Committee involved. Two of the meetings have now included people from other parts of the organization, including the GAC.

Whether we succeed or not on this particular issue is almost unimportant compared to the fact that we seem to have established a process by which we don’t just toss pieces of paper and answers over brick walls, but we think that perhaps talking and discussing issues might allow us to come to a better end conclusion. That’s such a radical change in how both the Board approach things, and to be honest, how we approach things, because we didn’t think that was even a possibility until very recently - that it bodes very well for the next problem that comes up, and perhaps we’ll address on a more timely manner. Thank you.

GARTH BRUEN: So the cocktail hours with the Board didn’t work too well?

ALAN GREENBERG: Cocktail hours are really nice for having cocktails and having social conversations. They rarely get down to nitty-gritty things.

GARTH BRUEN: Oh boy! Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't drink all that much, so...

GARTH BRUEN: No. Community updates, going right back to ALAC, Glenn, Eduardo and Alan, maybe in that order. Glenn, first, any ALAC business you wish to discuss?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No. Due to limitation of time, Garth, there's really not enough an update on it.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Do you have any really quick important think you might want to let people know about?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: No, not at this time.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. I believe Eduardo is not on the call. He sent his apologies. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we've just discussed some of the more interesting stuff. Other than that, IANA and accountability seem to have all of our focus.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. What are some of the major issues in problems with the accountability in the transition discussion?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the transition first, for the longest time, basically the CWG was proposing a plan that the ALAC objected to very strenuously, and we believed it wasn't implementable and would cause all sorts of problems, and that plan is essentially now on the back burner. It's not what we're focusing on, at least part of which is because we got legal advice at the ALAC, suspected that part of what was proposed was not legally possible. And we're now pretty well focusing on addressing the details of the implementation. The call I have to go back to is talking with our lawyers. The CWG contracted with a very impressive set of lawyers.

GARTH BRUEN: When you say it might not be legal, legal where? In the US?

ALAN GREENBERG: No-no. It may not be possible to do something and defend it. As an example, several of the possible models looked at involved trusts. In our environment in North America that would work just fine. Trusts are not accepted as legal entities in many jurisdictions, and therefore in those jurisdictions it would essentially not exist as a corporate entity, and that was very problematic. As such, we're off the board for that kind of reason. There were other issues. As an example one of the things suggested is IANA should become a wholly-owned subsidiary of ICANN.

Well, it turns out in most jurisdictions you cannot have a not-for-profit having a not-for-profit subsidiary, since not-for-profits are typically not owned, you cannot own a not-for-profit. So it was a nice concept but it won't work, and there are ways around it. We're looking at that. So there are a lot of issues. We're bringing good lawyers into it who can tell you what's possible and what isn't possible, or you tell them what you're trying to achieve and they'll come up with a way of doing it. It's really effective.

GARTH BRUEN: This is a really ridiculous question - who's paying for the lawyers?

ALAN GREENBERG: ICANN is paying for the lawyers.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. That's interesting. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Large pot of money, but the lawyers were selected by the volunteer group and essentially the customer is CWG or the CCWG, and that's been made very clear. So we're starting to come to closure on a methodology of handing an IANA transition that we think could work, we think the NTIA will accept, and how there's still an awful lot of work to get the details into it. On the accountability essentially we're trying to make sure that as good as any Board might be, the community must be able to set the rules.

We're putting in place a number of things, which include things like community being able to essentially veto budgets, perhaps veto other things, put in bylaws that the Board cannot change on their own volition - they need community approval for -, ejecting the whole Board, and likely ejecting individual Members of the Board if we feel they're not doing what the community believes they should be doing. Of course, those kinds of threats are not necessarily going to be exercised, but knowing the threat is there changes behavior.

It's looking good. There's a huge amount of work to be done, but we're in a stage where on both of these things where many of us would not have predicted ICANN would ever get to. So the world is changing, at least in small ways.

GARTH BRUEN: Or at least they're just trying to be nice so that they can get their way.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I don't think... Well, the US Department of Commerce NTIA has made it clear they're not going to do a transition unless ICANN can be shown to be accountable to the community, so these things are linked.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. That's good to know. All right, even though Eduardo is not on the call he did send me some information that refers to the next Item. He wants to update the community about the newsletter initiative. He's looking for snippets of information from individual ALSes. He wants to build this information pipeline. I think it's a really good idea, but this is

like one of many things we work on - it's just difficult to do, everybody's pushed to the limits of their capacity in work. Does anybody else have any comments about the newsletter idea? Glenn typed something: "Inspired by the Technology Taskforce newsletter produced and distributed in Singapore." I genuinely think it's a good idea. Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you Garth. Eduardo and I chatted about this. He would like it to be no longer than two pages and be produced on a monthly basis, with, again, as you mentioned, snippets of information about what the ALSes are doing. We are going to work together, Eduardo and I, with our Communications Department to come up with a template, so it will be easier for him to produce this, and it will likely be produced on a HTML basis.

GARTH BRUEN:

Wonderful. The CROPP, Evan, Glenn, Judith and staff, any comments?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

I just wanted to say I completed my CROPP trip to SXSW, but it was a very successful. I met a lot of people who hadn't know about At-Large and what we are doing, and what our goals on advocacy are. Hopefully we'll be able to get some new volunteers or just increase the outreach, and now it's about what our At-Large does.

GARTH BRUEN: Wonderful. That's why we do it. That's great. How was the meeting in general, having never been to a SXSW meeting?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: It was very interesting. It was my first one. It was a bit overwhelming. I think there were a lot of sessions that I missed and... It was hard to network with people. You had to do it mostly before or afterwards the sessions, or on different cocktail things, so it's hard to figure out who to talk to. There are no lunches like there are in NTEN, so you can't just do "birds of a feather". You have to network before the meetings, before different events start and that gets harder when you're running between different places, but I think there are a lot of great things I'd also like to do.

I know Glenn also talks about us trying to get some partnerships with IEEE, who are very active there, and I think we have a lot of things in common. So try to get some of the groups who are part of that to also be active in At-Large.

GARTH BRUEN: Great. Evan and Glenn have their hands up and they're on a CROPP trip right now. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Evan and I both attended NTEN, including two of the ICANN staff were there. The major focus we had at the event was to talk about accessibility. We were on the not-for-profit radio talking about different techniques and how ICANN is a progressive not-for-profit moving in this

direction, which got a lot of mileage. We attended every session that had accessibility, and we also did a “birds of a feather” at lunchtime. As a whole, raising the awareness of ICANN, because I think the net neutrality issues was hot.

One of the platinum sponsors was TIR, so they raised the issue of the new gTLD program to the larger community. I think it went quite well, but I’ll turn to Evan to give a perspective on NTEN.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Well, regarding NTEN, raising awareness is a really big thing, and NTEN, but its nature, is technology people involved in the non-profit sector, so it’s definitely a challenge. The big focus there is things like fundraising and how do you attract people to your website. So things like names and numbers are not at the top of mine. TIR, as Glenn said, was there, trying to promote the idea of what they’re doing with .org as well as more recently with .ngo and .ong. I’m currently on a CROPP call, calling from San Francisco from the middle of the ARIN trip, where I’ve just missed lunch, but that’s okay.

It’s a very different thing here, because at ARIN everyone here knows what ICANN is, so it’s a very different conversation. I’m not here to explain what ICANN is, so much to try and put a face on At-Large. John Curran, the President of ARIN, in his opening remarks, spoke to a slide on the MOU that was signed between NARALO and ARIN this year. He raised the awareness of that. Hopefully we’ll make some contacts off of that. Last night I spent the evening talking to two people from the

California Public Utilities Commission who are involved in telecom issues. They're involved in fact with the ComCast Times Warner merger.

So IT and especially Internet infrastructure issues are top of mind to them, so they're going to get far more involved with Leah's organization and potentially through that into ICANN itself. It's a matter of seeking out contacts like that; people that are interested in engaging more. It's a different challenge from something like NTEN, because on one hand I don't have to tell anyone what ICANN is. On the other hand, sometimes I find myself having to say what ICANN is not, but that's something different around here. Anyway, it's definitely been interesting.

I've been fascinated, between my trip to ARIN, my trip to IETF, at the very different ways to engage in multistakeholder decision making. So the cultural differences between them I'm finding absolutely fascinating. Thanks.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you Evan. That's the third time that we've heard Leah's name on the call in different contexts. I see Leah is on the call. Leah, are you able to speak quickly and introduce yourself?

LEAH SYMEKHER:

Absolutely. My name is Leah Symekher and I'm currently President Chair for the San Francisco Bay Area ISOC Chapter. I joined the Chapter three to four years ago as a Member, then I was on the Board and then I acted as VP. Last year I took over the President's role from Michael Snail. I've been working very closely with Konstantin, who you all know

very well, and it's looking at really continuing to grow and re-engage the Membership here through the events and networking more. As Evan mentioned, last night at ARIN it was great to meet the representatives from the public utility and tell them about what our Chapter does and how they can get involved.

In terms of participating more at NARALO, I know Konstantin has been the one who's been spearheading this for our Chapter, and I look forward to being more involved now that he's taking a back seat on this and putting me in the driver's seat for this. I look forward to working with you all.

GARTH BRUEN:

Wonderful. Thank you very much. The sound on your phone is actually very crisp. Okay. Let's see here - moving on, we have the NARALO special budget requests. Staff, what is this all about?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi everyone. These, as you may recall, the ALAC submitted 13 on behalf of all of At-Large for special requests for FY16. The deadline for the results of this was the 15th of April, but I've heard it will be slightly delayed until the end of the month, around the 29th of April, for the official announcement, because it has to go to the Board.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you very much. Next we have the IANA transition issues. Is Olivier on the call?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry Garth, quick question on the allocations? Heidi, do you have any indications at all, in advance of this going to the Board, whether or not staff are recommending to the Board some of the ones NARALO has put forward? Do you have any indication of at least what's been put forward on our behalf?

HEIDI ULLRICH: My understanding is that all of them are being put forward to the Board, and it just depends now on what the final results are.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, thanks.

GARTH BRUEN: I don't see Olivier, but Alan has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think I already covered it when we talked about what the ALAC is doing. I think that's as good a summary as you're going to get right now, without spending four or five hours. We're doing webinars, there's an IANA issues call once every week or so that people can sign up for if they're not Members, and we're continually doing briefings on where we are and trying to get the pulse of the organization, because in many cases the ALAC At-Large people in these groups are being asked for

opinions and we're trying as best we can to make sure it reflects not just our personal opinions but those of the whole group.

But what I summarized before I think is where we stand right now. Both of the groups are progressing well, and from an ALAC perspective there are no major red flags we need to wave right now, which is very different than it was a month or two ago.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. No red flags but no white flags either?

ALAN GREENBERG: Some people will wave white flags, but we're not rubbing their noses in it. There have been positions that have changed very radically, and as it turns out, generally not ours. We've gone from a position where we were a very small minority to essentially having the whole group going very closely to what we were originally suggesting. We try not to say that in public forums.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. We'll keep their secret; that they're doing the right thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: We wouldn't want that to happen too often.

GARTH BRUEN: Capacity building survey, staff item. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Silvia, would you like to take this one?

GARTH BRUEN: Terri has put a link up there to Survey Monkey.

SVI: This survey was launched in compliance with the recommendation, which looks to create an inventory of what different types of capacity building are in each RALO. It was completed. Unfortunately, the way it was responded to was not so good, so the latest count was seven had responded.

GARTH BRUEN: Is it still open or closed?

SVI: It's already closed, however we have a conference call for it, probably among all the RALO Secretariats, and this will hopefully discuss the way forward. It may be reopened if there is such a request, and that is among all the RALO Secretariats.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. There is a monthly report template. Glenn, do you want to speak about this at all?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yes, in response to discussions started with feedback from Olivier, in one of the ALAC calls, he mentioned about the lack of consistency. I started to create - using a simple Google form - to get the juices going. I'm looking for feedback so we can have qualitative and quantitative information, so that it will be a lot easier just to read the report. I'm still looking for feedback from the community.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Glenn. Community vacancies in leadership - we spent quite a bit of time talking about this at the beginning of the call, because I know that Evan and Alan had conflicts, so we wanted to make sure we got to it. It was bubbling in my head too. Just so we're clear, Chair is open, Secretariat is open - those are open every year anyway, but I mean the incumbents are moving -, the ALAC representatives are all going to be open, and the unaffiliated member representative - I think that's an internal selection by that particular constituency - and then the NomCom representative who we have to recommend to the ALAC and then they will select.

Also, Committee vacancies and reviews - CROPP Review Team and the Outreach and Engagement Sub Committee - Glenn, Murray and staff. What does that part mean? Are there vacancies within these two areas?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Garth, I can talk about that. What it is is that in some of the Secretariat meetings and others they were talking about confirming our nomination for thee Committees, and also, since they're reviewing the Outreach and Engagement Sub Committees and they're reviewing the budget, they're

looking at trying to create different people on these. The requirements were that one of the people on the CROPP Review Team has to come from the FBSC and one from the new Outreach and Engagement Sub Committee. We need to look at these lists and pick who we want on there.

I know Alan is on the Outreach, so we needed someone from the FBSC, and I think Glenn said he could be interested in being that person, but those were a while ago, before these new changes, so I don't know. So we are looking to figure out who's going to be that new person, and then also when we rename the Outreach and Engagement Sub Committee and figure out what the terms of that is going to be, I don't know if that's been decided yet, so we can't really talk about that. That's about those two positions.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Judith covered a fair amount of what I was going to say. Essentially, the Outreach Committee has been renamed Outreach and Engagement. It's become painfully obvious that we are much better at getting new ALSes and Members than we are at actually getting them involved. That looks really good on the numbers but doesn't hold up when people start asking what they're doing. Our focus is going to be strongly on engagement, and the name change goes along with that.

We're in the process of reconstituting that group, and it should have been done right after the last Singapore Meeting, and it's gotten delayed for all of the reasons we've been talking about - that people have just been too occupied with the IANA and accountability issues. You'll be seeing something very soon on that; requesting NARALO input into the process. The CROPP Review Team, as Judith said, is being reconstituted and the details of that will be coming out very shortly.

A lot of activity, a lot of opportunity for people to get involved, in particularly an Outreach and Engagement Group - although NARALO will formally name people to it, there's no limit who can also join, and that's a good place for people to come into and start getting involved. I think we need to continually remind people that you don't need to be elected to a position to be able to start working.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Alan. Very quickly, Allan Skuce, and then we're going to have to end the call soon. Go ahead Allan.

ALLAN SKUCE: My position on the Review Team was because I was on the FBSC and I've been replaced on the FBSC so I don't qualify for the CROPP Review Team. Darlene was both on the FBSC and the Outreach, so as far as I know she may still be able to be on there.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you Allan. Judith, very quickly, and then we're going to end the call.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thank you Alan Greenberg for those ideas, and also for suggesting that you don't have to be suggested by NARALO to be on the Outreach. That's also good, because then it can be a place where we can bring up some people to be leaders. So if they come on Outreach and are working at that, then maybe soon they can also get on the CROPP Review Team and move up in to the different positions, and try to get people more active and involved. That's all.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. All right, thank you everyone very much. I will be in touch. Please be in touch with me, and I wanted to jump right back into it. I'll talk to you all later. Have a great rest of the month. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]