MARRAKECH – ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session Part 2
Sunday, March 06, 2016 – 13:30 to 17:30 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I ask staff to please try to find ALAC members? We're at the meeting start time. We did have quorum a few minutes ago. We've now lost quorum.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the Sunday ALAC and Regional Leadership Working Session Part 2. The time is 13:30, Sunday.

ALAN GREENBERG: …the right to request that any of the recommendations be set aside out of the package that we will decide on separately. Is that an agreeable process? Do I have anyone who's objecting? Hearing none, we'll decide that is decided.

The next question is how we make the decision. Our Rules of Procedure say that the ALAC will generally, and I'm not quoting verbatim, make decisions by consensus. Consensus is a call of the chair with a rule of thumb that 80% is required for consensus. That translates to, if all ALAC members are present, 20% is three. If three people we're to object, there would be

barely 80%, and I think my opinion would be that is not consensus.

Barring consensus, we can choose to use an actual vote. All votes in the ALAC are decided by greater than 50% unless the rules explicitly call for something else. And I would assume that applies in this case. Moreover, if a consensus call is made by the chair, any ALAC member has the right to request that a vote be taken, and that vote will be used in lieu of the consensus call. So I am proposing that we first attempt to use consensus. Should that fail, we will use a vote. And, of course, if we use consensus and someone questions it, it reverts to a vote. Comments? No comments. Then I'll take that as accepted.

Next part of the question is, and we can defer this until after we have made the decision, we have to decide whether we are going to include a statement with any of the decisions, if there are multiple decisions, or with the single decision. My understanding, and I will be, I'm sure, corrected if my understanding is incorrect, is that should we make a statement for transparency, the CCWG will likely transmit that to the Board along with the approval. Leon is shaking his head yes. I also have confirmation that should the Board receive any statements from the CCWG, it will pass them on. I'm presuming the – now clarity. Do we pass it on directly to the NTIA? We don't go through the ICG, I don't believe. Okay.

I will give you a personal opinion that I would prefer not to provide additional ammunition to Senator Cruz and Donald Trump, but that is a personal position. Anyone, of course, can disagree, and we will honor that. So do we want to make a decision on a statement or no statement or do we want to defer it until we see how the various decision processes play out and then decide? I think the latter is probably more reasonable. So we will defer the decision and statement or statements until we know what the outcome is.

Everyone accept and understand the ground rules? Thank you. Heidi, you had said somebody wants to be photographing the decision process. It might take. Well it might happen in a minute and a half from now. Okay, well, it will not. Okay, I'm told it will not. In that case, we'll start the process in saying does anyone on the ALAC wish that any of the recommendations, and be specific as to which one, be addressed as a separate entity and not as part of the package?

I have Sebastien speaking.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Mr. Chair, I didn't follow everything, but I guess I would like for us to go through the all recommendation and to decide that afterwards. I would like to finish the 12 recommendation. We didn't get through the 12. And I didn't have any trouble for you

to start to discuss how we will proceed, but I suggest that we go back to the hard work to discuss the recommendation and then to ask if we have global point of view on the system and not how we'll decide because you already described that very well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The chair begs the forgiveness of the ALAC for forgetting that we hadn't done number 12 yet. Maybe it was just wishful thinking, but it was not intended to jump the gun. The mind does play funny games with one. May I ask staff to advance to Recommendation 12, then? Thank you, Sebastien.

Recommendation 12 is a recommendation, again, to the ICANN Board that we will continue as per the original plan and go on to Work Stream 2. Work Stream 2 is defined as the items which were not absolutely required for the transition and, as the CCWG decided early in its process, were not required to provide us with sufficient power to ensure due consideration of the Work Stream 2 items by the ICANN Board.

The items, if I remember correctly, and I seem to remember that this slide had an error and was not corrected. Sebastien, am I correct that there were two items missing that you identified? Yeah, okay, then you're going to have to help my memory if in case I forget them, also. But I think I know what they are.

Enhancements to ICANN's existing documentary information disclosure policy. ICANN currently has a policy by which anybody can request access to information. It has routinely, it has been used many times, many such results result in either denial for one of many reasons or heavily redacted documents. This is felt to be insufficient in a position where we are supposed to be judging the Board's action and judging ICANN's action, the community is, access to information without access to reasonable information that is a very difficult process.

Transparency of ICANN's interactions with governments, improvements to the existing whistleblower policy. ICANN has a policy by which people can anonymously, should they choose, report things. The process has been judged to be somewhat insufficient by a number of bodies, including ATRT 2.

Access rights to ICANN documents. This is akin to the access rights that members would have and other documentation. There is some of that already included in Work Stream 1, but this is further enhancements.

Accountability of the ACs and SOs at a further level. Accountability of ICANN staff. Diversity issues. And I think that is all of them, if I got them alright. Thank you.

I open the floor. Just for the record, the ALAC in general has not commented on this in earlier versions, I believe. We have agreed

that the work needed to be done. There had been some discussions at times, whether it should be the CCWG, some of CCWG. Issues spun off to other groups.

I'm sorry, that wasn't complete. Human rights was also there. The Framework of Interpretation on Human Rights.

There have been many discussions as to exactly how this be done. Clearly, at this point, we have a CCWG, it is chartered, it is in their charter. Should the chartering organizations choose to make it change to that, it's fully within our ability. But that's a debate to be that once that level of work starts. Leon, go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. Yes, what we have in this light is, of course, just the assurance that the work that the CCWG determine to be carried out as the second phase of its work will in fact happen. So what we're saying here is we support that Work Stream 2 exists and it will be carried out.

Now another question is just what Alan said, and we have circulated a letter to the chartering organizations earlier today asking them exactly what Alan has just pointed out. Should it be the CCWG, the group in charge of overseeing implementation of Work Stream 1, as well as carrying out Work Stream 2? Should it be a new group? Should it be different groups?

But that's not under discussion here. It will be discussed. I understand your frustration, Seun, but I just want to keep us focused. I just want to keep us focused. This is not what we we're discussing here. We're discussing or trying to get approval to having Work Stream 2 happen, actually.

How that will happen? That is, of course, open to discussion, but not at this exact stage, I think. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have Tijani then Sebastien.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Alan. I'm sorry to change place because of the air con. I am okay. For the record, to tell you why we need this recommendation, at a certain time, there were people or some parties saying that we would not need Work Stream 2, which would be part of the revision, the review process, etc. I think the existence of this recommendation is very important. That means that the Work Stream 2 will be conducted as it is in the charter. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. I agree with what was said before and with Leon particularly. I just think that we need to schedule some time to have a debate within ALAC and with the regional leader on how we will handle the Work Stream 2 because it will be a lot of work. If we want to move things, we will have to do part of the job and it will take time. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, just to make it clear, Work Stream 2 is going to take a lot of time. It has some very diverse issues within it. It's far more diverse than the relatively focused ones that were in Work Stream 1. It will require some discussion and Sebastien, you're right. We will have to put some time into it. I think there are needs to be some discussion with other ACs and SOs because there's no point in each AC and SO coming out with a random different answer. So we're going to have to figure out how to do that, but that's not today's job. All this is recommending to the Board that these items be addressed. And for want of any other process, it will be Work Stream 2 of the CCWG. The world can always change if it decides to.

Any further discussion? Leon? Leon does not have further discussion. Anyone else? Seeing no one, thank you very much. I believe we have now addressed all 12 recommendations. Is

there any reason we should not now go to the discussion on how to ratify or not? Sebastien, go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I don't know if it's under to the level of ratifying but I would like to suggest prior to the process, you explain at the beginning of this meeting as the decision we will have to take, it's on behalf of the users, of [inaudible] users. I think we need to have some inputs before we take a formal vote or a formal decision.

I suggest that we ask each and every chair of RALO to tell the ALAC, who will be the voting people, what is the current thinking of each region and how they form this position. Then I would like to have the member of the working group to give us and to give you their point of view. I would like also very much at the end of this process we, I would say, we ask each ALAC member to say what is their position.

I really think that it's a very important topic, and it can't be just, yeah, I agree because whatever. The chair votes this way or the other way because my friend vote this way or the other. We need to take a conscious decision of why we are going in one direction or another. And for my point of view, I will be very happy to have some of our inputs from the region and from our ALSes indirectly through the RALO will be a good step.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Sebastien. If I may summarize, you are asking three things. Number one, that we do around the table of any RALO chairs who are present at this meeting – I haven't counted whether they all are here or not – for any input that the RALO has. You explicitly said, "What is the position of your RALO, and how did you arrive at that?" I don't know for a fact that all of them have formally gone through any process, so I will not make the presumption, but the request to ask each RALO representative through their chair what the position is of their RALO, if they have one.

Number two, to do the same with the five formal members of the working group. And number three, you are effectively calling for a vote instead of a consensus call on, well, you're saying going around the table and giving everyone a chance to say what it is. That effectively makes that a vote. Okay. Whether it's a vote or an opportunity to make a statement, we can debate. May I have any comments from any other ALAC members? Does anyone object to that? Does anyone support it? We had three different items. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I certainly don't object to anyone who is seated around this table having anything to say. I think that these issues have been

on the table long enough and the input is urgent enough that I would not like it further delayed. But certainly if there are any opinions that have not been expressed, I think it's fair enough to invite those opinions before we take a vote. Listen carefully, but I would hate to see it go any longer than that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. If I may ask Heidi to quickly recount what the agenda was. Or is that the correct agenda on the display right now? Okay. We currently, and I can't quite read it, but I think we had an hour and a quarter allocated to this session – another 45 minutes. After that, we have a scheduled meeting with the SSAC. We had scheduled an hour for Holly to review the directory services issues, and then we have an hour and a half, sorry, a half hour – please, it's hard enough to read without it moving – and then a half hour scheduled to ratification.

With the additional items planned, I would alter that agenda to say, "We will go as far as we can in this session." At 3:15, we will reconvene and keep on working through until we finish the process.

Should we enough time at that point left, we will go to Holly and her directory services presentation. I personally think it's a really important one, but I think we have no choice but to finish the CCWG activities first. So just as we go around the table, be aware

of the time and the implications of decisions to have an extra ten speakers each with a few minutes of time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do you want the secretaries to speak too or just the RALO chairs?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just the chairs are speaking on behalf of their – plus the five members of the CCWG. That, I think, makes ten. Next we have Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Alan. I think I'm fully in line with what Holly said. In the case of LACRALO, we've been coordinating ourselves together. We have been working together throughout the whole process. It's not new to LACRALO this process on CCWG, and I am pretty sure that Alberto would be able to confirm this. I would also encourage if there is any opinion that hasn't been heard to be voiced and if it's an opinion that only reiterates support or points that have been already addressed, to keep it as short as possible so we can expedite this process.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. To be clear, I said the chair of each RALO, the chair obviously could delete someone else to speak on their behalf, should they choose. Next, we have Jimmy.

JIMMY SCHULZ: I think this will unnecessarily prolong the whole process. Maybe we should, so everybody can be heard, ask if anyone likes or the RALO chairs or the members of the CCWG, ask them if they want to say something, and if not, we can just go on to the vote.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Jimmy. In my mind, if we go around the table and someone says, "I support it, I have nothing else to say." I don't mind going through that process. No one has to use up their two minutes or whatever we decide we allocate to it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry? I didn't… Never mind. Alright. Next we have Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I think you made one of my points in that this doesn't hurt going around the table and asking each person to give their view as

per the chairs and the five members. Of course, they could just say "Pass" as a word will be fine.

But for the third point, it seems that it was referring to us voting. If I understand that correctly, I thought we already agreed to go by consensus first before we then go to voting if consensus doesn't work. I'm in favor of consensus. I think we should try that first. If it doesn't work, then we could then use the other option. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun, you're suggesting effectively what Sebastien said with a shrug of his shoulders after I made a comment that we do it by consensus but then give people an opportunity to make a statement should they choose. Sebastien, I think that was effectively what you were implying, not the way I interpreted, but what you are implying. Thank you. Next, we have Siranush.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Actually, if I tell you honestly, we didn't ask our ALSes to give feedback on that, and we didn't collect that feedback and if we are going to do it now, it will really delay the process. But we have an APRALO representative in CCWG, and we are quite well aware of what's going on there and in full agreement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So I think you're saying should we call on you, you would defer to the CCWG member. Noted. And lastly, at this point, we have Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: We have worked a lot in conjunction with Leon, and for the purposes of impartiality, we have called others in our monthly meetings. This has been one of our political objectives necessary to gather knowledge and valued views and opinions. We were able to gather several opinions, not only Leon's. He was very kind, and he has devoted a lot of his time in addition to working in other fields. So we received diverse opinions as it may be in any room, such as this one, but none of them represents an objection, a contradiction, just minor issues that have no significant impact against approval. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. So I think you're supporting the concept and actually have just made your statement. Sebastien, is that a new hand?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you, Alan. Yeah. I would like to bring in another issue about another process, but when we will do it. I am not sure that it's a – there is discussion going on, on two other groups parallel

to ours, and I would prefer that we handle the formal vote almost at the same time as the other, that it's done together.

I heard that somebody asked why. Yes, I know. And I would like to try to explain why. If there are some discussions between those group at what time one moment, it could change some of our perspective. I really feel that this last mile is need to take into account the others.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: I'd like to think we could make our own minds up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. I think I see some reason in what Sebastien said. At the same time, I also think that making our decisions early enough could also change the minds or improve the decision making of the other two groups that are pending. So it's either here or there. We wait till Wednesday to see what others are doing, or we do it now with the hope that that will actually encourage them to also expedite their own processes.

Just one thing I wanted to ask as a follow-up. If we approve now, because the charter is not actually specific on the number of chartering organizations that actually approved before sending to the Board, do we have the assurance that it goes anyway even if the two other groups says no? Leon, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I call upon Leon at this point to address that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. Thank you very much, Seun. While there is no specific provision or charter, it would obviously not help if there was any kind of opposition. So my advice or my wish is that we could, of course, send a statement or a proposal to the ICANN Board of Directors that has been wide supported by all chartering organizations. Okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien? Alright. I've put myself in the queue, and I'm taking off the chair's hat. I strongly support making our own decision. I believe we have discussed this a lot. I do not believe one iota that our decision will influence the ccNSO or the GNSO. An iota is too large a number, perhaps. Okay? It might be of interest to the GAC, but it will not influence the others.

Moreover, we are an independent group. We have been claiming that we want to be one of the deciding bodies in the empowered community to stand back and say, "We want to do everything at the same time because we perhaps want to hear what other people have to say first," we've heard a lot of what other people have to say. I think we understand the positions of pretty much everyone. We [do not necessarily] understand the outcomes.

So I strongly support us making the decision at the earliest possible moment and not wait for Wednesday. I would like to call for a – I see no more speaker requests. Am I correct? I would like to call for a sense of the room. This is not a formal vote but a sense of the ALAC.

Who among the ALAC would prefer to defer the decision process until Wednesday? Which is, I believe, when the other groups are doing it. I take it that everyone who did not indicate yes would prefer to go ahead and do that now. Is that correct? Seeing no objections, I think we will go ahead and do it now.

Following the recommendation, however, of the suggestion of Sebastien and the support of a number of other people, I would like to first go around to the chairs or their delegates to give a position of the RALOs. APRALO?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Yes. Just reinforcing what our chair had said. APRALO did not take any formal advice, polling, or temperature taking from our At-Large structures. However, apart from regular reporting at our monthly meetings over the last 15 months by me, and that's probably taken far more of our chair's agendas than she would ever want to give me for any other purpose – and I want to thank you for that, by the way, Siranush – we also, in conjunction with our AP regional office, ran webinars on this subject.

So not only did we inform our own community and seek their input, we informed the wider Asia-Pacific community, specifically those interested in the domain name system, be they registrars or registrants, and certainly a number from the business community. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Slightly out of alphabetical order, we have AFRALO, so Aziz or whoever his nominee is. Or his, or do we neither right now? And we'll defer you in the list, if you wish.

AZIZ HILALI: Okay, yes, we can defer from.

ALAN GREENBERG: This is going quicker than it might have, so it might not be a long deferral. Next, we have Europe, and Olivier is not here. Has he been notified?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He's with the ALAC, the GNSO board meeting is almost over, so I will [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier will be here shortly. Alberto, you have, you're satisfied that you've already made your statement and don't want it any further, but I'll give you an opportunity to further say anything, if you choose.

ALBERTO SOTO: We've had 40% to 60% attendance in our monthly calls when we discussed these matters, so in the belief that there are no oppositions, I am able to say that it should be finished as soon as possible by approving this. So rather than saying then we should wait the others to adopt decision, I think they should take us as example. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Alberto. Glenn?

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Yeah. Fortunately, Gordon Chillcott has been on the Adobe Connect today, and he's been our designate for this process and Murray McKercher has been following it quite well. Those are the two that have been the most active. I've tried to be on most of the calls, as well. Yeah. We have no problem with it. We endorse it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Perfect time. Olivier, the process we're using at this point is we are asking all of the RALO chairs or their delegate to give any opinion that they have based on discussions held within the RALO as to whether we should go ahead and ratify it or whether there are any concerns or cautions on behalf of the RALO. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, EURALO chair. We've had extensive discussions on our monthly calls. And we've also asked our members to take part in the At-Large, the overall webinars and discussions that have taken place. We were going to have a special webinar for our members, but that was not possible given the amount of time

that we had left on the calendar before the Marrakech meeting took place and the last minute changes and so on.

Yes, there are concerns in our community and those are reflected by the concerns that have been expressed in our own IANA Issues Working Group. But asking whether there was any significant objection to ratifying the overall proposal, I certainly have not received any response from anyone in EURALO in saying, "Yes, we need to stop this. We need to block it altogether."

There are concerns about the process which is being used. There are concerns about the overall danger to ICANN in implementing some of these policies. Some have been very vocal, certainly, about the potential for having turned what used to be an organization that was stewarded by the U.S. Government into a very commercially-minded organization. But nobody has said that they would want EURALO and its representatives to not ratify the end result. That's on the table at the moment, so that's all I can say.

I could ask some of my colleagues who were present on the calls if they have a different view or have any additional information that I might have overlooked. And when I see my colleagues, I'm saying in EURALO, so Jimmy, secretary; Wolf, of course, who's been following these.

WOLF LUDWIG: Now I can just confirm what Olivier summarized. So there have been some occasional discussions but no dissent in that way, so you brought it to the point. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I could add, as well. As I said, there have been some significant concerns and this is just me taking a step forward. If there was to be an ALAC, I don't know what you would call it, minority statement or a comment that would accompany its vote, I know that there would be some interest in our community. I don't know if there's an overwhelming interest, but there is some interest from some of our members to take part in bringing their input to the drafting of such a note. That's just in case there was one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We decided to defer the decision on whether there will be a statement until after we have our decision, number one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We're just saying we'd be there if there was.

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. And number two, we have established that should we make a statement along with our decision, the CCWG will forward that to the Board, and the Board has made it clear they will forward that to the U.S. Government, and there has been a desire expressed from me, but with a number of people shaking their head, that we don't wish to add any ammunition to Senator Cruz or Donald Trump's list, but Europe is free to act as it wishes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: As a European, I would answer, "Who are these people?"

ALAN GREENBERG: No comment, as a Canadian.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are you speaking on behalf of Cruz?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next we have. Do we have Aziz or are you speaking on behalf of Aziz? Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. At the AFRALO, we used to present the report on each monthly call, on the work of the CCWG, I was in charge of that since I a am member of the CCWG. This month, we didn't meet yet, so I cannot say that the ALSes will endorse my position or not. But my discussion with my colleagues here in ALAC as African members and my discussion with the leadership also – Alan, you hear me?

So my discussion showed that we have concerns, yes. We made it clear, we made it even a minority statement, but now we are aware that we need the transition to happen so we don't want it to be breaked. That's why we don't want to block the system. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We will now go around the table to the – sorry, you have your hand up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I have a question to Tijani, please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Tijani, there is tomorrow, I guess tomorrow after tomorrow, an AFRALO-AfrICANN meeting. You will issue a declaration. Don't you think that it could be useful for us to know what is inside the declaration?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The content of the declaration is exactly the point of view that is expressed by us – me and Seun – here in this room several times. Our statement didn't say that we don't want it to happen. We said we want that in the implementation phase and in the drafting of the Bylaws, our concerns are taken into account. This is the content, but it is not yet the statement of the community because On Thursday, it will be adopted. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Any more issues on that part of the process? Seeing none, we will now do the ALAC formal members on the CCWG, and we will do these in alphabetic order to change the order. And alphabetic order by first name, as has been the practice within the CCWG. Is a horizontal card on top of your machine a request to speak? Thank you. I call upon Alan Greenberg, the representative member for North America, to speak.

I have been very vocal throughout this process both within the IANA Issues Group and within the CCWG itself. I have also been the person who has drafted many of the statements, doing my best to make sure it reflected not just my opinions but the opinions of the overall group. I have many reservations in this process. I look at it and say, and you've heard me make statements like this before, if I were king, this isn't the way I would have done it. I'm not king.

We ask all the time for diversity. We support the concept of multi-stakeholders. Both of those imply we need different people at the table because they have different ideas. If they didn't, we wouldn't need multiple stakeholders, we wouldn't need diversity. We could say, "Julie is representing us all," because there's clearly no difference in her opinions from any of ours or anyone else around this table. We are different.

We have hammered out something that I believe is acceptable. I do not believe it's going to be harmful. I can come up with extreme cases where it could be harmful, but I think the probability of those – why is my microphone doing this? I think the probability of those happening is small enough that I'm not worried by it. Is this coming through properly in the speakers? Okay.

It is certainly not perfect from my point of view. I not only have individual worries about some of the specific points, like many of you do. I also question whether the overall thing is really in the best interest of ICANN.

But the bottom line is we are on this path, we did have to go through an accountability mechanism process in order to proceed with the IANA transition, and given the fact that this kind of multi-stakeholder process is exceedingly messy and will inevitably bring in issues that were not my or your preference, I think we have hammered out something that is reasonable.

When we look at some of the interim solutions, where at one point we had membership model, which we did not feel comfortable about at all, where we had the ACs and SOs having to incorporate individually where we did not feel comfortable at all, I think we've achieved something that is much, much closer to the At-Large's and ALAC's level of comfort than we had in any interim positions, and I am prepared to wholeheartedly support this. Thank you.

Next, we have Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. And as the Asia-Pacific regional representative as a member on the CCWG to Enhance ICANN Accountability, but

also as someone who's been somewhat passionate and engaged in accountability matters since before ATRT 1, going back to joint project agreements and other things so certainly predating 2005 and into 2003, the words accountability and transparency have fallen out of my mouth more times than I'd care to count.

Before I go on to my specific recommendation to you all, I wanted to compliment each and one of the people, be they member or participant or, in particular, co-chair for what I think is demonstrably, yes, messy, torrid at times, stressful absolutely, but highly accountability process. I have seen under the hood of this process and I want to be able to stand here, and I can, if I got up from my seat, put my hand on heart and say, "Every single word that has been uttered other than in absolute joke has been looked at, analyzed, and taken seriously at, actually, the cost of progress in some cases."

This has been an extraordinarily transparent and accountable activity, and that in its own right is something I think the At-Large community and ALAC has an enormous amount to be proud of. Is it perfect? Nope. Is it how I would have written it? Hell no. Is it as good as it's going to get right now in the time constraints? Yes. Could we do better if we're working into 2017? Yes. But we're not. We're working it now, and under these constraints, with an eye on the ball for IANA oversight transition, I would strongly urge you to support unconditionally and with

minimal, if any, commentary the recommendations in the final report. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I now have the pleasure to call on not the co-chair of the CCWG but the ALAC representative from Latin America/Caribbean, who at this point is now no longer allowed to talk about his opinion as a co-chair, but his opinion as an ALAC person.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. I would like to take advantage of the translation services, since it would be meaningful for me to express my vote in Spanish.

As my colleagues have already said, Alan and Cheryl, this has been a historical process, a process which has meant a lot to me. It is a process where I thank ALAC for the trust. I like to thank my representatives, my colleagues of LACRALO for the trust, the chairman and the secretary of LACRALO for the trust and support of all my colleagues who participated in the work of the CCWG.

If somebody would ask me what I think about the multi-stakeholder system, I would suggest that you read the report to the CCWG. As Cheryl has said, each word in that report has been

defined by consensus and the approval of those who have worked for this 18 months. We have in our hands the opportunity to approve, pass this report, mark the beginning of this transition, which we have asked for, which we have waited for because this is a demand, a requirement that has been submitted by the multi-stakeholder community for many years.

We have asked to be given free rein to leave in our hands the control of the last element of the Internet, to leave it in our hands, in the hands of the community. So it's time for us to say we take up the challenge. We are up to the challenge, and we ratify this proposal to the CCWG. That's my vote is in favor of ratifying the CCWG proposal.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next we have the member from Europe, Sebastien Bachollet.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you for all the nice words that were said regarding the work that we all did together. I absolutely agree to the compliments from Cheryl regarding our work, and the co-chair, Leon did tremendous work.

The issue today, the issue is to accept or not this report. It's not perfect, just like Alan said, but for me, it's really not perfect. So the issue is, do we jump in a void without knowing what's going to happen? We're going to come up within an organization, which is very complex in the future. It's going to give power to the people with time, money, and qualifications. We have a lot of qualifications. For some of us, we have time, it might be possible. But not for everybody in our community. And it's very difficult with the money. So we are going to be not favored in that situation. It's going to be difficult for us.

And I like to repeat what I said yesterday, it's a shame that all the actors, all the stakeholders were not able to fully work and be committed. I think there was a void here, a lack. ICANN tried to give a room and something to do to everyone, but I think the SSAC and the [root server] system should have a place to play, a role to play, and I think they shouldn't have been excluded. And the risk is that we come up with this system where all the stakeholders are at the same level. This is a reality.

And the last point on the topic, what we should have changed was the way the Board works, the diversity at the Board level, the work of the Board. I think to add another complex structure above the Board might not be the best solution. That's where we're at.

If I have one global position, the only reason and the only reason that I would vote yes would be not Mickey but Donald and it's really too bad that I feel obliged to have a consensus, and you'll see with our vote later on. But it's too bad that it's not on the positive basis with more on being afraid about something else that I feel obliged to have this report supported by ALAC.

Thank you so much, my RALO friends. You did trust me for that work, and thank you at EURALO. I hope we made some progress, and I'm glad I was able to represent Europe. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have six minutes at this point before we have another session starting with some visitors. Are they? Julie, is Patrik and whoever coming? Do you know what their schedule is? Oh, okay, sorry. I can't see. Okay.

I would like to, at this point, ask to revert back to where we were. We have no gone roundtable.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: There is a fifth of the CCWG, Alan. If we have forgot him, okay. Important. It's not important.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I thought I could get up again, I would come down on my knees and beg your forgiveness, but I'm not quite sure I can right now. Tijani, I apologize. Go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Alan. I will speak another language. I am hesitating between Arabic and French. But yeah. Okay. So, perhaps French, so that Sebastien will be happy.

Yes, Sebastien, I agree with you. You're right. That's a result that we do not accept it because it's the best one. We do not vote yes because it's the best one. We spent a year and a half, maybe more, on that work, on those debates, and we saw the interests at stake going one way or the other.

We did understand that some people have more interest, financial interest, material interest. Us, this is public interest. The interest of the public. Other interests are being defended and this is the way it goes. Where we're strong enough to preserve a minimum of public interest? That is the question.

I think that after so many months of work, difficult times at the CCWG. At one point, we were really upset and angry at one another, but we were able to find not a consensus but the lesser evil, and we are at the lesser evil situation.

We had, frankly speaking, a couple of choices. You know well that recently, I did two minority statements on two points. I'm not happy with the results. At the end, what's going to happen? Or we have the transition or we don't have our IANA transition. I want the IANA transition to happen, and I do everything in my power to do so but not at any price.

There were some redlines that couldn't be crossed, and I said so in my group. Ask Olivier. I was a minority. I refused to accept certain points. I said that it was not possible to go over some lines, but at the end, I can only try the lesser evil solution so that the transition happens. That is why I will vote for this report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Tijani. My apologies again. Something Tijani said I think needs a comment because a fair number of people around this table did not participate actively in the IANA Issues Group. It wasn't only Tijani who had redlines; the entire group had redlines. And by redlines, we mean if you do not satisfy these needs, the ALAC will not support it. And there were a fair number as we went along. The number varied from day to day, from month to month.

But I think all of us around the table, and there were no exceptions, well, as co-chair, Leon was in an awkward position, admittedly. But there were many things that we said along the

way, if we are not satisfied. For instance, there was a strong push at various points to disenfranchise all ACs or to rate them as a lower class than SOs. The decision of this group would have been really easy if that had come past.

So there has been an awful lot of discussion going on. We learned a lot about some of our colleagues in ICANN, sometimes things we didn't want to ever know about them. We learned that there are people with many motivations for doing this, some financial, some passionate, some other. It has been an interesting experience except, forgive the editorial comment from the chair at this point, but it has been interesting and there are many ways to define that.

The session is just about over. I wonder can we make a decision right now. Is everyone prepared? We'll not have time for the formal vote at this point or formal decision process. Is there anyone on the ALAC who wishes to segregate out any of the recommendations? We had said that if there were no opposition, we would do it as a package. If there is anyone who wants to segregate out specific ones, we will do those separately. Can I ask for any input from the ALAC of anyone?

If a single person wants to segregate an issue, it will be segregated. Olivier is not an ALAC member, but he has something to say.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. As a bystander here, no matter which way you end up voting, whether it's by recommendation or as a whole, it would be interesting for us public to find out what the intent or what the view is of each one of the ALAC members when they cast their vote. So rather than just a show of hands and we're done with it, it'd be interesting if, I don't know, Seun voting yes or no and says, "Well, I'm going to vote yes because of this or I'm going to vote no because of this." I think it might be helpful for us. It's just a suggestion.

ALAN GREENBERG: The disadvantage of being the GNSO liaison where you're not present at all with the meeting is we did decide that should we decide whether it's by consensus or vote, every ALAC member will have an opportunity to make a statement. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes. I would like to suggest that we segregate the number 12. Yes to segregate the number 12. I know that it's you can be surprised but if you want, the Recommendation 12.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me. I didn't ask for opinions of other people. I'm asking is anyone requesting?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, please. 12.

ALAN GREENBERG: If anyone requests it, it is done: 12 is separated out. Any other further ones? Alright. We have a meeting with the SSAC now. There is a coffee – there is not a coffee break afterwards. The SSAC meeting will terminate at approximately 3:15, maybe a little bit later, because we're starting a few minutes late. We will immediately go back into the CCWG discussion and vote at that point or, sorry, decision at that point. And following that, with sufficient time, Holly Raiche will have the floor on the RDS discussions, so we're flipping items three and four. Thank you all very much and who are we? Who is speaking on behalf of SSAC?

Ladies and gentlemen, we have the honor of having a meeting with SSAC. I will turn the chair over to Julie Hammer to introduce our speakers and anything else that she feels must be done.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, everyone. Just like to welcome Patrik Faltstrom as Chair of SSAC to present our brief to you and also to welcome a number of other SSAC people in the room. I wonder if the SSAC members would identify themselves just by raising a hand. Lyman, Jaap, and of course our wonderful support staff, Julie and Kathy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Patrik.

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, and sorry. And Patrik and Andrew. Yes, I caught Lyman first. Okay, thank you. Over to you, Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much, and thank you for allowing me to present what we have done lately. Next slide, please. Next slide. So we are in the Security and Stability Advisory Committee of 30 members. We're appointed by the ICANN Board. One of the reasons why I want to mention explicitly what we do is that that will be a pretty important thing to know when we later describe our view of the CCWG Accountability.

Our charter is to advise the ICANN community and Board on matters related to the security and stability of the Internet's

naming and address allocation systems. Excuse me, I just need to bring the presentation up here. I'm getting old. I cannot read on this distance. And certain things are pretty important. It's exactly the same. Oh, well I have, yeah, never mind. Thank you for offering your glasses. So we have so far 80, eight zero, publications since 2002 when we were created. Next slide, please.

And the reason why our charter is written like it is, is because it's anchored in two of the missions and core values of ICANN: to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems and preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

Our view is that we are chartered to overlook what is happening in the ICANN community as a whole and what decision ICANN Board is making or thinking about making and, if needed, give recommendations so that these mission and core values are still protected. So that's where we are. And that also means that things that cannot be tied to these mission and core values of ICANN, we feel that that is out of our of scope for SSAC.

The publication process itself builds upon us first creating a work party. We do some research and writing. We review and approve the work, the result, SSAC as a whole, and finally, we

publish the report that might include recommendations. If it is the case that recommendations to ICANN Board, in that case, as you see to the right, SSAC submits the advice to ICANN Board, the Board acknowledges and studies the advice, and then ICANN Board take formal advice.

And this is something that is also mentioned in the ATRT 2 recommendations that ICANN Board should take action on advice from the advisory committees. And that is something that we also are looking very carefully at, that that still exists in the Bylaws and instructions for ICANN and ICANN Board.

What does it mean to take an advice into account? Well, we see from our perspective and what we are discussing with ICANN Board four different actions or four different paths forward. One is that ICANN Board launches a PDP. The second, that is instructions or requests to the staff to do an implementation with the public consultation, as staff is doing. The third, that ICANN Board is disseminating whatever the recommendation is and all the advice to the affected parties. And the fourth, that ICANN Board is choosing a different solution than what is recommended, but that ICANN Board explained why the advice was not followed.

That fourth part that exists is something that we find being really important and really important to point out, including to the

ICANN Board, so that they understand they don't have to do what we are saying, although we would like them to do, of course, otherwise we'd not give that advice. But it might be other kind of things and other sort of criteria and other whatever that makes ICANN Board choose different path, and that has happened a couple of times. Next slide, please.

We will come back to the recent publications, but the ones that we will present today are 77, which is a comment on the gTLD marketplace health index; 78, which is advice on the use of a shared global domain space; 79, an advisory on the changing nature of IPv4 address semantics; and then, of course, number 80 from last week, which is our approval of the CCWG Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations. That's a very short title. And even though the title is that long, it still includes acronym. I think it's just amazing.

Otherwise, it would be Security and Stability Advisory Committee Approval on the Cross-Community Working Group, blah, blah, blah. I'm sorry. We've run out of time, so let's go to the next slide. Oh, no, sorry. Back one slide again. Thank you.

This is ALAC, I think this is important. If you look at the bottom right, left, you see outreach. We have the ssac.icann.org webpage where we have our information. We have a specific

corner of the ICANN webpage. We have some multimedia that we're trying to create. We have a Facebook page, which you can follow where try to let people know where it is. Oh, bloody hell, that's new.

It's also the case that we started to create videos that explain the advisories, specifically [end use] with people that have been most active. For example, SAC067. We have workshops at the Internet Governance Forum. We have drastically increased the number of advisories that we translate to languages. We have, I think, translated all reports that ALAC has requested us to translate.

So I can say that the fact that the box to the down right exists is thanks to requests from ALAC. Yes, you know that, so thank you very much for helping us. We also have now really good cooperation with Duncan on the communication team, and you will see more actions that so the release of our reports is more predictable than what it is now. Next slide, please. Next.

What we are working on at the moment has to do with name space issues, which is sort of the in general terminology the name space we use for, among other things, the DNS. Auction proceeds. We just, like many others, are looking at the auction proceeds discussions in here in ICANN. Although we decided to participate there, we're not really doing anything because so far,

we're not seeing anything that is tied to the Bylaws of ICANN that I pointed to, but we're keep your eyes on it.

Harmonization issues regarding internationalized domain names is another work item that just started up. And then we have ongoing work related to DNSSEC. We have DNSSEC for Everybody that basically starts this afternoon in just a few minutes. And then we have a general DNSSEC session, which is more for engineers on Wednesday. Excuse me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: The question is whether the sessions will be comprehensible to nontechnical people. I think that the one on the Sunday, the idea is that it should at least give an introduction if you're technically interested. So you need to at least be used to being in an environment where technical things are discussed because the idea is that it's really a primer.

The workshop on the Wednesday, no. That is a discussion between people that actually do run DNSSEC. Because that's held specifically for, for example, ccTLDs of developing countries, which have had issues with DNSSEC can meet and talk with people running DNSSEC for ccTLDs in Sweden, etc. So

it's for those people that actually work with it. Sunday is newcomers, entry level; Wednesday is deeply technical, but you're welcome anyway.

Then we also have ongoing work regarding Board advice tracking to keep track of what I just showed you and a membership committee that reviews membership applications to SSAC. Next slide, please.

The first quarter 2016, we published four reports, which is kind of strange because we had never published so many reports, but many of them have been correspondence, and I will go through them. And then you will probably not see much from us before third quarter 2016 because we're launching quite a large number of new things at the moment. Next slide, please.

Any questions so far in SSAC? Okay. I think it's better to just go through the reports. We have, since the last ICANN meeting, published one, two, three, four, five, six, seven reports. And when I started as a chair, SSAC published four reports a year, and now we're up to six. Many of these are very, very short and responses to letters, but it's still the case that we are pretty happy that we are producing more.

Of course, this implies that even for you who are interested in SSAC – yes, I'm looking at you, Holly – we probably need to give you some reading advice on what you should focus on because

it's too much for normal humans to digest. Yeah. Next slide, please.

Let's go down to the recent publications. The first one, SAC080, the approval of the accountability. This might be a little bit of an interesting reading for you. What you see on the page here is not the overview. It is the report. So yeah, we didn't write an executive summary. The executive summaries is "yes."

Let me explain how we were able to come up with this because this is the more serious part because the charter that we have is pretty serious regarding security and stability issues. We wrote a couple of reports, one that described the IANA function, one that describes what IANA is supposed to do according to the contract, and a third one, which is a gap analysis between what IANA is doing and what NTIA has asked IANA to do. The gap analysis includes our recommendations related to the IANA operation, how that fits and maps to the bylaws. That's what we did before we even started to participate in the CCWG. As some of you might know, we were not even a chartered organization of the CCWG originally.

The next thing we did was that we got these excellent SSAC members, Lyman, actually, and Julie, that signed up to be the by SSAC appointed members of the CCWG. The SSAC together with them more or less wrote a document with where the SSAC

redlines were based on those three documents that everyone knows.

The rest has been so easy because we decided, before we participated, what were important things and what we wanted out of this. We have not been forced to have a single discussion on what is right and what is wrong in the strategy discussions in these meetings.

What we have discussed, though, is when Julie and Lyman has come back and said, "This thing that is discussed, is this related to this or that topic of what SSAC has been discussing about?" So it's only the mapping that we have been discussing, which, of course, has been very, very hard work. I'm not saying that they have been lazy, the other way around. But when we have done, we have not been forced to reopen what the SSAC's view is, and that made it really easy for us to finally approve the document, given that we have been fighting for where our redlines are throughout the process.

Of course, if something in the final document would have crossed one of the redlines, that would have been kind of, yes, Alan, thank you very much. The correct word is that would have been interesting. Okay. Because it's not very often SSAC changes its mind. Next, please.

SAC079 on IPv4 address semantics. Next slide, please. So if not everyone knows, I can tell people that we are now out of IPv4 addresses except AfriNIC, which means that if it is the case that you're an ISP, you get ten more customers, you want IPv4 addresses for them, you will not be able to get them. There are IPv4 addresses on eBay. IPv4 addresses cost today between $10 and $12 each, which is kind of interesting by itself.

If you're a large ISP with 1 million customers next year, that suddenly $12 million extra in cost just to get addresses, if you can find a seller, as Alan says, yeah. Which means that the price must be higher. What is happening, of course, is that people and ISPs start to deploy various carrier grade NAT and other kind of technical solutions.

What we do in this report is that we explain how bad those deployments are because most people run that already in their phone or in their [inaudible], which means that if the ISP is doing it, as well, then you will get multiple layers of NAT, and that's bad.

So even though some people say that NAT is a good thing or whatever, we can argue about that, I haven't seen anyone really saying that multiple layers of NAT is a good thing, specifically if you're two parties with one CP each, that's two layers of NAT. Then each one of the ISPs run carrier grade NAT, that's four

layers of NAT between the two parties that try to communicate. Now you might understand why Skype doesn't work so well anymore.

On top of that, which is what we really point out, is that an IPv4 address alone does not necessarily identify an endpoint. Just by looking at an IPv4 address, you don't know who that is or it doesn't even identify at a single endpoint. And specifically – which one could say is an information to law enforcement and others, IPR owners – that IPv4 address alone may not be sufficient to correlate Internet activity observations with a specific endpoint.

Then we have (next slide, please) we have specific recommendations that network operators should, and this is not the first time we say this, should accelerate the plans to deploy IPv6 and consider the consequences of deploying IPv4 continuation technology such as NAT prior to deployment. The calculations that you have to do today on how you manage your endpoint addressing is different than just a year ago.

And then device manufacturers, which is a little bit problematic. Like if you buy CPE from a random manufacturer, they will not support IPv6, which means that there's not much the consumer can do. So device manufacturers also must start supporting IPv6.

So basically, in this report is like, "This is serious. This is really serious." Yes, questions? I think you should use your microphone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Patrik, [are] the laptop sellers now not supporting IPv6, for example, the latest in say, the Apple Mac or something like that, will that support v6 or not? I understood they did.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: All modern operating systems from Windows, Apple, Linux, whatever, from maybe six or seven years back all support IPv6. It's really hard to turn IPv6 off. For example, in Microsoft's operating system, the latest two major versions, you cannot turn it off. You will always have IPv6 in your local network. You might not route it globally, but you will always have that. There are lots of discovery protocols for file sharing and others that actually use IPv6. So enterprises that claim to me that they don't run IPv6 in the network, I know there are. That's an indication they don't know what packets they have on the network.

So it's not a problem in the endpoints. The problem is in the network and specifically the access.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think today most of devices support IPv6.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Most devices do, but there are still lots of problems regarding specifically if you have DSL connection over copper, you have problem. There are still some problems where the provisioning of IPv6 addresses is in fiber to the home networks. It is still a problem in certain kinds of mobile networks. But for example, there many mobile providers that for new Android devices and iPhone deploy, give IPv6 to the phones. So yes, you're absolutely right. Most things do, but my point is it's absolutely not the computers and phones that people use. That's not where the problem is. Next slide, please.

The next SAC078, next slide, please. What we do here is that this document actually doesn't really give an advice at all. It is an information to the community that we think this is really serious, really important, and that we have started a larger study on this issue.

If we take, for example, the two URLs there, you have the Facebook [inaudible] i.onion or mycomputer.local. Both of them exist in the domain name space, but none of them use DNS as the resolution protocol. This is something that, of course, involves not only ICANN but also the IETF, and this is something that needs to be harmonized.

For example, start to talk about what a domain name is, who has the ability to say what can be domain name and who has the right to say who is not supposed to be a domain name. Also, look at what kind of processes and corporations are needed to avoid potential side effects.

For example, IETF has said that "onion" is a reserved string that should never become a TLD. Now if it is the case that ICANN created a top-level domain with the name onion, we would have problems. So that is one of these sort of overlaps that's the set of TLDs that we are using in the root zone and the set of reserved names by the IETF, the intersection of those two sets should be empty. So those kind of things we are launching a study on, and SAC078 describes the problem.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Excuse me, Patrik. We have a question from Alberto Soto.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Please?

ALBERTO SOTO: [inaudible] is class R, class A.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. Originally, when we handed out IP addresses, it was decided to be in classes A, B, C, and D, where class A was handed out to what is now called /8s. That was all IP addresses that started with the network 0/8 to 127/8, and everyone knew that that subnet mask was eight bits for IP addresses that started like that.

In the early '90s, it was already at that time discovered that we will run out of IP addresses if we continue to hand out addresses that way. So IETF came up with something called CIDR, C-I-D-R, Classless Internet Domain Routing, I think the acronym stands for. I'm looking at Leon here to see whether – yeah. Several people say I was right there. Classless Internet Domain Routing.

From that point in time, it was about '95-'96, I guess, we stopped using classes, and instead any IP address block or any subnet can have any length of the net mask. So people that after 1996 talk about classes, they have read really old schoolbooks. On the other hand, of course, one can understand that it's easier to say "class C" than "/24" but there are other semantics with word class.

On the other hand, what I think you are asking is that because we handed out addresses that way, if it was the case. Now okay, thank you.

So let's move on. We just have a few more seconds. We have five minutes. SAC077, this is something which I will also actually mention tomorrow in the open plenary. Next slide, please. Because I think this is so important. I think this is something I will mention. Anyway, we'll see. I might change my mind.

There was a report about health index for the gTLD process, and that document was sent out for public comment. We read that in SSAC and normally we should not. Normally, we don't comment on these kind of things. But as the KPI that was discussed was supposed to identify whether the gTLD process runs according to plans or not or whether there are any dangers, we felt that maybe we actually should have a look at this because it might be the case that things are not really running as smoothly as people think just because they're looking at the wrong things.

So when we looked at this, our conclusion is that ICANN has approached the whole KPI problem backwards. They have started by looking at what data do we have and then from that, they are trying to say, "Oh, if this data is this value or that value, then everything is fine." We don't think that is good. That is not the way you define a KPI.

If you're going to define a KPI in the correct way, you start by identifying and agreeing on what it is you would like to measure. What is it you would like to know. Then from that, you derive

what kind of data you need to be able to draw that conclusion to minimize the number of false positives and to make sure that you actually can draw the conclusions that you wanted.

When I presented this to GNSO yesterday, I was handed a different report, which also was about KPIs that we had to look at in SSAC this afternoon. And I must say that, unfortunately, we don't know where to start with that report, either.

It seems to be the case that ICANN is, at the moment, at the situation where many companies are and many parties' operations are, including my own. From the beginning, you collect some data to make sure that your server's up and running, and then you go into the second phase, where you collect all data you can just because it looks cool with all these different graphs. But then after a while, you understand that wait a second, all this data, you still don't really know how to draw conclusions out of it, and you need to start the other way around and start by defining and agreeing on what conclusions you want to draw. Next slide, please.

We are recommending explicitly that ICANN must start with understanding and agreeing on what they want to see and then have a look at what kind of data is needed. It's absolutely true that some data that probably is needed is data that ICANN today do not have. That then has implications on the RRA, on other

kind of data. It might have impact on the privacy discussions. There might be some data that cannot be extracted just because there are privacy implications.

Then you must go back to your discussion about what you want to measure, what are the implications if you cannot get this data, can we get similar kind of data from somewhere else, etc. That's a really complicated discussion, but you must start it from an agreement on what conclusions you want to draw, and we have not seen that. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I will try to be very short, but ICANN since the beginning is in trouble with data. If you remember in 2000, there were new gTLDs. In 2004, ICANN decide to have more gTLDs because they weren't able to gather data from the first round. They were not able to have data from the second round in 2004, and we are still here. ICANN is not able to gather data about their own work. It's something maybe we need to find somebody to take care of that. We don't have, but I think your point is very, very important. It's a long struggle from my point of view that needs to be taken into account. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes, Sebastien, thank you very much for that. That reminded me to say one thing that also SSAC has asked about data, specific data points earlier, including discussions that we have had when you were on the Board. So also, SSAC has learned that, and this is what we're trying to say in this report that just because it's so hard to find the data that probably the only way we're getting out of that is to start by just discussing the [meta] issue of what we want to know and then you can go back.

Because the other report that we had a quick look at this afternoon lists, I think, 64 different values that should be measured. The question is, "Why?" It might be the case if you agree on what you want to measure that you only need two or three. So by just knowing what you want to say, it might even be the case that you need less data, which might make the problem that Sebastien pointed out easier.

And that's it. I just wanted to mention, if you go forward two slides, something that you and ALAC are really good at to give us feedback. I want to thank our liaison, Julie Hammer, again for all the good cooperation that we have with ALAC. Thank you. And you are coming with very good feedback to us regarding translation, regarding feedback, regarding outreach. We are now, as I said, working with outreach with the communication team, and you will see more of that and that is thanks to the communication with you.

One thing that we still would like to see more of, of course, are questions to SSAC. At the moment, we sort of invent these. We find these issues ourselves. Now because of this presentation, the KPI, we did get sort of informally appointed to this report this afternoon. But also cross constituency working groups and others, if they hit something that touches these things in ICANN Bylaws and you start to discuss that and get stuck, send us a question, please. And with that, Alan. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Thank you, Julie. We will take five minutes for a bio break or to stretch your legs, but please be back. We will start shortly. Are there any ALAC members who are in the vicinity and not in the room and not at the table? I will point out the schedule is incorrect. We do not have a one-hour break now. We are reconvening right now. Sorry, Cheryl. No one-hour break.

Can I have a tally from staff of how many ALAC members we have here? Everyone who is actively known to be here and hasn't disappeared is here. Thank you. Alright. The decisions we have made so far – if I could have everyone's attention, please. The decisions we have made so far are that we will vote, we will take a decision on the entire package of recommendations excluding Recommendation 12. We will attempt to make that decision by consensus followed by an opportunity of any ALAC

members of making a comment. We will then proceed to Recommendation 12 and do the same thing.

Are there any questions on the process? I would like to move that following the extensive consultation and discussion process that has been followed by the ALAC, which has included nearly 2,000 person-hours of teleconferences purely within the At-Large community, significant consultation on RALO calls and on ALAC calls, that the ALAC approve Recommendations 1 through 11 of the CCWG Accountability Final Proposal. I call for a second.

Holly. Pardon me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Kaili is on his way.

ALAN GREENBERG: Kaili is on his way. Is there any discussion on the motion? Is there anyone who does not support the motion? One. Is there anyone who wishes to abstain? Let the record show we held one objection, no abstention, and of the 13 people we have, are therefore – I understand, Sebastien – there are therefore 12 people who are supporting the motion.

Subject to the people who are not here, and we do need to consult them, that motion will pass by consensus if they approve

it. Should both of them not approve it, we will revert to a vote. I'd like to call for a statement from the person who objected. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I'm sorry, but when you ask the question, an objection, what is an objection? You are for, you're against. I abstain. It's my position I express earlier, and my vote must be taken into account as an abstention to this proposal. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien. What I meant by objection is do you not support the motion? I will take that into account, however, and we revised the count. We have no people who are objecting to the motion. We have one abstention. Do you wish to make any further statement as to why or your previous statement stands?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Alan. I will like just to tell you that what I say earlier expressing my point of view about the full report remains, and it's why I abstain for this part of the report. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further discussion on the motion on the first 11 recommendations? Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah. Mr. Chair, could you kindly recount the status now based on what Sebastien said? Is it abstain or objection? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sebastien's position is abstention. Kaili, welcome. A few minutes ago, we are in the process of making the formal decision on the CCWG Accountability proposal. The original concept was we would make the decision on all 12 recommendations at the same time unless any ALAC member asked for any of them to be excluded. Sebastien did ask that number 12 be excluded and, therefore, we have just concluded the initial pass on approving the first 11 recommendations. We did it by consensus call.

The result of that consensus call was one abstention and 12 people present supporting the recommendation. Are you in a position to say whether you are supporting the motion to ratify these recommendations, or do you abstain or object to them?

KAILI KAN: I support.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. At this point, we now have, if may do the arithmetic properly, 13 out of 15 supporting, one abstention.

And Tim Denton is hopefully on his way. He was unfortunately delayed until today, but we expect to see him soon and hopefully we will be able to complete the count at that point.

We now go on to a motion to support – excuse me. We have a request for a photo op. Does anyone object to having a raise of tent cards for those who are supporting the motion? If anyone objects, we will not do it. If anyone is objecting to us doing it, we will not have this photo op. Okay. Anyone who supports the motion – excuse me, Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And then you will ask for second photo with the one who abstained, I hope, so.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you wish, I certainly will.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: It's already late in the week. We can only go so high.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I would have suggested to do that at the recommendation 12. You are not doing well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: My apologies. Would anyone who has abstained care to raise their flag? I would like to move that the ALAC ratify Recommendation 12 – I will ask for speakers in a moment – ratify Recommendation 12 of the CCWG Accountability final proposal. Can I have any second on that? We have a second.

Is there any discussion? Could I ask if there's anyone who objects, who is not supporting the ratification of Recommendation 12? Only ALAC members. Is there anyone who wishes to abstain from this motion? We have 14 out of the present 14 people supporting the motion. The motion passes by consensus.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Full consensus.

ALAN GREENBERG: Full consensus of those present at the moment. May I ask everyone who supports the motion or who supported the motion to raise their cards because we seem to want photo ops? With the permission of the ALAC, I will delay making any formal

announcement until we can contact Tim, which will allow us to report the full position of the ALAC. No objection? Thank you.

It is with great pleasure that I introduce Holly Raiche. Holly is going to talk about something called RDS. I don't know what it means. That's a joke. For better or worse, I do know what it means.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do you know how sad that is?

ALAN GREENBERG: Something we used to call WHOIS and related stuff, but we're not allowed to anymore. The words have changed. And there are a number of interesting issues related to it going forward, not to mention a number of interesting things going backward for the last 15 years or so. I will turn it over to Holly and by the end of this, everyone here is going to understand it all. And, therefore…

HOLLY RAICHE: There will be questions.

ALAN GREENBERG: Therefore, we will have significantly larger participation in the PDP that's going on, on this, than we already do. This is a really crucial issue for At-Large. It has always been a crucial issue for

At-Large. We have not always agreed on it. We have had violent, well maybe not violent, but close to violent disagreement within At-Large on the various issues related to WHOIS in the past. I firmly believe that will continue. Holly and I have actually come to, well, maybe not physical violence.

HOLLY RAICHE: Never blows. Let me first say that it is quite legitimate to have differing views.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It's an interesting topic and it's a vital one to us, so I ask you to pay attention and ask questions. It's really important that everyone understands what's going on. Thank you, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. The first thing that needs to be said is this particular working group will be issuing the first of probably what's going to be thousands of PDPs very soon to get initial ALAC sentiment on these issues, and I would like to think that this is your introduction to what the whole issue has been. It's been part of my life since 2009, probably much longer for Alan.

This has been a really, really ongoing issue. For those of you who are particularly interested, there is a thing called the final report

of the review team of WHOIS or something like that. It summarizes to date, and that was about three years ago, where the issue was up to. But it explains the acronyms, it explains all of the issues, and it sort of is a milestone after which the Board started to realize that where we're up to at this stage, in fact, we need to be moving in another direction.

Because of the varying expectations on what we mean by personal information, what we mean about the protection of personal information, each country has its own set of laws, definitions, and so forth, so I will expect that there will be differences. I hope there will be differences, and I hope we can at least come to some sensible outcomes.

What I'm going to do is walk you through, and this is the agenda, just a bit of background because you need to understand at least a little bit of where we've been and why we're up to where we are. Long about 2012-2013, the Board responded to a lot of the WHOIS issues with a couple of important decisions on where to move forward. One of the ways forward, it's called the EWG and that's because if there are not at least 17 acronyms between now and next to 15 minutes, I would have failed.

That was the Expert Working Group. It was appointed as one of the Board decisions. It has come up with a set of very different recommendations on what to do with the data and how it is

formed. The RDS, you see I can come up with acronyms, Registration Directory Services is one of the outcomes of that Board decision. The EWG was another. They're all tied, they're all linked, and I'll explain how.

And then what has happened and Alan, for his sins, is on the same working group that Carlton and I are on. The working group will be in three phases, and I reckon it's going to be going in – I will be dead and buried by the time that working group is finished, I think. Hopefully, at least, we got, I mean, I'll finish through phase one but I'm not sure I'll see out phase three. And then report on where we're up to, to date. It's going to take a fair bit of time, so let's start with the next slide. Thank you very much.

Where we start with is really the core issue, which is – now does anybody what the RAA is? And does everybody realize there's a new RAA as of 2013? Good. Under the contract that ICANN has with the gTLD registrars, is that there must be open access to a range of personal data about each registrant that must be provided on a free webpage and a free Port 43 service.

That means that the data, it includes the registrant, that is the person who has the domain name. Their name, their phone number, their contact address, what in most privacy regimes we'd call personal data, must be publicly available. And for the

Europeans around the table, you would be going, "Oh, my goodness. This is against EU privacy directives."

Registrants who do not want their details to be made public can use services, privacy or proxy services, to ensure that those personal details are not made public. And indeed, some of the uses of privacy and proxy services are specifically for that purpose to ensure that private details are retained as private. Could I have the next slide, please?

Proxy services are in essence where somebody acts as agent for you. Most often, this will be in the case of, say, corporate entities who are going to launch a new product, a new service, or whatever. They would ask their lawyer, possibly their Web designer, or whatever to use the lawyers or agents name details in place of the actual personal details of the registrant. So in fact, it's really an agency relationship rather one where somebody is seeking the specific privacy protection of a privacy service.

In a privacy service, they provide simply the registrant's name and other details, which may amount to nothing. In other words, you may simply say that's somebody, that is the name of the registrant and that's the only detail you will be getting. So it is in fact a real privacy service. Now some privacy services will in fact substitute their contact details for the registrant's details.

Sometimes, you'd get no information at all, although that's changing with the Privacy Proxy Services Working Group Final Report. That's another step we'll get to.

But those are the two ways in which if you as a registrant are not to have your personal information made public, you will use one of these services. That's the only way that that can be avoided at this stage. Next slide, please.

The WHOIS Policy Review Team, and I have to say that for probably at least ten years prior to this, probably 20, ever since a lot of privacy law has developed, there has been a real tension between the RAA requirement on the publication of registrant details and increasingly privacy protection or, to be more precise, data protection laws in either the European Union or other jurisdictions, as well.

As a response to increasing difficulty that registrars, particularly in the EU and Canada, to some extent in Australia, were faced in terms of their reluctance to publish details, the WHOIS Policy Review Team was commissioned. It came up with its report in 2012. That is a very useful document to read. It actually outlines the origins of what's called WHOIS.

Now WHOIS, by the way, the WHOIS data, it is a lot more than just registrant details. It's a lot of technical information as to where you can actually locate the actual address, if you can call

it that, of the registrant and the sort of process that you've gone through.

What the Review Team did in its report was review the very beginnings of what WHOIS is, how it grew up, and why it is creating problems. It starts with the very beginning of the actual why there was personal information published in the first place. Well in the early days of the Internet, it was a bunch of geeks, and basically, what they did was say, "Look, what server are you on?" Essentially. It wasn't personal information; it was about a bunch of people sort of just wanting to be able to contact.

But when ICANN was formed, the sort of information that people published about how they could be found was unfortunately translated into the name, the address, the e-mail address, the phone, and so forth. So all the details that weren't originally part of the first information that was exchanged between the very early pioneers of the Internet was translated into a lot more in terms of registrant details. Garth, you have a question?

GARTH BRUEN: No. I have a counter statement, but I can wait for you to be finished with your presentation. I just want to make sure I'm in the queue.

HOLLY RAICHE: It's a long time. What's your counter statement?

GARTH BRUEN: I have to disagree with some of the statements you made about the origin of WHOIS and the intent of WHOIS. The original specifications for WHOIS explicitly state that the data entered is to be nonsensitive, nonsensitive information.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. It wasn't…

GARTH BRUEN: This idea that the people are required to put personal data in, and that somehow violates their privacy, that's actually, there's no requirement for them to enter personal data. No requirement for that.

HOLLY RAICHE: Stop. Have you read the RAA clause 3.1.7?

GARTH BRUEN: It requires that somebody be contactable, that somebody be responsible.

HOLLY RAICHE: There is a name. There must be a name.

GARTH BRUEN: A name, yes. A name.

HOLLY RAICHE: And what, he's made a good point here. He's made a good point because what people do if they don't want their personal data is they will put down the name of Mickey Mouse and their phone number will be 1234567, and their address is going to be 27 Hollywood Boulevard. And coming out of the Review Team, and I'm going to list the issues, one of them was the lack of accuracy for WHOIS data because if people didn't use a privacy or a proxy service, they got around the need to have name address phone number, which they didn't want to give, by giving a fictitious name, address, phone number.

Now when the – you're going to be the only one listening to this, you know that? Yes.

GARTH BRUEN: I know because I'm not done with my comments, but go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, Garth prefixed what he said with the origins of WHOIS did not talk about personal information. It said contact

and said nonsensitive. And in fact, in those cases, everyone worked at a university or a research lab and gave the contact associated with those places. I think what he said was in fact quite accurate.

HOLLY RAICHE: Oh, no, absolutely accurate. But the problem was from the early days of giving contact details to what was specified in the RAA – don't need to listen to the cause again – a lot of people were uncomfortable providing accurate information and what they did instead was provide inaccurate information.

One of the problems identified in this report of 2012 was to say a lot of this information is inaccurate, and one of the outcomes of that was for the registrars to have requirements on them to check the accuracy of the data because law enforcement agencies were particularly concerned they were reliant on WHOIS data to actually track down people and the trouble was, in most cases, the inaccurate detail just happened to be the details provided by the crims, surprisingly or not.

So what came out of the 2012 report, there was a lack of consistent policies. I mean, quite seriously you looked at the policies, try to make sense of them in terms of really what was required, how it was implemented. What they observed, in fact, is that there are legitimate as well as illegitimate uses of privacy

and proxy services, that in fact there are quite legitimate reasons why people may not want to be identified. You can think of many of them. You can think of women's refugees. You can think of human rights groups in countries where human rights are not necessarily respected. We can all come up with reasons why people would quite legitimately want not to have their details public.

For law enforcement, however, having inaccurate details meant they could not respond. Garth, you want to sit here?

GARTH BRUEN: I just want the opportunity to respond to some of the points. That's all.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alright. We're going to have a conversation. What did I get wrong?

GARTH BRUEN: Holly, Holly. It's not a question of what you got wrong. I just want to make sure that everything has been included. That all topics are being addressed. I have to object to this classification that the only people who have a right to look at the data would somehow be law enforcement.

HOLLY RAICHE: I didn't say that at all. That is not what I said.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay. I feel like that because governments can look at data whenever they want to. They have the power of the courts, etc., to do so. The issue that I've been concerned with is the ability of the ordinary consumer to be able to mitigate abuse by completely commercial and illicit parties on the Internet.

HOLLY RAICHE: I haven't even gotten there, Garth.

GARTH BRUEN: Okay, okay. Go for it.

HOLLY RAICHE: In fact, that very point was made by you, and I took it up, and I made a change, but I haven't got there yet. Okay. What the report said was essentially there are legitimate and not legitimate uses of it. Law enforcement agencies, obviously, would want access to it. When I started to talk about WHOIS within Australia, I also found other agencies such as our corporate regulator, our competition regulator, fair trading – a lot of government agencies wanting simply to find information

out about businesses that may or may not have had interesting practices.

There are a whole range of quite legitimate reasons why you would want personal information, quite apart from law enforcement. One of the very large and influential lobby groups has been, for example, the IP community wanting to track down people who are violating IP. So in fact, there are a lot of quite legitimate reasons why you would want to get at personal information and there are a lot of legitimate reasons why people would not want to have their information made public.

Another highlighted issue as part of the final report was the accuracy of the data. The only way people could, well, one of the ways that people would avoid having people access their information was just to put in inaccurate data for legitimate or otherwise reasons. And what the report also highlighted was there were a lot of technical issues in terms of just what was wrong with the protocol. It was outdated for a number of technical reasons that I will not touch. Next slide.

The Board accepted that report and, as a result, did two things. They first of all amended the RAA and a couple of amendments of the RAA, which were important for this topic. One was to say you must develop specifications for the privacy proxy services such that the services they provide meet certain standards,

there's certain access under certain circumstances, and in fact, that working group alone took about two years and we're still not talking.

Another thing they did as part of the report was to say in the new RAA, the amended RAA in 2013, that there were stronger obligations on registrars to check the accuracy of the data. Also, the registrar's agreement was amended to say, by the way, you are responsible for the resellers and making sure the resellers also comply with the RAA.

So in fact, the whole RAA agreement was tightened as a consequence of this report, but they also establish what's called the Expert Working Group. It was reexamined and defined why it is you collect personal information, how to safeguard that information so that it's only used for legitimate purposes (but then you have to establish what that means), and then propose some kind of solution because the WHOIS is broken in a number of respects. Next slide.

The EWG, and for my sins, I did not sit on it, but Carlton did. He sat through. It was 15 months of hard slog. It's an interesting report that was never finally accepted, by the way, but did a lot of really useful work. What they did was go through and say, "Well, who uses the data and for what purpose?" And it turns out

there are a lot of quite legitimate uses of different kinds of data that is generated.

Who uses it? There were a lot of legitimate uses, so in fact, the EWG report is a very valuable source of real information about the sorts of data that is gathered and the way it's used. What they recommended was to replace the whole WHOIS thing with a registration data service that actually collects and validates and discloses RD – I'm calling it RD, it's registration data, registrant data – for permissible purposes only. In other words, you're starting to move towards, if you will, the European view of access to personal data, which ought to be only for legitimate purposes and only by accredited users in some way.

One recommendation, which probably a lot of people have a level of discomfort with was all of the data is collected in one place. All I can think of is this massive stack of personal information that would be hacked within about two days because everybody would be after that data. However, as I say, this particular set of recommendations and information is a very useful step forward. Next slide, please.

The Board did accept the final report, and what they also did the Board and together with the GNSO got together and said, "There has to be some kind of framework for a PDP that will actually address that huge set of issues involved in registration data

accuracy, privacy, and access." And those are three huge terms. What do you collect? Who gets to access it? For what purposes? How do you protect it? All of the sorts of information, principles that would be in most data protection legislation.

At the same time, the board charged the IETF with the development of a thing called WEIRDS (yes, it's called WEIRDS), which is the Web Extensible Internet Registration Data Service. This would have been a protocol that would replace the WHOIS protocol. It would address many of the technical issues that were identified by the 2013 report, and at the same time, have features that would allow what's called gated access. Access such that there would be some information that would be publicly available, but no longer all of the information.

There would be some further set of information that would be available depending on the person who could credential themselves that they had a legitimate use, and that they were who they say they were, and some further level that would possibly be available to law enforcement security and other agencies, but the concept of having access based on both the use and the user being identified and certified before access being given to a certain amount of information. Next slide, please.

What was established then in November this past year, the PDP was established and we now have a membership on the working group. God knows how many people are just sitting in it not participants, but there are about 120 members.

And you can imagine the constituencies. There's law enforcement, I was just talking to Patrik. There are three members from the technical community, the SSAC, they're on it. There are lots of people who are from the intellectual proper who are on it. There are privacy advocates who are on it. We've even got somebody from the EU human rights, and that's probably one of the first times that they have understood that what ICANN is doing impacts on what is seen as a human right. Alan and Carlton and I from [inaudible] are on it, so there's a huge lot of people. I'm not sure how many could be left in a year's time. It's a very large working group.

The work of this group is in three phases. The first phase alone is simply going to set out the policy requirements, and that means a complete understanding of what policy or policies should be in place in terms of the actual data, in terms of the data that is collected. Again, it involves a revisiting of the – I've lost a slide.

I've gained. No. I've lost it again. I've got two screens, neither of which I want.

EN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry. We have a technical issue.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, somebody has just plugged and unplugged.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The computer is restarting.

HOLLY RAICHE: That doesn't matter.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hold for a moment.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'll hold. I hate it when they fix things. When I fix things, it gets worse. I know that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Opportunity for a song or dance by anyone. Were you volunteering for that?

HOLLY RAICHE: I was probably going to foreshadow what we're up to. Where we're up to and the reason that I think it's important to give this

presentation is that the PDP that is underway at this stage will very shortly be going out to the community asking for feedback. The feedback is going to be asking what kind of privacy protection do you think there should be for what kind of data, who should have use of that data? What I expect is, I hope there will be lots of different input.

Now to answer Garth's question, I'll give a couple of working groups that I've been on that have been part of this whole process of finally realizing that we just need a fundamental rethink about WHOIS completely. One of the working groups arising out of the 2013 RAA was the Privacy and Proxy Services and one of the questions was about access to some of the information.

There's no question in most people's minds that law enforcement will probably get information, but one of the points that was actually made here was, in fact, there are other government agencies, such as what will be our own competition and consumer commission, which deals with consumer complaints. So if there's a complaint that a consumer has about a website that in fact own regulatory body ought to be able to find out that information.

Similarly, our ACCC, which is our competition body, our corporate body, there are a lot of government agencies that are

not necessarily law enforcement but nevertheless aspects of either consumer protection or competition policy that ought to also be able to have access.

Now I know that you would like to have individual access.

GARTH BRUEN: Not necessarily.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, okay.

GARTH BRUEN: If I can talk about it for [inaudible].

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah, fine. By the way, it was talked about and the decision was made. In fact, most people are not, would not know to go to WHOIS. If you have, if you feel you've been cheated out of a website, you're going to do a couple of things. You're going to go to the cops or you're going to go to your consumer body or you're going to go somewhere, and where you go should have the ability to track down to use whatever information is available to find the miscreant.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, you're making a number of statements. I don't know whether these are your opinions or these are opinions that have already been decided by some other group or recommended by some other group.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: For instance, you said, "An individual user would not go to WHOIS; they would go to somewhere else and that body must be able to have some access." I'm not sure on whose behalf you're speaking.

HOLLY RAICHE: That was a discussion within the Privacy Proxy Services Working Group in terms of trying to work through who should have access. Some of the comments that came out of ALAC were to say, "Well actually, it's not just law enforcement. In fact, there may be individuals, there may be bodies like our own consumer and competition group."

I actually put that viewpoint, which was what about individual access? What about government agency access? And what was accepted and written into the result of the privacy proxy thing

was not individuals have access, but the sorts of outcomes were, at the very least, you have government agencies, not just law enforcement, so it was an expansion. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. There's a massive class, an important class that you've completely left out of that list. Okay? And these are nongovernmental security groups and consumer groups. People who are not affiliated with the government who have organizations that work to solve a number of these problems unofficially. And actually, things work much better when you don't have to go to the government and when you don't have to go to law enforcement and you don't have to go to court.

HOLLY RAICHE: And you know what I'm hoping is that you put that, when it comes time for comment, that's a comment that I would like to put forward.

GARTH BRUEN: I will write it formally.

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I'm here listening to everybody and raising these issues because, in fact, what we have to put forward is the view of all of you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We only have limited time here, indeed. I guess I would like to request that you try to present not only the opinions of one group, but where possible, the ranges, so that we have some idea of where the comments are. I know I personally vehemently object to some of the conclusions within the privacy and proxy report. I believe I am going to raise those issues again in the more general case because the privacy proxy is an interim thing pending this.

So let's try to open people's minds to the issues and not simply state what the conclusions of the last PDP were or something because we're really entering a grave new world and we're trying to set things up properly for the next decade or three.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE: And, okay. Let me just finish this, and then I was about to throw the floor open anyway. The PDP was established in November. We're at the very beginning of what's going to be a really long process, and that is to rethink. I mean, I would expect we would be going back to the Expert Working group and just looking at all of the work. That I did because I spent a lot of time trying to understand what data is gathered, what data might be gathered, how is it used, who uses it, and trying to work through some of the big issues in terms of personal information, other information.

The phase two and three, once you understand and can reach some kind of agreement. It was interesting, one of the guys from the SSAC said, "By the way, you're never going to reach agreement." I thought, "Great."

Once there's an understanding and some kind of consensus on the actual policy, which is an understanding about what data should be collected, who should use it, under what circumstance, there's a whole range of issues there. And we will be asked as ALAC, and I hope to goodness all of you will go into your own constituencies and ask for the opinions as to what should that look like because we've got the opportunity to make those comments.

After that, there will actually then be the functional design of what are we doing. Now when we, as ALAC looked at, there was a letter that we drafted about what was called the RDAP, which is the registration data access protocol, which was developed by that WEIRDS group. It has functionality right now to address a lot of the technical issues that were identified in the 2013 report.

It has additional optional functionality that will allow gated access, will allow the registrant to be able to – or whomever, holds the data, and again, that's another issue – to be able to say, "Well, we can authenticate the user. We can authenticate the use. You are allowed certain access or not." So that part of this is going to be translated into some kind of technical requirements around the collection and the access of data.

The phase three is really going to be the implementation of those policy requirements and designs, and give some kind of implementation guidance. Next slide, please.

These are the range of issues that have been listed in the working group's charter that we have to get our heads around, and it means you guys are also going to get your heads around. What are we talking about in terms of the users and the purposes of what data? Do we think there should be gated access or not? And there is not unanimity, I have to say.

Data accuracy, to what extent is this a function of something we should be worried about? And data elements. Going back to what Patrik was saying, and you should be listening to Patrik and saying, "For goodness sake." A lot of the issues he raised are right here on your screen, privacy. And for privacy, you can read data protection. Compliance. What kind of compliance systems do we want? And then they're going to be the technical issues. In terms of cost and benefit, all of this is going to cost because there's going to be huge changes to systems, there's going to be huge changes potentially to who stores the data, where is it stored, what are the risks for storage, what are the benefits? And so forth.

So this is just the task in front of phase one of the working group, and it is a huge set of issues. We'll be lucky to go through this in two years is my guess. Next slide, please.

Where we're up to. We've agreed to the charter. There's a working group, it has a leadership team of four, it's headed by Chuck. It's developed what's called a mind map, which is just setting out how we think we're going to manage all of the issues. We're in the process of developing a working plan and we will be seeking public input.

So, Garth, that's exactly when all of the stuff that you want to say has to be said. And every one of you in terms of your

understanding of your own data retention policies and so forth, we'll be seeking that kind of input. Because at the initial stage, we need to have all of the information on the table and this is the best place to get it. I think that's it. Next slide. Okay. Clarifications, questions, comments? Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Quickly and then I'll let anybody else talk. So as far as European law has been mentioned, you cannot have secret ownership of a bank or a pharmacy in Europe. It applies to individuals. This is really the sort of sector that I'm talking about are operations where usually, normally a consumer has a right to know who's operating a particular business. So we're not talking about necessarily individual websites.

We've also had high-profile situations where the actual owner of domains turns out to be the registrar itself who is trying to profit from an auction, and this violates their contract. They're not supposed to be warehousing and selling names for their own purposes.

HOLLY RAICHE: We allow that in Australia, but that's okay.

GARTH BRUEN: But under .au?

HOLLY RAICHE: Not exactly what happens, but you are allowed to sell names.

GARTH BRUEN: They can sell names, but they can't warehouse them. That's the difference.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, well probably they don't technically warehouse, but I can tell you there's a whole industry around selling names.

GARTH BRUEN: Yeah, but, I mean, there have been situations where there's been some abusive domain and you push, push, push, push through and you find that it's actually the registrar who owns it. This is extremely problematic from our perspective in this room.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah.

GARTH BRUEN: We're ultimately dealing with the principle of a responsible party because the Internet's a shared space, and that's the original

intent of the record set was somebody who plugs a machine into the network has to be accountable to everybody else on the network. That's the real intent of it. And things work best if everybody plays nice, and one of the ways that we play nice is if we know who we're playing with.

HOLLY RAICHE: Look, absolutely agree. I mean, some of you may not know [inaudible], but he's a small registrar in Ireland. On the one hand, he has data protection law that he has to comply with, but on the other hand, as he says down at the bottom, he has to put his company details and contact details. Now this has been one of the issues that we've dealt with in privacy proxy in terms of at one point, there was a whole push to have corporate, the financial – we tried to define those bodies that should not be allowed to use privacy proxy services as commercial organizations.

By the time we tried to define how that was going to look, we got so bogged down in the definition, everybody threw their hands up and said, "This is too hard. Anybody can use it." But then part of the outcome was also there has to be verifiable some way, some contact screen.

We probably wouldn't be comfortable where we wound up with the privacy proxy, and I don't think Alan is. It was a heap of

compromise and every one of those issues is about to resurface on here, and that's a real tension between corporate responsibility and being accountable and genuine privacy. So I'm hoping the rest of you actually are going to be contributing to the debate in terms of your own experience of what information you think should be available to anybody at any time, what information should be not available, how you would define it for what use. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll give as an example the one place where I disagreed vehemently with the recommendations of the privacy proxy service. I believe very much that if an organization is – don't hit on the word because I'll explain it in a moment – if an organization is doing commerce on the Internet, if they are selling people things, you should be able to find out who they are.

There are a close to infinite number of websites where they have no real contact information. You don't know whether they're in Hong Kong, Shanghai, or Los Angeles, and there is no way of finding out because they're hidden behind a proxy service.

Now I understand not everyone knows how to use WHOIS, but if there is not a website out there that is entitled, "Who are you

doing business with?" then there could be. And you type in a domain address and it tells you the salient information.

Now I understand that the term "doing commerce" has caused significant unrest in people in that some people classify a charity. Sorry? Yes, it is, Tim. Some people classify a charity as doing commerce, and there are reasons why some classes of charities do not want their identity revealed. However, there are jurisdictions around the world, including a number in Europe, that do have rules such as this that is if you're doing business with individuals.

If you're doing business with IBM, you're on your own. But if you're doing business with individuals, essentially selling things, that you should be identifiable. I ended up supporting the privacy proxy recommendations because it is an interim one, and the battle was fought, and I lost.

But in the long term, we need to protect consumers, and if it's difficult, then we need to do more work to figure out how to do it. Thank you. That's an example. I'm sure there's going to be others, but that's one of the ones that's near and dear to me because I use the Internet to buy things and I'm very upset sometimes when I sometimes refuse to buy something that looks really good because I have no clue who these people are. And I have no trouble buying something on eBay from someone

from Shanghai but it's sort of nice to know that's where they're from.

HOLLY RAICHE: And that's just a taste of some of the debate that is actually going to be going on and has gone on and will continue to go on for some time. What I'm looking for, though, is when (and it will be soon) we are working through, first of all, the charter and how we're going to deal with that list of issues that we have to deal with. But at that stage, we will be seeking initial comment from this group and the broader the comment, the more issues will be identified because this will be our, if you will, the first and probably best chance to get all of our issues onto the table and say, "These are the things that actually ALAC and all of your organizations think." And I would expect there's going to be a lot of disagreement or not necessarily aligned with, and that's fine.

I can guarantee that this working group is probably going to be as difficult and as fractious as all of the others have been because there are absolutely legitimate viewpoints, and they don't necessarily agree, and that's why the guy from SSAC was saying, "Well I don't know how you're going to come to agreement."

And I'm not sure how we're going to, either, but we're going to have to try. So if there are any questions or comments, I would really welcome them now or later. If not, I'm on time. Sebastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. A few things. The first one is in your presentation, only you talk about the fact that the EWG report, Expert Working Group report, was not endorsed by the Board. But it was not meant to be a report to the Board to be endorsed. It was meant to be a report to help the community and here, unfortunately, more specifically, the GNSO for the gTLDs. And to help to start a new way of thinking around the data in the domain name system.

And I was one amongst few who pushed hard into the Board to have this working group. I don't like the title of this working group because hopefully there are other experts outside of this working group, but this EWG came with a report and it's now the starting of the PDP taking into account this input.

The question I ask in the comment of one vote of ALAC few weeks ago, it's the fact that now for end users, we will have really two systems for we will have in the future two system to access data. We will have still WHOIS for the ccTLDs and there are different country by country [inaudible] but it's the same type. At least it's on the same technical base.

We are developing a new way of accessing data with new rules and that's good, but I think that from an At-Large perspective, end user perspective, we need to see how we can involve also the cc in this journey because, at the end of the day, we need as end user, I will say, a single or maybe a singles, but a single way of accessing those data. And for me, that's a very important point to take into account. I know that it's difficult, it will add to the difficulty of all you already present, but I really feel that we need to take that into account.

And to finish, I would like to thank you for the hard job you have done on that because it's not an easy topic and it's a lot of work. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. And although the EWG report was not, if you will, that final report in the sense of the report, it has an enormous amount of useful information. People spent 15 months gathering, thinking through the policies. It is a very important resource for this working group. So while it doesn't have the status that you would have if it had gone through a proper PDP process, it's still is in our charter as one of the foundation documents to look at.

And I take your point about the ccTLDs. This is for the new gTLDs, and maybe we can [inaudible] to our ccTLD liaison, but in

the end, we are stuck with the fact that ccTLDs are creatures of their own government.

One would hope that if we can set up a really good system that is responsive, strikes an appropriate balance between protecting individuals, both in terms of protecting privacy where it should be respected, providing information where it should be respected, and striking that balance, which is a difficult one, one would hope it's a model.

But the end of the day, with CCLTs, each country can make its own mind up. Now that isn't to say it will not be a guidance. Rafa?

RAFA RASHDAN: Yes. For the [project] of ccTLD, Iranian [ccTLD] and we received requests from people to dismiss their personnel information. But all what you speak only about gTLDs and we want that will be also available for ccTLDs because we have a contractual relationship with ICANN and we are doing what they require from us. Why only gTLDs?

HOLLY RAICHE: There's an easy answer and a hard answer. The easy answer is that each country has sovereignty over its own country code, and that is obviously respected. That is in no way stopping any

country from saying, "That is a very sensible balance that you have struck in terms of both the protection of customers and protection of privacy and, yes, we'd like to in some way replicate that taking into account any of our own national imperatives." So there won't be anything stopping ccTLDs but there is not the power, the contractual power of ICANN to say, "You must do this." Hopefully, we have done the job well enough that it will be a useful model.

ALAN GREENBERG: I take it we have exhausted all questions and discussions at this point. Sorry. I have been focusing on another little matter I had to work on. Alberto has a comment.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Alan mentioned a concern, which hasn't been met, I believe, on an e-trade side. I am buying from their many websites. Well, I can know through WHOIS the address and the information of who is selling it, eBay for example, but not whom I am selling to. In some sides, through an e-mail address you can get to the origin. Some other times, I cannot know who is on the other side until I have made a purchase. I cannot communicate in this way,

and I think this will never be available because this is protected or allowed by the legislation of each country.

I don't think we can do it in this way. Thank you very much.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you for your comment, and I'd keep that in mind so that when we are looking for comments, as many comments as possible will contribute to a really fulsome response by ALAC when initial comments are sought. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: One further thought on what Alberto said, and not a modification but a qualification of what I said. Everyone has a choice on whether to use commercial sites or not. If I choose to use eBay, for instance, the policies of eBay do not really allow me to know who my vendor is. And I'm making a conscious decision whether I want to use eBay, whether I trust eBay to back up the transaction sufficiently that I don't need to know who it is or if it's completely invisible.

So we all have choices, but I think at the same time, we have to ensure reasonable protection to allow people to, in fact, be able to deal with some confidence on the Internet. I know somebody who does not use the Internet to buy anything period because

he does not trust anyone to hold his credit card. Now that's his personal decision.

But at some level, we have to make sure that people can make decisions based on reasonable input, and that's a lot of what we're talking about now. And what reasonable is today is not what reasonable was five years ago and probably will not be reasonable ten years from now. So we're in a real challenge. Going to be lots of fun, lots of work. Depends on your definition of fun.

Thank you, Holly. We have the ccNSO coming in at 17:00 hours. I, with some trepidation, say, "I will give people the time off and let you go stretch your legs." But I'm afraid people will disappear and not come back. So I can spend time talking here for the next 15 minutes, or I can trust you.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Don't trust me. No way.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Sebastien is the accurate one. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes. I'm sorry. We always give everybody a round of applause. Why don't we give a round of applause to Holly?

ALAN GREENBERG: Deficient, and I can't speak. Thank you very much, Alberto. Yes, thank you, Holly. Alright, please be back in ten minutes. Ten minutes. No longer. The meeting starts officially in 15. I want people sitting around the table waiting for them. And if you let me down, I will never, ever do this again. I have a request in for leg shackles on all chairs in the future.

Can everyone please take your seats? In that case, we're going to do something remarkable. We're going to start on time. I'd like to welcome you to the joint ALAC/ccNSO meeting held on Sunday afternoon at 5:00 PM, 17:00 hours, in Marrakech. The agenda is on all of your screens and has been published for a while.

And I'm going to – you see what a supportive group I have here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Is he tired or what?

ALAN GREENBERG: I will turn the microphone over to Byron Holland, the chair of the ccNSO, for any introductory remarks, and we'll go on to the first agenda item following that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much. Thanks for having us for our regular meeting, although it is at a different time compared to when it usually is, so thanks for being flexible on that. As we all know, this is a very, very busy week and it has been very challenging to schedule everything, so thanks for your flexibility on that. I'm looking forward to hearing officially how ALAC is doing with the CCWG proposal.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have spent a good part of yesterday and today discussing the proposal, and that was following four hours of briefings we did with the ALAC and community last week to do the essential overview of it. I am happy to say that we have conducted a ratification process and, unfortunately, one of members was not present because he was arriving late, and that's Tim Denton. I have discussed the issue with him, and he has informed me that he is prepared or was prepared to vote in favor of all 12 recommendations, so I can officially say that the entire proposal was ratified by consensus by the ALAC.

The first 11 recommendations were ratified by full consensus with the exclusion of one member, who abstained. And the last recommendation was ratified with full consensus of the ALAC. And that announcement went out about a minute and a half ago

to the Accountability Group and the chairs of the other chartering groups.

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, congratulations. I know how much effort the ALAC community has put into this. So, well done. And congratulations to you, Alan. I know how hard you've worked among many people on this issue, so you're getting tongue tied, I can understand that. It has been a long week, even though it's only Sunday at five, right? The meetings start shortly.

Well as per the agenda, the first item on the agenda also included what the ccNSO is doing vis-a-vis the CCWG. We still have our council vote ahead of us, and just to give this community some sense of how we're doing that, yes, we are, I believe, the last community who will be voting on it, but such is the nature of our council meeting. It's Wednesday at 5:00.

We talked about having a special council meeting just for this, but given the nature of the subject itself and the ongoing conversation within our community, it was felt that trying to short circuit it and have an earlier council meeting would far more likely do harm than good.

So the proposal will come to the council for support or not at our regular council meeting Wednesday at 5:00. In the interim, we

have had, like you, many, many discussions over time. Certainly in Dublin, we had general consensus, though absolutely not unanimous, to be supportive of the third proposal. And the way that we are looking at it is to focus not on reprosecuting the entire case, but looking at what are the deltas or changes between the third and, effectively, the fourth proposal and trying to focus on those.

In the interim, we've had a couple of special council meetings, we've had webinars, we've tried to educate our community to the greatest degree possible. In our ccNSO meetings, (which are all day Tuesday, all day Wednesday), our agenda has devoted a great deal of time to this subject. So in fact, we have three separate blocks or sessions, almost five hours of this meeting will be devoted to various aspects of CWG, CCWG, the interrelationship between the two, and where we're at.

Some of you may know we have five members of the CCWG. All five of them will be reporting back to the full ccNSO with their opinion. And to some degree, we have delegated the responsibility for them to be paying close attention, reading all 337 pages, etc., and providing us their detailed feedback. Not only will they provide their feedback and input, but then we as the broader community will have the opportunity to question them in detail in specific sessions but also over the course of a couple of days.

So while I understand you have recently spent two days talking about it, our two days to talk about it will commence Tuesday morning and last through Wednesday, culminating with our council meeting Wednesday at 5:00, where we will vote on it. So that's the process. I don't want to short circuit that process by commenting too much on how it may go. I know our members still have lots of questions and there's still lots of debate to be had much like I'm sure you have had over the past two days.

So that's the process and that's where we're at right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Byron. We'll lend you our 70- or 75-slide deck if you'd like to review the issues. Well, good. That sounds positive and I understand your position. Based on the extensive discussions we've had over the last week and the last month, there was not a high likelihood that this group was going to reject the recommendations, but I was very careful not to make any promises on behalf of it because you never know how these things play out.

And it is sending the wrong message to pre-announce the outcome before the vote or whatever is taken, so I completely agree with your position and support it. Anyone in the room have any questions in either direction?

Certainly been an interesting experience, not necessarily one I want to repeat. Seun? Work Stream 2 I think is going to be different, I hope will be different. Seun, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Byron, for the information. I just wanted to ask three chartering organizations have responded now, and their response basically was less than a page. Do you actually recognize the fact that those responses were short and precise and is their intention to also try to go in that direction, as well? Of course, I recognize that you say you do want to give us a prejudged response. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, thank you for your understanding on that. It is my intention as chair to make it a short and simple resolution, supporting or not the entire package. Because I think your question was as opposed to growing recommendation by recommendation, it is not my intention to do that, although of course there is a council beyond me who may have other thoughts, but that is how I intend to proceed forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? On to the next agenda item.

BYRON HOLLAND: So the next agenda item was around implementation proposals for CWG and CCWG. We've certainly completed or are near completing a lot of the heavy lifting around both of those in terms of creating the proposals, and now it's the implementation phase. One of the challenges that I know the whole community has had, and ours is no different, is the level of effort that has been required over the past two years to do this has certainly taxed our resources and, like many communities, there's often a small subset of people who do a lot of the work, and that has most definitely been the case in our community.

One of the great challenges is, what do we do now? And I wanted to pass it to Katrina, who is one of the ccNSO's vice chairs, and she's going to talk a little bit about that challenge.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Byron. Katrina Sataki, ccNSO. Yeah, it definitely has been the case, at least for the ccNSO, as I'm sure for other communities, as well, that those members on CCWG Accountability and other groups, they're really tired, and as Alan just pointed out, that's nothing they would like to do ever again.

So therefore, another challenge that we're facing is implementation. Yes, as Byron already noted, we haven't accepted the proposal yet. Still, we think about the challenges we'll face should we need to implement the proposal.

This morning, during the ccNSO Council workshop, we discussed the ways how to get people involved in the processes. Maybe not only on this particular process, but in the real life of the ccNSO. Two-thirds of ccTLDs around the world are members of the ccNSO but, again, ccNSO is very open to all of the ccTLDs around the world, so we do not distinguish members and nonmembers, so every ccTLD is welcome to participate in the work.

Still, there's really a very small subset of really active people who know the stuff, and when we talk about implementation, we definitely need people who know the stuff, who have read perhaps 300-something pages of the proposal, and are willing and ready to contribute even more time to implement it.

So, yeah, even if we get new members onboard, it's still a challenge because new people when they hear like ten acronyms in one paragraph, well, it can scare off anyone, even the bravest ccTLDs. It takes time for them to get used to acronyms, to get used to multi-stakeholder community, to get used of doing things the way they are done in this community.

Maybe sometimes they want to change things, and they need a lot of strength and time to move things forward.

So we thought, "How can we make somebody who is probably not an active newbie, not an active participant into an active participant and then into contributor?" And this is perhaps the time for me to pass it back to your communities or your communities as diverse as the ccTLD community. So how do you deal with attracting new people onboard and making them contribute? Maybe there's something. We'd love to learn your experience and probably do that with our people, as well. I mean, without beating and twisting their arms.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you talk to Cheryl, you'll find that's a really major part of it. Let me add two more aspects to it before I'll turn it open to our group. It's not only a matter of finding people who are willing to do it and will get up to speed to do it. It's also a matter of finding people who you trust to do it on your behalf, given that most of the rest of us will not pay nearly as much attention as they have to. So it's a complex relationship.

The implementation, I think, is going to be a really key one. There are a large number of bylaws that have to be written, and they have to reflect not only the exact words but what we meant by them if we weren't clear enough. I'm not quite sure who's

going to be doing that, but I don't think we can afford to just presume it has all been done properly.

I have certainly have, I won't say worries, but concerns over how we go through that process, and that's going to have to happen very, very quickly. We're talking about the next two or three months, all of this has to be signed, sealed, and delivered. So there are going to be really narrow windows in which to review things, so it's going to be a real challenge. I'm not sure we can turn that over to new people, which means taking the exhausted people and continuing. But it's a really essential part of it. We can't just forget about it.

I don't know how the ALAC has not yet discussed what we're going to do for phase Work Stream 2. My sense is it's going to be a very different vehicle than the previous one because the different areas are very disjoint, and I suspect we will have quite different people who are passionate about one part and don't really care about the other, or at least not enough to put their own work into it.

It's not clear whether the CCWG will be basically the same. We all have the option of simply resigning and have to be replaced by our AC/SO, but whether we will actively try to replace people or not is not clear and it's not clear that the formal members have to be the ones to do the work. So I think it's going to be quite a

different vehicle than we have seen in Work Stream 1, but your guess is as good as mine of how it's going to go.

None of that alters the fact that we have a lot of work to do. Some of the people who have been the heavy lifters right now are not the experts on some of these subjects, and we have a lot of work to do in finding and recruiting people and putting them in these positions of a high level of trust when it comes down to it. I see Cheryl has put her hand up and Garth.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Alan. Look, this is an opportunity as much as it is an impost on our time. I think, in my very biased view, that it's an opportunity to perhaps help some interested parties within our organizations who may not feel they have the skillsets and experience to step up and fully engage in some of the Work Stream 2 activities and have a somewhat informal but nevertheless deliberate "come and shadow me and hopefully by the time we get halfway through this, I can step back and you can step forward" system.

It has happened informally with other parts of ALAC, as you might have noticed with Maureen suddenly appearing on your decks. But what it does is it gives the incoming confidence, and it allows the incumbent to replace themselves.

Now that doesn't mean that everyone one of us old dogs isn't going to still want to play in the policy and development and implementation field, because we are. But what it does mean is that for every one of us old dogs, we – well, alright, let's be honest. I'm an old bitch, but that's a different story. It had to be said. One of you would have otherwise – that we become a roadblock unless we bring people along with us and we can have a multiplier effect if we do that job right.

We talk about diversity, we talk about getting fresh blood in, but you can't just pop fresh blood into some of these trust relations because it's unpredictable how they will respond and what they will do. But we can help them get through the early days and become still their own person but more effective. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Garth?

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. Garth Bruen, ALAC North America. So I'm wondering, in your opinion, and I'm curious, what prevents the ccTLDs who are not participating from participating? I mean, what do you think is their big obstacle? I mean, in our case, we representative Internet users who don't understand that they have a stake in

things, and we have to explain that to them. But it's probably different in your space.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think it's hardly any different, but yes, we've tried to analyze potential reasons behind this inactivity of actually many, many ccTLDs. First of all, it's a language. Well, because you do have one, two, three, four booths for translation. The business of the ccNSO is run in English.

Then, well, not all ccTLDs are big enough and have enough budget to travel around the world and to actually dedicate people for policy work, and it takes a lot of time and a lot of effort. So if they have their daily work plus they have to do some really heavy lifting in the ICANN community, it's not easy for them.

Then, of course, maybe we have too many really good people and community trusts these people who will do the heavy lifting and they actually do the heavy lifting, and people trust them and really appreciate their efforts.

BYRON HOLLAND: I would just add to that. I mean, I would concur with everything Katrina said and maybe also add there are a number of different reasons, of which you've heard a few. There are a couple more

that I think are worth noting. Sometimes, ccs are run by governments. Mine happens to be a private not-for-profit corporation but that's just one structure. And often, government departments don't want to be a member of something that they feel may subjugate their interests. Even though I don't believe that to be the actual case, that can be a perception. So sometimes, the government-operated ones don't want to participate.

And there's still some legacy hangover from the very, very, very old days in dawn of time of the ccNSO where there was considerable struggle in its formation, etc., and some of those operators remember those days and don't want to be part of something that they consider too ICANN-centric, even though we've maintained considerable distance from ICANN.

So there's, I think, a whole range of reasons that you've just heard why, even though we have a significant majority, it's not absolute by any stretch.

ALAN GREENBERG: No other thoughts? We spend a lot of our time talking about outreach and recruiting. I'm surprised we don't have a few more comments here.

BYRON HOLLAND: Because any tips, tricks, help, and hard lessons you've learned in generating how you get new people involved may be different for us, but we're always interested in the stories. And then once somebody has actually poked their head up above the surface, how do you then bring them up to be a meaningful contributor?

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have Sebastien and then Garth.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. Thank you for the question. I am not sure that I have an answer, but I will take from your question that we need to work on that together. One level of discussion we need to try to set up is at the regional level because they are doing more outreach than we at the global level. And second, one of our dreams since a long time is to have at least one At-Large structure in each country and you can help us with that because, obviously, you have a ccTLD in each country.

Where we are, we have At-Large structures already. One way to see how we can help the involvement both side is to eventually try to have contact between the ccTLD from a country and the At-Large structure from the country. And I guess it could be useful. You have around this table I guess few people who are connected with their ccTLD – member of the Board, or

participant, or whatever – and they could be a good link also to add to this discussion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have Garth and, Sandra, did you put your card up? Okay. Maybe Sandra and Alberto.

GARTH BRUEN: Thank you. I agree very much with what Sebastien just said. I think that there's room for cooperation. I think that if we can find cases where we have At-Large structures in countries where there's no representation with you, maybe we can address that and vice versa. I think that we can probably share some recruitment in that case.

In our recruitment efforts in North America, we did some extensive recruitment with mixed results. I usually started the conversation by asking the different groups, "What do you want or expect out of the Internet or what are you not getting right now that you would like to get? And then let's get you involved and figure out how we can get that.

Specifically, within the disabled community, we've had some input. We've had some really positive input and some positive output from people within our community who've done captioning work, and they've done some excellent captioning

work. So if you can find one issue that would be important to people and really get them engaged on that, that was useful.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have a problem, unfortunately. We now have a large number of speakers. We have not talked about the last item and in theory, another group is meeting here in two minutes. I am willing to let people have a very short intervention, if you feel you want to, but if people want to put their cards down, fine.

The next I had Sandra, you're waving or you're going ahead?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I was hesitating if I raised my card or not because I have nothing to contribute which might be helpful for this discussion. I just want to share some, well, some assumptions or some conclusions I have drawn from the experience as the EuroDIG organizer and also within our ALS in Europe and Germany in particular.

And I must admit the interest for Internet governance on ICANN issues, how the Internet is regulated, is very, very low. People just expect that the government is going to resolve the issues, at least in the people I talk to, that the government is going to resolve because they were elected and so on and so forth. And

why should the end user or why should I care about how the Internet works?

This is real life. So taking this as a matter of fact and being in the opinion or recognizing that we are a very small community of so-called experts, what we definitely are, because we are having a language with which no one understands. But think of it as somebody who is a doctor, a medical doctor. They have their own language, as well, they talk Latin and they don't give a shit if you understand or not.

Maybe we should just accept the fact that we are a small community with a strange language and those who want to join us are welcome, of course, and we should make it easy for them to step in and to think about it. But as a matter of fact, we are a group of experts with their own foreign language and, yes, I do understand that it's difficult to follow all these in English because you would never have a German translation over there.

So I have to do the hard work, as well, and have to understand all this in English. But that's just another fact of our expert life. I think if we can accept that at some point, this might be the first step to think in different directions. And here, I don't have a solution yet, but this is just something which developed in my mind over the last, I would say, month. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sandra. Everyone else has put down their cards. If you'd like to take a minute or two and tell us, if you can summarize in a short time, what the group on country and territory names is doing, I wouldn't mind a very quick update if it can be done quickly.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. And I think actually Bart is going to do that since I don't see our representatives from that working group. So Bart's going to do that. But if I could just paraphrase Sandra then, because you do bring up a very interesting point on this. But essentially, what you're saying is no matter what language we're speaking, we speak a language nobody understands. Okay. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: So I'll try to avoid jargon this time. The Cross-Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs has sent out a survey to all the chartering organization and other interested parties. They collated the responses and they're now discussing how to deal with the responses. The responses they received were very divergent, even within one single group. I think there were a lot of ccTLDs who responded to the survey on the use of three-character names as TLDs, and these responses from the ccTLDs were probably the most divergent of all, so that's interesting.

There is a divergence, as you could expect, between some of the ccTLDs and the GNSO, but at the same time, some of the ccTLDs were aligned with the gTLDs. So the working group has a lot of work ahead trying to reconcile these different responses and come up with a recommendation on the use of three-letter codes. They've just started that process, and they will meet on Monday. So if you're interested, that meeting is open. That was my brief update.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just something I'm running the [inaudible], I'm one who responded to your survey of three characters.

BART BOSWINKEL: If that were the case, we would find a resolution if it's just one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I thank all of the ccTLD folks who have joined us here, and I adjourn this meeting. There is a meeting in Outreach and Engagement meeting. You can stay in here, but are outreach and engagement, if you choose. Or the bar might be open, I'm not sure. Thank you all. Always look forward to this meeting and it was a good one. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much and congratulations again.

[**END OF TRANSCRIPTION**]