

– 18 February 2016

---

TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to LACRALO GSE capacity building webinar, final report recommendations of the geographic regions review, held on Thursday the 18<sup>th</sup> of February 2016 at 23:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call as it is a webinar.

But if I could remind everyone on the phone bridge as well as computer, to mute your speakers and microphones, as well as state your name when speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but to allow our interpreters to identify you on the other language channel.

We have English, Spanish, and Portuguese interpretation.

Thank you for joining. I would now like to turn it over to our moderator, Silvia Vivanco, manager of At-Large regional affairs. Please begin.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco speaking. Thank you Terri. Hello everyone, and welcome to this LACRALO GSE capacity building webinar on the final report of the recommendation of the geographic regions review. This is the sixth webinar that we hold together with LACRALO and the global stakeholder engagement team, and the first one this year.

The aim of this webinar is to focus on recent progress within ICANN in terms of the review of geographic regions. Our guest speaker is Mr. Robert Hoggarth, our colleague from the policy development

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

– 18 February 2016

---

department. He's a senior director of policy development and engagement, community engagement within ICANN. And he's in charge of this initiative, in terms of the geographic review working group. He has worked together with Cheryl Langdon-Orr, together, in order to submit the final report to the ICANN Board last year.

He has also engaged in other initiatives related to policy development and community support among the CROPP program. We now have certain housekeeping rules for this webinar. This is an interactive session, so please feel free to raise your hand in the Adobe Connect room, or else type your questions in the chat part.

The staff will be taking your questions, and they will be replies to in a first come, first serve basis. If we run out of time, please send us your questions in writing, and we will be sending them to our speaker for a later reply, and that will be posted on the webinar page. We will have a survey at the end of this webinar. It will be conducted in the Adobe Connect room.

And please, we ask for your feedback. We do need your feedback as input so as to hold more webinars this year on the basis of your needs and requests. We thank Robert for joining us, and without further ado, I give the floor to Robert. Robert, go ahead please. You have the floor.

ROBERT HOGGARTH:

Thank you Silvia. Good day everyone. Thank you for joining this webinar, both live and those of you listening to the recording at some point in the future. I appreciated Silvia's introduction. One point that I

– 18 February 2016

---

would like to clarify, I have helped to support the efforts of a number of very wise and valued community members who participated to the geographic effort.

I'm proud to be able to play a supporting role, but I certainly did not need or, in any other way, help the community come up with their conclusions. So I just wanted to clarify that, thank you.

The geographic regions review effort is something that has been under development for some time. And what I'm hoping to do for you today is to give you a sense of the history of the effort, including some background on ICANN's geographic regions generally. I also hope to share with you a brief summary of the working group's efforts, to give you an idea of how they conducted their work.

We'll spend the bulk of our time on the third part of our agenda, talking about the findings and recommendations that the working group has made to the ICANN Board. We'll talk a little bit about the next steps that will take place after the current public comment period has ended. And then we'll devote a good period of time at the end of the webinar, to a discussion and questions and answers from all of you.

I'm hopeful at that point that Silvia will be helping me to field any questions there in the chatroom, would any of you like to provide to me. So that's a general overview of what I hope to address during the next hour or so.

It's an honor to be a part of the LACRALO growing tradition of webinars. And Silvia and Terri, our secretariat and operator for this call is helping,

---

– 18 February 2016

---

I've learned that there is a tradition of pop quizzes, and it's basically an effort to help you get more involved for the conversation of the day.

And so Terri, I would like you to start off with the first of our pop quiz questions, written there in English in my screen. The question is, how many geographic regions does ICANN have? I'm not going to try to pronounce the Spanish translation. I'll give people an opportunity to answer that and see how many people come up with the right answer.

That will give me a sense of the general skill level and understanding, you know, knowledge level of those of you on the call.

I have been told in the past that the true key to answering these multiple choice questions is, when in doubt, answer B, and I think that this one person has taken advantage of that option.

Well thank you. The answer to that first question is correct for 90% of you, and that is five. There are five ICANN regions. I tried to play a little trick with any of you who were paying attention to the graphic on the screen right now. That's not a detail more accurate description of ICANN's geographic regions, [inaudible].

So I'm delighted to see that a number of you do realize that five is the correct answer for that. Terri, if you could put up our second question. Thank you. I'm interested in your feedback on what year was the current regional framework established? In other words, our current ICANN regional framework. What year was it established?

– 18 February 2016

---

I'll wait a couple of more moments for another couple of answers. This is a pop quiz so there is no awards for getting the correct answer, there is no penalty for guessing wrong.

Okay, well the correct answer that might surprise some of you is that the current regional framework was established all the way back in the year 2000. So it has been in place for a considerable period of time. And when the Board merged to conduct the current review that we're now going to be evaluating over the next hour or so, there was actually 2007.

So the review itself is taking a considerable period of time. And what's interesting to me is that while there have not been many, or any specific changes in terms of the original framework, what we're seeing now with considerable interest, considerable conversations among the community about what the future should look like in terms of how ICANN addresses issues of diversity, beyond just geographic diversity.

So it's something that I'll be interested to hear some of your feedback as we go, our conversations today. We can take down the pop quiz now Terri. We'll turn to another one, a final question toward the end of the presentation.

Well let's talk a little bit about the history of where we are, or how we got to where we are today. One of the very most important reasons for establishing geographic diversity within ICANN was fundamental back in 2000. And that was to focus on achieving geographic diversity on the ICANN Board of Directors.

– 18 February 2016

---

The first direction that the Board provided to ICANN staff back in 2000, took place at the ICANN meeting in Japan. We were following the current ICANN numbering scheme, that was all the way back at ICANN public meeting number six. Now what has happened since that original development of the framework, is that it has been applied in a number of different ways as organizational structures within ICANN have been established, or as they have evolved.

And so for example, the ALAC, the GNSO, and the ccNSO are particular communities within ICANN who have continue to apply the general example and tradition of geographic diversity, that was originally intended for the Board of Directors. The ICANN bylaws are very specific in terms of the requirements and the expectation with respect to the bylaws.

And as we note the current slides, article six of the bylaws specifically outline the current five regions. We see them there on the screen as Europe, Asia/Australia/Pacific, Latin American and the Caribbean Islands, Africa, and North America. An important element of the bylaws is that they should be regularly reviewed, and there should be an opportunity for changes as appropriate taking place in the evolution of the Internet, to potentially impact how the geographic regions are displayed, laid out, or organized.

As I noted back in 2000, the Board directed ICANN staff to assign countries and geographic regions to the framework, and the basis on which the guidance was provided to staff, was the United Nations specifics, the visions, classifications on countries and areas. The current

– 18 February 2016

---

system that the working group evaluated is still based on that original outline that the Board provided.

What I want to do for you as part of the history is to share with you how those two system somewhat diverge. The fundamental thing that you need to remember from this was that what was important at the time, was that the Board have staff use some independent system to identify or provide classification. It was important at that time, and I think remains, in some respects, although I'm not speaking for the Board, that ICANN rely on an authoritative source to help it do those assignments and allocations.

The ICANN Board wanted to focus on diversity. They didn't want to put themselves in the position as a decision maker with respect to particular geographic allocations that might be impacted by local matters or local issues. ICANN wanted to be able to simply apply a system, an existing system, to help it promote this concept of diversity.

Now what I've done is help give you all a background in terms of how this all evolved, is I had borrowed from some slides that our original chairman of the geographic regions review working group developed, to explain the challenge that has evolved over time at ICANN. Our original chair of the working group was Dave [inaudible] from the Cayman Islands.

And Dave, through his work on the ccNSO, was an integral part of raising some of the current issues with the ICANN Board, and somebody who helped get the working group established when it first began its

– 18 February 2016

---

work some time ago. So I wanted to give due credit to Dev for some of the artful animation that you'll see over the course of the next few slides.

So what you see currently displayed is the existing ICANN regional structure, and the original UN statistical divisions structure that ICANN staff was asked to rely on. And if you look at the two, they aren't the same. And what I'll try to do is begin to illustrate for you how some of those changes transpired.

First off, there was a recognition when looking at the divisions that the UN statistical divisions started off, that apparently there was some concern about the American being too large. And so one of the initial decisions seem to have been made is to divide North America and South America. Also there was a concern apparently about the characterization of Oceania at the time.

So what happened there is a decision was made not to have an Oceania region, but in fact to move that Oceania region over into the Asia Pacific classification that the UN [inaudible] had created. Now the next step was to change the name of Asia there to Asia Pacific, and what you see in terms of the numbers, as you look at some of these numbers here, they're not going to be applicable to the current day, and you'll see them change a little bit throughout the course of this slide deck, as I go through this description.

Again, look at this phase more for illustrative purposes than for some of the specifics in terms of the smaller numbers. After Oceania was moved



– 18 February 2016

---

to Asia Pacific, there was the recognition now that okay, there was Latin American and Caribbean, and there is North America, and what should happen with those groups?

Well then the next step was to move North America into its own particular ICANN region. And that's reflected there. And then secondly to move Latin America and the Caribbean over to their own separate region. And so you see now those regions moving up and being their own regions, separately, not being combined together under the Americas.

The next step was to recognize that there were a number of countries that were not on the UN statistics list. And that continues to be an issue that the working group identified as well, in that, you know, various territories or countries, as changes take place throughout the world, there are those changes. And that it's important not only for ICANN to recognize this, but also to have it reflected in its allocation from a regional perspective.

Subsequently there was the recognition that a number of the identified groups or territories or countries within Latin America or North America, should be identified with their quote/unquote host. So I think the term the working group used was from other countries as well. And so as a result, you saw the number of entities underneath each of these regions become reduced.

So the Latin American region was reduced from 46 to 33 entities. In Africa, there were similar issues. So those numbers went down from 57

– 18 February 2016

---

to 54. The same as in the Pacific, the numbers going down from 75 to 73. And finally, seeing those numbers going back into the European designation, so that number increasing. And then, as you see in North America, that number also increasing as some territories were then reclassified back into North America.

So you see very quickly over the course of about 20 slides there, that there were substantial changes made to the original UN statistical division to make it conform to the ICANN regional system, as identified in the bylaws. Now the result of this, if you look at, or do the math, is that if you include the Latin America and North America changes, more than 40% of the countries are in a different region than the one originally allocated by the UN.

And even if you don't include Latin America and North America, you're looking at about 20% of countries that are no, or territories that are no longer matched up with where they originally sat under the UN statistical divisions. Now, this presents certain challenges, clearly that were identified that prompted the need for this community working group.

There are issues firstly of remoteness, of some countries or territories being part of a region that they simply are not close to geographically. Secondly, as the Internet has evolved, as ICANN has evolved over the last 16 years, there was a recognition that common languages were no longer being associated together, or that based upon the regions, a number of regions would have a number of different languages.

– 18 February 2016

---

And some countries or territories found themselves in regions where they did not share common languages with the other members of their region. There are often challenges which developed with respect to culture. An example of that came up in the most recent review was that some cultures span a number of different regions.

An example of this was the Arab or Arabic culture, recognizing that a number of cultures found themselves based on their country or territory of origin, to different regions of the world. And then of course, on top of that, from a political system perspective, from economic relationships as well, there were some real challenges in terms of individual countries or territories finding themselves, if not misaligned, differently aligned than was ideal for their participation in ICANN.

Again, if it's important to take you back to the original purpose of the geographic regions of ICANN. It was to create more diversity on the ICANN Board, not to solve some of these issues of remoteness, language, culture, politics, or economics, but at the same time, as the working group began to appreciate and understand some community comments, these are issues and challenges that exist in the current world and need to be considered, need to be... The Board needs to be made aware of that.

So, the goal was set to create this matchup with the ICANN region using some United Nations statistics. We see that the challenges that were presented by that work, and a number of concessions or compromises was made over a number of years by the ICANN staff to do those allocations. And in the mid-2000s, a number of these problems became

– 18 February 2016

---

significant enough, particularly, excuse me, particularly within the ccNSO. That the ccNSO came to the Board and highlighted a number of concerns that we just saw in the previous slide.

And the ccNSO at the time, recommended to the ICANN Board that a cross community working group be created to look at this issue. They recognized that the bylaws anticipated that there would be regular reviews, and they thought it was very timely, after a review to begin, in or around that timeframe. So the result was that at the ICANN 30 meeting back in Los Angeles, the Board asked for further input from the ICANN community, and a number of the communities responded and provided feedback to the Board.

The GNSO, ccNSO, ASO, staff, and ALAC all provided feedback, recognizing that this was a good idea. And the accumulation of these efforts through a period of about 18 months or so, resulted in a charter being developed by the ICANN Board for a cross community working group to begin to examine this issue in great detail.

And so that's where the current system of work began that resulted in the recommendations that we'll see here in a moment or two. So let's talk about the working group efforts for a moment.

The purpose of the working group was essentially to bring together a broad variety of representatives from the different supporting organizations and advisory committee. Over the life of the working group, participants from five of those communities participated in the deliberations of the working group.

– 18 February 2016

---

The ALAC, the ASO, the ccNSO, the GAC, and the GNSO. For purposes of your community, you'd be interested to know that Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Carlton Samuels were the representatives for the ALAC on the working group. They were the longest standing members and I think the most committed members to the effort, which spanned several years.

With respect to the other groups, there were multiple participants over the years, simply because of different people coming on to the various communities, or stepping down from leadership positions. So it was very interesting to see that culture develop within the working group. And I think it gave a number of people some great comfort that a variety of perspectives and views were shared over the course of the working group deliberations.

The Board had a couple of specific instructions to the working group. They were asked to identify the different purposes for which ICANN's geographic regions are used. As I described to you originally, the sole purpose of the geographic regions were to ensure this geographic diversity of the ICANN Board.

But as was observed over time, geographic diversity was used in a number of different ways by different community groups, and even by ICANN staff to organize operations, to set up working groups, to create various policy development processes within the various groups. The working group was also asked to determine whether the uses of the ICANN geographic region of the relevant stakeholders and stakeholder groups.

---

– 18 February 2016

---

And so that was an important connection to make. Not only for the working group to identify the purchases, but to provide some assessment of relevancy, to see that the requirements still apply. And then finally, you know, the work product of the working group, the Board asked that the group submit proposals for community and Board consideration relating to the current and future use of the definition of the ICANN geographic region.

So it was a fairly broad remit that the working group had. And the working group adopted a very strict approach to its work. A very diligent way of approaching the work. They basically first took the time to review not only the history, but objectives and general principles of the geographic framework to begin with.

Then they spent a considerable period of time researching the various ways that the regional framework had been applied over time, by ICANN's structures like the various SOs and ACs, as well as by the ICANN staff and Board as well. And then a very important aspect of their work was to make sure that they engaged in extensive and regular collaborative dialogue with the community.

And over the course of the working group's deliberation, they sponsored numerous public comment opportunities, and workshops at various ICANN public meetings. That they were able to share information, that they were able to develop, and consideration of some of their thoughts and ideas over their time as a working group.

– 18 February 2016

---

Essentially, the working group adopted a three phased approach. First they produced an initial report, which basically outlined the facts, that they were able to gather about the operations and management of the various ICANN structures and staff and organization. To see how geographic regions were used in a variety of ways. So that was the initial report.

They then produced an interim report, which was designed to share some thoughts and ideas from potential directions from where they might be going with their... ....report, which outlined their recommendations, and the direction they were going in terms of what they were going to be advising the Board on.

Now as I noted, the expectations were for an extensive and length opportunities to comment and dialogue with the community, and that promise was kept. And what became interesting is that it created a fourth phase, if you will, which helped to extend the period of the working group's deliberations, but was well received by the community.

And ultimately what happened is that the final report document, based upon community feedback, was taken back by the working group to be reconsidered. And so ultimately, the final report that was generated and shared with the Board of Directors last November, in November 2014, actually represented the final, final report, which respectively noted this fourth phase of the deliberations where community reaction to the original final report prompted some rethinking by the working group, and some recasting of the recommendations in a manner that

– 18 February 2016

---

seemed to be much more in line with the feeling and points of view of the community.

So all that is background. It leads us up to what the working group has recommended to ICANN's Board. And basically what the Board has shared with the members of the community to comment on. Let me walk through those for you. We'll spend a number of minutes on each one of the major recommendations where you have a good sense as to where the recommendations might be taking ICANN, and suggestions for how you may be able to contribute to the effort.

First let's look at the major findings of the working group. I think the most critical finding that the working group made right off the bat in its final report, was a recognition that geographic diversity remains an important and relevant component of ICANN's mission. And as a result of that wholesale, in other words, complete modifications to the original geographic regions framework is not merited at present.

So the basic feedback to the Board of Directors is that the current five region system seems to be working in terms of the geographic diversity component. They need to be looked at in the future, but at the present time is not right for changing. There were a number of reasons that the working group gave for the reason for this by not changing, and some of it frankly was that a number of community structures are currently utilizing the current regional framework, and to change that, either to reduce the number of regions, or increase the number of regions, would have an impact in participation as the structure is currently engineered.



– 18 February 2016

---

And so the concern there was not making the immediate changes upon this first review, but maybe to consider something in the future. The second major finding of the working group, was that ICANN had deviated significantly from the UN allocations that the Board had asked the staff to look at. So that in moving some of those categories and breaking them up in the way that day, and acknowledging the UN statistical framework in part but not in whole, has now created this, not conflict, but substantial difference from the existing definition that had been originally intended.

Now, the working group was quick to note that despite these deviations, it had found that ICANN has largely applied geographic diversity principles consistent with the organization's diversity goals, so that although there wasn't this consistent application, it had not had bad consequences, but fundamentally that had to change in basically you'll see later in the recommendations, that allocated had to be updated and brought current with the UN statistical models that currently exist.

And then finally, what's important to note is that the working group looked very carefully at other alternatives, in addition to the UN, to see if there were opportunities to look at regions in a different way by ICANN. And despite all of its efforts and research, the group simply could not identify an alternative standard with consistent geographically across the board.

One that had international recognition, and that would be better than what ICANN currently has. There were clearly a number of different

– 18 February 2016

---

types, and at one point, the working group had considered looking at how the RIRs, the regional Internet registries, had utilized their application, their geographic region. But ultimately based on feedback from the community and others, that decision was made not to move in that direction.

So basically to say there isn't a better system out there than what ICANN currently has. However, ICANN currently is, you know, is not perfect, and it needs to be improved. That was the overall recognition by the working group. So, let's look a little bit at the overall working group recommendations before we talk about specific ones.

The first was that ICANN really needs to adopt its own geographic regions framework, based on the current assignment of countries to regions. And that this new framework system should continue to govern the makeup of the ICANN Board. So it was a fairly limited, clear direction which said, let's fix what you have. Let's make sure that it's clear. Let's make sure that it's based upon, you know, the current assignments that the UN has for assignment to countries to region.

And then, part two is, of the recommendations, provides flexibility to individual communities and structures within ICANN, so that they can either follow the same framework as the Board, or to develop some of their own mechanisms with Board oversight, for ensuring geographic diversity within their own organization.

So again, I think it's important when you look at this process and the recommendations, that so far, that the focus is and remains on

– 18 February 2016

---

geographic diversity. What you'll see as we go to the next couple of slides is, the working group fulfilled its mandate with respect to geographic diversity, very specifically, but then also looked a little bit more broadly at every forms of diversity.

Because as I noted to you before, the working group had been looking for some significant feedback from the community about diversity principles in general. And as the primary staff support for the working group, I think it's fair to say that they were considerable community comments talking about language diversity, talking about cultural diversity, talking about the remoteness issues, or common issues that might not be in a typical diversity category.

And so there was a lot of feedback from community groups that said, the working groups should look more broadly. And I think you'll see that the working group honored a lot of that feedback in a lot of those comments.

Well let's talk about the first five notable recommendations. There were a total 10 notable recommendations, and I admit that I'm limiting myself to those that have been identified primarily as part of the public comment efforts, and that the working group had identified primarily to highlight for the Board, in the executive summary of the final report.

There are other smaller recommendations or notes. Some of them you might identify through some of your questions to me, but I would recommend that you read the full report to get the complete form of recommendations, of all of the recommendations that came from the

– 18 February 2016

---

working group. But let's go through in order, the notable recommendations. The first five are in this slide, and the first was very clearly that the application of geographic diversity principles had to be more rigorous, more clear, and more consistent.

And I think that was reflected in the request to have ICANN staff go back and essentially recreate the list using the current UN statistical information, to make sure that the list that was created 15 years ago, now be updated appropriately. There was a recognition that over time, obviously, ICANN has not stood still as different territories or countries have been formed.

And, over time, what the working group found is that individual communities were able to essentially deal with those changes by making adjustments within their own processes, by making adjustments within their own traditions, cultures, or principles. However, the working group wanted to emphasize that, you know, in looking at the geographic diversity principles across the organization, it was really important to be more clear and consistent and rigorous in terms of the work that was being done and the information that was provided.

Secondly, that I already noted to you, but was noted as a specific recommendation, is that adjusting the number of ICANN geographic regions was not, and these are important words in English, currently practical. There was a recognition by the working group that, sure, you could make adjustments to some of the regions, but that it wasn't going to be practical under current conditions.

– 18 February 2016

---

And I think what we're observing is, as we go through the stage of a potential IANA transition and a reexamination of ICANN's accountability principles and the rest, will be very useful and helpful for us all, as members of the community, to see what the future might look like, in terms of the allocation of countries and territories to different regions, and maybe consideration of individual regional groups as well.

That's something for all community members to take some consideration of, I think, over the next couple of years. As I mentioned before, another major recommendation was that no other international regional groups, structures, or standard organizations, offered useful options for ICANN, beyond what ICANN already had. And I think this was a surprise to some members of the community, but it was something that the working group had looked at quite exhaustively, that when it comes down to it, other than some of the work that's taken place at the UN, there were really no other international organizations that seemed to surpass ICANN, at least in terms of setting up the regions that currently exist and creating some of those classifications.

Clearly they need to be updated. Clearly they need to be made more consistent, but there was no other option that was found to be better than what could be improved upon currently at ICANN. And then, you know, that was the result and conclusion in the fourth recommendation here, that ICANN must formally adopt and maintain its own unique geographic regions framework.

So the expectation would be that, as far as next steps are concerned, is the Board accepts the recommendations of the working group, that you

– 18 February 2016

---

know, once staff has provided updated lists and the rest, that the Board has to circle back from a process perspective, and formally adopt and maintain ICANN's own geographic regions framework, particularly for ensuring geographic diversity on the Board of Directors.

Now what's important is that the working group found that the community wanted to minimize changes to the current structure. In other words, because of the concerns of a number of the SOs and ACs, there was a concern that there not be any drastic changes. An example might be within the At-Large structure to substantially change the number of regions might create some challenges or difficulties.

That's something... And it's an area that a number of you may have comments or observations that you may want to make, during the comment period, that the Board is currently having open. Some advice to the Board in terms of numbers, pardon me, and the allocation of regions as well.

That was an important and notable recommendation that the working group made. I would like to, and I'm pausing just a bit very quickly, to jump out of the slides, and to see if I can read to you some of the specific language of the working group in this area, because I think it's an important area to look at.

I'm just scrolling through that for a moment. Thanks for your patience. I'm reading now from the final report itself. The working group believed that the measures detailed in the report, would be helpful to a number of countries and territories who may wish to move to a new regional

– 18 February 2016

---

structure. And basically, the working group recognized that there was, now I'm reading, a disappointment to at least some members of the working group about inevitable changes coming much more slowly under an opt-in scheme.

What the original working group recommendation to them was to lay out the structures consistent to the RIR, regional Internet registries, recommendations that I chatted about a little bit earlier. And the original recommendation would have called upon individual community members to opt in to particular countries or regions. The concern was that the working group did not want to unduly burden various communities, but to create an opportunity for individual communities to declare their interests and potentially relocating from one region to another.

And the focus was much more on allowing those communities to make that decision on their own, rather than for the ICANN scheme to require them to quote/unquote, opt out of a particular region. So it's a point that gets somewhat detailed, and is a little confusing. But the bottom line is that the working group wanted to make sure that individual communities that had the support within their own communities, could move to relocate from an existing region, but otherwise under the current system, could stay where they were.

The concern that if there was a broader change in the regions, that it would create a lot of busy work on the part of communities that did not want to move, of countries or regions that were happy where they were. And so that's where the working group focuses its

---

– 18 February 2016

---

recommendation from that perspective. I'm sure that may engender some questions, so Silvia please, make an effort to capture any thoughts that folks make on that piece.

Turning to the next one, which my title is a little bit incorrect there, there is the second set of five recommendations. It was very important to members of the working group, that ICANN acknowledge the sovereignty and right of self-determination of states, to let them choose their region of allocation. And so they made a recommendation that countries and territories who did not feel that they were inappropriate region, could exercise their right of self-determination and ask to move to another region.

That, as we noted a little bit earlier in the presentation, is part of the history of the work. That a number of territories and regions felt very remote from geographically, from some of their common folks. In terms of region, or diversity, or language, or culture. And so it was important to create an opportunity for certain countries or regions to be able to change their official ICANN region.

And so that's an area that will continue to be made up of. And we'll talk a little bit about on the implementation side of things. It was also important in number seven, that ICANN communities who have flexibility applied their geographic diversity principles over the years, to be able to maintain that. And so the working group was very specific, how it was important that the Board stick to a rigorous application to the geographic principles, for geographic diversity on the Board, but



– 18 February 2016

---

that individual communities continue to have the flexibility to apply geographic diversity principles.

Some SOs or ACs may choose to adjust their principles, or have them evolve over time. And it's important, and was important from the working group recommendation perspective, to give them the option to do that. Earlier I mentioned the challenges of cultural or language diversity.

And for number eight of the notable recommendations, the working group advocated for the option of special interest groups or certain cross-regional subgroups to develop themselves within the various ICANN SOs and ACs. And even in some cases, to recognize that there were issues that spanned SOs and ACs, and to give like groups, and I use that term in parenthesis, like groups, that means groups who are like each other but not defining how, in a general sense, how these likeminded, or likely situated groups could band together.

They would exist potentially outside the current ICANN structures. The current ICANN governance structures would remain in place, but there was a recognition by the working group that for example, on particular issues, members of small island states might want to get together. There might be members of a particular culture, like the Arab culture, who wanted to come together as a special group and be supported by ICANN staff to help them in terms of making a particular point of view.

Again, these groups wouldn't necessarily, at least initially figure in the ICANN governance structure, but it provides some means, some

– 18 February 2016

---

mechanisms for them to organize themselves, get together, be able to share points of view, to share positions in the rest, in a variety of different ways.

And so that was a very important recommendation from the working group perspective about that. The last two recommendations went more toward the operations of the regional framework. The important aspect of the first was in number nine, to have the staff create some implementation mechanisms and processes, that gave life to the working group recommendations. So in other words, there would need to be processes created for some of these activities to come into play.

There would have to be a process or a special interest group to be formed. There might have to be a process certainly if a particular country or territory wanted to change regions, and so processes need to be set up for that, and that's going to be the responsibility of the staff to coordinate that.

As someone who has been quite involved in the working group deliberations, I would anticipate that there would be some public comment opportunities for some of these processes to get feedback from various groups. And finally on the last item, it was very important from the working group perspective that the Board preserve its oversight and future review opportunities.

There was a recognition that the Board should probably do this a little bit more regularly, but not on such a short timeframe as three years, considering that the work of this working group took closer to six years,

– 18 February 2016

---

there was a recognition that those timeframes should be expanded a bit. Moreover I think there was a recognition that it will take some time, if the Board adopt these recommendations to actually begin to implement them.

And so I think the working group recognized that as well. Finally, from that perspective, there is also the recognition that because geographic diversity remains an important bylaw principle of ICANN geographic diversity needs to be at least reviewed by the Board. And so if there are special interest groups that come into play, if there are changes that are made within existing communities about how they apply the geographic regions, that the Board be made aware of those changes, and have an opportunity to express their point of view, or potentially change some of those if they don't remain consistent with the ICANN bylaw principles.

So I'm going to stop there and extend my apologies to the interpreters and some of you that are listening to the Spanish translation. I went a little bit quickly on some of that.

So let's turn to next steps. What happens with these recommendations? Well currently there is a community comment opportunity, and so there is a focus on... The Board at this stage, looking for community feedback. This is a final of many opportunities from either the working group or the Board of Directors, to get community feedback.

– 18 February 2016

---

And the working group recommended that there be an extended public comment period to give people an opportunity, and to give community members an opportunity to comment on the recommendations. So there was a 120 day comment period established, that is still ongoing. We're close to halfway through, maybe a little bit more than halfway through that comment period.

I believe there are about 65 or 66 days left as of today, February 18, 2016 left in the comment period. The comment period closes on the 24<sup>th</sup> of April, 2016. So there is still over two months of time for interested parties to familiarize themselves more closely with these recommendations, and to develop some feedback or comments to the Board about them.

Now once the Board has received the comments from the community, it will go through its review steps, and ultimately take some action. For those of you who are generally aware of what takes place in terms of timing at the Board level, it's not likely that the Board will act prior to the ICANN meeting in June of this year certainly, and maybe more likely that activity would take place in terms of an actual decision closer in time to the Puerto Rico ICANN meeting, ICANN 57.

So it's still some period of time before the Board will likely act on these recommendations. Some of that timing may depend upon how many comments are received, quite frankly. So after the Board decides, there is even additional time before anything goes into play in terms of new processes.

– 18 February 2016

---

You know, there will be, I imagine, some staff implementation responsibilities. It's not clear what department of ICANN will be responsible for establishing some of those responsibilities, but that's likely to be a several month process, perhaps longer if there are public comments involved, and I would anticipate that would likely be the case.

So we would likely see some public comment period opportunities developing around this time next year, as they relate to the process for a country or territory to change its ICANN region. There may be a comment opportunity for the process by which community groups would want to form a particular special interest group.

Although I think things could move faster in that regard if an individual SO or AC took on that responsibility. And I would expect as well, that some of you may want to have comment opportunities regarding ICANN's list and the allocation of countries and territories to region. Granted, those will be based on the UN models that are currently in existence, simply because ICANN, I don't think, has any interest in making those decisions or putting itself in that role of having to have those sorts of conversations.

So they would likely rely initially on that authoritative UN list, but I'm sure there would be some areas where folks would want to comment. So that may be another area that there may be a public comment opportunity. Then again, the list itself could simply be something that gets produced and published, and then at that time, you know, an

– 18 February 2016

---

individual country or territory could opt to relocate if they don't like the region they're in.

So those are the next steps in general. As I mentioned, the public comment opportunity is currently open. The close date is 24 April. And a part of every public comment opportunity is a staff summary report that gets generated about two or three weeks after the public comment period closes, and so that will be produced in early May.

So that's the summary not only of the history of the effort in the working group, and the working group recommendations and findings but also next steps. What I'd like to do is perhaps open the lines for questions from anybody. Before we do that, we have one last pop quiz, a sort of a call to action for all of you.

We want to move from PQ2 Terri, there we go, PQ3. I hope this is a fairly easy for you. When are the public comments due on the working group recommendations? In hopes that those of you who remember and recognize that date will potentially take advantage of the opportunity.

And thank you, yes. Just about everyone has gotten that right. And one person needs to just change theirs from 24 May to 24 April and we'll be set, because that will be the timeframe. And I know nobody looked back in the chat to find that answer.

Well thank you very much for the opportunity to present this general information. If you have any specific questions about a particular recommendation, if you have any specific questions about next steps or

– 18 February 2016

---

timing, please feel free to ask it now. If you have a question that develops at some point in the future, please feel free to reach out to Silvia, who can get in touch with me, or to me directly, and I'll be more than happy to give you some further perspective, or talk through, or clarify any aspects of the work that has been done to date. Thank you very much. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Silvia Vivanco speaking. Thank you Rob. Thank you so much for this very thorough and interesting presentation. I have a question by [inaudible]. What are the criteria related to the steps to be taken in terms of the changes of regions?

Let me see if I understand the question. I think he wants to know what the next steps will be and what the criteria are for those next steps in terms of changing regions. Thank you Robert.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you very much for that question. At this point, no specific criteria has been created or established. That will be the responsibility of Board direction to the ICANN staff. If there is any recommendation from the community as to what those criteria might be, those are so things that should be, those are some ideas that should be shared in the comment period over the next couple of months.

I think it was very important, if I recall correctly, some of the working group's deliberation, that an area that they thought was very important

– 18 February 2016

---

was that there be clear direction from a particular country or territory that was interested in making a change. And that would include some demonstrational support from a live cross-section of those communities.

So this would not be a request that would likely be made an individual, or by even one group within a country or territory. That there would have to be some definitive demonstration that this was a request that the country wanted to, or the territory wanted to be made that would apply all across ICANN. So having some consensus between groups that might be impacted within the ALAC, and the GNSO, and the ccNSO, as well as the GAC, would likely be very important for a country to, or a territory, to attempt to relocate itself.

That would be my personal assumption, again just based upon some of the comments that the working group members made. I'm hopeful that that answered your question.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Silvia Vivanco speaking. Thank you Rob for your reply. I will now give the floor to Mr. Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you Silvia. Rob, I'm interested in two parts of the multistakeholder model. In the GAC and in ourselves, in that we represent the interest of the end users. When you say that someone wants to move from one region to another, let's think for



– 18 February 2016

---

example of a government. We're speaking of a country. Within that country, we have different stakeholders that are part of the multistakeholder model.

For example, an ALS, an At-Large structure. If the country is relocated, does the country take all the multistakeholder, including an ALS? My understanding is that if an ALS wants to leave, the government will not leave. But if a government is relocated or goes to another RIR, the government will have a new relationship with or within the region. That's my question. Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you Alberto. I appreciate that question. In order to answer it, I am going to read to you from the final report of the working group, because I think that makes things very clear. So I don't misspeak. Very specifically, and I'll refer to a paragraph so that you have the reference for future use.

In paragraph 60 of the final report, the working group says, in order to protect the sovereignty and rights of self-determination, the working group recommends that every country and territory should have the opportunity to request a move to another geographic region. The request should be initiated or supported by the local governments of the relevant country or territory, and should take into account the views of the local Internet community.

Further, and I'm skipping a couple of paragraphs here so you should consult the entire section of the final report. But in paragraph 62, there

– 18 February 2016

---

are two sentences that say, well let me read the whole paragraph. ICANN should not become involved in the complex and differing relationships between territories and other countries, but neither should it impose its own unilateral decisions.

Individual territories, or collective community members within those territories, should be able to petition to move to a new ICANN geographic region. However, no territory reassignment should be made if objections are raised by the government of the, quote, mother country, unquote.

So I think that there is recognition within the final report, that there should be consensus among the governments and local Internet communities is a country or territory to choose to collectively relocate the region, with what appear to be recommendations that suggest, more power on the part of the quote/unquote mother country if you will, in the case of a territory.

My understanding is that from the recommendation perspective, and again, I'm just paraphrasing here, is that the working group would expect that once a decision was made that a change to a country or a territory to another region, would apply to all aspects of ICANN participation. Much of it exists today, you may be able to point out one or two instances where there are differences, and if so, that will be very helpful in the public comment forum, even if it's just a short comment to say, that might be a problem based on the experience in X-country or X-territory.

– 18 February 2016

---

That would be very helpful feedback, I think, for the Board, and ultimately for the staff who would have the responsibility for setting up a process. I hope that answered your question. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Alberto Soto speaking. Yes thank you very much Rob. I understand that when you speak about the mother country, well, I will make a suggestion about that, because Argentina's mother country would be Spain. And if we want to move to another region, we no longer have any relation with Spain. So Spain has no say in what we do.

My understanding is that that term might be applied to colonies that are still under debate regarding where the territory would be allocated. Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you Alberto. This is Rob. I would agree with your assessment, your interpretation. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Silvia Vivanco speaking. I will give the floor back to Rob, so that Rob can reply to Alberto's prior comment again, if you may Rob.

ROB HOGGARTH:

I'm sorry [inaudible] clear, if it didn't come across in the audio. I would agree with Alberto in his assessment of countries versus colonies or territories. I would agree that there is much more quote, mother

---

– 18 February 2016

---

country control there. Whereas in your first example, it was more historic than still a legal connection there. I would also observe that the characterization or use of the term mother country, was in quotes by the working group.

And I don't think that that was interpreted by the working group drafters as a technical term, but more colloquial term perhaps, that was a general or common understanding. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

This is Silvia Vivanco. Thank you Rob. I have a question by Diego Acosta Bastida. Are there regions or country reallocations already proposed for these LACRALO regions?

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you for that question. This is Rob. The short answer is, no. The longer answer is, no and based on the comments that were submitted, there were not even suggestions at that point, not specific suggestions of reallocations. There were some observations about, I believe, some territories in Latin America might be eligible to do that, but nothing that I would characterize as a formal request.

And I would use the next year or so, if there are countries or territories who are interested in, you know, planning some requests, to use that as an opportunity to participate in the comment periods. Make suggestions about process, or otherwise be engaged from that perspective. Certainly the working group did not make any specific

– 18 February 2016

---

recommendations or proposal for any reallocation in its final, final report. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia Vivanco speaking. Thank you Rob. Albert Daniels, now you have the floor. Go ahead please.

ALBERT DANIELS: Thank you Silvia. I think [inaudible] quick request for clarification on terminology. I notice that in some of the slides, with regard to the Caribbean, if it is in Latin America, it was referred to as Latin America and the Caribbean. But I also [inaudible] slide that for right now, [inaudible] Latin America and the Caribbean Islands.

So my question is, during the deliberations of the working group, did it at any place come up that's [inaudible] the Caribbean, you have territories that are not islands, like Belize, Ghana, and the Dutch Caribbean, [inaudible] an island. You have [inaudible] which is French, which is not an island. And even have some islands that are split in two for example, Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and St. Martin [inaudible] on the other side.

So was there any particular standard referring to the Caribbean [inaudible]...

– 18 February 2016

---

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you Albert. And you and I will have to have this conversation offline, based on the source of where I took this slide from. I think it's fair to say that the working group did not have that specific discussion, and if there is any inconsistency in the slides, in terms of those characterizations, that's my fault and my responsibility, so please accept my apologies if anyone interprets those slides as making any statements about that.

As far as I recall, there were no conversations within the working group with respect to that distinction. And in fact, I think the region was regularly referred to as Latin America and the Caribbean, not the islands designation.

ALBERTO DANIELS: Thank you very much Rob.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco speaking. Thank you Rob. Now I give the floor to Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Go ahead Dev, please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Rob, thank you Silvia. Thanks Rob for the presentation. My question is, I think, I guess I'm going to focus a little bit more on the implementation. I've noticed that, you know, the ICANN list has been a relatively static list since around 2000, 2002, when the allocations were being as to which territory country was belong to.

– 18 February 2016

---

And I noted that the ISO list, it's not a static list. They have no territories since 2002, the most [inaudible] one for the Latin American and Caribbean region was [inaudible]... and there has also been the St. Martin and St. Martin, the French and Dutch part of the island.

And you can think of things like South Sudan, for example, that was relatively new territories that was established. My question is, within ICANN, is there a policy as to which, as to where these new territories are allocated? That's my first question.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Okay. Thanks Dev for breaking up your questions one at a time. I appreciate that. I'm not involved in the current creation of those lists. I can say that while the working group was undergoing its deliberations, it became aware of that inconsistency. I think that it's clear from the working group recommendations, that it is important for that list to be updated.

And even when I look today, the list that I'm referred to is the quote/unquote Montreal list, which I think is that 2000 or 2002 list to which you are referencing. So I don't think that there is an existing process for regularly updating that list, and that's what prompted the working group recommendation. I hope that answers that first question, sir.

– 18 February 2016

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thanks. This is Dev, and indeed, it does. And I will say that this implementation needs to happen. My second part of the question, refers to the countries and territories needs themselves. I've been doing quite a bit of work on outreach and engagement subcommittee, also LAC strategy, trying to analyze [inaudible] from all of the different territories.

I've been trying to have them in a database. And I've noticed that what ICANN has done is that the names, the country names are different from the ISO country names, for example. And I've noted that different ACs and SOs are using the different country names for the same territory, as the ICANN fellowship for example, uses different country names that's different from the ICANN, for example.

So it's just an observation [inaudible] to be submitting is that there should be a harmonization that should be of the country names, so that's all of these [inaudible] one common name, and this would make open data practices possible, when you do analysis across all stakeholders. I'll post a link in the chat for people to take a look at some of the changes that I've noted. Thanks.

ROB HOGGARTH: Thank you very much Dev. This is Rob. I really appreciate that comment, and I think it underscores the working group recommendations for rigorous and consistent application of the geographic regions framework across ICANN. I think you've cited a



– 18 February 2016

---

perfect example for the value of that recommendation, and the importance of implementing that recommendation.

Perhaps that's an area, particularly if there is an advisory component for a community component of that implementation work, that we can take advantage of your knowledge, and some of the information that you've developed to improve that during the implementation phase of this work. And maybe that's something we can even encourage as a pre-implementation efforts, given the time that it may take for these recommendations to be approved.

I hope you will be open to being recruited, sir. Thank you.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Certainly. This is Dev. No problem.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Silvia Vivanco speaking. Thank you Rob. Jason Hynds, you have the floor now. Go ahead please.

JASON HYNDS: Hi Rob. Great work. I was wondering what you perceive the impact would be for transitions between the regions on meeting allocations and engagement programs, like maybe the Fellowship and the NextGen program? And secondly, if I could squeeze in another one.

I was curious about how someone would be able to, [inaudible] to say a Board position, and the Board having the restrict geographical layout,

---

– 18 February 2016

---

but allocation probably based on support from their original region prior to a move. Thank you.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Sorry for the interruption. This is Silvia Vivanco from the staff. I will ask Jason if he can be kind enough to type his question in the chat pod, because his audio is very faint for the interpreters. Thank you.

ROB HOGGARTH:

Thank you Jason and Silvia. This is Rob. Our attempt to rephrase... While Jason is typing, we'll see how accurate I am in rephrasing his question for purposes of me answering. Jason's first question focused more on the operational impact potentially of some of these changes, recognizing Dev's point that different applications currently within the ICANN model.

I think, to answer that question, or at least to address it Jason, I would harken back to my chairing of the working group recommendations, and the operations of the working group. One of the areas that the working group looked at first, was how ICANN operates and potentially uses geographic diversity in a number of different ways.

And Albert Daniels, who is on the call, may be familiar with this, where just from an operational standpoint, within our global stakeholder engagement team, and with other teams, ICANN applies geographic regions in different ways. Many of you will note that the regional teams, that service a number of different communities, organize

– 18 February 2016

---

themselves on regional basis that are different from the ICANN regions themselves. And the working group found a number of other examples like the Fellowship program, where the application of regions is different depending upon different operations.

In fact, I can even use the example of ICANN's regional funds, or engagement offices, as recognition where, from a practical or an operational standpoint, the operations of the organization are different from the geographic regions. I think that's candidly one of the reasons why the working group has recommended a more rigorous application of the regions across the ICANN organization.

I remind you all that the original purpose of the geographic regions was for Board diversity. And the working group addressed that straight forwardly, to say that that effort should continue. But as you were all pointing out in your comments and questions on this call, geographic diversity has a substantial impact in a number of different areas of ICANN.

And it's very important that what I'm hearing from you is that operationally ICANN needs to be very clear on how supplying geographic diversity, has to be very clear on how the organization is interpreting the geographic regions, and at the very least, has to be, has to have a clear list that can be the first point of reference. But I think we also recognize the value of the ICANN community over the last 15 years, has been to be flexible.

– 18 February 2016

---

And as we do move toward implementation, ultimate implantation of these recommendations, we have to keep that clarity and balance with the flexibility, and find ways to, I think, regularly collaborate going forward. Surely in this new epic, in this new era of ICANN accountability, the application of these geographic regions are going to be important components that likewise would have to keep an eye on cultural language, and other forms of diversity that are going to be important to demonstrate the full multistakeholder concept that Alberto noted earlier.

Thanks for being able to answer that aspect of your question, Jason. The other aspect, I think, and maybe you typed it and I'll just check it here, is impact on the elevation to persons to Board positions, that I think is a little bit different, and that I think would be more as I interpreted your question, being a concern that if someone was originally moved up to the Board level with a particular geographic designation, that as they might, you know, move to another region, or you know, because of strict application in the geographic region structure, they might have to be reclassified or reexamined.

I think that would be something that would depend upon whether that Board member was a nominee from the nominating committee, or where that Board member came from a particular SO or AC, from a representational standpoint. I think depending upon where that Board member originated, that would then determine what group might need to look at, you know, somebody who moved, or somebody who was relocated based upon a country or territory request.

– 18 February 2016

---

I hope that answered your second question Jason. At the very least, what I think it demonstrates is the level of detail that may be required in terms of looking at geographic regions. I think it's fair to say that geographic areas where an area of great focus on a number of levels, but now it's a level of focus that all aspects of the organizations should take on, and be expanded potentially to cultural language and other potential considerations of diversity by the organization.

So thanks for that question. I note that we're close to the end, Silvia, so I don't know if there is time for any more questions, but I will leave any wrap up to you, with my thanks to everyone who has stuck through a 90 minute presentation, that I have found to be a very useful conversation. Thank you very much.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Silvia Vivanco speaking. Thank you Rob. I see that my colleague Albert Daniels would like to take the floor. So Albert, go ahead please.

ALBERT DANIELS:

Thank you Silvia. Just quickly to support Rob's point that it can be very complex in some regions compared to the others, and the Caribbean is a particularly complex place, which sometimes requires our flexibility. We have four languages: English, French, Dutch, Spanish. There are 42 territories in total, [inaudible] about [inaudible] territories are considered Latin America and the Caribbean. We have some islands like Anguilla, Aruba, the Turks and Cacaos are considered part of Europe,

– 18 February 2016

---

there are some territories like Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands that are part of North America.

And if that wasn't complex enough, you also have a situation where there are two regional [inaudible] registries for [each?] region. LACNIC is part of the Caribbean, and ARIN is in another part of the Caribbean. So just to say that sometimes refer to [inaudible] reflects [inaudible] because of the situation.

In the interest of time, I will end comments there.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Silvia Vivanco speaking. Thank you Albert for your comments. And finally, I want to thank my colleague, Rob Hoggart, for his presentation, and I want to thank you all for your participation. We are now moving to a survey, a final survey, so please stay for us, for five minutes, at the most.

And once you reply to the survey, you can leave the Adobe Connect room. Terri, go ahead please.

TERRI AGNEW:

Thank you. We will have a series of five questions for you to fill up for this survey. We appreciate your time. The first question, please provide your comments or feedback on the substantive technical aspects of the webinar.

– 18 February 2016

EN

---

We will give you one more moment before we proceed on to the next survey question.

Survey question two, please provide your comments or feedback on the organizational logistics call facilities aspects of this webinar.

Please provide your comments now.

One more moment and we'll continue on with survey question three.

Moving on to question survey three. Was the level of complexity of the presentation appropriate? Yes or no?

Please provide your answer now.

We'll now move on to survey question four. Do you have any suggestions for the speakers or future speakers? Please type your answer now.

And one moment, we'll move on to our final survey question.

Moving on to our final survey questions. Are there any specific topics that should be covered in future webinars? Please type your answers now.

I will leave this final survey question up. But again, I would like to thank everyone for joining today's webinar. Once you have finished filling out the final question, please feel free to disconnect. Enjoy the rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**