
BEIJING – ALAC: Policy Discussion - Part I
Tuesday, April 09, 2013 – 11:00 to 13:00
ICANN – Beijing, People’s Republic of China

MALE: Good morning it is Tuesday, April 9, 2013 the time is 11:07 AM, we are in Function Room 6 of the International Beijing Hotel. This is the ALAC Policy Discussion Part I.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Good morning everybody. We have a full agenda this morning. We are going to have a couple of housekeeping notices, the first being that you all have to say your name. I am Olivier Crepin-Leblond. We have remote participants, we have interpretation, don’t speak too quickly.

First is to have a look at updates from the At-Large working groups, the first one being the Academy. Sandra Hoferichter who is going to provide us with an update, Sandra? She just walked out. We have the Future Challenges Working Group. Evan Leibovitch?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Just to mention that we have already had an initial meeting. We had a roundtable yesterday on the R3 paper that was very well received. There were a lot of faces in the audience that we did not recognize. There was some very good input which I’ll be summarizing. We’ve received the staff summary of the comments to the public comment period that was done on the R3.

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.

That was actually moving forward very nicely. That right now is the top of our list. But like I said there has been good progress on that and I'm happy with the interest that's been received. It was mentioned today at the Board meeting and even [Inaudible 00:02:51] has indicated an interest in having it help his own judgment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Evan, Jean Jacques?

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. To follow up on what Evan just reported, two things. One is the attendance and the actual discussion was quite lively. This is the largest group we've had so far. Yesterday we had about 50 people compared to an average of 15 or 20 the other times. The interest has grown if that is any indication at least. My second point is to underline the next steps or the way forward.

We as the coauthors and some of them are present here really thought of this as a thought paper, something to provoke a debate. Our impression is that we have achieved at least that part of our goal because there has been a very lively debate. I want to along the line also the status of this paper. Normally in the ICANN method a public comment period gives rise to comments which are then integrated automatically into the draft which his being discussed.

This is not the case here because there were six initial coauthors and it was agreed that it would be left to us as coauthors and as co-chairs of this initiative to take what we thought was consistent with the general approach that we had proposed. Now of the written remarks we've

received during the comment period one at least and perhaps two were not consistent with the general thrust of our proposal.

What we will do is to mention them, acknowledge them and give the links to their existence on the web but we will not integrate them as our own thinking. I wanted to make that very clear. Now the final point is where do we go from here? This will give rise to a report from the co-chairs, Evan and I, on the crux of the discussion yesterday.

And this will be submitted to further to and fro period where we will try to arrive at a more definitive state of the document. Why is this necessary? Well first of all to take into account the discussion yesterday but also for another reason which is that our document was dated September 2012.

It so happens that the new CEO assumed his duties officially in October 2012 and it so happens that this new CEO is quite a person so we want to acknowledge the fact that there have been already quite significant transformations in the processes but also in the structures of ICANN since his arrival. And this is some of the stuff that we have to take onboard, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Jean Jacques. I now open the floor for questions or comments. I see no hands up, I have to thank you very much for the work you've done on the R3 and the follow up. I've also noticed a real uptake in the community and I've heard a lot of people having read that paper now. It's very good to see that the discussion is going on and progressing and keep on moving forward.

I think we can now go to Sandra who has come back and she's going to be providing us with an update from the Academy Working Group, Sandra you have the floor.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Olivier. The academy is moving forward that's the good news. And you might remember when I gave you an update in Toronto we planned to do a survey among the ICANN community. And today I just wanted to give you a brief update on the outcome of the survey and current developments the next steps.

The purpose of the survey was to find out what the needs within the community are and what my already existing constituency where we have no knowledge from so far. It should help finally to harmonize and synchronize all existing efforts and all efforts which might be developed in the future according to the need which were defined by the survey. The survey was [Inaudible 00:08:13] question.

It was sent out to all stakeholder groups by ICANN staff. We had good cooperation with ICANN staff at that time. And they were very helpful in setting up and sending it out to all constituency leaders. It should actually - the duration time was planned to stop before Christmas and then we realized there is not an outcome - so far not enough results.

We extended the deadline after Christmas so it was mid-January. We had 22 or 21 responses. There is [Inaudible 00:08:56] in the what the survey says and what really came out. Unfortunately we had no participation from the technical community, the [Inaudible 00:09:06]

the SSAC that did not participate. But I'm trying to reach out now to them to participate in the development of the future Academy.

I list the number of participants from the survey and at this stage I'd like to thank all of my ALAC and ALS fellows for participating in this exercise. We received at least one answer from every region of the At-Large, really thankful for that. Also thanks to the cooperation of the regional leaders. By the numbers you should know this differs. For instance for AFRALO they submitted one survey but in this survey they represented the view of the whole AFRALO region.

For the [Inaudible 00:10:09] from the GNSO they submitted six surveys and these were individual answers. It differs and this depends on the way the stakeholder group or the region is structured. It differs if it is individual answer or if it is a community answer.

I'm going to go through the questions quickly. We made a conclusion for each of the questions asked in the survey and the conclusion will now be compiled and sent to ICANN leadership for consideration. Matt please go through those 14 questions quickly. If you are interested in the question itself and in the conclusion I invite you to visit ICANN Wiki space and read it yourself. I think it will eat up too much time to go through this.

Just as a reminder we are a point of departure. We were talking about the Academy as a level system, as a framework for which should be the host for all future and all current existing educational training programs within ICANN. And you see there is one wide brick in this pyramid which says advanced virtual learning. Within ALAC and also within the

entire ICANN community it turns out there is a great demand for any online education tool.

And at the beginning of the year ICANN leadership contracted a person who's name is Matthew Shears and he is very experienced in that field to make a feasible study and to develop an online education platform which should be then used or should be a tool to be used by the entire ICANN community by people who are not participating actively in ICANN but who may in the future or who are observers.

This online education tool will be an integral part of the ICANN Academy framework. I'm sure it will change the picture of this pyramid because it becomes a three dimensional figure because this is a two dimensional figure and now it becomes a three dimensional figure with the online educational tool which brings in another dimension and which could be a sort of underlying tool for all efforts which are currently existing and might be developed in the future.

How to move forward? The conclusion in short from the survey is yes there is a need for a leadership development program and this brings us actually back to our original project proposal where we submitted a budget for and which was actually approved but finally did not happen because of the history we all know about this. There is a need for the leadership development program.

The community says yes ICANN should fill that gap. ICANN should be the responsible party to do so. And any efforts should take into account that there are different needs in stakeholder groups and we should be aware of this that the different needs has to be matched by the tools to be developed. This is of course implements using different tools.

With this I will conclude. The next steps for the ICANN Academy Working Group are that the survey results the conclusions to the questions are compiled and forwarded to ICANN leadership. This is done during that meeting or shortly after. We will work on the synchronization of the structure of the online education platform here as a new ICANN acronym OEP, Online Education Platform.

And the ICANN Academy, I think this has to be done in line with ICANN global stakeholder engagement. This is a midterm goal. as for the private leadership program we have to submit a revised proposal based on the proposal which was made last year by the end of April for the acknowledgement and then work out the curriculum including the online education platform as an integral part by [Inaudible 00:15:22] first version of the online education platform should be operable.

And once this approved and we know that pilot leadership program can take place in Buenos Aires we can then discussion who is going to participate and who are going to be the trainers after the NomCom elections. This year we have plenty of time between the NomCom elections and the Buenos Aires meeting. And this was actually the reason why it could not happen in Toronto. Thank you and I remain open for any questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sandra. And I have to correct you on one thing, it's the NomCom selections. If it became an election that would certainly be interesting. Very, very good report, thank you very much. Any questions from the floor? I do have to say I was particularly pleased to see Matthew Shears - [Inaudible 00:16:44].

While we are on the subject of the Academy and we are ahead of time since we have Sala in the room and she wasn't able to provide us an update on capacity building, perhaps she could spend five minutes to give us an update.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Hi everyone. We've been working with the RALOs and the ALSs in terms of looking into how we can strengthen capacity building strictly within the At-Large community. That's our remit, how do we strengthen and enhance capacity building. As most of you know particularly the meeting with the Board one of the issues that came up was global public interest.

And in terms of legitimacy one of the core [Inaudible 00:01:57] of At-Large's legitimacy as far as reporting to represent the interests of ordinary end-users is the ability to facilitate and broker meaningful participation from our constituencies within At-Large. When I say that I mean the ordinary members within the At-Large structures, how do we get them to seamlessly integrate into the policy processes?

Very happy to report that we have a very thorough spreadsheet that contains refined information that was lifted from the dashboard. We've been correcting the dashboard. We've been communicating with staff to make corrections to the worksite, particularly in relation to ALS contact details and that sort of thing. And also looking into our ALS constituencies and identifying the types of interest that they may have.

I was very pleased to be present in the NARALO meeting today and to see how they've actually sort of teased out or have data set in terms of how they've aggregated their members. And I think the other RALOs can follow suit. But particularly in terms of capacity building we're looking at taking that information, looking at some of the potential synergies within the At-Large community in instances where the ALSs may also be registrars or the ALSs may also be ccTLD operators or where the ALSs may also hold other functions.

And looking into how we can harness the synergy in terms of identifying strategies for enhance capacity building, so whether that means face-to-face capacity building within regions or within countries or also writing online capacity building as was eluded to by Sandra. She had sort presented to the community about it, so essentially we're still at the phase where we're devising the strategy based on teasing up information from our trend analysis and it's all on the Wiki and feel free to pop into the Wiki and have a look, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sala. Any questions or comments?

VICTOR NDONNANG: Thank you Olivier. I just need a clarification from Sala, when you are saying that ALSs can also be registrars or new gTLD applicant or ccTLD or maybe network operation. As I know there are constituencies in ICANN for those groups. I also participate in the session this morning.

I arrived late because I [Inaudible 00:05:22] and I used to say in order [Inaudible 00:05:27] in the past the motion of ICANN was one internet, everybody connected and then they remove everybody connected because they are focusing on one world, one internet and they don't care about connecting people.

They are the only organization to do that. But now I'm seeing that ICANN is coming back to that mission, trying to connect people, trying to do other things and I need clarification about that because I am lost.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: I will say as most of you already know ICANN has support organizations, it also has constituencies and advisory committees. As far as At-Large goes and particularly in context of the working group our remit strictly is within is in terms of capacity building for At-Large community. And we are just executing what is in the ICANN bylaws trying to facilitate that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Fatimata?

FATIMATA SEYA SYLLA: Thank you Olivier. Sala I think what he is asking is because I was kind of also wondering if you meant what you said saying that ccTLDs and other registries might be ALSs. Was it what you really said?

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Just to give a bit of context to the question and alluding to my previous comments earlier, when we were compiling the spreadsheet earlier one of the things we tried to do was identify potential indicators and how we could aggregate those indicators to make it more useful particularly when we devise strategies. And that means that we would look into the nature composition of the ALSs. Some of the ALSs are also ccTLD operators. Some of the ALSs are potentially are registrars and that sort of thing.

But the reason why I'm saying that is for the capacity building our interest in the information would be how we can harness and utilize that skill set or that resource particularly in terms of when we're building capacity that is subject based. For example, if we are compiling information in terms of curriculum or developing curriculum where we could like our people to understand the ccNSO better, so we can write our ALSs that have skill set of expertise in that area to sort of you know empower other ALSs.

And they have different skill sets. Some ALSs that focus on - Armenia has more [Inaudible 00:09:32] and have that sort of interest where other ALSs may not have. But in identifying potential indicators we can better see who are potentially subject matter experts. I hope that answers your questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Follow up from Fatimata.

FATIMATA SEYA SYLLA: Sala I think I understand what you meant and for Victor I think you meant ALSs representatives wearing several hats?

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Yes and no, both. Again all ALSs are different.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you wearing her ccTLD operators hat and wearing her ccNSO liaison hat, so let's be really clear what hats I'm wearing here. first of all for the diversity and we need to celebrate the diversity and we need to recognize that with the huge divergence of socioeconomic and political status of all the countries we'd like to reach into the matter of public private partnership is going to be something we're going to have to deal with.

But we would expect our At-Large structures to clearly delineate what they're saying and why they're saying it in any given forum. And that's okay, that's what statements of interest being lodged online is all about. And that of course is what continuous disclosure is all about. I do not believe we have a registrar or a registry that is not larger than - certainly if we do as an ALS they would be singular in state individual operator and that's a very rare thing but something we have to deal with.

I see what you're saying there. however, when you're looking at expansion and I think that's what we're all about here and now I would like to remind you that the ccTLD operator whether they're members of

the ccNSO or not, the ccTLD operator does have a requirement to interact with and find out the best interests of their local internet community.

And it's that nexus that exists that we can benefit from because if it is a small operation and there's nothing wrong with that, little acorns grow into big oak trees, then that may be that that person has to sit here and decide what hat they're wearing and be really clear about it. but it's more likely and in fact I would like to think something we should transition to for all regardless that that will be somewhere we can find where the local internet community it, where those people who represent At-Large interests can be coming from.

But when we're matching up and we have matched up before and we will match up again with a fresh look including the GAC, the country pattern on where a ccNSO member is, so it's a ccTLD operator, a county code, top level domain operator, that has joined the ICANN entity called the country code name support organization where those things occur in a given country where we have our At-Large structures and indeed what we should also be looking at and I know Olivier is talking to Heather on this is where the GAC members are. That's just an opportunity for sharing and mutuality.

If you were to say to the ccNSO that there's an expectation you will get a brick wall. I will guarantee you we will close ranks and we will give you a brick wall. Because what we will do, this is me with my other hat on remember, what we will do is say no, some of our members won't want that. And if some of our members don't want it we will go for solidarity every time. So see it as an opportunity not an expectation and

as an opportunity I think we'll get far. If we see it as what we want matching what you want, not so likely, just be forewarned, thank you.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Cheryl raised an excellent point in terms of that being a nexus in some of those countries the ccTLD operator is potentially perhaps the most informed particularly in terms of issues pertaining to critical internet resources. and I'll speak from experience within the pacific we have had instances where we have used the ccTLD operators to run and facilitate online capacity building streaming using things like Skype over eight or something countries which has received widespread response. These are just examples of how indicators can be useful as aggregators.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sala. Next is Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I think Cheryl clarified that. But Sala I'd just pick you up on a word and ask you if meant something because you said you used these operators as a facilitator for training. I think the question was are they are ALS or are they facilitating the training of the local community, different things.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: You're right Holly. There are two totally different things. When I was making my observation and comments earlier they were based on the spreadsheet that the working group has compiled and that spreadsheet is confined to the ALSs within the At-Large and the example

that I just most recently used is separate from that experience. I hope that clarifies things Holly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sala. Victor?

VICTOR NDONNANG: Thank you Olivier. Okay I was going to tell Sala that I'm not completely satisfied with her reply because I cannot think of an operator as a ccTLD operator belonging to one of ICANN's At-Large structures. And I was going to comment on the ccTLD assignment and I was going to ask this question and I know there were some members of the Board when I came up to him and they said there is a request for comment which clearly detailed how ccTLDs must normally be managed.

But in many countries they're not managed with regard to these rules. They don't respect these rules because they say that ccTLDs must be managed for the interest of the local internet community. It's true that it's hard to define the interest of the local internet community but the ccTLDs they have to manage usually have almost 100% governmental members.

And as an ISOC chapter represents quite a great portion of internet users and we're not satisfied with the management we've seen in Cameroon so we addressed our minister and what we wanted to ask was if the local community is not satisfied with how ccTLDs are being managed whether or not they can resort to ICANN. And they replied no, ICANN cannot meddle in the way our ccTLD is managed.

And I said but we're speaking of delegations because ICANN delegated a resource to an entity so that if they managed following certain criteria. If they don't respect this criteria can ICANN intervene, and they said no. But if the At-Large structure is the frame of the ccTLD would it be possible for ICANN to intervene. I think it would be really complicated to find a ccTLD within the ALSs. That's what I wanted to clarify thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Victor thank you for the question I'd like to offer to take this offline specifically with you because it is a much deeper and detailed discussion that would come out of that. It's one I'm happy to have and I in fact there are other members of the regional leadership and ALAC community that can also be part of that conversation.

Let me make something fairly clear to you we are in the country code name support organization currently going through what's called a framework of interpretation activity which has actually run over a couple of years. And it is all about delegation and redelegation. It's looking at exactly what we understand every specific word in the reference documents.

Two things are happening, that work is not quite finished yet but you haven't been given a complete truth in as much as you are correct and they are correct in what they're saying. ICANN can't because it is in fact an IANA function to delegate and redelegate. We get into all sorts of subtleties of language I think we need to be really clear about what we're talking about.

There are very strict criteria which have not changed I doubt will change as a result of this program of what's called framework of interpretation that we're going through that deal with what is an indicator of dissatisfaction for action to occur. They do exist. They are on paper. And you and your community and any other community are welcome to them and I will point you to them. But it isn't a simple question because we have legacy from the very first John Postell distribution all the way through to current day.

There is a framework of interpretation working group please find it on your schedule. It is open. You are more than welcome to come. And again we may be able to assist you further. It's a long answer to say it doesn't belong here but I do think it's one that needs to be dealt with, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. I think we're straying off capacity building. You can take this offline. It was good that you asked a question and you have answer here. I'm going to close the queue. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier, thank you Victor for having reminded me that I did not speak French since Sunday. And it's true Olivier that it's not capacity building but I think this matter of ALSs which have an interest I think it's a matter which should be solved for good and this is not a good flow in this case. Each interest group has a place at ICANN. Users are usually those who have no interest. And I think Olivier we should

carry out a specific work to define what an ALS is or what an ALS could be.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. I don't wish to go any further in this. I think there is real support in this community in linking with the local ccTLD operators, linking with the local RIRs, between RALOs and RIRs and there's a lot of opportunity for collaboration. But as we know this is a world where there's a lot of bottom up, there's a lot of separate organizations out there and we just can't impose what we wish. It's more of an offer or invitation than anything else. Sala?

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Just final words in response to Victor and Tijani. I think it's very important to understand to acknowledge and to note that as far as the Capacity Building Working Group is concerned our remit is strictly capacity building. The politics and that sort of thing in terms of redelegation and those other issues those are issues that you can raise in perhaps other groups and discussions or on the mailing list.

However what I would like to say is the spreadsheet the information that being compiled and the reason we're mapping these indicators is to identify even within a country that an ALS is how we can maximize capacity building for that ALS in that country or whether it's on a national scale, in a regional scale on a global scale or within ICANN context. I hope that clarifies things.

If you have other questions in relation to capacity building, the working group or if you want to join, it's open, just send staff any email. If you have any other questions feel free to send us an email. There is a steering committee made up of Dev, Tijani and Carlos. We will help you answer them.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sala and before closing this which started from the Academy Working Group there are a couple of questions from remote participants Alejandro Pissanty and I'm going to ask Matt to read the first one.

MATT ASHTIANI: Hello we have a question from Alejandro Pissanty. I applaud this effort and the way it is going. It is along the lines I have just asked for in the Board contribute not just ask.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That was ICANN Academy. I'm sorry. Alejandro applauds the Academy's work. He's also sent me a message that he was one of the skeptics originally thinking it's just going to be an At-Large thing. But seeing the way it's grown he is entirely supportive as well.

MATT ASHTIANI: He says a careful read of RFC 1591 and later version shows the way, I'll be glad to assist.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: With regards to Sala?

MATT ASHTIANI: He says Sala I disagree. While the group should not intervene understanding basic structures and processes is vital capacity and should be built.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sala?

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you Alejandro. Just to respond in fact if you look at the spreadsheet that's on the Wiki it actually lays out very neatly not only the ALSs, the type of ALSs, the countries, the territories, whether or not they have ccTLD operators, whether they've been delegated a country code, whether they have registrars and the model of governance and that sort of thing.

So to address you Alejandro the spreadsheet actually covers your concerns. And if there are other indicators that you'd like to recommend for the working group to consider in terms of the spreadsheet please feel free to do so by sending us an email. And in response to the context of the discussions as far as the remit of the working group is concerned we're focusing strictly on capacity building for the ALSs.

And so we're not dealing with the type of ALSs, the model of governance. We're just looking into how to integrate their participation and nurture their participation and bridge it into the ICANN experience

so that it's sustained, it's holistic, it's meaningful and it's for the long term, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Sala. We're going to move on. The next part is the ALAC Internationalized Domain Name Working Group. We will have an update from Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Olivier. Edmond Chung and I agreed that I would provide this update to the ALAC today because he has to focus on the content for the IDN Working Group meeting that will happen tomorrow. The At-Large IDN policy focus since October of last year until now have been focused on three things, two in the IDN variant program, one specific to what we discussed in the APRALO panel yesterday and it related to the procedure to develop and maintain the label generation rules for the root zone in respect for IDN labels.

We produced two statements regarding this topic, one specifically to the IDN VIP team while the process was ongoing and one through an official public comment process. The other topic we responded to in terms of a statement was examining the user experience implication for active variant IDN TLDs. And the third statement we produced was on the topic of overall policy for the selection of IDN ccTLD strings.

In addition to the statements Edmond and I participated in this project on the label generation rules. Edmond wore the hat of GNSO observer,

I wore the hat of At-Large observer and collaborated in figuring out what were the issues that would be relevant to At-Large and that was how the panel came about yesterday.

I think the discussion was useful to highlight what are the complexities and what else could we do to raise the awareness of our community about these complexities so that our community members can decide how they want to advocate on these particular topics. In terms of our focus in Beijing at this particular meeting we had yesterday a multi stakeholder policy round table on community readiness for IDN variant TLDs.

We had various Asia Pacific language represented in the discussion. And I've had very good feedback about the quality of that session itself, not only from our community but also from the ICANN IDN VIP team. And I think that they would like to collaborate with us more in going forward on this issue. There was yesterday also a session on universal acceptance of IDN TLD.

This was basically organized by the JIG, the Joint Implementation Group, between the ccNSO and GNSO, and there is going to be an ICANN IDN program TLD briefing tomorrow at 1:30 until 3 o'clock. And if you're interested to know exactly what is being done in ICANN, please attend that session. We also have the At-Large IDN Working Group meeting tomorrow, and we will focus on three things. The label generation rules process for the root zone, the active variant TLD implications for user experience, and a long term IDN strategy.

I myself have not looked at the outlines of this possible long term strategy. I think Edmond has it in his mind, and I hope to see it tomorrow, to have an idea of what it is tomorrow or if it is at all possible. And yesterday I mentioned during the panel that the Board will be deciding on the IDN variant TLD root LGR procedure and the user experience study recommendations.

If they approve it, what we discussed yesterday will become live issues. In terms of future focus, if the Board approved those two sets of recommendations, then the next set of projects in the IDN variant TLD program will come online -- Project 2.2 which is implementation of the root LGR or IDN table processes. Project 7 which would be an update to ICANN's new DTL IDN ccTLD programs, and this is where we will see the root LGR process supposedly integrating with the new gTLD application follow-up as well as Project 8 which is updates to ICANN operations.

In terms of IDN crosscuts, I envision that internationalized registration data will have an IDN input specifically on impact on WHOIS and RAA, and my suggestion to the chairs of these working groups and at large is to reach out to the IDN Working Group so that we can provide the input and collaborate on what we need to address. Okay. That's it basically. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. Any questions or comments on this great report? Jean Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean Jacques. I made a remark yesterday. I want to make it here because I think some of the people are not the same as the session yesterday. I would like to underline once again the political importance of the work which is being done by this group because it's the kind of discussion about the very touchy element which are languages.

And someone remarked, I think it was Ram Mohan, that it is the stuff of wars, the stuff that wars are started for. And there are not many places in the world where there is an open discussion between people who think they are the sole owners of any given language. So, for instance, in the United Nations or in UNESCO this is not discussed in this way.

The fact that Taiwanese and Singaporeans and Chinese can discuss the hand script in this way and to arrive at joint solutions which are both accepted and implemented by all is quite unusual, and I would like to commend this.

So, my second point about this is that this is one of the, if not success stories, at least very meaningful dimensions of ICANN which need to be played up, and I would ask for the Chair of ALAC to bring this message to the leadership of ICANN, the Board and also the CEO, to make them aware of the fact that this is one of the elements which seems a bit abstract and far away but really has a bearing on the reputation of ICANN as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Jean Jacques. Next we have someone who should really have a roving mike. I'm not sure why she has to lean over every

time she wants to speak, but maybe that provides her with exercise.
Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Yes it does provide me with some exercise but my friend to the left here Matt is going to fix all that very shortly. I really want to follow on from what Jean Jacques has kindly said to you Rinalia and make sure that the Chair does formally pass up through the chain link of communication which we work it through, not just the success of our round table but also some of the details, at least those who contributed because you had a starring group do the work.

You know, like any show it really did go on the quality of its actors, and its actors were par excellence. That said, I particularly wanted to drill into, what I've asked Matt to do is go back to your previous slide. And that's with the crosscuts there. There was, and it's a couple of years ago now, but it is valid work I believe, work out of the SSAC on the accuracy and script issues for WHOIS.

It's probably appropriate for us, because I am part of your work group but sort of an inactive part at the moment because I'm busy doing other things, to approach perhaps via Julie the SSAC liaison and have the group perhaps briefed just back up onto speed. There has been some additional new work done on this. I'm not sure about its publication status, but I think it's appropriate for us to have that type of briefing.

And I would suggest it would be worthwhile making that an open briefing so any of our At-Large structures and language communities could also perhaps join in. But I want to make sure we don't go on in

the absence of recognition of work already done in this area. That was a very hard sentence to say, and I apologize to the interpreters.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. That could be an action item for the IDN Working Group. Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes thank you Cheryl. We'll take it on as an action item, and I would also like to take Jean Jacques's comment as an action item for the Chair of the ALAC. And I will tell Heidi exactly what that action item is. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Certainly the round table which took place yesterday, I believe yesterday, was very impressive indeed with the lineup and the organization and the interest which it brought. There were a lot of people in the room so it was very good indeed. I do have one comment to make on your presentation Rinalia.

And that's just something I've been criticized for in the past, I think many of us have been criticized for in the past. Just an example, here's a page [Inaudible 00:38:48] FY14 IDN TLD LGR IDN CCTLD GTL RAA RRR. My goodness. I thought that you didn't like acronyms.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Mr. Chairman, if you are sitting around table, you're expected to know these acronyms. There is also the At-Large Beginner's Introduction

Document which lists all of the acronyms, and if you haven't looked at those, then there is a problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rinalia. That's the sort of answer I would give you when you criticize me that you've just. Evan Leibovitch.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Hi there. It's Evan. And it doesn't help the situation that we actually have two different initiatives within At-Large that use RRR.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Any other questions on the Internalized Domain Name Working Group's work? Izumi.

IZUMI: About abbreviation if I may.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Izumi.

IZUMI: Izumi for the record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead.

IZUMI: May I ask about or comment about the abbreviation thing? As much as I appreciate your work of making the glossaries and making the [Inaudible 00:40:12]. Could we do something a little bit modified that in the beginning of the session like these open meetings you can fully spell out or just confirm our [Inaudible 00:40:30] I don't remember. I know the concept, but I cannot remember so that those who are this first time coming don't feel that intimidated.

If you're told, "Okay. Read the glossary. Study more." Then it's impossible to do within 45 minutes now. Right? So, sometimes certain groups have that rule in the meeting like [Inaudible 00:40:55] every time you bring up the new abbreviation you have to spell it first. Then, clearly, then you can use that as a common sort of knowledge inside a meeting room. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Izumi. So, we'll move on to the next part of our morning, and that's an update from the WHOIS Working Group. And the Registrants' Rights and Responsibilities, the RRR, or one of the RRR's, that we're speaking about who is going to provide this I see Carlton Samuels and Holly Raiche. It's joint. Are you going to sing as a duet or – great the floor is yours.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: With the microphone would be more helpful.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you. We're going to use some terminology, and for those who don't live in this world, we're going to talk about the RAA which is the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. It is the agreement which is between ICANN and all of the registrars. We're also going to use a term WHOIS and WHOIS refers to, and it's been pointed out it refers to about three different things, and it refers to the data that the Registrar Accreditation Agreement says must be made publicly accessible.

It also has been used to be both the service that makes that data available and the protocol, the IETF, the Internet Engineering Task Force protocol that makes the data available. We joined up, Carlton and I, on the two issues because, in fact, they've really become one issue because WHOIS is one of the requirements in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement. And so, although there's sort of a different history to the two issues, they've wound up being almost intertwined, and therefore Carlton and I have decided that we're actually going to speak together on the two issues.

Now is there enough time left? Thank you. Okay. This is a bit of background. So, Izumi here's your background. And this is why we're going to actually talk about the two issues as one. The WHOIS accuracy which is the accuracy of the data about the registrant and other details has been literally on the agenda since 2001. And when I say DNSO that refers to what used to be the Domain Name Supporting Organization.

That has since split to become the Country Code Supporting Organization while DNSO was ccNSO and GNSO. This was before that. So, it shows that the WHOIS accuracy has been an issue for a very long

time. This is just a part of history, actually it's a very long history, but 2009 was sort of when I became a bit involved.

And at that time the Registrar Accreditation Agreement had been modified, but the CEO at that point, yet another Australian, had said, "Well we need further work to modify the Registrar Accreditation Agreement." So, some of us sat on teleconferences for hours at odd hours coming out with a final report in October 2010. We had a number of suggestions on how the RAA might be improved.

When I say including the LEA request, what I mean is the Law Enforcement Agencies had a particular set of requests they wanted in terms of not only information but other provisions of the agreement that they wanted to be implemented. As a result of the final report that came out, negotiations were started. Now about the same time really the basic agreement that underpins the existence of ICANN is our agreement with the US government NTIA, the National Telecommunications Information Agency, which is a subsidiary of the Department of Commerce.

The agreement, the Affirmation of Commitments, is the agreement on which ICANN sits, and one of the very clear requirements of that affirmation was a requirement for a review of WHOIS within the year. So, some of us became involved in this. Meanwhile, the RAA negotiations were going on. And as part of the RAA negotiations there was some discussion about WHOIS. Now in May 2012 we've seen the WHOIS Policy Review Team final report, and that report had a lot to say about WHOIS accuracy and the requirements for it in the RAA.

So, we're now just about here which is March 2013. There have been those negotiations on the RAA. Those negotiations are ongoing, but a number of documents were released in March, and I have to say a number, and you're about to see how many, which includes an updated Registrar Accreditation Agreement, and it included a number of other documents.

And some of us have been silly enough to read all 100, 200, whatever pages and have lots of comments. So, literally March 2013 is where we are. The documents that came out that we have been commenting on, I don't know how many people have actually read the Wiki, but there's lots of comments. Well first of all, this is the Review Team's recommendations. Now some of these have been implemented.

The things that the WHOIS Review Team, remember this is what was required under the Affirmation of Commitments, was that, in fact, determining what the WHOIS policy is and actually implementing it should be a strategic priority. And there is a recommendation that there be a high level committee headed up by the CEO. Now that hasn't happened, but there is a high level committee.

That there be a WHOIS policy document. That, in fact, there is a terrific need for the community itself, and they do mean community of users, not simply registrants, as to what WHOIS is and why it might be useful in a number of ways. They had a lot to say about compliance with the RAA in terms of WHOIS accuracy. In terms of compliance transparency, as to what is happening, accountability to the ICANN community for the compliance action that is or is not being taken?

And some comments about adequate resourcing of the compliance area to make sure that they're carrying out their function. The WHOIS Review Team had a lot to say about data accuracy. In fact, they pointed to a study done in the US, and in the study done in the US there was found to be inaccuracy only of about 8 percent. But it was pointed out that, in fact, that was because in that study nobody actually tried to use the data about WHOIS to see if there was a real person behind it.

The WHOIS data accuracy that was undertaken for this WHOIS Review Team went that step further to say, "Well this data is supposed to result in data about a registrant who's actually got the domain name." And what they found was almost 25 percent of the WHOIS data there was no way they could actually find an actual person. And that there was substantial failure of [Inaudible 00:50:18] substantial failure and there were also a huge percentage of registrant data that simply is inaccurate.

Now in some cases there was enough data there to contact the person, but they said, "That level of inaccuracy is simply not acceptable, and you have to pull yourselves up, so to speak." That you have to, in fact, reduce that substantial failure rate, i.e. there's no data there that will turn up an actual person, that must be reduced by 50 percent within 12 months and another 50 percent in another 12 months.

And parenthetically that hasn't happened. Their other recommendation was about I'd say regulation or oversight of the proxy privacy service providers. I don't think I want to go into too much detail except to say that there's some work that was done by the Stability and Security Advisory Committee, the SSAC, that showed that for one proxy privacy service that they looked into that had been identified by the Federal

Trade Commission in the US, 49 percent of the registrants that were using the service actually had already been identified as taking part in at least one malicious activity, if not completely fraudulent.

So, there was a real concern that the people who were using privacy proxy service providers are using them to hide their identity and their activities. Now the recommendations continue. There should be a one shop stop for consumers so that if you want to know who the registrant is behind the data, you should be able to find it quickly. They suggested it enhanced visibility for internet to do so.

There were some additional recommendations on WHOIS and IDN's which I will not go into. There should be a comprehensive plan to implement the recommendations and an annual status report. I think what was on the final slide, and it is a very long one, was simply a list of the documents that have been released at the end of March that some of us have plowed through in terms of what we are expected to comment on in a fairly short space of time. Now this is what some of us have been reading.

And you say, "You're all mad" which is probably true. And when I say the updated RAA, you get updated and you will get one document that shows what the changes are that have been agreed. Another document of the same document that shows a red line to show the changes and where there is agreement and where there isn't agreement. And then you get a document, same thing, showing nothing else except what the text is.

So, sometimes you get three versions of the same document. So, there are three versions of the updated RAA. You should go through all three. You've then got the consensus, policy specification. You've got the data retention specification. One critical one that I will talk about after Carlton takes the floor is WHOIS accuracy and what is meant by what you have to do to make sure that the WHOIS data is accurate because that's been such an issue.

Other things, specification of privacy proxy services which is new and important and I think really a step forward -- additional registrar operation. There's the information specification. There is a new document called the Registrant's Rights and Responsibilities. That is a one page document that purports to summarize the registrant's rights that come out of the much longer document of the RAA.

There's a compliance certificate which is boring and one page, and there is a transition addendum because, as Eleanor said, basically how do we get from here to there? And that's going to be a very long journey indeed. What we have to ask is do we want to get to where this is going? Carlton, you're next.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Carlton Samuels.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton Samuels for the record. So, I'm going to zero in on the WHOIS issues that are attached to this RAA 2013. The major one, of course, is what we are now calling the RDDS, Registration Data Directory Services. The data services it specifies the data elements that are

collected by the registrar that must be stored and provided to the WHOIS query by way of Port 43 or on what they call an interactive website.

There are a couple of additions to that data set. There is no request to have reseller information in that data set as well as the status of the domain name. Two very important pieces of data additional to that, the other area that is critically important, and this was mentioned earlier by Holly, and that is the accuracy, the accuracy specifications and we need to look at that carefully.

Because the idea is that there are certain pieces of data, certain elements of that data set, where the accuracy requirement, for it to be meaningful, the accuracy requirement has to be more stringent than for other pieces of data. And I think it's important for us to ensure that any piece of data, any of those elements that allows us to contact someone.

The registrant requires a certain level of accuracy. And we should also ensure that the accuracy is maintained, so there has to be a process by which the registrar is committed to ensuring that those pieces of data that are absolutely critical for contacting a registrant is accurate and kept up to date.

The specifications - what they've done in this case is quite interesting because they have, as it were, extracted bits and pieces of the big agreement into what they call specifications, and that's where the details are. And you want to look very closely at the specifications because it is the specifications that determine what the outcome is going to be especially when this is challenged. The proxy privacy issue is one that is of great importance to the at large.

Most of you will know that there is a strongly held view in parts of our community and indeed in other parts or sides of our community and the community at large that there is a right to privacy and the personal data for the registrant on the privacy rules that are extent in certain countries may not be violated so that people who believe for example that the requirement for the “who is” data that contains specific elements of personal data to be publicly available is a violation of privacy rights and a violation of law in several counties where there are strong privacy, personal privacy, data privacy regulations and laws.

We would have thought that as it happens now there are services that provide registrants with the ability to conceal or confiscate. Let’s use the word confiscate or not to conceal but to confiscate which means you don’t to it very readily by display the personal data of registrant. They are called first privacy provides and they are not regulated to the extent that these services are provided to registrants.

They are not now regulated and this is an attempt to put together a framework by which these services can be regularized and be brought into the framework as a part of the entire process for registration so it’s important for us to understand for what this is intended. It is intended for the first time to define a space for privacy proxy services where people who are providing registrants the ability to confiscate their personal contact details can be regularized and can be regulated by contract.

It is important to understand that. This is important to us because most of you will recall that was something even before the force final review team report was published by a lack of record for supporting

some kind of regulated privacy proxy service and this was also supported by this final review report. So this is one of our babies and it is important for us to keep note of it and make sure that the way we intend it to work is what emerges from the specifications.

Let me tell you why I say that. There are some in the community that believe that privacy proxy registration extends to anonymity. What do I mean? It means that you can register the main name but under no circumstances the registrant is to be identified. That is not what we mean by privacy proxy services. We mean that there must be some higher level interaction to access the registrant data and only by need and purpose.

That's what we mean. That's what we meant when we endorsed privacy proxy services. It's not about anonymity and it was never about anonymity that people could register the name and you don't know who they are and there is no way of accessing them. We were purposeful in our statements to say that the privacy proxy provider must accept liability for the registration.

We did say that so it's a little bit different from I hear others in the community are making reference to the privacy proxy registration and it's important for us to understand that we are absolutely concerned that there are privacy rights that we feel should be embraced, but the method by which we embrace those privacy rights does not extend to anonymous registrations. So that is important. Finally, before we get to the questions the RAA as it is today . . . but before I say that.

The board in November of last year had a resolution in which the board committed to implementing and enforcing existing "who is" policy while

at the same time chartering a group to have a holistic assessment and a new look at what we call the next generation of “who is” services and so on and that is what we call the EWG, Expert Working Group, that I happen to be a member of and this group is now looking at the whole thing from scratch and if you read the EWG Review Final Report you will see that what we are doing there is no more or no less than one of the sixteen recommendations in that report. It’s nothing new.

It’s an implementation as it were of some of the recommendations however they are inflated. Yes, they bring together several recommendations, but that’s what this Expert Working Group is about; about moving forward with some of those recommendations so you are going to hear a lot of arguments that tend to be conspiratorial of what the EWG is doing. It’s nothing more than making sure that those recommendations are fully applied and fully aired. I wanted to just put that in as a part of that.

We will have more on the on the RAA Record of Negotiations tomorrow at the meeting and I will be there and Alan will be there because Alan will have a lot more to tell us from his perspective being his energetic self. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you and there is a queue in operation and I was going to let the two co-presenters finish with their presentations and I will open the queue and so back to you Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Right. I was going to go into just a little bit of detail. I am glad that Carlton went into the privacy proxy because that's one of the really big issues and we really have to be involved in the privacy proxy specification because that hasn't been developed. All that's happened is in the RAA contract there are some temporary provisions until a specification is developed.

Well it hasn't been so that's going to be a task that Carlton and I am certainly going to be involved in but the way that it's set up now is it actually starts to mirror on a lot of very good privacy principles in terms of you must do this but then the access can only be done in this particular way and it starts to look a lot better, but there actually isn't enough flesh now for me to sign off on it or for Carlton for that matter.

I just want to go into a couple of things before we finish and as Carlton said the specification on accuracy is really, really critical because it is literally if it is followed and I am "if" it is the problem is going to be dealt with. There is some really, really critical bits about it. The first requirement is all the data fields have to be filled in. Well you say they should have been before but it is a new requirement. Next there has to be validation of the email address, the phone number, and the postal address according to relevant standards which means the email actually has to work and the phone number has to work.

It means when you verify it means you actually have to send a message by phone or SMS and you have to get a response or you send something by email and you have to get a response so you can't fill in Mickey Mouse in California any more. That is actually a huge step forward again if it's complied with and it has to be. There is an affirmative

received and if it is not then the registrar must either suspend or cancel the registration so the first time it's like you have to do something if this doesn't happen so that's another step forward that is critically important. The next thing that's important within fifteen days after receiving any changes to the data you as a registrar have to go back and re-verify and again if there is no affirmative response you have to suspend.

Finally, if the registrant willfully provides inaccurate, unreliable data or willfully provides or fails to provide or update response to a registrar saying I have been told that you have been provided inaccurate data. If the registrant does not come back and verify and the registrar doesn't verify then again there is a requirement to either terminate or suspend registrations. None of those things were there before. They are all now there.

We have been quibbling over language for a while and I think we have got there but it is a huge step forward. Again reminding everybody at the top of this document there is a statement that says this is still under negotiation so in fact it is still in negotiation. But it would have to be a document that we would have to say well terrific so now just do something about it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly. I have put forty minutes aside for a discussion from start to end or this working group and it's been thirty minutes. It's a very comprehensive update, but I am a little concerned that we've only got five minutes until the end of this and I only have a lot of people in the queue. Just one thing, just a point when it goes to

the number of documents that are there I have made it known to the CEO of this organization that the public comment process for this is absolutely insane.

There is about four hundred or five hundred worth pages and there is a lot to read and it's just crazy to have just twenty-one days to answer that. I know that Alan lives in that so for him he already knows most of it. Anyway, let's just go through the queue. We've got Sala to start with.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: One the things I would just like to say at this point is that the at large committee is well aware that I can complain that it has been on record for saying that they are not regulated is one and two the community is structured in such a way where everything in relation to who is particularly pertaining to registrant rights and that sort of thing is very much self-regulated and the third point I would like to make is that globally that who is considered back-off cyber security national strategies and has also been woven into policy.

Not only in terms of cybercrime as cybercrime is concerned but also in terms of taxation and the OECD is very much on record in terms of emphasizing who is issues and having said that the comment I would like to make particularly given that who is given in context is largely self-regulatory pertaining to contracts. It's disconcerting to note the termination of the bulk who is in a crazy reporting program in March this year and is something that got picked up in his routine laboratory report and I know he mentioned it briefly yesterday but I would like to

really recommend that all ALAC members read Garth Bruin's paper, particularly the latest release and it's a really good paper.

I took time to read it yesterday and the termination of the bulk that is in the inaccuracy reporting program and the removal of key employees is really, really worrying especially in the context that in himself can regulate particularly in this matter. The other thing is the rejection of several documentary disclosure information policy requests pertaining to some of the complaints and I am sure that Garth can elaborate and he can also read about it in the paper but very briefly the point I would like to make is this.

The fact that we heard yesterday even at the monthly stakeholder round table anyone can register and he can say my address is sentinel and I can come up with a name Mark Powell and I am not even Mark Powell and that sort of thing in tracking people down to their roots and that sort of thing so if in the context of I can be self-regulated and if we don't want this regulated by government and as I had mentioned it is not part of country cyber-security and cybercrime strategies and various texts and laws that are coming out that are weaving all these issues into the policies purposes.

It is very, very critical that the ICANN community sets a very high standard so the motion that I would like to make is that the ALAC proposes to create a very strong statement to the global ICANN community in this regard and we leave it to all of them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Sala and the next is Garth.

GARTH BRUEN:

Thank you and I was going to open up by thanking the "who is" review team and who is working group for all these things, but I should thank Sala first for that statement. I appreciate your backing on this. The excellent work by the various parties involved in examining who is in registrant rights and responsibilities are phenomenal and what we see from this is the fact that the registrant does have obligations and we know what those obligations are.

What I would request and recommend to the group is that we take this to another level. The document that Sala mentioned demonstrates that the registrars in certain cases and ICANN in certain cases has not followed through within forcing down the chain when those obligations are not met by the registrant.

The process itself has failed truly from end to end. I think as far as a group effort goes if we are going to maybe finish or complete what is defined by a registrant obligation and what is required in the who is record as an obligation we need to take this next step and formally analyze what the registrars are doing and what ICANN is doing to make sure that it works. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Garth. Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE:

May I separate out two things. Number one I am certainly well aware of the need to actually insist on compliance and there is a who stream of

stuff we have done and that we should continue on this, but this is about new documents and instead of talking about I would just like to separate out what we are doing about that compliance up to now versus compliance in the new scheme and what I would be concerned about is that we don't support what looks to be a much stronger regimen than has been in place.

So I would like to think to please support the accuracy specification. Please support some of the changes to the RAA. Please support the direction that is being taken now and say this will actually address a lot of the concerns that have been top of mind for a lot of us so please separate the issues here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Holly and we are way over time and we still have several people in the queue. I am aware that the gang of the red lanyards are here. Otherwise known as the numb come and they are slowly invading us and I am asking the area if it is possible for us to get another five or ten minutes more. The responses I have received were positive so far but let's make sure we move swiftly. [Inaudible - 0:21:32.4] is next.

FATIMATA SEYA SYLLA: Thank you and just for the record actually I have noted a number of remarks and comments on my list. I will reduce it to one comment due to time constraints as it is I personally regret that we have evolved due to capacity problems most not in a position to play a more active role in the respective working groups. As you may recall privacy and data

protection is normally or usually on the key topics of European concerns. I have followed the discussions and I have some kind of idea about some main discussion lines about but due to time constraints I couldn't participate actively in these personal comments and before I make personal comment I would like to make sure that this express a concern not only from my side but being backed from my region etc.

To make it short I regret that there is sort of zero I contributed to this whole debate. This does not mean that we didn't care about the discussion but only one point I would like to and only one comment I would like to make and send. We observe this increasing concern is it's a whole debate at the moment in Europe is abused by law enforcement.

More and more people from the European police and security etc. agencies are trying to pressurize gang members to influence decision making in the last minute to add some more flesh to some text for the only purpose for the task law enforcement are the same hand violating principles or European principles of data protection and this is something we couldn't bring into debate but it is to be noted here at this. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. At this point I will just say comments or questions and if there are any answers I will ask both Carlton and Holly to follow up by email afterwards. We are running out of time. Alan Greenberg is next in the queue.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. A couple of comments and I am afraid I'll disagree with some of my colleagues including Olivier. I'm among those who continually complain about the number of documents released just prior to ICANN meetings but this is not one of those problems. To use data base terms staff chose to give us about three or four different views of the RAA showing in very easy ways what is different from the last June one and what is different in the one before us.

A different document and each of them are thirty pages long and a different document showing what is different continuous points so by giving us different views of it made it very easy to hone in and think on what we ought to comment on and what was relevant and what was the change. Yes, they gave us many pages of documents but it really helped the analysis instead of trying to pack it all into one with curious notations.

I complement them on the number of pages they gave because it made it practical to analyze it. They didn't have to and they haven't always done that in past.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

I would have to agree with that. It was a real important different the way the documents are made.

ALAN GREENBERG:

If I may continue. Thank you. What hasn't come out in this discussion in the new proposed RAA is so much better than the previous documents in many, many ways. Among other things it makes the

future revision of the RAA possible where right now it is an obscure bunch of legal jumbo which nobody has the same opinion on.

There is so much that has changed that is positive that I think we really have to go on record of saying that they and I compliment both the registrars and ICANN though we cannot credit proxy and proxy services we have some pretty tight words in there and we are putting a lot of onus on registrars to take responsibility so there are some really, really big differences and overall this is a breath of fresh air.

It is not perfect and there are some things that are still missing from it but it's just so much better than anything we have seen before and a lot of motion forward on a lot of things that are very important to us and to other people. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan and next is [inaudible 0:27:18.8].

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Hi, this is [inaudible - 0:27:18.5] and I am from [inaudible - 0:27:20.2] India and with good grace I comment from Carlton's presentation on the topic. First of all I would like to thank Carlton for making it clear that there is an article in anonymity, however; there are also jurisdictions that pertain to anonymity, but the point I try to make is we need to get down to the facts to understand whether the previous of it all applies.

And the items to look at is information that is used in the crystals of time in the administration constitute any confidentiality or a person

which cannot be shared with the world at large giving an example of the Yellow Pages or a different fact that used to be there earlier and having said that, I think that concept from previous proxy service is being misused for crime and criminal purposes and it's not a [inaudible - 0:28:22.3] but it becomes more of a criminal right.

The best way of fixing this problem and also the premise are all the same as I saw in the original edition and they are not even there in the video edition so the best way I would suggest would be to make the policy and being a global policy subject to local privacy laws so that it takes care of the privacy laws if there are any so that if there are any so that the rest and the industry are not in a sticky position as the local jurisdiction is concerned while at the same time in the guise of privacy rights we are not allow criminal rights to foray. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Rinalia, and your comments will be noted in their replies. I ask you to speak to Carlton and perhaps even have a record of this on the list and there is also who is tomorrow at the working of tomorrow. Joining us at the table is Alac, known as the non-com chair. It's been a long morning and we also have the non-com chair elect who has been in the room for a while. So non-com chair, Alec, who has joined us and Cheryl is here for a while and we also have the associate chair, Adam Peak, who is on either side of me now. Alec you have the floor.

ALEC:

Thank you very much. It's nice to come to the at large room as a guest for a change. Need I say we are late and have experienced having to wait on the side and being frustrated by the slowness at which Alec, the Chair, runs things. I try to eat too much during lunch break which is short. Okay, so basically non-com us we have three messages to you and to everybody. First of all we need good candidates. We need good candidates for the board, for ALAC, for GNSO, and we need them now.

Of course, the deadline is next May 1st so please reply if you feel so and tell those we think could be good candidates for any of these positions to apply. Without a good candidate base we're pretty helpless. We can't invent them from thin air. The second message is actually help us by telling us here or during this meeting your ideas of what sort of people you would like to see. What sort of skills and implementations and so on and so forth. Not only regarding ALAC but also regarding the board and even regarding other sources.

On the screen right now we see how you get into the SOI, Statement of Interest link and then you just start filling the form. The third message is that this red crowd is now a bunch of Cardinals who have gathered to select a Pope and then the white smoke comes out and everybody wonders why did they pick that one? Basically what we try to do is to convince everybody that non-com is not a black box, not anymore at least and that's why we decided at our kickoff meeting in kick star at the meeting in Toronto that we respect the confidentiality of candidates, the names.

We will be as strict as ever because without that we wouldn't have any candidates but all the rest is the need for confidentiality about names is

no excuse for making everything so secret and mystical about non-com. We tried to open the black box and what we said was that the process is as open as possible and data is secret. We have implemented this in two ways so far if you haven't noticed we have started issuing report cards immediately after every meeting.

The idea came from Stefan from the other and he writes the first draft of these report cards which then are circulated, commented upon and then finally the agreed upon version is relayed by all non-com members to the constituencies that they come from. I hope that this system is now working also in at large. The other thing is that we have a couple of open meetings here in Beijing which I believe is a historical first.

There was an open meeting yesterday by the Outreach Subcommittee of the Non-Com Chair by Chair and today at 5:00 in Room 5-BC there will be an open meeting of the full nominating committee and you are all welcome if you can. Basically this is what I wanted to tell you and perhaps I can ask Cheryl after her ad to come in.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, [inaudible - 0:34:33.2]. This is Cheryl for the transcript record and like my friend it is rather delightful to come back home as such and be talking with you from the morning as your talent and resource pool point of view as to how it is being presented point of view.

One of the things I have made clear to the groups I have visited so far and will be making clear to every group we visit today and tomorrow is that please as with us do things for people to put forward or to

obviously put yourselves forward at various points in time for these leadership positions, but don't just think about looking for talent for just the ALAC positions.

If you can find someone who you believe would be perfect in an independent thinking capacity [inaudible - 0:35:28.0] looking forward in that capacity and obviously the board as well. Ilio is going to run you through a couple of the core criteria and qualities that we are looking for at least in the board position, but one of the issues that came up in another constituency committee earlier today which I wanted to share with you all because after all we are an opportunist lot here and at large.

It was the need and opportunity to tap into next generation leaders to grasp towards some of the younger, under 25, possible work into some of these shift positions. Clearly we recognize with a criterion that is counter-for the board positions that they are going to be an exceptional young person if they have all those boxes checked, but certainly the sort of thing that I believe would bring great energy to the large advisory committee if indeed you had a use by the representative.

Don't think in the traditional boxes. We have here unfortunately a black hole that has eaten all of the business cards which are the preferred mechanism to give you a pile and you can use the cocktail parties and elevators and things, but we do at least have some of the bookmarks and I am going to leave those with Heidi. If you believe you have an outreach opportunity please use those.

Adam will tell you about some of the ways to get to linked in with us, but the other thing we want to hear about is there particular talent sets

and skills that you believe you might be missing on the at large advisory committee. As we do sift and sort and sift and sort is under different filters every year so if you know someone who has applied previously for any of the positions feel free to encourage them to apply again this year and the following year.

Successful follow-up is not a measure of the individual; it's a measure of how well they fitted the criteria for that given year and if you could make that clear to people as well that would be greatly appreciated. The criteria that you would like us to be aware of would be useful when you ask for questions Mr. Jameson, but also I would like to give you in my capacity as most likely unless a bus hits me chair of next year's non-com the type of talent I want you to send me. You send me a bunch of people.

You send me five. You send me one from each region. I appreciate and genuinely want to commend the work done by each and every one of them but you need to up the ante. We need people who operate not just in your community where they are good civil society contacts. We need people who also have access to the higher echelons in business and in corporate governance as well.

I am looking to you to send me at least a couple of people to come with the experience of what I call the c-switch; the senior executive, the people who have been chief information officers, chief financial officers, chief.

I want that chief level because the people they need to reach out to the people running corporations at that level. I don't want five of them but I would like at least one of them. All right, so don't think in the same

populous ending. It's hard working group in non-com and they are going to work harder and harder as we do things in a more transparent manner and please we need access to those levels. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Cheryl and before we continue I just want to check with the interpreters if we could have another five minutes? Ten? Fifteen? Okay, we got ten. Excellent. I was going to go the other way around thirty minutes, then ten, then twenty but okay. I appreciate it. Thank you very much and I do apologize for the delay. Just a couple of comments; first on the publication of report cards on the non-coms report cards.

As much as I would hate to have to acknowledge some ideas from Stefan von Gilder, thank you. I think that's an excellent idea and what I would encourage on-com members to do is we do have one from each region is to actually each send it to their ray-lo list.

It's really important and works something out between yourselves as who would send it over to the ALAC list as well because some ALAC member might not be because there are so many lists that are it good to actually have that spread as much as we can. That information is really helpful. With regards to the points that Cheryl has made this is being taken into account. Thank you and the floor is now open for questions except if Ilio or someone else in your team would like to add something. Adam, please go ahead.

ADAM PEAK:

Sorry to interrupt. I am Adam Peak and I am the associate chair at the moment. Mack I understand that you are controlling the screen on the left. You are probably controlling all screens. Could you do something to or add a word? We have Non-Com.ICANN.org as the usual format for ICANN committee URLs. If you do slash then apply what that does is take you to the application form and our Statement of Interest form so it's quite simple and it's just adding the word apply.

One thing to remember about this form is it's an on-line form but when you enter the information it does not save it and we are very sorry for that so please prepare your questions off-line otherwise the form might eat it. I am very sorry about that. You have to go back to the nominating committee page and then if you instead of adding the word apply simple add /suggest and this is what you can do for friends.

You really, really can do this and we would love you to do this is to think about people you would like to see joining the ALAC and also who are the experts that you know in your life, your professional life, that could help the GNSO or the ccNSO and of course the directors. You have the opportunity here to recommend people and you can do it either or with your name going to them as the person recommending them and this is quite important.

People really do appreciate the fact that someone actually thinks that I am good enough to do this. This can be an important impetus to them to apply so you have these two opportunities and one is the apply and this is for you to submit your application and you also have suggest where you can encourage somebody else to join. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Adam, and I perhaps act as corporate memory having been on the non-com once here. One comment which was made at the time is who do you know and I am trying to remember the verbiage. Who do you know out of top executives that fills an online form? That was several years ago and I see it's still the same c-r-a-p. We have a list here and Jean Jacques is up first.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you chair, this is Jean Jacques. I have a question and depending on the answer I get to that I may have a comment. The question is this to you and your team. In 2009 the board or some members of the board began putting out the not the instruction but the recommendation to the non-com that actually you should be going back to the board to get the exact profile as it were of the people there to populate the board and I wondered what the status was just now.

To go to board to get a profile of the desired board member or are you doing this on your own and maybe I have a comment on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, we have the profile that is from the board. We have the profile from all the constituency that wishes and end to end we are an independent committee and we make our own decisions. Thanks. Next first we have an answer from Stefan van Gilder on an earlier point.

STEFAN van GILDER: Yeah, thank you, Olivier. Stefan van Gilder, non-com and I just want to address the point you made about the on-line form because just to

make you aware of some of the work that we have done. Obviously, we are outreaching and trying to get some recruitment from the community but we felt that was not enough and we have gone to a professional recruitment firm to get extra support.

One of the things that they said was exactly the comment you made that the SOI was a potential problem and for the level of candidates that we were looking for it could be extremely difficult to get these people to fill in an on-line form or send in a SOI, etc. We have explained that we have to judge all candidates equally and we have to have them go through the process, and equal process and if some candidates have to fill to fill in an SOI then all of them have to.

What we have done with the recruitment firm though and that's been extremely useful to us as a non-com in guiding us in trying to get to a point where we can be effective in attracting a new pool of candidates is to devise a process whereby the SOI doesn't come in straight away and if it comes in we understand that the candidate really has the profile to be a potential non-com selectee. These are problems that we are aware of and the non-com right now I think is in a two-step organization.

The first step that Euro described is becoming more open and transparent. The second is also looking at its process to make them more palatable to candidates and that's part of the second step. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much and I think you are talking about transforming non-com.ICANN.org to my.ICANN.org. Is [inaudible - 0:46:54.2].

MALE: This is [inaudible - 0:46:54.8] for the record. Related to that for the future position I understand that we cannot save any data on the form now. Our tax office in Japan not only saves the data of certain things of this year which I have done already. Its saves last year's data if you put it rightly so like my.ICANN.com and you can add or modify only the portions that you like.

I sent maybe five or seven applications in the past and each time I have to do it cut and paste and cut and paste and I got tired of and I just stopped. Likewise, if you can have a word of previous faults off line you send it later. There are a bunch of other technologies which can supplement. Even to the extent for those high profile guys or whatever it might be much easier for them. I just say one more thing like we can share that non-com thing with Facebook or any other S&Ss so we can share with just the friends or LinkedIN or whatever or any of the tool now but not five years ago.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Asumi. Before we continue with Cheryl, I feel I have a duty to let our interpreters go to lunch if we want to keep them alive. So thanks interpreters very much. (Applause). The last two or three minutes of this discussion will not be interpreted I am afraid but it is Cheryl who has agreed to speak. Cheryl, you have the floor.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will work out how to take that comment later. This is Cheryl for whatever record will exist on the MP3s and Pat, does it mean I am not being interpreted I can do it to my normal estranged language. Okay. In all seriousness, we hear what you say and it is something we have recognized actually and we are using a number of social networking and other aspects to do our outreach as well.

The issue of the form is fixable, but is not fixable for this set of activities and it will not be a problem for next year so we have already done the planning for remediation. We understand how frustrating it is but it is to be fixed and will be fixed but cannot be done during this particular session. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Next up is Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Olivier. We now have [inaudible - 0:46:54.8] for the transcripts. I have a comment for my at large colleagues. It's about quality processes. I like the non-com process so much this year that I appropriated their reporting format and modified it for the committee I lead on the ALAC candidate endorsement for ATRT2 and I like very much their confidentiality policies and I also appropriate that and modify that for my committee and I highly urge any future chairs of committees that will be doing vetting of candidates that have to do with confidential information to actually look at that precedence is the best practice or even look at the ones that I had modified as a best practice. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia, and well done for that and any other questions or comments around the floor I see no one. Jean Jacques.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: Just to ask for an update on numbers. Compared with other years or previous years what is the numbers you have at this stage of your search for candidates?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ilio.

ILIO: Well, we have less numbers. Let's say I am not going into the numbers themselves but I mean but I don't know but the numbers are increasing and growing all the time and I think that we are getting into this last minute rush but my guess is that a normal number has been 70 to 80 and we are not going to reach quite that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments or questions? I think one of the things that we need to get to you are the skill sets we are really looking for. One common problem is the volume of work that ALAC has to deal with and sometimes this is a little bit understated. Oh, you can do ten hours a month and you will be fine.

Actually, no, you have to be prepared for more than that and we do take our volunteer position very seriously here and once we have had some resounding successes in some non-com appointees and I am not going to look at them. I have to look at the ceiling don't I. There are some resounding failures as well over the years. We need to be quite aware of that. I can see you and there is a camera opposite there. I can see someone waving and doing all sorts of things. Adam Peak.

ADAM PEAK:

I wanted to respond to Jean Jacques questions because it is an important thing and it actually links with the point from Olivier about the skill sets that we need for the ALAC. If you go to the nominating committee website there are the types of skills for the board that you mention Jean Jacques we now have formal input from the Board of Governor's Committee and they do that each year. That was begun during your term during the year 2009 and then it became a formal requirement after the ATRT recommendations.

There is also the process where there is outreach to the community through various workshops and I will send to ALAC our latest long list of sort of ideal candidate characteristics and you may be interested in them. It is also something that we will be updating during the open workshops later in the week so you will find this information on the Nominating Committee website and I will send you an update and there is an opportunity for further input during the next nominating committee workshop which I think may be Wednesday or Thursday. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much and I think we are reaching the end of this session I see more hands coming up so you are getting into our eating time. So Jean Jacques and then Rinalia and then Alan.

JEAN JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean Jacques and actually this is my follow up questions. I just want to make sure as Ilio pointed out that the independence of the non-com there is such that the shieling committee given by the board governance committee does not have a negative impact on the fact that we want a board fully and independent as well.

This is of course, and although it's not nice to say so, but this could be a way of capturing art of the board to have the board itself a sitting board to amend and define the profile of the next board.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean Jacques. Ilio.

ILIO: Well, if it be so there will be no need for the Nominating Committee. It all could be done by the BGC so this is pretty much my answer and I repeat that this is an independent committee and that is the whole idea of having a Nominating Committee.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Chair. This is Rinalia for the transcripts. It's about recall process for non-com appointees and I know this was discussed at the last non-com and I'm not aware that there is a process but I urge that you do consider it for non performing appointees because you don't want the communities to be stuck with people who are not able to contribute. It's just an input. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ilio do you wish to respond?

ILIO: Or should we let Stefan Gilder.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan probably wants to clarify our rule.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Stefan and then Alan to clarify our rules.

STEFAN van GILDER: Thank you, Olivier. Stefan speaking and I think it is very difficult to measure performance of the candidate of some of the term times that we have. If you are just talking about bold time in three years and it is obviously a bit longer but don't forget we also recruit for other positions and those terms are shorter. They are not all the same.

There is no KPIs, Key Performance Indicators for how a non-com appointee will perform so I think you have to be careful what you ask

for and I understand the issue that some select power selectees have sometimes not measured up. There could be a lot of reasons for that and one could be the pool of candidates themselves and some people or a lot of people apply for the board but not many apply for the other positions so sometimes you don't have much of a choice.

I think we want to be careful not to put too much pressure on possible candidates. At this stage our aim is to try to get people in and not to put the bar up so high that people feel they do not want to come in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Stefan. We have had some candidates that have measured up to nil so that's a very low bar. Alan, do you want to just add to this.

ALAN GREENBERG: I originally raised my hand to ask a very quick question. Adam you said there is a session on Wednesday where we can add to your list of stuff or suggest new things. Some of us can't attend that session. Are you suggesting things like email and so to what address?

ADAM PEAK: Could we get back to you with the correct information? I promise to get back to you with the correct information.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We'll get the address later.

ADAM PEAK: Just for the record it's non-com13@ICANN.org.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. In the response to the question of recall the Board, the GNSO, and now as of a few days ago the ALAC have internal procedures that we all of us could remove a non-com appoint should we choose to take such a radical position. Replacing that person is not at all clear how that happens but that is a different issue. We have a procedure just as the GNSO in its last rules of procedure put a procedure in for removing non-com appointees and the Board can remove anyone except the [inaudible - 0:58:42.7] in the by-laws.

With the happy note of removing people. Well at least we have not said terminating people and that's one step I invite you all to finish this session and get some food before we reconvene this afternoon at 14:00 hours I believe. So why bon aperiitif to everyone and this session is now finished. Thank you very, very much for spending the time with us.

[End of Transcript]